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Abstract

The twelfth century was a time of rejuvenated interest in the Holy Spirit in western Christendom. Two German theologians, Rupert of Deutz and Anselm of Havelberg, in particular offered new interpretations of the Holy Spirit that have generally been neglected by previous scholarship. Both of them showed a unique interest in salvation history and the renewal of the Church as shaped by the work of the Holy Spirit. This thesis provides a detailed study of the both writers’ works, placing them in a wider historical and theological context.

Rupert of Deutz (ca 1075-1129), a Benedictine monk, provided a ground-breaking contribution to the theology of history in the twelfth century through an original conception of the role of the Holy Spirit in Church history. Through a close reading of Rupert’s *De operibus Spiritus sancti* (1113-1117), this thesis analyses Rupert’s innovative Trinitarian scheme of salvation history, based around the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. It is also argued that Rupert’s work on salvation history and the Holy Spirit reveals his original (though so far unnoticed) reflections on the changes of the contemporary Church. Anselm of Havelberg (ca 1095-1158), a regular canon, carried on the new direction of salvation history and interpretation of the Holy Spirit as the driving force of the Church as proposed by Rupert. However, in sharp contrast with Rupert, Anselm emphasized the ideas of diversity and development in his major work, *Anticimenon* (1149). In addition to examining Anselm’s interpretations of the seven seals in the *Apocalypse*, my work also illuminates how Anselm applied his original understanding of the Holy Spirit’s work within Church history to his debates with the Greeks in terms of *Filioque* and papal primacy.

The thesis closes with a comparison between Rupert and Anselm, in particular focusing on their respective ideas of the Holy Spirit, salvation history and the renewal of the Church. This research not only constitutes the first detailed study on Rupert and Anselm’s understandings of the Holy Spirit in a broad comparative perspective, but also sheds light on important intellectual, theological and ecclesiastical developments in the first half of the twelfth century.
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Introduction

The Spirit filled a boy who played upon a harp and made him a psalmist, a shepherd and herdsman who pruned sycamore trees and made him a prophet, a boy given to abstinence and made him a judge of mature men, a fisherman and made him a preacher, a persecutor and made him the teacher of Gentiles, a tax collector and made him an evangelist. What a skilful workman this spirit is! The Spirit’s very touch is teaching. It changes a human mind in a moment to enlighten it; suddenly what it was it no longer is, suddenly it is what it was not.

Gregory the Great 1

Creative historical thinking occurs only in times of crisis. When men find the standards of the past no longer valid, and when they are uncertain or fearful of the future, they turn to history… They seek to understand what has happened, while searching for an idea of what may happen. When they attempted to clarify the situation, as often happens in history, the clarification, interpretation and vindication of an old world was the way to a new reality.

Friedrich Heer 2

1. The Holy Spirit in the Early Twelfth Century

From the beginning of the Christian Church, the conception of the Holy Spirit played a vital role in the battles defining orthodox and heretical teachings. In the Patristic period and early Middle Ages, the Holy Spirit was discussed extensively in terms of its nature, Godhead and relation within the Trinity. After centuries of disputations on the varied aspects of the third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit was still more flexible and less defined than the conceptions of God the Father and God the Son. 3

1 Gregory the Great, Gregory the Great: Forty Gospel Homilies (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1990), translated by David Hurst, O.S.B., pp. 244-245.
3 There are numerous studies devoted to development of the conception of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament before the Church Fathers’ time: see for example, Henry Barclay Swete, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers (London: Macmillan and Co. 1912); Theodor Ruesch, Die Entstehung der Lehre vom Heiligen Geist bei Ignatius von Antiochia, Theophilus von Antiochia und Irenäus von Lyon (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1952); Helmut Opitz, Ursprünge frühkatholischer Pneumatologie: ein
For the Latin tradition, interpretations of the Holy Spirit are chiefly formulated by the writings of Augustine of Hippo, Jerome and Gregory the Great, while the Eastern Church owes their theological tradition mainly to the Cappadocian Fathers, in particular Gregory of Nazianzus. These heritages became the foundation of further explorations and led to the formation of distinct interpretations of the Holy Spirit.

Among historians of medieval culture, it is generally agreed that the early twelfth century was a period of profound transformation in the economic, political, institutional, religious and intellectual life of Europe. In this sense, “the Renaissance of the Twelfth Century” created a vivid atmosphere for intellectual life and advancement of theology, much of which contributed to the rejuvenated interest in the Holy Spirit. For example, the “Gregorian reform” and the great schism between the West and the East facilitated the relevant theological discussion on the authority of the Church and coincided with ecclesiological interpretation; the changing religious landscapes witnessed a special liturgical reform (such as devotion to the feasts of Pentecost and Trinity Sunday) and a renewed enthusiasm for the *vita apostolica*; and the revival of classical learning and advancement of theological development contributed to the tension between monastic theology and the rising scholasticism. Therefore, a detailed study of the conception of the Holy Spirit from the perspective of selected twelfth-century authors has the potential to offer us a better understanding of one of the most transformative periods in the Middle Ages.

2. A New Perspective: Salvation History and the Renewal of the Church

In this research, I will attempt to show the Holy Spirit’s crucial role in the writings of the twelfth century. I will focus on the works of Rupert of Deutz and Anselm of Havelberg, and especially on their emphasis of the Church as a whole and salvation history. In the twelfth century, there were two great shifts closely related with the conception of the Holy Spirit as reflected in Rupert’s and Anselm’s works. First of all, the renewal function of the Holy Spirit

---


This will be investigated in more detail in Chapter I. J. N. D. Kelly also suggests that in the development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the third century marked the divergent paths led by Augustine on the one hand and the Cappadocian Fathers on the other hand: see John Norman Davidson Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrine* (London: Adams & Charles Black, 1958), p. 136.
moved gradually from a focus on the perfection of individual Christians to one of renewal of the Church as a whole. Gerhart Ladner persuasively demonstrated that the conception of reform in the first centuries of Christian history chiefly concentrated on a personal process of purification, in which “individual Christians sought to renew themselves by emulating the asceticism and spiritual focus of the original Church”. However, from the middle of the eleventh century, the concept of the reform of the Church focused more on the Church as an institutional body and this idea prevailed in the twelfth century. In this sense, the twelfth-century conceptions of the Holy Spirit reflected dramatic changes in the religious landscape, the ecclesiastical structure and theological advancements.

The second shift relates to the idea of salvation history. Although the purely theological discussions on the Godhead or nature of the Holy Spirit continued in the twelfth century, the introduction of salvation history offered a brand new perspective for the conception of the Holy Spirit’s work within the Church. Thanks to the thriving awareness of history in the early twelfth century, the idea of salvation history greatly inspired theological investigation into the role of the Holy Spirit within the Church at this point. In other words, the work of the Holy Spirit was not only understood in terms of the Scriptures and the writings of the Church Fathers, but also in relation to the development of the Church in the unfolding of history. Indeed, it could be argued that many twelfth-century theologians shared visions of ages succeeding each other under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and progressively moving the Church forward.

It was, in particular, through Rupert and Anselm’s works that the Holy Spirit was given a pivotal role in the ongoing renewal of the Church and came to be regarded as the ultimate authority, protector and guide of the Church. To some extent, this approach could be seen as a continuation of an older, still thriving tradition of Geschichtstheologie. Consequently, understanding the changing interpretation of the Holy Spirit could help us to re-examine the theological, intellectual and ecclesiastical developments in the “renaissance of the twelfth century”.

---

6 See Chapter I for a more detailed treatment, pp. 35-37.
3. Literature Review and a Step Further

The unique devotion to the Holy Spirit in the twelfth century has been noted by previous scholarship, and so it would be unfair to say that there is no research on the Holy Spirit in the twelfth century or the Middle Ages in general. But the Holy Spirit, to some extent, seems to have been absent from most studies focusing on this period, despite its significance in the theology, ideology and spirituality of the time, and thus a comprehensive treatment is still required. Yves Congar suggests that the twelfth century is notable for its renewed interest in the idea of human society and of the brotherhood of man, and “this renewal was often linked with a strong devotion to the Holy Spirit”. Moreover, Giles Constable has observed that there was a growing interest in the idea of salvation history, especially the Trinitarian order and the particular position of the Holy Spirit. There are, however, still wide gaps in our understanding of this transformation which might be filled by more detailed research. Indeed, Bernard McGinn insightfully points out that the history of twelfth-century theology of the Holy Spirit “remains to be written”, and further argues that “this era was a particular vibrant one for pneumatology.” John Van Engen also suggests that the study of the shift in piety to the Holy Spirit is prerequisite to understanding later medieval millenarian movements, which indicates the wider significance of this research.

To the best of my knowledge, the earliest modern research on the Holy Spirit in the Middle Ages is Howard Watkin-Jones’s *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*. Watkin-Jones’s concentration on the Middle Ages represents a continuation of Henry Barclay Swete’s comprehensive treatment of doctrinal development of the Holy Spirit in the ancient Church. With regard to the twelfth century, Watkin-Jones focuses only on the flourishing period of

---

Scholasticism (which he defines as lasting from the end of the eleventh century to the close of the thirteenth century) and, overall, his contribution is rather superficial.\textsuperscript{13}

In the middle of the twentieth century, Yves Congar’s \textit{I Believe in the Holy Spirit} offers a comprehensive study of Catholic teaching on the Holy Spirit, which forms part of his interpretation of Church reform. Congar surveys the Scriptures and early Christian tradition on the Holy Spirit, investigating the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church and discussing the developments of this tradition in both West and East. Congar’s reflection of the role of the Holy Spirit in the development of the Church contributes many insightful thoughts on the development of the understanding of the Holy Spirit. However, his discussion of the Holy Spirit in the Middle Ages (especially the twelfth century) is constructed in a purely theological way and necessary historical background and individual theologians are absent.\textsuperscript{14} Stanley M. Burgess has also contributed a series of works concentrating on the Holy Spirit, with his third volume focusing on the Middle Ages and the Reformation.\textsuperscript{15} Although Burgess offers a broader and seemingly more systematic summary of the conception of the Holy Spirit, his work is quite general. Recently, Matthew Knell has offered a more academic and comprehensive treatment of the Holy Spirit in the twelfth century. Focusing on the immanent state of the Holy Spirit and the rising scholastic methodology, Knell divides theologians into three groups: those who reacted against the new methodology (William of St. Thierry and Bernard of Clairvaux), those who accepted but were not bound by its limitations (Peter Abelard and Peter Lombard) and those who “engaged in study in one of the early schools” (the Victorines and the Chartrains).\textsuperscript{16} However, historical contexts are entirely overlooked in this work, which reads more like a list of theologians’ views on the Holy Spirit in the twelfth century.

It is noteworthy that much research on the medieval conception of the Holy Spirit has mainly concentrated on the \textit{Filioque} debate. In recent years, the most important contribution on the procession of the Holy Spirit is that of A. Edward Siecienski’s \textit{The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy}. Siecienski attempts to excavate the intricacies of the \textit{Filioque} controversy from its beginning down to the present day; the sixth chapter is dedicated to the

\textsuperscript{13} Howard Watkin-Jones, \textit{The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church}, pp. 21-78.
eleventh to the thirteenth century. In spite of his insightful narrative, the attention paid to the twelfth-century theologians seems relatively inadequate. Since Siecienski’s focus is on the *Filioque*, many other aspects of the Holy Spirit are neglected, especially the role of the Holy Spirit in Church reform and salvation history.

Studies which have focused on salvation history and Church renewal in the early twelfth century also deserve special attention, since they are the key to comprehend the changing conception of the Holy Spirit. The rising awareness of history and particular interest in salvation history among twelfth-century writers have been noticed and discussed by previous scholars. In 1929, Alois Dempf published a highly influential, if controversial, evaluation of the group of “*der deutsche Sympolimus*”, which features an allegorical and symbolic methodology and ultimately “imperial” orientation. Most importantly, Dempf suggests that almost all of the writers in the group adopted “salvation-history” as the fundamental structure. Dempf’s work offers a very stimulating approach to the conception of the Holy Spirit in the twelfth century. Herbert Grundmann takes a similar view to Dempf, arguing that medieval historiography sought to grasp the *ratio temporum* in history, which is viewed as the divinely established order of time. However, both of them, neglected the specific and diverse historical contexts of the writers in the Middle Ages that essentially contributed to the formation of those thoughts. Indeed, Marie-Dominique Chenu has highlighted the “active awareness of human history” in the twelfth century, and even claims that “no century of medieval historical thought was as productive, as innovative as the twelfth century”.

Similar to Congar, Chenu grants a crucial role to the thinkers in the twelfth century in developing piety towards the Holy Spirit and hints at the potential relationship between salvation history and the Holy Spirit. As Chenu argues, those authors were not merely learned men but “men

---

19 According to Grundmann, historical personages and events were investigated by the twelfth century writers in a typological or allegorical way in accordance with the divine providence, which is eternally valid. This is the crucial statement given by Grundmann in his work. See Herbert Grundmann, *Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter: Gattungen-Epochen-Eigenart* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1978), p. 72.
living on the fringes of the main intellectual activities of their time” and men who were working out a theology firmly tied to the Scriptures, and in particular the historia, which means the evangelical awakening of the Church exhibiting over the course of history.21

Mainly influenced by Dempf and Chenu, current scholarship has created the term “reformist apocalypticism” and assigned it to Rupert of Deutz (ca. 1075-1129), Honorius Augustodunensis (1080-1051), Anselm of Havelberg (1095-1158), Gerhoh of Reichersberg (1093-1169), Joachim of Fiore (1135-1202) and many other authors in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. According to E. Randolph Daniel, the term “reformist apocalyptic” designates a person who applied the characteristic that was expected to occur at the end of history to reform of the Church. In this system, an unprecedented struggle against anti-Christian powers, and a crisis of turbulence and suffering that surpassed anything that had previously occurred, were to be indications of the imminent coming of a holier, purer Church, but not of the end of history.22 Brett Whalen also insightfully summarizes their characteristics as taking the Scriptures as their guide and scrutinizing the divinely ordained patterns of history with a heightened imagination. In many cases, they were not only searching for an understanding of the past, but also of the tumultuous changes of the present “along with the possibility of future changes.”23 However, it seems that this assumption requires further clarification through more detailed examination of their actual writings, personal experiences and broader historical contexts.

Based on previous scholarship, this thesis aims to offer a different perspective for the revaluation of the conception of the Holy Spirit in the twelfth century. It is my contention that the understanding of the ideas of salvation history and the renewal of the Church as a whole are the key issues. From a broad perspective, the proper order of Christendom requires the proper order of salvation history, which could be used to justify or rebuke the activities or novelties in the development of the Church. The proper order of the unfolding of history needs a proper authority, which is ultimately attributed to the Holy Spirit. In this sense, the Holy Spirit’s role in successive ages had been highlighted as the driving force of renewing and guiding the Church as a whole. It should be noted that the previous scholarship on the

understanding of the Holy Spirit during the twelfth century focused almost exclusively on purely theological or philosophical issues, without paying enough attention to the historical contexts and the audiences of individual authors. As a result, the theological works of Rupert and Anselm have thus far been treated as isolated from their intellectual environments and specific aims. This is partly due to the fact that some authors, especially Chenu and Congar, tried to reconstruct the historical debates in the twelfth century primarily in order to support their contemporary ideas of Christian philosophy and in particular their criticism of Neo-Scholasticism in the first half of the twentieth century. This tendency impeded a fuller and more historically accurate assessment of the Holy Spirit in the minds of twelfth-century authors, and it also failed to contextualize their authentic and original interpretation of the third person of the Trinity.  

Therefore, through the mixture of salvation history, renewal of the Church and the conception of the Holy Spirit, new light can be shed on the “paradigm shift” and theology of history in the twelfth century. This is the main goal of the current research. Moreover, in the twelfth-century theologians’ narratives of salvation history, numerous reflections on the current situation within the Church and their perceptions of the past are revealed. In this sense, the description of salvation history is also a pursuit for authority, even an ultimate authority, which will establish the proper order of Christendom.

Since there is no research focusing on the associations between the renewal of the Church, the idea of salvation history and the employment of the Holy Spirit in the early twelfth century, this work could offer a richer and more accurate presentation of how the Holy Spirit functioned in twelfth-century theology. Through the contextualization of Rupert and Anselm’s thoughts on the Holy Spirit, the renewal of the Church and salvation history, I will provide a new perspective from which to comprehend the shift in conceptualization of the Holy Spirit in the early twelfth century.

4. The Significance of Rupert of Deutz and Anselm of Havelberg

Many theologians in the late eleventh and the early twelfth century wrote about the Holy Spirit. However, many of them continued in the traditional teachings on the Holy Spirit as the Godhead of the third person of the Trinity and on its moral meanings with regard to the

---

24 This tendency is most obviously in Chenu’s treatment of Rupert. See M.-D. Chenu, “The Masters of the Theological ‘Science’”, pp. 270-309, esp. 270-272.
perfection of individual Christians. Furthermore, medieval theologians often found themselves on perilous ground in writing on the Trinity and no theme proved more dangerous than the nature and especially the earthly action of the third person of the Trinity - the Holy Spirit. The writers on the Holy Spirit had to struggle with the scriptural ambiguity and were at pains to distinguish the Spirit’s unique person and functions from those of the Father and the Son. The confusion surrounding the Holy Spirit resulted in numerous heresies in the history of Christianity and contributed directly to the schism between the East and the West in the middle of the eleventh century, which evidently justified the fear in engaging in interpretation of the Holy Spirit’s nature and role. The perceived danger was great enough to keep many medieval writers away, and this is further evidence of the significance of Rupert and Anselm’s thought and their unique approaches. However, as I suggested above, the key for comprehending the changing conception of the Holy Spirit is to understand how the work of the Holy Spirit connected with salvation history and the renewal of the Church as a whole. As Chenu demonstrates in his research, those people filled with sensitive awareness of salvation history were “closer to the evangelical awakening of the Church” than the masters who contained their dialectic within the schools. In other words, their thoughts were more engaged with the transformative world. In this case, Rupert of Deutz and Anselm of Havelberg could be regarded as the two most significant examples.

From many perspectives, Rupert of Deutz showed an early and peculiar devotion to the Holy Spirit (perhaps the earliest in the twelfth century) and should be regarded as the first Latin theologian of history to bring salvation history into his own period. Especially in his De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius, Rupert offered a ground-breaking contribution to the theology of history in the twelfth century. The extent of Rupert’s writings, since he was one of the most prolific writers in the Middle Ages, may impede deeper research into his thinking. However, we can observe some continuity in Rupert’s thoughts in his exegetical career. To some extent, Rupert’s other works on salvation history repeated, although in a more polished form in some cases, the thoughts expressed in his De Trinitate et operibus

25 For more detailed discussion of this point, see chapter I.
Anselm of Havelberg continued the new direction of salvation history and interpretation of the Holy Spirit as the guide and driving force of the Church which was established by Rupert. Although Anselm wrote much less than Rupert, he provided an original understanding of the gradual unfolding of the Trinity and presents his salvation history based on the seven seals in the Apocalypse. Anselm shared an “astonishing sensitivity to history” with Rupert, but the ideas of diversity and development played a much more significant role in Anselm’s theology of history and his conception of the Holy Spirit.

In Rupert and Anselm’s writings, the Holy Spirit, salvation history and the renewal of the Church were intentionally integrated. Both of them identify the Holy Spirit as the prime mover of the Church as a whole and pave the way for the coming of “the Age of the Holy Spirit”. They investigated the work of the Holy Spirit through the interpretation of the successive ages of the Church and in this way revealed the Holy Spirit’s role of guiding and renewing the Church in its entirety in the unfolding of salvation history. More significantly, they have different ideas on the renewal of the Church, which reflected their respective concerns on contemporary issues. It is precisely because they held different opinions on the ongoing movements of the Church, that their similar perspective, approach and particular devotions to the Holy Spirit are significant.

There is no doubt that previous works have noticed the importance of Rupert and Anselm in the intellectual history of the twelfth century and these works lay the solid foundation for my current research. For example, with regard to Rupert, Dempf highlights Rupert’s originality as a biblical interpreter and thinker preoccupied with salvation history, and names him the first great representative of “Deutscher Symbolismus”. John Van Engen’s *Rupert of Deutz* has been widely regarded as a classic study since its publication in 1983. In this masterpiece, Van Engen provides a comprehensive treatment of Rupert’s life and theological views. John Van Engen highly values Rupert’s investigation of the Holy Spirit and suggests that apart from polemics on the *filioque*, Rupert’s *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius* was in fact the first such separate treatment of the Holy Spirit in the West. This work represents an important early witness to a new form of piety singling out the Spirit’s work in Christian life,

---


29 Although there is, in fact, no solid evidence to show that Anselm was influenced by Rupert directly, which might indicate the general atmosphere of the devotion to the Holy Spirit in the twelfth century.


which is even comparable to the new cult of Christ’s humanity.\textsuperscript{32} Although Van Engen notices the originality of Rupert’s interpretation of the Holy Spirit, it is a pity that he did not develop it any further.\textsuperscript{33} Rupert’s strong historical awareness and idea of renewal of the Church were also noticed by Maria Lodovica Arduini.\textsuperscript{34} However, she does not provide an elaborate study on the role of the Holy Spirit in Rupert’s thinking but focuses more on mysticism and prophecy.\textsuperscript{35} Apart from the aforementioned works, there are some PhD dissertations that have dealt with Rupert’s individual commentaries.\textsuperscript{36} All of them addressed specific sections of Rupert’s theology but omitted the Holy Spirit and its connection with salvation history and the renewal of the Church.

On the whole, Anselm has received more attention than Rupert in modern scholarship, and this is mainly attributed to Anselm’s novel ideas on diversity and development of the Church over the course of history. However, Anselm’s most significant work \textit{Anticimenon} is generally treated separately, with most works focusing only on a single dimension of Anselm’s thoughts.\textsuperscript{37} On the one hand, many studies excessively concentrate on Anselm’s interpretation of the theology of history, the interpretation of the seven seals and the defence of novelty within the Church in Book I.\textsuperscript{38} On the other hand, other researches have focused only on the debates between Anselm and the Greek Archbishop Nicetas of Nicomedia.\textsuperscript{39} As a

\textsuperscript{32} John Van Engen, \textit{Rupert of Deutz}, p. 91. About the received interpretative tradition on the Holy Spirit in the Middle Ages, see Wilhelm Kamlah, \textit{Apokalypse und Geschichtstheologie: die mittelalterliche Auslegung der Apokalypse vor Joachim von Fiore} (Vaduz: Kraus Reprint, 1965), pp. 57-74; for a specific treatment of Rupert, see ibid., pp. 75-104.


\textsuperscript{36} The most important works include: Guntram Gerhard Boschoff, \textit{The Eucharistic Controversy between Rupert of Deutz and His Anonymous Adversary: Studies in the Theology and Chronology of Rupert of Deutz} (c. 1076-c. 1129) and His Earlier Literary Work (PhD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1965); Abigail Ann Young, \textit{The Commentaria in Iohannis Evangelium of Rupert of Deutz: A Methodological Analysis in the Field of Twelfth Century Exegesis} (PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 1983); Karl Fredrick Fabrizius, \textit{Rupert of Deutz on Matthew: A Study in Exegetical Method} (PhD dissertation, Marquette University, 1994).

\textsuperscript{37} PL 188, 1139-1248. An English translation is available in \textit{Anticimenon: On the Unity of the Faith and the Controversies with the Greeks}, translated by Ambrose Criste OPraem and Carol Neel (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2010).


result, the inner connection between Book I and the debates with the Greek theologian Nicetas of Nicomedia is neglected entirely, which impedes the appreciation of Anselm’s understanding of the Holy Spirit in the unfolding of salvation history. Jay Terry Lees offers the first modern book-length treatment of Anselm’s life and works, in which he tries to uncover Anselm’s deeds and thoughts in their historical context. Although Lees attempts to demonstrate the potential cohesiveness in Anselm’s work, his division of the three books into five parts inevitably undermines the connections he tries to establish. In particular, his treatment of the debates with the Greek is, entirely isolated from the Book I of Anticimenon.

Even though there have been important studies focusing on Anselm’s and Rupert’s works, none has fully addressed the concept of the Holy Spirit within the framework of salvation history, which itself gives both authors a particular place in twelfth-century theology. In the chapters that follow, I will argue that their special devotion to the Holy Spirit in relation to salvation history is the key to appreciating their unique position in the early twelfth century.

5. Outline of Chapters

In what follows, I will try to answer the following questions through the investigation of the lives and writings of Rupert and Anselm against a broader historical background: How and why was the discussion of the Holy Spirit rejuvenated in the twelfth century? Why were Rupert and Anselm attracted by the concept of the Holy Spirit? How did Rupert and Anselm demonstrate the Holy Spirit’s work within the framework of salvation history and what are their originalities? How did they express their concerns about the renewal of the Church from the perspective of theology of history? And finally, what can we learn about medieval thought, the renewal of the Church and Rupert and Anselm as forerunners of the theology of history in the twelfth century?

The first chapter will offer a concise summary of the development of the conception and the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church from the Biblical literature to the twelfth century. First of all, we can see how the role of the Holy Spirit moved from the perfection of
individuals to the sanctification of the Church as a whole. Gregory of Nazianzus, Augustine of Hippo and Gregory the Great will be taken as the main representatives of the Church Fathers, since their thoughts are most influential for Rupert and Anselm’s writings. Secondly, I will try to demonstrate why there was a rejuvenated interest in the Holy Spirit in the early twelfth century. This could be explained through the broader historical context and religious landscape: the schism between the West and the East in the middle of the eleventh century, the ongoing reform activities within the Church, liturgical developments (especially Pentecost and Trinity Sunday), the decline of monastic theology and rise of scholasticism, and most significantly, the redefinition of the vita apostolica, all of which contributed to the revival of devotion to the Holy Spirit.

In order to contextualize Rupert’s thoughts, the second chapter is devoted to the life of Rupert of Deutz. In this chapter, I will try to answer the question of why Rupert was driven towards devotion to the Holy Spirit. I will argue that Rupert’s mystical visions before his final ordination as a priest are at the root of his enthusiasm for the Holy Spirit and his life-long exegetical career. Indeed, it appears that, all through his life, Rupert was confident that he was inspired by the Holy Spirit and that he could uncover the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church. In addition, his theology of history was, to some extent, formed by his furious debates with the school masters and elaborated in his De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius. In the last section, I will offer a re-examination of Rupert’s position and image in the twelfth century and modern scholarship in order to correct the widely-accepted misconception that labels him as “conservative”, and will highlight Rupert’s originality in his theology of history and pneumatology.

The third chapter will move to a detailed analysis of Rupert’s originality, concentrating on his Trinitarian order of salvation history and his unique employment of the seven gifts. I will argue that Rupert intentionally established his theology on the foundation of salvation history and conception of the work of the Holy Spirit even in his earliest mature work De divinis officiis. In his De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius (especially the third part, De operibus Spiritus sancti), Rupert offers a complete structure of theology of history and brings salvation history down to his own time. Through a detailed reading and analysis of Rupert’s writings, I will offer the first detailed picture of his thinking on salvation history. Especially in his division of post-Christ history, Rupert goes beyond the framework established by Augustine; this might be seen as his most significant contribution. In the discussions of the ages of “gifts
of knowledge and piety”, Rupert presents his worries on the novelties in his own time and also predicts the future. Through the revaluation of the seven liberal arts, Rupert opposes the rising school masters and their methodology, and argues that only the true understanding of revelation could lead to the final salvation. In his prediction of the future, Rupert proposes that the confessional monk will be the leader of the Church in overcoming the persecutions. By flagging up Rupert’s creativeness in his theological investigation, I would like to correct the misunderstanding that Rupert “ignored the present entirely”. Rupert’s bold Trinitarian order, viewing the history as successive ages of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and his new ideas about the Holy Spirit in history made a clear imprint on German monastic theology and apocalyptic thought, especially on Gerhoh of Reichersberg, Honorius Augustodunensis and even Joachim of Fiore. Indeed, it is in Rupert’s work that we see, for the first time in the twelfth century, the Holy Spirit being approached through salvation history and the renewal of the Church. In this sense, Rupert indeed created the new way of theology of history in the twelfth century.

The fourth chapter will move to Anselm of Havelberg. First of all, a brief summary of Anselm’s life will emphasize his position as a disciple of Norbert, as an active defender of the canons regular and as an operative participator in royal and ecclesiastical service. All of these factors laid the foundation for his unique spirituality. I will argue that his visit to Constantinople and debates with the Greeks stimulated his devotion to the Holy Spirit, and his banishment in Havelberg animated his ideas of diversity and development. Secondly, I will present Anselm’s overlapping historical schemes which are offered in the first volume of his Anticimenon. Implicitly based on the Trinitarian order articulated by Gregory of Nazianzus, Anselm elaborates his conception of the Holy Spirit as the driving force of the renewal of the Church. Through an original interpretation of the opening of the seven seals, Anselm offers an accurate historical narrative of the work of the Holy Spirit in salvation history. Therefore, I argue that for Anselm the novelties within the Church were precisely the signs of guidance by the Holy Spirit and that these developments contributed to the renewal of the Church.

Based on the framework and ideas established in the fourth chapter, the fifth chapter moves to Anselm’s debates with the Greek Archbishop Nicetas of Nicomedia. The two debates, in fact, chiefly focus on the procession of the Holy Spirit and the Eucharist and Roman primacy. In contrast to previous scholarship, I attempt to demonstrate that Anselm’s
defence of the Latin Church can only be understood through his conception of the Holy Spirit and his idea of diversity and development. To be more specific, Anselm tried to argue that the *Filioque*, the Latin rite for Eucharist and Roman primacy were all works of renewal undertaken by the Holy Spirit within the Church. In this way, the two parts of Anselm’s work can be united by the combination of the Holy Spirit, salvation history and the renewal of the Church, and Anselm’s unique theology of history and its significance can be appreciated. Ultimately, I would suggest that Anselm was the first to use a progressive theology of history and employ the continuous work of the Holy Spirit within the Church to address the Great Schism, and that his approach offers a new perspective to review the confrontation between the East and the West.
Chapter I. The Holy Spirit from Biblical Times to the Twelfth Century

(Faith) is received from the Church and kept by us; it always makes us young again and, under the influence of the Spirit, like a costly drink contained in a precious vase, even renews the vase that holds it. The Church is entrusted with this gift of God, just as God entrusted breath to the flesh that he fashioned so that all members receive life from it. In this gift the intimacy of the gift of Christ, that is to say, the Holy Spirit, is contained. God established in the Church the apostles, the prophets, the doctors and all the other effects of the working of the Spirit in which those who do not run to the ecclesia do not share.

St. Irenaeus (130-202) 42

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit developed gradually on the foundations of the Scriptures, along with Church liturgy, contemplation and missions. It was influenced by the ideas of different theologians and authors who themselves faced varied social, political and ecclesiastical environments and experiences which also shaped their thought. It was also affected by the great revival of learning and advancement in twelfth-century intellectual history, as authors turned to the ideas of their predecessors and contributed their own thoughts and interpretations.

In this chapter, I will sketch the development of the interpretations of the Holy Spirit until the early twelfth century. This overview will offer a broad picture of the gradual formation of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, from the Scriptures and the Church Fathers to the twelfth-century Renaissance.

It is only possible here, however, to provide a selective narrative of these developments. Given the fact that Rupert of Deutz and Anselm of Havelberg are the main subjects of this thesis, it seems appropriate to consider Gregory of Nazianzus (329-390), Augustine of Hippo (354-430) and Gregory the Great (c. 540-604) as the representatives of the Church Fathers, as they are the most closely related to the thoughts of these two twelfth-century German theologians. It seems that, between the work of the Church Fathers and that of the twelfth-

century Renaissance, there was little development in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. I would like to address the apparent revival of devotion to the Holy Spirit in the high medieval period which might be explained by various factors, including the great schism in 1054, the continuous development of the liturgy and, perhaps the most influential reason, the rise of a new understanding of the *vita apostolica* and the ongoing Church reform.

I will argue that the role of the Holy Spirit was gradually transformed from one relating to “perfection of individuals” to one of “renewal of the Church”. This change was deeply connected to the reform ideology in the twelfth century. The introduction of salvation history in an understanding of the Holy Spirit is especially significant, since it provides a different approach and perspective to view the historical developments of the Church. This novel perspective closely intersected with the active historical awareness in the twelfth century. We can thus obtain a deeper understanding of twelfth-century pneumatology and its relations to the broader themes of the renewal of the Church, theological disputes and the Church reunion.

1. Biblical Literature

The Scriptures do not offer a systematic outline of the definitions and works of the Holy Spirit, as they only depict its roles, features and functions through varied symbols and stories. This characteristic makes the biblical pneumatology a kind of “living” doctrine rather than a schematized dogma, which left space for further disputes.

The conception of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament is, according to the Christian tradition, generally catalogued into three groups. First of all, the Hebrew word *ríah* is used to denote wind or a breath of air. Secondly, it describes the force to vivify man. Finally and most importantly, this word indicates the life of God himself, through which God causes actions both at the physical and spiritual level. It should be noted that in the Old Testament, the Holy Spirit’s power of sanctification is not strongly emphasized, and there is a lack of

---


sense of an inner principle of perfection in life. This principle of sanctification became the main articulation in the New Testament and the core concern of the compositions of the Church Fathers.

However, from the Old Testament, we have already seen that the Spirit (breath) is the fundamental impetus for man to act according to the instructions from God and, in this sense, God’s plan of salvation would be fulfilled in the history of human beings. To be specific, “the Spirit of Lord” became increasingly significant in the time of Heroes, Judges and Prophets, and the wisdom literature offered more remarkable reflection on the Holy Spirit. Especially in the Wisdom, we can observe a trend of personalizing the Holy Spirit. The most important advancement is that the Holy Spirit is represented by subtlety and purity. The Holy Spirit could enter everything and everyone and be the principle of life, newness and action. Another crucial element is the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit written in Isaiah 11:2-3. This seems to have been one of the most attractive themes for Christian theologians, as a number of them developed elaborated interpretations based on the seven gifts.

In the New Testament, a more comprehensive pneumatology is established through the Gospels and the writings of the Apostles, in particular in St Paul’s epistles and Johannine literature. According to the narratives of the New Testament, the Holy Spirit accompanied Jesus from the Incarnation to the Resurrection and was regarded as the witness and participator of Redemption. The most important and dramatic scene relating to the Holy Spirit is that of the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan River. When Jesus was baptized, “the Holy Spirit descended upon him in bodily form, as a dove” (cf. Lk 3:22). According to the Gospel, Jesus not only went to the wilderness “led by the Spirit” but also “full of the Holy Spirit”. Most importantly, he undertook his mission “in the power of the Holy Spirit” (Lk 4:1, 14). In other words, the pneumatology contained in the Gospel is inherited from the Old Testament.

---

45 See for example, Ex 31:3ff, Deut 31:3-34:9, Num 5:14, 10:4-10, 24:2, I Sam 16:14, 18:10, 19:20-24.
46 See for example, Judges 3:10, 6:34, 11:29, 13:25-14:19. The prophetic books are particularly vivid in their discussion of the Holy Spirit’s role in the course of salvation and revelation.
48 “The Spirit of the Lord will rest on Him, The spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and strength, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord. And He will delight in the fear of the Lord, And He will not judge by what His eyes see, nor make a decision by what His ears hear.” In the Middle Ages, the seven gifts were widely summarized as: sapientia, intellectus, consilium, fortitude, scientia, pietas, timor Domini.
50 Besides the dove, the image of the Holy Spirit is also widely represented as tongues of fire or the finger of God, a luminous cloud or a ray. In very rare situations, the Holy Spirit is also depicted in various human forms.
Testament, which conceived the Holy Spirit as the divine action. The Acts of Apostles professes that the same Spirit who brought Jesus to life in the womb of Mary also brings the life of Church into the world; the appearance of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost is therefore recognized as the birth of the Church. 51 It should be noted that the rise of the feast of Pentecost was also one reason for the rise in devotion to the Holy Spirit in the twelfth century.

If the synoptic Gospels offered a Christology-centred pneumatology to show the divinity of Jesus and the Acts of Apostles established the communion between the Church and the Holy Spirit, Paul’s epistles are more concerned with the internal experience of individual Christians. Paul’s emphasis on the renewal of individual believers also dominated the later interpretations of the Church Fathers. 52 For instance, in the first letter to the Corinthians, Paul says the Christian should be transformed by “a life-giving Spirit” (1 Cor 15:45). With a strong eschatological viewpoint, Paul emphasizes that in the final resurrection, the Holy Spirit will bring full “spiritualization” to the believers and in this way will involve the whole universe in the salvation. 53 Another significant contribution of Paul’s is the idea of diversity. He argues that everyone will be “having gifts that differ according to the grace given to us” (Rom 5:16). Paul greatly developed the theory of the varied gifts of the Holy Spirit and this was used in the twelfth century to testify the legitimacy of innovative religious life and to develop further the interpretation of the Holy Spirit.

The Gospel of John is another crucial reference for the exegesis of Church Fathers and medieval theologians, in particular the concepts of “Spirit of Truth”, “the Giver of life”, “Comforter” and “Paraclete”. 54 According to John 14: 26: “The Counsellor, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you all things and will remind you of everything I have said to you”. One of the activities most explicitly attributed to the Holy Spirit is that of doing the work of God in the sphere of faith and knowledge. In the Gospel of

53 Cf. 1 Thess 1:5-6, 1 Cor 2:4-5:13, 12: 3-13, 15:43-44, Rom 8:20-23.
54 John 6:63: “The Spirit gives life; the flesh counts for nothing. The words I have spoken to you are spirit and they are life.” John 4:23-24: “Yet a time is coming and has now come when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth, for they are the kind of worshipers the Father seeks. God is spirit, and his worshipers must worship in spirit and in truth.” See also Leo D. Davis, The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1983), pp. 81-133; Gary M. Burge, The Anointed Community: the Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition (Grand Rapids: Emedmans, 1987), pp. 14-21.
John, the interactive relationship between the three persons of the Trinity became more obvious. As Jesus announced:

> When the Paraclete comes, the Spirit of truth who comes from the Father – and whom I myself will send from the Father – he will bear witness on my behalf. You must bear witness as well, for you have been with me from the beginning… He [the Spirit] will guide you into all the truth; for he will not speak on his own authority, but whatever he hears he will speak, and he will declare to you the things that are to come. He will glorify me, for he will take what is mine and declare it to you.\(^{55}\)

This important passage, perhaps the most referenced quotation in discussions of the Holy Spirit in the history of Christianity, proclaims that the Paraclete will accompany the disciples and the whole Church on their journey to the last judgment and, most importantly, will guide them in the fullness of truth. In this way, the fourth Gospel offered a remarkably coherent teaching on the Holy Spirit which inspired many great theologians in the classical period to investigate the Trinitarian relationship.\(^{56}\)

In sum, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures was greatly developed from the Old Testament to the New Testament. The Spirit of God was not only the action through which God reveals himself and animates life, but was also the teacher of disciples who renewed believers and guided the Church. Indeed, as Yves Congar suggests, from the very beginning of Christianity, “the Spirit is regarded as responsible for sanctification, inhabitation and intimacy”.\(^{57}\) It was conceivable that, even though the Holy Spirit would not bring new revelation, it could deepen the understanding of the revelation through the inspiration of individual Christians and the Church as a whole. This would make the constant renewal of the Church possible, and therefore laid the foundation for the later theological advancements.

2. Church Fathers: *Revelatio et inspiratio: deus cuius inspiratione ecclesia eius instruitur*

Long before the Holy Spirit was a theme of doctrinal debate, the existence of the Paraclete was known to the Christian community. The apostles and early Christians viewed themselves as the instruments used to fulfil the plan of God and as “filled with the assurance of the Holy

---

\(^{55}\) *John* 16:13-14.


Spirit”. The believers regarded their lives as guided directly by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. To some extent, this belief was reawakened in the twelfth century with the emergence of the new form of Christian mysticism which enhanced the authority of the Holy Spirit in the renewal of the Church.

As a matter of fact, the issue of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son did not receive much attention in the pre-Arian age; the Godhead of the Holy Spirit continued unexplored with few exceptions.58 The disputes and ambiguities of the Holy Spirit, however, provoked great schisms in the early Church. During the battles with Arianism and Montanism, there arose a pressing need for a systematic and authoritative interpretation of the nature of the Holy Spirit.59 Irenaeus (130-202), Tertullian (160-220), Origen (184/185-235/235) and many other leading theologians who were involved in the confrontations gradually established a new uniform pneumatology. To some extent, it is fair to say that the doctrines of the Church were established in these battles with heresies. In other words, the struggles facilitated the progress, consolidation and refinement of orthodox conceptions.60 Once the Christological questions had been settled, the Church was ready to focus on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.61

The Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed (381) officially proclaimed that the Holy Spirit is “the Lord and life-giver, proceeding from the Father, object of the same worship and the same glory with the Father and the Son”. In the following year, in the letter sent to Pope Damasus, the descriptions of “one substance, the uncreated Trinity, consubstantial and


60 This mode of historical advancement was summarized by Anselm of Havelberg in his narrative of the seven stages of the Church history as the battle-victory pattern. See chapter IV. For more detailed research on the varied interpretations of the Holy Spirit, see John R. Levison, “The Pluriform Foundation of Christian Pneumatology”, in Bradford E. Hinze and D. Lyle Dabney eds., Advents of the Holy Spirit: An Introduction to the Current Study of Pneumatology, pp. 66-85.

“eternal” were added to the canons, and the Pope convoked a synod in Rome in 382 which expressed the exact same faith formulation.\textsuperscript{62} In this way, the fundamental and orthodox understanding of the Holy Spirit was established.

2.1 Gregory of Nazianzus: Gradual Revelation of the Holy Spirit

The theological discussions of the fourth century are decisive in the construction of doctrinal pneumatology. In many cases, the Greek theologians acted as forerunners to this development. Athanasius of Alexandria (295-373)’s \emph{Letters to Serapion} and Basil of Caesarea (330-379)’s \emph{On the Holy Spirit} paved the way for the investigation of the Holy Spirit and remained the authoritative references throughout the Byzantine period.\textsuperscript{63} It is noteworthy that negative theology played a greater role in the Eastern Church than the Western Church. Basil states that “it is impossible to give a precise definition of the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit and we must simply resist errors concerning Him which come from various sides”.\textsuperscript{64} Notwithstanding this, Gregory of Nazianzus distinguished himself among the late-fourth-century fathers for his clear and systematic teaching on the divinity of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{65}

On the other hand, Gregory of Nazianzus also influenced the Latin tradition of pneumatology. Through Rufinus’ Latin translation around the late 390s, nine homilies of the Greek Father became available to Western readers, and many Western theologians were greatly influenced by Gregory of Nazianzus.\textsuperscript{66} For example, the direct influence of \emph{Oration 2} on Pope Gregory the Great’s \emph{Pastoral Rule} has already been noted by Christopher A. Beeley. Beeley argues that Gregory of Nazianzus can claim to have had a major impact on Jerome

\textsuperscript{62} It is noteworthy that the Creed authorized by Pope Damasus clearly expressed the doctrine of \emph{Filique}, saying that “the Holy Spirit is not only the Spirit of the Father, or not only the Spirit of the Son, but the Spirit of the Father and the Son”. However, some scholars suggest that the \emph{Decretum Gelasianum (Explanatio fidei)} is not the original product of the Roman Synod of 382 due to the Trinitarian language used within the text which reflected Augustine’s influence and thoughts, especially the Carolingian general usage of the biblical references. See Bernd Oberdorfer, \emph{Filioque: Geschichte und Theologie eines ökumenischen Problems} (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2001), p. 132.

\textsuperscript{63} For a brief introduction to the Holy Spirit from the Byzantine perspective, see John Meyendorff, \emph{Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes} (New York: Fordham University Press, 1974), pp. 168-179.

\textsuperscript{64} \textit{Cat.} 16; PG 33: 932c. Quoted from John Meyendorff, \emph{Byzantine Theology}, p. 168.

\textsuperscript{65} Swete, \emph{The Holy Spirit and the Ancient Church}, pp. 245-246.

\textsuperscript{66} The translations include orations 2, 6, 16, 17, 41, 26, 27, 38 and 39. See Rufinus of Aquileia, Augustus Engelbrecht ed., \emph{Orationum Gregorii Nazianzeni novem interpretation}, CSEL 46 (Vindobonae: F. Tempsky; Lipsiae: G. Freytag, 1910).
and Gregory the Great, and possibly Ambrose and Augustine, especially as regards their teachings on the Trinity.⁶⁷

Gregory is possibly the earliest theologian to use the word “procession” in the description of the relationship between the Spirit and the Godhead. In Oration 34 (not included in Rufinus’ translation), Gregory writes:

> The Holy Spirit is truly Spirit, coming forth from the Father indeed, but not after the manner of the Son, for it is not by Generation but by Procession (since I must coin a word for the sake of clearness); for neither did the Father cease to be Unbegotten because of His begetting something, nor the Son to be begotten because He is of the Unbegotten, nor is the Spirit changed into Father or Son because He proceeds, or because He is God.⁶⁸

As Gregory himself professes, his theological position is chiefly in opposition to “those who fight against the Spirit”, and deny the full divinity of the Holy Spirit despite admitting the divinity of the Son. In his first episcopal orations in Nazianzus, he paid special attention to the Holy Spirit which itself indicates his belief in the importance of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.⁶⁹ In other words, although the Eunomians and Pneumatomachians were right to point out that the deity of the Spirit is absent from the literal text of the Scriptures, Gregory tried to argue that the Scriptures did not contain everything that God intended to reveal to the Church and the believers. Instead, he believes that the Holy Spirit, as the teacher and Paraclete, would renew the revelations to the Church over the course of history.

This idea of development of the revelation is most clearly expressed in his Oration 31. Gregory of Nazianzus explicitly declares the progression of revelation in the course of salvation history through a deeper and fuller understanding of the Holy Spirit:

> The old covenant made clear proclamation of the Father, a less definite one of the Son. The new (covenant) made the Son manifest and gave us a glimpse of the Spirit’s Godhead. At the present time the Spirit resides amongst us, giving us a clearer manifestation of Himself than before.⁷⁰

---

⁶⁹ Gregory’s special attention to the Holy Spirit was possibly also related to his devoted reading of Origen.
This is quite a startling statement on many levels. Frederick W. Norris argues that although Gregory often condemns his opponents as innovators, “this daring claim is itself an innovation.” 71  Gregory does not call the revelation of the Holy Spirit the third covenant, but does state that the process will be “in gradual states proportionate to their capacity to receive him”. 72  It is indeed the case that nothing similar had been taught specifically in the Scriptures and other Church Fathers’ works, and that this statement had a pervasive influence on the history of Christian theology.

Gregory develops his statement of the Holy Spirit’s self-revelation and associates this process with the three stages of the dwelling with the disciples. This is also an example of his idea of gradual revelation. In the first stage, the Holy Spirit works in the disciples and enables them to heal the sick and cast out evil. The second stage is when the resurrected Jesus breathes the Spirit into the disciples as divine inspiration. The Pentecost is the third stage, when the Holy Spirit appears in fiery tongues and descends onto the disciples. Through these three events, Gregory interpreted the gradual revelation of the Holy Spirit and the importance of Pentecost in the life of the Church:

The first instance manifested the Spirit indistinctly, and the second more distinctly; but this present occasion [i.e. Pentecost] did so more perfectly, since the Holy Spirit is no longer present only in energy as before, but in its very being, so to speak, associating with us and dwelling among us. For it was fitting that as the Son had lived among us in bodily form, so too the Spirit should appear in bodily form; and that after Christ had returned to his own place, it should have come down to us.” 73

In sum, Gregory of Nazianzus indeed laid a solid foundation for a deeper exploration and understanding of the Holy Spirit and many of his ideas, especially gradual progression, found echoes in the twelfth century.

However, in the early centuries of the Christian Church, the Latin West adopted a very different approach. Théodore de Régnon argues that “Latin philosophy considers the nature

71 Frederick W. Norris, Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning, p. 58.
72 Ibid, pp. 206-207. It is arguable that this idea could also apply to the belief that the fullest revelation of the Holy Spirit will be obtained outside the Scriptures. In this sense, the best way to gain a fuller understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit is to see His works in Church history, which indicates salvation history. In this sense, both Rupert and Anselm could be viewed as spiritual heirs of Gregory of Nazianzus.
73 Theological Orations, 41. 11. Quoted from Christopher A. Beeley, Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God: In Your Light We Shall See Light, p. 172. As John Meyendorff concludes, “the mystery of Pentecost is not an incarnation of the Spirit, but the bestowing of these gifts. The Spirit does not reveal His person, as the Son did in Jesus, and does not en-hypostasize human nature as a whole; he communicates His uncreated grace to each human person, to each member of the Body of Christ.” See John Meyendorff, Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes, p. 173.
in itself first and proceeds to the agent; Greek philosophy considers the agent first and passed through it to find the nature. The Latins think of personality as a mode of nature; the Greeks thinks of nature as the content of the person”.

This turning point, in many cases, should be attributed to Augustine and was the basis on which the breach between the East and West became wider and deeper in the following centuries.

2.2 Augustine of Hippo: *in Spiritu Sancto, quo in unum Dei populus congregatur*

When Augustine was only a simple priest, he developed a special interest in the Holy Spirit and noted the lack of preceding discussion of its nature. Augustine claims in the *De fide et symbolo*:

> Now with the Father and the Son, learned and spiritual men have dealt in many books in which they have tried to make us know...But the learned and great commentators of divine Scriptures have not yet dealt so extensively and diligently with the Holy Spirit and Its distinctive character.  

Augustine’s life-long theological investigation displays his intensive interest in the theology of the Holy Spirit. Augustine’s *De Trinitate* represents a particularly pregnant moment in the formulation of Trinitarian doctrine. With the freshly-established doctrine of the Holy Spirit, Augustine develops his own theology of the Holy Spirit during the battle with the heresies. Moreover, he moves to a deeper intellectual reflection in order to work out an agreement between the unity of the Trinity and their distinguishing diversity.

The most influential contribution to pneumatology made by Augustine is the pattern of “mutual love”, which is widely accepted by most medieval theologians and acts as a foundation for the Latin teaching on the Holy Spirit’s nature. Augustine employs terms such as “amor”, “voluntas” and especially “invicem” to describe the connections between the three Persons of Trinity. The most explicit articulation can be observed in *De Trinitate*:

---


where he is the unity of the other two Persons or their holiness or their love [charitas], where he is their unity because he is their love, and their love because he is their holiness, it is clear that he is not one of the two [other Persons]… The Holy Spirit is therefore something that is common to the Father and the Son, whatever he is. This communion, however, is both consubstantial and coeternal. If the term “friendship” is suitable, then let us use it, but it would be more exact to speak of ‘charity’… they are therefore no more than three: the one loving him who has his being from him, the other loving him from whom he has his being, and that love itself. And if that love is nothing, how can God be Love? And if he is not substance, how can God be substance?77

We can see that the Johannine literature plays a crucial role in Augustine’s conception of the Holy Spirit and the theme of “mutual love” also contains the potential expression of “Filioque”. According to Augustine, the Holy Spirit is the most proper bearer of charity (the love of God), and the divine mystery of the Trinity could only be understood in this interactive relationship. As he states: “the Holy Spirit is a kind of inexpressible communion or fellowship of Father and Son (Ergo spiritus sanctus ineffabilis quaedam patris filioque communio).”78

Augustine also develops the relationship between pneumatology and ecclesiology, where he argues that the Holy Spirit plays the crucial role for the remission of sins. It is through the sanctification of the Holy Spirit that the people of God are gathered together in unity. The remission of sins could only be given to the Church which has the Holy Spirit.79 Augustine sees the Holy Spirit as having a distinctive role as the agent of visible change and individual renewal in both the preachers and the listeners. In other words, according to Augustine, the role of the Holy Spirit is chiefly manifested in individuals, and with the power of the Holy Spirit, frigid hearts, locked lips and fear of speaking the truth will be transformed.80

77 De Trinitate, VI.5-7.
78 De Trinitate, V.9; XV.17. See also Lewis Ayres, Augustine and the Trinity (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 261-263. As a matter of fact, Augustine is not so reticent about the “double procession” of the Holy Spirit in his early work. For example, Augustine writes in De Fide et Symbolo: “the Holy Spirit is not begotten, as they assert of the Son, from the Father, for Christ is the only-begotten Son, nor is he begotten from the Son, the grandson, as it were of the almighty Father… The Holy Spirit owes his existence to the Father, from whom everything comes, lest we should find ourselves postulating two principles of origin without an origin, an assertion that would be totally false, utterly absurd, and contrary to the Catholic faith.” See Augustine of Hippo, The Works of St. Augustine: A translation for the 21st Century (Brooklyn, N. Y.: New City Press, 2005), edited and translated by Boniface Ramsey, pp. 168-169. This argument precisely reoccurred in the debates between Anselm and Nicetas. See chapter V.
79 This idea can be seen in Sermon 71, 12, 18; 12, 19 and 17, 28; 20, 33 (PL 38, 454-459; 463-464.) As a matter of fact, this image had been highlighted by Rupert of Deutz in his Commentary on the Gospel of John, for which see chapter III.
80 Augustine of Hippo, On the Gospel of John, XCII.2; PL 35, 1863; De cathechizandis rudibus, II.3; PL 40, 311. Based on Augustine’s interpretation, Congar developed two levels for the Church. The first is the communio sacramentorum, which is the work of Christ; the second is the societas sanctorum, which is the work
In general, Augustine’s interpretation of the Holy Spirit paved the way for further disputes with the Eastern teaching on the Holy Spirit. His emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit as the love between the Father and the Son, the relationship between his pneumatology and ecclesiology, and the renewal function of the Holy Spirit for individual Christians also dominated the Western Church for centuries. Indeed, in the writings of Rupert and Anselm, we can still sense the power of Augustine, even as they started to concentrate more on the function of the Holy Spirit in the renewal of the Church as a whole.81

2.3 Gregory the Great: *Let us love this Life-giving Spirit!*

Besides Augustine, Gregory the Great also made a great theological contribution in the transition from the ancient world to the Middle Ages.82 Although some scholars argue that Gregory the Great was not strictly a theologian, but rather the first medieval pope, it is hard to neglect his contribution of transmitting Patristic theology to the Middle Ages. As Thomas L. Humphries observes, Gregory the Great’s homilies and commentaries provide “an ascetic pneumatology that supplements Cassian’s system with Augustinian insights”.83 Gregory the Great’s *The Moralia in Job*, which also displays his moral approach to pneumatology, had a great influence on monastic theology throughout the whole of the Middle Ages.

Gregory the Great’s special piety towards the Holy Spirit can be traced back to his personal experience. John the Deacon writes that Gregory experienced the Holy Spirit speaking to him in the form of a dove.84 Paul the Deacon also calls the Pope “a vessel of the

---

81 About this change, see also the Introduction’s section of the changing idea of reform. As a matter of fact, Rupert takes Augustine as his example of an exegete and was influenced by Augustine’s idea of salvation history. On the other hand, Anselm mainly receives Augustine’s demonstration of *Filioque* and applies them to his debate with Nicetas of Nicomedia. See chapters II, III and V.


83 Thomas L. Humphries, Jr, *Asctic Pneumatology from John Cassian to Gregory the Great* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 156. Mews and Renkin also share a similar view, saying that “although Augustine had introduced a new awareness of human frailty and continuing dependence on divine grace, Gregory combined Stoicism with an ascetic tradition shaped by Ambrose and Origen, which emphasized how prayers, penance, and intercession of the righteous could help bridge the gulf between man and God”. See Mews and Renkin, “The Legacy of Gregory the Great in the Latin West”, p. 318.

84 John the Deacon, *Vita S. Gregorii Magni*; PL 75, 221D-222A.
Holy Spirit dwelling” (\textit{vas electionis et habitaculum sancti Spiritus}) as the third Person of the Trinity directly inspired Gregory’s writing on Ezekiel.\textsuperscript{85}

In the teachings of Gregory the Great, the Holy Spirit is first regarded as the reformer of desires and affections and also the reformer of thoughts. Secondly, the Holy Spirit forms the virtues of Christians and guides them in the process of reading the Scriptures. Last but not least, the Holy Spirit is also the giver of ecstatic contemplation, through which humans will obtain a clearer understanding of the divine revelation. More importantly, Gregory expands the role of giver of virtues to that of giver of gifts.\textsuperscript{86} Gregory expresses that the best example of the gifts of the Holy Spirit can be seen in Jesus Christ, who is “full of the spirit of sevenfold grace”.\textsuperscript{87} Gregory is certain that the Holy Spirit both creates and renews humans and that this renewal brings the freedom of the Spirit which works within humans. It is obvious that Gregory’s conception of the Holy Spirit also focuses more on individual perfection.

Another important part of Gregory’s pneumatology is the tendency towards moral theology and his theory that the gifts of the Holy Spirit represent steps on a ladder which could be ascended. Gregory views the gifts of the Spirit as an armour against evils. He contends that the Christian should first climb the step of the fear of the Lord, then that of knowledge and piety, and proceed up the ladder to the heights of wisdom and understanding.\textsuperscript{88} As a consequence, Gregory the Great underscores the significance and order of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, which came to be of central importance to medieval exegetical tradition.\textsuperscript{89}

The most complete articulation of Gregory the Great’s teaching on the seven gifts is in his \textit{Moralia}, a standard and longstanding textbook for monastic education. Gregory’s connection of the seven gifts and three cardinal virtues with the seven sons and three daughters of Job influenced generations of theologians from the Middle Ages until the present day:

\textsuperscript{85} Paul the Deacon, \textit{Vita S. Gregorii Magni}, XXVIII; PL 75, 57D-58B.
\textsuperscript{86} As Humphries argues: “Gregory does separate the theological virtues (faith, hope and love) from the cardinal virtues (justice, temperance, fortitude, and prudence), and he separates all virtues from the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit... when considered specifically, the different categories of the seven virtues and the seven gifts of the Spirit are not themselves interchangeable.” See Thomas L. Humphries, Jr, \textit{Ascetic Pneumatology from John Cassian to Gregory the Great}, pp. 157-177; the quotation is from p. 165.
\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Moralia}, XXXV, 15-18. “The number seven is perfect because every good work is performed with seven virtues through the Spirit in order that both faith and works may be perfected at the same time.” Gregory the Great, \textit{Morals on the Book of Job, Volume Three} (Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1845), translated by James Bliss, pp. 8-9.
\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Homiliae in Hierochilem prophetam} 2, Homily 7.7 (CCSL 142), p. 320.
For there are seven sons born for us, when the seven virtues of the Holy Spirit spring up in us through the conception of good thoughts. Thus the prophet enumerates this inner offspring, when the Spirit makes his mind fertile… thus, when wisdom, understanding, counsel, fortitude, knowledge, piety, and fear of the Lord are born in us through the coming of the Spirit [adventus Spiritus], it is as though the offspring to come is born in our minds… These seven sons have three sisters in our hearts because whatever these virtues generate is joined to the three theological virtues of hope, faith and charity. The seven sons cannot achieve the perfection of the number ten unless everything they do is done in hope, faith and charity.90

In sum, Gregory the Great conveyed the heritage of the Latin Church Fathers into the Middle Ages; his moral approach to the interpretation of the Holy Spirit, and his teaching that the Holy Spirit guides Christians through reading the Scriptures into ecstatic contemplation as the culmination of comprehension of the divine revelation, had great influence on medieval exegeses, especially in the monastic milieu.91 More significantly, he reminds us that many Western Christians in his own, troubled, time held a deep belief in the intervention of the Holy Spirit in their daily lives. His emphasis of the role of the Holy Spirit in the renewal of individual Christians was gradually expanded to an understanding of the Holy Spirit as instrumental in the revival of the Church as a whole.

3. The Holy Spirit in the Early Middle Ages

In general, the writings on the Holy Spirit in the Early Middle Ages were much less attractive and less original than those of the Church Fathers. While the equal divinity and nature of the Holy Spirit had been widely accepted as an orthodox stance, the interpretation of the Holy Spirit seems prominent only in the dispute over the Filioque. On the other hand, it is arguable that the Greek contribution to medieval pneumatology is small in proportion to that of the West, which was due in large part to the comparative “unprogressiveness” of Greek theology.92 Siecienski argues that after the death of Maximus the Confessor in 662, there was

90 Moralia, I, 38; English translation based on Morals on the Book of Job, Volume One (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1844), p. 27.
92 As Harnack states “the Greek Church has no history of dogma after the seven great councils”; the dogmatic development of the Eastern Church ceased with the death of John of Damascus, who died in the same year as the meeting of the seventh Ecumenical council. See Adolph Harnack, History of Dogma, vol. I (London: Williams & Norgate, 1897), translated by Neil Buchanan, pp. 18-19. However, this is also partly due to the lack of bilingualism among the Latin and Greek theologians.
a centuries-long silence over the *Filioque* in the Eastern sources. Therefore, the Western Church became the forerunner in the new explorations of the Holy Spirit.

Thanks to the valuable legacies left by Gregory the Great and efforts made by Isidore of Seville (560-636), Alcuin of York (735-804), John Scotus Eriugena (815-877) and others, the Carolingian Renaissance represented a fertile era in the middle of the barren post-patristic age. In general, there was nothing original about the interpretation of the Holy Spirit in the Early Middle Ages. To some extent, their understanding of the procession of the Holy Spirit was a continuation of Augustine’s view and the Latin view of the procession of the Holy Spirit was enhanced during these centuries. For example, Isidore, argues that the *Filioque* is a strengthening of belief in the Trinity and in the Godhead of the Spirit. Alcuin articulates his belief in the dual procession of the Holy Spirit in the pamphlet *On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*. Although Alcuin’s thoughts on the Holy Spirit are not as original as the Church Fathers, he nevertheless reorganized its doctrine systematically. As Nielsen suggests, from the late eighth century to the beginning of the twelfth century, few theologians explored the mystery of the Trinity and Alcuin of York and Anselm of Canterbury “mark the start and the end of the period and also the main contributors to the development of the Trinitarian theology during these centuries”. Howard Watkin-Jones also suggests that the tenth century yielded no writer of importance in connexion with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

However, a novel development can be seen in the liturgical texts, which revealed new ecclesiastical and liturgical dimensions. The hymn devoted to the Holy Spirit entitled *Veni Creator Spiritus*, which was written around the ninth century by an unknown writer (though many attribute it to Rabanus Maurus, 780-856), is one of the most compelling testimonies. This poem reconstructs the traditional images of the Holy Spirit in the form of water, fire and oil, and places more emphasis on the work of the Godhead of the Holy Spirit. In the last petition, we can see the poet attests the power of the Holy Spirit to let people know God.

---

95 *De Processione Spiritus Sancti*, I; PL 101, 63A-82D. It should be noted that besides the Latin Church Fathers like Jerome and Augustine, Alcuin also quoted from Gregory of Nazianzus and other Greek Fathers. See Douglas Dales, *Alcuin: Theology and Thought* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 2013), pp. 99-102, 104-105.
You who are sevenfold in your gift, finger of God’s right hand, you who were rightly promised by the Father, enrich our throats with speech... through you may we know the Father, and recognize the Son; and may we always believe in you, Spirit of both.98

Another significant phenomenon is the increasing devotion to the feast of the Pentecost; its importance in political and religious life also attests to the piety to the Holy Spirit. For example, in the tenth and eleventh century, the feast of Pentecost was generally chosen as the date for anointing the kings of France.99 The Benedictional of St Æthelwold of the late tenth century also offers us a new sense of the development of Pentecost and the conception of the Holy Spirit. In the first blessing for Pentecost, it records: “And may he who deigned to unify the diversity of tongues in the confession of the one faith, cause you to persevere in the same faith, and by this to come from the hope to the vision of God.”100

4. The Rejuvenated Devotion to the Holy Spirit

From the middle of the eleventh century, there was a revival of interest in the doctrine and work of the Holy Spirit, which paved the way for Anselm’s and Rupert’s understanding of its role in salvation history.101 For example, when we talk about the medieval understanding of the Holy Spirit, Anselm of Canterbury might be the first name that comes to minds. As a speculative theologian, Anselm of Canterbury did not develop his pneumatology through the perspective of salvation history, but moved immediately from the activity of God in the salvation to the eternal procession.102 Other theologians also contributed some novel thoughts on pneumatology. For example, Peter Abelard’s likening of the Holy Spirit to the Platonistic idea of “the world soul” strengthened the movement of the Holy Spirit in the world, while focusing more on its procession instead of its work.103 In other words, Abelard focused more on the Holy Spirit’s role in the Trinity rather than salvation history. Hugh of St. Victor also revealed a strong historical awareness, while his teaching on the Holy Spirit chiefly followed

99 For example, Louis V was anointed on the day of Pentecost in 979. Robert II the Pious’ sons, Hugh and Henry were anointed at Pentecost in 1017 and 1027.
the moral teaching inherited from Gregory the Great.\textsuperscript{104} Both Hugh and Richard of St. Victor view the Holy Spirit as the mutual love in the Augustinian sense, while Richard offers some novel ideas while continuing the focus on the Godhead and nature of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{105} Among the mystical thinkers, those such as Bernard of Clairvaux and Hildegard of Bingen developed theological reflections on the Holy Spirit, viewing the Spirit as gift and concentrating on the awakening love and fire in the heart of the believer.\textsuperscript{106}

This new spirituality was apparently connected with the reform movements of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which emphasized the idea of “restoration” not only as marks of personal holiness but as a means of calling for the restoration of the Church in its entirety. This renewed interest in the Holy Spirit can be observed in the hunger of individual Christians for a deeper connection with God, the Church seeking to renew itself, and the formal inquiry of academic philosophy.\textsuperscript{107} Augustine takes the reform function of the Holy Spirit as a personal process, which could free Christians from sins and help the individual undertake a spiritual journey toward God. But for the reformers in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the primary thrust was to purify and renew the Church. Through this process, there were some original comprehensions of the Holy Spirit which connected with the idea of the renewal of the Church, the advancement of liturgy and the enthusiasm for apocalypse and salvation history. This rapidly changing world needed a proper understanding of the guidance of the Church. In this sense, the devotion to the Holy Spirit was indeed a response to a fundamental transformation in terms of society, the status of the Church and, most importantly, the religious landscape.

There were many factors that contributed to the revival of devotion to the Holy Spirit in the twelfth century. First of all, the official schism between the Eastern and Western Church fuelled the continuing disputations on the \textit{Filioque} and the conception of the Holy Spirit. This motivation can be seen most clearly in Anselm of Canterbury’s work. Anselm of Canterbury

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
introduced an infant Scholasticism into pneumatology and paved a new way for the interpretation of the Holy Spirit. Anselm proposed his *De Processione Spiritus Sancti* (1098) in the Council of Bari, in which he expanded his conception of the divine simplicity and its implication for the plurality of persons.\(^{108}\) He does not make use of the previously-formulated idea which took the Spirit as the love of God the Father and the Son, but did focus on the breath given by Jesus to his disciples.\(^{109}\)

The second significant factor in the revival of the Holy Spirit could be explained from the perspective of liturgical development, especially the particular enthusiasm for the feast of Pentecost. Gregory the Great had highlighted the importance of Pentecost as the beginning of the Church, but in relation to a specific concern for the perfection of individual Christians. In Church history, Pentecost developed as a feast celebrating the Spirit in distinction to Ascension as a feast celebrating the Son.\(^{110}\) The calling and anticipation of the advent of the Holy Spirit are not only revealed in the great feast of Pentecost, but also in the observations in which the Holy Spirit reveals Himself in the history of God’s people, and the history of God’s divine plan for salvation. In this way, the birth of the Church is associated with the renewal of the Church and the feast of Pentecost was granted new meaning in the rejuvenation of the Church as a whole. In fact, this idea of the Holy Spirit as “the other hand of God” which will renew the Church had been stressed in the early centuries, especially by Irenaeus, who considers Pentecost to be the foundational moment in the possession and transmission of truth for the Church, the moment at which both the content of the tradition and the impetus to share that tradition originated. In this sense, the Church possesses the truth of revelation because of the work of the Holy Spirit, and the work of the Spirit alone guarantees the truth of the gospel.\(^{111}\) However, it seems that this tradition was only

---


109 For a discussion related to the weakness of Anselm of Canterbury’s demonstration of the Latin position on *Filioque*, see Matthew Knell, *The Immanent Person of the Holy Spirit*, pp. 31-36. As Lauge O. Nielsen observes, “at the very core of the Latin conception lie the absolute simplicity and unity of divine nature which determine the causality in the divine; and from this the *Filioque* follows with inexorable logic.” See Lauge O. Nielsen, “Trinitarian Theology from Alcuin to Anselm,” p. 165. *De Processione Spiritus Sancti*, 16: “I, trusting in the Holy Spirit rather than myself, have presumed to write these things about the procession of the same Holy Spirit, with other compelling things, in favour of the Latin against the Greeks… Therefore, let every statement of mine that should be maintained be attributed to the Spirit of Truth rather than to myself.” English translation taken from Davies and Evans, *Anselm of Canterbury: The Major Works*, p. 434.


rejuvenated in the late eleventh century and the early twelfth century, when the Church *pe se* gained more attention. One of the most persuasive examples can be seen in Rupert of Deutz’s *De divinis officiis*:

> In proportion to the dignity of the Person coming and the reason for His advent, the solemnity of the advent of the Holy Spirit is as glorious, bright, venerable and sweet to the house of the Holy Church as the most sacred feast of the resurrection of the Lord, because just as it would have benefited us nothing to have been born without being redeemed, so it would have benefited us nothing to have been redeemed without being illuminated by the Holy Spirit and receiving remission of our sins.\(^{112}\)

However, the most important factor facilitating the enthusiasm for the Holy Spirit and salvation history was perhaps the rejuvenation of the idea of *vita apostolica*, which did not only relate to the theological and liturgical interpretations of the Pentecost, but also reflected the dramatic change of religious life. As Etienne Delaruelle notes, there was a great spiritual movement in the late eleventh century and the early twelfth century, in which the idea of the Holy Spirit was associated with the notion of the *vita apostolica*.\(^{113}\) Through the development of the conception of *vita apostolica*, we can see the interaction between the religious life and theological ideas.

As a matter of fact, the term *vita apostolica* was rarely used in the patristic period and the Early Middle Ages.\(^{114}\) Historically, the concept of *vita apostolica* had long been regarded as a life of renouncing the world, with the distinguishing characteristic of imitating the disciples of the primitive church. In the Early Middle Ages, the lives of apostles were universally regarded as models for monks, and apostolic life almost exclusively meant monastic life. As Dom Germani Morin states, “In the first twelve centuries the word ‘apostolic’ was understood in a totally different sense from our nowadays’ application to those who exercise the ministry of preaching”.\(^{115}\) According to Ernest McDonnell, the imitation of the poor and

---


\(^{113}\) Quoted from Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit. vol. 1*, p. 111.


simple primitive Church, the passionate love for souls, and evangelical poverty in common
made up the three fundamental principles of the concept of *vita apostolica*.116

This concept had played an important role from the late eleventh-century, and the new
elements such as the emphasis on poverty, pastoral work and preaching increasingly became
the decisive components of apostolic life. This change not only reflects the rising requirement
for purification and the increasing need for pastoral care in Church reform, but also indicates
the shift of exegetical approaches coinciding with the flourishing of new theological and
intellectual endeavours to restore Christendom.117 The rise of the canons regular created an
innovative challenge to the long-established dominance of Benedictine monks or
monasticism as a whole and gave birth to furious debates. As suggested by Chenu, one of the
most urgent questions faced by monasticism in the twelfth century was the reconsideration of
“the permanent value of the monastic state of life face to face with the new society”.118

This process was greatly facilitated by Pope Urban II. In his bulls and letters, Urban II
describes the canonical movements as *instinctu Spiritus Sancti*.119 Especially in his bull
addressed to the Church of Raitenbuch in Bavaria (1092), Urban II makes a clear distinction
between *vita monastica* and *vita canonica*. This is seen especially in a letter to the abbot of St
Ruf, who was viewed as a leading reformer for the canons regular:

> We give you thanks since you approved a renewed life of the holy fathers and the institutions according
to the apostolic doctrine. The Saints of the Church had already formed it in the beginning, but it had
been almost destroyed with the increase of the Church, which is being alarmed by the inspiration of the
Holy Spirit. In the earliest days of the Church, there were two regulations to guide its children. One of
them is reserved in a weak status, and the other one is so strong… One made use of earthly things and
one despised them… They are almost the one and the same divine project which is divided into two

---

116 Ernest W. McDonnell, “The *Vita Apostolica*,” p. 15. McDonnell’s study offers a comprehensive and long-
term historical analysis of the notion and transformation of the idea “vita apostolica”. For example, on the
significance of the *vita apostolica*, he stated “[t]he *vita apostolica* was not only enlivened by the examples of
individual reformers and by the foundation of religious orders, but also by the establishment of sects which were
forced by conviction or by circumstances to separate themselves from the church”. See, ibid, p. 18.
117 For a general description, see Frans van Liere, “Biblical Exegesis Through the Twelfth Century,” in Susan
Boynton and Diane J. Reilly eds., *The Practice of the Bible in the Middle Ages: Production, Reception and
Performance in Western Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), pp. 157-178; Caroline
119 Cf. Ch. Dereine, “L’élaboration du statut canonique des chanoines réguliers spécialement sous Urbain II,” in
parts, namely, the canons and the monks. By the grace, it is very clear that the second one had already proliferated around the whole world, but the first faithful almost decreased to completely fade. Moreover, Urban II’s famous “two laws” (public law and private law) highlights that the “private law is the one that is written in the heart by the instinct of the Holy Spirit”. He further explains that those who are guided by the Spirit of God are guided by the Law of God: “If you are guided by the Spirit, you are no longer subject to the law”. This statement primarily addresses the issues of anyone who “seeks his salvation in a monastery or as a canons regular”. In this sense, the renewal as a call to return to the primitive Church made the vita apostolica equal to the vita communis and the exemplo primitiae ecclesiae. This stimulated the interest in re-investigating apostolic life in the early Church period. It also highlights the theological and liturgical meaning of Pentecost and subsequently, led to a particular focus on the work of the Holy Spirit within the Church. As a matter of fact, both Rupert and Anselm were involved in this debate. In De vita vere Apostolica, Rupert of Deutz claims that the monastic life is the real realization of the apostolic life: “if you wish to consult the relevant passages of the Scripture, you will find that they all say plainly that the Church originated in the monastic life”. He even argues that the monastic regula was in fact the regula apostolica. On the other hand, Anselm of Havelberg in his Epistola apologitica (1138) elucidates his point of view that the apostolic life indeed symbolised the life of canons rather than monks and in the structure of the Church the


122 De vita vere apostolica, IV.4; PL 170, 644: “Si vis omnia scripturarum consulere testimonia, nihil aliud videntur dicere quam ecclesiam inchoasse a vita monastica.”

123 De vita vere apostolica, iii.15; PL 170, 641-642. In his latter commentaries on the Rule of Benedict, Rupert continued to ask: “Which activity is more legitimate, to do manual labour as ordered by St. Benedict and thus live the life of apostolic perfection, or to live by the altar in the service of the Lord’s worship?” In regulam S. Benedicti, III. 4; PL 170, 513B.

124 Anselm of Havelberg’s arguments are mainly based on the fact that the apostles were not monks; consequently, the apostolic life was not the monastic life. As Anselm states: “You insist that all the faithful of the Old and New Testament alike were in fact monks. You do not hesitate to say openly that the passage where the evangelist Luke writes, they had but one heart and one soul (Acts, 4:32), and so forth, pertains to the
monks are inferior to canons regular (canonicorum ordo sublimior sit in Ecclesia quam monachorum).\textsuperscript{125} Anselm even mentions Rupert in a very satiric tone, and this suggests that Egbert, the abbot of Huysburg, might have relied on Rupert’s authority to defend the dignity of the monks.\textsuperscript{126} Anselm criticizes Egbert for being contemptible of the term of “regular canon” simply because it is a novelty, since everything old was new at some time.\textsuperscript{127}

Finally, the disputes on the \textit{vita apostolica} promoted the understanding of the function of the Holy Spirit and introduced the perspective of salvation history into the comprehension of the work of the Holy Spirit. From the discussion of the apostolic life, the writers in the twelfth century started to review the development of religious life from the very beginning of the Church and their reflections moved forward to their own time. To some extent, the disputes on the \textit{vita apostolica} could be regarded as the crucial inspiration for the introduction of salvation history into their interpretation. As noticed by Peter Classen, in the twelfth century the question concerning the place of the present in the history of salvation was posed more emphatically than ever.\textsuperscript{128} As I mentioned before, the rising awareness of history can be seen to have been closely related to the comprehension of the Holy Spirit from a perspective of salvation history. Through these associations, efforts were also made to re-establish the framework of salvation history and to identify the Holy Spirit as the inner and ultimate authority in the Church.

5. Conclusion

We have seen that, from the beginning of the Christian Church, the notion of the Holy Spirit played a vital role in the interpretation of the doctrine and shaping of Christian culture. From company of monk, not to the apostles and those who were with them-- people at whose time even the term monk was unknown, whence it is that the book is called \textit{Acts of Apostles} instead of \textit{Acts of Monks} (ad societatem monachorum, et non potius ad apostolos et eorum asseclas pertinere, inter quos nec nomen quidem monachorum tunc temporis sciebatur, unde et idem liber Actus apostolorum, non Actus monachorum inscribitur).” PL 188, 1119D. English translation based on Theodore James Antry, O. Praem and Carol Neel edited and translated, \textit{Norbert and Early Norbertine Spirituality} (New York: Paulist Press, 2007), pp. 38-39.


\textsuperscript{126} As Anselm writes: “You adduce the teaching of some Rupert or other whose authority, because it is unknown in the Church....but perhaps you consider him great not because he wrote great things but because he was an abbot of monks. Out of curiosity I read something that he wrote, I confess, so that I know and have seen his work, but I found the Greek proverb true of him: A fat belly need not give birth to great understanding.” Theodore Antry, O. Praem and Carol Neel, \textit{Norbert and Early Norbertine Spirituality}. p. 39; PL 188, 1120B.

\textsuperscript{127} PL 188, 1119B-1123A, this is especially clear in 1122D; see also \textit{Norbert and Early Norbertine Spirituality}, pp. 40-41, 42-43. The detailed analysis on this letter and Anselm’s attitudes see chapter IV.

the time of the Church Fathers, theological interpretations of the work of the Holy Spirit
moved gradually from the perfection or inspiration of individual Christians to the renewal
and restoration of the Church and the world as a whole. This trend became much more
obvious from the eleventh and twelfth century, as it suffused the thoughts on salvation history
and apocalyptic narratives. In short, there was seen to be two basically complementary
aspects of the Holy Spirit: a function related to its source that remains a constant norm, which
established the Church; and a function related to its development over successive ages, which
would guide, cultivate, govern and sanctify the Church. Therefore, from the *vita apostolica*
to the investigation of salvation history, the final goal of piety for the Holy Spirit was
increasingly understood to be the restoration and sanctification of the Church.

It is very important to contextualise the conception of the Holy Spirit in the twelfth century
against the background of individual theologians’ lives- in their respective intellectual
settings. In each case, descriptions of the work of the Holy Spirit function in distinctive ways
depending on the authors’ perceptions of the needs of the audience they addressed and the
historical contexts they lived in. To be specific, without an understanding of Rupert’s
experiences of visions and his disputes with the school masters, it would be impossible to
understand his special devotion to the Holy Spirit and his elaborated framework of salvation
history. It would also be extremely difficult to comprehend Anselm of Havelberg’s structure
of his *Anticimenon* without a clear perception of his life as a follower of Norbert of Xanten,
as a debater with the Greeks and as the defender of the new spirituality.

Therefore, in the following chapters, I will present the lives of Rupert of Deutz and
Anselm of Havelberg respectively, in order to emphasise the significance of events or
experiences which affected their thoughts, and in particular those related to their piety
towards the Holy Spirit in the broader theological framework of salvation history and the
broader sense of the renewal of the Church as a whole. We will thus see why the authors
were attracted to the conception of the Holy Spirit and how they understood and employed
the work of the Holy Spirit in their construction of theological discussions in the
“Renaissance of the twelfth century”.

---

129 See also Yves Congar, *The Revelation of God* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd., 1968), translated
by A. Manson and L. C. Sheppard, p. 156.
Chapter II: Vision, Disputation and Defence: Rupert of Deutz’s Life and Devotion to the Holy Spirit

Rupert of Deutz (ca. 1075-1129) is widely recognised as one of the most prolific writers of the Middle Ages. Along with other Church Fathers such as Augustine of Hippo, his work occupies more than three volumes of the Patrologia Latina. During his lifetime, he devoted more than twenty years to tireless commentary on the Scriptures and was involved in many theological debates. His writings touched almost all of the genres of religious literature for that period: numerous biblical commentaries (on all the historical books in the Old Testament, on the twelve Prophets, on the Gospels of Mathew and John, and on the Apocalypse), commentaries on the Rule of St. Benedict, two Lives of Saints and more apologetic works. The fact that his works are preserved in more than 250 manuscripts is a testament to his popularity, especially across the German Empire (and more specifically, the ecclesiastical provinces of Cologne and Salzburg). More than half of these manuscripts date from the middle of the twelfth century, and thereafter his influence appears to have dwindled dramatically. This noticeable phenomenon witnesses the vicissitudes of traditional Benedictine monasticism during the transformative period of the first half of the twelfth century.

---

130 For a comprehensive list of Rupert’s works as described by himself, see Reg. I: PL 170, 489; Officis, Epistola; CM 7, p. 3; Glor. Epist., PL 169, 9A-10D. For a detailed categorisation of all Rupert’s work, see Ann Abigail Young, The “Commentaria in Johannis Evangelium” of Rupert of Deutz: A Methodological Analysis in the Field of Twelfth Century Exegesis (Unpublished Ph. D thesis: University of Toronto, 1983), p. 8.


132 A general narrative on this issue can be found in James G. Clark, The Benedictines in the Middle Ages (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011), pp. 255-315; As John Van Engen suggests, “[w]ell into the twelfth century and beyond, most medieval Christians instinctively identified some form of the contemplative life, usually Benedictine monasticism, as the highest ‘order’ in Christian society and the exemplar toward which all should strive”. See “The ‘Crisis of Cenobitism’ Reconsidered: Benedictine Monasticism in the Years 1050–1150,” in Speculum, 61-2 (1986), pp. 269-304, quotation here at p. 269.
Rupert’s life was full of controversies and disputes. All of these events played a part in the formation of a leading Benedictine theologian in the first half of the twelfth century. Although several studies offer biographies of Rupert from varied perspectives, I will provide an overview of his life by focusing on the formulation of his theological thinking, in particular his understanding of the Holy Spirit and his historically-oriented approach to theology, which paved the way for his successors, including Gerhoh of Reichersberg, Honorius Augustodunensis, Hugh of St. Victor, and most importantly, Anselm of Havelberg.

Therefore, in this chapter, I will concentrate on the following aspects to show how the historical context of Rupert shaped his particular theological thinking and how these ideas intertwined with the development of intellectual life during the first half of the twelfth century. First of all, I will explore his education, exile and ordination which laid the solid foundation of Rupert’s divine and profane learning and his experience of the Investiture Controversy. The struggles of his youth gave Rupert a strong desire for the purification and reform of the Church. Secondly, I will chiefly focus on Rupert’s visionary experience, especially the third, sixth and seventh visions. Through these visions, Rupert developed a personal piety towards the Holy Spirit and embodied within the framework of salvation history (that will be the main topic in my next chapter). Thirdly, I will discuss Rupert’s disputes with the school masters and their supporters which centred on Rupert’s peculiar exegetical methodology. Those years of controversy became the most significant period for Rupert’s formation as an influential theologian in the second decade of the twelfth century. It is only with a clear understanding of these controversies that we can understand Rupert’s thoughts in his De sancta Trinitate (this will be the main source used to investigate Rupert’s thought in this thesis and will be discussed in detail in the next chapter). This work was composed during the most controversial period of his career and developed the fullest expression of his theology of history within the framework of salvation history. Lastly, I will move to the period of Rupert’s abbacy, to investigate his defence of the Benedictines and monastic theology in the last phase of his life. His disputes with the school masters and new

religious orders contributed to the construction of Rupert’s image as a conservative monastic theologian. I will, however, discuss whether the image of Rupert as a “conservative monastic theologian” is still suitable. I will suggest that Rupert’s attitudes toward the writings of the Church Fathers, productive historical awareness and original understanding of the Holy Spirit, did indeed contribute to the many innovations made during his life-long exegetical career. And then based on the detailed discussion of Rupert’s life, we can move to the deep comprehension of Rupert’s understanding of the Holy Spirit and salvation history in the chapter III.

1. The Formation of Learning and Exile during the Investiture Controversy

Rupert was born circa 1075 in Upper Lorraine and was, around 1082, given to the Benedictine monastery of St. Lawrence in Liège as an oblate. He spent approximately 40 years in this abbey, except for two short periods of exile, before he eventually moved to Cologne. During his stay in the monastic community, he received a very solid and comprehensive training in the liberal arts and biblical interpretation. It could be argued that the period of Rupert’s education occurred during the heyday of Liège. The intellectual atmosphere in the city flourished from the late eleventh century, especially at the remarkable cathedral school of St. Lambert and Rupert’s own Benedictine monastery of St. Lawrence. In the preface of his De sancta Trinitate, which Rupert dedicated to his patron, the abbot Cuno of Siegburg (ca. 1070-1132), and later bishop of Regensburg, Rupert referred to his teacher Heribrand as a “faithful and prudent man, who being also skilled in letters, shone

134 From the tenth century, St. Lambert had been one of the leading monastic educational centres. See the testimony given by Bishop Stephen of Laon, in C. Stephen Jaeger, The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950-1200 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), p. 24. Concerning the famous theologians and other celebrities who had been trained in Liège during the High and Late Middle Ages, see Christine Renardy, Le monde des maîtres universitaires du diocèse de Liège, 1140–1350: recherches sur la composition et ses activités (Paris: Belles lettres, 1979); see also John Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz, pp. 14-26.
forth as a teacher during my youth”. In his own writing, Rupert displayed a vast knowledge and familiarity with the compositions of classical writers and Church Fathers.

The ecclesiastical conflict in Liège is crucial in the formation of Rupert’s personality and greatly influenced his future career. In 1092, Otbert (1092-1119) was consecrated as bishop of Liège with the support of the Emperor Henry IV. The new bishop launched a series of actions against those who complained about his secular investiture. Even though Otbert had maintained a relatively friendly relationship with the abbot of St. Lawrence, Otbert requested that Berengar, abbot of St. Lawrence, leave his abbey immediately. The deposed abbot had to flee to France for protection and the young Rupert was among the first monks who voluntarily followed their abbot into exile. After several years in exile, Berengar received a letter from Pope Urban II proclaiming that Otbert had been accused of simony and excommunicated. Pope Urban II issued another letter to Liège in 1098 and called for the people to cast out the excommunicated Bishop Otbert or at least avoid communion with him. With the further deterioration of the situation in Liège, Pope Paschal II even called Count Robert of Flanders to launch a crusade in Liège aiming to dislodge the rebellious bishop and clergy.

However, Berengar decided to restore his house and made peace with Bishop Otbert who was still excommunicated. After moving back to Liège, Rupert’s uncompromising attitude toward Otbert put him out of favour with the bishop and affected his relationship with the diocesan authority for a long time. In 1106, with the death of Henry IV in Liège, many bishops who had opposed the Papacy during the reign of Henry IV were re-installed by the pope at the synod of Guastalla. However, Otbert was condemned again. It is possible that Otbert was reconciled with the reforming papacy later that year as he ordained Rupert as a

135 Rupert of Deutz, De sancta Trinitate, CM 21, p.121: “vir fidelis et prudens Heribrandus, qui et ipse litterarum peritus pueritia meae magister exstitit.” Heribrand was the master of novices and eventually became the abbot of St. Lawrence. Rupert probably took Heribrand’s position later and himself became the master of novices in this monastery. See John Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz, p. 103.
138 John Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz, p. 38.
139 MGH, LdL, 2., pp. 451-452.
priest around 1107-1108, when Rupert was around 33 years old. This was quite an old age to become a priest in the Middle Ages, especially for an oblate.\textsuperscript{140}

It is possible that these experiences gave a pessimistic overtone to the writings of Rupert. In a poem composed during his exile, Rupert lamented that the Church was divided or even almost destroyed by the reign of heresy and widespread simony. When the true pope (that is, Gregory VII) was driven away from the See of St. Peter, the world could not be in unity given the collapse of the reforming papacy which had tried to establish the right order on earth. Using poetic language, Rupert described Henry IV as Nero and Antichrist, and the antipope Clement III as Simon Magus; Otbert figured as a wolf in shepherd’s clothing.\textsuperscript{141} The vocational crisis and visions during those years of suffering are generally seen as the inspiration and driving force in Rupert’s career as a peculiar and original exegete, which developed even in those most intractable times.

2. Visions and Apologies for Writing: The Inspiration of the Holy Spirit

Visionary experiences played a crucial role in Rupert’s life. Robert Lerner has employed the term “ecstasy defence” to describe the use of visions as a means to justify the scriptural interpretation that did not accord with the writings of the Church Fathers and other authoritative sources.\textsuperscript{142} Rupert was one of the early participants of a development of ecstatic visionary piety in the early twelfth century.\textsuperscript{143} Rupert’s record of his visions was not just a personal defence; it was in fact also a defence of his monastic theological methodology and a defence of the role played by the Holy Spirit in the comprehension of divine revelation. We can observe that these visions provoked Rupert’s special enthusiasm towards the Holy Spirit,

\textsuperscript{140} There is no exact date for Rupert’s ordination recorded; the current presumption is based on John Van Engen, \textit{Rupert of Deutz}, pp. 54-55.

\textsuperscript{141} For relevant passages see \textit{Monachis cuiusdam exulis S. Laurentii de calamitibus ecclesiae Leodiensis opusculum}, I.21-22; III.42-48; IX.25-36; IX.58-64; X.17-23. Rupert’s earliest works, which are mainly poetic works, are contained in H. Boehmer ed., \textit{Monachis cuiusdam exulis S. Laurentii de calamitibus ecclesiae Leodiensis opusculum}, MGH, Libelli de Lite 3 (Hanover: Hahn, 1897), pp. 622-641. See also Maria Lodovica Arduini, \textit{Non fabula sed res: Politische Dichtung und dramatische Gestalt in den “Carmina” Ruperts von Deutz} (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1985), pp. 25-57.


and his understanding of the Holy Spirit could be regarded as the foundation of all his exegetical works and especially his understanding of the unfolding of salvation history.\footnote{144}{P. Engelbert, “Christusmystik in der Autobiografie des Rupert von Deutz,” in M. Löh rer and E. Sal mann eds., Mysterium Christi. Symbolgegenwart und theologische Bedeutung. Festschrift für Basil Studer (Rome: Centro Studi Sant’Anselmo, 1995), pp. 259-286.}

It is interesting that Rupert’s visions are included in \textit{De gloria et honore filii hominis super Mattheum}, which is composed around 1127, some two years before Rupert’s death.\footnote{145}{See H. Haacke ed., De gloria et honore filii hominis super Mattheum, XII (CCCM 29, Turnholt: Brepols, 1979), pp. 363-396. Rupert does not write any comprehensive or systematic work about his life, at least not in Abelard’s style, but there is a German translation of the biographical information collected from many of his works: see Os meum aperui: Die Autobiographie Ruperts von Deutz (Köln: Luthe-Verlag, 1985), edited and translated by Walter Berschin. For a record of Rupert’s vision, see Karl Fredrick Fabrizius, Rupert of Deutz on Matthew: A Study in Exegetical Method (Ph. D dissertation, Marquette University, 1994), pp. 69-99. For a general discussion about medieval visionary culture, see Barbara Newman, “What Did It Mean to Say ’I Saw’? The Clash between Theory and Practice in Medieval Visionary Culture,” in Speculum, 80-1 (2005), pp. 1-43. For more recent research, see Jean-Claude Schmitt, The Conversion of Herman the Jew, pp. 93-110.}

This was when Rupert finally spoke out about what he had encountered approximately thirty years earlier. According to Rupert, the initial motivation for writing down these visions came at the request of Cuno of Siegburg, who believed that the driving force behind Rupert’s tireless composition was a divine gift.\footnote{146}{In a letter Rupert writes to Cuno (who had by then been elected as the bishop of Regensburg): “Almost three years before this [meaning before the composition of Rupert’s \textit{De Gloria}], I narrated to you, who admired and often favoured me, how it happened through an event that after so many holy, catholic, and most celebrated fathers whose writings sufficiently fired the chest of the Church of Christ, that I, by the same path as all those, was led in the heart to writing so copiously, and, as you are accustomed to say, so efficaciously or usefully, so that you are not able to doubt that this is a gift of God and that this is also an ability from on high and comes down from the Father of lights from whom is every best gift and every perfect gift”. See De Gloria, XII; CCCM 29, p. 366.

During his adolescence, Rupert had several visions. In the fifth vision, he was told that he had only eight years to live, after which Rupert devoted most of his time to meditation. However, Rupert finally realised that he had misunderstood the revelation. It was actually a divine calling for him to be an exegete. Yet, he could not fully appropriate the gift of interpretation until he was ordained as a priest.

Among Rupert’s visions, the third, the sixth and the seventh directly related to his special devotion to the Holy Spirit and the Holy Spirit’s role as the guide of his exegetical career. The third vision directly related to Rupert’s desire and obligation to write as an exegete. While Rupert was participating in a morning Mass, he saw three people (two were old and one was young) dressed in royal clothing, standing at the right-hand corner of the altar. One of the old people (the Holy Spirit) came to Rupert and kissed his hand, and talked about the necessity of writing for the glory of God. The young man, who, according to Rupert, was the Son of God, whispered to him “wait a little while, Jesus will come immediately and assist you”. The three people (representing the Trinity) took Rupert on high and put him on a very large opened book. Then the person who kissed his hand pointed to the relic of a saint on the altar and said: “Fear not, you will be greater (melior) than these.” According to Rupert, this was an invitation for him to interpret the large opened book: the Scriptures. With the assistance of the Trinity, he would pronounce better things than had been revealed by previous saints:

There is no need for me to explain to your loving-kindness the opening of the book or the reason why the Person said those words while pointing to the golden memorials or phylacteries of the saints; many have often heard and agreed with your judgement of me, that God has truly opened his book, that is, the holy scriptures, to me and that I say some things better than many opinions of the holy Fathers whose memory is worthyly celebrated in the holy church and shines like gold.

The sixth vision further demonstrates Rupert’s piety towards the Holy Spirit. When Rupert was attacked by evil spirits, an old man appeared, recognized by Rupert as the Holy Spirit, and this old man protected him. Rupert asserted that “He is the author of our holy regeneration in baptism, and He is the fire whom our Lord Jesus sent upon the earth and

148 De Gloria, XII; CCCM 29, pp. 370-372.
149 De Gloria, XII; CCCM 29, pp. 372-373: “De apertione libri et de ratione quam persona illa dixit aureas ostendens sanctorum memorias siue phylacteria non opus est, ut interpretationem faciam tuae caritati, cuius de me iudicium saepe audierunt et secuti sunt multi, quod uere Deus librum suum, id est Scripturam sanctam mihi aperuit, et multis sanctorum Patrum sententias, quorum in sancta ecclesia digne celebris est memoria et uelut aurum rutilat, aliquanta meliora dixerim.”
ardently desired to be kindled".\textsuperscript{150} In this vision, Rupert first dispelled an army of evil spirits coming to get him by calling on the name of the Holy Spirit; after that Rupert found himself able to drive off the loathsome hosts by calling on the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{151} One of the most vivid details in Rupert’s account of his visionary experience is his description of the Holy Spirit as a mentor armed with a cane with which to beat recalcitrant students; this depicted how his work was indeed supported by the Paraclete.

The seventh vision was on the Ash Wednesday of the eighth year. According to Rupert’s interpretation of the fifth vision, he could not live longer than another eight years. As a consequence, this should almost have been the time of Rupert’s death. Rupert slept during the Mass and experienced himself as if impregnated by a luminous substance, sweeter than honey, heavier than gold.\textsuperscript{152} Bernard McGinn has suggested that this seems to be a kind of spiritual pregnancy under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and it is even perhaps a typologically daring claim to be a new Mary who gives birth to the golden reality of the Christological meaning of the biblical text.\textsuperscript{153} Rachel Fulton Brown has recently remarked that past scholarship has concentrated more on Rupert’s first, eighth and ninth visions, which are concerned with the crucified Son of Man. But she contends that we should pay closer attention to the third, sixth and seventh visions, since not God the Son but God the Three-in-One is Rupert’s great love.\textsuperscript{154}

In fact, we can see that the Holy Spirit, as the guide and protector of Rupert, plays the most important role for him. Rupert’s special devotion to the Holy Spirit from his youth developed into the formation and construction of his theology. Rupert’s encounter with the Holy Spirit in visions greatly influenced his theological investigation. When he was puzzled over the meaning of his former visions, Rupert began to invoke the aid of the Holy Spirit:

Even if there is one substance of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, one divinity and inseparable operation, nevertheless, just as the proper work of the Father is the creation of man, and the proper

\textsuperscript{150} \textit{De Gloria}, XII; CM 29, p. 377
\textsuperscript{152} \textit{De Gloria}, XII; CCCM 29, pp. 376-379.
\textsuperscript{153} Bernard McGinn, \textit{The Growth of Mysticism}, p. 332. Moreover, in the later years of Rupert’s life, his closest patron Cuno told Rupert that he also had a dream, where he saw Rupert espouse this life and give birth to sons from this marriage. The sons undoubtedly meant the volumes written by Rupert devoted to the Trinity.
work of the Son is the redemption, so the proper work of the Holy Spirit is the illumination of that same man, the grace of revelations, and the distribution of all gifts. Rupert’s autobiography is not intended to offer a timeline of his life or a list of events. Instead, his main goal is to speak of the gifts given to him by the Holy Trinity, and especially the Spirit, since the Holy Spirit not only stirred Rupert’s exegetical works but also acted as the source of revelation for his time. Rupert cherishes the spiritual gift: the understanding of the still-hidden meanings in the Scriptures. Rupert claims that his heart was leading him to write so copiously, even though many holy, catholic and most celebrated Fathers’ writings had sufficiently filled the chest of the Church. The visions granted Rupert the confidence to uncover the true spiritual meaning of the Scriptures, and this confidence sometimes made him fearlessly articulate in his opinions against his contemporaries and even the Church Fathers. In his later works, Rupert repeatedly asserted his own independence as an exegete, which aligned him with the most self-confident masters. As Hubert Silvestre noticed, Rupert quoted the Church Fathers by name, or even directly, more frequently in his earlier works than his later works. With increasing self-confidence, Rupert later preferred to integrate the thoughts of the Church Fathers and other authoritative sources into his own prose.

This is not only a personal defence to justify the orthodoxy of his teaching and his reputation as an exegete but also a defence of the theological methodology he inherited from the monastic milieu. Through Rupert’s work, we can observe that the central concern was increasingly focusing on the Holy Spirit in terms of understanding divine wisdom, and that the role of the Holy Spirit gradually moved from individual renovation to the renewal of the Church as a whole. As we will see in the next chapter, Rupert demonstrates the role of the Holy Spirit not only based on the quotations of the Scriptures and the writings of his processors, but also on the earthly actions of the Holy Spirit over the course of history: this is the work of the Holy Spirit within the Church.

155 De Gloria, XII; CCCM 29, p. 375: “quoniam et si Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti una substantia est, una divinitas et operatio inseparabilis, tamen sicut Patris proprium est opus hominis conditio, et Filii proprium opus re demptio, sic proprium est opus Spiritus sancti eiusdem hominis illuminatio, revelationumque gratia, et omnium gratiarum divisio.”
156 However, as Jay Diehl insightfully argues, “invoked as an example of both a student of the liberal arts and a visionary who denied such training, it almost seems as if Rupert had been understood to hold a paradoxical position, simultaneously endorsing two mutually exclusive means of producing knowledge.” Jay Diehl, “The grace of Learning: Visions, Education and Rupert of Deutz’s view of Twelfth-Century Intellectual Culture,” in Journal of Medieval History, 39-1 (2013), p. 23.
In many ways, Rupert and some of his contemporaries, such as Guibert of Nogent, shared a strong and singular personality, which “must confront both a surrounding hostility and the drama of an inner crisis”. These dreams and visions granted Rupert the necessary courage to defend himself as an exegete and launched his special piety towards the Holy Spirit. As a consequence of this confidence, Rupert was drawn into those confrontations chiefly related to the masters and pupils of early cathedral schools in Liège and Laon. During these disputes, Rupert’s theological methodology strengthened and led to him becoming one of the central figures in the development of historical theology in the first half of the twelfth century.

Table 1: The Ten Visions of Rupert Recorded in *De gloria et honore filii hominis super Mattheum*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of the Vision</th>
<th>Descriptions of Visions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>While Rupert is kissing the Crucifix, Christ lowers His head as a sign of pleasure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Two groups chanting psalms in the Church (50, 27); Evil adversary at the entrance to the church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>When Rupert enters the Church, he sees two old people and one young person dressed in royal clothing. One of the old people (probably the Holy Spirit) kissed his hand and spoke of the office of writing; the young one (Jesus) gazed at him and penetrated his heart to defend him against evil spirits. Rupert was taken on high and placed on an open book; the same old person as earlier (the Holy Spirit) tells him that he will be greater than the saints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rupert carries a very large cross; the Father reaches out to take the cross and grants Rupert an embrace and a kiss.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vigil of St. Matthew
A man tells him he will live only another eight years.

The Eighth Year
Rupert was attacked by evil spirits, fled and encountered an old man (the Holy Spirit) carrying a rod in his hand and calling Rupert by the name of “godson” (*filiole*). And then, a bright shining Being appeared where the Old man stood.

The Eighth Year’s Ash Wednesday
Heaven opens and the substance of the Living One poured forth upon Rupert’s breast, heavier than gold, sweeter than honey.

Before Rupert’s Ordination
The Lord on the Crucifix gazes at Rupert and inclines His head, Rupert comes in through the altar and kisses Christ deeply.

Three days after Ordination
 Likeness of a man from above sinks into Rupert and fills the entire substance of his body.

New to the Divine Office
Rupert’s right hand is torn away; a tender new right hand grows.

3. Controversial Exegete in Liège: Eucharist and the Will of God

During the composition of his most systematic commentary on all of the Scriptures, *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius* (1113-1117), Rupert faced a charge of heresy and was in danger of losing his “*licentia scribendi*”. At the same time, it seems that a trial took place toward the end of 1113. The first controversy started possibly shortly after the death of Rupert’s abbot Berengar. The rejection of Rupert’s teaching on the Eucharist was made by Alger of Liège, who had been the personal secretary of Bishop Otbert since 1101 and was regarded as one of the most learned clerics in Liège.\(^{160}\) Other clerics in Liège quickly took

---

\(^{160}\) In his *Commentary on the Benedictine Rule*, Rupert retells the controversy briefly and called him “*scholasticus licet monachus*”. See *Reg Ben*, 1; PL 170, 495-496. About the identification of Alger of Liège, who eventually entered the Cluny in 1121, see Guntram Gerhard Bischoff, *The Eucharistic Controversy between Rupert of Deutz and His Anonymous Adversary: Studies in the Theology and Chronology of Rupert of*
part in, and spearheaded, the most crucial attack on Rupert. Furthermore, Rupert’s criticism toward Anselm of Laon and his student William around 1116 aggravated the opposition of those famous school masters. The continuing deterioration of the unfavourable situation of Rupert resulted in his exile to Siegburg, where he finished his *De sancta Trinitate*. Rupert’s exile greatly influenced his presentation of salvation history in the time of gifts of knowledge and piety, where Rupert identifies the school masters as the hypocrites and false brothers.

In fact, the clerics’ main grievance was not so much a theological issue but Rupert’s slighting of the authority of the Church Fathers. Moreover, the clerics disliked the way in which the young monk arrogantly defended his views, and they mocked him for being ignorant of the basic rhetorical techniques, which were cherished and practised by the pupils of the school masters. Confronted by their scorn of his “dated and babyish” interpretation and monastic educational background, Rupert accused them of being “false masters” and “pretended-wise men”, who were showing off their knowledge rather than seeking the glory of God and preferring “Plato’s Academy” to the Table of the Lord in the Last Supper. As John Van Engen suggests, the “age-old rivalry between monks and canons was further exacerbated by Rupert’s confidence in his divine call to interpret Scripture and the clerics’ pride in their modern education at the feet of renowned masters”.

The main target for the charge over the Eucharist is Rupert’s belief that Judas had not received communion in the Last Supper, and how this idea expressed Rupert’s doubt about another view advanced by Augustine. As Rupert himself stated to Cuno:

They hold against me what they consider the great proof of my criminal contempt, namely, that I have dared to raise the question if the traitor Judas was present at the sacramental communion of the Last

---


161 For a detailed treatment see chapter III. Concerning the different dates of Rupert’s escape to Siegburg, see H. Silvestre, “La date de la naissance de Rupert et la date de son départ pour Siegbourg,” in *Scriptorium*, 16 (1962), pp. 345-348; V. J. Flint, “The Date of the Arrival of Rupert of Deutz at Siegburg,” in *Revue bénédictine*, 81 (1971), pp. 317-319. However, the most comprehensive and, in my point of view, most convincing treatment of the date of Rupert’s flight to Siegburg is still Guntram Gerhard Bischoff, *The Eucharistic Controversy between Rupert of Deutz and His Anonymous Adversary*, pp. 120-167, 240-259.

162 Rupert’s responses to the charges concerning his teaching on the Eucharist are mainly contained in his *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. See John, VI,VII; CM 9, pp. 334-338, 393-396.

Supper – as Father Augustine indeed asserts – or if one must believe that he was not present because he had already left – as St. Hilary insists.\(^{164}\)

As a matter of fact, this issue concerns the problem of sacramental efficacy and validity which is immediately applicable to the ongoing Church reform. In contrast to Hugh of St. Victor, who views the sacrament metaphorically as “medicine bottles” and the grace in it as being distributed by the priest as a metaphoric “physician”, Rupert suggests that the sacramental grace was identified closely with the action of the Holy Spirit.\(^{165}\) There is no doubt in the mind of Rupert that the Holy Spirit should be taken as the arbiter and author of all the sacraments, and that the clergy who perform the sacraments are only the “channels” of the grace coming from God. However, Rupert argues that as long as the minister of the sacraments is still in communion with the Church as a whole, what he does would be valid; if he is condemned or even excommunicated publicly, the performance of the sacraments would not be valid.\(^{166}\) For example, Rupert suggests in an ironic tone that certain people, who were not unlike Judas, attained the apostolic (episcopal) office, “adhering to Christ solely because of their cupidity since they have the treasury of the Church under their control”.\(^{167}\) To some extent, Rupert maintains the Humbertian position in the middle of the eleventh century, which particularly related to the theological and juridical implications of simony.\(^{168}\)

The unexpected intervention of Abbot Cuno of Siegburg saved Rupert from a harsh or even perilous condemnation. Cuno was one of the most powerful and influential abbots in the Archdiocese and even the entire ecclesiastical province of Cologne. He became Rupert’s

---

\(^{164}\) Epistola Ruperti nuncupatória ad Cunonem, PL 169, 202B-202C: “sciente Ecclesia catholica, quia verum corpus et verus sanguis Christi est. Aliud est, quod pro magno crimini argumento in me iactitant, quia dubitare ausus fui de Iuda profitore, utrum eiusdem sacramenti communioni interfuisset, sicut idem Pater Augustinus asserit, an non interfuisset, sed iam exisse putandus sit, sicut S. Hilarius constanter affirmat.”


\(^{166}\) De Gloria, XII; CM 29, p. 381 and John, II, XI; CM 9, pp. 67, 651. The influence of Rupert’s theology on the sacraments is mainly observed in Gerhoh of Reichersberg, who referenced heavily from Rupert; it is noteworthy that Gerhoh was also charged with heresy in 1130. See Peter Classen, Gerhoch von Reichersberg: eine Biographie mit einem Anhang über die Quellen, ihre handschriftliche Überlieferung und ihre Chronologie (Wiesbaden, F. Steiner: 1960), pp. 47-57.

\(^{167}\) John, I.1; CM 9, p. 11.

most dependable and intimate patron after the death of the abbot of St. Lawrence. Cuno of Siegburg obtained a passage from Hilary of Poitiers’ *Commentary on Matthew* which took precisely the same view as Rupert’s. This discovery frustrated the furious student-clerics, who wanted to demolish Rupert’s career as an “arrogant monk” exegete, and eventually freed Rupert from formal condemnation.

Both Guntram Gerhard Bischoff and John Van Engen have observed that Rupert made his response through a strict salvation-historical approach to the theological issue. For instance, Rupert contends that the manna and the Eucharist cannot signify the same verity because the Old Testament and the New Testament radically differ from the perspective of history. Their relationship is an historical one, in such a way that, through the power of the Holy Spirit, the ancient events became spiritual forms of the reality to come. To some extent, this historically-oriented methodology is the crucial foundation for Rupert’s whole theology. He views all theological topics and ecclesiastical institutions from the perspective of salvation history and believes the Holy Spirit played the central role of connecting all aspects during the unfolding of divine revelation. This theological feature is observable in his early treatment of the Divine office and was fully expressed in his *De sancta Trinitate*, which will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

---

169 Cuno might have taken a position as a master in the abbey school at Siegburg when Rupert first met him and later became the Bishop of Regensburg. Cuno played an extremely significant role in Rupert’s career as an exegete; for biographical information on Cuno, see Monica Sinderhauf, “Cuno I (ca. 1070-1132) Abt von Siegburg und Bischof von Regensburg”, in Mauritius Mittler and Wolfgang Herborn eds., *Temporibus tempora: Festschrift für Abt Placidus Mittler* (Siegburg: Respublica, 1995), pp. 1-125. It is noteworthy that Cuno also promoted several authors such as Gerhoch of Reichersberg and Honorius Augustodunensis; both of their works were greatly influenced by Rupert. For comprehensive research on the three of them as a group, see Wolfgang Beinert, *Die Kirche--Gottes Heil in der Welt. Die Lehre von der Kirche nach den Schriften des Rupert von Deutz, Honorius Augustodunensis und Gerhoch von Reichersberg*.

170 Hilary of Poitiers, *In Matt.* XXX.2; PL 9, 1065C.

171 Regarding the significance of the Eucharist controversy, John Van Engen insightfully points out that although it was correct to view Berengar of Tours’ application of speculative grammar to the Eucharist as marking a crucial turning-point in medieval thought, “it also merits attention that Rupert sought to find definitions of the sacrament by freshly interpreting and applying texts from St. John’s Gospel.” See idem, *Rupert of Deutz*, pp. 175-176. About the influential Eucharistic Controversy in the late 1070s, see Charles M. Radding and Francis Newton, *Theology, Rhetoric, and Politics in the Eucharistic Controversy, 1078-1079* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002). For the later impact of the Berengarian controversy, see also Macy, “Berengar’s Legacy as Heresiarch,” and Ludwig Hödl, “Die theologische Auseinandersetzung mit Berengar von Tours,” both in Peter Ganz, R. B. C. Huygens and Friedrich Niewöhner eds., *Auctoritas und Ratio: Studien zu Berengar von Tours* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1990), pp. 47-88. In fact, Rupert’s explanation of the Eucharist was echoed by many Protestant theologians of the sixteenth century; for a general introduction to this, see J. J. Herzog and A. Hauck W. Roelants eds., *Rupert von Deutz, in Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3-17 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), pp. 229-243; see also J. Beumer, “Rupert von Deutz und sein Einfluss auf die Kontroverstheologie der Reformationzeit,” in *Catholica*, 22 (1968), pp. 207-216.

The disputation with two leading school masters in the first decades of the twelfth century—Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux—and their pupils is the most widely known theological controversy in Rupert’s life. In general, the interpretation of this event in current scholarship have been greatly influenced by Chenu’s narrative, which formed Rupert’s image as a bellicose monastic theologian. However, it should be noted that there was some dynamism or changes in Rupert’s attitudes toward the usage of the liberal arts. The starting point for Rupert’s dramatic change was his hostile encounters with the school masters; the culmination of such change can be placed around 1125, when he finally retold his visions to his readers. Rupert thus put the grace and inspiration of the Holy Spirit in an exclusively crucial position.

This intense debate was provoked by Rupert’s De voluntate Dei (The Will of God, ca. 1116). According to Rupert, one of his confreres at St. Lawrence had studied with Master Anselm of Laon, and this confrere claimed that the “evil will” of God (Deus uult malum) had been taught by Anselm. Rupert directly challenged the venerable master Anselm of Laon in very aggressive terms. He referred to Anselm and his student William of Champeaux as

173 To some extent, Anselm of Laon is the key figure through which to understand the intellectual web of the first half of the twelfth century: he was the teacher of William of Champeaux, and William was the founder of the school at St. Victor around 1108; Anselm also had taught Peter Abelard in 1113. To put it another way, most of the new theologians in the first half of the twelfth century shared a common intellectual heritage emanating from the school, and even the person, of Anselm of Laon. Another important fact was that Anselm and his brother Ralph went on teaching for over almost half a century without saying anything that led them into the public charge of heresy. According to Giraud, Peter Lombard’s Book of Sentences crucially depended upon the collection of sententiae from Laon. See Cédric Giraud, Per verba magistri: Anselme de Laon et sn école au Xlle siècle (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), pp. 477-492. Obviously, the controversy with Anselm of Laon was a great event for Rupert, possibly even the most important event which influenced his later formation and individual career as an exegete. As a matter of fact, Anselm of Laon also contributed a very solid interpretation of the Gospel according to John, so it is possible that Rupert composed his own commentary on the fourth Gospel as a response to Anselm. On Anselm of Laon’s glosses on John, see Anselm of Laon, Glosae super Iohannem (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), edited by Alexander Adrée. Also see Alexander Andrée, “Anselm of Laon Unveiled: The Glosae super Iohannem and the Origins of the Glossa Ordinaria on the Bible,” in Medieval Studies, 73 (2011), pp. 217-240. For the newest and quite informative research on Anselm of Laon, see Cédric Giraud, Per verba magistri. According to Giraud, “the scriptural competence makes the master a norm of orthodoxy” among his contemporaries (p.176).


175 De voluntate Dei. I; PL 170, 437B. About the educational operation of the school at Laon, interesting research can be found in Michael Clanchy and Lesley Smith, “Abelard’s Description of the School of Laon: What Might it Tell us about Early Scholastic Teaching,” in Nottingham Medieval Studies, 54 (2010), pp. 1-34.
“the Lucifer of Laon” and “Lucifer’s pupil”. This disputation opened the door to the first major collision between the “monastic” and “scholastic” theology in the second decade of the twelfth century.

Anselm of Laon made a strong distinction between the “approving will” (voluntas permittens) and “permitting will” (voluntas approbans) of God. However, Rupert rejected such “senseless distinction” and argued it was no more than the trick of “dialectical consistency”. Chenu views the definitions given by Anselm of Laon engaged the mind in a “wholly different manner of thinking from that of scripture”, which could not be appreciated by Rupert as an ardent contemplative. On the one hand, Anselm’s pupil pleaded that God permitted evil unwillingly in order to allow time for repentance; on the other hand, Rupert insisted that God never causes evil, but in some instances He did not soften (emollire) the hearts of the sinners. Therefore, Rupert still asked Anselm of Laon and William to retract their “horrendous teachings”. However, the school masters started to charge Rupert with a rejection of “the omnipotence of God”. In order to defend himself, Rupert had to compose a work titled De omnipotentia Dei (On the Omnipotence of God) and quote texts from the Scriptures and the Church Fathers at length.

Around the end of September 1116, Rupert confronted another charge of heresy and was nearly condemned to silence. This tough situation forced him to seek the protection of Cuno in Siegburg. It was approximately in May 1117 that Rupert went back to Liège for his trial. Unfortunately, there is not enough information to allow us to reconstruct the details of Rupert’s trial. It is possible that Rupert’s teachings regarding the Eucharist and predestination were discussed during the trial, which was presided over by Archdeacon Henry with the assistance of two theological advisers: Stephanus and Alger. According to Rupert himself,

176 On the direct opposition to Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux, see De voluntate Dei, I; PL 170, 437C: “Haece ideo nunc ad vos dicere incipimus, o magistri, temporibus nostris inclyti, Wilhelme Cathalaunensis pontifex, et Anselme, Laudunensis lucifer, quia de vestris scolis hoc se quidam nostrorum accepsisse fatetur, ut diceret: Quia Deus malum fieri vult, et quia voluntatis Dei fuit quod Adam praevaticatus est.” John Van Engen indicated that the only extant manuscript indeed originated from St. Lawrence (Bib. Roy. 9607, fols. 171-177), which is titled “Liber eiusdem apologeticorum de voluntate Dei”. See John Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz, p. 191.
177 It is clear that this definition derived from the philosophical categories to act (agere) and to bear (patei).
180 De voluntate Dei, I; PL 170, 437B-438C and 440A.
181 On the date of composition of these two works, see Guntram Gerhard Bischoff, The Eucharistic Controversy between Rupert of Deutz and His Anonymous Adversary, pp. 240-259; John Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz, pp. 203-204.
both of the advisers and the archdeacon genuinely lamented “the injury I had suffered in defending the truth” and found nothing guilty in his teaching. 182

The supporters of Anselm of Laon and other new school masters did not cease their attacks against Rupert. Anselm’s letter to Abbot Heribrand (rather than to Rupert) expressed a very contemptuous view of Rupert’s ideas. After a brief re-interpretation of his thoughts, Anselm dismissed this event as deserving no more of his attention and left all that remained to Abbot Heribrand.183 It was reasonable for a distinguished school master not to consider a simple monk as a serious opponent. As R. W. Southern put it, the letter seems like a missive “an elderly professor might have written to a headmaster complaining about the ill-behaviour of his pupils”.184 Anselm expressed his superior position, writing that “men discuss the meaning of the word while boys bicker about verbal trifles since they do not properly understand what they speak or hear”. At the end of the letter, Anselm defends the underlying principle of his teaching:

The statements of all Catholic writers are different, but they are not divided; they agree in meaning, even though in words they may seem to contain contradictions and discords. These apparent contradictions scandalize the faint-hearted, provoke the busy-bodies, and provide contentions for the proud, but they are quickly resolved by men experienced in bringing harmony out of discord. 185

However, this letter confirmed Rupert’s belief that Anselm and his followers treated monks without respect “as if there are no knowledgeable men in monasteries”.186 Outraged by the attack, Rupert decided to go to the city of Laon to debate with Anselm in person. It was quite unusual for a Black Monk to leave his monastery and travel about 150 miles over the course of several days to debate with the most famous school master in the whole of Western Christendom!

182 On the trial of Rupert, see John Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz, pp. 158-168. Rupert did not record the process of the trial scrupulously, and this, to a certain degree, hinders our reconstruction of this event. The most important information concerning the trial can be found in the prologue of Rupert’s later work: see De omnipotentia Dei, prologus; PL 170, 455; see also Reg. 4.13: PL 170, 536-537, and PL 170, 495-496.
183 The letter can be found in O. Lottin, Psychologie et morale V. Problèmes d’histoire littéraire (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1959), pp. 175-177. Cf. H. Silvestre, “La letter d’Anselme de Laon à Héribrand de S. Laurent,” in Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales, 28 (1961), pp. 5-25. Giraud suggests that “the main intellectual characteristic of the man from Laon is his moderation, which distinguished him clearly from Abelard”. Anselm also advocated the multiform nature of religious life and inner conversion, and this was the reason why his pupils embraced varied religious life and his works also circulated among monastic communities. See Cédric Giraud, Per verba magistri, pp. 325, 330ff.
186 De omnipotentia Dei, PL 170, 472B.
In his *Commentaries of Benedictine Rule*, Rupert recorded minutely the melodramatic story of his journey to Laon. He was accompanied solely by a servant and rode on a donkey to the city of Laon in 1117, imitating the procession of Jesus entering Jerusalem. He was confident that he would overcome this renowned school master in front of his followers. Dramatically, Anselm of Laon died suddenly when Rupert entered the gate of that city. The death of Anselm prevented any meeting between them. Rupert believed that this was a sign from God confirming the orthodoxy of his interpretation of the will of God, which greatly enhanced his confidence as the Lord’s prophet. It was reported that he still had a debate with Anselm’s pupil William of Champeaux, who was the Bishop of Châlons but still taught in Anselm’s school.\(^{187}\)

There is no doubt that the arguments and even fights with the school masters and their followers are crucial to comprehend how Rupert became more aware of the methodological challenge represented by the school masters. In particular he became more pugnacious in his attacks against the use of dialectic for exegetical purposes. This became more evident in his work *De sancta Trinitate*, where Rupert regarded the school masters as the enemies and hypocrites within the Church. Rupert insisted that the understanding of the divine revelation could be nourished by faith rather than “reasoning” in the manner of those *scholares*.

Chenu argues that according to Rupert, “to look for reasons was to lack respect for God who spoke”.\(^{188}\) However, this statement, which led to the formation of Rupert’s image as a “conservative monastic theologian” is perhaps exaggerated. In general, Rupert was not opposed to the study or teaching of secular subjects by which he learned from an early age. What irked him is the conviction that the new school masters did not apply their knowledge of the arts to the study of the Bible appropriately, resulting in fundamental misunderstanding of the Scriptures, thereby giving birth to heretical thoughts. As Rupert emphasizes in his *Commentary on the Gospel of John*

So those who study sacred letters in Christ’s school must give away everything so as to buy that single pearl (which means the true love of God) and cleanse their mind’s eye from all the filth of physical affections. In that way, they are able to follow in some degree that eagle John whom a clean heart

---


strengthened to be able to behold the brightness of the eternal Sun with unimpaired keenness of mind, beyond the other animals of Ezekiel’s divine vision.  

In Rupert’s later writings, he complained that he was disdained simply because he had been a monk since childhood, which secluded him from the outer world:

I did not travel across sea and land like those rich merchants in whose opinion I am a poor man… For they went long distances, and journeyed to celebrated masters. And after they found many pearls that seemed good, the pearls of poets and philosophers, they found one truly good and valuable pearl, the pearl of holy and divine Scripture, which they brought for a great price in vigilance and anxiety, if only they could find it perfectly and keep it into eternity! I did not do this, but like simple Jacob with his mother Rebecca, I lived at home. Consequently I am a poor and contemptible man in their minds, and they say: “who is this? For he writes and speaks, speaks and writes, a chap who was not worthy even to set eyes on our master and teachers.

Rupert deplored how his “faithful and constant” defence of the “true doctrine” had been ignored by those “great masters and celebrated teachers, bright lights of all France”. These criticisms and responses (sometimes only indifference) usually put Rupert in an awkward position, which deepened his inner tension with the school masters and in particular their new exegetical methodologies, that is, the extensive usage of dialectic in the interpretation of the Scripture.

These four years of controversy (1113-1117) should be considered as the major formative period for Rupert’s thinking, and as the foundation for Rupert’s image as a “conservative monastic theologian”. His confidence as an exegete was greatly intensified by these charges and his attitudes toward the cathedral school masters and its followers sharply deteriorated. From the autumn of 1117 until the spring of 1119, Rupert’s teaching on the creation of

---

189 John, Prologue; CM 9, pp. 6-7. For further discussion about Rupert’s idea of the liberal arts, see chapter III.
190 Rupert of Deutz, Reg, Apologia; PL 170, 480B-C: “Ex eo pauper ego reputatus sum, apud cogitationes illorum, quod a puerilibus annis monachus et coenobii claustris fui contentus, sive detentus, et non circuivi mare et aridam… Ierunt enim in longinquum, et apud magistros inclytos peregrinati sunt, et post multas margaritas, quae bonae esse videbantur, margaritas poetarum atque philosophorum, unam vere bonam et vere pretiosam, sanctae ac divinae Scripturae margaritam invenerunt, eamque magno pretio vigilantiae ac sollicitudinis emerunt, et utinam invenerint ad perfectum, et habeant in aeternum! Hoc ego non feci, se d tanquam simplex Jacob cum matre Rebecca domi habitavi. Hinc ego apud cogitationes illorum pauper et contemptibilis, et dixerunt: Quis est hic? Scribit enim et loquitur, loquitur et scribit, qui magistros et praeceptores nostros saltem videre nunquam dignus fuit.” Here the translation is drawn in consultation that of Ian P. Wei; see Ian P. Wei, Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris, p. 13. It is interesting that the monks of Bec enjoyed high reputation for their learnings of letters. ORDERIC Vitalis proves that: “a great store of learning in both the liberal arts and theology was assembled by Lanfranc in the abbey of Bec, and magnificently increased by Anselm… So by good custom the monks of Bec are so devoted to the study of letters, so eager to solve theological problems and compose edifying treatises… the most erudite doctors can learn things to their advantage.” Ecclesiastical History, II, pp. 296-297.
Angels was once again under attack in Liège.\footnote[191]{This was the last charge he confronted in Liège and he still kept silence instead of fighting back. Rupert prepared to depart to Cologne under the protection of the archbishop of Cologne. With a deep-seated sense of scorn and the same strong self-justification, Rupert was leaving the city where he had lived for more than forty years.} This was the last charge he confronted in Liège and he still kept silence instead of fighting back. Rupert prepared to depart to Cologne under the protection of the archbishop of Cologne. With a deep-seated sense of scorn and the same strong self-justification, Rupert was leaving the city where he had lived for more than forty years.

4. Defender of Benedictine Monasticism and Rupert’s Legacy

Jay Diehl suggests that the exile in Cologne (shortly before taking the abbacy of Deutz) marks the final shift in Rupert’s life.\footnote[192]{Prior to his exile, Rupert attributed his works to traditional and strict book learning, which he claimed to be equal in terms of quality with that offered in cathedral schools. However, after his move to Cologne, Rupert insisted that the visionary experiences he had in his youth formed the foundation of his exegetical analysis. To some extent, this is also a reasonable response to what he suffered over the preceding years.} Prior to his exile, Rupert attributed his works to traditional and strict book learning, which he claimed to be equal in terms of quality with that offered in cathedral schools. However, after his move to Cologne, Rupert insisted that the visionary experiences he had in his youth formed the foundation of his exegetical analysis. To some extent, this is also a reasonable response to what he suffered over the preceding years.

The abbey of Deutz was founded by Archbishop Heribert of Cologne (999-1021) around 1003 and its church was dedicated in 1020. Abbot Markward (1110/13-1120) had reformed the abbey with the protection and assistance of Archbishop Frederick and Abbot Cuno. It was recorded that Abbot Markward asked Rupert to promise to take over the abbey of Deutz after the abbot’s own death. On 11 September 1120, Rupert succeeded Markward as abbot of Deutz, due to the “great fame of his learning in Holy Scripture” and his “numerous, large, and magnificent books”.\footnote[193]{The period from 1120 to 1129 was the final period of Rupert’s mature composition and coincided with his abbacy of Deutz and ultimately, his death. Although his abbacy at Deutz covered only the last 10 years of his life, the majority of Rupert’s literary output occurred during this period.} The period from 1120 to 1129 was the final period of Rupert’s mature composition and coincided with his abbacy of Deutz and ultimately, his death. Although his abbacy at Deutz covered only the last 10 years of his life, the majority of Rupert’s literary output occurred during this period.\footnote[194]{The general introduction to Rupert’s thoughts on Angels can be found in Vojtěch Novotný, Cur homo? A History of the Thesis Concerning Man as a Replacement for Fallen Angels (Prague: Karolinum Press, 2014), pp. 73-82.}
In Deutz, Rupert also participated in many arguments. The increasing tension between the clerical and monastic groups within the Church resulted in Rupert becoming one of the most articulate advocates for traditional Benedictine monasticism against the claims of Cistercians and regular canons alike. While Rupert grew up as an oblate and served as a teacher in a monastic school in Liège, the Benedictine Monks still enjoyed an exclusive privilege such as monastic tithes and undoubted respect from the clergy and the laity.\(^{195}\) For Rupert, it was unthinkable to undertake a fundamental reconsideration of monasticism’s role and function in the world. However, the situation changed dramatically in the early twelfth century due to crucial changes in the religious landscape.

With the support of Archbishop Frederick of Cologne, a previous Benedictine nuns’ convent had been transformed into a house of canons regular in 1121. During the ceremony, the Archbishop classified the canons’ Rule as “apostolic and Augustinian”. What made the situation worse were these emerging communities of canons regular who were mainly under the influence of Norbert of Xanten, since most of them belonged to the recently established Premonstratensian Orders.\(^{196}\) According to the record of Norbert’s hagiographies, a sudden thunderbolt in 1113 pushed Norbert, previously a chaplain in the royal chapter in Cologne and son of noble family, to lead a life of penance and pursue a more appropriate religious life. The initial choice made by Norbert was the monastic life, and he devoted himself to Cuno, the Abbot of St Siegburg, while Rupert was staying at Siegburg around 1116-1117.

According to Rupert, he generously lent his *De divinis officiis* to Norbert at the request of the young man. However, after having kept this copy for a long time, Norbert returned it to Rupert without any comment. Later, when Norbert started his journey as an itinerant preacher and became increasingly famous, he attacked Rupert’s “heretical thoughts”, especially “the incarnation of the Holy Spirit in the womb of the Virgin”, and requested that Rupert’s works be burnt.\(^{197}\) However, this is not to say that Norbert was supporting the school of Laon or


\(^{197}\) Around 1119-1120, Pope Callixtus II asked Bishop Bartholomew of Laon to look after Norbert and Norbert attended the lectures given by Anselm and Ralph of Laon. However, Drogo wrote to him angrily that “you were brought up and educated in the school of the Holy Spirit, who is not slow in teaching; do you now leave that school and attend a secular school? Divine wisdom espoused you; now worldly philosophy has loved and allured you”. After receiving the letter, Norbert immediately withdrew from the cathedral school of Laon. See “The Hagiography of Norbert, Version A: Life of Norbert, Archbishop of Magdeburg,” in *Norbert and Early Norbertine Spirituality*, pp. 136-137. Norbert also denounced the writings of Abelard: see W. Grauwen, “Het getuigenis van Abaelard over Norbert van Gennep,” in *Analecta Praemonstratensia*, 63 (1987), pp. 5-25 and “Nogmaals over Abarlard, Bernard en Norbert,” in *Analecta Praemonstratensia*, 65 (1989), pp. 162-165.
other school masters. This charge was viewed by Rupert as the fourth and the last controversy in his life, and there was no doubt that Rupert would take quite a negative view of Norbert.\footnote{198 Even before the confrontation with Norbert, Rupert had debated over the nature of religious life with Bishop John of Thérouanne. This bishop was widely known as the most vigorous promoter of the canons regular in the Flanders area. \textit{De vita vere apostolica,} I.2-3; PL 170, 615A-615C; concerning Bishop John of Thérouanne, see Brigitte Meijns, “The ‘Life of Bishop John of Thérouanne’ by Archdeacon Walter (1130) and the Bishop’s Pastoral Activities,” in Werner Verbeke, Ludovicus Milis and Jean Goossens eds., \textit{Medieval Narrative Sources: A Gateway into the Medieval Mind} (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), pp. 77-90. For a more comprehensive treatment, see Giles Constable, “The Language of Preaching in the Twelfth Century,” in \textit{Viator,} 25 (1994), pp. 131-152, especially pp. 135-141.}

In his \textit{Altercatio monachi et clericorum quod liceat monacho praedicare} (1121-1122) and in the whole of Book IV of his commentary \textit{Super quaedam capitula regulae Benedicti,} (ca.1125),\footnote{199 See \textit{Altercatio monachi et clerici,} PL 170, 537-542; IV, \textit{Reg.}, PL 170, 525-538. Also see Rupert’s letter to Abbot Eberhard of Brauweiler, \textit{Epistola ad Everardum abbatem Brunwillarensem,} PL 170, 541D-544B.} Rupert extensively treated the issue concerning the Benedictine monks and canons regular. In the fictional dialogue, the anonymous interlocutor of Rupert (the monk) is perhaps Norbert of Xanten (the canon). Philip of Harvenget argues that Rupert twisted the real debate and manipulated its outcome in order to make himself a victor. Because Philip believes that in respect to knowledge of Prophecy or Aristotle, Norbert would surely have been unrivalled: “Indeed he would have far surpassed the monk (Rupert), for, he was well schooled in secular literature and eloquent in debate. But he had also studied religious works so deeply that, in the debate he had with the monk”.\footnote{200 De \textit{institutione clericorum tractatus,} PL 203, 807B-C. In addition, Anselm of Havelberg also mentioned that Rupert explicitly and discussed the text from St. Jerome which said that the monks held the duty of weeping rather than teaching. See A. Leone, “Ruperto di Deutz e il problema della predicazione dei monaci,” in \textit{Benedectina,} 27 (1980), pp. 497-507.}

Nevertheless, the main task for Rupert was to defend the position of Benedictine monasticism in the Church and the right of monk-priests to preach and perform the Sacraments.\footnote{201 It is admitted that from the ninth century onwards, there were increasing numbers of monks who had been ordained as priests and took care of the faithful. However, we should also note that this sort of tendency or development had never been legalized by Rome.} Rupert argues that in recent years Norbert’s pupil, some canons regular, had denied the right of the monks to celebrate the sacraments outside the boundaries of their abbeys or to preach. It seems that “some of God’s servants, devout men of us, that is the monastic way of life, have raised questions that ought not to be dismissed”.\footnote{202 \textit{Reg.}, I; PL 170, 478D: “maximeque de illis de quibus questiones non contemnendas moverunt quidam servorum Dei, viri religiosi, nostrae, id est monachicae professionis.” See also Chenu, “Monks, Canons, and Laymen in Search of the Apostolic Life”, in idem, \textit{Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century,} pp. 202-219; Christopher Brooke, “Monk and Canon: Some Patterns in the Religious Life of the Twelfth Century,” in W. J. Sheils ed., \textit{Monks, Hermits, and the Ascetic Tradition} (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985), pp. 109-129; Constable, \textit{The Reformation of the Twelfth Century,} pp. 54-58. As a twelfth-century urban canons articulated: “If you are a monk, what are you doing in the midst of the crowds? I wish to instruct others, you say. This is not your office; your office is to weep. In feeing the word you instruct yourself more than in seeking the world.” Quoted from}
Rupert, the essence of being a priest was the service of the altar, which was shared by ordained monks, secular clerics and canons regular. Consequently, the ordained monks also enjoyed the right to baptize, to say public Mass and to preach in front of the faithful. The right to preach played an extremely significant role in Rupert’s life and his career as an exegete, and his life-long works represented the preaching and teaching offered by a monk in a different form from the oral sermons. This was his ultimate vocation and divine obligation. When he confronted the greatest challenge of his time, which arose from the development of the canons regular, Rupert strongly defended the monks’ rights of pastoral care. While facing the onslaught of Benedictine monks by canons regular and other new orders, Rupert upheld his precious notion of the “monk-priest”. To Rupert, nothing was more important than the monk-priest’s constant service of praise and intercession at the altar.

Moreover, Rupert’s disagreement with the canons regular could also be observed in many encounters that occurred during his abbacy in Deutz. For example, Rupert could not accept that the provost of the house of canons regular would use the title of “abbot” and would be granted the staff in his investiture. Furthermore, the staff, according to Rupert, came from the Old Testament period and only two staffs really possessed the authority of the Holy Spirit: the staff of the bishop and that of the abbot, which were independent of each other. Therefore, the use of the staff by a so-called “abbot” of the house of canons regular should not be allowed. According to Rupert, the order of the Church divided into two areas as under the bishop and under the abbot, with no extra space for the canons regular. On the other hand, the canons adopted the Rule of St. Augustine and created neither a life of prayer nor pure monastic steadfastness. They thought of themselves as “clerics” par excellence, dedicated to preaching and performing the sacraments, which they saw as superior to meditation and asceticism. This idea is expressed explicitly in Rupert’s early work, especially in his

---

203 *Reg.* IV.8, 10; PL 170, 532-534, 538-540, 543-544.
205 “…tota quidem illi offert ecclesia credens et coiffens quia uere Deus est, et omnis in eo plenitudo diuinitatis corporaliter in habitat (Col. 2:9), maxime autem sanctorum ordo sacerdotum qui propter eum caelibem ducentes uiam semper altari praesto sunt, offerre illi incensum dignum et omne sanctum iugiter exsequi sacri altaris eius ministerium”, *De gloria et honore filii hominis super Mattheum* (CCCM, 9) (Turnhout: Brepols, 1979), edited by Dom Rhabanus Haacke, p. 39.
206 *Reg.* IV.1; PL 170, 525C-526C.
207 *Reg.* IV.4; PL 170, 528C-528D and IV.10-12; PL 170, 533B-535D.
treatment of the “Age of Piety” in *De operibus Spiritus sancti*, where Rupert pictured how the suffering Church was being led by the confessional monks.\(^{208}\)

In defence of the authority of St. Benedict, Rupert especially highlighted the role of the Holy Spirit in his inspiration. This application echoes Rupert’s special piety towards the Holy Spirit in all of his works:

> The Holy Spirit, with Whom he was filled, had indeed arranged it in his mind and had spoken through his voice, and that it had been entirely built upon the foundation of a divine arrangement, a foundation of evangelical authority, to which such a builder, or writer, no doubt turned the open eyes of his mind as he was writing.\(^{209}\)

In fact, the core of the dispute between Norbert and Rupert centred on the ideal religious life. Norbert’s pursuit of religious life and the spirituality of renewal went against the Benedictine traditions in which Rupert was deeply rooted. Norbert’s chief aim was to provide a serviceable routine for ordinary people, so that they could worship on the basis of clear and unambiguous doctrinal declarations. R. W. Southern offered a very insightful interpretation of this disagreement, in which Rupert, while welcoming Norbert’s distrust of the endless doctrinal refinements conducted by the school masters such as Anselm of Laon, found it impossible to understand Norbert’s rejection of liturgical elaboration. For Rupert, the fully developed liturgical life, with its richly enacted ceremonies and not too sharply defined theological statements, was the solemn expression of the religious life at its best and most complete. However, what was cherished by Rupert was not what Norbert was looking for: he was seeking a simplicity which would be serviceable for ordinary people.\(^{210}\) Even though Rupert also had a strong pastoral concern, it was quite different from that of Norbert as a wandering preacher. For Rupert, the intended audience were his confreres—such as monk-priests or the novices who inhabited in cloisters—and those who might be deceived or even victimized by the new school masters; on the contrary, Norbert’s purpose was to establish a new simple way of preaching for the average people living in villages, towns and cities.

---

\(^{208}\) See Chapter III.

\(^{209}\) *Reg*, I; PL 170, 479A: “et per os eius locutus fuisse Spiritus sanctus, quo ille plenus fuit, et quod omnino superaedificata esset super fundamentum divinae positionis, fundamentum evangelicae auctoritatis, cui nimium talis aedificator, sive scriptor apertos suae mentis oculos, dum scriberet, intendit.” (Young’s translation, via http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~young/regben.html)

These divergences coincided with the economic, demographic and social developments of the beginning of the twelfth century, which influenced rituals and daily worship practices.\textsuperscript{211}

Moreover, it should be noted that this controversy about the religious life was also connected with the conception of the guidance of the Holy Spirit through the revival of \textit{vita apostolica}. As discussed in the first chapter, the disputes which were concentrated on the understanding of \textit{vita apostolica} could be regarded as one of the most important issues in the early twelfth century. In many ways, both monastic and clerical camps tried to justify their peculiar religious life as the fullest expression of the apostolic life. This dispute can be seen more clearly through the perspective of salvation history, and the works produced by Rupert and Norbert’s immediate disciple, Anselm of Havelberg.\textsuperscript{212}

The fire in Deutz that occurred in 1128 brought a great shock and another divine revelation to Rupert.\textsuperscript{213} The fire destroyed almost the entire abbey of Deutz but the room which contained all his works and notes escaped the damage. The survival of all these works from a catastrophic fire symbolized their value through the protection of providence. In the last stage of Rupert’s life, the miraculous survival of his works led him to express his self-defence again:

\begin{quote}
I have a witness in my soul that I have received the power and ministry of writing... I have tried to desist from writing in deference to the criticisms of my enemies who declare that there are enough books already; but whenever I have stopped writing, God, who makes the whole earth to tremble, has struck me and caused me to tremble under my Master’s rod.\textsuperscript{214}
\end{quote}

On the fourth of March, 1129, Rupert died at around the age of fifty-five years old. Despite his many debates, Rupert still had his own admirers and followers. Since the 1120s, in the north-western part of the Empire, Rupert had been considered the leading theologian and scriptural commentator among the Benedictines and was admired by many monks as the defender of the monastic religious life and its theology.\textsuperscript{215} For example, Arno of Reichersberg described Rupert as the leading scholar among the traditional Benedictines, together with

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{212} See chapters I and IV.
\textsuperscript{213} For Rupert’s accounts of the fire, see \textit{De incendio oppidi Tuitii}, PL 170, 333A-358A. See also W. Becker, “Der Brand von Deutz im Jahre 1128. Auszüge aus dem Buch De Incendio des Abtes Rupert von Deutz,” in \textit{Rechtsrheinisches Kölner Jahrbuch für Geschichte und Landeskunde}, 6 (1980), pp. 121-139.
\end{footnotes}
Hugh of St. Victor and Bernard of Clairvaux among the canons regular and Cistercians respectively. Gerhoh of Reichersberg, viewed as one of the indirect but quite fervent disciples of Rupert, referred to him as “Rupert, the Abbot of Deutz, a man of blessed memory”. Even Herman the Jew said that he was convinced by Rupert’s demonstration of the teaching of Christianity.

And in this way, against all of my objections, Rupert, both with beautiful arguments and with powerful proofs of the Scriptures, kept dispersing them like a cloud of dark night by the brilliant rays of his responses.

Wibald of Stablo, who was a close friend of Anselm of Havelberg during their youth, had studied with Rupert for a couple of years when he was a young monk. Wibald even paid Rupert a visit after he had been back to Stablo. But the most significant, lasting and powerful supporter of Rupert was no doubt Cuno. Cuno’s promotion to the bishopric of Regensburg gave him more power to facilitate the dissemination of Rupert’s work in his own and nearby dioceses. The bishop himself became the most energetic agent in spreading Rupert’s works throughout the monastic world, in particular in Cologne, Bavaria and Austria. It is arguable that almost all the theologians who were greatly influenced by Rupert of Deutz’s works were located in these areas.

5. Conclusion: Conservative, Transitional or Innovative?

Rupert of Deutz has been widely regarded by modern scholarship as an exemplary figure of “pre-Scholastic” medieval exegete, who opposed the new pastoral and intellectual trends. Chenu points out the “institutional differences” and “divergent emphasis” of the new intellectual tools used by the school masters, such as the rational device of the questio and the

216 Arno of Reichersberg, Scutum canonicorum; PL 194, 1519A-C. However, as John Van Engen points out “no such testimonies have come down from anyone outside the German Empire, and none at all from after the year 1150”. See John Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz, p. 4.

217 However, Herman the Jew eventually converted to Catholicism and became a canon of Premonstratensian house at Cappenberg, which was precisely the religious order of which Rupert heartily disapproved. Cappenberg was the first Premonstratensian house in Germany, which had been founded in 1122 by Counts Godfrey and Otto of Cappenberg. On Herman the Jew’s meeting with Rupert, see Jean-Claude Schmitt, The Conversion of Herman the Jew, pp. 78-113.

218 On three occasions Rupert attempted to compile a full list of his writings. The first time was around the spring of 1125, when he had been the abbot of Deutz for several years, and put his works-list in an apologia for all readers who “might find them interesting or worthy reading”; the second time occurred when Rupert wrote to his patron Cuno for his elevation to the bishopric of Regensburg in the autumn of 1126; and the last time was in the work he devoted to Pope Honorius II in autumn of 1128. Reg. I; PL 170, 489; Officis, Epistola; CM 7, p. 3; Glor. Epist, PL 169, 9A-10D.
construction of the *summa* which often ignored the contents and purposes of the Scriptures and the writings of the Church Fathers. This approach was far from that of the theologians who worked “within the institutional and spiritual framework of the monastic life”, embroidering the word of God with their particular purpose. From this perspective, Rupert is widely treated as the epitome of traditional Benedictine monasticism. In addition, Dom Jean Leclercq’s masterpiece *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* and his idea of division between monastic theology and scholastic theology intensified this trend, and presented Rupert as a paragon of “traditional monastic theology”. This has remained the most widely-received image of Rupert. Furthermore, R. W. Southern argues that, among the people who opposed the analytical treatment of the sacred area of God in a profane atmosphere, Rupert of Deutz is “the most vociferous, outwardly indeed ridiculous but intellectually far from contemptible”. Jean-Claude Schmitt shares a similar view saying Rupert was an “intellectual ‘conservative’”, both on the basis of his defence of traditional monastic theology “against the ferment of early scholasticism in the urban schools” and on the grounds of his institutional hostility to the new orders of canons regular. It is true that Rupert rejected those new masters we now recognize as the forerunners of Scholasticism and that he strove to work within the world of monastic and contemplative Scripture reading, which was assuredly the way the Bible was most often read in the Middle Ages.

However, John Van Engen has observed there was a hidden contradiction in Rupert’s thinking and especially in the developments of his theological ideas, suggesting that Rupert of Deutz was “someone deeply rooted in the old order struggling alternately to keep up with and to resist the new”. Studies of Rupert have often grappled with the tension between innovation and tradition. In fact, Rupert could not easily be claimed by one school of thought,

---

224 John Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, p. 3. However, this description should be understood within the limitations of a general theological approach and should not be applied to every aspect of Rupert’s work. John Van Engen’s other similar articulations can be found in pp. 8-10, 57-58, 314-323, 345-352, 371-375.
especially if we use the terms “monastic” or “scholastic” in a mutually exclusive sense. The inner tension and dynamic revealed in Rupert’s life and thinking offer more diversity and originality than we might expect. The long-established division between monastic theology and cathedral schools has now been gradually replaced by a more unified interpretation of the intellectual world of the twelfth century. Many scholars argue that the old division based on different religious practices and territories oversimplifies the complicated context of this period. Marcia Colish even suggests that Rupert could be taken as a participant (though not intentional) in the formative period of scholastic methodology, rather than a leader of a conservative school of thought that fiercely rallied against the emerging scholastic movement in cathedral schools. Zemler-Cizewski also argues that we should move away from the labels of Rupert as a “conservative thinker” and “representative of the old-fashioned monastic approach to Scripture”, which fail to appreciate the considerable originality of Rupert’s exegetical work.

As a matter of fact, Rupert’s image as a “conservative Benedictine theologian” is mainly attributable to his later works. An increasingly apologetic nature and confessional spirit are displayed in Rupert’s later works, so much so that he almost entirely denied the importance of reasoning, teaching, learning and schooling at the end of his life. As he explains in *De gloria et honore Filii hominis super Matthaeum*:

> Where are your fathers? Which or what kind of things did your masters teach you? … I was able to have such confidence in drawing out the mysteries of the Holy Scriptures not on account of the proud spirit, nor on account of the presumption of one’s own heart; but on account of the grace of the Lord, on account of the worthiness of the Holy Spirit. And I was in no way able to comprehend this ability except by the good Spirit, by whom and from whom all good things proceed… although I am myself a

---

225 For one insightful reconsideration of this topic from the perspective of theological development, see Constant J. Mews, “Scholastic Theology in Monastic Milieu in the Twelfth Century: The Case of Admont,” in A. I. Beach ed., *Manuscripts and Monastic Culture*, pp. 217-239.
student in the books of the liberal arts, I confess that the visitation from on high is better to me than ten fathers of that kind (which means the school masters).  

In this passage, Rupert seemed to fiercely reject the impact and influence of his early education on his writing. Jay Diehl observes that after 1124, Rupert’s views in terms of education, learning and knowledge all “changed dramatically in character”. He argues that “references to learning in the arts and their absorption into sacred studies all but vanished from Rupert’s writings.” Rupert revealed his own visionary experiences, which were never mentioned in any of his writing before c. 1125, but which he claims date to 1108 and to have infused him with the knowledge necessary for his exegetical and theological writings.

Rupert’s later writing style was in fact quite similar to that of Anselm of Canterbury, who had been accused by his mentor Lanfranc of scarcely quoting the Church Fathers and other authoritative works. However, there is an obvious and crucial difference between Rupert and Anselm: Anselm reached his conclusions through the act of reasoning, while Rupert relied more on meditation on the figurative message in the Scriptures and divine inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and this became increasingly evident in his later works. Rupert heavily employed the technique of “holy reading” (lectio divina) in his work, which was the cultivation of a quiet receptiveness which allows the Holy Spirit to speak in a man’s heart as it will, and patient reflection upon every detail of expression; while Anselm of Canterbury used his mastery of the classical technique and study of dialectic to achieve the correct definition and only quoted the Scriptural texts where necessary.

---

229 De Gloria, XII; CM 29, PP. 385-386: “Tui patres ubi sunt? Qui vel quales magistri te docuerunt?... non ex praesumptione proprii cordis, sed ex dono mihi accidisset gratiae Domini, ex dignatione Spiritus sancti, fiduciam talem habere tractandi sanctarum Scripturarum sacramenta, et quod nullo modo facultatem hanc assequi potuisse, nisi per spiritum bonum, de quo vel a quo bona cuncta procedunt. Ego, quamvis et ipse nonnullos in discipulis scholaribus patres habuerim, et in libris artium liberalium non segniter studio sus exstiterim, hoc profiteor, quia visitatio ab Altissimo melior mihi est quam decem patres eiusmodi.”

De Lubac describes the proliferation of Origen’s works in the eleventh and twelfth centuries and demonstrated connections between Rupert’s work and that of Origen. Indeed, there are obvious similarities between Origen’s and Rupert’s use of allegories in understanding the meaning of Scripture. See Henri De Lubac, Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture. Vol. III (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009), translated by E. M. Macierowski, pp. 85-86, 163-176.

230 Cf. Spiritus, VII.11-17; CM 24, pp. 2050-2070. See the detailed discussion in chapter III.


232 About the different exegetical interpretation approaches between Rupert and Anselm of Canterbury, also see G. R. Evans, The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Earlier Middle Ages (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 13-26. However, Anselm of Canterbury was not received by all the scholastics as a leading figure in their investigations, and especially not by Abelard. See M. T. Clanchy, “Abelard’s Mockery of St. Anselm,” in The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 44-1 (1990), pp. 1-23.
In order to clarify Rupert’s ambition, it would be beneficial to examine Rupert’s attitude towards Augustine of Hippo.\textsuperscript{233} For example, Rupert admitted that the great Augustine had elaborated “a sonorous and sweet sermon-series” on the \textit{Gospel of John} and many people were “extremely indignant” because Rupert dared to challenge this authority.\textsuperscript{234} However, he justified his enterprise by highlighting the divine will and inspiration that led him to undertake such a difficult task. Rupert humbly praised Augustine as “the pillar and firmament of truth, truly the pillar of cloud, in which the wisdom of God has set his throne”.\textsuperscript{235} Reading between the lines, we can, however, see a veiled but strong desire to surpass Augustine as an exegete, as Rupert implies that there was much left to be interpreted and understood by Augustine and he even explicitly claimed that we cannot put our trust in Augustine for everything.\textsuperscript{236} Rupert may have thought of himself as a successor or even competitor to Augustine. Rupert attempted to offer his original re-interpretation of salvation history with the emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in order to comprehend and guide the renewal of the Church.

***

Rupert was at once traditional and progressive. While many approaches employed by Rupert in his exegetical works were traditional, his treatises were neither simple recapitulations of received exegesis established by the Church Fathers nor adaptations of


\textsuperscript{234} In the later apologetic letter to Cuno, Rupert recalled how his opponents criticized him for daring to reconsider the same Gospel that had been interpreted by such a great Doctor of the Church. As he said: “But I have seen the wisdom of God; I have seen in some manner the Incarnate Word, Christ, the Son of God. He was wholly golden, having as it were a body wholly formed of the finest gold and from it living waters poured forth into me with force, through many pipes projecting from that body of his on every side.” \textit{Reg}, I; PL 170, 480C: “Sed vidi sapientiam Dei, vidi quodammodo Verbum incarnatum, Christum filium Dei, totum aureum, totum quasi corpus habentem optimo ex auro formatum, et ex ipso vivas aquas in me cum impetu profluentes, per complures fistulas ex ipso eius corpore undique proeminentes.”

\textsuperscript{235} See Rupert of Deutz, \textit{Spiritus}, VII.19; CM 24, p. 2071.

\textsuperscript{236} See \textit{John, pro.}, CM 9, p. 7; \textit{Reg}, I; PL 170, 496B: “Eius rei necessitas me compulit, ut dicerem non esse in canone scripta beati Augustini, non esse illi per omnia confidendum sicut libris canonicis.” This was quite a bold statement in the first decades of the twelfth century, not only because the great Father had been the primary patristic authority during the Early Middle Ages, but also because from the 1090s on, Augustine’s authority had been rapidly achieving a position of unparalleled pre-eminence. See M. W. F. Stone, “Augustine and Medieval Philosophy,” in Eleonore Stump and Norman Kretzmann eds., \textit{The Cambridge Companion to Augustine} (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 235-255.
conventional understanding derived from acknowledged authorities. He was not merely the conservative imitator of his Carolingian predecessors. Instead, he can rightly be counted among some of the twelfth century’s “more innovative theologians”, both in his scope and magnitude. As we are going to demonstrate in the next chapter, Rupert’s theology of the Holy Spirit was one of the most striking examples of his innovative thinking.

Rupert’s expression and devotions were far from the new intellectual worlds, such as Paris and Laon, but he also developed his own innovative thoughts on historical theology and biblical exegesis to the twelfth century. The fundamental divergence between the Benedictine traditions represented by Rupert and the new school masters, as R. W. Southern remarked, was located in the opposition between the ceremonies and symbols and the definitions and systems: “they are remainders of one important fact … the increasing wealth and power of western Europe from the middle eleventh century to the early fourteenth century provided the conditions and resources to support several lines of development which had different origins, different milieux, different sources of inspiration, different readers”.

The main task for the school masters in the first decades of the twelfth century was to establish a systematic procedure for theology as a new discipline. Systematization requires the definition of individual theological loci and their correlation, but it can accomplish this only through a process of abstraction from historical processes and developments. However, Rupert was not a compiler and harmonizer of patristic material like the school masters. He was an intuitive thinker, aware of occasionally departing from patristic tradition, but convinced of his special gift from the Holy Spirit, as legitimized by a series of visionary experiences. The meditation on the divine wisdom was the source of Rupert’s inspiration. There was a fundamental difference in theological orientation between those school masters and Rupert, and this difference must be sought in Rupert’s theology of history which in turn determined his theological method. To be more specific, the opus Dei, the unfolding of salvation history, was axiomatic to Rupert and fundamental to his entire theology. The humanistic element lay in his view that an appreciation of salvation history rather than dogmatic abstraction is the proper concern of research. In other words, a visual concept determined his exegesis: a viewing of divine mysteries in the scenes of salvation history. Yet,

---


it seems that the dialectically trained mind of nascent scholasticism had no room for the kind of “historical realism” that Rupert offered.

Based on the discussion above, it is obvious that Rupert’s thinking was greatly influenced by his personal confrontations with other theologians, especially the school masters in Laon and Liège and new religious orders in Cologne. During these disputes, Rupert formed a solid theological methodology, defined by a very strong historical consciousness, contemplative orientation and special piety towards the Holy Spirit as both guidance and authority. As we will demonstrate in the next chapter, the theology of history and the characteristic historical tendency played a crucial role in Rupert’s comprehensive theological investigation, as he constantly highlighted the role of the Holy Spirit from the perspectives of his own experience and, more importantly, salvation history. Similarly, Anselm of Havelberg also expressed a peculiar emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit and salvation history; unlike this Benedictine predecessor, Anselm offered a quite different picture in his framework of salvation history. This is mainly attributable to their respective experiences and religious identities in the different religious landscapes of the 1120s and 1140s.

As a consequence, Rupert’s ambition and tireless writings paved the way for the revival of theology of history and piety towards the Holy Spirit in the first half of the twelfth century. Rupert’s experiences of the Investiture Controversy, furious encounters with the school masters and strong historical awareness enhanced his mystical, allegorical and historical interpretations. Most importantly, Rupert tried to establish his systematic and allegorical theological investigation against the broad background of salvation history, which was most clearly demonstrated in his Trinitarian order of the unfolding of providence and the guidance of the Holy Spirit within the Church through the granting of the seven gifts in respective periods. These innovative contributions to the twelfth-century intellectual environment, more specifically to the historical theology and the understanding of the renewal of the Church, will be the central theme in the next chapter.

\[239\] Rupert’s influence travelled east and south and through Gerhoh of Reichesberg it moved also in the world of the canons regular. See Peter Classen, *Gerhoh von Reichersberg*, pp. 36–40. This will be discussed in the chapter IV and V.
Chapter III: The Work of the Holy Spirit in Salvation

History: Rupert of Deutz’s *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius*

Rupert of Deutz’s *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius* (*On the Holy Trinity and its Works*) is one of the most comprehensive commentaries on the Scriptures (approximately 2000 pages in the modern edition) of the High Middle Ages, and is probably the longest single original work of the twelfth century. As discussed in the previous chapter, Rupert began his composition around 1113 while still at Liège, but his progress was soon interrupted by his flight to Siegburg, which was itself due to the condemnation of his teaching on the Eucharist and the will of God. Rupert completed his work around 1117 under the protection of Cuno of Siegburg, to whom it was dedicated. *De sancta Trinitate* comments on most parts of the Scriptures and is widely regarded as Rupert’s most comprehensive theological masterpiece. This work fully exposes Rupert’s theology of history and became the cornerstone of his theology. This exceptional work exhibits the most significant features of “monastic theology” and reflects the response of monastic writers to the ongoing dramatic transformation of ecclesiological and intellectual fields in the twelfth century. After this work, there is no monastic commentary on the Scriptures on such a scale which focuses on the topic of salvation history.

*De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius* is divided into three parts which correspond to the work of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. To be specific, the work of God the Father (*creation*, in Book I to III) deals with the seven days of Creation recorded in the Book of Genesis; the work of God the Son (*redemptio*) spans from the Fall of Adam and Eve to the Passion of Christ, and constitutes Rupert’s exegesis on the historical books of the Old Testament and the Gospels (Books IV-XXXIII). The third part concerns the work of God the Holy Spirit (*renovatio*) and is given the special title “*De Operibus Spiritus Sancti*” (Books XXXIV-XLII). The third part of *De sancta Trinitate* is not an exegetical work in the

---

240 The immense size of this work also indicates Rupert’s intended audience. R. W. Southern states it was “certainly not a work for itinerant students” who needed textbooks or small sized references; Rupert’s work is for the people who “were irremovably settled in their monastic communities”. See R. W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe: vol. 2*, p. 9.


242 For a brief outline of Rupert’s schemes, see *De Trinitate*, CM 24, XXXIV.31, pp. 1860-1861.
traditional sense. Although it offers commentaries on the *Acts of Apostles*, it also, most interestingly, offers a grand scope from the perspective of salvation history covering the period from the Incarnation of Christ to the Last Judgment.\textsuperscript{243}

The crucial role played by the Holy Spirit in Rupert’s theology of history can be seen in the structure of this work. In the respective works of the Trinity, there are seven subsections representing the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. According to Rupert, the gradual distribution of the seven gifts is the driving force of the development of salvation history. Therefore, a better understanding of the meaning of specific gifts in specific periods would facilitate the true reform of the Church in accordance with divine providence. Consequently, in Rupert’s work, the Holy Spirit dominates the progress of salvation history and serves as the Church’s guide throughout salvation history.

Rupert therefore produced, in the first half of the twelfth century, a grand and original understanding of salvation history with an emphasis on the Holy Spirit. Although some scholars suggest that Rupert’s *De sancta Trinitate* is Christology-centric, I want to argue that, in fact, there is a distinguishing role of the Holy Spirit in Rupert’s work which has long been neglected by modern scholarship.\textsuperscript{244} Rupert’s writing demonstrates a strong and innovative piety towards the Holy Spirit which had never been fully expressed from the perspective of salvation history before his masterpiece. In addition, it seems that Rupert’s conception of the Holy Spirit stimulated further works devoted to salvation history. His work pioneered the future mystical understanding of the “Age of the Holy Spirit”, which was handed down through Anselm of Havelberg, Gerhoh of Reichersberg and other twelfth-century authors to, eventually, Joachim of Fiore.\textsuperscript{245}

In what follows, I will firstly discuss the development of Rupert’s Trinitarian scheme, particularly in the *De sancta Trinitate*. As the title suggests, the work may be regarded as an extended treatise on the Trinity, in which each of three phases in the history of the world and human beings is treated as an illustration of the activities of one of the three persons. While

\textsuperscript{243} Haacke’s introduction to CM 21 contains a schematic overview of Rupert’s divisions: see pp. x-xvi. However, there are some minor errors. Haacke wrongly attributes the gifts of fortitude and counsel to chapters 48 and 54; they should be chapters 40 and 48. For another summary, see Anton Leichtfried, *Trinitätslehre als Geschichtslehre. De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius* “Ruperts von Deutz” (Würzburg: Echter, 2002), pp. 147-154.

\textsuperscript{244} John Van Engen noticed this phenomenon, but did not pursue it in his otherwise brilliant work. See John Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, p. 97.

\textsuperscript{245} For a brief and thought-provoking summary of the role of the Holy Spirit in the Middle Ages, see Hans-Werner Goetz, *Gott und die Welt: religiöse Vorstellungen des frühen und hohen Mittelalters* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011), pp. 253-268; on Rupert, see pp. 267-268.
Rupert had launched his preliminary division of the Trinity through the perspective of salvation history in his earliest mature work, *De divinis officiis*, this idea became increasingly clear with the advancement of Rupert’s theological career. This is the introduction of the seven gifts into the work of the Trinity. As a consequence, in the next step I will move to an investigation of the unique structure of Rupert’s *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius*, in order to explain how Rupert frames the seven gifts within his Trinitarian scheme of salvation history. We can appreciate Rupert’s original and creative employment of the seven gifts in his interpretation of salvation history from a broad perspective.

Based on these discussions, I will move to a more detailed discussion and take *De operibus Spiritus Sancti*, the third part of *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius*, as the main focus of this chapter. This work articulates the development of the Church during the period of “the Works of the Holy Spirit”. Firstly, I will re-examine Rupert’s interpretations of salvation history in the successive ages and investigate how, in Rupert’s exposition, the Holy Spirit renews the Church as a whole through the distribution of the seven gifts. More significantly, I will challenge the widely-received misconception that Rupert “ignored the present entirely” and that, in his work, “the vast period between the patristic age and the present remains undifferentiated”. It can be argued that Rupert’s views on the contemporary Church are chiefly manifested in his commentaries on the gifts of “knowledge” and “piety”. It is also noticeable that Rupert’s ideas are closely associated with his exile in 1116-1117 and his polemics with the school masters. It is thus important to re-examine Rupert’s thoughts on salvation history within the grand framework of continuing Church reform and disputation in the first decades of twelfth century.

1. The Trinititarian Scheme

Rupert’s Trinitarian scheme of salvation history was revolutionary in terms of the Christian conception of history; he was possibly the first person in the twelfth century to carry the

---

history of salvation down to his own age. In order to comprehend Rupert’s originality, it is necessary to undertake a brief exploration of earlier traditions relating to salvation history.

In the works of the Church Fathers, most structured their interpretations of salvation history into a two-fold rather than a three-fold scheme. For instance, in the writings of Augustine and Jerome, there are no clear divisions between the Incarnation of Christ and the Last Judgment. Christ was presented as the sole hallmark of salvation history, which left no room for further division. As Robert Markus argues, Augustine’s thinking moved with increasing certainty towards the rejection of any division derived from the sacred history of the age after Christ. Augustine asserts that to see the hand of the Lord in biblical history is one thing, but to find coordination between historical events after the New Testament is quite another. In most cases, salvation history is divided into seven ages based on the seven days of Creation or into three ages according to Paul the Apostle’s categories of before the law, under the law and under grace. In these divisions, the Incarnation of Christ naturally forms the centre point of history. The same framework was inherited by Bede and applied throughout most of the early medieval period until the late eleventh century. For example, Bede states that “the Sixth age, which is now in progress, is not fixed according to any sequence of generations or times, but like senility, this [Age] will come to an end in the death of the whole world.”

Giles Constable suggests that the various systems of historical ages were resuscitated in the twelfth century and that we can observe this first in Rupert’s works. Rupert therefore led the development of this movement when he established his scheme based on the Trinity and creatively introduced the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit into it.

In retrospect, St. Irenaeus was perhaps the first among the Church Fathers to set the Trinitarian order as the framework of salvation history:

---


249 Augustine’s threefold division of history is different from Rupert’s expositions. First of all, Augustine’s division is not based on the three persons of the Trinity. Secondly, for Augustine, the second part of excursus represented the whole of human history and the third part, titled “sine ullo temporis fine,” was the stage beyond time and history, since it exists after the Last Judgment. See *De civitate Dei*, XV.1.


Such is the order, rhythm, and movement through which a human being is created and modelled in the image and the resemblance of the uncreated God: the Father decides and commands, the Son executes and models, and the Spirit nourishes and gives the growth, the human person progressing thus, little by little, as an elevated being coming to perfection, that is, approaching the Uncreated.\textsuperscript{253}

However, Irenaeus did not formulate a historically-linear development to explain his Trinitarian order and this idea does not seem to have had any great influence in the Early Middle Ages.

Rupert himself professes that his understanding of the division of the works of the Trinity was mainly inspired by Leo the Great,\textsuperscript{254} but it is also clear that this idea was developed along with the advancement of his own theological thinking. Rupert preliminarily outlined his thought on the Trinitarian scheme in his \textit{De divinis officiis}.\textsuperscript{255} When he discussed why God allowed the fall of man and the necessity of the Incarnation, Rupert argues that:

Therefore I say, we proclaim the glory of the same Lord’s incarnation, we praise God the Father who showed his face to us by means of it (incarnation); we glorify the Son, our Lord of salvation, who took our flesh; we give thanks to the Holy Spirit, whose proper work had made the miraculous conception of the new man.\textsuperscript{256}


\textsuperscript{256} \textit{Officiis}, III.14; CM 7, pp. 121-122 “his, inquam, praemissis, gloriand praeberamus eiusdem Dominicae incarnationis, Deum Patrem laudantes, qui per \textit{illum nobis faciem suam ostendit}, glorificantes Filium salutare nostrum, qui carmen nostram assumpsit, gratias agentes sancto Spiritui, cuius proprium opus illa novi hominis mirabilis conceptio fuit.” See also Wilhelm Kahles, \textit{Geschichte als Liturgie: Die Geschichtstheologie des Rupертus von Deutz} (Münster, Aschendorff, 1960), pp. 172-188.
In the eleventh volume of *De divinis officiis*, Rupert wrote a specific “doctrinal thesis” elaborating the definition and distinguishing features of the Trinity. 257 The main content there reappears exactly in the prologue to the *De sancta Trinitate*.

It seems then, that while St. Irenaeus and Leo the Great inspired Rupert’s thoughts on the Trinitarian scheme, his own work on the scheme of salvation history certainly surpassed that of his predecessors. In the preface to the *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius*, Rupert explicitly articulates the whole framework of his work:

> Therefore, seeking to adore the glory of the Holy Trinity in this pilgrimage, let us bring the mirror of its works to our understanding, so that even though we cannot fix our weak eyes on the splendour of its majesty due to our mortal condition, we may at least walk without error by beholding its works to a small degree in its light. The work of the Trinity has three parts from the creation of the world to its end. The first is from the rise of the first light to the fall of the first man. The second is from the fall of the same first man to the passion of the second man, Jesus Christ, the Son of God. The third is from His resurrection to the end of the world, that is, to the general resurrection of the dead. The first work is proper to the Father, the second to the Son, the third to the Holy Spirit. The Trinity is inseparable and the one God works in undivided fashion; but in the case of each of these Persons, that is of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, just as there exists a personal property, so too there is a proper action to each to be considered in the perfection of the world, namely, that creation pertains to the Father, redemption to the Son, and the work that is the renewal of the creation to the Holy Spirit…. 258

It is apparent that there is a progression between Rupert’s *De divinis officiis* and *De sancte Trinitate* in terms of the Trinitarian scheme. As far as I know, neither his predecessors nor his successors ever established such a systematic pattern centred on the Trinity to reveal the unfolding of salvation history from the Creation to the Last Judgment.

By framing the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit within a Trinitarian scheme of salvation

---


History, Rupert broke the mould established by his predecessors and distinguished himself from his contemporaries. For example, Hugh of St. Victor, who is widely recognized as the most prolific theologian of history of the twelfth century, also divided history between the works of Creation and Restoration in his *De sacramentis christiana fidei*. But Hugh ascribes the whole restoration to Christ while Rupert devotes the salvation history after the Passion to the Holy Spirit’s work of “sanctification.” In this, we can see Rupert’s unique understanding of the Trinitarian scheme and in particular his special piety for, and conception of the role of, the Holy Spirit. In what follows, we will investigate how Rupert employed the seven gifts in his Trinitarian scheme, as it is only in this way that we can fully comprehend Rupert’s originality.

1.1 The Seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit in the Trinitarian Scheme

Rupert’s peculiar use of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit within a Trinitarian framework testifies to his original systematic interpretation of salvation history. In his liturgical work *De divinis officiis*, Rupert depicts a line of development which connects history with the gradual revelation of the Holy Spirit through seven gifts. The seven gifts of the Holy Spirit became even more significant in Rupert’s later work, *De sancta Trinitate*. In this work, the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit are essential for Rupert’s understanding of salvation history, since the respective work of the Trinity is delineated into a structure according to the seven gifts. This ground-breaking conception of the seven gifts gives the Holy Spirit an unprecedented role in salvation history. Moreover, for Rupert, the Holy Spirit was the giver of gifts associated with the Church as a whole, rather than with individual perfection.

In the Latin Church, it was Augustine of Hippo who first related the seven gifts to the seven petitions of the Lord’s Prayer and to the eight beatitudes. Augustine understands the beatitudes and the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit as representing seven stages in a Christian’s

---

259 Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis christiana fidei*, PL 176, 183. Hugh is more influenced by Augustine. As Smalley argues “Hugh constructed a Victorine version of the philosophy of history which he learnt from St. Augustine… Unlike the normal twelfth-century summa, *De Sacramentis* is planned on historical instead of theological lines… thus the history of the Church coincides with world history, in time, if not in scope”. See Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), pp. 89-90.

260 Rupert’s discussion concerning the Holy Spirit in *De Divinis officiis* is principally manifested in the eighth to tenth volumes, which coincides with the liturgical season from Easter to Pentecost. See *Officiis*, VIII.5; CM 7, pp. 273-274; concerning the seven gifts, see *Officiis*, VIII.5; CM 7, p. 274.

life which relate to the individual’s spiritual progress. This conception of the seven gifts as the driving force for individual advancement in spirituality was the most widely-received interpretation in the Latin West and dominated the Church for centuries.

Alcuin of York, one of the most significant scholars of the Carolingian period, argues that the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit aid in spreading the Catholic faith. Alcuin takes the limbs of the human body as an example to show how the different parts of the body have various functions. Since one spirit animates and governs all parts of the human body, Alcuin states that “although in the entire multitude of the faithful there are diversity of the gifts of grace, nevertheless the Church is one body connected and glued together through the Spirit by the bond of charity”. However, Alcuin’s emphasis was still on the “invisible work in the souls of all believers” rather than the Church in its entirety. Ratramnus of Corbie in his Contra Graecorum Opposita Romanam Ecclesiam Infamantium also focuses on the Holy Spirit as the power to sanctify and purify the individual Christian.

It is perhaps the case that Pseudo-Alcuin’s On Seven Seals (composed around the middle of the ninth century) is the only work explicating the seven gifts from a historical perspective. However, his commentary on the seven ages of the world exclusively focuses on the deeds of Christ. For example, in this work, the gift of wisdom indicates Christ was born from a virgin without the seed of man; the spirit of fortitude equals Christ’s descent into hell where he bound the devil and released other souls. The sixth gift of piety suggests Christ’s ascension into heaven, while the last gift of the fear of God predicts that Christ will return for the Judgment at the end of the world. It is obvious that the use of the seven gifts here exclusively focuses on the life of Christ and not on the full historical scope of the Bible.

262 According to Augustine, the beatitude of humility related to the gift of the fear of God, meekness to piety, sorrow to knowledge, justice to fortitude, mercy to counsel and purity to understanding. Most importantly, “Blessed are the poor in spirit”, the seventh and most elevated beatitude, related to the gift of wisdom. See Saint Augustine, Commentary on the Lord’s Sermon on the Mount with Seventeen Related Sermons (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1951 ) translated by Denis J. Kavanagh, O.S.A, pp. 27-30, 55-72.

263 Alcuin, Liber secundus, PL 101, 38C: “Quamvis enim, et in omnifidelium multitudine diversae sint donorum gratiae, unum tamen corpus est Ecclesiae per unum Spiritum, una charitatis compage conglutinatum atque connexum.”

264 Alcuin, Epistola CXIII, PL 100, 341B-342D.

265 Ratramnus of Corbie, Contra Graecorum Opposita, I.7, PL 121, 238B-242D.

Therefore, up until Rupert, the analyses of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit were mostly related to the individual’s growth in sanctity and lacked a grand historical scope. St. Augustine established the common ground for further explorations among medieval theologians, who principally focused on the connection between the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew, 5-7) and the gifts of the Holy Spirit. In the twelfth century, the new generation started to depict the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit as allied with the seven virtues in a fierce struggle against the seven vices. As a consequence, as John Van Engen argues, the doctrine of the seven gifts became a standard part of medieval moral theology.²⁶⁷

The moral tendency of the interpretation of the seven gifts is most clearly observed in the works of Hugh of St. Victor, in particular his *De quinque septenis* and *De septem donis Spiritus sancti*.²⁶⁸ In Hugh’s interpretation, the purpose of the Holy Spirit is to restore the health of sinful people. With regard to the seven gifts, Hugh investigated five distinct series of seven steps in the Scriptures based on the patristic and medieval traditions and organized the “five-sevens” (namely, the seven vices, the seven petitions in the Lord’s Prayer, the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, and the seven virtues and seven beatitudes) into a single conceptual structure that focused on the spiritual reformation or restoration of individual Christians.²⁶⁹

The idea of restoration figures prominently in Hugh’s theology and this is evident in his works on the seven gifts. Hugh’s theology chiefly concentrates on returning to the “prior state of original creation” in order to dispense with “the service of slavery” and to achieve liberation from the weakness of spiritual corruption (*infirmitas spiritualis corruptionis*).

According to Boyd Taylor Coolman, the process of restoration in Hugh’s theology should be understood as a reconstruction project.²⁷⁰ Hugh describes the condition of fallen humanity thus: “a man lying in sins is sick; the vices are wounds; God is the physician; the gifts of the


Holy Spirit are antidotes”. Hugh also suggests that the Holy Spirit must address each illness with the appropriate gift.\(^{271}\)

Despite his obvious interest in history and chronological order, Hugh of St. Victor never applied the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit to salvation history.\(^{272}\) Thus, Rupert paved the way for a novel interpretation of the seven gifts from the grand view of salvation history. In the following section, I will demonstrate how Rupert relates the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit to the works of the Father and the Son and, most significantly for my research, the Holy Spirit.

1.2 The Seven Gifts in the Works of the Father and the Son

In the works of the Church Fathers, the seven days of Creation naturally become the scheme of periodization. According to Rupert, the seven days of Creation coincide with the gifts of the Holy Spirit from the fear of God to wisdom. The presence and activity of the Holy Spirit signal the beginning of ornamentation in the corporeal substance, and Rupert introduces the notion of the cosmic egg: warmed and animated by the warmth of the mother bird, identified as the Holy Spirit. The whole ordering of the Creation is seen as a consequence of the activity of the Holy Spirit.\(^{273}\)

The first day of Creation is linked to the gift of the fear of God, when God revealed himself to the world he created.\(^{274}\) In the second day, the division of the water coincides with the gift of piety, since God the Father creates the possibility for knowing Him.\(^{275}\) The third day relates to the gift of knowledge, as Rupert suggests that the gift of knowledge is the most beautiful thing on earth which is fully expressed in the creatures God put in the garden.\(^{276}\) The fourth day is represented by the gift of fortitude. God creates the Sun and the Moon and schedules the seasons, which establishes the basic natural order for the operation of the

---


\(^{274}\) *In Genesim*, 1.21; CM 21, pp. 150-151.

\(^{275}\) *In Genesim*, 1.30; CM 21, pp. 158-160.

\(^{276}\) *In Genesim*, 1.39; CM 21, p. 167.
world. The fifth day presents the gift of counsel through the creation of fish and birds since God blesses them to be fruitful and multiply to fill the waters in the seas and in the earth. According to Rupert, it is evident these animals are natural counsel, by which they seek each other in mutual affection, build nests, and produce offspring. On the sixth day, God creates human beings and brings the gift of understanding. Since the human is a rational creature, with the breath of God, humans are able to understand God. On the seventh day, God rests and the first stage of the Son begins. In this way, Rupert presents a threefold movement in creation. With regard to the creatures, there is a development in the material substance from chaos to formation, paralleled by a unique spiritual development by participation of the Holy Spirit. In addition, in terms of the Creator, the triune God, there is a descent into intimacy with the Creature. This process begins with exterior and physical formation, moving towards the Incarnation and the subsequent interior work of the Holy Spirit on the creatures. Later, we will see the earthly work of the Holy Spirit within history and, more important, within the Church.

In his commentary on the work of the Son, Rupert divides world history into seven ages (Septem aetates mundi) chiefly based on the widely received scheme elaborated by Augustine and Bede. It was common in the Middle Ages to devote the period after the Creation and Fall to the work of the Son. But, in contrast to his predecessors and contemporaries, Rupert also connected the seven ages of the World with the predication of Christ and the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit.

According to Rupert, the first period from Adam’s expulsion from Eden to Noah reflects the Fear of God and foreshadows Christ in their deeds (factis praefiguratur). The second

---

277 In Genesim, I. 40; CM 21, p. 167-168.
279 In Genesim, I.54; II.12, CM 21, pp. 182, 197-198.
280 In Genesim, II. 18; CM 21, pp. 203-205.
282 See Augustine, De Civitate Dei, XXII.30. For Bede’s interpretation, see Faith, Bede: The Reckoning of Time, pp. 157-239. On Rupert’s interpretation of the seven ages see De sancta Trinitate, In Genesim, III.36, CCCM 21, pp. 279-280. It should be noted that the same division also appeared in his early work; see De divinis officiis, IV.3, 13; CM 7, pp. 104, 109-120. For a brief summation of Rupert’s framework of salvation history in De divinis officiis, see Wolfgang Beinert, Die Kirche--Gottes Heil in der Welt: Die Lehre von der Kirche nach den Schriften des Rupert von Deutz, Honorius Augustodanensis und Gerhoch von Reichersberg (Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 1973), p. 323. For a brief introduction to the historical scheme from the period of the Church Fathers to the High Middle Ages, see Jennifer A. Harris, “The Bible and the Meaning of History in the Middle Ages,” in Susan Boynton and Diane J. Reilly eds., The Practice of the Bible in the Middle Ages: Production, Reception and Performance in Western Christianity (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), pp. 84-104.
period from Noah to Abraham prefigures Christ in their deeds and words (factis et sermon praefiguratur), and indicates the gift of piety. The age from Abraham to David coincides with the gift of understanding through the promise of the birth of Christ (nasciturus promittitur). 283 The fourth period from David foretells Christ as the King (rex promittitur) and the gift of fortitude, which is represented by David’s victory. 284 The gift of counsel appears in the Babylonian captivity with the promise from God to re-establish the Temple and prefigures Christ’s role as Priest (sacerdos praemonstratur). The sixth stage starts from the Incarnation and ends with the Passion, when Jesus enters the world (mundum ingreditur) and reveals the gift of understanding. 285 The seventh stage is represented by the tomb of Jesus and the Resurrection, which is associated with the gift of wisdom.

John Van Engen argues that Rupert’s commentaries on the work of the Son presupposed a Christological reading of all the Scriptures. 286 Jay Terry Lees also contends that Rupert’s exegesis is highly Christocentric, in the sense that “each period is treated as a means of revealing a different aspect of Christ rather than showing different stages of human development”. 287 However, both Van Engen and Lees neglect the significance of the seven gifts in Rupert’s construction of salvation history. Indeed, it should be emphasized that in the work of the Holy Spirit the different stages also run throughout the period of the work of the Son. For example, Moses received the Ten Commandments in the work of the Son as a representation of the gift of knowledge; this became the gift of counsel in the work of the Holy Spirit. 288 According to Rupert’s scheme on the work of the Son, the Intellectus notably marked the present time, as seeking understanding was the chief task of the contemporary Church. Rupert then further subdivided according to the seven gifts, since in his scheme of salvation history it was also the period animated by the work of the Holy Spirit.

In this way, Rupert established a subtle system of periodization that consistently placed the Holy Spirit at the centre of salvation history. Moreover, while the Church Fathers focused more on the perfection of individual Christians, Rupert preferred to treat the Church in its entirety as the object receiving the gifts of the Holy Spirit. The work of the Holy Spirit was thus closely and intrinsically intertwined with the renewal of the Church. This shift evidently

283 In Genesim, III, 36; CM 21, pp. 279-280.
284 In Libros Regnum, I; CM 22, p. 1193.
285 For summaries of the six ages in the work of the Son, see Hrabanus Haacke, O. S. B., Einleitung, in CCCM 21, pp. x-xv; Wolfgang Beinert, Die Kirche--Gottes Heil in der Welt, p. 327.
286 John Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz, pp. 89-90.
288 In Exodum, II; CM 22, p. 635.
informs Rupert’s idea of the Church as the place where the gifts of the Holy Spirit are unveiled.

Rupert believed that the Holy Spirit would guide and renew the Church through the distribution of the seven gifts and that all of these had been observed in the Scriptures. Based on his theology of history and piety towards the Holy Spirit, Rupert expressed his concerns and considerations of the renewal of the Church in a general sense through his exegetical work. This is manifest in his demonstration of the work of the Holy Spirit, which itself requires in-depth investigation here.

Table 1: The Framework of Salvation History in Rupert of Deutz’s *De sancta Trinitate*. 289

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gifts</th>
<th>In the work of the Father (Creation)</th>
<th>In the work of the Son (Redemption)</th>
<th>Prefigure of the Christ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timor</td>
<td>Night and Day</td>
<td>Adam-Noah</td>
<td><em>Factis praefiguratur</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietas</td>
<td>Sky and Sea</td>
<td>Noah-Abraham</td>
<td><em>Factis et sermon praefiguratur</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientia</td>
<td>Land and Vegetation</td>
<td>Abraham-David</td>
<td><em>Nasciturus promittit tur</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortitude</td>
<td>Stars, Sun and Moon</td>
<td>David-the Captivity</td>
<td><em>Rex promittit tur</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consilium</td>
<td>Fish and Birds</td>
<td>The Captivity-Incarnation</td>
<td><em>Sacerdos praemonstratur</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectus</td>
<td>Animals and Mankind</td>
<td>Incarnation-Passion</td>
<td><em>Mundum ingreditur</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapientia</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>Christ rests on the Tomb</td>
<td><em>Divinae festivitatis requies</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

289 Based on Wolfgang Beinert, *Die Kirche--Gottes Heil in der Welt*, p. 327
2. The Seven Gifts in the Work of the Holy Spirit: *De operibus Spiritus Sancti*

John Van Engen clearly values Rupert’s investigation of the Holy Spirit, as he claims that “apart from polemics on the *filioque*, Rupert’s [*De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius*] was in fact the first such separate treatment of the Holy Spirit in the west, and thus represented an important early witness to a new form of piety singling out the Spirit’s work in Christian life, comparable to the new cult of Christ’s humanity.” However, Van Engen has not developed this idea in depth. Furthermore, although many other scholars have emphasized Rupert’s original division of the work of the Holy Spirit, few of them offer a detailed analysis of Rupert’s particular system.

I would like to demonstrate that Rupert attempts to use history as a vast edifice through which the Trinity may be understood. As Mariano Magrassi argues, Rupert projects a much clearer equivalence between the Church and the City of God than does Augustine. As a consequence, we can see that the Church in its entirety is viewed as the historical recipient of successive gifts granted by the Holy Spirit, through which the divine plan for the world is realized.

The order of the seven gifts deserves special attention. In Rupert’s treatment of the works of the Father and the Son, the gifts are listed from the fear of God to wisdom. However, the work of the Holy Spirit is approached in reverse order. Among Rupert’s contemporaries, Theophilus Presbyter and occasionally Anselm of Laon presented the seven gifts in such a

---


way. Gerhoh of Reichersberg even copied this unusual order from Rupert of Deutz when he was preaching a sermon before the Roman Curia in the 1130s. However, we cannot take the descending line of the gifts of the Holy Spirit as simply identical to the declining line of history. Rupert gives his answer for his arrangement:

Here we descend from wisdom to fear, having at the end of time what we would always fear, however perfect we may be and however much we seem to have already attained.

Rupert argues that the present Church is to be seen as the very person of the Holy Spirit of God (personam Dei sancti spiritus); this perspective offers the Holy Spirit a role of renewing and guiding the Church in the broad context of salvation history. In Rupert’s system, the Age of the Holy Spirit does not start from Pentecost but from the Incarnation. He even argues that the Incarnation of Christ is the chief work of the Holy Spirit. As Rupert announces:

The most beautiful and the most pious work of the Holy Spirit is the coming of the eternal love, who shaped the Lord into the form of human, an everlasting union, an indissoluble union. The form is so beautiful and God and man in one glorious Jesus Christ.

From the Incarnation, Rupert allocates the seven gifts to the successive stages of Church history. The first four stages are in accordance with the four gifts (wisdom, understanding, counsel and fortitude), which present Church history from the time of Jesus and the apostles to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Roman persecutions. The main theme of the fifth stage, which corresponds to the gift of knowledge, is the battle between defenders of the Church and heretics. This stage started in the Church Fathers’ era and continued to Rupert’s own time. Rupert addresses the “current issue” by discussing the “proper usage” of the seven liberal arts; it is clear that his writing was greatly influenced by his polemics with the school

---

296 Spiritus, I.31; CM 24, p. 1861.
297 Spiritus, I.15; CM 24, p. 1839: “Pulcherrimum hoc atque piissimum huius Spiritus sancti opus est, quod interventu amoris aeterni, qui ipse est, formam Domini formato conjunxit homini, coniunctione sempiterna, coniunctione indissociabili, ita ut forma et formatus unus sit formosus, unius personae speciosus Deus et homo Iesus Christus”; see also, Spiritus, I.2; CM 24, pp. 1823-1824. As a matter of fact, the most controversial sentences regarding the so called “incarnation of the Holy Spirit” tightly connect with Rupert’s Marian theology as well. Rupert states: “[f]or the same Holy Spirit, who accomplished the Incarnation of the only-begotten Son of God in her womb, would accomplish the rebirth of innumerable children of God from the womb of the Church or by means of her womb, in the life-giving bath of his grace.” See Spiritus, I.7; CM 24, pp. 1829-1830.
298 Rupert summarized the structure of his salvation history in Spiritus, I.31; CM 24, pp. 1860-1861.
masters. These had forced Rupert into exile at precisely the same time as Rupert’s composition of De operibus Spiritus Sancti. Rupert’s analyses of the seven liberal arts also represents the emerging monastic view of the first half of the twelfth century. The sixth stage coincides with the gift of piety. In previous scholarship, the main theme of this stage was generally regarded as “the final conversion of Jews”. However, it is arguable that the rise of the confessor of Christ (confessor Christi) should be viewed as the main event before the Last Judgment, which is the “immediate future” for Rupert. Rupert clearly argues that the confessional monk-priests like himself will lead the Church to overcome the persecution of the Antichrist. For him, the gift of the fear of God explicates the Last Judgment and eternal blessedness.

No one before Rupert linked the seven gifts to salvation history. For Rupert, the seven gifts are not understood in the sense of perfecting individual Christians, but rather as a sanctification of the Church as a whole. He creatively employs the seven gifts to interpret the development of the Church in successive ages and brings the divisions of salvation history into his own age. Discussion of this is the main task of the following pages.

2.1 The Deeds of Christ to the Apostolic Church: Gifts of Wisdom, Understanding and Counsel

2.1.1 Wisdom

According to Rupert, the real spirit of wisdom (Spiritu sapientiae) was granted by God as the fruit of obedience and suffering of Christ. The central figure of the gift of wisdom is Christ. From the perspective of salvation history, the age of wisdom covers Christ’s Incarnation,

---


301 In fact, Rupert had expressed this framework of salvation history in his De divinis officiis. See CCCM 7, pp. 366-368; see also Beinert, Die Kirchen--Gottes, p. 327.

Baptism, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension and therefore witnesses the coming and work of Jesus as God the Son.

From the very beginning, Rupert divides wisdom into two levels: on the restoration of the individual and on the renewal of the Church as a whole. In the first level, Rupert concentrates on the individual, and suggests that Man is a rational creature and that only human beings can discern the words from God and therefore follow the way of grace. In addition, Rupert divides wisdom into seven ascending degrees corresponding to the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit again. In this way, Rupert creates a double cycle: through a deeper understanding of wisdom through the seven stages, our understanding of the divine mystery will be fulfilled and perfected. By receiving the gift of Wisdom, man will be regenerated through the grace of mercy and hold a deeper understanding of the divine secret of God. This traditional interpretation of the seven gifts as intended for renewal of the individual is perhaps influenced by Gregory the Great and St. Benedict. Gregory the Great interprets the gifts of the Holy Spirit as a ladder which one could climb to ascend from virtue to virtue. In addition, we can see that the Rule of St. Benedict also includes ascendency through twelve rungs on a ladder of humility. The seventh chapter of the Rule (On Humility) records that the first stage is the need to put the fear of God always before one’s eyes and the last, neatly circling back to the first, is the stage at which a monk comes to the love which casts out fear.

However, Rupert’s interpretation goes beyond his predecessors. This is the second and more significant level, where Rupert concentrates on the establishment and performance of the Sacraments from the perspective of the Church as a whole. Rupert argues that wisdom is granted to humans through the Sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist. The water, the body and blood of Jesus are three witnesses of wisdom on earth. Only through the performance and receiving of the Sacraments could humans be saved and renewed as members of the Church.

---

303 *Spiritus*, II.12; CM 24, p. 1876.
304 *Spiritus*, II.12; CM 24, p. 1888.
306 The twelfth rungs possibly stems from Augustine’s seven rungs, see *De doctrina christiana*, 2.7.9-11. (CCSL 32, pp. 36-38.)
307 *Spiritus*, III.2, 8, 10-14; CM 24, pp. 1905-1906, 1911, 1914-1921; *Spiritus*, III.12; CM 24, pp. 1918-1919.
308 *Spiritus*, III.1; CM 24, p. 1905.
In the investigation of the gift of wisdom, therefore, Rupert established two levels of renewal or restoration: the first one concerns the individual, and is mainly inherited from the Church Fathers; the second one concerns the Church in the eternal sense, which reflects the changing conception of the Church in an institutional sense during the transformative age of the early twelfth century. This interpretation also lays the cornerstone for Rupert’s further discussion on the interactive operation between the Church as a whole and the Holy Spirit’s gifts in the unfolding of salvation history.

2.1.2 Understanding

The second age, the age of understanding, signifies the establishment of the Church and the activities of the apostles. This stage in history is explicitly identified with the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, which moment Rupert views as the birth of the Church. It might seem surprising that Rupert argues that even the apostles had failed to understand the teaching of the Lord and that it was only once the spirit of understanding had arrived, that the apostles finally comprehended the truth and became the “mouth of God”. 309

The spirit of understanding is central to Rupert’s interpretation. He insists that true understanding of the revelation had been the core concern of the Church from its beginnings to his own time. Moreover, he sees the understanding of divine revelation as essentially a gift and grace granted by the Holy Spirit, and not the result of talent or effort through man’s learning. This reminds us of the vision that Rupert had during his vocational crisis and his quarrels with the school masters which occurred during his composition of De sancta Trinitate. Through the example of Peter, Rupert argues that the mysterious meaning of the Scriptures and prophesies of prophets were opened to unlearned and ignorant men, but closed to the wise and prudent who were learned in letter and law. 310

Indeed, Rupert harshly criticizes “the wise and prudent of the world” and condemns them for promoting themselves rather than the glory and wisdom of God. Gribomont suggests that Rupert in fact criticized the school masters in general and here referred to the scholastics in particular, and specifically those from the school of Laon; 311 while D.E. Timmer contends that Rupert might have had the Jews in his mind as there were Jewish polemicists who

309 Spiritus, IV.1, 9; CM 24, 1938, 1948.
questioned the sacramental efficacy, and no scholastic opponents in this area. However, we should also note that there was a flourishing Jewish community in Laon from the early twelfth century and that their presence might have left its mark on the school masters.

Rupert used three apostles to represent three different forms of understanding: firstly, Peter symbolizes the mysteries to be understood by the illiterate; secondly, John, through his *Apocalypse*, signifies the understanding of the harmony of the Old and New Testament; and lastly, Paul represents the understanding of the transmission of grace to the Gentiles. Rupert’s interpretation of Paul the apostle is quite interesting. Rupert argues that Paul had to keep defending his apostleship precisely because he was not present at Pentecost and was trained only in the “deadly letter” (which means Hebraic Law). Based on these understandings, the gate of salvation opens to the Gentiles and all over the world and salvation history moved to another stage: this is the coming of the gift of counsel and the evangelization of Gentiles.

2.1.3 Counsel

The core of counsel is the discernment between right and wrong, which highlights the Jew’s rejection of Christ and true comprehension of divine revelation.

This idea of development is observable in Rupert’s treatment of the relationship between the Jews and Christians. Rupert highlights the “renewed revelation” which distinguishes the Christians from the Jews and opens the gate to the Gentiles. With the coming of Jesus Christ as the fulfilment of God’s promise about the Messiah and the re-establishment of the covenant between man and God, the old customs and ancient laws had been renewed. Anna Sapir Abulafia suggests that a crucial dimension to Rupert’s treatment of the “renewed revelation” was his notion of Christian universality as opposed to Jewish sectarianism. This idea is clearly expressed in the period of counsel.

As with the twofold division of the gift of wisdom, there are also two levels in the Jewish heritage: something to be abolished and something to be preserved. For example, circumcision must be given up but the Ten Commandments are taken as the standards of practice and closely associated with the gift of Counsel for discerning. Using the work of the Jewish historian Josephus, Rupert describes the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews as the transmission of God’s grace from the Jews to the Gentiles. Rupert argues that the dispersion of the Jews reveals God’s divine plan, as by fleeing to diverse lands, the Jews become the living witnesses of the Christian faith and confirmation of the authenticity of the Gospel. In Rupert’s view, the gift of counsel reflected the conveyance of grace from the Jews to the Gentiles. In the next stage, the gate opens to the history of persecution and the gift of fortitude, which itself moves beyond the biblical historical scope.

It is noteworthy that there is a developmental line in Rupert’s narrative on the first three gifts. Rupert’s instinctive sense of history is revealed in his statement that the gospels were written down only after the events they depict. Therefore, the New Testament represents, in a sense, a developing understanding of the revelation. Wisdom allows people to discern the worldly and heavenly issues, and understanding enables them to penetrate the mysteries of faith. Consequently, the gift of counsel will lead people out of their sinful state and towards devotion to God. Through this sequence, Rupert demonstrates the renewal of the Church through the gifts granted by the Holy Spirit, and history becomes an expression of the temporal order of salvation.

See Spiritus, V. 17-26; CM 24, pp. 1996-2006. Moreover, Rupert specifically states that only the Ten Commandments appeared on the tablets. Perhaps he was subtly rejecting the rabbinic theory of the interlinear mishpatim. See In Exodum 3. 44; CCCM 22, p. 741. He contends that Jews had put the law before faith for such a long time that they had forgotten faith itself, and he contests that Jewish religious practice was completely superfluous and the Mosaic Law was limited and unspiritual in its own right. See Anna Sapir Abulafia, Christians and Jews in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), p. 102.

Spiritus, V.15; CM 24, pp. 1994-1195. On Rupert’s use of Josephus’ writings as tragic poet, see Carol Symes, “The Tragedy of the Middle Ages,” in Ingo Gildenhard and Martin Revermann eds., Beyond the Fifth Century: Interactions with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to the Middle Ages (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), pp. 352-353.

Spiritus, V.1; CM 24, p. 1977; Spiritus, V.5; CM 24, p. 1981.
2.2 Beyond the Biblical Historical Scope: the Gift of Fortitude

Rupert grants a special theological connotation to the spirit of fortitude (Spiritus fortitudinis), which locates at the centre of the seven gifts. Rupert indicates that through the gift of fortitude, the gifts of wisdom, understanding and counsel will be transformed into action and then bear the fruit of the gifts of knowledge, piety and the fear of God. Through this interpretation, Rupert established a clear chain of causation among the seven gifts and displayed a strong sense of theological and historical progression.

The central topic in the age of fortitude is the persecution and the martyrs. As with other stages, Rupert divided these into two different levels. The first is the historical level, including the Christian martyrs from St Stephen to the Roman persecutions. The second is a prediction of the final battle between God and Satan on the theological level. Rupert moves out of the historical period covered by the New Testament. After his discussion of the apostolic martyrs, Rupert’s work was mainly relied on Boethius’s work and reconstructed the persecutions during Nero and Domitian.

It is interesting that Rupert combines the fall and rise of the Roman Empire and the Frankish Kingdom as a testimony of the work of the Holy Spirit in the course of human history, which indicates the shift of secular power. According to Rupert, these developments of secular history also reflected the gradual revelation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. He deems that the struggle of empires and kingdoms are the symbols of the beast as predicted in the Apocalypse. As the secular empires pass by, the kingdom of Christ remains eternal, since the gift of fortitude encourages the faithful to keep the faith and defend the true teaching. Rupert’s conception of the vicissitudes of secular power also indicates his interpretation of the Church-State relationship. However, for Rupert, the central goal for every gift of the Holy Spirit is the final salvation and advancement of the Church. Rupert’s description of secular empires testifies Chenu’s statement, that in the twelfth century, history remained “clearly

---

323 The narratives of apostolic martyrs are chiefly summarized from the Scriptures, especially from the *Acts of Apostles*. See *Spiritus*, VI.4-9; CM 24, pp. 2011-2021.
324 *Spiritus*, VI.10-13; CM 24, pp. 2021-2027.
325 *Spiritus*, VI.2; CM 24, p. 2009.
marked by its birth among, and in a climate of, religious things."²²⁶ In other words, this history emerges from a flourishing of the theology of history. Every secular event should therefore be granted a spiritual meaning, and in Rupert’s structure, all of them should be integrated into the work of the Holy Spirit. As a consequence, from the war between the pagan persecutors and the tenacious Christians on earth, Rupert moves to another war in the last days in heaven. Following Augustine, Rupert named the two camps as civitas Dei (Archangel Michael and his followers) and civitas diabolic (Satan and his supporters). He argues that only the people who have truly received the gift of fortitude can have the strength to defeat the devil.²²⁷

It is interesting that at the end of the book on fortitude, Rupert quite surprisingly inserts a homily on St. Laurence, who was the patron of his abbey in Liège. It is crucial for us to keep in mind that this work was composed during Rupert’s first exile in Siegburg. Rupert attempted to appeal to the authority of the Holy Spirit to defend himself. Rupert records that Laurence heard the call from God and bravely articulated his heart without the fear of persecution, and that the martyr deserves a holy kiss because of his loyalty to the words of God.²²⁸ Obviously, in this description of the kiss Rupert recalls his early vision in which he received an open-mouthed kiss from Christ and which signalled the Spirit entering into his own understanding.²²⁹ Reference to the holy kiss in the book of fortitude therefore implicitly places Rupert’s own situation within his work.

2.3 From the Church Fathers to the End of Time: Gifts of Knowledge, Piety and Fear of God

2.3.1 The Gift of Knowledge: the Patristic Age to Rupert’s own Time

The gift of knowledge (Spiritus scientia) is the first gift poured forth from the gift and action of fortitude and plays a significant role in Rupert’s framework of salvation history. It is not

²²⁶ Chenu, “Theology and the New Awareness of History,” p. 167. Rupert further displayed his view of history as a battlefield in his later Commentary of Apocalypse (1120) and On the Victory of God’s Words (1124), where he concentrated on the great red dragon with seven heads (Rev. 12:3) and Daniel’s dream of the four beasts. To some extent, Rupert’s other works on salvation history repeated, although polished in some cases, his own thoughts expressed in De Trinitate et operibus eius. Cf. Rainer Klotz, “Zur Trinitätslehre des Rupert von Deutz in De glorificatione Trinitatis et processione Spiritus Sancti”, in Heinz Finger, Harald Horst and Rainer Klotz ed., Rupert von Deutz – Ein Denker zwischen den Zeiten? (Köln: Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dobibliothek, 2009), pp. 133-162.

²²⁷ Spiritus, VI.13-14; CM 24, pp. 2025-2029.

²²⁸ Spiritus, VI.17; CM 24, p. 2033.

²²⁹ See the relevant discussion in Chapter II, p. 50.
uncommon for medieval authors to frame the fight against heresies in the historical period of the Church Fathers, but Rupert’s approach is quite distinct because he combines the historical period of the Church Fathers with his own time. By doing so, Rupert warned his audience that they are still in an age of doctrinal confrontation with heresies, which indeed reflects his argumentation with the school masters again. Since many previous scholars have tended to minimize Rupert’s concern for “the present”, I would like to re-examine how Rupert discusses the Church in his time through the treatment of the gifts of knowledge and piety and to show how Rupert linked the heresy with his hostile school masters.

According to Rupert, many secular rulers’ conversions to Christianity after the persecution brought a new and peaceful period to the Church but there also arose many heresies. As the courage to withstand persecution became less necessary than the knowledge required to combat heresies, the Holy Spirit renewed his gift in order to strengthen the Church to face the new challenge.

However, it is surprising that Rupert offers little attention to the Church Fathers or the Ecumenical Councils and focuses more on the seven liberal arts and their “proper use”. Rupert has a specific conception of the enemy of the Church in the age of knowledge. In relation to the eleventh and twelfth centuries, historians usually interpret the false brothers as the simonic clerics or apostates. However, I would like to suggest that Rupert saw the school masters as the contemporary heretics. He associates the heretical threat with the inappropriate use of the liberal arts, which is explicitly directed at his opponents in the Schools of Liège and Laon.

As Wanda Zemler-Cizewaki points out, Rupert’s main task in the discussion of this gift is to demonstrate that not all knowledge is truly deserving of the name. As such, he recasts the classical description of the liberal arts in such a way as to distinguish between true and divinely inspired knowledge, and the false knowledge of secular learning. This statement also agrees with Rupert’s emphasis on the gift of understanding. Through his attempts to re-

331 For Rupert’s condemnation of school masters as heresy, see the relevant discussion in chapter II, pp. 57-59. In his cotemporaneous work (slightly earlier), he even called Anselm of Laon as “Lucifer”. See De voluntate Dei, I; PL 170, 437B.
establish the proper use of the liberal arts, Rupert displays his point of view on “current issues”.

Rupert first distinguishes the differences between the gift of knowledge and that of wisdom:

Let us then say that knowledge is acquaintance with all the good and licit arts, but wisdom in fact is the love or reverence- not without holy fear- for one thing only, that is God, if indeed He can be called a thing \( (res) \). And certain of the pagans \( (ethnici) \) say that the first wisdom is to lack folly. To which we say that those who have however much knowledge of things, but have not attained the knowledge of God, are wrongly called wise, because in fact they are foolish… so also with removal from knowledge of the wisdom which is the knowledge of God, what remains is folly. \(^{333}\)

Rupert’s argument here is reminiscent of the work of Hugh of St. Victor. In *De tribus diebus*, Hugh also distinguished the “foolish and animal man” who cannot perceive the things of God \((I\ Cor. 2:14)\) and the spiritual man who “is able to judge all things”. \(^{334}\)

It is perhaps because Rupert wanted to show his mastery of the liberal arts, that he discussed the seven arts intensively in the rest of this volume. As a matter of fact, Rupert’s demonstrations of the liberal arts are chiefly based on the writings of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (which was commonly attributed to Cicero in the Middle Ages), Cassiodorus (ca 485-585) and Isidore of Seville (ca 560-636), and his understanding was quite traditional in comparison to those school masters. This is, however, typical of monastic training in the Middle Ages, especially from the eleventh century. Indeed, Dom Jean Leclercq suggests that the *Institutiones* of Cassiodorus was “a program of studies for monks”. \(^{335}\) Rupert is no exception of this long-standing tradition.

A major difference between Rupert and his contemporary school masters lays in the fact that Rupert does not regard the newly elaborated liberal arts as essential to the understanding of divine revelation. On the contrary, the new theologians, such as Anselm of Laon and

\(^{333}\) *Spiritus*, VII.2; CM 24, pp. 2039-2040: “Dicimus ergo quia scientia omnium bonarum et licitarum artium est notitia, sapientia vero unius tantum rei, id est Dei, si tamen res dici potest, non sine timore sancto dilectio sive reverentia. Dicimus deinde rerum quantuncunque notitiam habentes Deum autem in notitia habere, non probantes abusive dici sapientes, quia revera stulti sunt.” Here, Rupert employs many examples from the Old and New Testament to demonstrate the differences between the two gifts. A simpler distinction can be found in the later text, which states “Sic ergo scientia sapientiaque differunt ut maius et minus, quia plura scientiae quam sapientiae nomine significamus, et nomen scientiae quam sapientiae generalius est”. \((Spiritus, VII.5; \text{CM 24, p. 2042.})\)


\(^{335}\) Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, p. 19
William of Champeaux, saw the liberal arts, especially dialectic, as essential since they could reveal much that had been neglected or missed by traditional exegesis.\footnote{336 Cf. Edward Grant, *God and Reason in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 118; G. R. Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginning of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), p. 58.} It also should be noted that there was an increasing tendency to isolate profane learning from the divine revelation, a practice which was greatly enhanced in the first decade of the twelfth century.\footnote{337 On the trend of isolating secular learning from sacred learning, see R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages*, pp. 175-183.} More importantly, in Rupert’s time, there was a movement towards synthesis of theological disputes, which brought about a different understanding of the liberal arts and their uses.\footnote{338 See the insightful discussion given by R. W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe, volume II*, pp. 16-20.} Rupert was, however, inclined to go against this trend which was, according to him, closely associated with the school masters and a potential threat of heresy.

Therefore, on the one hand, Rupert appreciates the value of secular arts as they could facilitate the understanding of the Words of God. He claims that secular learning was a substantial source of the gift of knowledge and defended the usage of the liberal arts in his commentaries.\footnote{339 *Spiritus*, VII.3; CM 24, pp. 2040-2041.} Rupert even claims “who can doubt that these and all such arts are the gifts of God?”\footnote{340 “quis dubitet has vel omnes eiusmodi artes esse Dei dona?” *In Exodum*, IV.44; CM 22, p. 802.} On the other hand, what worried Rupert is that the liberal arts could be used as deceptive instruments to lead the faithful astray. Interestingly, Rupert demonstrates this potentially negative employment of the liberal arts through a historical retrospect. For example, Rupert argues that Arius’ vicious words were the poison of death under a beautiful cloak. Facing the challenge, three hundred and eighteen bishops celebrated the synod of Nicaea and stood up to fight for the pure teaching and the glory of the Lord with the guidance of the Holy Spirit.\footnote{341 *Spiritus*, VII.7; CM 24, pp. 2044-2046.} For Rupert, Church history reveals how heretics used “the copiousness of their eloquence” falsely “against the simplicity of the gospel faith”.\footnote{342 Relevant passages can also be found in *Spiritus*, VII.9; CM 24, p. 2048; *Spiritus*, VII.10; CM 24, pp. 2048-2049.} As Rupert clearly illustrates:
Shamefully, they dared to examine the secrets of God in the Scripture in a presumptuous way, motivated by curiosity and not by love. As a result they became heretics. God has decreed that the proud are not to be admitted to the sight of divinity and truth.343

This is an obvious attack on the school masters who prevailed in Rupert’s time and reveals precisely the worry occupying Rupert’s mind. As a matter of fact, Rupert is not fearful of or hostile to the use of reason and all that came to be associated with it. What differentiates Rupert and school masters is that Rupert stressed more contemplation, and how the soul comes to know and to love God instead of analysing God. Moreover, it has to be noted that most information Rupert got about school masters came from their pupils. It is likely that some statements taught by those masters had been exaggerated or overstated by their pupils. All in all, the inordinate usage of dialectic was a dangerous and worrisome tendency in the eyes of Rupert.

As a consequence, it could be concluded that Rupert admits the significance of the liberal arts while taking a more traditional approach to them.344 This can be seen in both his structure, where the treatments of Trivium occupied the majority of Rupert’s narrative, and his understanding of the arts.

Rupert writes that grammar comes first among the liberal arts and also comes first in the wisdom of God. The Scriptures per se are viewed by Rupert as a par excellence usage of grammar.345 His discussion on rhetoric is essentially based on Rhetorica ad Herennium, though Rupert also contributes some innovations to medieval rhetoric. In contrast to Augustine’s expression in De doctrina christiana, Rupert’s understanding of rhetoric is as guidance for future preachers which aims at a great understanding of how skilfully Scripture perfects its discourse and purveys its message of salvation.346 We can see Rupert’s constant emphasis on true understanding, which once again suggests that he deems the school masters to be misleading the faithful.

344 Spiritus, VII.3; CM 24, p. 2040.
346 In this part, almost all the technical matters of rhetoric and streamlined presentations of the elements had been directly derived from the Rhetorica ad Herennium: see Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric, p. 391. This feature of Rupert’s work has been masked by Haccke’s edition, which cited only De inventione and Isidore’s Etymologiae.
Dialectic is the most sensitive topic since it is the most powerful weapon used by the school masters. Rupert’s writings witness the great intellectual transformation of the early decades of the twelfth century. Contrary to the previous historiographical image of an “extremely conservative and bellicose” monastic theologian, Rupert professes himself “not hostile to the study of grammarians, dialecticians or the teachers of rhetoric, arithmetic, geometric or music and astronomy”, but he insists that all these arts should seek the glory of God rather than flaunting their “ secular knowledge”. Moreover, it should be noted that in Rupert’s time, there was no comprehensive translation and research on Aristotle, so the liberal arts had not developed into a proper philosophy and metaphysics yet – something that arguably happened later, from the middle of the twelfth century.

As a matter of fact, Rupert does not offer any original or up-to-date interpretation of the dialectic, but rather a summary of Cassiodorus’ lengthy discussion. However, a noteworthy point is Rupert’s interpretation of Peter the apostle’s sentence:

Understanding this first: that no prophecy of the Scripture is made by private interpretation. For prophecy came not by the will of man at any time: but the holy men of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Spirit.

Through the interpretation of this sentence, Rupert emphasizes that the Holy Spirit is the ultimate authority and that He will speak to the “religious people” about the divine messages. Only with the assistance of the Holy Spirit can men really understand the meaning of the sacred text; only knowledge with a divine basis can be treated seriously. This stance reminds us again of Rupert’s early dream, when the Holy Spirit poured out of him and stirred him to write the commentaries. This is the ultimate motivation for Rupert’s life-long exegetical work.

---

347 *Spiritus*, VII.3; CM 24, p. 2041: “Non ergo studia condemnat vel scholas grammaticorum, dialecticorum, rhetorum, arithmeticum, geometricorum, musicorum, astronomorum, sed haec in eis culpae quod non quaesierunt ex eis sapientiae fructum, propter quem artes istae a Deo datae sunt, id est in notitia habere Deum et glorificare sicut Deum.” The real philosophy was the opposite of secular learning, since it was not according to the tradition of men (traditionem hominum) or elements of the world (elementa mundi) but according to Christ. *Spiritus*, VII.3; CM 24, p. 2041. Rupert references the teaching of St. Paul, who warns the faithful “beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy, and vain deceit; according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ.” (Colossians 2:8.)


350 Cf. 2 Peter 1:20-21.
and this also indicates the role played by the Holy Spirit in Rupert’s contemplative approach to his theology of history.\textsuperscript{351}

On the other hand, Rupert shows his insistence to the earlier reception of the usage of the liberal arts and his idea precisely contradict to that of school masters. In short, according to Rupert, there is no independent value to the liberal arts if they cannot be applied to the comprehension of the divine mystery. As he concludes:

> Therefore the seven liberal arts, like maidservants, have entered into the sacred and venerable dining-room of their mistress, wisdom, and they have been redeployed, as it were, from the lawless crossroads to the strict and severe superintendence of the word of God and they have been bidden to sit down....

> For those who have examined the Scriptures by way of wisdom are amazed to make the discovery not only that these arts were always there, but also that they were so hidden, so obscured by the light and the majesty of mistress’ wisdom, that it was not easy to see that they were there...\textsuperscript{352}

Rupert’s view is quite similar to Augustine of Hippo’s position,\textsuperscript{353} though for Rupert, this statement reflects more his specific context of the disputes with the school masters and monastic formation. G. R. Evans suggests that “a leisurely approach to the text, the cultivation of a quiet receptiveness which allows the Holy Spirit to speak in a man’s heart as it will, patient reflection upon every details of expression; these had long been the features of the ‘holy reading’ (\textit{lectio divina}) of monastic life. At its best it led to a sharp and lively perception of the text and its meaning.”\textsuperscript{354}

In the Benedictine monasteries of Rupert’s time, the liberal arts were taught in a liturgical setting, which was a preparation for the

\textsuperscript{351} The much shorter treatment on the \textit{Quadrivium} is also based on the writings of Cassiodorus and Isidore of Seville. For example, arithmetic is expressed in many mysterious calculating systems recorded in the Scriptures and the awareness of the nature of calculation distinguished the human from other animals as the rational creature (\textit{Spiritus}, VII.14; CM 24, p. 2067); the constructions of Noah’s Ark and the Temple and the diverse measurements are the embodiment of the use of geometry (\textit{Spiritus}, VII.15; CM 24, pp. 2067-2068); music is treated as useful in the service of God and for assistance of, or cooperation with, the heavenly doctrine (\textit{Spiritus}, VII. 16; CM 24, pp. 2068-2069); the most important contribution of astronomy made in the Scriptures and the revelation of God is the establishment of the calendar (\textit{Spiritus}, VII.17; CM 24, pp. 2069-2070 and \textit{The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville}, III.27, p. 99); see also Michael S. Batts, “The Origins of Numerical Symbolism and Numerical Patterns in Medieval German Literature,” in \textit{Tractio}, 20 (1964), pp. 462-471; G. R. Evans, \textit{Old Arts and New Theology}, p. 72; G. R. Evans, “The Influence of \textit{Quadrivium} Studies in the Eleventh and Twelfth-century Schools,” in \textit{Journal of Medieval History}, 1 (1975), pp. 151-164.

contemplative atmosphere of the *lectio devina*. In this sense, Rupert demonstrates that he would prefer to put his wholehearted trust in the Holy Spirit than to rely on the liberal arts or reasoning.

Moving back to the structure of salvation history, Rupert’s intention in discussing the liberal arts is revealed more clearly. The gift of knowledge is represented by the doctors and teachers of the Church, which was first manifested in the Church Fathers, but is still at work in present-day exegetes and Church teachers such as Rupert himself. In this battle, the Holy Spirit plays a crucial role in guiding the Church along the right path. Rupert indeed considers that his own age is a continuation of the reign of *scientia*, and of the battle with heresy, since he was still fighting with the “heretic” school masters. This battle is crucial not only for the purity of the teachings of the Church but also because of the coming age: in the age of the gift of piety, the persecution of the Church will rise again, and more brutally. Only the truly faithful and steadfast people could overcome these difficulties and this would be realized by the continued gift of the Holy Spirit: the gift of piety.

2.3.2 Piety: The Immediate Future

The gift of piety (*Spiritus pietas*) relates to Rupert’s own period and immediate future from the perspective of salvation history. Following Augustine, Rupert asserts that true piety is the worship of God in meekness and penitence. Many scholars suggest that Rupert’s chief concern here is the final conversion of Jews to Christianity. However, it should be noted that Rupert’s reproaches of the Jews and prediction of their ultimate conversion to Christianity comes at the very end of this volume. Although the ultimate conversion of the Jews to Christianity is the summit and final fulfilment of piety, I would argue that the gift of

356 This can be seen as Rupert’s principle for understanding. As he clearly states earlier on the *Commentary of Ezechiel*: “it is our task to open the mouth, to seek the understanding of Scripture; it is for God to fill it, to open the true sense of the divine text.” See *De sancta Trinitate*, XXX.18; CM 23, p. 1666.
357 *Spiritus*, VIII.2; CM 24, p. 2075, where Rupert extensively quoted from Augustine’s *City of God*. See *De civitas Dei*, I, 77-89; CC 47, p. 273. As Augustine says, “the term piety is often used in connection with works of mercy, in the language of the common people; the reason for which I consider to be the fact that God Himself has declared that these works are more pleasing to Him than sacrifices. This custom has led to the application of the word ‘pious’ to God Himself.” (*De Civitate Dei*, X) and “piety is becoming to the meek.” (*De Serm. Dom. in Monte*, I). Gregory says “Piety, on her day, provides a banquet, because she fills the inmost recesses of the heart with works of mercy.” (*Moral.* 1).
359 *Spiritus*, VIII. 20-21; CM 24, pp. 2097-2100.
piety is chiefly manifested in the confessors of Christ (*confessor Christi*). For Rupert, these confessors, such as the monk-priests like himself, will succeed to the positions once occupied by apostles, martyrs and defenders in the history of salvation.

At the beginning of this volume, Rupert suggests that if people could “follow in order” (*deinde ordine sequitur*), the gift of piety will have been granted to “the most in need” (*nos maxime pauperes*). In seeking order, people should have a confessional heart. Therefore, repentance takes the central position in the final salvation. As John Van Engen has noted, Rupert constantly returns to the mission of *intellectus*, namely the exegetical understanding, when he set out these issues as crucial to the present stage of piety. It is noticeable that Rupert still sees the literal meaning of the Scripture as essential for salvation. His perception of salvation as unfolding in history, of the Trinity as working in history and also the reality of the “present Church” applies an historical foundation in the literal sense.

According to Rupert, with the abundance of knowledge and the gift of understanding, the gift of piety can be more powerful and our hearts will be anointed by the grace of the Holy Spirit. However, the age of piety will also witness false teachers like errant school masters and false performers of the Sacraments such as simonia, who sinned by blaspheming the Spirit’s gift. He argues that despite possessing the gift of knowledge in its superficial form, the false brothers act or teach contrary to the truth granted to the Church by the Holy Spirit. Certain adversaries of Rupert had been accused of impiety for blaspheming against the Holy Spirit by impugning Holy Scripture and His other works. Rupert portrays the rising school masters as false brothers and even heretics in his structure of salvation history. Therefore, their impenitent hearts “deserve not to be visited by the Holy Spirit but the righteous judgment of God”.

Rupert constantly mentions that repentance is crucial in this age. Rupert argues that this gift will not be granted to the wise or intelligent, nor to the strong or those full of knowledge,
but to the pious. Unlike some other medieval authors, Rupert did not make any dramatic call for reform or any concrete plan for the purification of the Church. Nevertheless, he placed the monk-priest at the centre of the stage before the Last Judgment which is a telling sign of his view of the renewal and sanctification of the Church as a whole. Based on the canons of Gregory the Great and St. Boniface, two of the most famous popes who were once monks, Rupert professes that:

He has found ways to console the mourner. He has found means to uplift the downtrodden. He has taken care to see to it that he might invest the depraved with restored honour and nobility. We are speaking here about the monastic order of life and habit, which the holy Fathers did not hesitate to consider and call a second baptism…Which in all evidence, as somebody insinuates, concerns and brings to attention the way of life and the customs of monks. In Greek the word for “messenger” is “angelos”, in Latin “nuntius”. This allows us to presume that priests, monks and canons, who proclaim the ordinances (teachings) of God, may rightly so be considered and called “messengers” or “angels”. However, there exist various orders of angels, and each and every one of them stands out all the higher in dignity depending on the circumstance how close his rang is positioned near God…As, therefore, the kindest of all fathers receives the prodigal son upon his return, although the latter arrives totally distraught and distressed by shame, with overwhelming grace and insists on clothing him with the best and apparently all new tunic – in similar fashion, we may assume, is this habit of holy conversation, which the garb of the monk appears to imply, to be worn with honour and in the spirit of penitence and is to be all the more revered, as it expresses the spirit of penance…The (monk’s) tunic is therefore the kind of vestment which is not at all vile – which, after all, this spirit whose father is the Spirit of piety has invented in the lives and minds of the most renowned and orthodox men in whom, without doubt, he had deigned to choose his dwelling (presence).

Rupert here justifies his idea that the confessional monk-priests should be the leaders of the Church and makes the confessors the symbol of piety in this difficult time. Moreover, he also assigns matters of demonstrable concern in his own life a particular place in salvation history.

365 *Spiritus*, VIII.1; CM 24, pp. 2074-2075.
366 *Spiritus*, VIII.8; CM 24, pp. 2082-2083: “Invenit in quo tristem consolatur, reperit in quo deiectum sublevet, providit sibi, in quo ignobilem clara nobilitate perornet. Dicimus autem ordinem habitumque monachicum, quem secundum dicere baptismum sancti Patres non dubitaverunt... Quod evidenter affirmat quisquis statum monachorum habitumque considerat. Angelus enim Graece, Latine nuntius dicitur. Sacerdotes igitur, monachi atque canonici, qui Dei praecepta annuntiant, angeli vocantur. Sed unusquisque angelicus ordo quanto vicinius Deum contemplatur, tanto sublimius dignitate firmatur... Igitur filio prodigo revertenti, quantumcumque sit deiectus et infamis, habet et scit clementissimus pater, unde stolam primam, aut prope primam, proferre possit, scilicet habitum sanctae conversationis, habitum monachi, cum reverendum et omnino poenitentialem, atque ideo reverendum, quia poenitentialem... Stola ergo habitus iste est, non vilis, quam per notissimos atque orthodoxos viros, quorum sine dubio habitator erat, adinvenit hic spiritus, huius patris spiritus pictatis.”
It could be argued that other contemporary authors also added a monastic age to the traditional scheme. This is seen especially in the writings of Honorius Augustodunensis and Gerhoh of Reichenberg and even in those of the later and more famous Joachim of Fiore, but Rupert’s narrative and demonstration were evidently the first and most definitive. For example, like Rupert, Gerhoh made use of apocalyptic themes to interpret the events of his own times, as well as the expectation of the imminent End. He appropriates Rupert’s scheme wholesale and translates his own ages of piety and fear into a fiery treatise on the need for continued reform in the spirit of Gregory VII. Gerhoh’s most famous four ‘watches’ shows a similar scheme to Rupert’s but grants a more significant role in salvation history to the Roman pontiff. As he states:

In the second through the confessors, in the third through the holy fathers, the teachers of moral discipline, among whom was Pope Gregory… For in the first watch he who disputed against idolatry was seen to have a foundation of firm truth through the witness of accompanying miracles. Likewise in the second watch the defenders of the Catholic faith were seen and found to rest upon a solid foundation of Scripture.

In this sense, Joachim of Fiore’s illustration focuses more on the role played by monks. According to Joachim’s Trinitarian order of salvation history, the first status belonged to God the Father, which is identical with the married laity and lasted from Adam to Christ. The second status subjects to God the Son, which would endure for forty to forty-two generations. This means around 1200-1260 years after the birth of Christ. The dominant order in this period is clerical. Joachim also hints that the monks were also present from Elijah onward and their existence became more evident from St. Benedict. However, the summit of the monastic order comes in the third status, the age of the Holy Spirit, as in its mature period (fructificatio). Interestingly, Joachim admits that the Church had understood the letter of the two testaments and certain parts of their spiritual meaning and the Holy Spirit had operated in the prophets of the Old Testament era, especially in Elijah and Elisha. Joachim argues that

368 Spiritus, VIII.1; CM 24, p. 2074. See John Van Engen, Rupert of Deutz, p. 93. For Rupert’s influence on Honorius Augustodunensis and Gerhoh of Reichenberg, see Wolfgang Beinert, Die Kirche--Gottes Heil in der Welt, pp. 329-335; concerning Gerhoh’s dependence on Honorius, see Peter Classen, Gerhoch von Reichenberg, pp. 433-444. More importantly, it should be noted that Rupert’s elevation of the monks probably had a great influence on the writings of Joachim of Fiore: see Marjorie Reeves, “The Originality and Influence of Joachim of Fiore,” in Traditio (1980), pp. 269-316; see also Brett Edward Whalen, Dominion of God, pp. 100-124.


the Holy Spirit was also active in the development of the monastic orders among the Greeks and Latins, culminating in the existence of the Cistercians. In this sense, we can see the mixture of Rupert (monastic order) and Anselm (reunification of the Church)’s idea revealed in the writings of Joachim. But Joachim is more similar to Rupert, who believed that he was living on the edge of the opening of the sixth age. This age paralleled the exile and persecution of the Jews in Babylon.

According to Rupert, with the emergence of the persecution of the Antichrist, there will be false prophets and even the false Christ (pseudochristi et pseudoprohetae), and under such circumstances the gift of piety will become increasingly important since it can help the faithful to keep their loyalty to the real God under affliction and torture. It is clear that Rupert had a more urgent concern about the coming of the end, especially in comparison to Anselm of Havelberg.

Therefore, the final conversion of the Jews before the end of time is only the fulfilment of the gift of piety rather than the main task of it. The gift of piety, according to Rupert, is to guarantee the true understanding of the revelation for salvation. By accusing the heretics and false brothers within the Church and locating the monks in the leading position, Rupert did not “ignore the present entirely” but addressed the challenge that confronted the contemporary Church and offered his view of its further development. He argues that he and his contemporaries live in the overlapping age of “knowledge” and “piety”. This reflects Rupert’s belief that only confessional monks’ austerity, asceticism and repentance, as well as the understanding of the true teaching of God, can fully fulfil the requirement of piety.

2.3.3 The Fear of God: The Last Judgment

The fear of God is the last gift from the Holy Spirit, and it is the most important instrument of the universal judgment, leading to the completion of salvation. The central figures in the
last stage of salvation history are the people who will enjoy the eternal blessedness and the people who will suffer from eternal condemnation in the fires of Hell.

Rupert states that the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom. Through the fear of God, people gain the wisdom to understand God, and in this way another inner circle is established. Within this cycle, the fear of God is the beginning of a long journey as well as the end of the unfolding of providence.\textsuperscript{375} Furthermore, Rupert insists that the fear of God is not the fear of being punished but the fear of losing God’s grace.\textsuperscript{376} In the Last Judgment, the shepherd will separate the sheep from the goats and all the nations and peoples will gather before him singing for the last triumph.

Unlike the widely-received framework proposed by Augustine, Rupert put the Last Judgment and the ultimate rest within the boundaries of salvation history rather than outside them. This is another great originality in Rupert’s historical scheme. In Augustine’s threefold division, the third part, titled “\textit{sine ullo temporis fine}”, is the stage beyond time and history, since it exists after the Last Judgment.\textsuperscript{377} Many medieval authors, following Augustine’s tradition, left the Last Judgment outside of history and contributed nothing in detail to its exposition. For example, the Frankish abbot Adso of Montier-en-Der (920-992) in his treatise \textit{On the Birth and Time of Antichrist}, suggests that the Last Judgment would not occur immediately after the return of Christ, since there would be a period of “rest” for the faithful and penance for those seduced by the Antichrist.\textsuperscript{378}

On the contrary, Rupert offers a detailed narrative on the resurrection of the dead. He divides all the resurrected into four categories: the good people with the revelation of God, the good people without God, the people with the law and the people without the law. Those who died in the faith of Christ will rise first and they will not be judged but be judges.\textsuperscript{379}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{The Seven Gifts in the Framework of Salvation History} 
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\hline
Historical Period & Representatives & Events \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{375} This interpretation is especially clear in \textit{Spiritus}, IX.3; CM 24, pp. 2102-2103. The previous inner circle can be found in the first gift of wisdom: see my previous discussion.
\textsuperscript{376} \textit{Spiritus}, IX.4; CM 24, p. 2103.
\textsuperscript{377} \textit{Spiritus}, IX.13; CM 24, pp. 2102-2103. The way of perfecting in spiritual life was recorded in the teaching of Jesus and was divided six-fold by Rupert. See \textit{Spiritus}, IX.13; CM 24, p. 2115.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Spiritus sapientiae</strong></th>
<th>The Deeds of Christ</th>
<th>Christ</th>
<th>Incarnation to Ascension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spiritus intellectus</strong></td>
<td>The Apostolic Period</td>
<td>Apostles</td>
<td>Understanding of the revelation from God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spiritus consili</strong></td>
<td>The Apostolic Period</td>
<td>Apostles (especially Paul)</td>
<td>Rejection of the Jews and bringing the Gentiles to God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spiritus fortidudinis</strong></td>
<td>The Early Church to Roman Persecution</td>
<td>Martyrs</td>
<td>Persecution of the Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spiritus scientiae</strong></td>
<td>Church Fathers to Rupert’s Own Time</td>
<td>Defenders and Teachers of the Church</td>
<td>Against heretical teaching and false brothers’ misunderstandings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spiritus pietatis</strong></td>
<td>Rupert’s Own Time to the Immediate Future until the Coming of Antichrist</td>
<td>The Confessional Monks</td>
<td>Led by the Confessors, the Church overcame the heretical teaching and false Antichrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spiritus timoris Domini</strong></td>
<td>The Last Judgment</td>
<td>The Resurrected Dead</td>
<td>Double resurrections and the judgment of the living and the dead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Conclusion

We have seen how Rupert combined the devotion to the Holy Spirit, salvation history and the renewal of the Church in a complex structure. In this sense, Rupert’s *De Trinitate et operibus eius* could be viewed as the lengthiest treatment of salvation history since Augustine’s *City of God* and the earliest theological summa extant from the twelfth century. Giles Constable contrasts the long-dominant view that “the world was going from bad to worse as the end approached” with a new “optimistic vision of ages succeeding each other under the guidance of the Holy Spirit”, and this notion that the Holy Spirit guided a positive progression of ages was one of Rupert’s fundamental theological innovation.

---

First of all, Rupert of Deutz’s most original and influential contribution to twelfth-century theology of history was his establishment of a Trinitarian order of salvation history and the introduction of the Holy Spirit into the ongoing development of the divine plan. As Giles Constable suggests, the introduction of the Holy Spirit into the succeeding ages of salvation history was Rupert’s most innovative contribution. Given the fact that most authors in the Middle Ages associated the seven gifts with individual virtues, Rupert was the first one (and perhaps the only one) who granted the seven gifts a special historical dimension.

It is clear that Rupert can be considered the first among medieval authors such as Hugh of St. Victor and Otto of Freising, who shared a common interest in historical theology. In terms of historical thought or “new awareness of history”, Rupert was not working on the fringes of the main intellectual activities of his time, but produced a theology that was firmly tied to the teaching of the Scriptures. Influenced by the writings of Rupert, many of his successors, such as Honorius, Gerhoh and in particular Anselm of Havelberg, shared a similar piety for the Holy Spirit and offered their respective explanations of the Holy Spirit’s role in salvation history. They made attempts to appeal to the authority of the Holy Spirit, and their works illustrate the richness and complexity of theological development in the twelfth century. Although there is not much direct evidence to show that all of these writers were influenced directly by Rupert, it is certainly the case that Rupert was the first to associate the Holy Spirit with salvation history. The gradual distribution of the seven gifts coinciding with the seven stages of the development from the Incantation to the Last Judgment embodied the foundation of Rupert’s theology of history.

Secondly, Rupert’s original framework of salvation history and strong historical awareness deserve special attention. With regard to the historical framework laid down by the Church Fathers, Rupert also made great innovations: the most significant ones are his detailed divisions after the Incarnation of Christ and application of salvation history to his own period. While Rupert’s scheme is hardly a detailed guide to post-biblical history, it marks his ambitions and strong desire to go beyond Augustine’s scheme of historical order after Christ.

382 Chenu, “Theology and New Awareness of History,” p. 163.
Friedrich Heer depicts the twelfth century as “the first century of modern European historical thinking”, which witnessed “the birth of history”.\footnote{384 Friedrich Heer, *The Intellectual History of Europe* (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1966), p. 80} The historical thinking of the twelfth century was built upon Augustine, but the twelfth-century theologians of salvation history were not strictly Augustinian. This is particularly true for Rupert. In his treatment, world history is considered as an unfolding of the Trinity, especially of the Holy Spirit. Herbert Grundmann insightfully points out that Rupert’s expression of salvation history is not a purely historical and successive scheme, but his meditation on world progress.\footnote{385 Herbert Grundmann, *Studien über Joachim von Floris* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1927), p. 94.} Peter Classen also observes that Rupert did not enter into a detailed theoretical discussion of salvation history, but that this systematic conception had been taken for granted throughout his exegesis.\footnote{386 Peter Classen, “*Res Gestae, Universal History, Apocalypse*,” p. 405.}

Rupert’s passion for historical awareness might be another reason for his rejection of the school masters. In the school masters’ pursuit of systematization, the increasing application of the dialectical method necessarily obscured the historical aspect in favour of a static view, according to which all historical time is relative to eternity. Therefore, their views are essentially homogeneous, however differentiated they may be, as history. In this sense, Rupert’s rejection of the new dialectical theory occurred precisely because he felt that dialectical realism fundamentally questioned the salvation-historical aspect of the Scriptures. Moreover, the new dialectic theory was not yet elaborated by the scholastic philosophy that would rise in the following centuries. At the very least, Rupert believed that Christianity was not based on logical reasoning or dialectic proof, but on a series of historical events which were arranged in a history. For Rupert, it was important that this history was explored with an appropriate method and it was clear that this method was not the dialectical pattern.\footnote{387 See ibid, p. 166.}

Thirdly, by moving salvation history into his own time, Rupert’s writing reveals his conception of the Church *per se* and the renewal of the Church in a broad sense. Rupert is a steadfast supporter of Gregory VII’s conception of the Church as an assembly and his unique spirituality is strikingly displayed in his convictions concerning the Church as the bearer of grace in the world.\footnote{388 *The Register of Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085: An English Translation* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), translated by H. E. J. Cowdrey, p. 249.} Through a careful examination of his divisions of the works of the Holy Spirit, we can observe that Rupert’s perception of ecclesiastical renewal from a perspective of
the Church’s development in the course of history. The allegorical interpretations of the Old and New Testaments combined with a sense of progression from the early Church to the contemporary is hardly unusual, but it hints at a growing preoccupation among “Gregorian” exegetes, namely how to unlock the providential patterns of history from the time of Christ until the tumultuous events of their own present and beyond. In this sense, the role of the Holy Spirit is to sanctify and to perfect the Church rather than to drive personal purification. Through the sacrament of the Church, the Church as a whole becomes the unique bearer of divine grace. To a certain extent, Rupert’s work witnesses the great shift from personal reform to Church reform and the development of an innovative piety towards the Holy Spirit which served as the guide throughout salvation history.

With specific concern for his own time and the immediate future, Rupert argues that the Church cannot be fooled by the experts of “profane learning”, whom he treats as false brothers and heretics. Rupert vigorously criticizes the false brothers’ contamination of the Church through their heretical thoughts and highlights the role of the monk-priest in the coming period of piety; he constantly reaffirms that true understanding of revelation is essential for the final salvation. Thus, Rupert addressed the issue of the renewal of the Church: only with the guidance and revelation of the Holy Spirit, led by confessional monk-priests such as himself, could the Church overcome the reign of the Antichrist and arrive at the final salvation. As a result, we can dismiss the previous misconceptions that Rupert completely “ignored the present” in his salvation history. On the contrary, Rupert combines theological expression with the historical development of the Church, and produces an unprecedented historical scheme in which he illustrated his understanding and reflections on the ongoing changes of the Church.

It is clear that, for Rupert, an understanding of the true teaching of the Lord is crucial for the Church, and that this understanding comes from the continued revelation of the Holy Spirit and its guidance within the Church. Rupert believes that providence is the main revelation of the Scriptures and that this could not be achieved solely by reason and human intelligence. The guidance of the Holy Spirit is manifested through the development of the Church rather than through abstract summary of the dogmas. Therefore, Rupert could be regarded as a historical realist. This idea was also shared by important figures of the following centuries, in particular St. Bonaventura and Joachim of Fiore.
It is important to emphasise that Rupert’s theology cannot be fully appreciated without the comprehensive understanding of his theology of history. His theology of history made a great contribution to the historical thought and intellectual history of the twelfth century. In general, Rupert concentrates on the agency of the Holy Spirit, and believes that the Church would be sanctified and guided by the third person of the Trinity through its historical development. The emphasis on the Holy Spirit, a deeper concern for the development and renewal of the Church, an urgent sense of the nearness of the end, and a strong historical awareness can be taken as the central elements of Rupert’s theology of history.

As Peter Classen states, “taking up where Rupert left off, Gerhoch of Reichersberg and Anselm of Havelberg went further along this path”.389 Although Anselm of Havelberg did move along the lines of salvation history and contributed his respective interpretation of Church history through the agencies of the Holy Spirit, he viewed the same issue and same agency from a fundamentally different theological foundation and perspective. This is what will be investigated in the following chapters.

Chapter IV: Diversity and Growth: Anselm of Havelberg’s Life and the Holy Spirit in His Theology of History

Anselm of Havelberg (ca. 1095-1158) was an intimate disciple of Norbert of Xanten (ca. 1080-1134) and an active reforming bishop of the first half of the twelfth century. He witnessed a great wave of transformations and the emergence of new ideas and institutions within the Western Church. At the same time, Anselm worked as adviser to kings and popes. In many ways, therefore, Anselm’s theological thinking is closely connected with his distinguished ecclesiastical and political career and the vicissitudes of political service.

This chapter will deal with two main tasks. First of all, I will provide a concise biography of Anselm which chiefly focuses on the events that formed his thoughts. For instance, Anselm’s early education in Liège and strong attachment to Norbert offers a very interesting connection with Rupert of Deutz. Anselm’s life exhibits a peculiar spirituality of “teaching others by words and deeds” following the example of his mentor Norbert. In contrast to Rupert, and mostly due to the influence of Norbert, Anselm had a more politically-oriented life. These experiences gave Anselm a pragmatic mind and a broad oversight of theological thought. Similarly, we might argue that his trip to Constantinople and the banishment to Havelberg stimulated Anselm’s reflections on religious life. Thus a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of Anselm’s thoughts can be revealed.

Secondly, I will concentrate on the first volume of Anselm’s Anticimenon to show his unique framework of salvation history and “astonishing sensitivity to history”. This volume addresses the shaping of Christian time and various advancements of Christian worship, doctrine and religious life. Similarly to Rupert, Anselm expounds three stages of gradual revelation according to the Trinity. The Holy Spirit also dominates Anselm’s narrative, though he was more enthusiastic than Rupert about the idea of development. More significantly, Anselm views the novelties within the Church, especially the varied religious changes, through the lens of the Holy Spirit.

life and orders, specifically as the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Within modern scholarship, Anselm’s interpretation of the seven seals as the seven successive stages of the Church has attracted more attention than his other writings. I will argue that this part cannot be viewed separately from Anselm’s other writings. As a matter of fact, the gradual revelation of the Holy Spirit through the course of Church history dominates Anselm’s narrative. Moreover, I will attempt to show the originality of his interpretation in the Western exegetical tradition and to demonstrate the progress achieved by Anselm. It is clear that Anselm was greatly indebted to patristic tradition, especially in his Augustinian notion of secular time as a mirror of providence. However, I will argue that although Anselm shared the interest in interpreting the history of the Church according to temporal development, he also emphasized doctrinal and institutional developments as the hallmark of unfolding salvation history. Anselm’s optimistic theology of history and passion for diversity are firmly associated with his conception of the influence of the Holy Spirit on the course of history.

1. Anselm of Havelberg’s Life: Words and Deeds

1.1 Early Education in Liège and Disciple of Norbert

There are not many sources that allow us to reconstruct Anselm’s early life and family background; even his birth date can be inferred only by the date of his ordination as the bishop of Havelberg. We know, however, a little more about his education. It seems that Anselm received his education in Liège and was likely a pupil of Ralph of Laon.

---

393 Smalley argues that “modern scholars have spilled rivers of ink on Anselm’s theory”: see eadem, “Ecclesiastical Attitudes to Novelty”, p. 124.
395 According to canon law in the twelfth century, the minimum age of a bishop (vir perfecti aetas) was 30 years old. See Burchard of Worms, Decretorum, 2.9, PL 140, 627A; Ivo of Chartres, Decretum, 6.29, PL 161, 451D; Claudia Rapp, Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), p. 30. With regard to his birthplace, Lees suggests that Anselm was born in the east of Burgundy. Jay Terry Lees, Anselm of Havelberg: Deeds into Words in the Twelfth Century (Leiden and New York: Brill, 1998), pp. 13-14.
396 Petit argues that Anselm was “one of those students from Lorraine whom Saint Norbert attracted during his first preaching at the renowned cathedral school there”. See François Petit, Spirituality of the Premonstratensians: The Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2011), translated by Victor Szczurek, O. Praem, p. 59.
wide variety of religious schools (monastic and cathedral) and theological approaches. Anselm did not write anything specific about his early education in Liège, but Wibald of Stablo and Corvey (1098-1158) referred to Anselm and Arnold (ca 1100-1151, later the archbishop of Cologne) as his intimate friends “whom since our youth we have embraced in the greatest love and venerated in diligent devotion with ever growing affection”. Wibald came to Liège from Stablo in 1117 and returned to his monastery after one year, where he was appointed abbot in 1130. Since neither Anselm nor Arnold led a monastic life, the most likely opportunity for their meeting would be Liège, when they were all studying in those distinguished schools in the second decade of the twelfth century.

It is noteworthy that Rupert was also then living and teaching at Liège, possibly shortly after the end of his exile at Siegburg and the publication of De sancta Trinitate. In a letter to his friend, Wibald wrote that he returned to Liège in 1118 to meet Rupert again, since he thought Rupert an honourable and ingenious exegete and teacher. Arnold was also inspired and influenced by Rupert’s writings and valued Rupert’s thoughts highly. However, Anselm did not share the same opinion of Rupert with his friends. In a letter responding to Egbert of Huysburg and regarding the disputes between the canons regular and monks, Anselm specifically mentioned “a certain Rupert” (cuiusdam Roperti) in a tone of abrupt arrogance and said that “a fat belly cannot give birth to wisdom”. It is possible that Anselm was among the pupils of cathedral masters who tried to deprive Rupert of his “licentia scribendi”; his hostile attitude also possibly stems from the clash between Norbert and Rupert in the 1120s. It seems that Anselm was never attracted to monastic theology when he was

---

studying at Liège and there is much evidence to show that he learned dialectics.\textsuperscript{402}

Before meeting Norbert of Xanten in the late 1120s, Anselm may have worked for secular and ecclesiastical rulers, thereby paving his future career as a courtier-bishop. Indeed, C. Stephen Jaeger has suggested that cathedral schools were designed specifically for this sort of education, and that Liège was one of the most advanced schools at that time.\textsuperscript{403} When Anselm finished his studies, he needed a patron to protect him and to elevate his position and even to introduce him to royal or papal courts. He eventually met such a patron in the form of the Archbishop of Magdeburg: Norbert of Xanten.\textsuperscript{404}

There is no doubt that Anselm was greatly influenced by the words and deeds of his mentor Norbert of Xanten. As discussed in the second chapter, Norbert was one of Rupert’s most significant opponents in the 1120s. With the permission of Pope Gelasius II, Norbert became an itinerant preacher and travelled throughout northern France where he attracted many followers. The establishment of the community of the canons regular of Prémontré was one of Norbert’s greatest achievements.\textsuperscript{405} Having received a grant from the Bishop of Laon, Norbert, along with 13 disciples, chose a valley in the forest of Coucy as the location of his community. It is noteworthy that Norbert’s first generation of disciples included seven students from the celebrated school of Anselm of Laon. After the constitution of the order (Augustinian Rule) was approved by Pope Honorius II, Norbert himself was appointed to the Archbishoipr of Magdeburg in 1126.

There are few documents that allow us to reconstruct the meeting between Anselm and Norbert.\textsuperscript{406} They certainly met after the ordination of Norbert as Archbishop of Magdeburg, which gave Norbert the power to promote Anselm to the bishopric on the Eastern border of the Empire. Anselm’s name is first recorded in an official document when he was ordained as

\textsuperscript{402} In his own writings, especially the debate with the Greek, he referenced heavily the works of Peter Abelard as well as other influential scholars which might come from a gloss. Anselm’s use of quotations and paraphrases in his reconstruction of the debates with the Greeks will be discussed in the next chapter.


\textsuperscript{405} This order had actually been established at the request of Pope Calixtus II at the council of Reims in October 1119. For the establishment of this order, see François Petit, \textit{Spirituality of the Premonstratensians}, pp. 31-43; Florent Cygler, “Le chapitre général des Prémontrés au Moyen Âge,” in \textit{Analecta Praemonstratensia}, 81-1/4 (2005), pp. 5-34.

the new bishop of Havelberg in 1129. After his ordination as bishop of Havelberg, Anselm would still accompany Norbert on his trips and services in the papal curia or king’s court until the latter died in 1134. It is possible that Anselm helped Norbert to reform the Archdiocese of Magdeburg, which led to several assassination attempts on Norbert. During his reforms, Norbert maintained a good relationship with both secular rulers and popes, which reflects his pursuit of a ‘mixed’ life.

Norbert’s ideas can be clearly seen during the de facto schism of 1130, which reflected the continuous conflict between the Church and the Empire and the division within the Roman curia and the College of Cardinals. The antipope Anacletus II was a hard-line Gregorian reformer with very strong anti-imperial convictions, whereas Innocent II was more moderate and showed respect for imperial authority. Under the recommendation of Norbert, Emperor Lothair III agreed to accept Innocent as the new pope and promised military assistance to restore Innocent II to Rome. Through all these events, it is clear that both Norbert and Anselm were strongly pragmatic in their treatment of various issues.

There is no doubt that Anselm’s close relationship with Norbert facilitated his political and ecclesiastical career. As one of Norbert’s most faithful assistants, Anselm probably attracted the attention of Lothair III. For instance, Anselm, on behalf of the emperor, led a delegation to meet Bishop Bernard I of Hildesheim at Goslar and Liège in 1131. In 1133, accompanying Lothair and Norbert to Italy, Anselm even won the favour of Innocent II who asked the young bishop to preach in his presence at the solemn liturgy on 8 September.

After the death of Norbert in 6 June 1134, Anselm of Havelberg presided over his mentor’s funeral. This is a clear indication that Anselm was viewed as Norbert’s closest disciple.

---

407 The archdiocese of Magdeburg comprises five episcopal sees: Brandenburg, Meissen, Merseburg, Naumburg and Havelberg. Given the complicated circumstances in Magdeburg and the lands occupied by Slavs, Norbert’s attempts to Christianize the pagan area and to keep his threatened position in Magdeburg demanded the assistance of loyal and competent men. See Charles Higounet, Die deutsche Ostsiedlung im Mittelalter (Berlin: Siedler, 1986), translated by Manfred Vasold, pp. 49-63.

408 The antipope Anacletus II had wide support, controlled Rome with Pierleoni soldiers, and was recognized by Roger II of Sicily. This is the main reason that Innocent II had to appeal to the emperor for his support, which included military forces. Moreover, the two candidates of the pope represented the “new” and the “old” cardinals in the college of 1130: see I. S. Robinson, The Papacy, 1073-1198: Continuity and Innovation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 46-50; see also Mary Stroll, The Jewish Pope: Ideology and Politics in the Papal Schism of 1130 (Leiden: Brill, 1987), pp. 22-34.

409 Vita A, in Norbert and Early Norbertine Spirituality, pp. 170-172.

410 Lees, Anselm of Havelberg, p. 40.


412 Vita Norberti, A, 23, p. 703; Gesta archiepiscoporum Magdeburgensium, MGH SS 14:414.
The model he found in Norbert was that of an active and loyal prelate, an intelligent, frank and skilled adviser to secular and ecclesiastical rulers. As Jay Lees points out, “it is worth considering what Anselm witnessed because his major works are, at heart, works about imitating a model life”.414

1.2 The Diplomat to the East and Defender of the Canons

After Norbert’s death, Anselm began to play an independent role which was nonetheless based on the deeds of his former mentor. The first and perhaps most significant mission of his life was that of his visit to Constantinople in 1135-1136. The record of his debates with the Greek Archbishop Nicetas of Nicomedia represents Anselm’s most important work, and one which gives him a position in the history of the Western-Eastern Church relationship. According to Anselm,

I had earlier been legate in Constantinople on behalf of the great Lothair, august emperor of the Romans. I had stayed there for a long time conducting many conversations and debates of this nature, sometimes private and sometimes public, about the doctrine and ritual respectively maintained by Latins and Greeks.415

Although in his later reconstruction of the debates Anselm emphasised his debate on the reunion of the Church, this mission was essentially a political one. According to the official document of this delegation, their main task was to achieve a military alliance between the two emperors and against the Normans in Sicily without the involvement of the pope.416 However, it is noteworthy that Anselm did not write up his debate in Greek until 1149. The only surviving work of Anselm from this period is his apologetic letter defending the canons regular.

415 PL 188, 1140C: “Unde, quoniam ego aliquando Magni Lotharii Romanorum imperatoris Augusti legatus fui in Constantinopolim, et ibidem aliquam moram faciens, multas super huissusmodi doctrina et ritu collationes et quaestiones, modo in privatis, modo in publicis, tam Latinorum quam Graecorum conventibus habui.”. Anticimenon, p. 44.
416 Translatio Godehardi episcopi Hildesheimensis, MGH SS 12, pp. 648-649. For a general historical background of this mission, see Donald Matthew, The Norman Kingdom of Sicily (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 254-284. In his own work, Anselm speaks of himself not only as a legatus but also as an apocrisiarius (papal legate). Yet we need to be careful about using this term to describe Anselm’s mission, since there are no other documents to confirm that Anselm’s mission to the Byzantine court was a religious one with papal backing.
As mentioned above, his political service had a great effect on Anselm’s life and thought. The first example of this is the death of Lothair III in 1137, which brought about a dilemma which curtailed Anselm’s royal political service.\textsuperscript{417} It seems that Anselm returned at this point to Magdeburg and composed the *Epistola Apologetica* to defend the religious life of canons regular.\textsuperscript{418}

In 1138, an Augustinian canon of Hamersleben (near Magdeburg) named Peter revised his religious vocation in order to become a monk at Huysburg.\textsuperscript{419} Since this Peter was also a successor of the provost of that community, his departure had a seriously negative impact on the canons regular. As discussed in the first chapter, the early twelfth century was a time of extraordinary religious diversity with varied forms of religious life. Anselm’s *Epistola Apologetica* is a defence of canons regular against the monastic Benedictines in which he also attempts to define the clerical life of the former. In general, Anselm argues that the primary mode of Christian leadership is the apostolic rather than the monastic one, and that the canons regular in the twelfth century were the real disciples and successors of the *vita apostolica*.\textsuperscript{420}

As Jay Lees insightfully points out, Anselm gave his voice to a view of the clerical life that was no longer willing to accept a lower position in the spiritual hierarchy.\textsuperscript{421} In this letter, Anselm shows his great enthusiasm for the spirituality and ecclesiastical position of canons regular. Moreover, Anselm exhibits a certain hostility towards the monastic life and his tone is aggressive to the point of bitterness. Especially in his comparison between the abbot Egbert of Huysburg and his monastic predecessors, Anselm adopts a sharp edge of cynicism:

> [when they were] hungry, they found their food with their own hand, and they leaned on ropes and mattocks, but you do not do this. They were needy, but you are wealthy. They were afflicted, and you have consolation. They suffered, and you lead a peaceful life. They wandered in solitude, and so forth, and you are secure in the midst of your people in your lofty seat.\textsuperscript{422}


\textsuperscript{418} The date of the composition of Anselm’s apologetic letter has led to many assumptions. In my point of view, this question is addressed convincingly by Jay T. Lees, “Charity and Enmity in the Writings of Anselm of Havelberg,” in *Viator*, 25-1 (1994), pp. 53-62.

\textsuperscript{419} See Lees, *Anselm of Havelberg*, pp. 44-45.

\textsuperscript{420} See also the first chapter. It is noteworthy that Rupert of Deutz deems that the “confessional monks” will be the future leaders of the Church, leading the Church to overcome the destruction of the Antichrist. See previous chapter.

\textsuperscript{421} Lees, *Anselm of Havelberg*, p. 130.

\textsuperscript{422} Anselm, “Apologetic letter”, p. 41. See also the discussion in chapter I.
Anselm argues that those saints who led the monastic life would not support the abbot but will judge him harshly for his ignorance: “since they are themselves the worthier of heavenly life to the degree to which they were too humble to enter the order of the clerics who rule God’s Church.”

However, we should not exaggerate Anselm’s condemnation of monasticism. In the same letter, Anselm shows his interest in the idea of diversity. Anselm states that “yet even the Church might be able to stand unornamented by monks, it is in fact built the more appropriately and decorated the more beautifully, wrapped as it is in the diverse orders of the elect.” It is clear that Anselm’s scornful and pejorative attitude was not against monasticism itself but the monks who claimed that they enjoyed higher authority than the canons regular.

1.3 The Banishment and the Anticimenon

Anselm’s reflection on diversity and the role of the Holy Spirit was facilitated by his banishment after the Wendish Crusade; his thoughts are presented fully in his Anticimenon which was composed in this period.

Anselm’s involvement in the Wendish Crusade centred on his negotiation between King Conrad III and Pope Eugene III. Conrad’s interest in conquering and converting the lands on the Eastern border had been piqued by Bernard of Clairvaux who, as the most influential monk in the first half of the twelfth century, was also the most active promoter of the Second Crusade. Following his meeting with Bernard to discuss the new crusade in 1146, the king sent three legates, including Anselm, to meet Pope Eugene III in Dijon, and to present his idea of a northern crusade. In a bull issued by Eugene III, the pope mentioned Anselm:

Because we judge it to be expedient that some spiritual, discerning, learned person be among you who will provide for your peace and tranquillity, preserve unity among you, and impress upon you (the requirement) to further the Christian religion, we have provided for this our venerable brother Anselm, bishop of Havelberg, a spiritual, discerning and learned man; and this responsibility we have given to

---

425 Here Anselm even uses Bernard of Clairvaux as an example to show the humility of a monk in front of a canon. See Anselm, “Apologetic letter”, pp. 49-50.
426 On the role that Bernard of Clairvaux played in the Wendish Crusade, see Manfred Unger, “Bernhard von Clairvaux und der Slawenkreuzzug 1147,” in Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft, 7 (1959), pp. 80–90.
On the other hand, the Wendish Crusade also corresponded with Anselm’s desire to rebuild his own diocese. As early as 1144, Anselm was planning to establish a Premonstratensian abbey at Jerichow, which was intended to function as the cathedral until an ecclesiastical foundation could be established at Havelberg itself. In a charter, Anselm articulated:

Although my heart has often been moved to penance by pious and divine inspiration concerning whether I would ever be able to reform the episcopate of Havelberg, which bristled all over with the barbarism of pagan inhabitants and was almost non-existent because of the destruction of the Christian religion, omnipotent God, who always deems it worthy to consider pious prayers, gave more than the longings of my soul and mind.\(^{428}\)

As the delegate of the pope in the Wendish crusade, and as a bishop whose own see had repeatedly been attacked by the Wends, Anselm gave “wholesome counsel and admonitions, as well as humble precepts” to the crusaders to ensure that they honoured God and maintained themselves in “a state of concord and of fraternal love”.\(^{429}\) However, with the deterioration of the relationship between Conrad III and Eugene III, Anselm found himself in an awkward and even dangerous position. The pope hoped that the German bishops could persuade their secular ruler to “set forth to you the affection and good will which we feel toward you, and that what we may know from their lips what we desire to hear about you”. Their task therefore, was to clarify the messy situation in Italy and to ask for support from Conrad.\(^{430}\) Anselm stood in the middle between the king and the pope and did his best to restore equilibrium.

On Conrad’s defeat and return from the Holy Land in 1148, Anselm and Hartwich of Bremen were sent by Eugene III to greet the king. However, the pope himself had turned to the help of Roger of Sicily, who was, incidentally, the man who had battled with Conrad on


his return journey. A.F. Riedel suggests that the banishment of Anselm might be attributed to Conrad’s failure in the battlefield as well as to the king’s increasing suspicion of the pope and German bishops. Anselm’s friends Wibald and Arnold also suffered Conrad’s anger. In a letter to Anselm, Wibald stated that “your very fault, if indeed it is a fault, is also shared with you by us and certain bishops”. Under such circumstances, Anselm went back to his own bishopric.

Following his return, Anselm settled communally with a group of Premonstratensian canons in the Havelland. While the forced banishment brought a sudden break with Anselm’s early more politically-oriented life, it also offered Anselm the opportunity to revisit his religious vocation. Indeed, even before the Wendish Crusade, the order established by Norbert and other communities of canons regular had become the most important and productive means of extending Christianity across the Eastern border.

The common life encouraged Anselm to refine his understanding of the vitae apostolica and varied religious life within the Church. Anselm’s letter promotes the varied forms of religious life within his community:

But I have retreated now into the chamber of my heart... What indeed is there for me among those who toil, given that I have assumed another [place] in the meantime, where the way is continuous and infinite? ... I, a poor man of Christ, remain in Havelberg, my manger, with my brothers who are poor in Christ. Here some of us build our tower of power in the face of the enemy [Psalms 60: 4]. Others are out on watch, so as to defend us against the insults of the pagans. Others daily await martyrdom with divine prayers. Others purify their souls by offering up fasts and prayers to God. Others stay away from their bed and pursue holy meditations and train themselves in imitating the lives and examples of the saints, and all of us, in so far as we can, follow the naked and poor Christ.

The banishment facilitated Anselm’s reflection on the value of different forms of religious life and ultimately contributed to his more favourable view of diversity within the Church. This is revealed in his Anticimenon, which was composed in this period.

In early 1149, Anselm was invited by Margrave Conrad of Meissen to visit Pope Eugene III in Tusculum where a Greek delegation had recently visited the papal curia. Anselm’s

---

experience of debating with the Greeks in 1136 led the pope to ask him to present his thoughts on the divergences and the potential possibility of the reunion of the Churches. In this book, Anselm attempted to demonstrate his conception of the varied religious life within a unified faith and narrated his debates with the Greeks. The diversity within the Church (either the religious life or the divergence between the East and the West) was distinctively correlated with the Holy Spirit, which indicated the advancement of Anselm’s thoughts during his banishment.

1.4 Adviser to Fredrick Barbarossa

The death of Conrad III in 1152 brought Anselm back as a royal adviser to the new king’s court in Gosla. During his service for Fredrick Barbarossa, Anselm held another debate with the Greek Archbishop Basilius of Achrida in Thessalonica. Unfortunately, not enough materials exist to reconstruct this debate in the same way as the previous one in 1136. In 1155, Anselm came back from the East to meet his king in Italy and was granted a new episcopal duty. According to Otto of Freising, Anselm enjoyed a good reputation at the court:

Anselm, bishop of Havelberg, returning from Greece, received from the prince, upon election by clergy and people, the archbishopric of Ravenna as well as the exarchate of the same province- a magnificent reward for his labour.

Frederick was eventually crowned emperor by Hadrian IV, in Rome, on 18 June, 1155. On the same day Anselm was bestowed the pallium as archbishop of Ravenna. The last phase of Anselm’s life coincided with Frederick Barbarossa’s expedition to Italy. Having turned his attention to the Lombard cities, and in particular Milan, Barbarossa received an offer of a large sum of money which the Milanese hoped would prevent the siege. While some advisers and military leaders were satisfied with the Milanese offer, Anselm’s last-known speech destroyed the almost-confirmed compromise:

434 PL 188, 1140C-1141B; Anticimenon, prologue, pp. 43-44.
435 PL 188,1544B; note also that Anselm, at that time, worked for the Treaty of Constance; see Otto of Freising, The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa, pp. 118-123.
437 Otto of Freising, The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa, p. 142.
438 Boso, Adrien IV, Liber pontificialis II, in Louis Duchesne ed., Le Liber Pontificalis, Texte, introduction et commentaire (Paris: E. Thorin, 1892), pp. 390-391. According to his title (Sancti Ravennatis ecclesiae archiepiscopus et eiusdem civitatis exarchus), Anselm was not only the Archbishop but also exarchus of the province. This was a rarely-used title at the beginning of the eleventh century, and one which made Anselm subordinate to the emperor rather than to the pope. See Lees, Anselm of Havelberg, pp. 114-115.
You do not know the slyness of the Milanese. They give you pleasant and humble words while carrying a wicked fox in their hearts. They should be judged by the standard with which they have judged others. They have destroyed the churches of God and the free cities of the emperor. They have not shown mercy, and so should be shown none.\(^{439}\)

This statement ruined Anselm’s reputation in history. The emperor declared Milan under his ban and the siege began on 6 August, 1158. However, Anselm’s sudden death six days after the siege began led to numerous rumours and fears within the army that this was a punishment from God.\(^{440}\) Under such circumstances, Frederick ended the siege once the Milanese people had paid a fine and showed their loyalty to the emperor.

2. Diversity, Development and the Holy Spirit: *De Una forma credenda et multiformitate vivendi*

In the first volume of *Anticimenon*, Anselm addresses one central issue: *Quare tot novitates? Quare tot varietates?* Why so many new things, such variety?\(^{441}\) It seems odd that Anselm placed such a lengthy volume (entitled *Liber de una forma credendi et multiformitate vivendi*) on the diversity within the Church before the records of the debates with the Greek Archbishop Nicetas of Nicomedia.

In much of the modern scholarship, this first volume and the remaining two volumes have generally been taken to represent two completely separate works which are only loosely connected. Jay Lees suggests that Book I is linked to the other books only by a general rhetorical intent (“teaching by example”).\(^{442}\) But Karl Morrison suggests that Anselm showed an essential unity of his writing on historical theory and hermeneutics.\(^{443}\)

In relation to these ideas, I will argue that Anselm intentionally wrote the first volume before the debates. In the previous pages, I attempted to demonstrate that during his

\(^{439}\) Vincent of Prague, *Annales*, MGH SS 17, p. 671.

\(^{440}\) The Archbishopric of Ravenna was vacant from September of 1158, and Frederick tried to appoint Guido, the son of Count Guido of Biandrate to take Anselm’s place in the Church of Ravenna. However, this proposal was rejected by Pope Hadrian, which invoked more tension between the secular ruler and the pope. See Otto of Freising, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 253-255. Note also that the pope wrote to the people of Milan to urge them to revolt again: see *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 255-261.

\(^{441}\) PL 188, 1141C; *Anticimenon*, 1.1.


banishment, Anselm reflected on his conception of the varied religious life. As Pegatha Taylor suggests, Anselm’s defence of the diversity of religious practices and orders within one united Church drew from his career “spent on the physical and spiritual frontiers” of the Church.\footnote{Pegatha Taylor, “Moral Agency in Crusade,” p. 761. See also Lees, Anselm of Havelberg, pp. 84-85, 125.} Anselm states that he was invited by his brethren to address the novelty and diversity within the Church:

I have set at the head of this dialogue, moreover, a book about the singularity of belief and the multififormity of life from the time of Abel the just until the last of the elect. I had earlier been constrained to write this by entreaties of certain brothers who declared that many ordinary folk, even wise men, are scandalized that, within one Church holding one faith, so many new and varied forms of religious life arise in all times and places.\footnote{PL 188, 1142A; Anticimenon, prologue, p. 46.}

In addition, the first volume of Anticemenon laid the theoretical foundation for the debates with the Greeks. All three volumes of Anticimenon are apologetic in nature and in dialogue with the others: the first volume defends the variety and novelty within the Church and the remaining two volumes focus on the reunification with the Greek Church.\footnote{Barmann also accentuates the apologetic nature of these two parts; although the immediate object of the apology differs in each instance, the final object is the same in both. See Lawrence F. Barmann, “Reform Ideology in the ‘Dialogi’ of Anselm of Havlerberg,” in Church History, 30-4 (1961), p. 3825.}

However, I want to propose that there is another, more subtle, and crucial point made throughout these works: the role of the Holy Spirit. Both Book I and the dialogues consistently identify the Holy Spirit as the ultimate motivating force. The gradual revelation of the Holy Spirit coincides with the unfolding of divine providence in the course of history. Anselm encourages his reader to abandon a narrow vision of religious life and to revisit the scriptural and patristic texts in the light of the Holy Spirit’s inspiration. As Anselm explicitly states at the beginning of Book I:

May we invite them to consider what we must hold and believe according to Catholic faith and Sacred Scripture, how the Church of God is one in herself and in her nature but multiflorm in respect to her children, whom she has shaped and will shape in diverse ways and by diverse laws and institutions from the time Abel’s blood was shed until the last of the elect.\footnote{PL 188, 1144A: “et eos ad videndum nobiscum invitemus, quid secundum fidem catholicam, seu secundum sacram Scripturam super hoc faciendum et tenendum sit, videlicet quomodo Ecclesia Dei sit una in se et secundum se, et quomodo sit multiflormis secundum filios suos, quos diversis modis et diversis legibus et institutis informavit et informat, a sanguine Abel iusti usque ad novissimum electrum.” Anticimenon, 1.1, p. 49.}

The core of Anselm’s thought is that “the one body of the Church is clearly brought to life by
the Holy Spirit, who is both singular in himself and manifold in the multiform distribution of his gifts”. Anselm explicitly claims that “the faith is one and in single form (una forma), while the expressions of faith were varied (multiformitas), and the constant change will make the last as the “newest” (novissimus)” This is clearly revealed in Anselm’s narrative of salvation history.

2.1 Anselm’s Overlapping Periodization

Anselm moved dexterously among a variety of patristic paradigms to understand the growth of the Church over time. Walter Edyvean argues that Anselm employs three different schemes to present his view of the Church throughout the entire course of history. These schemes were not original but were rather common across medieval historiography and theology. However, the content and interpretation offered by Anselm to the periodization illuminates his original views on the theology of history.

The three periodizations employed by Anselm in the first volume are as follows:

A: From Abel to the last elect. This scheme generally originates with St Augustine of Hippo and was the most widely accepted periodization during the Middle Ages. However, Anselm employs a less-known division transmitted from Hippolytus and Hilary of Poitiers (Adam to Noah to Abraham to Moses to David to Christ to the Last Judgment) instead of the better-known Augustinian division (Adam to Noah to Abraham to David to the Babylonian exile to Christ to the Last Judgment).

B: Four Ages of the World. This scheme is based on the Pauline division of history: the Age of the Law of Nature; the Mosaic Law; the Age of Grace; and adds another Age of Glory.

C: Seven Seals of Apocalypse. The interpretation of the seven seals had a long tradition in the Latin Church and became increasingly influential in the theological and mystical

448 PL 188, 1144B: “Et est unum corpus Ecclesiae, quod Spiritu sancto vivificatur, regitur et gubernatur, cui Spiritus sanctus est unitus, multiplex”; Anticimenon, 1.2, p. 50.
449 PL 188, 1144B-1144C: Anticimenon, 1.2, pp. 50-51.
writings in the High Middle Ages. Anselm’s interpretation of the seven seals is the most
original and attractive part of his writings, and will form the main focus of the following
discussion.

Under the first historical scheme, Anselm announces that salvation is the central concern of
his study of the ancient fathers in the Old Testament. The first and most prevalent aim was to
revise tradition by seeking to prove that what looked novel really went back to antiquity,
especially through the prefiguration of the Old Testament. The investigation concentrates on
the change of the sacrificial rites from Abel to Christ. It is apparent that Anselm repeatedly
emphasizes the idea of a single faith in varied modes of worship. Smalley argues that
Anselm saw no reason to defend the diversity by searching for precedents. Instead of trying
to find similar examples in the Old Testament history to legitimize current practices, Anselm
chose a more fundamental way to justify the apparent novelties and developments. He
argues that renovation itself had constantly existed within the Church from the very
beginning, and represented the essence of the Church’s renewal and divine superintendence.
Therefore, the core argument was not to advocate specific novelties, but it was rather to
vindicate the on-going advancement and renovation within the Church.

The second historical scheme originates from Paul the Apostle’s division. According to
Anselm, when the Law and the Gospel were given to the people of God, their significance
was affirmed with earthquakes. The third earthquake will predict the coming of the Last
Judgment and the Age of Glory. Anselm suggests that the progression “from idols-sacrifices-
circumcision-baptism” signified the continuous work of revelation alongside the
advancement of human capacity. Following the writings of Paul and Augustine, Anselm
emphasized the role of the Holy Spirit as a teacher and a physician, whose work “little by
little—removing, transferring and arranging” (et paulatim subtrahendo, et transponendo, et
dispensando) in an “almost as if secret” way will lead the people to the way to salvation.

Before the discussion of the third scheme, that is, the seven seals coinciding with the seven
ages of the Church, Anselm clarifies his understanding of the gradual revelation of the divine
providence through each person of the Trinity respectively. Like Rupert, Anselm displays a

452 PL 188, 1144C-1146B; Anticimenon, 1.3, pp. 51-54.
Edyvean contends that this part presented a certain positive orientation towards the vicissitudes and changes:
Walter Edyvean, Anselm of Havelberg and the Theology of History, pp. 50-52.
454 PL 188, 1147C-1147D; Anticimenon, 1.5, pp. 55-56
special piety towards the Holy Spirit and an idea of gradual revelation through the three persons of the Trinity. But, as we argued in the first chapter, Anselm’s conception of the Holy Spirit and the idea of successive revelation was possibly influenced by Gregory of Nazianzus. Anselm articulates this in a very systematic way:

The Old Testament clearly announced the Father, but did not so clearly foretell the Son, rather did so subtly. The New Testament then revealed God the Son plainly, but offered only a glimpse of the Holy Spirit, so implying his divinity. Afterwards, the Holy Spirit was announced, granting us still clearer evidence of his godhead. It was not fitting that the Son be clearly announced before the divinity of the Father was made known, or that the divinity of the Holy Spirit be proclaimed to us when the divinity of the Son was still not acknowledged. Nor is it appropriate that human souls be overburdened by more nourishment than they can manage… therefore, the health-bringing medicine of the Gospel was applied little by little to weak humankind. 455

Therefore, the changing rites in the Old Testament period became the changing religious life following the establishment of Christianity. With the birth of the Church, the Holy Spirit constantly renews the Church through gradual revelation. In this sense, the innovations within the Church could be justified as the insignia of the ceaseless work of the Holy Spirit. The faith in the Holy Trinity is measured out gradually according to the capacity of the believers. In other words, the advancement of the liturgy and the emergence of novelties within the Church reflect the development of the doctrine and the improvement of people’s understanding.

In this context, Anselm’s use of the image of the eagle also deserves special attention. This psalmist’s image is frequently utilized during the twelfth century to illustrate the renewed faith and the Church; simultaneously, this image is also connected with the vision of time, especially relating to the developmental stages of the Church. In Anselm’s conclusion on the discussions of the changing rites and gradual revelation, he states that the Church, “passing through various successive stages, has been so renewed up until our own times… Like the

455 PL 188, 1147D- 1148A: “Vetus Testamentum praedicavit manifeste Deum Patrem, Filium autem non adeo manifeste, sed obscure. Novum Testamentum manifestavit Deum Filium, sed submonstravit et subinnuit Deitatem Spiritus sancti. Praedicatur postea Spiritus sanctus, apertiorem nobis tribuenus suae Deitatis manifestationem: non enim conveniens erat, nondum confessa Patris Dietate Filium manifeste praedicari, neque Filii adhuc non suscepta Deitate, Spiritus sancti Deitatem nobis praedicari, et quemdmodum cibo gravari super virtutem, et supra modum onerari mentes humanas… ideoque tanquam ab infirmis evangelica et salubris pharmacia paulatim suscepta est, arte divina benignioribus medicinaliter commista.” Anticimenon, 1.6, pp. 56-57. This statement is obviously fundamentally based on the writing of Gregory of Nazianzus. When the absence of early discussion on the Holy Spirit was raised, Gregory of Nazianzus explained it through his idea of development of doctrine, see Oraciones theologiae. 31.26. For the English translation see Frederick W. Norris, Lionel Wickham and Frederick Williams, Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning: The Five Theological Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus (Leiden, The Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1991) p. 293.
Based on the gradual revelation of the Holy Spirit in the unfolding of divine mystery, Anselm moved to the successive ages of the Church according to the Apocalypse. Through his interpretation of the seven seals, Anselm highlights the role of the Holy Spirit as the motivating force in the course of salvation history.

2.2 Theology of History: The Seven Seals in Church History

Numerous studies have been devoted to Anselm’s interpretations and explanations of the seven stages as an example of Christian historical periodization and apocalyptic visions in the twelfth century. Bernard McGinn rightly points out that “the most direct and obvious aspect of the Apocalypse’s influence in the Middle Ages is to be found in the history of theology, especially the history of exegesis”. In this sense, Anselm of Havelberg could be regarded one of the most interesting exegetes in the twelfth century.

Francis X. Gumerlock suggests that all interpretations of the seven seals can be classified into three dimensions: Christological interpretation (which refers to the seven phases of the life of Christ), ecclesiastical interpretation (which refers to development of the Church and predictions of the future) and historical interpretation (which refers to world history being divided into seven ages). However, it seems that the latter two classifications are combined together in Anselm’s writings.

From the early period of the Church, there were numerous commentaries on the Apocalypse, and thus the exegetical works concentrating on the seven seals attracted particular attention over many centuries. Christian eschatology and millenarianism developed from the allegorical interpretations of the Apocalypse, which in some cases associated

---


bibilical prophecies with actual historical events. However, the majority of commentaries relating to historical events should be considered as symbolic rather than as accurate historicity.\footnote{Douglas W. Lumsden, \textit{And Then the End Will Come: Early Latin Christian Interpretations of the Opening of the Seven Seals} (New York: Routledge, 2013), pp. 3-5; Bernard McGinn, \textit{Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages} (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), pp. ii-iv.}

In many ways, Victorinus of Pettau (d. 303/304) should be regarded as the leading forerunner of the Latin tradition of apocalyptic interpretation. He views the seven seals as the signs of the fall of Rome, the greatest enemy of the Christian Church in his time.\footnote{Victorinus In \textit{Apocalypsin}, XIII.17 (CSEL 49), pp. 118-121. Pierre De Labriolle even called Victorinus “the first Latin exegetist”: see idem, \textit{The History and Literature of Christianity} (New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 220-223.} Jerome played a crucial role in the transmission of the interpretation of the seven seals based on Victorinus’s interpretation. With the end of persecution of Christians and as the situation became more favourable for the Christian Church, Jerome eliminated millenarian concepts while preserving the more optimistic elements.\footnote{Pierre De Labriolle, \textit{The History and Literature of Christianity}, pp. 221-222; Lumsden, \textit{And Then the End Will Come}, p. 24.} Jerome, Orosius and their successors started to concentrate more on Church history itself as a symbol of the revelation of the seven ages of the World.\footnote{A general discussion of this change can be found in James Palmer, \textit{The Apocalypse in the Early Middle Ages} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 32-34.}

Another decisive turning point was established by Augustine, for whom there was no essential connection between the salvation of God and the tumultuous destinies of profane empires. R. A. Marcus suggests that, following Augustine’s views, apocalyptic prophecies were not to be read as relating to any specific historical event or even catastrophe.\footnote{\textit{De civitate Dei}, XX.11; R. A. Marcus, \textit{Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St Augustine}, pp. 53-54. Cf. Lactantius, \textit{Divine Institutes, Books 1-7}, p. 115.}

Therefore, from the fourth century onwards, and in particular after Christianity reached a position of dominance in Europe, most early Christian exegetes did not advocate millenarian interpretations. They emphasized the role of the Church in salvation history rather than impending end times.

Apocalyptic thought and the interpretation of the seven seals took on a new direction in the twelfth century. By this point the breaking of the seals was not described in a context of catastrophic death or destruction, but as a prediction of the emergence of a victorious Church. In this sense, Anselm of Havelberg’s interpretation of the seven seals breaks from the great
heritage of Christian exegetical tradition. According to Anselm, the development of the Church is the advancement of human history, and the announcement of salvation history and the Holy Spirit dominate the whole progression. In other words, the picture given in the Apocalypse is not a miserable prediction of the Church’s future but a destined unfolding of history under the gentle guidance of the Holy Spirit.

In addition, Anselm’s exposition reveals his ideas on reform. The early Christian interpretations of the seven seals was usually connected with the concept of “reform”. In Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, the conception of “reform” chiefly focused on the dimension of the individual Christian and advocated constant personal renewal, with the renunciation of worldly possessions and the acceptance of eternal spiritual existence.465 On the contrary, Church reform of the eleventh and twelfth centuries encouraged Christian thinkers who increasingly considered the Church the institutional form of the body of Christ, to accept guidance from the Holy Spirit. Anselm’s interpretation of the seven seals offers us an interesting account of this change.

2.3 Seven Seals and Seven Stages of the Church History

Anselm’s interpretation of the seven seals is indebted to his predecessors (especially Bede) and in turn his work facilitated the development of apocalyptical thought in the later Middle Ages.466 But what distinguishes Anselm’s thoughts is his acceptance of novelties within the Church and his view that diversity is precisely the sign of the renewal of the Holy Spirit. These ideas can be clearly seen in Anselm’s exposition of the seven seals.

In the Latin tradition, the first four horsemen (white, red, black and pale), coinciding with the openings of the first four seals, usually represent pestilence, war, famine and death.467 Since the fourth century, these images were regarded as signs of the successful spread of the


466 Guntram Bischoff argues that Anselm was possibly influenced by another Premonstratensian canon, Eberwin of Steinfeld, or that they shared the same source. In a letter from Eberwin to St. Bernard, he uses the seven jugs of water turning into wine at Cana to symbolize six attacks on the Church. Bischoff argues that “the amazing agreement between Eberwin’s and Anselm’s views, even to the point of identity, can hardly be accidental”. See idem, “Early Premonstratensian Eschatology,” in Rozanne Elder ed., The Spirituality of Western Christianity (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), pp. 41-71.

Gospel over all parts of the World. However, Bede started to dissociate these visions from prophecies of otherworldly disasters by interpreting the arrival of the first three horsemen as symbols of moral choices and concentrating on the contrast between heresy and orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{468}

In Anselm’s writings, the first stage represents the coming of Jesus Christ as the white horse. The red horse indicates the persecution of the Church, and the red colour suggests that “the blood of the martyrs poured out in witness of Christ”. Anselm describes the period after the persecution and during which the prohibition of Christianity had been relaxed as an age when “a different law was promulgated to keep peace for the Church”. The third age is signalled by the black horse bringing the doctrines of heretics. With the prevalence of the teaching of faith and the rise of the holy order of bishops and clerics, the heresies were stirred up by the great dragon who aimed to demolish the Church from the inside. For this interpretation of the first three horsemen, Anselm chiefly relied on Bede.\textsuperscript{469}

Anselm therefore emphasizes how the ambiguous aspects of the revelation of God were misinterpreted by the heretics and how the ecumenical councils endeavoured to clarify and defend the truth:

> The orthodox faith was so strengthened, founded, and fortified after these attacks that from now on, by God’s favour, it might always remain indestructible, unshaken, whole without accretions and inviolable without detractions; since it was now clear and unambiguous, for it is madness to seek artificial illumination in broad daylight.\textsuperscript{470}

Nevertheless, Anselm still leaves room for the continuous development of the Church in the following periods, especially for the varied forms of religious life. Anselm’s narrative of the first three seals laid the foundation for his exposition of the fourth seal. He shows how the doctrine of the Church gradually developed and multiple forms of grace emerged from the united single faith. Jay Lees argues that there is an Attack-Victory pattern in Anselm’s


\textsuperscript{469} PL 188, 1149C-1152B; \textit{Anticimenon}, 1.7-1.9; concerning Bede’s interpretation, see Faith Wallis, \textit{Bede: Commentary on Revelation} (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013), pp. 140-143. It is noteworthy that Rupert also gives a vaguely similar interpretation of the first four seals, though it is quite ahistorical. See Rupert, \textit{In Apocalypse}, PL 169, 942B-943C.

\textsuperscript{470} PL 188, 1152A: “Ipse vero fides orthodoxa post tot impulsiiones adeo est roborata, et fundata, et solidata, ut iam amplius, Domino favente, semper inconvulsa, semper inconcussa iure permanere debeat, tota integra, ut nihil sit addendum; et tota inviolata, ut nihil sit auferendum.” \textit{Anticimenon}, 1.9, p. 64. We should pay special attention to Anselm’s attitude towards the council. As we will discuss in the next chapter, Anselm had a strong preference for holding a council to solve the schism between the Latin Church and the Greek Church. Here, Anselm states that the true doctrines of the Catholic Church are protected and must be entrenched in the universal ecumenical councils.
exposition, with “the Church mounting a successful defence against attack”. 471 This pattern is revealed in the first three seals and could be viewed as the backbone of his framework of salvation history; it also reveals Anselm’s optimistic view of the end of the time.

The fourth stage represented by the pale horse is generally taken as the age of false brotherhood (falsi fratres). However, Anselm does not concentrate on a specific group of false brothers as many of his predecessors did (like Rupert, who hints that the school masters are hypocrites). Anselm states explicitly that the core feature of the hypocrites is that they cannot be identified. 472 According to Anselm, the coexistence of hypocrites and religious people within the Church was the most significant issue of his time.473

It may be, however, that Anselm considered this issue from a wider perspective. Anselm expresses his strong desire to achieve Church reunion among varied religious orders and the Latin and Greek Churches. We might suggest that Anselm’s criticism of the false brother is aimed not at a specific group but at those who impede the reunion of the Church in general or those who create a schism in “the house of God”. In doing so, Anselm articulates a harmonious coexistence of diversified religious orders, and indeed his ideas of progress and diversity by means of varied forms of religious life are a central dimension of his conception of reform.474

In the fourth stage, Anselm offers an accurate historical description of the Church in his own time. Through the upsurges of the Premonstratensian and Cistercian orders, Anselm endorsed the new religious life and diversity within the Church. Furthermore, Anselm demonstrated the dynamic development of the Church which was, according to him, precisely the work of the Holy Spirit.475 Therefore, Anselm attempted to show the harmony between varied forms of religious life and to endorse his claim for diversity.

471 Lees, Anselm of Havelberg, pp. 207-208. Lees argues that, according to Anselm’s description, “this is not the image of a primitive Church that had been lost … but of a community grown larger through the efforts of those who carried the Gospel through the world.”
472 For example, Beatus of Liébana (ca 730-ca 800), who is renowned for his Commentary on the Apocalypse, which defines false brothers as hypocrites who do not oppose the Church openly, but instead simulate an appearance of holiness while actively destroying the Church from within. See John Williams, “Purpose and Imagery in the Apocalypse Commentary of Beatus of Liébana,” in The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages, pp. 217-230; John Williams, “Isidore, Orosius and the Beatus Map,” in Imago Mundi, 49-1 (1997), pp. 7-32. See also Bernard McGinn, Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages, pp. 77-79. See chapter III for Rupert’s thinking of hypocrites.
473 PL 188, 1157A-1157C; Anticimenon, 1.10, pp. 55-56.
475 Interestingly, Joachim of Fiore also interprets the recent changes in religious life as a sign of the Holy Spirit’s activity within the Church. However, Joachim claims that the future role of monks will effectively
It is not hard to imagine why, in his conception of the variety of religious forms, Anselm put the canons regular first. Anselm argues that the canonical life is traced back to Augustine and renewed by the founder of St. Ruf. However, there is no doubt that, for Anselm, his own mentor Norbert of Xanten played the most crucial role in his renewal of canons regular. Norbert instigated and the rapid spread of Norbertines along the Eastern border and even in Jerusalem. Anselm thus created an image of an ideal religious reformer based on the life of Norbert.

Furthermore, Anselm portrayed the development of varied monastic life in both the Western and Eastern Church. In this sense, the idea of ecclesia primitiva is integral to the notion of reform not only in the case of the canons regular but also in that of the monks. The Holy Spirit dominates the whole progression as, similarly to the canonical life, the monastic life was also renewed by the Holy Spirit in the unfolding of history. For example, in Anselm’s narrative, St. Benedict is referred to as a “worthy man of God filled with the Holy Spirit” who “prescribed a rule for his monks dictated by the Holy Spirit”. Anselm also argues that Camaldoli and Vallombrosa encouraged many people to follow their models as “new habits” (novo habitu), and that the Cistercians had become one of the most attractive monastic orders “differing in pattern of life and in dress from all those who are called and indeed are monks”.


476 PL 188, 1155A-B; *Anticimenon*, 1.10, p.70. It should be noted that the vita apostolica of the early Church, which was the ideal held up for imitation in the reform ideology, was still very much alive in the post-Gregorian period.


479 In Anselm’s age they were led by St. Bernard of Clairvaux, possibly...
the most influential ecclesiastical figure in the first half of the twelfth century, who Anselm described as “a man of the highest piety”. It is obvious that the idea of development and diversity dominates Anselm’s narrative of monasticism. To be specific, certain transitional stages observed in the monastic life revealed the incremental understanding of divine wisdom and the gradual distribution of the Holy Spirit. This is how Anselm applies his idea of progression and novelty within the Church as the gifts of the Holy Spirit in multiform expressions.

Moreover, Anselm includes the Knights of the Temple and the religious life in the Eastern Church in his narratives. On the one hand, Anselm not only praises them for their fight against the Saracens, but also refers to the statement of Pope Urban II to prove their order is no lower than the common life of monks and canons. On the other hand, Anselm’s discussion of the religious life in the Eastern Church creates a tangible connection to his visit to Constantinople and the remaining volumes of Anticimenon, which extends his narrative from the Latin Church to the Eastern Church. Anselm depicts himself as an avid observer and zealous investigator of the different religious life led by Greeks, Armenians and Syrians witnessed during his journey to Constantinople. He also observed that the monks of the Eastern Church lived under the varied monastic rules of Antony, Pachomius and Basil the Great. According to Anselm, the Greeks and the Latins share the one faith and a variety of forms of religious life. Indeed, it could be argued that, for Anselm, the dissimilarities in religious life between the two parts of the Christendom manifest the varied grace of the Holy Spirit rather than a schism.

In his narrative of the fourth stage, which addresses the Church in Anselm’s time, Anselm cautiously avoids any issues of contention between the different religious orders and portrays them as working toward the same goal. Anselm insists that religious life could be improved through the advancement of human comprehension and that varied expressions of grace and diversity itself are the signs of divine providence. Regardless of the types of religious life

---

481 PL 188, 1156C; Anticimenon, 1.10, p. 72.
483 For example, in the debates with Nicetas, Anselm never attacked the Greeks’ religious life.
484 Lees, Anselm of Havelberg, p. 211.
adopted, they are all realized throughout history as the work of the Holy Spirit in the single body of the Church:

One and the same Spirit works all these divine, holy and excellent things at different times and in different ways of life, dividing to every one according as he will. That Holy Spirit who governs the whole body of the church from the beginning, now and forever, has recognized how to renew the sluggish souls of men, of faithful people cloyed by a long-familiar religious life, by the beginning of a new form of religion. The Spirit sees that, when such folk see others ascend to a higher form of religious life they are the more inspired by new models.... So by God’s wondrous design, since from generation to generation new forms of religious life always arise, the youth of the church renews itself like the eagle’s, so that it may fly the higher in contemplation, with the strength to gaze directly, unblinded, at the rays of the true sun.  

This idea is closely connected with Anselm’s conception of the Holy Spirit and its role in salvation history and renewal of the Church. Anselm deemed that the emergence of varied forms of religious life was the fruit of the Holy Spirit, and that divine wisdom led the whole Church (both ancient and new, West and East) to worship the same and only God in varied ways. All these innovations of religious life constituted the contents of “reform”, for the renewal of the Church by the Holy Spirit coincides with the entire course of salvation history.

In order to understand better this idea, special attention should be paid to Anselm’s view of salvation history and his conception of the Church in the institutional sense, especially through the observable renewals of this stage of history. As we see among the Church Fathers, Victorinus proposed an ever-present role for the Church in the course of history, which represents a non-historical interpretation of the symbolic language of the Apocalypse. Augustine in particular dissociated the symbols of the Apocalypse from historical figures and events.

---

485 PL 188, 1157A-1157B: “Porro haec omnia tam divina, tam sancta, tam bona in diversis temporibus et in diversis ordinibus operatur unus atque idem Spiritus, dividens singulis prout vult. Novit quippe Spiritus sanctus, qui totum corpus Ecclesiae ab initio et nunc et semper regit... Et fit mira Dei dispensatione, quod a generationem in generationem succrescente semper nova religione, renovatur ut aquilae iuventus Ecclesiae, quo et sublimius in contemplatione volare queat, et subtilius quasi irreverberatis oculis radios veri solis contueri valeat.” Anticimenon, 1.10, p. 74.

486 Lees argues that Anselm’s view of salvation history is “an integration of changing attempts by the faithful to imitate the Lord with the changeless image of Jesus” and also accentuates Anselm’s particularly optimistic view: see Lees, Anselm of Havelberg, p. 79.

487 For a general discussion, see Lumsden, And Then the End Will Come, pp. 23-25; see also Weinrich, Latin Commentaries on Revelation, pp. 13-14, 16-19. On Augustine, see James Palmer, The Apocalypse in the Early Middle Ages, pp. 45-46. This is especially clear in the work of Ambrosius Autpertus, as he transforms the apocalyptic narrative from a development of the historical Church to a personal imperative for its members with
However, the twelfth century witnessed a great shift from understanding reform as personal perfection to seeing it as purification of the Church as a whole. The image of the eagle arises here again and reflects Anselm’s idea of renewal within the Church in an institutional sense. Most medieval authors, under the great influence of Augustine, interpreted the eagle as the individual, the beak as the sins of the person and the rock as the salvation granted by Christ. However, Anselm transforms this image from the individual Christian into the Church in its entirety, which is similar to Rupert’s understanding of renewal and the gifts of the Holy Spirit. But Anselm takes a more optimistic view of the rejuvenation of the Church through institutional revival than Rupert, and he made this revival historically traceable. Therefore, Anselm attempts to unite all canons, monks, laymen, and Greeks and Latins in a common effort for a comprehensive spiritual renewal which closely connects with his conception of the Church as a unified and multifaceted institution.

From the opening of the fifth seal, Anselm’s framework moves to the future. As pointed out by R. W. Southern, Anselm is not willing to investigate or predict the future like Joachim of Fiore. Lees also suggests that “if there is any real attempt to prophesy the future in Anselm’s history, it is found in the pattern he finds in these second and third states and projects into his own time”. The pattern of “attack-victory” re-emerges at the end of the fourth stage. Anselm admits that there might be some false brothers and prophets, and that even communities of true Christians could be infiltrated by those false brothers. However, Anselm’s solution differed from previous models which aimed to vanquish such false brothers, instead insisting that true Christians should “bear them in charity and prayerfully wait for them to lay aside their pretence and become true brothers”. This is a practical agenda, given the historical context of Church reform already embodied by a multitude of


Lees suggests that Anselm might reference the work of Honorius Augustodunensis, whose Commentarium in Psalmos also highlights the division of salvation history. See Lees, Anselm of Havelberg, pp. 215-216. As discussed in the previous chapter, Honorius was greatly influenced by Rupert of Deutz. In this sense, Anselm could also be viewed as a successor of Rupert.

See R. W. Southern, “Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing 2”, pp. 159-179. For the fifth seal, early Latin exegetes generally agreed that this vision represents an existing condition rather than a future event. In this sense, Anselm perhaps brought something new into the apocalyptic tradition.

Lees, Anselm of Havelberg, p. 207.

movements and institutions. This idea was apparently influenced by Anselm’s previous experiences that enhanced his practical outlook for the sake of the renewal of the Church.

In the fifth stage, Anselm describes how the souls of the saints will cry out under the “altar of God”, which indicates the struggle and the persecution of the Church, followed by its growth. The sixth stage signals a terrible persecution with a great earthquake and the coming of the Antichrist. Thereafter, the ravaged Church will witness the disappearance of the sacraments from the earth. In the last and seventh stage, the history of salvation will be fulfilled in the silence of divine contemplation, and the truth of all time will be revealed.

Anselm displays an optimistic attitude towards the future of the Church. As Alois Dempf argues, Augustine replaced the original faith in progress with a pessimistic picture of a declining world and it was only with Anselm of Havelberg that the original optimism has reasserted itself. In Anselm’s mind, the suffering borne by the Church is repaid by the increasing strength of its faith. Matter argues that when biblical exegetes again turned their attention to this prophecy in the eleventh century, they began introducing new concepts that culminated in the radical proposals of Joachim. However, most authors in the twelfth century showed more moderate attitudes and a less urgent sense of the coming of the end than their predecessors in the Carolingian period and the eleventh century, even those who had suffered greatly in the Investiture Controversy. For example, Hugh of St. Victor believed that the Last Judgment would not come until the gospel had been preached to all nations.

By the end of the twelfth century, the interpretations of salvation history seemingly returned

---

493 “Heaven here signifies the Church, in which the ecclesiastical sacraments are kept wrapped and preserved, so that they disappear from the use of Christians, hidden away from solemn public ritual.” PL 188, 1159A; Anticimenon, 1.12, pp. 76-77.
494 We should pay attention to the fact that Anselm used the first person singular “puto” in his own reading of the half-hour silence in the Apocalypse, which may indicate that he was uncertain about the prophecy about the future. See Karl Morrison, “Anselm of Havelberg: Play and the Dilemma of Historical Progress,” pp. 232-239.
497 Beryl Smalley disagrees with the idea that Rupert of Deutz and Anselm of Havelberg expected the immediate coming of Antichrist and suggests that both Rupert and Anselm “hold to tradition in believing themselves to be living in the sixth age of the world, but do not speculate on its end”. This statement seems accurate in terms of Anselm since he still viewed his current Church as being in the fourth stage. For Rupert, however, it can be questioned. It is admitted that Rupert’s Commentary on the Apocalypse showed a relatively more optimistic view about the immediate future of the Church, but we suggest that his De sancta Trinitate possibly indicates another version of his thoughts on the status of the Church. See Beryl Smally, “Ralph of Flaux on Leviticus,” in Studies in Medieval Thoughts and Learning, p. 56; also cf. Chapter III.
498 De sacramenta, II.17; PL 176, 597C.
to the previous more prophecy-oriented stance, which would be presented by Joachim of Fiore.\textsuperscript{499}

3. Conclusion

We can now answer the question raised by Anselm in the very beginning of the work which reflected many contemporaries’ worries: Quare tot novitates? Quare tot varietates?

According to Anselm, novelty and variety within the Church are precisely the gifts and works of the Holy Spirit. Anselm sees the Holy Spirit as the driving force in the unfolding of salvation history and the diversities of the Church as the signs of multifaceted forms of grace. Anselm is quite confident about his answer, as he concludes in Book I:

It was necessary that the signs of the spiritual graces grow in the succession of time. Those signs might thus proclaim the truth more and more fully, so that the knowledge of truth might be increased in time to effect salvation. So first came forth good things, then better, and finally the most excellent...Therefore from now on may none of the faithful suspect any scandal if the faith of the Church remains the same even if her form of life changes. For the time being let this suffice to have answered those who slander so much variety in the holy Church.\textsuperscript{500}

From the very beginning of his writing, and from his description of the development of the rites and sacrifice in the Old Testament period, Anselm encourages his reader to abandon a vision of religious life grounded in narrow historical precedent, and attempts to draw his reader’s eye to an interpretive height from which all history may be viewed from God’s perspective.

In contrast to previous research, I have accentuated the role of the Holy Spirit in Anselm’s structure of salvation history.\textsuperscript{501} Even though scholars have mostly emphasized the Christological reading of Anselm’s work, I would like to argue that the pneumatological


\textsuperscript{500} PL 188, 1160B-C: “Itaque nemo miretur, neque causetur Ecclesiam Dei ab invariabili Deo variis legibus et observationibus ante legem, et sub lege, et sub gratia distinctam, quia oportebat ut secundum processum temporum crescerent signa spiritualium gratiarum, quae magis ac magis ipsam veritatem declararent, et sic cum effectu salutis incrementum accipere de tempore in tempus cognitio veritatis: et ita primo quidem bona, deinde meliora, ad ultimum vero optima proposita sunt... Ideoque iam deinceps nullus fidelis suspicetur in hoc esse aliquod scandalum, si Ecclesiae cuius semper est eadem fides credendi, non semper est eadem forma vivendi.” \textit{Anticumon}, 1.13, p. 79. Hugh also expresses a similar idea: “Through the times faith grew in all things but it did not change so as to be different.” See Hugh, \textit{De sacramentis}, 1.10.6; PL 176, 339B.

\textsuperscript{501} Walter Edyvean suggests that the Christology of Anselm’s vision of history appears only in conjunction with the roles he assigns to the Holy Spirit and to revelation, but he does not continue to establish the relationship of the Holy Spirit with the innovations within the Church and Anselm’s conception of the Church. See idem, \textit{Anselm of Havelberg and the Theology of History}, pp. 44-45.
reading offers a better approach. It is obvious that Anselm’s interpretation of the gradual revelation of the Trinity functioned as the theoretical foundation for his further exposition of the seven seals. In his narrative of salvation history, the Holy Spirit plays a crucial role in moving the Church through constant renewal. This broad renewal coincides with the diversity in expression of the religious life, and also hints at doctrinal development.

In conclusion, the distinctiveness of Anselm’s thought lies in the three aspects of: 1) positive acceptance of the diversity and advancement within the Church across time; 2) a vivid interest in plotting the history of the Church according to exegetically grounded stages of development; 3) a strong conviction that the Holy Spirit renews the Church in successive stages.

Firstly, the acceptance of diversity and the idea of development of the Church are the most distinctive features in Anselm’s writing. His dynamic conceptions of growth and diversity in the life of the Church and his optimistic historical outlook make him in many ways unique among early twelfth-century writers. By associating the varied religious life with the renewal of the Church and grace of the Holy Spirit, Anselm not only attempts to justify the status of innovations, but also endeavours to argue that diversification under the guidance of the Holy Spirit is an eternal driving force in the Church. Anselm argues that the life of the Church is a continual growing process both in its external expression (religious orders or the rites of sacrifice) and in its understanding of the faith (the gradual revelation of God). More than any other medieval writers on theology of history, Anselm emphasized doctrinal and institutional development as the hallmark of the unfolding of God’s divine plan. When Anselm’s contemporary Otto of Freising lamented the “world grown old”, Anselm of Havelberg saw the return of youth and vitality, the advancement of Christian doctrine and human possibility. As R. W. Southern points out, Anselm of Havelberg extends the development into his own time, and “everywhere he saw ecclesiastical history as the story of innovations”. Instead of a pattern of increasing evil, cosmic catastrophe, and new beginnings, Anselm established a pattern of “attack-victory” throughout the history of the Church and saw history as moving

---

502 R. W. Southern, “Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing 2”, p. 176. In some cases, this idea became much more radical in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In many cases, the thirteenth century had a more radical conception of the role of the Holy Spirit and the dramatic change within the Church. For example, Master Prepositinus of Cremona (d. 1210) suggests that the doctors and prelates supplied what apostles failed to make plain when the Church reigned over an expanding Christendom, that is by the constant revelation of the Holy Spirit. The Dominican Monetta of Cremona (1180-1238) contends that the Church which existed throughout the course of history must necessarily change with the times. In other words, the continuity must include innovations, and the innovations are generally viewed as the operation of the Holy Spirit within the Church. Cf. Beryl Smalley, “Ecclesiastical Attitudes to Novelty: c. 1100-c. 1250,” pp. 102ff.
through purifying catastrophes from one stage to a better one. The doctrinal and institutional development is also the fundamental idea for Anselm’s debate with the Greeks in order to pursue the reunion of the Church.

This is one of the most significant divergences between Rupert and Anselm’s thoughts. For Rupert, he principally focuses on theological and exegetical reflections and uses the Holy Spirit’s implication as a tool to legitimize his original interpretation and break free of the heritages represented by the Church Fathers and the intellectual system of the school masters. This is why Rupert lamented the novelty which supposedly contaminated the spontaneous teaching of the Holy Spirit. In contrast, Anselm’s employment of the Holy Spirit takes a much more positive attitude towards diversity in religious life and the development of the Church. For Anselm, diversity itself is precisely viewed as a sign of guidance from the Holy Spirit. There is no doubt that this difference between the two writers could be attributed to their respective religious status as Benedictine monk and Premonstratensian bishop.

Secondly, Anselm displays his understanding of the reform (or more precisely in this context, “renewal”) of the Church through the reconstruction of salvation history. According to Gerhart B. Ladner’s definition, Anselm viewed reform as a continuation of spiritual regeneration by both individual and ecclesiastical renewal. However, Augustine never envisioned a reform of the Church. Many reformers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries still thought of reform in individual terms, but their ultimate thrust was to purify and renew the Church. Similarly to Rupert, Anselm views the Church in an institutional sense and treated it as the receiver of the grace of the Holy Spirit. As a consequence, Anselm actually concentrated more on the renewal of the Church as a whole.\footnote{Gerhart B. Ladner, “Terms and Ideas of Renewal”, in Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable eds., \textit{Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century} (Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press, 1982), pp. 1-36, quoted from p. 1.} For Anselm, the notion of reform is not exclusive to the moral status of the clergy or the authority of the papacy in terms of ecclesiastical appointments, but rather the growth of the Church led by the Holy Spirit. Anselm’s concern for novelty and diversity within the Church developed into a theory of universal history, and he considers those novelties as effectively bringing a fuller understanding of God’s revelation through the Holy Spirit. Anselm expresses innovative development of his era and argues that history has a meaning of its own. In this way, Anselm
portrays a continual, progressive renewal within the Church: over the unfolding of history under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. 504

Thirdly, the special devotion to the Holy Spirit in the Trinitarian order functions as the theoretical foundation of Anselm’s whole system of theology of history. Both Anselm and Rupert perceived the gradual revelation of the Trinity in the unfolding of salvation history (though they were inspired by St. Irenaeus and Gregory of Nazianzus respectively), and views of the Holy Spirit dominate their own period. For Anselm, the renewal function of the Holy Spirit is not a simple restoration but a more positive innovation. Through the careful exposition of the seven seals, Anselm pictured the unfolding of Christian history and showed the vitality of the Church through diversity and novelty. The Church becomes the most effective agent of receiving and distributing the gifts of the Holy Spirit. In this sense, the Holy Spirit is the protagonist of history, while novelty and variety are witnesses of His work within the Church. In fact, Anselm identifies the Holy Spirit as the motivating force behind the development of the Church and seeks to discern the mechanisms of the Spirit’s agency as a means to interpreting time. 505

In addition, Rupert and Anselm also had different approaches to the role of the Holy Spirit. They both used the development of the Church to elaborate the role played by the Holy Spirit, but it is obvious that Anselm focuses more on the historical narrative and attempts to summarize certain ideas or patterns in order to legitimize novelty and diversity. Unlike Rupert of Deutz, we find in the writings of Anselm an attempt to understand the present by seeing it as part of a continuous historical progress. Although Rupert does not ignore the present, his view (and also Hugh of St. Victor’s) is coloured by theological concerns about understanding the Divine Mystery. On the contrary, the present is at the heart of Anselm’s view of history. He is confident to profess that all these novelties are the work of the Holy Spirit within the Church.

Both Rupert and Anselm’s lives greatly shaped their thought. For Rupert, the visions of his youth stimulated his special piety towards the Holy Spirit and his conflicts with the school masters in the early twelfth century contributed to his understanding of the Holy Spirit and the development of salvation history. For Anselm, his theology of history is informed by his encounters with the Greeks and other opponents within the Latin Church. It is possible that

505 The most significant expressions are in Anticimenon, 1.3, 1.6, 1.10, as quoted above.
Anselm’s debate in 1136 with the Greeks gave him access to Gregory of Nazianzus’ work and inspired his special devotion to the understanding of the Holy Spirit. In the *Anticimenon* composed in 1149, Anselm firstly elaborated his understanding of the Holy Spirit in salvation history and the idea of development, and he applied this to his reconstruction of the debate with Nicetas of Nicomedia. In this sense, his employment of the Holy Spirit and salvation history went beyond Rupert and many contemporaries’ scopes and contained a new dimension: the reunion of the Church.
Chapter V: Reunion of the Church and the Holy Spirit: Anselm of Havelberg’s Debate with the Greeks

After expositions on innovation within the Church through a perspective of progressive historical theology and historical interpretation of the seven seals, the second and third volumes of Anselm of Havelburg’s Anticimenon provide a unique record of the mutual understanding (or misunderstanding) of the Latin and Greek Churches in the twelfth century.506 The issues of the “Filioque” and the Roman primacy emerged as the pivotal concerns in the debates between Anselm of Havelberg and Nicetas of Nicomedia.

It must be noted that there is no possibility that Anselm was able to reconstruct literally the dialogues with his Greek counterparts as they actually took place, since Anselm wrote it up thirteen years later. Karl Morrison argues we should concentrate on the intricate literary artifice at the heart of Anselm’s writings, in which he created “hermeneutic predicaments” and made the figures in the debates undefined.507 Therefore, we have to note that Anselm de facto reconstructed the debates with his own intentions and reinterpretations. An interesting question, as a consequence, is why Anselm composed the debate in this manner. In other


In this sense, Anselm’s thought on the unification of the Church can also be understood from the perspective of his devotion to the Holy Spirit and the gradual progression of Church history.

The Holy Spirit reappears as the driving force in Anselm’s dialogue with Nicetas. The third person of the Trinity is directly and doctrinally discussed in their first debate. Although this record is filled with theological and philosophical terms and demonstration, I would like to argue that Anselm’s exegetical pilgrimage through rational, scriptural, patristic and conciliar texts and authorities theoretically builds on his conception of the Holy Spirit in the dynamic of salvation history.

In this chapter, I will examine Anselm’s debates with Nicetas regarding the theological issue of Filioque and the more practical issue of Roman primacy. For the first debate, I attempt to offer an exploration of Anselm’s demonstration of the Latin doctrine and the mutual usage of Latin and Greek sources in Anselm’s writing. The second debate focuses on Roman primacy and announces more explicitly Anselm’s idea of the development of history and innovation. The coherence between the two parts of Anselm’s Anticimenon can be observed through his ideas of progressive development and the Church as constantly renewed and protected by the grace of the Holy Spirit. Anselm professes this through his writings on the debate with Nicetas and, in this way, expands the Holy Spirit and salvation history into a real universal sense: embrace both the West and the East.

In other words, the Holy Spirit is affirmed as a historical agent in book 1 (which we discussed extensively in chapter IV) and glorified in relation to both Father and Son in his procession in book 2 (the first debate), which summons all Christians to the same table of the Eucharist under the authority of the Church (the second debate). With regard to the debates, the first debate reveals the gradual revelation of the Holy Spirit in the dimension of doctrine, and the second debate shows the renewing function of the Holy Spirit, in an accurate historical framework, in the dimension of ecclesiology and liturgy.

1. The Gradual Revelation and Procession of the Holy Spirit

As discussed in the first chapter, the schism between the Western and Eastern Church in 1054 also contributed to the new devotion to the Holy Spirit in the Latin Church. The great
transformations which occurred from the middle of the eleventh century reshaped the ecclesiastical-intellectual map in the Latin West. In particular, the ground-breaking conception of the Papacy and the novel understanding of the Church required the advancement of the theology and principles of government of the Church.

In fact, it was only in the beginning of the twelfth century that the Filioque became the most powerful weapon in the arsenal of the Greek and Latin polemists.\(^{508}\) What makes Anselm of Havelberg different from his forerunners and contemporaries is his sympathetic understanding of the Greeks’ stance and his unique comprehension of the Greek Fathers. Anselm presents a charitable and harmonious understanding of the points within these debates.\(^{509}\) Moreover, this charitable expression also illuminates Anselm’s core concern and fundamental spirituality: the cherishing of diversity and growth, which he views as a sign of the ongoing work of the Holy Spirit within the Church.

In the foreword to Anticimenon, Anselm tells us the origin of this book and illuminates its central concerns. He describes a Greek bishop who visited Pope Eugene III and “disputed most vehemently about the procession of the Holy Spirit, whom the Greeks believe and declare proceeds only from the Father, while the Latins believe and declare that he proceeds truly from both the Father and the Son”. In addition, this envoy debated contentiously about the liturgy, especially the use of the unleavened bread and the primacy of Rome. The aforementioned issues will be addressed in discussion of Anselm’s debates with Nicetas.\(^{510}\)

Since there is a lack of relevant records from the Byzantine perspective, we can reconstruct the debate only from Anselm’s writings. The first debate was held on 10 April 1136 in Hagia Eirene, which was located in the Pisan quarter of the city and the second debate was located in Hagia Sophia. It seems that the debate between Anselm and Nicetas was treated as an

\(^{508}\) See Francis Dvornik, Byzantium and the Roman Primacy (New York: Fordham University Press, 1979), pp. 13-14. Until the late ninth century, the Credo was recited by the Roman Church without the insertion of Filioque, apart from in some old Carolingian sees. In fact, the insertion of Filioque seems to have been quite slow, and the practice probably did not prevail before 1024, when the Nicene Creed was sung in Rome with the clause.

\(^{509}\) For the general background of relations between the Roman Curia and Byzantine Empire during Anselm’s mission to Constantinople, see John Gordon Rowe, “The Papacy and the Greeks (1122-1153),” in Church History, 28-2 (1959), pp. 115-130. Norman Russell highlights how the atmosphere of the dialogue between Anselm and Nicetas of Nicomedia “was conducted with a courtesy and charity unusual in religious controversy”: see idem, “Anselm of Havelberg and the Union of the Churches: I. The problem of Filioque”, p. 19.

\(^{510}\) PL 188, 1140B: “Inter quae maxime, sicut dixistis, de processione Spiritus sancti disputavit, quem Graeci quidem a Patre tantum, Latini vero a Patre et Filio procedere credunt et dicunt; et [de] ritu sacrificii in altari, quod Latinis quidem in azymo, Graeci vero in fermentato celebrant, nec non de quibusdam aliis satis argumentose in quaestionem positis.” Anticimenon, Prologue, p. 44.
important event in Constantinople, since the emperor and many leading theologians in the Royal City joined them.\textsuperscript{511} Anselm mentions that he had gained a certain reputation as a “Latin theologian” since he was already involved in some debates and discussions both private and public. At the same time, Nicetas is introduced as one of the leading professors of the Patriarchal Academy, “a distinguished member of the twelfth didascali who, following the practice of the wise Greeks, supervise the study of the liberal arts and the divine Scriptures”.\textsuperscript{512} It was, according to Anselm, an evenly matched debate.

The translators and the principle of translation deserve special attention. Anselm lists the names of the three translators --James of Venice, Burgundio of Pisa and Moses of Bergamo-- all of whom enjoy high reputations in the cultural history of Europe, which is mostly attributable to their invaluable translations of Greek theological, philosophical and medical treatises.\textsuperscript{513} With regard to the way of translating, Nicetas suggests that the appointed interpreters should translate what they said word by word, whereas Anselm thought the literal way of translation might lead to a preoccupation with individual words and this could result in trivial quibbles concerning the exact meaning of each word and impede the in-depth discussions. Anselm proposed that the translation should concentrate on the “flow of thought, in its full meaning” instead of being fixed on their expressions.\textsuperscript{514} He also expressed the wish that they would “let no battle of words arise between us, but let us carefully discern the truth of each other’s thoughts”\textsuperscript{515}.

\textsuperscript{511} “The members of the imperial court took their places according to custom. Arbiters were appointed and notaries seated to take down faithfully in writing everything said on either side.” See PL 188, 1163A-1163C; Anticimenon, 2.1 pp. 85-86. This hints at the existence of the Greek sources, but we have no evidence of these.

\textsuperscript{512} PL 188, 1141B; Anticimenon, Prologue, p. 45.

\textsuperscript{513} Anselm devotes many praises to Moses of Bergamo, who “was eminent even beyond the others, for he was the most illustrious of either people in the teaching of both Greek and Latin letters.” It is quite possible that Moses of Bergamo translated a Greek treatise on the Holy Spirit by Gregory of Nazianzus, which was probably used by Anselm in his debate with Nicetas and his later composition of the Debates. For a general introduction to Moses of Bergamo, see Charles Homer Haskins, Studies in the History of Medieval Science (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927), pp. 194-222; idem, “Moses of Bergamo”, in Byzantinische Zeitschrift, 23-1 (1919), pp. 133-142. See also J. T. Muckle, “Greek Works translated into Latin before 1350 (continuation),” in Medieval Studies, 5 (1943), pp. 102-112. On James of Venice, see L. Minio-Paluello, “Iacobus Veneticus Grecus: Canonist and Translator of Aristotle,” in Traditio, 8 (1952), pp. 265-304; on Burgundio of Pisa, the classical work is Peter Classen, Burgundio von Pisa: Richter, Gesandter, Übersetzer (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1974).

\textsuperscript{514} PL 188, 1164C-1164D; Anticimenon, 2.1, pp. 86-87.

\textsuperscript{515} “Non sit igitur inter nos verborum litigium, sed exquisita veritas sententiarum”: see ibid, p. 87. This kind of view on translating and communicating was possibly also influenced by the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus: see Theological Oration, XXXI. 24: “There is so much difference in terms and things, why are you such a slave to the letter, and a partisan of the Jewish wisdom, and a follower of syllables at the expense of facts? …I should have been looking, not so much at the terms used, as at the thoughts they were meant to convey; so neither, if I found something else either not at all or not clearly expressed in the Words of Scripture to be included in the meaning, should I avoid giving it utterance, out of fear of your sophistic trick about terms.” In Norris, Faith
From the beginning of the debate, we can observe that Anselm exhibits his kindness and solicitousness. As Norman Russell points out, “Anselm of Havelberg approached his eastern colleagues in a spirit of humility and conciliation”. In the following pages we will see that the Latin bishop not only tries to discover the reasons for the Greek faith and practice, but also allows himself to be critical of the Latin attitude. The latter proclivity in particular appears to have engendered an amicable atmosphere. This was quite a unique phenomenon for his generation and it reflects Anselm’s practical tendencies and his strong desire for the fulfilment of reunification of the Churches.

1.1 Three Dimensions of Debate on Filioque: Rational Argument, Authority of the Scriptures and Councils

The first question raised between the two interlocutors is the Filioque, and this matter of contention occupies the whole first session of the debate (and the whole second volume of Anticimenon).

At the beginning, Anselm articulates the Latin doctrine of the Trinity, stating that “the Father is begotten of no other, that the Son is begotten by the Father, and that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both”. In response, Nicetas expounds the disagreements of the Greek Church in three categories: rational argument (ratio), authority of canonical scriptures (auctoritas canonicarum Scripturarum) and general councils (generale concilium). The lack of teaching and evidence from these three sources in the Eastern Church contributed to its resistance to the Latin doctrine of Filioque. The following debate focuses on these triple sources of authority.

First of all, the disputants focus on the rational argument. Nicetas argues that the term “Filioque” will lead to the multiplicity of principles (polyarchia) of the Holy Spirit, which will be in violation of the “monarchia” (singularity of principle) of God. Accepting the doctrine of Filioque means accepting that God is of plural principles (polyachos, πολύαρχον) or without principle (anachos, ἄναρχον). Both of these views, according to the Greek Church, should be avoided. Nicetas contends that if we were to say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, and the Father and the Son would be imputing two principles to

---

Gives Fullness to Reasoning, p. 292. A similar sentiment also can be seen in Gregory the Great: see Dag Norberg ed., Registrum epistolarum (Turnholt: Brepols, 1982), pp. 485, 855.
the Holy Spirit, then we are attributing plurality of principles (*polyarchia*) to the Holy Spirit. Such an existence is contrary to all reason.\(^{518}\)

Anselm acknowledges the singularity of principle and also takes this as a stand of reason, but he denies that the acceptance of *Filioque* will result in the conclusion of “two principles to the Holy Spirit”. Anselm explains that in terms of substance, the Son is the same principle as the Father; but in terms of person, the Son is not the same principle. The term of “*principium*” is introduced here to clarify the relationship of the Trinity to creation. To be specific, the Father is *ex quo omnia*, the Son is *per quo omnia* and the Holy Spirit is *in quo omnia*. This does not mean that there are three creators, because the works of the Trinity are inseparable. The Father is the principle of the Son, while the Father and the Son together became the one principle of the Holy Spirit.\(^{519}\) Therefore, the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son as from one principle, since everything that belongs to the Father belongs to the Son as well. As Anselm states:

Father and Son are not therefore two principles because, just as the Father and the Son are one God, so too in relation to the Holy Spirit they are one principle. Clearly, then, the Holy Spirit is given and proceeds from nowhere other than the Father and the Son together as one principle.\(^{520}\)

Therefore, Anselm argues that if the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, this must also mean that the same Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, and that whoever denies the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son also denies the same Spirit proceeds from the Father.\(^{521}\)

It seems that Anselm solves the problem of multi-principles through the unity of the Father and the Son, but Nicetas suggests this will provoke another problem: since the Holy Spirit and the Father and the Son are one divine essence, this indicates that the same Holy Spirit


\(^{519}\) PL 188, 1167D; *Anticimenon*, 2.2, p. 93. See also Rupert of Deutz’s relevant discussion in the *Commentary on Genesis*.


\(^{521}\) PL 188, 1169C-1170C; *Anticimenon*, 2.3, pp. 96-97.
could proceed from himself as from the Father and the Son. Anselm replies that where the Holy Spirit exists, thence he proceeds and whence he proceeds, thence he exists. The being of the Holy Spirit consists in his procession, since it is the unity of the three in God that represents the proper relationship, not his relationship with the individual persons.

Nicetas then sets a trap for Anselm requiring him to give a precise description of the procession. However, Anselm employs Gregory of Nazianzus’s way of parrying the question skilfully: if Nicetas could tell him what the kind or nature of the Father’s unbegottenness and Son’s generation is, then Anselm can tell him the kind or nature of the Holy Spirit’s procession.

When it comes to the issue of the order of the persons of the Trinity, Anselm makes a great effort to demonstrate the harmony between the Greek interpretations (chiefly Gregory of Nazianzus) and the Latin Church Father (Augustine of Hippo). According to the teaching of Augustine, the Holy Spirit is the coeternal connexion, communion, concord, love, gentleness and holiness of both the Father and the Son. Although the Holy Spirit is called the third person of the Trinity, this does not indicate a level of dignity but an order of enumeration and “in distinction or designation of his discrete and singular person”. Besides Augustine, Anselm also quoted from Hilary of Poitiers and Pseudo-Jerome to support his argument. As firstly pointed out by G. R. Evans, Anselm’s narrative here could be seen as directly dependent on Abelard, which also shows that Anselm had been greatly influenced by the master of Scholasticism in the first half of the twelfth century.

For the distinction among the three persons of the Trinity, Anselm’s treatment pays special attention to the indispensable relation of the Trinity. He concludes that the Greek doctrine seems to dissolve the second and the third person, but the Latin doctrine through the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son allows for a relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit as they relate to each other (ad illo de medio amborum):

---

522 PL 188, 1170D; Anticimenon, 2.3, p. 97.
523 Cf. Select Orations, 28.3. For a detailed discussion and theological demonstration, see Christopher A. Beeley, Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God: In Your Light We Shall See Light (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 90-110, and for the pneumatology of Gregory of Nazianzus, pp. 153-186.
524 PL 188, 1174A-1175C; Anticimenon, 2.7, pp. 102-104. It is noteworthy that Anselm’s demonstration in this part showed Abelard’s influence: see Peter Abelard, Opera Theologica, vol. 2: Theologia Christiana (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), edited by Eligius M. Buytaert, pp. 99-100. Anselm even claims that the names of the persons may be positioned in any order: see PL 188, 1176C-1176D; Anticimenon, 2.8, p. 106.
Therefore, because we speak of each person in respect to his substance in relation to himself, we say that the Holy Spirit proceeds, but no more according to his person than to his substance. Finally we must say that just as we call the ‘Father’ in relation to the Son (secundum relativum ad Filium) and ‘begotten of no other’ in relation to the one begotten and just as we call the Son ‘the Son’ in relation to the Father (secundum relativum ad Patrem) and is thus the begotten one. So too we call the Holy Spirit who proceeds in relation to the others (secundum relativum). He is sent by each who sends him, as a gift from each giving him, as love from each in his love.525

It is very interesting to note that Anselm is speaking not only in the tongue of Augustine but in the tongue of Gregory of Nazianzus! The term proboleus (product) is a key expression in the oration of Gregory of Nazianzus on the divine “monarchy”. In Gregory’s text, the terms proboleus and genneror (offspring) are both applied to the Father to distinguish generation from inspiration and are applied to the Holy Spirit and the Son respectively.526 Thus, Anselm tries to defeat the Greek position with their own theologians.

Nicetas admires the great thoughtfulness of Anselm’s response, but he objects to the “assumption” of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit by those who deny the Filioque as claimed by Anselm. A lengthy speech was then employed to testify the faith of Greeks in one God adored and worshipped in three persons. According to Karl Morrison and Jay Lees, Anselm developed the characters and “dramatic” scene in the narrative of the two interlocutors. To some extent, Anselm the writer composed the debate between the interlocutors Anselm and Nicetas like a drama which pushes the discussions forward.527 Anselm depicts the eagerness to express the true faith of a passionate and faithful Orthodox Church, in particular in Nicetas’s eulogy of the Holy Spirit.528

In the debate centring on “rational argument”, both Anselm and Nicetas refer back to biblical exegesis and patristic tradition. These two factors indeed mattered much more than

525 PL 188, 1179B: “Relinquitur ergo dicendum quod sicut Pater secundum relativum ad Filium dicitur Pater, et ingenitus ad genitum, et sicut Filius secundum relativum ad Patrem dicitur Filius, et genitus, et verbum, et imago, et sigillum, et character, et splendor; ita etiam Spiritus sanctus secundum relativum dicitur Spiritus sanctus procedens, et missus ab utroque mittente, donum ab utroque donante, amor ab utroque amante.”; (Select Orations, 29. 2). The translation is quoted from Christopher A. Beeley, Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God, p. 215.
526 Gregory articulates: “while there is a difference in number, there is no division in essence. Hence from the beginning a Monad, being moved toward a Dyad, stops at a Triad- and this is for us the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. The [Father] is the begetter and emitter, and the others are the offspring and the emission.” (Select Orations, 29. 2). The translation is quoted from Christopher A. Beeley, Gregory of Nazianzus on the Trinity and the Knowledge of God, p. 215.
528 This part was mainly taken from the works of Gregory of Nazianzus.
the rational argument *per se*. It seems that Nicetas was persuaded since the Greek Archbishop finally said that “we cannot accept it hastily because no authority of the Gospel or of canonical scriptures, or even of the holy councils persuades or teaches us so to believe”.

Obviously, Nicetas omits the aspect of “contrary to reason”, which paves the way for further discussion on the teachings of the Scriptures, Church Fathers and the authority of ecumenical councils.529

The second step for the debate is the discussion of the Scriptures. While sharing the same Scriptures, the divergent exegetical traditions had led to diverse understandings. Nicetas warns Anselm to expound the Latins’ understanding but not to “force your interpretation to supporting your own opinion because it is yours, not because it is true”.530 Additionally, Nicetas also points out that one passage of Scripture often elicits different and equally valid interpretations, and by no means should these be spurned. What might surprise us here is that Nicetas speaks in Augustine’s tongue. Nicetas announces that he cannot either affirm or deny whether the Spirit proceeds from the Son since there is no phrase in the Bible that taught this. In addition, he professes that “we are only human beings” and that fallibility is inevitable for us.531

Furthermore, with the advancement of the debate, the Holy Spirit as the ultimate source of divine revelation is gradually revealed. Anselm develops the procession into two modes and especially accentuates its grace:

The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son in two ways. The first is his eternal procession according to affect, the love the Father bears for the Son and the Son bears for the Father, and the second is his procession in time according to the effect of his gifts for men. … That the Holy Spirit was given twice instructs us that we should believe him to proceed from two persons at the same time, and

---

529 “non subito accedere possumus; praesertim cum nulla nobis auctoritas Evangelii, vel canoniarum Scripturarum, vel etiam sanctorum conciliorum hoc ad credendum suadeat, vel doceat.” PL 188, 1183B; *Anticimenon*, 2.13, p. 115
530 The same structure of sentence can also be observed in Anselm’s early writing: see *Apologetic Letter*, p. 36.
531 For the parallels see *Anticimenon*, 2.21 (PL 1197A–97B) and Augustine, *De Baptismo* 2.5.6 (PL 43,130). See also Jay T. Lees, *Anselm of Havelberg: Deeds into Words*, pp. 249-257. In 1281 the Byzantine theologian Maximos Planoudes, who engaged in the disputes with the Latin Church, translated Augustine’s *De trinitate* in its entirety. Augustine’s thought was almost totally unknown to the Eastern Christendom before this translation. See “Augustine in Byzantium”, in Henrik Lagerlund ed., *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy: Philosophy Between 500 and 1500* (New York: Springer, 2011), pp. 131-133; see also Nichols Aidan, “The Reception of St. Augustine and His Work in the Byzantine-Slav Tradition,” in *Angelicum* 64-3 (1987), pp. 437-452.
not in two processions but in one. He was given from heaven as from the Father who is in heaven and on earth as from the Son who dwelled with men on earth in his humanity. 532

As Nicetas explains, the Greek theologians humbly hand over all of these divine secrets to the fire of the Holy Spirit when the Scriptures articulate only little, or when the human intellect fails to comprehend them. 533 It is apparent that Nicetas the interlocutor repeats Anselm’s progressive idea of gradual revelation seen in the first volume. Anselm here employs his theory again, which enhances the cohesiveness of the first volume and the debates.

Moreover, Nicetas also complains about the misbehaviour of the Latins and suggests that this has impeded the process of unification of the Churches. As a reference for the pope in his addressing the reconciliation of the two Churches, Anselm warns the pope about the negative deeds and words in the communication with the Greeks, and the over-arrogant attitude expressed by other Latin interlocutors. In this sense, Anselm shows great appreciation of, and sympathy with, Nicetas’s stance and practical tendency.

There was no doubt that mutual misunderstanding resulted from the respective interpretations of the Scriptures, and thus the investigation moved to the third stage: the authority of the Church Fathers and ecumenical councils. This is, in fact, the most crucial part of Anselm’s debate with Nicetas on the Filioque and also reflects mainstream theological thought in the twelfth century’s Latin West. 534

As usual, Nicetas proposes the question firstly with a testimony of the First Council of Nicaea. He states that there is nothing in the creed issued by the council on the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, and nothing should be added or taken away from the sealed creed since the Church Fathers were inspired by divine intervention. Any changes made by anyone would bring the greatest scandal to the Church as a whole and danger to the salvation

532 “Duobus quippe modis procedit Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio: est una processio eius aeterna, quae est secundum affectum, id est charitatem, qua Pater diliget Filium et Filius Patrem; et est illa processio temporalis, quae est secundum effectum, id est dona eius quae dantur hominibus... Et haec quidem donatio Spiritus sancti primo facta est in terra per insufflationem propter dilectionem proximi, et postmodum facta de coelo in variis linguis de coelo propter dilectionem Dei; ubi etiam aliquatenus instruirur quod, quia bis datus est Spiritus sanctus, a duobus quoque non bis, sed simul et semel procedere sit credendus; et de coelo quidem tanquam de Patre qui in coelo est, in terra vero tanquam de Filio qui per humanitatem in terra cum hominibus conversatus est.” PL 188, 1185C-1186C; Anticimenon, 2.15, pp. 119-121.

533 PL 188, 1197B-1197C; Anticimenon, 2.21, pp. 136-137.

of souls. However, Anselm elucidates that the truth is the council prohibited that we add anything contrary to its creed but they did not forbid that we add anything in accordance with them. To put it differently, although the doctrine of *Filioque* does not appear in the documents of the council, this is not prohibited.

More significantly, Anselm claims that as many creeds approved by the council cannot find explicit teaching in the Gospel, the creeds of councils also could develop with the unfolding of the divine plan. It is apparent that Anselm’s progressive theology and idea of development become the core theoretical foundation to justify the Latin stance. Therefore, from the perspective of Church history and salvation history in a broad sense, the addition of *Filioque* could be viewed as God’s renewed revelation to the Church. Here we can see that Anselm echoes what he stated in the first volume:

Since the Lord was aware of how many things would have to be added for the establishment of the catholic faith after he had told his disciples everything that was appropriate for that time, he added: I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. But when he, the Spirit of truth, has come, he will teach you all truth… (Therefore) proceeding from the Son who is Truth, the Spirit framed the Gospel and established a faith suitable to the apostles living in their own time. Behold, the Spirit was promised by the Son when he affirmed that he still had much to say, but in good time.

The shadow of “Diversity-Holy Spirit-Renewal” re-emerged in the debate with the Greeks. The idea of diversity combined with the development become the core concern of Anselm. Anselm’s reconstruction of his debate is precisely based on his idea of the development of the Church. The Holy Spirit takes the central stage as the guide, teacher and driving force for the renovation of doctrine and the elucidation of the faith, since the Holy Spirit may still “have much to say in a good time”. As in Anselm’s narrative in the third stage of the seven seals, the Holy Spirit “powerfully demolished” the heresies that “crept in little by little, and through apostolic men he proclaimed ecclesiastical laws for the preservation of the Christian religion.” Therefore, Anselm explicitly states that the Church as a whole is the object for

535 PL 188, 1197B; *Anticimenon* 2.21, p. 137.
536 “Unde et Dominus sciens tam multa adhuc addenda ad instaurationem catholicae fidei, postquam discipulis suis universa quae illi tempori congruebant, dixerat, adiecit ita dicens: Adhuc multa habeo vobis dicere, sed non potestis portare modo; cum autem venerit ille Spiritus veritatis, docebit vos omnem veritatem… Spiritus, inquam, Filii qui est veritas, Spiritus veritatis docens omnem veritatem, qui et ipse procedens a Filio, qui est veritas, Evangelium condidit, et fidem secundum tempus sufficientem apostolis instituit: ecce a Filio, qui adhuc multa se ad dicendum habere dicit, promittitur, ut videlicet ipse congruo tempore dicat, quod Filius adhuc ad dicendum se habere dicebat.” PL 188, 1201A-1201B; *Anticimenon*, 2.23, p. 142.
537 Cf. *Anticimenon*, 1.9.
receiving the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which grants the debate on *Filioque* a novel meaning from the perspective of salvation history:

In sum, the Holy Spirit illuminated the entire Church had so instructed in holy teaching by the light of true knowledge, gradually teaching the complete truth. He still sheds such light and always will.\(^538\)

From this perspective, Anselm talks not only about the procession of the Holy Spirit, but moves to the pivotal role of the Holy Spirit in the process of salvation history and the unfolding of divine Providence. The doctrine and creed have been contextualized in the different stages of ecclesiastical history and arranged in accordance within his framework of progressive theology of history. Anselm accentuates the Holy Spirit’s role of renewing and guiding the Church. Anselm may also be hinting that the Roman Church enjoyed more grace than the Greek Church so the Latin West could understand and accept the renewed teaching *Filioque*. This manifests the distinctiveness of Anselm’s pneumatology and strong historical awareness in the light of salvation history.

Nicetas acknowledges the ultimate authority of the Holy Spirit in the revelations concerning salvation, but he still insists that no term like “proceeds from the Son” had been granted to the third person of the Trinity according to the long established teachings. Interestingly, Anselm demonstrates that many Greek sources like Athanasius, Didymus, John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria and the council of Ephesus all precisely articulated the doctrine of *Filioque*. However, it should be noted that this does not mean that Anselm knew Greek theology perfectly. Dunkle has pointed out that Abelard’s system and understanding of presenting authorities from the Greek sources “would have been vital to Anselm’s project as he composed the *Anticimenon*”, and most of these references relied on the writings of Abelard.\(^539\) Anselm also professes that he made no distinction between Greek, Latin or any other, since the gifts of the Holy Spirit will be given to any faithful Christian.\(^540\) This indicates Anselm’s openness and idea of diversity.

\(^{538}\) PL 188, 1201C; *Anticimenon*, 2.23, p. 143. See also *Anticimenon*, 1.6. In this place, Anselm repeated his framework of historical theology on the Trinity again, which probably involved citation and implication from the work of Gregory of Nazianzus.

\(^{539}\) Brian Dunkle, “Anselm of Havelberg’s Use of Authorities,” p. 710; on the references from Abelard, see idem, *Theologia Christiana*, 4.128-130, pp. 162-165.

\(^{540}\) This statement is valued by Nicetas who treated Anselm as a true catholic. Nicetas complained again that most Latins come to them and “act superior even to everything great and wonderful, never speaking to us humbly and inclusively but haughtily and intolerably”. See PL 188, 1204D; *Anticimenon*, 2.24, p. 147.
According to Anselm, the two interlocutors exposed consonance between western and eastern beliefs. Anselm articulates that the Roman Church, as the mother of all churches, teaches and writes the truth of Filioque and hopes for unity with the Eastern Church. Nicetas responds even more warmly, which suggests he had been fully persuaded by Anselm. Through the mouth of Nicetas, Anselm proposed a plan for launching an ecumenical council to address this issue. Since the Filioque had never been taught or written about openly among the ordinary people, those words have never been heard publicly in the Greek churches; the sudden change would therefore bring unexpected scandal and chaos:

We must rather celebrate a general council of the western and eastern churches by the authority of the holy Roman pontiff and with the approval of our devout emperors. At such a council these and several other essential issues concerning God might be set forth such that neither we nor you lack understanding. Thereafter all of us in the Christian east may in communion with the Holy Roman Church and other churches in the west, freely accept, preach, teach, and write that the “Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son” with common will and equal agreement, without any scandal on our part. And we even might introduce it (Filioque) in the public singing of the Eastern Church.

It seems odd that Nicetas suddenly accepted the Latin position, which has led some scholars to strongly question the authenticity of Anselm’s record. For example, Milton Anastos argues that Nicetas pretends that the Greeks will assent after an ecumenical decision, as he knew that no Greek delegation would ever submit to a dogmatic decree authorizing the addition of the Filioque to the Creed. Henry Chadwick also questions the reality of Anselm’s success and treats the debate in terms of ecclesiastical reunion as a “failed and marginal mission”. Jay Lees suggests the Greek audience would hardly have applauded upon hearing their agreement.

---

541 According to the record, Nicetas even said “I agree with everything that you said” (assentio etiam omnibus quae dixisti). But it seems that there is no possibility that Nicetas responded in such a precise way.
542 “sed aliquod generale concilium occidentalis et orientalis Ecclesiae auctoritate sancti Romani pontificis, admittentibus piissimis imperatoribus celebrandum esset, ubi haec et nonnulla alia Catholicae Ecclesiae necessaria secundum Deum diffimirentur, ne forte vos vel nos in vacuum curremur. Extunc omnes nos qui in partibus orientis Christiani sumus, una cum sancta Romana Ecclesia, et cum caeteris Ecclesiis quae sunt in occidente, communi voto et pari consensu sine alique nostrorum scandalo verbum hoc, Spiritus sanctus procedit a Filio, libenter susciperemus, et praedicaremus, et doceremus, et scriberemus, et in Ecclesiis orientis publice cantandum institueremus.” PL 188, 1210A; Anticimenon, 2.27, p. 155. At the same time, we have to keep in mind the later Greek positions in the fifteenth century when an unstable agreement had been achieved by the two Churches, in which the different stances benefited from the process of conciliation in a similar way to that which had been expressed by Nicetas: see, for example, Alexakis Alexander, “The Greek Patristic Testimonia Presented at the Council of Florence (1439) in Support of the Filioque Reconsidered,” in Revue des études byzantines, 58 (2000), pp. 149-165.
544 See Henry Chadwick, East and West, pp. 228-232. Chadwick states that “Anselm of Havelberg was to play a marginal role in east-west relations. Admittedly his record cannot be described as an outstanding success. But he tried”. 
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archbishop accepting the *Filioque*. However, a Latin reader (especially Pope Eugene III) would see a message of hope and encouragement in this writing. Anselm attempts to prove that the *Filioque* is more of a complicated misunderstanding than a real obstacle.

By establishing the boundaries between orthodoxy and heresy, historical schemes of providential history could raise the possibility that the Greek Church, which denied the procession of the Holy Spirit also from the Son, fell on the negative side of the line. For example, Anselm’s contemporary Gerhoh of Reichersberg argues that the Greek Fathers indeed supported the double procession as the Latin doctrine, in stark contrast with the contemporary Greek Church. Using the Old Testament, he even parallels “errors of the Greek” with the “fall of the Tower of Babylon, in which heretical perversity exhaled its primordial audacity.” Instead, Anselm created a remarkably charitable image of himself in the debate by highlighting the history of the Church after Revelation. Therefore, although he endeavoured to defend the Latin teaching of the procession of the Holy Spirit, Anselm did not claim that the teaching of the Greek Church was heretical, or even comparable to the Babylonian rebellion against God. This interesting phenomenon could be partly attributed the employment of authority of the Greek Fathers in Anselm’s writing.

1.2 The Authority of the Fathers

Special attention should be paid to the turning point of the debate on the *Filioque*: the authority of the Greek Church Fathers. As mentioned earlier, Anselm of Canterbury treats this issue in a different way. In his *De Processione Spiritus Sancti*, St. Anselm seeks to defend the Latin doctrine through reasoning, but ignores the style and special concerns of the Greeks. Also Anselm of Canterbury had tried to justify the Latin doctrine with the use of logic, but he had shown no deep knowledge of the works of Greek Fathers. His demonstration is nothing compared to Anselm of Havelberg’s confidence in diversity and knowledge of Greek sources. The most significant example for Anselm’s favour for diversity is his narrative of the religious life that he encountered on his way to Constantinople, where he saw “many Christian religious orders” living under the different rules of St. Anthony,
Pachamius and Basil. In addition, it seems that Anselm of Havelberg was fascinated with the Greek Fathers and indeed quoted them at length in his debate.

Reading the debate of the procession of the Holy Spirit carefully, we can observe a very interesting phenomenon: every time Anselm quotes supportive texts from the Greek Fathers to reinforce the doctrine of Filioque, Nicetas presents an observable tendency towards the position of the Latin Church. If we examine the dialogue carefully we can see that almost every statement supported by the Greek Fathers is admitted or accepted by Nicetas. Therefore, the authoritative texts of the Church Fathers play a crucial role in their final agreement of calling for an ecumenical council.

As mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, the feature of “non-historicity” in Anselm’s writing is most evident in the sources of authoritative texts of the Church Fathers used in the debate. As a matter of fact, the intensive referencing of the writings of the Church Fathers is one of the most popular phenomena of the twelfth century. This feature raises some concerns on the authenticity of Anselm’s composition of the debate. However, it cannot be a completely invented literary fiction since there are many occasions where the expressions used must come either from Greek sources that were not available in the Latin West or from Anselm’s Greek interlocutor during the debate. The most convincing evidence is Anselm’s employment of Gregory of Nazianzus. It is noticeable that Anselm quotes Gregory of Nazianzus quite frequently but never mentions his name. The only Latin translation of Gregory of Nazianzus available in the middle of the twelfth century was the work of nine Orations translated by Rufinus. However, Anselm never quotes any passages from Rufinus’ translation. It is quite possible that Anselm obtained the translation from one of his

---

548 See PL 188, 1156D-1157A; Anticimenon, 1. 10, p. 73.
549 Even Nicetas was astonished by Anselm’s knowledge and he exclaimed that “I see that I have found a Latin man who is truly catholic! Would that [more] such Latins would come to us in these times!” See PL 188, 1204B: “Videor mihi invenisse hominem Latinum vere catholicum; utinam tales Latini istis temporibus ad nos venirend!”, Anticimenon, 2.24, p. 147. See also Tia M. Kolbaba, “The Orthodoxy of the Latins in the Twelfth Century”, in Andrew Louth, Augustine Casiday eds., Byzantine Orthodoxies: Papers from the Thirty-sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham, 23-25 March 2002 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 199-214, especially pp. 210-213.
550 For example, Hermann Josef Sieben in his Die Konzilsidee des lateinischen Mittelalters 847-1378 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1984) explores the extent to which Anselm as the composer inserted the texts of the Church Fathers into the two interlocutors besides the directly drawn patristic sources. In addition, Jay Lees discusses the distinction between “Anselm the Writer” and “Anselm the debater”: see idem, Anselm of Havelberg, pp. 240-281; for the latest research on the usage of the authoritative sources in Anselm’s second volume of Anticimenon, see Brian Dunkle, S. J., “Anselm of Havelberg’s Use of Authorities in His Account of the Filioque,” in Byzantinische Zeitschrift, 105-2 (2012), pp. 695-722.
translators at the debate, possibly Moses of Bergamo, who later published a fuller translation of Gregory of Nazianzus, because some of its contents can be found in Anselm’s anonymous quotations. In the later discussion, we can also see more evidence of other Greek sources which were not accessible to the Latin west at that time.

Interestingly, Anselm displays a tendency to insert the teachings of the Latin Fathers in the words of Nicetas, while making himself (Anselm the interlocutor) speak in a tone more similar to the Greek authorities. On the one hand, Anselm depicts Nicetas as an “idealized and Latinized” Greek archbishop, and sometimes Nicetas’s “hidden western personality” is extended beyond the verbal quotation to the tones of his argument. On the other hand, Anselm depicts himself as a tolerant Latin bishop, full of desire for reconciliation. This balanced and neutral image could be attributed to the mutual usage of the Latin and Greek Fathers in the expressions of Anselm and Nicetas, where Nazianzus dominates Anselm’s writing.

Gregory’s fifth Theological Oration is the crucial source for Anselm as this work intensively addresses the Holy Spirit. As was argued in the first chapter, Gregory’s understanding of the Holy Spirit frames Anselm’s piety towards the Holy Spirit and the idea of “gradual revelation of the Trinity”, which should be regarded as the cornerstone of Anselm’s framework of salvation history. The Greek sources Anselm most extensively referenced were derived from the work of Abelard, but the sentences of Gregory of Nazianzus are excluded from this work. Another puzzle is that Anselm never mentioned Gregory by name. Lees suggests that Anselm kept these quotations anonymous since he knew that a careful check of the original text of Nazianzus would show his reference was not entirely accurate. Dunkle suggests that this choice to leave the westerner’s Greek source

---


554 Lees, Anselm of Havelberg: Deeds into Words, pp. 197-199.
unnamed also happens to correspond to Anselm’s practice of not naming the western sources that he places in the speeches of Nicetas of Nicomedia. Dunkle also suggests that the quotation of Gregory on the procession of the Holy Spirit might derive from the work of Nicetas Seides, who held a debate with the Archbishop of Milan Peter Grossolanus in 1122. However, there is only one text in common which was written by Gregory of Nazianzus, so it is impossible to establish the dependence convincingly and directly. 555

I believe it more likely that the translator Moses of Bergamo offered a draft of his translations to Anselm. Although there is no extant manuscript or recorded evidence to support this conjecture, we can still re-construct this possible scenario through the examination of Anselm’s writings. At the very beginning of the debate, Anselm introduced the three translators and highly praised Moses of Bergamo. Moses possibly had been working at the Byzantine imperial court since 1130. He translated many theological works and enjoyed a reputation in Constantinople for his excellent knowledge of Latin and Greek. 556 Anselm had spent quite a long time in the Eastern Empire and had held several public or private discussions with the Byzantine theologians. Through the translations of Greek texts and his discussions with the Greek theologians, Anselm perhaps became ever more familiar with the Greek theological tradition and its reasoning for theological divergences. It is quite possible that Anselm asked his translator to offer him an authoritative text of the Greek Church addressing the Holy Spirit. Anselm’s comprehension of Byzantine theology, especially the Fifth Theological Oration formulated by Gregory of Nazianzus, shaped his mind and became the cornerstone of his historical theology. This distinguished him from his contemporaries as an embodiment of the mutual-understanding and exchange of ideas between the Latin West and Greek East. And it seems that Anselm’s unique devotion to the Holy Spirit also originated from this period, or was directly inspired by the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus.


The second debate between Anselm and Nicetas concentrates on the divergent usage of the bread in the Eucharistic liturgy and from this point moves to the discussion of the authority of

the Roman papacy. In the previous scholarship, this debate is generally taken as evidence for
the disputes between the Latin and Greek positions in the twelfth century. However, if we
examine it from a different perspective, we can see how the gradual guidance of the Holy
Spirit and its renewing function featured in the development of the Church as a united
institution according to Anselm’s system. Therefore, in this section, I would like to suggest
that Anselm utilized his idea of development and the conception of the Holy Spirit to defend
the Latin position with regard to the Eucharist and Roman primacy. In this way, we can
appreciate the cohesiveness of Anselm’s thought and devotion to the Holy Spirit as a
dynamic mover in history. As Lees argues, if one distinguishes between Anselm the debater
and Anselm the writer, then the words of Nicetas could be taken into consideration as the
views of Anselm the writer.557 In this debate, we can see that Anselm’s strong historical
awareness and the idea of development directly connect to his understanding of the ongoing
work of the Holy Spirit within the Church. We can also see how Anselm creatively applies
this framework to solve the problem of ultimate authority.

The second debate was located in the basilica of Holy Wisdom, which emphasizes the
significance of the dialogue and figuratively invokes the Spirit of wisdom. Before the start of
the debate, Anselm states that the Holy Spirit informed them in mutual deliberation and
brought them humbly together in the law of love and in harmonious agreements.558

As with the first debate, Anselm identifies three ways to recognize the universal Church:
the authority of the Scriptures, the universal tradition and a singular institution. For Anselm,
the idea of diversity and development takes a central position, and he interpreted the
interaction of the three principles proposed through a dynamic perspective:

The Church in its entirety is subject to this authority [referring to the Scriptures], and in that entirety is
bound by the universal tradition of the Fathers, even though individual churches exist and are governed
according to distinctive arrangements and ideas particular to their respective locations and
perspectives.559

557 Lees, Anselm of Havelberg, p. 254.
558 PL 188, 1209C-D: “ipse nos mutua collatione sufficienter edocuit, et post multos non contentiosae et
fraternalis disputations anfractus, tandem in legem charitatis, et in eiusdem sententiae concordiam nos humiliiter
composuit”; Anticimenon, 3.1, p. 157. See also the early discussion in this thesis, pp. 128-129.
559 PL 188, 1211C: “auctoritate tota Ecclesia constringitur, universali quoque traditione maiorum nihilominus
tota obligatur, privatis constitutionibus et propriis informationibus unaqueaque, vel pro locorum varietate, vel
prout unique bene visum est, subsistit et gubernatur.” Anticimenon, 3.2, p. 159. This idea perhaps derives
from Boethius’ On the Catholic Faith, see Theological Tractates: The Consolation of Philosophy (Cambridge,
As a matter of fact, Anselm depicts the development of the sacrifice in the Old Testament period in book 1. Thus, Anselm was amazed that the Eastern Church differed so much from the western rite of Eucharist, because this was the universal tradition of the Fathers and one which should be maintained inviolably through all time. Interestingly, Nicetas’s response also echoes Anselm’s early writing in the first volume which highlighted that salvation, not the form of liturgy, should be the fundamental aim of the sacraments. However, this does not mean that Anselm the interlocutor gave up his idea of diversity. On the contrary, Anselm accentuates how various people have various ecclesiastical customs and practices “as is appropriate to their diversity”, but suggests there should be no disagreement with Rome in the ecclesiastical sacraments themselves.

Thus, while Anselm cherishes the long-established tradition and custom of the Greek Church, he believes that “it is better to set aside error for a good reason, even if the error is longstanding”. In this sense, Anselm’s writings concern both diversity and authority. Anselm tries to demonstrate that the local custom should not contradict the universal tradition. Anselm’s consideration of “truth” and “custom” echoes the ideas of the reformed papacy, especially those of Gregory VII. Indeed, Gregory VII argues that not all long-established custom is the truth and therefore should be updated with the improvement in understanding of divine revelation.

The united Church requires a united Eucharistic rite and a single institution under one authority. In other words, the unique approach Anselm used in his debate for the defence of Roman primacy also connects with the renewal of the Church. We will see that Anselm

560 Cf. Anticimenon, 3.3 (PL 188, 1212D) and 1.1 (PL 188, 1143A). The discussion here might be summarized from Augustine: see De baptismo, 2.8, PL 43, 134. Augustine’s composition provides a context of Christian unity and conciliar authority, and this can also be observed in Anselm’s writing. See, for example, the end of the debate, when they discussed the issue of the Greek practice of rebaptism, which is precisely the issue addressed by Augustine.

561 PL 188, 1213D-1214A; Anticimenon, 3.6, pp. 165-168. Based on Anselm’s rejection of the Eastern Church for creating a schism (it “prefers to build up something new and unique”), Lees argues that the reader of the book 1 “could hardly help but be puzzled at such a charge which mouths their own earlier criticisms of the new order”. See Lees, Anselm of Havelberg, p. 257.

562 PL 188, 1213A; Anticimenon, 3.4, p. 161. Anselm mentions the practice of the baptism of Cyprian, the bishop of Carthage, who changed his own custom to the triple immersion which followed in the footsteps of the Roman Church. It seems that Anselm quoted from Hilary of Poitiers to narrate the story of Cyprian: see Hilary of Poitiers, Trinity (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1954), p. 280. It also should be noted that the first use of “Tu es Petrus” as the scriptural foundation for the papal primacy was by Pope Stephen (254-257) in his controversy with Cyprian.

563 PL 188, 1212D-1213A; Anticimenon, 3.4, p. 162.

attempts to demonstrate that the guidance and grace of the Holy Spirit is the ultimate source for the rise of papal authority and that this authority had indeed been proven in the unfolding of salvation history, which is the renewing work of the Holy Spirit. Through this point, their debate moves to the demonstration of Roman primacy.

2.1 The Fight with the Heresy

According to Anselm, the best way to demonstrate Roman primacy is through the development of the Church. The first evidence used by Anselm is that of the fight with heresy. The narrative here coincides with Anselm’s framework of salvation history established in book 1, which names the third age as “against the heresy”. It is noteworthy that in Anselm’s narrative of the seven stages of the Church, he overwhelmingly condemned the heresies from the East.  

With a strong historical awareness, Anselm utilizes a great many historical examples to demonstrate the disaster in the Eastern Church, especially the ferments of Arianism. It is interesting that the first example given by Anselm is Eusebius of Nicomedia, who seized the Church of Nicomedia and ruled the city of Constantinople. Anselm laments how innumerable heresies had arisen in the Constantinopolitan Church, and how this Church had abandoned the true faith since they were against God and the apostolic Church.

On the contrary, the Roman Church had never been tainted by any heresies at any time. According to Anselm, this is an apparent sign of the guidance and protection of the Holy Spirit within the Latin Church:

Thus the Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, and as well almost all the other Churches established throughout the East, have laboured in the catholic faith and suffered shipwreck, while the ship of Peter alone, although battered by waves of persecution and mighty wind, had nevertheless suffered no shipwreck in heresy. Rather, however hard is has laboured and still labours,

---

565 PL 188, 1151A-1152B; Anticimenon, 1.9, pp. 62-63. Cf. chapter IV. In this part, the heresies talked of by Anselm include: Arius, Sabellius, Nestorius, Eutyches the archmandrite, Macedoniüs, Donatus, Photinus. The only non-Christian is Mani of Persia.
566 PL 188, 1215 C: “In qua haeresi fuit praecipuus Eusebius, qui relictu haereticorum civitate primo concupivit et possedit Nicomediensem Ecclesiam, postea vero hanc Constantinopolitanam Ecclesiam invasit, et eodem fermento infectit, et ad mortem usque occupavit.” Anticimenon, 3.6, p. 165.
567 PL 188, 1215B-1216D; Anticimenon, 3.6, pp. 165-166.
Rome on its own or through its legates has driven out the ferment of malice and wickedness by which heretics have laid waste the Church of God. 568

However, Nicetas argues that heresies had been destroyed in the East. Nicetas explains that because the study of the liberal arts, especially many skilled in logic and discriminating in dialectic excelled here in discursive reasoning, they fell short in the investigation and rational consideration due to the arrogance of human reason.569 But this is a sign of a higher cultural level and the heresies had been extinguished by the ecumenical councils in the Greek Church. Nicetas even ironically says that “perhaps in the city of Rome such heresies have not arisen because wise, discriminating men and scholars of the Scriptures were not there as they are among us”. 570 It is noteworthy that through Nicetas’ defence, Anselm offered an “effective disassociation” of the Greek Church from the very same heresies to which the twelfth century authors such as Gerhoh (and even Rupert) were linking them. 571 Moreover, Nicetas the debater here employed Anselm’s description of the councils in book 1.572 When Nicetas argues that the Church of God increased more and more in the knowledge of the Scriptures through the occasion of these heresies, “and the faith grew stronger with their extinction”, he thus echoes Anselm’s early writing that the Church is growing in the third state.573

In his response, Anselm tries to establish a clear relationship between the Roman pontiffs and the successive councils. In other words, Anselm describes the battle against heresy in Church history as a battle led by the popes through the councils. For example, based on Cassiodorus and the Liber pontificalis, Anselm tries to argue that Pope Sylvester summoned the Nicaean Council and that the Roman priests on behalf of the pope were the first signatories to its statutes. Furthermore, Pope Agapitus came to the East and refuted Anthymius, the bishop of Constantinople, in the presence of the emperor Justinian

568 PL 188, 1217A: “Quapropter Constantinopolitana Ecclesia et Alexandrina, et Antiochena, necnon et aliis fere omnibus Ecclesiis per Orientem constitutis, in fide catholica laborantibus, et naufragium patientibus, sola navicula Petri, licet multis persecutionum fluctibus tunderetur, et quantulumque validus esset ventus; nullum tamen haereticae subversionis passa est naufragium; sed ut expurgaretur fermentum malitiae et nequitiae, quo haeretici corrumpabant Ecclesiam Dei, tam per se, quam per legatos suos, semper laboravit, et hodie laborat.”Anticimenon, 3.6, pp. 167-168.
569 PL 188, 1221D; Anticimenon, 3.11, p. 177.
570 PL 188, 1224D; Anticimenon, 3.11, p. 179.
571 Whalen, Dominion of God, p. 89.
572 There are many similarities in terms of words and phrases. See PL 188, 1152A-1152B; Anticimenon, 1.9 and PL 188, 1223B-1224B; Anticimenon, 3.11. For example, in book 1 it reads “celebrate multa concilia congruis in locis et temporibus”, and in the latter, “per diversa loca diversis temporibus... multa concilia celebravit”; in the former, “a sanctis Patribus convenienter inhibitum est ut de caetero nemo disputet publice de fide”, and in the latter “a sanctis Patribus inhibitum sit, quod nemo amplius de fide publice disputare audeat”.
573 Ibid. In fact, Anselm did not talk about the role of the Pope in book 1, and this is another similarity between Nicetas and Anselm’s words.
Augustus. As a consequence, Anselm concludes that the heresies were indeed destroyed by “the rock of faith through Peter the Apostle”.575

Based on this historical retrospect, Anselm moves to the guidance of the Holy Spirit within the Church and argues that the Roman Church possesses two exclusive privileges due to the grace of God: a faith purer than all other Churches and the power of judgment over all.576 Through the articulation of the superior power held by the Roman Church, Anselm establishes the role of the pontiff within his structure of salvation history: his optimistic pattern of the Church history fits into his defence of the Roman papacy. Anselm pictures the Roman Church as a defender of orthodox faith in Church history. The popes and the Roman Church, under the protection and guidance of the Holy Spirit, claimed the victory in the fight with heresies. These victories not only eliminated the contamination within the Church but also improved the understanding of divine Providence, through the historical development and theological debates.

2.2 Translatio imperii and the Guidance of the Holy Spirit

Similar to Anselm, Nicetas also tries to defend the eastern position from the historical perspective, while concentrating more on the transfer of secular power. Nicetas employs the idea of translatio imperii to explain his belief that God’s will transferred the empire to this younger and new Rome, which enjoyed a primacy second only to old Rome due to the dignity of empire and granted Constantinople the authority of jurisdiction over eastern provinces.577 Nicetas gives his history of the Church saying that the East and West were united from the apostolic times to Charlemagne, and he argues that a “certain Charles, king of the Franks” should take the responsibility for the split. The king of the Franks created the schism “not only by the division of imperial authority but also in the diversity of

574 PL 188, 1226B-1227B; Anticumon, 3.12, pp. 181-184. Cf. Cassiodorus, Historia ecclesiastica, pp. 212-302, and see also Davis, Book of Pontiffs, pp. 54-73. Anselm also states that no council should contradict the command of the pope. This is perhaps drawn from Cassiodorus, Historia ecclesiastica, p. 165. This principle was first explained by Nicholas I (858-867), in his letter to the Emperor Michael III. For a more detailed discussion, see F. Dvornik, The Photian Schism (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1948), p. 107.
575 “Ecce vides quaslibet haereses hic et ubique exortas a Petra fidei per Petrum apostolum collisas et destructas.”PL 188, 1228A; Anticumon, 3.12, p. 184.
ecclesiastical standards”. Nicetas takes the controversies during the Carolingian period as the origin of the liturgical divergence and current disagreements. Thereafter, the Latins started to attack the usage of leavened bread as a blasphemy and then the Greek Church had to fight back “in just retribution rather than in prideful arrogance”. Nicetas is incorrect in his statement that the relationship between Rome and Constantinople had been broken down by the intervention of Charlemagne, but he is quite right in claiming that it was “the West’s upsetting of the imperial world order” that launched the shift between the Churches.

Surprisingly, Anselm the interlocutor for the first time in his writing interrupts Nicetas’ speech. Through the rejection of Nicetas’ arguments, Anselm points out that the second council of Constantinople’s canon relating to “Constantinople second to Rome” was rejected by Pope Leo in 451. More significantly, the idea of giving the secular power the main role in the unfolding of God’s plan directly contradicts Anselm’s idea of salvation history. As Anselm argues, this idea rests on human rather than divine judgment.

Basically, Anselm’s idea of salvation history could not be supported by the historical change in secular power because it focused only on the Church. In this sense, the Church as a whole is the symbol of the unfolding of divine providence. For Anselm, the transfer of imperial power to Constantinople is a human but not a divine act, which had meant nothing for this city’s ecclesiological privilege and the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Moreover,

---

578 PL 188, 1231A: “…non solum in imperialis institutionum varietate, verum etiam in ecclesiasticarum regularum diversitate…”; Anticimenon, 3.14, p. 188. It is possible that Nicetas or Anselm the writer also mentioned the East-West controversies connected with the “Photian schism”. F. Dvornik suggests this schism “affected all religious and cultural contacts between East and West and raised problems that were to poison the relations between the two Churches and influence the whole course of Christian development for centuries”. See idem, The Photian Schism, p. 433.

579 PL 188, 1231A; Anticimenon, 3.14, p. 188.

580 Russel, “Anselm of Havelberg and the Union of the Churches: II The question of Authority”, p. 36. It is remarkable that Nicetas’s understanding was of external political pressures shaping the schism in the ecclesiastical dimension. This statement is more telling when we consider Anselm’s own banishment and the controversies between the pope and secular rulers he served before and during his composition. Therefore, we may suggest that Anselm tries to use Nicetas’ words to remind his reader not only of the historical division of the empire but the renewed outbreak of the conflict between the pope and secular ruler in the West.


582 PL 188, 1225C: “Quod si iure translati imperii existimas debere fieri, iam non divino, sed humano iudicio probaris imit”. Anticimenon, 3.12, p. 180.

Anselm argues that the Roman pontiff not only enjoyed the authority of a human empire but also the majesty of the divine judgements. This is one of the core arguments that Anselm repeatedly employs in his disputation with Nicetas.  

Furthermore, Anselm links the Roman primacy with the guidance of the Holy Spirit. For Anselm, the Roman Church enjoyed the highest authority in the universal Church “through God, from God and next after God”. In this sense, the indefectibility is the sign of the guiding work of the Holy Spirit within the Roman Church:

Because Rome is fortified against deceitful questions by the shield of divine wisdom wielded by the Lord, no fears or threats or emperors or any worldly powers can cause it to tremble. It is defended against all such attacks by the shield of great patience strengthened by the Lord. Therefore the Lord himself, knowing that the other churches would be grievously assaulted by heresy and that the Roman Church founded on a rock would never be weakened in the faith.

In this way, Anselm locates the Roman Church in a broader picture of salvation history. This statement also connects with Anselm’s idea of progressive development, especially the growth of doctrine and ecclesiastical institutions across time. For example, when Nicetas mentions Popes Miltiades (311-314) and Siricius (384-399) who used leavened bread, Anselm replies that the majority of the popes did not use fermentum and that they should outweigh the two popes. The most significant articulation is Anselm’s argument that the growing understanding and certain so-called novelties indeed reflect the will of God:

It was appropriate, was it not, for many other popes acting in the authority of the apostolic see they too ruled, to improve prior practice for good reason, in accordance with the growth of the Church as it rose from day to day into a higher level of understanding? … A synod sometimes supersedes an earlier synod in re-examining an issue—sometimes out of necessity, sometimes for convenience, sometimes according to the tenor of the times. This befalls entirely at the discretion of those presiding, whom then as now God has willed to have charge of his Church, and to whom he has entrusted the keys of

584 PL 188, 1226A, 1228B; Anticimenon, 3.12, pp. 181, 184. Anselm repeated these two particular privileges twice.
586 See Anticimenon, 1.6-1.8. See also the discussion in the previous chapter.
discernment and power for every holy task, so long as the foundation of the catholic faith is preserved unshaken.\textsuperscript{587}

Anselm explicitly articulates that “the Roman Church often changes its institutions in favour of better practices, and has humbly taken up as models the good institutions of others”.\textsuperscript{588} We can here clearly observe how Anselm’s idea of development and diversity runs throughout his debates with the Greeks. In other words, the Latin rite for Eucharist and Roman primacy could both be viewed as the renewing work of the Holy Spirit. In this way, the Holy Spirit as a hidden line constitutes as the ultimate authority in the debate concerning the Roman papacy and the rite of Eucharist.

At last, Nicetas seems convinced by Anselm’s demonstration and responds that because of the time-honoured usage of leavened bread in the Greek Church, it would be worthwhile for all Latins and Greeks to celebrate a general council, for all “to adopt in uniformity universally”.\textsuperscript{589} To some extent, the administrative and doctrinal juridical powers are essential for the formulation of Christendom as a community of right-believing and right-practising Christians with Rome as the head. When the papacy started to extend its authority to the East, especially in terms of liturgy and other administrative issues, the Greeks reacted fiercely. On the one hand, it is hard for Anselm to see the Church through the theory of the pentarchy of patriarchates, as he views the Church as a unitary body in the form of monarchical government. On the other hand, Nicetas admits that the Church should have a visible head while not in the sense of universal jurisdiction which Anselm had strongly argued for. The Church reform from the middle of the eleventh century was necessary in the West to liberate the Church from the secular control but it in turn, to some extent, obscured the distinction between the patriarchal authority and universal role of the Roman papacy. As Dvornik maintains, the radically transformed concept of the nature of the Roman primacy and

\textsuperscript{587} PL 188, 1232B-C: “Enimvero quod praedicti papae auctoritate sedis apostolicae suis fortasse temporibus observandum instituerunt, nunquid non licuit itidem plurimis pontificibus eadem auctoritate eiusdem apostolicae sedis, qua et ipsi praefuerunt, Ecclesia crescente, et in maiorum discretionem de die in diem ascendente in melius rationabiliter mutare?... synodus synodum solvit aliquando considerata meliori ratione, aliquando necessitate, aliquando utilitate, aliquando temporum qualitate: et hoc totum fit iuxta discretionem praesidentium, quos tunc vel nunc Deus suae Ecclesiae praeesse voluit; quibus et claves discretionis et potestatis in omne opus divinum commisit, salvo semper et immoto Catholicae fidei fundamento.”\textit{Anticimenon}, 3.15, p. 190.

\textsuperscript{588} PL 188, 1234A: “…quia propria instituta saepe mutaverunt melioribus institutionibus superordinatis, et aliorum bona instituta humiliter imitanda susceperunt…”; \textit{Anticimenon}, 3.16, p. 192.

\textsuperscript{589} PL 188, 1239D; \textit{Anticimenon}, 3.19, p. 199. According to the record of Anselm, Nicetas even states: “it appears according to the authorities and the logical argument we have set forth, as according to the very rite of the sacrament, that we ought to offer an unleavened host.” However, given the presence of the emperor and so many prelates in the Greek Church, it is hard to imagine that Nicetas would have expressed such a clear statement agreeing with the Latin position on this issue.
papacy led to the fundamental schism with the Greeks. In this sense, we can see that Anselm struggles to grant a definite position to the papacy in salvation history, and attempts to use the guidance of the Holy Spirit to justify the Roman primacy, which offers a novel perspective from which to review the schism between the East and West.

3. Conclusion

Eventually, both Anselm and Nicetas agreed to call a general council to address all of these issues in a charitable atmosphere. Both of them confirmed that the doctors of the Church were inspired by the same Holy Spirit, and therefore there should be no disagreements among them. This is based on the belief that the Holy Spirit could not contradict himself but could perfect the Church in the course of salvation history.

During the first debate on the procession of the Holy Spirit, they re-examined the most controversial issue through the perspectives of rational argument, the interpretations of the Scriptures and the teachings of ecumenical councils and Church Fathers. It is apparent that Anselm of Havelberg’s pneumatology is featured in the idea of development and the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus, Augustine and Abelard. He highlights the gradual progression of the understanding of human beings, the consecutive guidance of the Holy Spirit and the continuous unfolding of Providence. All of these could be understood as the unfolding of salvation history. Although there were some deficiencies and defects in Anselm of Havelberg’s theological demonstrations, the work represents a serious effort to reunite the Churches. When the discussion moved to the issue of Roman primacy, Anselm of Havelberg, as an unyielding defender of Roman primacy, also envisages a universal healing of divisions in the Church through the authority of the pope. To some extent, as Evans argues, Anselm did much to educate the West about the East; and in this process, the Eastern Christians are not portrayed as enemies but as members of a richly diversified Body of Christ to whom particular gifts of the Holy Spirit had been given. Through these discussions, Anselm set out clearly the significance of the ecumenical council, under the leadership of the pope, in saving the Church from heresies. Through granting a definite position to the pope in the history of the Church, Anselm in addition highlights the privileges enjoyed by the Roman Church, which consequently introduced the Holy Spirit’s ongoing work into the debate.

Anselm of Havelberg’s ecumenical conversation with Nicetas of Nicomedia conforms to his idea of diversity and growth as well as his theology of history. The Holy Spirit might be revealed most clearly to those who will hear others and this might be best accomplished in the context of an ecumenical council, which will lead to the reunification of the Eastern and Western Churches. Only in this way can the Holy Spirit bring the body of Christ to appropriate wholeness. Anselm’s work is thus the first comprehensive attempt from the Latin Church to address the theological, liturgical and ecclesiological controversies between the two parts of Christendom by setting these issues within a grand framework of salvation history and with an emphasis on the ongoing activity of the Holy Spirit within the Church.

According to what has been discussed, we can conclude as follows:

First of all, the three volumes of the *Anticimenon* could be seen as a unified work, because there are certain crucial arguments running through all of the writings. The essential point in Anselm’s view is that the faith must be one and that the multifariousness expressed in the different forms of religious life and practice should be seen as a positive sign of vitality on earth. Anselm cherishes the value of diversity in a united and single faith. Anselm’s focus on the diverse religious life within the Western Church in Book 1 sets the stage for his following treatment of the schism between the Latin Church and the Greek Church. On the other hand, Anselm and Nicetas’ debates in turn reflected back on the controversy within the Latin Church. Anselm’s record of debates could be regarded as an example of how to debate issues of divergences and innovations.

There is a clear progression in Anselm’s arrangement of these three volumes. Through the discussion about diversity within the Church from the Old Testament period to the future, Anselm prepares and even encourages his reader to take a grand view of the unfolding of God’s providential plan in Church history. This point is significant because the isolation of the first volume from the later books has fundamentally misshapen Anselm’s interpretation of history and his conception of the Holy Spirit.

Secondly, Anselm displays a strong historical awareness with an idea of development in Church history. In many ways, Anselm displays an optimistic concept of historical progress. As Karl Morrison suggests, Anselm of Havelberg’s *Anticimenon* employs historical arguments in an attempt to understand the perplexities of his age “without writing
histories”. In the first volume, Anselm wrote about the Church passing through its different ages. In the remaining two volumes, Anselm moved even further from a position of historical multiplicity and the Church history in present age showed the diversity of the graces of the Holy Spirit, which refers to the dogmatic and ecclesiological development of the Latin Church. Although Anselm did not form his debate in explicitly eschatological terms, his ecumenical vision of future Christian unification paved the way for a common theme of the following century’s Latin apocalypticism. Morrison even argues that Anselm moved toward “the pole of antihistorical unity” and “invoked the timeless organic metaphor of Christ”, but I would argue that the Holy Spirit as a dynamic mover in history might be a better description of Anselm’s historical thought in the light of his theology. Moreover, Anselm also reveals his pragmatism in his debates with the Greek Archbishop. He attempts to show his greatest sympathy to the Greek Church in order to achieve a real effective communication and mutual-understanding. It is clearly that Anselm wants his readers to comprehend that the Greeks are not monsters or heretics and they are open to resolve the schism. Here we can see a fascinating convergence of Anselm of Havelberg’s personal experiences and his historical-theological sense of the ongoing work of the Holy Spirit in the diverse forms within the Church as an entirety.

Finally, the Holy Spirit is taken as the impulse for the advancement of human understanding of divine revelation and as the constant driving force behind the renewal of the Church. This theory allows Anselm to defend the Latin Church against the charges of novelty by the Greek Church. As a consequence, Anselm associates the Holy Spirit, salvation history and the development of the Church. He tries to include all the differences between the West and East in this framework and offer a reasonable interpretation of the divergences. The understanding of the procession of the Holy Spirit, the usage of unleavened bread and the rising of papal primacy could all be justified from the perspective of salvation history and the role of the Holy Spirit in it. This paved a new way for the conception of the Holy Spirit with an emphasis on salvation history and the universal Church.

592 Karl Morrison, “Anselm of Havelberg: Play and the Dilemma of Historical Progress”, p. 219. Morrison also argues that this epoch in all its glittering magnificence “was darkened by the apocalyptic catastrophe of the second Crusade”.
594 On the contrary, when Urban II called Anselm of Canterbury, his biographer Eadmer saw the Greeks not as members of daughter Churches, but as outsiders impugning the very integrity of the mother. See Historia Novorum, p. 105.
Conclusion

It is the central contention of this dissertation that Rupert of Deutz and Anselm of Havelberg’s originalities and unique positions in twelfth-century intellectual and theological history cannot be fully understood without a proper assessment of their special devotion to the Holy Spirit, their focus on salvation history, and the relation of these to their reflections on the renewal and development of the Church. And yet, as has been highlighted above, the existing scholarship has not focused sufficiently on Rupert and Anselm’s understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit, especially as this relates to the two crucial themes I have concentrated on: salvation history and the renewal of the Church. As this thesis has endeavoured to demonstrate, it is the combination of these three dimensions that places Rupert and Anselm in positions of particular importance in the early twelfth century.

Among the main conclusions reached by this study, the first one regards Rupert and Anselm’s special devotion to the Holy Spirit. However, their understandings of the Holy Spirit and the unfolding of the Trinity over the course of history were inherited from different traditions and combined divergent approaches. Devoting all his life to biblical exegesis and theological debates, Rupert’s conceptions of the Holy Spirit and salvation history chiefly derive from the Latin tradition of Irenaeus (through the writings of Leo the Great), Augustine, and Gregory the Great. He insisted that the understanding of divine revelation is the crucial concern. Nevertheless, Rupert creatively introduced salvation history into the understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit, and thus gave the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit a historical dimension. On the contrary, the ideas of development and diversity dominated Anselm’s thoughts of theology of history, and were chiefly formed by the thoughts of Gregory of Nazianzus and enhanced by Anselm’s encounter with diverse forms of religious life. To some extent, we can regard Anselm’s theology of history as a product of Greek theology in the context of the Latin West. In this sense, a hidden contrast between Latin and Greek theology could be revealed in the different expressions of Rupert and Anselm. It is, therefore, all the more remarkable to see that both of them held a special devotion to the Holy Spirit.

Another important subject onto which this dissertation has shed light is the rejuvenation of historical awareness and salvation history observed in Rupert and Anselm’s work. In contrast

595 Yves Congar offers an excellent study on the Holy Spirit but he generally omits the perspective of salvation history and highlights the renewal of the Church in his time instead of the twelfth century. See Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 1, pp. 115-122; vol. 2, pp. 202-211.
to many of their contemporaries, both writers attempted to comprehend the distinguishing function of the Holy Spirit through the perspective of salvation history, thereby developing a creative and productive way to perceive the work of the Holy Spirit within the Church. As I have repeatedly asserted, salvation history is a key to understanding the devotion to the Holy Spirit in the writings of Rupert and Anselm. In their thought, the development of the Church was taken as a continuous unfolding of God’s divine plan. In this sense, the Third Person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, behaved as the most crucial agent in rejuvenating the life of the Church. Their constructions of salvation history went beyond the boundaries established by St. Augustine of Hippo and Bede the Venerable and created a novel dimension of theology of history. More significantly, the long-dominant view that the world was going “from bad to worse as the end approached” seen in the writings of the Church Fathers and early Middle Ages was replaced by a novel and optimistic vision of “ages succeeding each other under the guidance of the Holy Spirit”. This notion that the Holy Spirit guided a positive progression of ages is the fundamental theological innovation of both Rupert and Anselm.

In addition, through their depiction of the Holy Spirit’s earthly action throughout Church history, they showed a deep concern for the ongoing change of their time and appealed to the authority of the Holy Spirit to legitimize their specific understanding of the renewal of the Church. The shifting role of the Holy Spirit from one aligned to personal perfection to one of facilitating the sanctification and renewal of the Church as a whole deserves special attention. In their writings, the Church per se becomes the symbol of the world, and divine Providence is exclusively revealed through the developments of the Church, which is guided and protected by the Holy Spirit throughout the unfolding of history. Facing the novelties, diversities and challenges of their own world, Rupert and Anselm struggled to understand, demonstrate and assert their ideas of the renewal of the Church through new examinations of the work of the Holy Spirit in the framework of salvation history. My work is in this sense virtually unprecedented, as I illustrated how Rupert and Anselm are the first ones to associate the Holy Spirit with the development of the Church in the post-biblical period, and especially in their own time. Although neither of them actively participated in the reform of the Church from an institutional point of view, they were greatly influenced by the atmosphere and ideology of their time and contributed their reflections on the development of the Church as a whole.
There is no doubt that these authors’ personal and political circumstances had a strong effect on their theological interpretation: in the writings of Rupert and Anselm, we can frequently see the ghosts of their pasts. The integration of historical context and theology therefore constitutes another pivotal contribution of my research to the ongoing debate on twelfth-century theology, as it offers a better perspective from which to examine Rupert and Anselm’s thoughts. Indeed, their peculiar religious and personal experiences were the central elements in their comprehension of the contemporary Church and its renewal through the grace and gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Crucially, Rupert of Deutz showed an early and particular devotion to the Holy Spirit (perhaps the earliest in the twelfth century) and should be regarded as the first Latin theologian to bring salvation history into his own period. Rupert’s devotion to the Holy Spirit was deeply rooted in his personal mystical experiences, which gave him the confidence to defend his interpretation. As a steadfast Benedictine monk, Rupert insists on the value of traditional exegesis. He also exhibits distinguishing innovations in his writing, in particular his emphasis on the agency of the Holy Spirit and re-historicized pattern of salvation history. John Van Engen offers a masterly study of Rupert’s life and thought, though he focuses more on Rupert’s role as a debater with the school masters and defender of Benedictine monasticism. Chenu also highlights Rupert’s debate with Anselm of Laon and his pupils and contributed to the formation of Rupert’s image as “conservative theologian”. However, it should be noticed that Chenu’s writing, to some extent, was greatly influenced by the ongoing change of his own time and this made him show a strong sympathy to Rupert as a representative of “anti-Scholasticism”. Yet, as I discussed above, the mutual misunderstanding between Rupert and the schoolmasters impeded the fuller appreciation of each other’s stance. Furthermore, Chenu’s idea that Rupert was arguing against a form of Scholastic metaphysics and theology is anachronistic, as in the first half of the twelfth century Scholasticism had not developed into a philosophical system yet.

This thesis also tries to show that Rupert’s visionary experience and unique devotion to the Holy Spirit played the most significant role in his life as a monastic theologian, and he indeed contributed greatly to the development of theology of history in the twelfth century. His enthusiasm for, and his attempt to re-establish a novel interpretation of, salvation history symbolizes his ambition to compete with Augustine of Hippo. Throughout his career, Rupert

observed and recorded, with remarkable self-consciousness, the relationship between his personal experience and a voluminous theological authorship. Just as the exiled prophet saw heaven open to reveal visions of divine glory, so also Rupert’s “internal eye” was opened, so that he seemed to embrace and adore the consolation and inspiration of the Holy Spirit from his adolescence onwards. During his debate with the school masters, Rupert developed this devotion from the perspective of salvation history. In order to show this, in this thesis I offered for the first time a sophisticated analysis and contextualization of Rupert’s *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius*. This work is fundamental for a new assessment of Rupert’s theology, because here, with the gradual development of the Church as a whole in a Trinitarian order, the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit are employed as the sub-structure in the course of the unfolding of divine providence. This is also the first time that the seven gifts are applied to the interpretation of salvation history. With the belief that the Church would be renewed by the Holy Spirit, Rupert challenges the positions of the school masters and new religious orders but insists on the traditional monastic ideal. In sum, my research has attempted to integrate Rupert’s experience with his theological expression to see the inner connection between his life and work. In his demonstration of his belief, Rupert interpreted the earthly work of the Holy Spirit in the process of the unfolding of salvation history. Through the *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius*, Rupert offered a ground-breaking contribution to the theology of history in the twelfth century and paved the way for a deeper connection between the Holy Spirit, salvation history and the renewal of the Church. In addition, his understanding of the works of the Trinity in the different stages of Church history greatly influenced the subsequent interpretation of salvation history and contributed to the special devotion to the Holy Spirit in the High Middle Ages. In his later works, Rupert employed his theology of history and unique pneumatology as the foundation of his whole theological enterprise. All of his endeavours inspired the devotion to the Holy Spirit, Trinitarian order of salvation history and mystical theology in the following centuries.

Anselm of Havelberg, as a canon regular and courtier-bishop, continued the new direction of salvation history and interpretation of the Holy Spirit as the guiding and driving force established by Rupert. Compared with Rupert, Anselm developed his thoughts mainly through his personal engagements in royal and ecclesiastical service and his encounter with the Greeks, rather than exegetical works. Jay Terry Lees contributes a full picture of

---

598 For example, in Anton Leichtfried’s research, the interaction between Rupert’s life and his theological thoughts is excluded, which undermines the fuller appreciation of Rupert’s work. See Anton Leichtfried, *Trinitätstheologie als Geschichtstheologie*, pp. 270-283.
Anselm’s life and thought and endeavours to integrate them. However, his main task is to
portray Anselm as an imitator of his mentor Norbert of Xanten, and he fails to emphasize the
dramatic change which led Anselm to devotional piety towards the Holy Spirit and
enthusiasm for diversity and growth. Anselm’s banishment in Havelberg and his participation
in the Wendish crusade indeed sheds suggestive light on the dramatic change of his
attitudes. After living with his brothers and leading a varied religious life, Anselm started
to gain a deeper understanding of the diversity of the life of the Church and the grace of the
Holy Spirit. This growing process gives a more practical tendency to Anselm’s theological
thinking and offers an interesting comparison with Rupert. Anselm professed his own
understanding of the gradual unfolding of the Trinity and presented his salvation history
based on the seven seals of the Apocalypse. Although Anselm shares the “astonishing
sensitivity to history” with Rupert, ideas of diversity and development play a much more
significant role in Anselm’s theology of history and his conception of the Holy Spirit.
Anselm tried to clarify the doubts around the novelties being brought into the Church.
Everywhere Anselm saw ecclesiastical history as the story of innovations and viewed those
novelties and diversities as testimony of the work of the Holy Spirit in the life of the
Church. The Holy Spirit is the ultimate authority for the dramatic development in terms of
liturgy, laws, religious life, even the sacraments, institution of the Church and the
understanding of doctrine. More importantly, my thesis demonstrated that Anselm also
applied his theology of history and the ideas of diversity and development to his debates with
the Greeks. This is shown in his creative approach to the debates on the Filique, Roman
Primacy and Eucharist, and is a preliminary attempt to achieve the reunification of the
Church from the perspective of the development of the work of the Holy Spirit. Precisely
based on the theology of history, especially on the importance of the constant work of the
Holy Spirit within the Church, Anselm entered his debate with the Greek on procession of the
Holy Spirit and the Roman primacy, which he took the institutional and doctrinal
developments are the signs of the guidance of the Holy Spirit. At the same time, we could see
a fascinating convergence of Anselm’s personal experiences and his historical-theological
conception of the Holy Spirit’s activity of renewing and reforming through the diverse
expressions within the Christian community.

599 Admittedly, Lees discusses the Wendish Crusade, but he did not take it as the crucial changing point for
Anselm’s thoughts. See Jay T. Lees, Anselm of Havelberg, pp. 70-97.
Finally, my dissertation acknowledged that there are many disagreements between the Benedictine abbot and the Premonstratensian bishop. We can see the connections and divergences between Rupert and Anselm more clearly. Admittedly, Anselm was not as contemplative and profound as Rupert, but both of them attempted to establish their own interpretation of salvation history in connection with the Holy Spirit. This dramatic contention and alignment is indeed one of the most interesting aspects of this study. Through the examination of Rupert and Anselm’s lives and the role of their experiences in the formation of their thoughts, this thesis has endeavoured to show how their personal experiences integrated with their theological investigations and to offer a new narrative of the beginning of “the Age of the Holy Spirit” in the first half of the twelfth century.

My comparative approach allowed me to reach some new and important findings, through which I aim to reorient the historiographical debate on Rupert and Anselm. First of all, Rupert insists that the monk should be the leader of the Church in the future struggles to overcome the reign of the Antichrist, which in a way reflects Rupert’s disagreement with the new religious orders and his expectation of the guidance of the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, Anselm’s focus is on justifying the new religious orders and thus he tries to paint a harmonious picture among monks, canons regular and other religious people, where novelty and diversity symbolizes the grace of the Holy Spirit. There is no doubt that their respective religious experiences greatly affected their ideas. Secondly, their understandings of salvation history also involve some divergences. Admittedly, John Van Engen and Guntram Gerhard Bischoff have already noticed that for Rupert the true understanding of the Scriptures takes the predominant position. The significance of history for Rupert is theological: in studying the past, he studies God’s revelation, not man’s action. However, my dissertation is the first study of Rupert that proves how, through the reconstruction of salvation history, he attempted to demonstrate the true will of God and, in turn, to reveal the specific direction of the renewal of the Church. Obviously, Rupert’s ideas and methods bear evident characteristics of monastic theology. On the other hand, Anselm shows a more pragmatic tendency and offers a more accurate narrative of the development of the Church. Also in the case of Anselm, my findings integrate, expand and reorient previous scholarship on the subject. In particular, it is crucial to observe that, unlike Rupert, Anselm’s understanding of the Holy Spirit is mainly inspired by his travels to the East and his encounters with other forms of religious life, rather than by reading and commenting on the Bible and taking part in purely theological debate. Rupert intended to dig out the true revelation of God through the investigation of salvation
history, while Anselm endeavoured to justify the contemporary development and search for a way to achieve reunification of the Church. Thirdly, Rupert shows an urgent sense of the coming of the Last Judgment which is different from Anselm of Havelberg’s more optimistic view. This is also because there is no clear identification of the “false brother” in Anselm’s writings. Rupert explicitly regards the school masters as the heretics and false brothers and their emergence is seen as the forerunner to the coming of the Antichrist. However, Anselm offers a much more harmonious description of the varied religious community, including canons regular, monks, Templars and even the Eastern Greek Church, which is a vivid expression of Anselm’s central concern: diverse expressions in a united faith.

However, my research also suggests that Rupert and Anselm shared numerous similarities. Whalen has claimed that Rupert’s status as the defender of traditional Benedictine life and Anselm’s as a proponent of the Premonstratensian order would have prevented the affiliation of the two figures. However, as this thesis has endeavoured to show, their respective religious identification does not impede the significant similarity between them: the creative theology of history that viewed the Holy Spirit as the prime mover of the renewal of the Church, especially in the post-Christ period and in their own time. In other words, even though they were so different in terms of character, personal lives, and theological scope, both of them show evident and unprecedented piety towards the Holy Spirit along with a strong historical awareness. Given the fact that Rupert and Anselm came from two different religious orders (Benedictine monk vs. white canon), had different life experiences (monastic theologian and abbot vs. courtier-bishop) and different concerns in their ecclesiastical services as well as different intentional audiences, their similarities in terms of piety towards the Holy Spirit and theology of history are even more fascinating.

In Rupert and Anselm’s writings, the Holy Spirit, salvation history and the renewal of the Church are intentionally integrated. Both of them identify the Holy Spirit as the prime mover of the Church as a whole and pave the way for the coming of “the Age of the Holy Spirit”. They investigated the work of the Holy Spirit through the interpretation of the successive ages of the Church and in this way revealed the Holy Spirit’s role of guiding and renewing the whole Church in the unfolding of salvation history. More significantly, they have different ideas on the renewal of the Church which reflect their respective concerns on

contemporary issues. It is precisely because they took different opinions on the ongoing movements of the Church, that their similar perspective, approach and peculiar devotions to the Holy Spirit are particularly telling.

My conclusions with regard to Rupert’s and Anselm’s originality are significant for the field of medieval studies and religious history, as they allow to trace more accurately the historical and intellectual origins of subsequent theological and ecclesiological developments. Their devotion to the Holy Spirit and special interest in salvation history and the renewal of the Church paved the way for further investigation of this topic, informing and even inspiring the group given the collective term der deutsche Symbolimus. Rupert’s influence can be observed most vividly inside the German Empire, especially in the ecclesiastical provinces of Cologne and Salzburg, where he lived the last phase of his life and where his patron Cuno brought most of Rupert’s work. With Cuno’s constant support, there was a large readership in Bavaria. This is possibly where Gerhoh of Reichersberg and Honorius Augustodunensis obtained Rupert’s work and became influenced by Rupert’s thoughts. It is also possible that Joachim of Fiore was inspired by Rupert. However, Rupert’s influence declined rapidly after the twelfth century. Anselm’s writings may also have influenced many twelfth-century writers, especially his Premonstratensian contemporary Philip of Harvengt, in their vision of history and particularly their conceptions of growth and diversity within the Church. Although Anselm was not the first to employ the seven seals of the Apocalypse for a division of ages and his historicization is not as complete and influential as that of Joachim of Fiore, Anselm’s contribution to the apocalyptic pattern through the perspective of salvation history is very much a prelude of things to come. In addition, as an Ecumenist,

---

602 On my rejection of the widespread idea that Rupert “ignored the present entirely” see the discussion in Chapter III on the gifts of knowledge and piety.
603 Alois Dempf, Sacrum Imperium, pp. 3-7, 90-95, 121-126. See also the Introduction in this thesis, pp. 6-7.
606 See Caro Neel, “Philip and Harvengt and Anselm of Havelberg: the Premonstratensian Vision of Time,” pp. 483-493. Philip’s similarity with Anselm in terms of religious life can be observed in his De dignitate Clericorum, PL 203, 665D-849C.
Anselm’s writings saw a revival during the conciliar movement in the later Middle Ages, when schism and heresy within the Church and continuous doctrinal controversy were repeatedly addressed in councils. However, it seems ironic that Anselm’s work was used to resolve the disunity that threatened the Latin Church when, in his own time, there was no real success in achieving reunion with the Greeks. The special devotion to the Holy Spirit, the unique interest in salvation history and the enthusiasm of the renewal of the Church continued through to the late Middle Ages. Although Joachim of Fiore’s ideas on the Trinity were condemned at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, there were still intense emotions associated with the prediction that the year 1260 would inaugurate the third age of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, many mystical authors still spoke in the name of the Holy Spirit. While it could be argued that, in the long run, the scholastic and philosophy-oriented theology won the theological clash with historical-oriented theology, the story of the latter is still worth studying.

The medieval ideas of history and how the past might be divided up into periods according to an astonishing number of schemes of periodization were informed by Rupert and Anselm’s works. The understanding of their diverse interpretation of the work of the Holy Spirit within the Church therefore contributes a fuller appreciation of the dynamic development of theological, ecclesiastical and intellectual life in the twelfth century. As we discussed in the introduction and the first chapter, the potential danger in the investigation of the nature and work of the third person of the Trinity kept many theologians away from original interpretation of the Holy Spirit. However, both Rupert and Anselm were willing to take the risk. This is partly because they were not on the central stage of the twelfth century, but also because of their respective personal experiences. Through their sufferings, challenges and debates they were led to speak out about what they were deeply convinced of: that the Holy Spirit will lead the Church to the “place of God” (locus Dei), and that this place should not be understood geographically but functionally, as renewing the Church with grace and constant guidance. The promotion of this idea became their most significant mission. In this sense, we


For example, Gerard of Borgo San Donnino’s Liber Introductorius in Evangelium Aeternum (1254) continued to illustrate the advent of the Eternal Gospel of the Holy Spirit.
can see the originalities of Rupert and Anselm and how, in various ways, their special piety echoed millennial fears and hopes, and also paved the way for subsequent mystical thought.

Contrary to the presentist tendencies of Chenu’s and Congar’s scholarship, in my research the dynamic movement of the Holy Spirit in the twelfth century has been fully contextualised. The pursuit for the ultimate authority, the reflections on the ongoing Church reform, the seeking for a proper order of salvation history for a proper order of the forming Christendom are the main concerns of Rupert, Anselm, and other twelfth century’s writers. Therefore, in this thesis, we can see a new picture of the devotion to the Holy Spirit that lays stress on salvation history. The understanding of the Holy Spirit is not only a purely theological or philosophical issue, but also a pragmatic and consequential aspect of the life of the Church in every age. The discussion of the Holy Spirit is not exclusively restrained within the limitations of essence, Godhead and procession. To view the Holy Spirit’s work from the perspective of salvation history is one of the most vivid and original contributions of the first half of the twelfth century. By stressing this novelty and its historical context, my thesis aims to transform the previous pictures offered by scholars who focused too much on pure theology. Through detailed case studies focusing on Rupert and Anselm, we can see that Christendom became aware of its historical evolution in the twelfth century and the Holy Spirit became understood to be the ultimate driving force behind this progression. Thus, we can observe that the theology of history established by Augustine had started to change: the status of the Deus immutabilis was replaced by the processus Spiritus sancti.
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