

Anselm of Havelberg

CISTERCIAN STUDIES SERIES NUMBER TWO HUNDRED THIRTY-TWO

Premonstratensian Texts and Studies, 1

Anselm of Havelberg

Anticimenon:
*On the Unity of the Faith and
the Controversies with the Greeks*

Translated by
Ambrose Criste, OPRAEM, and Carol Neel



Cistercian Publications
www.cistercianpublications.org

LITURGICAL PRESS
Collegeville, Minnesota
www.litpress.org

A Cistercian Publications title published by Liturgical Press

Cistercian Publications
Editorial Offices
Abbey of Gethsemani
3642 Monks Road
Trappist, Kentucky 40051
www.cistercianpublications.org

© 2010 by Order of Saint Benedict, Collegeville, Minnesota. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, microfilm, microfiche, mechanical recording, photocopying, translation, or by any other means, known or yet unknown, for any purpose except brief quotations in reviews, without the previous written permission of Liturgical Press, Saint John's Abbey, P.O. Box 7500, Collegeville, Minnesota 56321-7500. Printed in the United States of America.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Anselm, Bishop of Havelberg, d. 1158.

[Dialogi. English]

Anselm of Havelberg, Anticimenon : on the unity of the faith and the controversies with the Greeks / translated by Ambrose Criste and Carol Neel.

p. cm. — (Cistercian studies series ; no. 232) (Premonstratensian texts and studies ; 1)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-0-87907-106-6

1. History—Religious aspects—Christianity. 2. Church—Unity.
I. Criste, Ambrose. II. Neel, Carol. III. Title.

BR115.H5A513 2010

280'.209021—dc22

2009034791

Contents

Preface vii

Foreword ix

Introduction 1

Anticimennon: On the Unity of the Faith and the Controversies
with the Greeks 41

Prologue 43

Book 1 47

Book 2 85

Book 3 157

Bibliography 213

Preface

As president of the editorial board of *Premonstratensian Texts and Studies*, I introduce the reader to the first volume of our new series with great excitement and pleasure. This series seeks to bring to light primary works and scholarly studies on the history of the religious order founded in the twelfth century by Norbert of Xanten. Our endeavor joins together the work of regular religious maintaining the vital Norbertine tradition with the efforts of professional academics in historical and theological studies, thus affirming the mutual contribution of a lived spirituality and scholarly investigation in bringing to a wide English-speaking audience monuments of European spiritual and religious life that have been little known until now.

That so many of the foundational texts of Premonstratensian history and spirituality have never been translated into English is a serious and unfortunate lacuna, given the prominence of the Order in the articulation of the ideals of the Gregorian reform. The canons regular, among them the Premonstratensians, played a crucial role in the theology and devotional life of the High Middle Ages, and indeed continued to do so until the devastations of the French Revolution. While the most important writings of the canons of the abbey of St. Victor have long been available in English, the same is not true for their fellow Augustinian canons, the Premonstratensians.

This first volume of *Premonstratensian Texts and Studies*, the *Anticimenon* of Anselm of Havelberg, represents one of the most interesting and important texts of the whole medieval period, by an author whom the translators rightly name “Norbert’s most devoted, proximate, and successful disciple and most articulate

apologist." Anselm's treatment of the issues dividing Roman Catholic and Orthodox Christians is unparalleled until, perhaps, the twentieth century in its attempt to offer a fair and thorough presentation of the theological and indeed psychological premises for each side. As Carol Neel and Fr. Ambrose Criste, OPRAEM, demonstrate in their introduction, Anselm's nuanced treatment of issues dividing Latin and Greek Christendom is an outgrowth and application of his equally compelling treatment of the issue of historical development and diversity in the church. In stressing the fundamental unity of the argument of the three books that comprise the *Anticimennon*, the translators eloquently demonstrate how Anselm's attempt to point the way forward in Roman Catholic and Orthodox dialogue is part of his larger goal to "illuminate for his contemporaries the agency of the Holy Spirit in human time."

Anselm's belief is that variety and diversity among Christians sharing the common core of faith is actually a strength and sign of the continuous work of the Holy Spirit among the Christian people rather than being necessarily divisive and problematic. This perspective was hardly typical of his era, but it is a profoundly hopeful message that may well find a receptive audience in our own time. Who can disagree that Christians, divided both within and between the churches, need more than ever to listen to one another in charity and engage one another, eager to discern the works of the Holy Spirit in each other's midst? This first volume of Premonstratensian Texts and Studies thus is an auspicious occasion for which we owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Neel and Fr. Criste and to our collaborators at Cistercian Publications and Liturgical Press. It is truly a moment full of hope that Anselm's voice as an advocate of reform and renewal in the church, fully accessible now in English translation for the first time, will provide both an appropriate inauguration and continuing inspiration to all those who will come to seek wisdom from the deep well that is Premonstratensian tradition.

William P. Hyland, PhD
Director, Center for Norbertine Studies
St. Norbert College, De Pere, Wisconsin
September 29, 2008
Michaelmas

Foreword

This translation has brought together interests and contacts extending over many years. Carol Neel first read Anselm of Havelberg's *Anticimenon* in the course of her graduate studies in the late 1970s. Ambrose Criste and Neel began working together while the former was a student at Colorado College in the 1990s, but Criste did not himself encounter Anselm's great work until after he had entered the author's own religious order, the Premonstratensians, several years later. As a novice, Criste read elements of *Anticimenon's* Book 1 as translated by Fr. Hugh Barbour, O.Praem., for the novices' instruction at St. Michael's Abbey. His interest so piqued, Criste then completed his own translation of Books 1 and 2. Subsequently, during one of Criste's annual visits to Colorado College, he noticed a typewritten translation of *Anticimenon's* Book 3 on Neel's desk. We had been discussing contributions we might respectively make to a planned new series, Premonstratensian Texts and Studies. Development of a polished, publishable English version of this twelfth-century text of mutual interest seemed to us both topically appropriate and a happy opportunity to work together again. Our collaboration on this text has been in this instance at long distance, since Neel was in the United States while Criste continued his own graduate studies in Rome.

We are grateful for the support to Neel, during her 2007–2008 residency at the Collegetown Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research, of the monastic community of St. John's Abbey for their hospitality; the reference and interlibrary loans staffs of St. John's University's Alcuin Library, especially Stefanie Weisgram, OSB, and Janine Lortz, for their seamless helpfulness; the staff of St. John's

Hill Monastic Museum and Library for access to their rich reference collection and other medievalists' tools; colleagues and staff at the Institute for their companionship and interest; Fr. Kilian McDonnell, OSB, the Institute's guiding spirit, for his scholarly and personal model. The Definitory of the Order of Prémontré, Daylesford Abbey, St. Michael's Abbey, St. Norbert's Abbey, St. Norbert College, and the Paul Sheffer Memorial Fund for Roman Catholic Studies of Colorado College have supported this project and the initiation of the series in which it is the inaugural volume. To these institutions and the encouragement of the persons who form them we are again grateful.

Rozanne Elder, long-term editor of Cistercian Studies, and the editors of Cistercian Publications have fostered this work at crucial moments in its development; the translators thank Dr. Elder, in particular, for sharing with us the typescript translation made in the course of graduate study many years ago by the late Fr. Raymond Bierlein, her student. Although we have nowhere followed the Bierlein translation closely, it has been of invaluable help in sharpening our sense of Anselm's meaning. This translation is therefore a tribute to Fr. Bierlein's pioneering work on the text of *Anticimenon* and to Dr. Elder's commitment to both his and his medieval subject's work. We add here our appreciation of the editors of Premonstratensian Texts and Studies for enabling and improving the publication of this important medieval work in a language accessible to many interested in its author's period and concerns; William Hyland of St. Norbert College and Theodore Antry, OPRAEM, of Daylesford Abbey have greatly facilitated this book not only in their advocacy of our project but in their expert, meticulous, and generous attention to its detail. Finally, we express our gratitude to our respective religious and scholarly communities, and to our families, for their consistent interest, assistance, and patience with our engagement with Anselm of Havelberg.

Ambrose Criste, OPRAEM, and Carol Neel
Rome/Colorado Springs
June 6, 2008

Feast of Saint Norbert, Founder of the Order of Prémontré

Introduction

Anselm and his *Anticimenon*

Anselm of Havelberg's *Anticimenon*, written in 1149/50 on medieval Europe's northeastern frontier, addresses differences among Christian communities and divisions among Christian peoples as troubling to moderns as to his work's immediate medieval readership.¹ This twelfth-century author's discourse on doctrinal and ritual variation across time and his representation of dialogues based on his own historical encounter with a Greek theologian nearly fifteen years earlier offer an authentic portrayal of controversy within European Christianity and separation from the Greek-speaking East. His work nonetheless concludes with a hopeful call for a universal council to reaffirm the unity of the faith. Anselm's *Anticimenon*—both ecumenical and, broadly speaking, conciliarist—is thus important for the study of historical theology, but also for contemporary interchange among Christian communions. The author's belief that the Holy Spirit

¹ On the date of *Anticimenon*'s text see Jay T. Lees, *Anselm of Havelberg: Deeds into Words in the Twelfth Century*, Studies in the History of Christian Thought 79 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 91, 164–65; Sebastian Sigler, *Anselm von Havelberg: Beiträge zum Lebensbild eines Politikers, Theologen und königlichen Gesandten im 12. Jahrhundert* (Aachen: Shaker, 2005), 130, 152. Lees' biography, the first book-length attention to Anselm's career and written works, is fundamental to subsequent commentary; Sigler's generally responds to it. Both recent volumes depend, especially with regard to *Anticimenon*, on the basic study of Anselm's text: Johann Wilhelm Braun, "Studien zur Überlieferung der Werke Anselms von Havelberg I: Die Überlieferung des *Anticimenon*," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 28 (1972): 133–209; on *Anticimenon*'s composition see pp. 135–36.

militates toward the concord of all believers even as it renews the church through continual change is deeply grounded in his own period's spiritual revival. Although Anselm's conviction that the faith's unity is paramount is a profoundly medieval perspective, it nonetheless challenges more recent times' weary acceptance of Christianity's fragmentation.

Anselm's Latin work in three books, despite its interest as a historical source and ecumenical charge, has until now been among the most important of medieval European works unavailable in English.² Indeed, although a French translation of the first book was completed in the 1960s, the entire text has never been published in any modern language.³ Meanwhile, despite abundant recent scholarship on Anselm's period—especially on the twelfth century's reformation of European Christianity—this author's own religious order, the Premonstratensians, has received less attention both inside and outside the academy than its historical extent and influence merit. Further, while Anselm's thought with respect to the shape of time and the development of the church in expectation of the apocalypse has been much discussed in scholarly literature, the relationship between his historical and ecumenical interests has

² This translation adopts Anselm's Latinate spelling, *Anticimenon* (*Anticymenon* in some manuscript exemplars) rather than the standard Greek transliteration *Antikeimenon* used in some modern scholarship, notably Lees', because Braun establishes the former as the likely title of an eventual critical edition: see Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 4 and *passim*; Braun, "Studien"; see also Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Ms. theol. fol. 80, fol. 208r: "*Incipit prolog(us) Anselmi havelbergens(is) ep(iscopi) in anticymenon i(dest) libru(m) cont(ra)positor(um) sub dialogo (con)scriptum ad ven(er)abiliem papa(m) Eugenium secundu(m).*" A later copyist identified the wrong Eugenius; Anselm in fact addressed Eugenius III.

³ The available edition is a faulty nineteenth-century Latin version: *Dialogi, Patrologiae Latinae cursus completus, series Latina*, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne (Paris, 1841–64), 188, cols. 1138–1252. This edition is itself based on a seventeenth-century redaction: *Antikeimenon*, ed. Luc d'Achéry, in *Spicilegium sive collectio veterum aliquot scriptorum*, vol. 13 (Paris, 1677), 88–252; this early edition was emended in the following century: *Antikeimenon*, ed. Étienne Baluze et al., *Spicilegium sive collectio veterum aliquot scriptorum*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1723), 161–207. The first book of d'Achéry's Latin text is reprinted with facing French translation as *Dialogues, Livre I: Renouveau dans l'église*, trans. Gaston Salet, Sources Chrétiennes 118 (Paris: Cerf, 1966). Salet adds notes but makes no new contribution to establishing the text. Reference below to the Migne editions of Anselm's *Anticimenon* and related texts are as PL.

been little investigated. The connection between Anselm's written works and his life as a member of the new, dynamic religious order founded by Norbert of Xanten has meanwhile received little serious exploration.⁴ The present volume aims to redress the unevenness of

⁴ Lees, in particular, minimizes the importance of Premonstratensian identity to Anselm's thought: see esp. *Deeds into Words*, 30. Sigler, by contrast, notes that Anselm was consistently loyal to his Premonstratensian "roots" and Norbert's model while furthering the interests of the white canons within his diocese; Sigler does not, however, develop this discussion with extensive reference to *Anticimenon*: compare Sigler, *Beiträge*, iii, 238–43, 259, 282, 317. The fullest recent scholarly attention to Anselm as Premonstratensian is by Werner Bomm, "Augustinusregel, *professio canonica* und Prämonstratenser im 12. Jahrhundert. Das Beispiel der Norbert-Viten, Philipps von Harvengt und Anselms von Havelberg," in Gert Melville and Anne Müller, eds., *Regula Sancti Augustini: Normative Grundlage differenter Verbände im Mittelalter* (Paring: Augustinerchorherren-Verlag, 2002), esp. 276–92; Bomm's focus, however, is on Anselm's earlier *Apologetic Letter*, not the *Anticimenon* centrally at issue here. For an older, still-useful discussion of Anselm's engagement in the contemporary conflict among religious orders in relation to his Premonstratensian identity see Georg Schreiber, "Studien über Anselm von Havelberg zur Geistesgeschichte des Hochmittelalters," *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 18 (1942): 46–87.

Among the lengthy bibliography of older works on Anselm's place among the historical theorists of the High Middle Ages the following elements are central: Herbert Grundmann, *Studien über Joachim von Floris*, *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* 32 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1927), esp. 92–94; Johannes Spörl, *Grundformen hochmittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreibung: Studien zum Weltbild der Geschichtsschreiber des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: M. Hueber, 1935), 18–113; Horst Dieter Rauh, *Das Bild des Antichrist im Mittelalter: Von Tyconius zum deutschen Symbolismus*, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters*, n.s. 9 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1979), 268–99. Of German studies focusing on his ecumenical thought see esp. Georg Schreiber, "Anselm von Havelberg und die Ostkirche," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 60 (1941): 354–411; Hermann Josef Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee des lateinischen Mittelalters (847–1378)* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1984), 153–67.

For studies in English focusing on Anselm's theology of history see Walter Edyvean, *Anselm of Havelberg and the Theology of History* (Rome: Catholic Book Agency, 1972); Bernard McGinn, *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), 109–17; Karl F. Morrison, "Anselm of Havelberg: Play and the Dilemma of Historical Progress," in Thomas F. X. Noble and John J. Contreni, eds., *Religion, Culture and Society in the Early Middle Ages: Studies in Honor of Richard E. Sullivan* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 1987), 219–56; Morrison, "The Exercise of Thoughtful Minds: The Apocalypse in Some German Historical Writings," in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard K. Emmerson and Bernard McGinn (Ithaca: Cornell

modern responsiveness to both Anselm's work and his confrères' role in the medieval reformation by presenting his *Anticimenon* as a major artifact of twelfth-century thought and a principal source on the early Order of Prémontré. Although the present volume's introduction outlines major trends in prior scholarship on this twelfth-century author and advances some fresh interpretation of his place in his period's intellectual and spiritual life, its principal goal is to enable a wider readership to engage with Anselm, so inviting further exploration of his place in the medieval religious revival and among the early followers of the Premonstratensian founder Norbert.

Anselm's work is often known as *Dialogi*, "dialogues," in the Latin in which its text is written. The Greek *Anticimenon* means, more strictly, "controversies." This translation maintains the latter title—although the term is less familiar to English-speaking readers than "dialogues"—because it is the author's own and is generally accepted in European scholarly literature. *Anticimenon*, moreover, reflects the interest in Greek language and Greek-speaking Christians memorialized in Anselm's work. Although several important writers of his and prior generations wrote theological dialogues, most notably Anselm of Canterbury—and although this genre had been modeled for medieval Christians by the greatest of the Latin Fathers, Augustine—the choice of a Greek title for such a work was virtually unique in the medieval West.⁵ The seventh-century Spanish bishop Julian of Toledo used the Greek title *Anticimenon* or *Antikeimenon* for his own commentary in two books on the Old and New Testaments respectively.⁶ Anselm, however, seems to have chosen the same exceptional title in recognition of his own en-

University Press, 1992), 352–73. On Anselm's dialogues with the Greeks see esp. Gillian R. Evans, "Anselm of Canterbury and Anselm of Havelberg: The Controversy with the Greeks," *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 53 (1977): 158–75; Norman Russell, "Anselm of Havelberg and the Union of Churches," *Sobornost* 1 (1979): 19–41; 2 (1980): 29–41.

⁵ Lees discusses patristic and medieval models in relation to Anselm's use of the dialogue form: *Deeds into Words*, 232–33. Sigler notes likeness to Abelard's dialogue with a Jew, in which the non-Roman voice has no possibility of winning the day: *Beiträge*, 311.

⁶ Julian of Toledo, *Antikeimenon*, PL 96, cols. 586–706. On the unusual Greek title see cols. 585–86.

gagement with his Byzantine contemporaries and his intention to communicate their perspectives to a Latin readership rather than in reference to Julian's exegetical model. The title *Dialogi* assigned to the work's three books in the widely available nineteenth-century Patrologia Latina edition thus seems ill-advised, and is corrected here.

Translation of Anselm's *Anticimenon* is necessarily informed by awareness that the author was himself attentive to the difficulty of the translator's enterprise. In the proem to *Anticimenon*'s second book, as its text begins to recount the author's conversations with a Greek interlocutor, Nicetas of Nicomedia, the speaker Anselm notes that word-for-word translation often distorts meaning. He petitions his Greek counterpart and the audience assembled to hear their discourse that the three translators facilitating their discussion focus on tone and meaning rather than on individual words. Close literal translation might, Anselm fears, create needless conflict through inexact representation of respective terms. As the author records, the dialogues' Greek interlocutor had first suggested literal translation: Nicetas remarks, "It seems to me that the appointed interpreter should translate what we are about to say word for word, because in this way we can better understand each other, and he can easily do this." The Latin speaker Anselm then counters, "But I do not speak in this way and such translation is suspect, in my view, because I can be misunderstood word by word if the translation is inexact, and we should not quibble over words. Rather the translation between us should gather and then set forth our respective speech as it develops, in its full meaning. In this way of speaking and translating we shall examine thoughts rather than be fixed on their expression."⁷ The *Anticimenon* text thus represents its author's confidence that his literary interlocutors' respective understandings of Christian doctrine and practice are proximate, but emphasizes that language can be an obstacle to Christian concord. The Greeks who are present accede to the speaker Anselm's request; the dialogue goes forward with principals, interpreters, and audience alike committed to appreciation of the speaker's full contextual meaning. In this spirit, as two days

⁷ *Anticimenon* 2.1.

of discussion ensue, according to Anselm of Havelberg's account the interlocutors achieve the rhetorical concord toward which they aim.⁸ The present translation of this 850-year-old work responds to its author's concern, expressed through the figures of his theological dialogue, that translation attend to holistic meaning. This English version therefore privileges the tone and nuance of both the author and the interlocutors he represents while reflecting as closely as possibly their precise, sometimes technical usages.

Anselm of Havelberg's *Anticimennon* is effectively a primer on the principal issues it addresses—the shape of Christian time and the variety of Christian doctrine. Book 1, in form a discourse rather than a dialogue, discusses the variety of doctrine and religious practice across Christian time, mostly in the Latin West. Book 2 relates a discussion—unlike Book 1's, indeed, in dialogue form—ostensibly solicited by the Greeks in their eagerness to engage with an emissary from Latin Christendom. The second book focuses closely on the procession of the Holy Spirit, the most important of theological controversies between Greek and Roman communions. As the author's description makes clear, the dialogue it represents purports to bear a close relationship to his own actual conversations with the Greek archbishop Nicetas of Nicomedia in 1136, during the first of the German prelate's two diplomatic missions to Constantinople.⁹ Book 3 continues with a second dialogue between Anselm, the author's own *persona*, and his opponent Nicetas on three matters of ritual difference between Greeks and Romans. First the interlocutors take up the Greeks' practice of leavening eucharistic bread, second their consecration of wine without water, and finally their custom of unction of Catholic Christians as a symbol of passage into Orthodox culture and belief—a practice Western princesses in particular had often undergone before the

⁸ At the conclusion of Book 2 (*Anticimennon* 2.27) and again at the end of Book 3 (*Anticimennon* 3.22) the interlocutors together call for an ecumenical council, to the acclamation of the dialogues' assembled audience.

⁹ *Anticimennon* 2.1. On the relationship between written text and historical dialogues see Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 232–33. Much scholarly debate about the historicity of Anselm's record of his dialogues with Nicetas has led to consensus that, while they are based on a historical encounter, their content is much enriched and edited: see esp. Sieben, *Konzilsidee*, 167.

celebration of their marriages to members of Byzantine imperial dynasties. Anselm was no doubt interested in this matter of unction upon marriage not only because it might seem a form of rebaptism, deemed heretical since the patristic period, but because the German emperors for whom he served as a councilor continually sought Byzantine marriage alliances for diplomatic and dynastic ends.¹⁰

All three books were written—and here are translated—to engage and inform readers who might lack prior experience of analogous theological material. Indeed, the tendentiousness of Book 1 and the lively give-and-take of Books 2 and 3 offer such expository clarity that recapitulation of their content here would not enhance it. Instead, the present introduction aims to provide useful background for its twelfth-century author's lucid, compelling text in terms of his historical and biographical circumstances, to outline modern scholarly perspectives, and to suggest pathways for further investigation. Anselm's goal in crafting the work at hand was ambitious: to illuminate for his contemporaries the agency of the Holy Spirit in human time. Modern readers will be supported, in their response to this cosmic and metahistorical enterprise, by awareness of Anselm's career as at once a magnate of the German empire and a member of a religious order at the heart of the twelfth century's reformation of European religious life, and also by his period's experience of separation from Eastern Christians and the tumult within European religious life.

East and West in the Twelfth Century

Ironically, Anselm of Havelberg wrote the optimistic, even triumphant account of his own conversations with a Byzantine theologian translated here only a little more than half a century before hope of concord between Roman and Greek churches was deeply undercut by European Crusaders' sack of Constantinople in 1204 AD.¹¹ This event was a dark consequence of the twelfth-century

¹⁰ Sigler emphasizes Anselm's role as a marriage broker: *Beiträge*, 133–35.

¹¹ On the abortive Fourth Crusade condemned by the papacy for its conquest of the Byzantine outpost, Zara, then the Greek capital, see Michael Angold, *The*

Western kingdoms' extraordinary economic and political expansionism. The same period had been the most transformative in the history of European religion with respect not only to its literature and doctrinal development but also to its phenomenology. Since the foundation of the new monastery at Cîteaux in 1098, regular religious life—that is monks, nuns, and clergy living together according to ancient rules for common life and liturgical practice—had been convulsed by challenges to the predominant monastic pattern, Benedictinism. Religious communities were the heart of the Latin church and in many ways the most important unifying force in European culture, so that their reformation had impact across European society far beyond the monastic houses governed by the sixth-century Rule of St. Benedict. Meanwhile, the secular polity of the church was at once invigorated and threatened by the epic conflict with the German empire resulting from the reformist pontificate of Gregory VII. Inextricable from all these developments was the rapid increase in the proportion of lay Europeans, including great numbers of women, non-elites, and townspeople, who demanded the opening of spiritual practices previously inaccessible to them.¹²

What Charles Homer Haskins famously called the “renaissance of the twelfth century” in the 1920s, historians now take to have been much more—a refashioning of Europeans' social and economic frameworks, political culture, and spiritualities.¹³ In this multilayered transformation, the people of Latin Christendom began vigorously to define themselves and expand their borders against a series of previously little-known others: the pagan, Slavic northeast; the Muslim east and southwest; the Orthodox and Greek-speaking south and east. East-West schism had been foreshadowed in late antiquity during the controversies surround-

Fourth Crusade: Event and Context (London: Pearson, Longman, 2003); on Innocent III's reaction see pp. 113–14.

¹² On the transformation of European monastic life and popular spirituality in the generations immediately around Anselm's see Giles Constable's magisterial account: *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), esp. 296–328.

¹³ See Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927), vii–ix.

ing the many heresies of the fourth and fifth centuries, accelerated by the collapse of the Roman Empire in the same period, then exacerbated by the ecclesiological conflicts of the ninth century in which the idea of empire was revived in the West by the Frankish ruler Charlemagne in his alliance with the Roman papacy. Theological difference, emphasized for the political ends of the Frankish monarchs, then separated Greek- from Latin-speaking churches, but this division had little practical effect—given the political and ecclesiastical confusion of the following two centuries—until the mid-1000s, when in the prelude to the twelfth-century revival the emissaries of a reformist Roman hierarchy made schism explicit. The papal legate Humbert, in Constantinople to negotiate a military and political alliance against the Norman invaders of southern Italy, instead took up theological and ritual difference, and in 1054 anathematized the patriarch Michael Cerularius for various heresies. The patriarch responded provocatively from the perspective of Orthodoxy's own assertive ecclesiology, with the general support of the Eastern churches, although without excommunicating the pope. Humbert had represented Leo IX, who in fact had died before his legate excommunicated the patriarch, so that little of real legal importance had actually happened. The repute and the effects of these events were nonetheless definitive. Humbert's action and Michael Cerularius' response were subsequently viewed as marking East-West schism.¹⁴

Although the occasion of 1054 was fortuitous, the theological distance between Greek and Roman communions now emerged as profound. The primary issue involved the procession of the Holy Spirit, which the Greeks understood to be solely from God the Father while the Latins believed to be from the Son as well. In the West the term *filioque*, meaning "and the Son," was conventionally added to the credal text established at Nicea in 325 in its description of the Holy Spirit. This insertion of *filioque* had been widely accepted in Europe since the Carolingian ninth century, in part in expression of the western kings' and bishops' claim of independence from

¹⁴ For a compelling outline of the events of 1054 and their etiology see Henry Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church from Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), esp. 193–221.

Byzantine imperial authority; *filioque* then became a verbal tool for separating Roman purity of belief from the heresies with which the Frankish kings and the popes feared the East was rife. This very doctrinal addendum or—as the Roman Church had it—clarification of the meaning of the Nicene Creed was rejected as abhorrent and itself heretical by Byzantine Christians. *Filioque* then became both pretext and irritant in the essentially political conflict that led to the more definitive schism of Orthodoxy and Catholicism in 1054. But this Trinitarian matter was not the only issue delimiting East-West difference in the eleventh century. Lesser but still important matters of ritual practice, especially involving the elements of the Eucharist, separated Greeks from Roman Christians. Complicating their discussion was the issue of Petrine supremacy; the Eastern church acknowledged the special prestige of the see of Peter but failed to accept that its leadership might elide the authority of the great Eastern sees, especially Constantinople, within their jurisdictions, or that its example or teaching might supersede Greek tradition on doctrine and sacred rites.¹⁵

Throughout the following century popes and other eminent Latins attempted to win the Greeks by argument to acquiescence in the central Roman theological positions. Urban II, the pope who summoned the First Crusade, convened a synod at Myra, appropriately at the shrine of Nicholas of Bari, a saint whose relics had only lately been brought to Italy from their original site in Asia Minor. At this meeting Anselm of Canterbury was the chief representative of the Roman side. His subsequent work *On the Procession of the Holy Spirit* reflects his argument there.¹⁶ But no resolution ensued, nor did any other Westerners conduct formal

¹⁵ Again for general background see Chadwick, *East and West*, 27–39, 77–94, 200–18,

¹⁶ On Anselm of Canterbury at Bari and in his related texts see Chadwick, *East and West*, 224–27. See also Anselm of Canterbury, *The Incarnation of the Word*, in *Anselm of Canterbury*, ed. and trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Toronto: Edwin Mellen, 1976), 7–37, and Anselm of Canterbury's later, more extensive discussions relevant to the second and third books of the later Anselm's *Anticimennon*, beginning with direct reference to the errors of the Greeks: *The Procession of the Holy Spirit*, in *Anselm of Canterbury*, 183–230, esp. 183–84; *The Sacrifice of Unleavened and Leavened Bread*, in *Anselm of Canterbury*, 233–240, esp. 233.

dialogues with the Greeks until the later Anselm's mission of the 1130s, although East-West theological difference continued to be both a rhetorical device and a real subject in increasingly rationalist discussion of theology within Latin Christendom, for instance in the various redactions of Peter Abelard's *Christian Theology*.¹⁷ Anselm wrote in a context of wide European awareness of active conflict with Greek Christians in the imperial politics of Italy as well as in theological discourse.¹⁸

Among the documents of these relations, the bishop of Havelberg's *Anticimenon* holds unique importance as the one major twelfth-century work representing dialogue between Roman and Greek communions, looking hopefully, moreover, to the healing of the rift in the church. Some scholars have understood Anselm's position in this work to be a partisan defense of the Catholic theological perspective and of Petrine supremacy rather than a balanced or sympathetic representation of the Orthodox point of view, while others have emphasized the accuracy and open-mindedness with which the author sets forth the arguments of the Greek speaker Nicetas.¹⁹ Anselm's literary representation of a Westerner's dialogue with the Greek theologian supports both interpretations to an extent. The author indeed portrays Nicetas of Nicomedia as a powerful apologist for Greek viewpoints on all the important theological, ritual, and ecclesiological matters. His own namesake speaker, the Roman advocate, nonetheless prevails, consistently winning Nicetas' agreement. Repeatedly, however, the two interlocutors call for a universal ecumenical council summoned by the pope to bring all European and Mediterranean Christians to concord. *Anticimenon's* author was surely aware that the hope his

¹⁷ See, for instance, Abelard's discussion of the procession of the Holy Spirit, which responds to Anselm of Canterbury's and in turn to the Greeks' perspectives: *Opera Theologica II: Theologia Christiana* 4.83–94 and 4.116–57, ed. Eligius M. Buytaert, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis* 12 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), 304–10, 323–42.

¹⁸ On Anselm of Havelberg in the contemporary context of East-West conflict, see Chadwick, *East and West*, 228–32.

¹⁹ See, for instance, Chadwick's emphasis on Anselm's evenhandedness: *East and West*, 232. Lees concurs regarding *Anticimenon's* sympathetic portrayal of Nicetas: *Deeds into Words*, esp. 237–38; see, on the other hand, Sigler, who accounts Anselm a thoroughgoing papal partisan: *Beiträge*, esp. 189.

literary figures expressed in their conciliarist appeal was not immediately realistic, but the text of their dialogues nonetheless testifies to his sense of that eventual possibility and his appreciation of the value of carrying forward such discussion. Essential to sensitive interpretation of Anselm's ecumenism and conciliarism as expressed in the later books of *Anticimenon*, however, is the relationship of Book 2 and Book 3 to the work's equally engaging first book on the variety of religious life within the Catholic West. Book 1 of Anselm's *Anticimenon* is the best-known and most-studied part of his *oeuvre* and requires historical introduction, in which Anselm's biographical context and regular religious affiliation will clarify his vision of both European and world Christianities.

The European Reform and the Bishop of Havelberg

Anticimenon's author was an important historical actor quite apart from the literary and theological achievement documented in the work's three books. Anselm's distinguished ecclesiastical and diplomatic career was rooted in his relationship with the guiding force of the Order of Prémontré, Norbert of Xanten. That charismatic reformer, itinerant preacher, community founder, and eventually prince-bishop of Europe's eastern frontier had been a secular canon and imperial courtier when in 1115 he experienced a conversion to ascetic penance and reformist preaching. Thereafter Norbert self-consciously modeled himself on the Latin father Augustine as the paradigm of a religious vocation blending active and contemplative visions of ideal Christian life. In that imitation Norbert founded the Premonstratensians, the most rapidly proliferating of the many new twelfth-century regular religious movements after the Cistercians.²⁰ This preacher-founder was a friend and traveling

²⁰ For a summary of Norbert's career see *Norbert and Early Norbertine Spirituality*, ed. and trans. Theodore J. Antry and Carol Neel (New York: Paulist Press, 2007), 7–12. The definitive biography of the reformer is in Dutch and focuses on his archiepiscopal career: Wilfried Grauwen, *Norbertus Aartsbisschop van Maagdenburg (1126–1134)*, Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren, Verhandelingen 40, no. 86 (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1978); Grauwen's work is, happily, available in German translation: *Norbert, Erzbischof von Magdeburg (1126–1134)*, 2d ed., trans.

companion of Bernard of Clairvaux, the most important figure in the early Order of Cîteaux, whose white-clad monks advocated a return to strict, primitive Benedictinism and embraced simplicity and manual labor in their pursuit of a life modeled on that of early Christians. Norbert too sought for himself and his followers such apostolic life, *vita apostolica*, so becoming Christ's poor, *pauperes Christi*.²¹ Unlike the first Cistercians, however, Norbert adopted the Rule of St. Augustine as his followers' pattern of life. This text, which had a complex history, was grounded in the instructions for religious community of the greatest of the Latin Fathers of the church, who himself lived a common life with other clerics while

Ludger Horstkötter (Duisberg: Prämonstratenser-Abtei St. Johann, 1986). The best one-volume treatment of Norbert's role in his period and as Premonstratensian founder is a collection of German essays: Kaspar Elm, ed., *Norbert von Xanten: Adliger, Ordensstifter, Kirchenfürst* (Cologne: Wienand, 1984).

Christopher Brooke offers a provocative introduction to Norbert in his survey of medieval religious life: *The Age of the Cloister: The Story of Monastic Life in the Middle Ages* (Mahwah NJ: HiddenSpring, 2003), 217–22. Lees' chapter on Norbert and Anselm also offers a useful biographical summary on the reformer: *Deeds into Words*, 22–39. Ernest W. McDonnell's discussion of the *vita apostolica* in the twelfth century, with special reference to Norbert and Anselm, retains usefulness: "The *Vita Apostolica*: Diversity or Dissent," *Church History* 24 (1955): 15–31. Among recent works see the source collection and commentary by Antry and Neel, *Norbert and Early Norbertine Spirituality*, esp. 23–27, and on Anselm specifically pp. 29–37. On the spirituality of regular canons, especially the Premonstratensian Philip of Harvengt, see also Caroline Walker Bynum, *Docere verbo et exemplo: An Aspect of Twelfth-Century Spirituality*, *Harvard Theological Studies* 31 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979), esp. 48–55; eadem, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 36–40; Giles Constable, *Three Studies in Medieval Religious and Social Thought: The Interpretation of Mary and Martha, the Ideal of the Imitation of Christ, the Orders of Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), esp. 71–72, 263–64.

²¹ On the Premonstratensians as "poor men" see Ernst Werner, *Pauperes Christi: Studien zu sozial-religiösen Bewegungen im Zeitalter des Reformpapsttums* (Leipzig: Koehler and Amelang, 1956), 19. On the order's place in the contemporary pursuit of apostolic life see again Brooke, *Age of the Cloister*, 219–22. On the Premonstratensians in their Augustinian context and in relation to the reform of Benedictinism see R. W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (New York: Penguin, 1970), 240–59. Antry and Neel discuss Premonstratensian spirituality in general: *Norbert and Early Norbertine Spirituality*, 23–27. The only monographic study of the spirituality of the order remains, however, the work of François Petit, *La spiritualité des Prémontrés aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1947), esp. 11–124.

serving as a bishop in north Africa.²² The Rule of St. Augustine therefore differed from the Benedictine rule in that it assumed its adherents might serve churches and persons outside their own circle, as Augustine himself did in his work in Hippo. It was thus appropriate for canons (clergy living in community), as opposed to monks, who might receive priestly ordination but whose central calling was prayerful separation from the secular world.

Norbert's clerical reform had immense immediate success. He founded his first community on Christmas of 1121. Three hundred houses of his white canons—for he chose for them entirely white garments symbolizing their purity of life—spread across Europe by 1200, falling behind the many hundreds of houses of the white monks in their explosive growth, but not by far.²³ Yet the ever-active and mobile Norbert, who died in 1134 as archbishop of Magdeburg on Europe's eastern edge eight years after leaving behind Prémontré in northern France and his other early foundations in the Low Countries and the Rhineland, left behind no written word. Bernard's abundant, mellifluous prose had brought immense notoriety to the Cistercian way of life in the twelfth century. That quantitative difference between the respective foundational writings of the two groups is a major root of the neglect of the Premonstratensians in modern historiography.

Little evidence survives about the early years of Norbert's follower Anselm. He seems likely to have come from the same general Rhineland region as his master Norbert, and like him to have been well educated in a cathedral school, probably at Liège.²⁴ Even before he became associated with Norbert, Anselm had in the course

²² See George Lawless, *Augustine of Hippo and His Monastic Rule* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987). Lawless summarizes the development of versions of the Augustinian rule on pp. 121–54; he offers an edition with English translation of both *Ordo monasterii* and *Praeceptum* chosen by Norbert as his followers' governing text: see pp. 74–103.

²³ See, for instance, Southern, *Western Society*, 312–18; Antry and Neel, *Norbert and Early Norbertine Spirituality*, 1–7, 11–15.

²⁴ Sigler argues against Lees that Anselm studied with the great Benedictine Rupert at Liège: *Beiträge*, 4. Lees agrees that Anselm studied in that city, but believes that—unlike his friend Wibald—he was uninfluenced by Rupert: *Deeds into Words*, 14–18. That Anselm ended up a regular canon and so in opposition to Rupert's advocacy of Benedictinism need not, however, mean that he was not informed by Rupert's

of his schooling made lifelong friends of two other ecclesiastics of eventual European influence, Arnold of Wied and Wibald of Corbie; his correspondence with Wibald sheds valuable light on his later career.²⁵ But Anselm's formation as a religious and a servant of church and empire was principally in Norbert's hands from at least his early twenties. As Norbert's principal biographer Wilfried Grauven has pointed out, Anselm was Norbert's most devoted, proximate, and successful disciple.²⁶ In 1126, when the reformer assumed the archbishopric of Saxon Magdeburg, Anselm accompanied him. Anselm was present during the multiple crises of Norbert's leadership in this important and tumultuous frontier region, where his prosecution of clerical reform and installation of canons in the cathedral church of Our Lady met with bitter, sometimes violent resistance. Anselm accompanied Norbert on a variety of missions on the emperor's behalf, including expeditions to Italy in the course of papal-imperial conflict and diplomacy.²⁷

In 1130, perhaps at the moment of Anselm's earliest canonical eligibility at age 30, Norbert appointed his young friend to one of Magdeburg's suffragan sees, Havelberg. This office then existed in exile and, for the most part, in name alone; the diocese established east of the Elbe in Slavic, pagan territory in the tenth century had been long since overrun and would be secured for settlement and conversion only through Anselm's own great effort, in the course of the so-called crusade against the Wends of the late 1140s.²⁸

teaching; on Rupert and the conflict among the orders see John Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 306–34, esp. 323–34.

²⁵ Lees emphasizes the lifelong importance of Anselm's early friendships: *Deeds into Words*, 14, 21. Wibald's and Anselm's letters are published in the records of the Benedictine's abbey: Philippe Jaffé, ed., *Monumenta Corbeiensia*, Bibliotheca rerum germanicarum 1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1864), letters 159 (263–66), 211 (330), and 221 (339–41).

²⁶ Grauven, *Norbert*, 164.

²⁷ Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 29–38; Sigler, *Beiträge*, 5–28.

²⁸ On the date of Anselm's elevation see Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 13 and n. 5. On the establishment of the diocese of Havelberg and its vicissitudes see A. P. Vlasto, *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom: An Introduction to the Medieval History of the Slavs* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 147–54. Vlasto believes that Havelberg was not secured until 1184 (p. 153), but as Sigler points out, Anselm was able to assume residency in 1147: *Beiträge*, 111. See also Franz Winter, *Die*

Recent biographies by Jay Lees and Sebastian Sigler have alike emphasized that Anselm—in his own multiple, complex roles—was not only chosen for ecclesiastical leadership by his master Norbert but framed on Norbert's personal model.²⁹ Among the most important reasons for studying Anselm's career is the light it sheds on Norbert, among the most elusive of important twelfth-century religious figures.

For the purposes of attention to Anselm's *Anticimenon*, however, a general outline of Anselm's episcopal career suffices. In Norbert's shadow until the archbishop-founder's death in 1134, at which he was appropriately present, Anselm then emerged as a leading imperial counselor in his own right. In 1135 the Saxon emperor Lothar sent him on a diplomatic mission to Constantinople, the occasion for the debates he later represented in *Anticimenon*.³⁰ Thereafter Anselm clearly had special dignity in both imperial and papal courts as an expert on Byzantine politics and religious life; in the later 1130s and early 1140s Anselm was a frequent witness to imperial charters and participant in imperial diets, as well as being imperial representative to the papal court. His close association with Lothar, who was succeeded by Conrad III, a monarch of the rival Hohenstaufen family, led to some coolness between the bishop and the new king.³¹ By the late 1140s Anselm was in such disfavor with Conrad that he experienced a period of isolation and inactivity. His letters to his old friend Wibald reveal that he deeply resented this forced retreat from influence and engagement with the affairs of church and empire.³² But the initiation of the campaigns against the Slavic Wends, a secondary consequence of the Second Crusade to the Holy Land preached by Bernard of

Prämonstratenser des zwölften Jahrhunderts und ihre Bedeutung für das nordöstliche Deutschland: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Christianisierung und Germanisierung des Wendlandes (Berlin, 1865; repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1966), 154–68.

²⁹ Lees, *Deeds into Words*, esp. 38–39; Sigler, *Beiträge*, esp. 27–28.

³⁰ On Anselm's role as imperial ambassador see Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 42–45; Sigler, *Beiträge*, 30–35.

³¹ Lees emphasizes Anselm's awkwardness in relations with Conrad and his subsequent "exile" in Havelberg: *Deeds into Words*, 53, 61, 72–97; compare Sigler, *Beiträge*, 64, 75, 141–48.

³² Anselm's letters in *Monumenta Corbeiensia*, ed. Jaffé, 339–41.

Clairvaux, gave Anselm the opportunity to emerge from his eclipse in the role of papal legate, in which he seems to have militated toward evangelization of pagan peoples rather than their slaughter.³³ Meanwhile Anselm had been able to establish a church and residence in Havelberg in 1147, and from there he worked to found Premonstratensian houses whose activities might contribute to the conversion of the Slavs.³⁴ Finally, the reign of Conrad's successor, Frederick Barbarossa, brought Anselm renewed recognition, a further diplomatic mission to Constantinople, and eventually an archiepiscopate beyond the Alps. In 1154 the new emperor appointed this able servant of the German church and authority on Byzantine relations to the important see of Ravenna, with its complex position as an outpost of Greek authority and influence among the ever-rebellious urban centers of northern Italy.³⁵ Anselm died in Frederick's army in the summer of 1158, as some said smitten by God for his vehemence in urging the emperor to besiege and reduce Milan.³⁶

Moderns unaccustomed to the interweaving of elites' religious and political roles may find the multiplicity of Anselm's activities improbable, even jarring: the same Anselm who followed the charismatic holy man Norbert was also an imperial magnate with

³³ Vlasto, *Entry of the Slavs*, 134–35. On Anselm's role, see Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 78–82; Sigler, *Beiträge*, 120–22.

³⁴ Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 70–73; Sigler, *Beiträge*, 75–81, 162. See also Winter, *Prämonstratenser*, 105–16, 148–54.

³⁵ Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 98–114, esp. 110. Sigler emphasizes that Anselm's success in representing Barbarossa in a second diplomatic mission to Byzantium in 1153/54 led to his archiepiscopal appointment: *Beiträge*, 192–96, 208. On Anselm's second embassy the bishop again conducted theological debates with the Greeks, this time in Thessalonica: Russell, "Anselm of Havelberg," 22–23; Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 109–10 and n. 42; Sigler notes that Anselm appears in the latter debates' records to be a less enthusiastic ecumenist than in *Anticimennon*: *Beiträge*, 202–3. Anselm's attentiveness to the Greek tradition is nonetheless attested in a further text: *De ordine pronuntiantiae letaniae ad Fridericum Magdeburgensem archiepiscopum*, ed. Franz Winter, "Zur Geschichte des Bischofs Anselm von Havelberg," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 5 (1882): 144–55; here Anselm includes many Greek saints: see esp. 152–53. On the ecumenical emphasis of this treatise on the litany of the saints, see Sigler, *Beiträge*, 155.

³⁶ Vincent of Prague, *Annales*, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Scriptorum 17 (Hannover, 1861), 671, 674.

the leisure to write theology or ecclesiology between episodes of high influence in the German court. As Jay Lees—whose meticulous work on Anselm is the first full biographical study and thus essential to further research—has usefully pointed out, however, Anselm shared with Norbert the intellectual and political ethos attributed by Stephen Jaeger to the northern cathedral schools, in which clerics of the generations immediately following the Investiture Controversy were committed to preserving the unity of Latin Christendom through service to church and secular empire alike.³⁷ Like Norbert's, Anselm's career in religious life and as imperial bishop demonstrated the profundity of this commitment and the efficacy of this preparation, and his work as bishop, writer, diplomat, crusader, both papal and imperial courtier—finally as ecumenist and conciliarist—consistently reflected this energetic ideal.

Anselm's Literary Oeuvre

In the course of his highly active administrative, religious, and military career, Anselm of Havelberg had, from the perspective of modern scholarship on the medieval reformation, become the twelfth-century Premonstratensians' most articulate apologist. His impassioned, startlingly original writings point to Norbert's inspiration. With the literary remains of other early white canons such as Philip of Harvengt, the written works of the bishop of Havelberg bespeak a distinctive Premonstratensian spirituality.³⁸ They show that in many ways the Augustinian communities inspired by Norbert were more innovative than the Cistercians and more prophetic of the pan-European Franciscanism of the following century with its huge popular following. Although Norbert understood himself to be returning to ancient ideals as did the Cistercian reformers of Benedictinism, his followers' expression of the apostolic life

³⁷ Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 18–19, 143–44, 285–86. Compare C. Stephen Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950–1200* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), with emphasis on the regular canons in this context at pp. 76–87.

³⁸ Petit, *La spiritualité des Prémontrés*, 129–66; Antry and Neel, *Apologetic Letter*, 193–200.

was more a departure from prior medieval patterns of devotional practice and religious community than the white monks' return to monastic origins.³⁹ They were highly self-conscious of the inventiveness of their movement, and as their outstanding apologist Anselm responded vigorously to the criticisms of contemporaries decrying novelty in religious life.

Anselm's first major foray into the lively contemporary discussion of the status and merits of the many new European apostolic foundations of the early twelfth century came in the early 1140s, when he responded to a critique of the white canons by the Benedictine Ekbert of Huysburg.⁴⁰ The black monk's letter does not survive, but Anselm's powerful rejoinder suggests its content in harshly, persuasively refuting both Ekbert's argument and his scriptural exegesis. The tone Anselm adopts in his later *Anticimennon* is markedly gentler—and this difference bears careful independent scrutiny—but from the perspective of the later work this *Apologetic Letter* is important in its articulation of the character and historical significance of the white canons. Here, in the context of an invective against those who challenge the reform of clergy according to the Rule of St. Augustine, Anselm offers a positive account of regular canons' charism. Although he at no point names himself a Premonstratensian or speaks directly of the network of religious houses founded by Norbert of Xanten, for him to have done so would have been anomalous in the twelfth-century context, in which the notion of a religious "order" was still inchoate, and he and others of Norbert's followers understood themselves rather as in their master's spiritual filiation than as a formal category within the larger context of reformed Augustinians.⁴¹ Yet Anselm here, in

³⁹ See again Brooke, *Age of the Cloister*, 217–32.

⁴⁰ Anselm, *Apologetic Letter*, in Antry and Neel, *Norbert and Early Norbertine Spirituality*, 38–62. Sigler has disputed Lees' (*Deeds into Words*, 54) dating of this text to 1138, arguing it cannot have been written earlier than 1143: *Beiträge*, 63, 235. Lees' analysis of the letter is nonetheless rich: *Deeds into Words*, 129–63.

⁴¹ On the frequently anachronistic usage of the notion of "religious orders" among modern historians see Constance Hoffman Berman, *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), esp. 221–36. On this issue in canon law, with special reference to Augustinians, see Peter Landau, "Der Begriff *ordo* in mittelalterlichen Kanonistik," in Irene Crusius and Helmut Flachenecker, eds., *Studien zum Prämonstratenserorden*,

the *Apologetic Letter*, treats the excellence of clerical as opposed to monastic callings, the fruitfulness of the contemporary reform, in particular the highly generative union of contemplation and active engagement in the secular church in terms of special resonance for the twelfth-century white canons.

This forceful apologetic work was then the by-product of Anselm's extraordinarily active years in service to the emperor Lothar, while *Anticimennon*, like many important works by busy public figures across time, owes its existence to a period of forced retirement. In his isolation in the late 1140s Anselm found greater focus on a still larger-scale literary effort than his polemic on behalf of the reformed Augustinians. He was still an apologist, although now more broadly the advocate of renewal and union in the church. Probably working in the library of the Premonstratensian canons established by his master Norbert in the cathedral church of Magdeburg, the bishop of frontier Havelberg sought to explain the tumultuous religious world he knew in the work translated in this volume.⁴² Attention to *Anticimennon's* large and complex structure is a useful starting point for its content's analysis.

The first of this work's three books, despite its inclusion under a Greek title implying dialogical content, is not a dialogue, nor does it have much to do with the Greeks. Its historical material surveys Christian history to the time of the work's composition by building from biblical texts, later historical works, and a lively awareness of the discussion of the theology of history current in northern Europe in the author's period. The last two books are indeed dialogues between a speaker whom the author names as himself and a Byzantine called Nicetas, a real historical figure, the archbishop of Nicomedia when Anselm made his first diplomatic mission to Constantinople in the 1130s; these dialogues do not purport to be a transcription, but rather represent an imaginative reconstruction of actual dialogues held in Constantinople more

Veröffentlichen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 185, Studien zur Germania Sacra 25 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 185–99. On Anselm's own usage see Gert Melville, "Zur Semantik von *ordo* im Religiosentum der ersten Hälfte des 12. Jahrhunderts: Lucius II., seine Bulle von Mai 1144, und der 'Orden' der Prämonstratenser," in *Studien zum Prämonstratenserorden*, 210–11.

⁴² Sigler, *Beiträge*, 154.

than ten years before the author recounted them in writing. Overwhelmingly, scholars who have treated Anselm's work have emphasized that, while he may have had some record of his conversations of 1136—and while he certainly did conduct actual debates with the Greek Nicetas, as his *Anticimenon* asserts—his representation of their two dialogues in Books 2 and 3 reveals much literary craft. The dialogues' speaker Anselm, whom the author presents as his own voice, adduces patristic and more recent sources that cannot have been available to him on a diplomatic mission. Meanwhile the author attributes to his Greek opponent knowledge of sources accessible only in the West, even placing on Nicetas' lips a passage from the author Anselm's own *Apologetic Letter*, written a decade later than the dramatic date of *Anticimenon's* dialogues.⁴³ Further, the Greek interlocutor and Greek audience seem occasionally to accept arguments against their own belief and practice to which, modern scholars agree, twelfth-century Greeks would have been loath to yield.⁴⁴

Clearly, then, the exact course and content of the dialogues Anselm recounts are fictive, but that is not to say they might not suggest the general shape of their historical referent, the actual discussion between Anselm and Nicetas of Nicomedia in 1136. Since antiquity the dialogue form had been viewed as a literary device enabling the presentation of multiple perspectives without any intent to represent literal historicity. Indeed, from the perspective of a reading of *Anticimenon* aimed at appreciation of Anselm's own views, acknowledgment of his agency in shaping the dialogue adds to the interest of his text rather than diminishing it. Whether or not the historical Nicetas of Nicomedia was as enthusiastic about the prospects of an ecumenical council for resolving the *filioque* controversy, the issue of leavening in the bread of the Eucharist, or disagreement over the primacy of Rome, as the author Anselm here purports, the bishop of Havelberg clearly desired those resolutions.

⁴³ *Anticimenon* 2.14; compare *Apologetic Letter*, trans. Antry and Neel, 38.

⁴⁴ Lees summarizes the scholarship: *Deeds into Words*, 233 and n. 217, 253. Regarding important arguments see esp. Russell, "Anselm of Havelberg," 20, 39–40; Sieben, *Konzilsidee*, 157–67; Morrison, "Play," 237–41; Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 229–30, 244–45, 253.

Meanwhile, the text he left is the most important extant evidence for the circumstances under which he assembled these ideas, the audience he intended, and the specific reasons for which he undertook to address variety in European religion and conflict with the Greeks. Attention to the manner of *Anticimenon's* composition therefore sheds light on Anselm's theology of history, ecclesiology, and ecumenical thought.

The whole of *Anticimenon's* three books is dedicated to the Cistercian pope Eugenius III, disciple of Bernard of Clairvaux and proponent of religious reform in the pan-European context. In his general prologue Anselm claims that Eugenius, in whose company he had spent a long sojourn in the later 1140s, has asked him for help in understanding the pretensions and arguments of Byzantine ambassadors to the papal court.⁴⁵ But Book 1 itself, and indeed Book 2, present further comments on their respective audiences and occasions; effectively, the three books, taken together, have multiple beginnings: (1) a general prologue to all three books (here *Anticimenon* 1. Prologue); (2) a proem specific to Book 1's material on the theology of history (*Anticimenon* 1.1); (3) a covering prologue to Book 2, providing a transition to its ecumenical material (*Anticimenon* 2. Prologue); (4) a further historical proem to Book 2, with an explanation of the occasion and physical context of the dialogue with Nicetas (*Anticimenon* 2.1). Book 3 continues with no explanatory proem, only a clarification of the change of venue from the location of Book 2's discussion (*Anticimenon* 3.1). These repeated beginnings, each casting different light on the various books' contexts, suggest the author's multiple intentions in writing each of these books and unifying them under a title more appropriate, on first consideration, to its last two.

Although the general prologue emphasizes the pope's charge to Anselm to compose such a work, Book 1's proem states that Anselm has been compelled to expound his theory of history by the entreaties of those "brothers" who want to know their own place in the proliferation of contemporary religious movements—where they find themselves in the extension of human time be-

⁴⁵ *Anticimenon* 1. Prologue. On Eugenius's relationship to Anselm see Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 744–78; Sigler, *Beiträge*, 136–42.

tween Genesis and Apocalypse. Book 2's prologue then says that, although his prior book has satisfied questioners and critics among his brethren about variety and novelty in Latin Christendom, these same confrères still wonder why and how the Greeks' beliefs differ. Anselm thus directs his work to the pope and purports to write at the papal behest, but acknowledges that Book 1 was a freestanding earlier composition. As he suggests, he now recycles the justification for novelty and diversity he has already drafted for the self-understanding of his own order as Book 1's introduction to the later dialogues on Greek otherness. But Anselm here in *Anticimennon* 1.1 confirms that all three books find an audience and rhetorical purpose aside from the pope's Byzantine diplomacy. They are written for the author's immediate canonical community and for those wider communities of discourse about European religious life in which they engaged. In all its parts, then, his *Anticimennon* speaks to the twelfth-century religious reform—to its papal leader but, more basically, to those who embrace its various charisms and wish to comprehend their mutual relations, their historical significance, and their providential meaning. While Books 2 and 3 concern controversy with the Greeks, they envision no Greek literary audience, but rather provide a Western readership with insight about the Greeks' difference and—still more broadly—the role of transhistorical difference in the one church.⁴⁶ The three books of Anselm's *Anticimennon* are therefore integral both as a literary work and in their representation of the scope of their author's thought. Book 1 on the development of the western church is essential to interpretation of Books 2 and 3 on East-West dialogue.

Interpreting Anselm's Vision of History

Despite *Anticimennon's* evident rhetorical unity, however, modern critics have overwhelmingly isolated the first book in their attention to Anselm of Havelberg's principal work.⁴⁷ Book 1 has been treated more extensively than any other early Premonstratensian

⁴⁶ Lees assesses Anselm's audience in *Deeds into Words*, 167–72.

⁴⁷ Lees' careful argument that Book 1 is thematically bound to the later books by its general goal of teaching by example is the culmination of this line of discussion:

text across several scholarly generations and in several languages, and its isolation from the later books has fundamentally misshaped interpretation of Anselm and his work. As that criticism has nonetheless demonstrated, Anselm is greatly indebted to patristic tradition for his fundamentally Augustinian notion of secular time as a mirror of providence. And he shares with other twelfth-century thinkers—notably his possible own early teacher Rupert of Deutz, the Cistercian Otto of Freising, the Calabrian visionary Joachim of Fiore, and the great Victorine Hugh—a vivid interest in emplotting the history of the church according to exegetically grounded stages of temporal development. Yet Anselm's thought is distinctive among the historiographical ideas of these other twelfth-century theorists, especially with regard to the meaning of doctrinal development. Hugh looked toward humankind's perfection through sacramental activity and advancements in secular knowledge. Joachim prophesied an apocalypse imminent in his own age, which he claimed for the Holy Spirit. But Anselm, more than any other medieval theologian of history, emphasized doctrinal and institutional development as the hallmark of Christianity's unfolding toward the apocalypse. In a period that most who cared about these matters saw as decline—in the words of Anselm's great contemporary Otto of Freising, a "world grown old"—Anselm of Havelberg saw the return of youth and vitality, the advancement of Christian doctrine and human possibility.⁴⁸

Historians of medieval thought have thus assigned Anselm an important place in the development of the Christian theology of history. Johannes Spörl's *Grundformen mittelalterlichen Geschichtschreibung* (1935), the foundational modern scholarly treatment

Deeds into Words, 164–77. Morrison, on the other hand, argues strongly for the essential unity of the three books: "Play," 236–45.

⁴⁸ For a summary of Anselm's relationship to the thought of twelfth-century theologians of history see Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 177–224; compare Edyvean, *Anselm*, 14–41. For emphasis on Anselm's appreciation of novelty see pp. 62–70 in this work, and Walter Berschin, "Anselm von Havelberg und die Anfänge einer Geschichtstheologie des hohen Mittelalters," *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch*, n.s. 29 (1988): 229–32. On Otto's sense of a world in senescence see Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities: A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146 A.D.*, 5, prologue, trans. Charles Christopher Mierow (New York: Columbia University Press, 1926), 322.

of the medieval understanding of the shape of time, privileged Anselm as a pioneer in his affirmation of the novelty of his own historical moment.⁴⁹ Subsequently many of the most acute students of medieval intellectual life have found him a startlingly original historical critic and theologian of time. Among scholarship in English, Bernard McGinn's *Visions of the End* (1977) describes Anselm as the most patently affirmative of novelty among medieval theorists of history.⁵⁰ Karl Morrison has more recently suggested that Anselm's writing bespeaks a historical theory and hermeneutics of interest from a postmodern critical perspective in its suggestion of the playfulness of providence in framing human experience.⁵¹

This rich critical tradition emphasizes that, like other medieval historical and theological authors, Anselm moved easily among a variety of patristic paradigms for the growth of the church in time: six days of creation as analogous to historical periods articulated in great biblical events, three ages analogous to the persons of the Trinity, four horsemen of the Apocalypse, seven apocalyptic seals. All these frameworks for historical interpretation are variously useful to Anselm's exposition of the variety of Christianity past and present in *Anticimemon's* Book 1; none is original with him.⁵² The distinctiveness of this author's thought lies rather in his unembarrassed acceptance of the diversity of Christian practice across time and his conviction that the Holy Spirit renews belief as historical ages follow upon each other. Both Book 1 and the later properly dialogical books consistently identify the Holy Spirit as the motive force behind secular developments and seek to discern the mechanisms of the Spirit's agency as means to time's interpretation. To study history, then, is to begin to understand the Spirit's will. Anselm writes:

The one body of the church is . . . brought to life by the Holy Spirit, who is both singular in himself and manifold in

⁴⁹ Spörl, *Grundformen*, esp. 24–30.

⁵⁰ McGinn, *Visions*, 109–10.

⁵¹ Morrison, "Play," esp. 220–23, 231–34, 245–46.

⁵² Lees' outline of Anselm's use of various schemata for time and comparison with other major thinkers' is compact and useful: *Deeds into Words*, 177–91.

the multiform distribution of his gifts. This true body of the church—so unified by the Holy Spirit, divided and articulated among different members in different times and ages—began with Abel, the first just man, and will be consummated with the last of the elect. It is always one in the singularity of its singular faith but expressed in multiple forms by the manifold variety of its ways of life.⁵³

Anselm resumes his identification of the role of the Spirit in the church's diversity throughout time in reference to his own century:

That Holy Spirit who governs the whole body of the church from the beginning, now and always, 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 religious life always arises, the youth of the church renews itself like the eagle's, so that it may fly higher in contemplation, with the strength to gaze directly, unblinded, at the rays of the true sun.⁵⁴

The eagle's youth, an image drawn from Psalm 102:5, had been the topic of much patristic and later exegesis, but Anselm alone among medieval theorists of time used it as a central figure for the development of belief and institutions.⁵⁵ In his reading of this image the

⁵³ *Anticimenon* 1.3.

⁵⁴ *Anticimenon* 1.10.

⁵⁵ Augustine's commentary—in which he iterated ancient natural philosophy describing the aging eagle as weighed down by the weight of its beak, then breaking off that burden on a high cliff—was normative: *Expositions on the Book of Psalms* 102.8, trans. A. Cleveland Coxe, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), 505–06. Anselm of Canterbury had used this image to suggest, characteristically, that understanding followed faith: *Incarnation* 1, trans. Hopkins and Richardson, 12. For Anselm of Havelberg's distinctive usage and its resonances among writings of other Premonstratensians see Carol Neel, "Philip of Harvengt and Anselm of Havelberg: The Premonstratensian Vision of Time," *Church History* 62 (1993): 488–90.

variety and innovation troubling to many in the twelfth-century church becomes instead the evidence of a vitality galvanized by the presence of the Holy Spirit. The church of Anselm's day soars like the eagle of mystical experience toward the sun of eternal truth. Anselm's image—and Anselm's view of the diverse and changing church—is eager, triumphant, and fearless.

In the context of the Middle Ages' well-known love of unity and uniformity and its consistently negative valorization of novelty, such a renewed church is indeed striking. It draws his reader's eye to an interpretive height from which all history may be viewed, as it were, from God's perspective. But this image is in no way discordant with the entire content of Book 1, which maps the stages, *status*, of the church from the creation to Anselm's own time. More emphatically than any other theologian of history of the twelfth century—in which theory of history was more at the center of western intellectual life than at any moment between Augustine and Foucault—Anselm lauds his own time. He praises Norbert of Xanten and Bernard of Clairvaux along with other contemporary spiritual leaders, but in contrast to twelfth-century preachers' and founders' generally meticulous self-description as revivalists of *vita apostolica*, he focuses on the Cistercians' and Premonstratensians' innovation.⁵⁶ *Quare tot novitates? Quare tot varietates?* Why so many new things, such variety?⁵⁷ Book 1's resounding answer is that novelty and variety are gifts of the Spirit. Anselm reemphasizes this theme with respect to differences between Latin and Greek communions in his Books 2 and 3.

While relatively few modern scholars have treated *Anticimenon* in its entirety, some have noted that the consistent theme of diversity constitutes its essential unity. Others have, with Lees, nonetheless stressed the different form and prior composition of Book 1 to the point that it seems a separate work.⁵⁸ Consideration of the centrality of the Holy Spirit to the three books assembled as *Anticimenon*

⁵⁶ On Norbert and Bernard see *Anticimenon* 1.10.

⁵⁷ *Anticimenon* 1.1.

⁵⁸ Lees argues that Book 1 effectively has a separate title, and that it is united with the other books only by a general rhetorical intent: *Deeds into Words*, 171–72. Again, the Salet translation, in its separate presentation of Book 1, effectively supports this view.

nonetheless sheds light on their common origin in Anselm's identity as a white canon. In Book 1 Anselm calls his reader to abandon a vision of religious life grounded in narrow historical precedent, to reread biblical and patristic texts courageously in the light of the Holy Spirit's fresh inspiration. The author scoffs at Benedictines who decry new movements such as the reform of the regular clergy promoted by his own master Norbert of Xanten. In a long and careful exposition of the seven seals of the apocalypse in terms of the unfolding of Christian history, Anselm responds vigorously to those who rail against the white canons and the white monks; their defense of conservative monastic models is the greatest danger to the vitality of faith. Conversely, then, those human souls willing to heed the Holy Spirit's call to spiritual progress are his most effective agents. Just as that Spirit is the protagonist of history, novelty and difference are evidence of his presence.⁵⁹

The Holy Spirit reappears as the driving force of secular time and of human action in Anselm's second and third books of dialogue with the Byzantine theologian Nicetas. In Book 2 the third person of Trinity is directly, doctrinally at issue, because the Spirit's procession from the Son as well as the Father has been since the ninth century the central theological obstacle to East-West unity.⁶⁰ Thus Anselm's exegetical pilgrimage through scriptural and conciliar texts of significance for his debate with Nicetas builds on his first book's preoccupation with the historical role of the Holy Spirit. At the same time this treatment of the *filioque* controversy looks forward to Book 3's discussion of ritual practice, in which the Greeks' usage of leavened bread and consecration of pure wine again separates them from the Roman communion. But in Book 3 the Holy Spirit remains central to the discussion. Affirmed as historical agent in Book 1 and glorified in relation to both Father and Son in his procession in Book 2, that Spirit now summons all Christians to the same table. Again and again the speaker Anselm and his interlocutor Nicetas remind their throng of listeners and, by implication, their dialogue's readership, including ourselves, that to attend to the Holy Spirit is to listen to each other in *caritas*,

⁵⁹ *Anticimenon* 1.10.

⁶⁰ See again Chadwick's introduction to this problem: *East and West*, 89–94.

in charity or brotherly love.⁶¹ Any doctrinal or ritual resolution in which Christian persons do not find concord is—for Anselm as author—objectionable, and we have failed each other and the Spirit alike if we do not, as members of Christ, heed this call to charity. As the speaker Nicetas reminds his Latin opponent in Anselm’s text:

The sacred host, whether of leavened or unleavened bread, is made of many grains gathered into one, so signifying the people of the whole church gathered into one and the same charity. . . . The rash perversity of the unfounded judgments with which we tear at each other seems to me a greater sin than the differences in sacramental practices occasioning that disagreement, for these rites make no matter to the Lord . . . [but our] discord offends God.⁶²

Anselm’s sympathy with Nicetas’s perspective, according to *Anticimenon*’s representation of their debates, at last persuades the Greek archbishop that East and West must receive the Eucharist in like fashion—or openly tolerate each others’ differing practices—because the Spirit’s call to union is paramount.⁶³ So he and Nicetas join with the voices of all their listeners in calling for a council of all Greek and Latin Christians to reunify Mediterranean and European churches as Christ’s singular body. This will be the Spirit’s will and work.⁶⁴

Anselm as a Premonstratensian Author

Nevertheless, twentieth-century and still more recent scholars have often considered the *Anticimenon* of Anselm of Havelberg a statement of Petrine supremacy more than an appeal for Christian

⁶¹ See, for instance, *Anticimenon* 2.1. Morrison in fact finds charity the unifying theme of *Anticimenon*’s three books: “Play,” 245.

⁶² *Anticimenon* 3.19.

⁶³ *Anticimenon* 3.19–20.

⁶⁴ *Anticimenon* 3.22.

concord.⁶⁵ Indeed, Anselm is patently an advocate for papal authority, but isolation of Books 2 and 3 from the prior, non-dialogical book overemphasizes his investment in Petrine authority, downplaying the harmony between the openly developmental emphasis of Book 1's discussion of the Western orders and the later books' conversation with the Byzantines. Anselm transparently believes—as his namesake speaker argues cogently and as the Greek Nicetas in the end concurs—that Peter's authority must prevail, but at the same time his literary dialogue calls upon the papacy to engage constructively and compassionately with the Eastern church. Nicetas says to the speaker Anselm of his own imagined contribution to an ecumenical council:

With due humility and reverence I would call upon the Roman pontiff, pointing out how—with his help—we who have always been one in our catholic faith might again have unity in the observance of the sacraments, so removing all occasion for enmity and discord. I hope that he might patiently hear me as I offered this humble counsel just as Peter, although he was foremost of the apostles, humbly listened long ago to Paul's frequent chastisement. In that reproach we commend Paul's firmness as confident, just rebuke and we praise Peter's patience in his gentle bearing. In this instance I would be far inferior to Paul, but the pontiff ought not to be inferior to Peter. Then the Roman pontiff might be a Latin to the Latins and to the Greeks a Greek, so *all things to all men* (1 Cor 9:22). He might gain all, settling all matters on which we disagree by the humble authority of his apostolic see, either taking away the one practice and instituting the other universally or, removing all scandal, authorizing both indifferently."⁶⁶

Anselm of Havelberg here places a moving laudation of Petrine authority in a Greek voice, in the context of the pope's unique potential to be *all things to all people*, so appealing for an ecclesiastical unity appropriately affirmative of the oneness of Christian faith.

⁶⁵ Sigler especially emphasizes Anselm's advocacy of papal primacy: *Beiträge*, 189; compare Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 259–61, 265.

⁶⁶ *Anticimenon* 3.19.

Notably, *Anticimenon*'s interlocutors mention imperial leadership only in passing in their appeal for a general council of Eastern and Western Christians. Here, for the author Anselm who so gives Nicetas voice, the primary explicit audience of the *Anticimenon* text is pope, not emperor. Therefore, one useful reading of Anselm's governing intention in assembling these three books on the theology of history and on ecumenical dialogue might indeed be encouragement of the papacy to adopt a less conflictual attitude with the Byzantines than the prior century's popes and their legates—a position of authority enabled by conviction of the solidity of the papal claim of primacy. Here Anselm's training as a court bishop underlay his position. As Lees has argued, so confident a paradigm of the essential unity and, by extension, hegemony of Latin Christendom was integral to the ideology of ecclesiastical leaders such as Norbert and this foremost of his disciples.⁶⁷ Recent scholarship, in acknowledging the importance of Norbert's personal model in shaping Anselm's career, nonetheless characterizes that influence principally according to the two canons' ecclesiastical, administrative roles. Lees thus minimizes the role of Norbert's spirituality for Anselm's career in his work, noting that the bishop of Havelberg "never identifies himself as a Premonstratensian."⁶⁸ Sigler acknowledges that the bishop of Havelberg indefatigably supported the work of Norbert's reformed canons on the Slavic frontier, but with Lees presents Anselm essentially outside the context of the religious vocation, to which he reveals passionate loyalty in his description of the eagle's youth.⁶⁹ Both omit what this twelfth-century figure himself attests in all his writing as most important to his own understanding of both history and his own time—the changing spirituality of the twelfth-century reform as the imprint of God's hand.

That Lees' and Sigler's, the first extensive scholarly treatments of this major author, should describe him as an essentially secular figure, however, comes as no surprise among the analogous general

⁶⁷ Again, see Lees, *Deeds into Words*, esp. 18–19.

⁶⁸ Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 30.

⁶⁹ Notably, Sigler's title makes no reference to Anselm as a white canon among his multiple roles as "politician, theologian, and royal emissary."

neglect of his Premonstratensian confrères. Anselm of Havelberg has been seen as an isolate because even a rich and well-developed scholarship on twelfth-century spirituality has until lately accorded the followers of Norbert disproportionately little attention. Even Rachel Fulton's brilliant and compelling study of the growth of feeling in medieval piety, *From Judgment to Passion*, which centers on the highly affective Marian devotion of Anselm's confrère and contemporary Philip of Harvengt, treats this other prominent disciple of Norbert outside the context of his role in articulating a Premonstratensian charism.⁷⁰ Nonetheless, consideration of these white canons from the perspective of the way in which their master Norbert shaped their sensibility—and the way in which life according to the Rule of St. Augustine influenced their sense of the church in time—opens a potentially useful perspective on Anselm's challenging and innovative *Anticimenon*, as to other works of the twelfth-century white canons. The distinctive theology and earnest ecumenism of Anselm in particular call for explanation in their relationship to the distinctive charism of Norbert and his early followers. Anselm's particular allegiance to Norbert, his centering of his master's language in his own literary works, and his direct praise of Norbert in his extant writings suggest that further aspects of his *Anticimenon* are reflective of Norbert's spiritual legacy.

Anselm of Havelberg's use of the image of the eagle's flight as a figure for the trajectory of human time was directly borrowed from the preaching of Norbert of Xanten. The founder Norbert called his followers his little eagles, urging them to fly with him toward divine truth.⁷¹ Norbert was not a writer, so far as we know, but he was an exegete, and his preaching—as documented in the works of his first-generation followers—was strewn with imagery binding them and him with Augustine as the first founder of the regular canons and the apostle John as their scriptural archetype. The evangelist and author of Revelation was, for Norbert and his

⁷⁰ See Fulton, *From Judgment to Passion: Devotion to Christ and the Virgin Mary, 800–1200* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 295–96, 351–404.

⁷¹ *Vita Norberti archiepiscopi Magdeburgensis*, Acta Sanctorum, ed. Society of Bollandists, Junii 1 (Paris, 1867), 823. See Neel, "Philip of Harvengt and Anselm of Havelberg," 493 and n. 39.

disciples, both preacher and mystic, apostle and contemplative. Their life followed his, rising and swooping between mystical contemplation and earthly engagement with the eagle who figured the evangelist's experience, as Anselm wrote in his *Apologetic Letter*:

John the apostle and evangelist, flying like an eagle in the heights and gazing directly upon the rays of the true sun, drank deeply from the fountain of the Lord's breast. Full of the spirit of wisdom and intellect, endowed with the special privilege of divine love, he penetrated the secrets of divinity and the hidden places of the heavens. Crossing into the active life he then taught in Ephesus and several other places, founded churches, ordained bishops and established priests. See how the living creatures of God burn and gleam like lightning!⁷²

The spirituality of the medieval Premonstratensians was then lived at no fixed location on a continuum between action and contemplation, but rather in their dynamic interaction. His identity as a white canon then became for Anselm a critical tool in his analysis of change and difference among communities and between communions in the three books of his *Anticimenon*.

Throughout these wide-flung discussions of doctrinal and ritual matters in Book 2 and 3 of his *Anticimenon*, Anselm of Havelberg shows himself a polished exegete with a special commitment to the historical level of interpretation—the material, political, even anthropological contexts of the biblical texts and figures he adduces—as well as a compelling apologist for Roman beliefs and, most especially, for the primacy of the Roman see. Throughout, he adduces Petrine authority as an ancillary argument, sometimes even a primary argument, for the superiority of Roman teaching and Roman worship.⁷³ But neither Anselm's intellectual and rhetorical prowess nor his loyalty to the Roman see is the salient feature of his work. Rather, his depiction of Nicetas as his own intellectual equal, his sympathetic portrayal of the theological tenets and ritual

⁷² *Apologetic Letter*, trans. Antry and Neel, 55.

⁷³ Anselm first argues Peter's special status in *Anticimenon* 1.5, thereafter regularly recurring to its doctrinal consequences until the speaker Nicetas finally protests his Latin counterpart's monotony: *Anticimenon* 3.16.

traditions of the Greeks, and the overwhelmingly warm and affirmative tone of his work's second and third books strike many readers—particularly medievalists familiar with the multi-level twelfth-century conflict with the Byzantines—as extraordinary.⁷⁴ The conclusion of the debates recounted in the *Anticimenon*'s two later books emphasizes the author's generosity to his Greek opponent and the Greek-speaking audience gathered around them first in the Byzantine church of Holy Peace and, on the next day, in the great church of Holy Wisdom. At the end of Book 2 and again in Book 3 the interlocutor Anselm seems to have won over his opponent Nicetas with careful exegetical arguments on the procession of the Holy Spirit and sacramental practice. The two speakers nonetheless agree that the issues they have addressed should rather be decided by an ecumenical council in which the Roman pope should assume leadership but in which all the churches of Mediterranean and European Christianity should find full hearing such that all believers might be brought by reason and prayer—not by compulsion—to unity of belief and ritual.⁷⁵ Anselm is then the first author to have proposed an ecumenical council specifically for the reunification of the Roman and Greek communions.⁷⁶

Anselm as Ecumenist

Anselm's apparent posture as bishop of Havelberg and papal legate in the crusade against the Wends, only a few years before his composition of *Anticimenon*, sheds suggestive light on his ecumenism toward the urbane Greeks, and further on his sense of

⁷⁴ Among scholarly notices of Anselm's generosity in representing the Greek perspective see esp. Morrison, "Play," 236–40; Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 45–46, 237–39.

⁷⁵ *Anticimenon* 3.22.

⁷⁶ Sieben, *Konzilsidee*, 153–57; Sigler, *Beiträge*, 42, 112. Notably, the standard English work on medieval conciliarism makes no mention of Anselm: Brian Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory: The Contribution of the Medieval Canonists from Gratian to the Great Schism*, rev. ed., *Studies in the History of Christian Thought* 81 (Leiden: Brill, 1988). Tierney's focus is canon law texts, but that his discussion elides Anselm's early advocacy of an ecumenical council nonetheless emphasizes the anomaly of *Anticimenon*'s appeal for ecumenical engagement in the twelfth-century context.

his and his order's agency on the Holy Spirit's behalf. Bernard, the great Cistercian, had argued that the Eastern pagans must be converted or die. But Anselm of Havelberg, despite his admiration for the white monk, adopted a different tack. After a troubling incident in which the Slavs of Stettin claimed prior Christianity as defense against depopulation in the name of the cross, Anselm urged the secular princes gathered for the reduction of the Baltic coast and Wendish interior to cease their depredations—to leave the pagan Slavs to be converted by their now-Christian princes and by his Premonstratensian confrères through peaceful means.⁷⁷ Here Anselm recalled his mentor Norbert's consistent pattern of healing heresy, calming conflict, and advocating concord among secular and ecclesiastical lords.⁷⁸ Still more, Anselm here advanced a perspective outside of history, above the view of the faith from the ground east of the Elbe. By itself, Anselm's role in the Wendish Crusade is singular, most notable for its difference from Bernard's. Alongside his discourse with Nicetas of Nicomedia it seems to express his sense of his own membership in a church renewed with an eagle's youth.

Anselm of Havelberg's ecumenical dialogue, in turn, conforms to his ecclesiastical career and theory of history as an injunction to Roman Christians to "listen in charity" to the beliefs and practices of the Orthodox. The Holy Spirit might speak most clearly to those who took such care to hear others' truths, and this might be best accomplished in the context of an ecumenical council joining Eastern and Western churches. Most strikingly, the author of the *Anticimenon* presents both voices in his dialogue as acknowledging the power of custom and the affect associated with credal language and sacramental materiality as compelling, worthy of respect and response whatever the truth of doctrine. *Filioque* is repugnant to the Greeks; leavened host is dear. Roman orthodoxy and Roman primacy must acknowledge these realities of religious practice in order for the Holy Spirit to bring the body of Christ to appropriate

⁷⁷ Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 74–82; Sigler, *Beiträge*, 98–106.

⁷⁸ Lees stresses Anselm's reception of Norbert's example in peacemaking: *Deeds into Words*, 33.

wholeness.⁷⁹ Norbert's Premonstratensian followers, Anselm's work suggests, were impelled by imitation of their founder not only to be good servants of the church but to make peace, to do good, to act in the temporal world from the insights of their contemplative experience, most distinctively to see value in variety and novelty such as their new canonical foundations embodied. The historical experience of Anselm of Havelberg in a new religious order convinced that it authentically performed the will of the Holy Spirit led him to revalorize alterity—both difference from the Benedictines and difference across the Adriatic. Such embrace of the diversity of Christian experience was then no outlier to the twelfth-century reform, but instead mapped a region of its extent.

Anticimenon's Text and This Translation

This translation of Anselm's work is based on the *Patrologia Latina* text, itself reproduced from a seventeenth-century edition by Luc d'Achéry. Ideally, translation into English would have been based on a modern critical edition noting manuscript variants and choosing readings according to their appearance in better manuscript exemplars, but this particular work poses extraordinary editorial difficulties. In 1974, Johann Braun of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* published a definitive study of the thirteen known manuscripts of *Anticimenon*. His intention was to follow this outline of the manuscript tradition with a critical edition, but the project remains incomplete.⁸⁰ Braun's work, though, clarifies the path an eventual editorial effort should take. His essay on the *Anticimenon*'s manuscripts is a methodological *tour de force*, exemplary of the utility of statistical study of manuscript variants rather than traditional principles of textual criticism for determining which of available manuscripts are proximate to lost originals and for choosing among variant readings. As Braun establishes, all extant copies of *Anticimenon* are at least two generations removed from the archetype. The Berlin manuscript of *Anticimenon* (Berlin ms. theol.

⁷⁹ Anselm's speaker Nicetas expresses this emphasis on the emotional significance of familiar practice in *Anticimenon* 2.27 and 3.19.

⁸⁰ See Braun, "Studien," 133–34.

fol. 80) is the single best surviving copy; it contains a preponderance of better readings and itself represents collation with another family of copies, from which missing elements of its archetype have been replaced.⁸¹ For this translation, problematic readings in Migne—as well as issues in the presentation and organization of the text's books, its various prologues and proems—have been resolved by collation with this primary Berlin manuscript. Even those readers of Anselm's text in translation with little interest in problems of textual scholarship or precision in editorial treatment of medieval Latin works should nonetheless be aware that the text of this important work calls for further careful study.

Meanwhile Braun's study is indispensable to all discussion of the text. It demonstrates that all extant copies are from the fifteenth century or later, yet the monastery of Cîteaux possessed two copies in the late Middle Ages. The relative poverty of Anselm's manuscript tradition and the late dates of all its representatives suggest that the work of the bishop of Havelberg met with only limited currency in centuries immediately following its composition, but received modest revival during the conciliar movement of the later Middle Ages, when schism, heresy, and doctrinal controversy were repeatedly addressed in intra-European councils.⁸² Such interest makes obvious sense in the context of Anselm's advocacy of ecumenical councils, although it is ironic: Anselm was untroubled by variety in religious practice within Europe and concerned to resolve schism with the East. He would have been saddened to know how, as modernity approached, further disunity threatened Latin Christendom and distanced any realistic possibility of reunion with the Orthodox East.

Anselm of Havelberg's prose is lively and readable, without the rhetorical embellishment characteristic of many contemporaries, notably his Premonstratensian contemporary Philip of Harvengt.⁸³ In Book 1 he demonstrates himself opinionated and forthright, harsh in his assault on the critics of the reform orders and of

⁸¹ Braun, "Studien," 173–76, 202–8; Valentin Rose, *Verzeichnis der lateinischen Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, vol. 2 (Berlin: A. Asher and Co, 1901; repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1976), no. 376, pp. 207–8.

⁸² Braun, "Studien," 136–39.

⁸³ On Philip's highly ornamented style, see Fulton, *From Judgment to Passion*, 364.

novelty within the church more generally. In the later books likewise he writes compactly, athletically, with clear intent to suggest verisimilitude in his account of the debate between the speaker Anselm and his Greek interlocutor, Nicetas. This author's theology of history and his ecumenical dialogue are both, therefore—among texts of interest for the Middle Ages' intellectual history and its spiritual life—uncommonly exciting and engaging. The present translation attempts to reflect Anselm's straightforward Latin style and evocation of his readers' interest and investment. Occasional notes explain technical or especially important usages, but for the most part terms in translation have been chosen to reflect contemporary American usage. Anselm's articulation of complex theological arguments is sufficiently transparent that few readers should experience difficulty in understanding his meaning.

Notes below introduce especially useful critical and historical perspectives, and uncover those sources Anselm names as well as many he—like most medieval authors—fails directly to acknowledge. Source references here are by no means exhaustive, but this translation goes well beyond the PL edition and prior scholarship in identifying Anselm's use of patristic texts and his reference to the late-eleventh- and early-twelfth-century discourse about issues in which he was interested. Like all medieval religious, Anselm wrote in constant reference to the Vulgate Bible. Direct biblical quotations are rendered here in italics with parenthetical verse references, while more general allusions are identified in notes. Quotations from biblical texts are adjusted to the Douay translation as the standard English version based on the Latin text Anselm knew. Quotations from all other sources are fresh, befitting their context in Anselm's work. Throughout, however, notes refer readers to sources' outstanding English translations or, if none are available, those sources' best available editions, since these texts will generally be most useful to a readership encountering the work in translation. Wherever possible, however, standard textual divisions (for instance, book and chapter numbers or letter numbers) are included so that those to whom the *Patrologia Latina* or other such resources are useful may find the relevant passages with facility.

References to scholarly literature are similarly aimed at English-speaking readers potentially interested in following Anselm's dis-

cussion into its patristic sources, twelfth-century analogues, and general historical background. They emphasize English-speaking scholars' work on Anselm's period and on his two great interests, the theology of history and the rift between the Roman and Greek churches. References here nonetheless include foreign-language works where resources in English are unavailable or where German scholarship, in particular, makes essential contributions to understanding the work of this German bishop, courtier, diplomat, and apologist for twelfth-century religious revival. The bibliography gathered at the end of this volume likewise emphasizes sources in English translation, but includes primary works in the original Latin and scholarship in the European languages where these might be especially important to readers pursuing Anselm's concerns into the wider fabric of the medieval reformation, the history of ecumenism, and historical Christians' sense of the shape of time. This bibliography has, finally, been constructed specifically to assist readers to enrich their appreciation of Anselm's role as a Premonstratensian and to follow his work into the scholarly literature about the medieval white canons—their writings, their spirituality, and their sense of their place in the unfolding of providence.

*Anticimenon: On the Unity of the Faith
and the Controversies with the Greeks*

Prologue

*Here begins the prologue of Anselm, bishop of Havelberg, in his book of Anticimenon, controversies, written as a dialogue and addressed to the venerable Pope Eugenius III in the year 1145, at the time of Saint Bernard.*¹

Anselm, poor man of Christ and unworthy bishop of Havelberg, proffers his absolute obedience in the Lord to that lord Eugenius who, as blessed pope of the holy Roman Church, compels our reverent embrace.²

When I was in Your Beatitude's presence last March, near the city of Tusculum, Your Holiness was pleased to discuss many things with me.³ Among them you told me that a certain bishop had lately come to the apostolic see as an ambassador from the emperor at Constantinople, and that he brought with him a letter written

¹ This historical note was clearly added by a later copyist to Anselm's text. For discussion of the work's title, see the introduction above and, among scholarly studies, Jay T. Lees, *Anselm of Havelberg: Deeds into Words in the Twelfth Century*, Studies in the History of Christian Thought 79 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 8. Although the title the annotator assigns indeed seems to have been Anselm's own, because he repeatedly so names his work later in the prologue, the date is inexact. Modern scholarship places composition of *Anticimenon* several years afterward, in 1149–50: see Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 85, 91, 164–65; Sebastian Sigler, *Anselm von Havelberg: Beiträge zum Lebensbild eines Politikers, Theologen und königlichen Gesandten im 12. Jahrhundert* (Aachen: Shaker, 2005), 266.

² See Ernst Werner, *Pauperes Christi: Studien zu sozial-religiösen Bewegungen im Zeitalter des Reformpapsttums* (Leipzig: Koehler and Amelang, 1956), 19. The Premonstratensians were among several twelfth-century reform groups with special attachment to self-description as *pauperes Christi*. Anselm had opened his epistolary apology for the regular canons with the same formula: Anselm, *Apologetic Letter*, in *Norbert and Early Norbertine Spirituality*, ed. and trans. Theodore J. Antry and Carol Neel (New York: Paulist Press, 2007), 38.

³ Anselm had spent much of 1149 in Eugenius's court. See again Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 164–65; Sigler, *Beiträge*, 130, 334.

in Greek characters.⁴ You also said that this bishop was deeply learned in Greek writings, that he was eloquent and confident in his speech, further that he spoke at length about the doctrine and ecclesiastical ritual of the Greeks. What he set forth accorded poorly with the teaching of the Roman Church, differing markedly from her ritual practice. The Greek bishop did violence to the authority of Scripture, twisting its meaning to fit his interpretation of sacred texts so that they seemed to support everything in which the Greeks differ from the Latins and prove incorrect those things in which the Latins differ from the Greeks. In sum the Greek bishop declared his own belief and practice entirely good because it was his own, not because it was rightly ordered. At the same time he altogether denounced our way because it was ours and not his own. As you told me, this legate 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. The envoy also disputed contentiously about the ritual surrounding the sacrifice of the altar, which the Latins celebrate with unleavened but the Greeks with leavened bread, as well as certain other matters.

I had earlier been legate in Constantinople on behalf of the great Lothar, 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.⁵ Therefore it pleased Your Holiness to direct me, after this recent encounter, to gather into one work what I had said in Constantinople and what I heard or understood others to say—that I write down a sort of *Anticimenon*, that is a book of controversies, in dialogue

⁴ The specificity with which Anselm describes the circumstances of the pope's request, especially the letter carried by the Greek legate, confirms that the historical and biographical context he establishes for his work is more than a rhetorical device. The Greek embassy to which he refers probably took place only shortly before. See Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 85.

⁵ Anselm refers to his own embassy to Constantinople some ten years before the composition of this work. See Lees, *Deeds into Words*, 42–44; Sigler, *Beiträge*, 35–39, 329.

form. You said that I should put forward for your consideration all that was said by or about those Greek people, or argued against them, so that you might consider these matters more freely in your judgment when they were better known to you. For some Latins are greatly deceived by the assertions of the Greeks when the former only listen to the topics the words of the latter address without understanding those words' exact meaning. So these Latins think they support what they do not or deny what they do not.

I have done as you commanded with that apostolic authority none should disobey. I have done so not only in devout humility but indeed for my eternal salvation. To the extent that my memory has served, I have maintained the tone of the dialogue I held with the learned and venerable archbishop of Nicomedia, Nicetas, in a public meeting in the city of Constantinople. I have made certain additions as essential to the faith and appropriate for this work.⁶ This Archbishop Nicetas was the chief of twelve *didaskaloi*, those teachers who, according to the custom of the Greek sages, direct studies of both the liberal arts and the divine scriptures.⁷ These twelve, preeminent in their learning, preside over the other Greek sages. The most difficult questions are directed to these sages and, when those questions are resolved, the answers of these men are immediately accepted and recorded without reconsideration, as established judgments.

I have set at the head of this dialogue, moreover, a book about the singularity of belief and the multiformity of life from the time

⁶ The author acknowledges that this representation of his dialogue with Nicetas has been enriched by texts available to him during the present work's subsequent composition. Sigler argues that it was probably written in Magdeburg, where such a library was available: *Beiträge*, 154.

⁷ Anselm refers to Nicetas with the Greek term here translated "sage." Throughout *Anticimenon* he includes Greek usages where he understands Latin to reflect their meaning inexactly, and also in deference to cultural difference. He thus reinforces his Latin readers' sense of how Greek intellectual and social life are constructed in a fashion they cannot assume mirrors the Western pattern.

On the role of the Greek sages, *didaskaloi*, with specific reference to Anselm's description here, see Michael Angold, *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni, 1081–1261* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 92–93. Anselm may have misunderstood the number and importance of this group of theologians.

of Abel the just until the last of the elect.⁸ I had earlier been constrained to write this by the 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.⁹

Of course Your Beatitude's judgment, eminent above all others and rich in the priceless treasury of the Sacred Scriptures, is abundantly sufficient to respond to the Greeks, just as that Lamb slain from the beginning of the world opens the seal of divine Scripture.¹⁰ Imitating the excellence of so great a teacher as you, other wise men among the Latins can indeed gather many arguments against the Greeks more decisive than mine. Nevertheless I hope that what I have written down as a dialogue in this *Anticimenon* may not be judged by those to be superfluous, since humble folk lacking the wit to reach quick conclusions might gladly read it to find out more precisely what the Greeks say. So these simple people may discover here how they too may respond. May whoever reads what I have written know that I did so not purporting to teach anyone or to vaunt what I have learned but to obey the holy mandate of your apostolic Beatitude. As I believe, not to obey would be a greater sin than obediently to write something of even little usefulness or merit. I have then done what I could, although it is less than I should have or wished to have done, and I have done what I should more laudably in my obedience than in my writing. To disobey a command is more serious a fault than obediently to write anything at all, so long as the correctness of the faith is intact. If a writer errs in ignorance, at least his humble fulfillment of obedience's command excuses his sin.¹¹

⁸ Gaston Salet (*Dialogues, Livre I: Renouveau dans l'église*, trans. Gaston Salet, Sources Chrétiennes 118 [Paris: Cerf, 1966], 40 n. 1) emphasizes the importance of the formulation of the history of the faith as proceeding from Abel until the last of the elect in patristic and liturgical traditions.

⁹ Again Anselm notes that Book 1 is a preexisting text, now added as a preamble to his dialogues with the Greek Nicetas.

¹⁰ See Rev 5:1-7.

¹¹ Anselm's depreciation of his abilities and his accomplishment in this work is conventional. In fact, he was the most experienced of all contemporary Latin ecclesiastics regarding the doctrine of the contemporary Greeks and in conversation with them—hence Eugenius's solicitation of his counsel.

Book 1

On the Unity of the Faith and the Many Forms of Life From Abel the Just to the Last of the Elect

Chapter 1

On how some are amazed at the varied forms of Christian religious life.¹²

Many people are amazed and skeptical at this, to the point of finding such variety scandalous and declaring it scandalous to others. They ask like cunning inquisitors, “Why does God’s church present so many new things? Why do so many orders arise in her? Who could count the orders of clerics? Who is not astonished at the many kinds of monks? Who is not even scandalized by the number of them, disgusted by the great variety and disagreement among the many forms of religious life? Who can, still further, fail to scorn the Christian religious life when it is subjected to so much variety, changed by so many new practices, disrupted by so many new laws and customs, tossed about year after year by novel rules and customs?” As these people say, a practice at one moment advocated for the sake of the kingdom of heaven is thereafter forbidden by the same people who instituted it or by others, again for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, or a practice now banned as sacrilege is soon declared holy and salubrious.

Whenever critics of such novelty have the opportunity, they raise questions misdirecting the hearts of the simple. These skeptics assert that religious life in all its forms is the more to be scorned the more

¹² As Salet notes, for Anselm the term *religio*, in this passage translated “religious life,” means variously regular life (that is, adherence to a religious rule such as the Rule of St. Benedict or the Rule of St. Augustine), the practice of Christian religion more generally, or—still more broadly—authentic, holy faith: *Dialogues*, 34 n. 1. Its translation below responds variously to its respective contexts.

it changes, for what could a wise man find to imitate in something so mutable and inconsistent? Surely religion reveals its loathsomeness in its variability. In our times, these same people say, we see in the church of God that folk appear who clothe themselves in strange habits on their own whim, choose for themselves a new form of life and—whether under the label of monastic profession or under the vow of canonical discipline—claim for themselves whatever they wish.¹³ These innovators develop a new way of singing the psalms, establish a new kind of self-abnegation and fasting, and serve neither like monks in the soldiery of the rule of the blessed Benedict nor like canons who lead the apostolic life under the rule of the blessed Augustine, but do everything new, as their critics say, according to their fancy. They are their own law and their own authority. They gather together whomever they can into their communities under the pretext of new religious life. Apparently they believe that they appear more religious if they hold with none of the practice or discipline of those living under an established rule and if they seem a finger's breadth more distinctive than the others.

The skeptics say these things and the like. They disturb others with their many questions, slandering religious life not overtly but in secret, insidiously. They speak as if they loved and esteemed religion in saying “would that somewhere we might find something of certitude, a place where we could rest our heads confidently, in expectation of eternal salvation!” In fact, though, they are such irksome detractors that whenever they see anyone stray from the religious life to which he has committed himself, they are immediately inflamed against all such commitment. They ascribe the misdeed of one to all, scorning and rejecting everyone persevering in the fear of

¹³ Anselm establishes monastic and canonical life as twin norms of religious commitment, so implying that such reform of regular clergy as his master Norbert promoted held importance commensurate with the long history and contemporaneous reform of monastic life. See the introduction above and, for an example of this sort of complaint targeting the followers of Norbert, Idung of Prüfening, *Cistercians and Cluniacs, The Case for Citeaux: A Dialogue between the Monks, an Argument on Four Questions*, trans. Jeremiah F. O'Sullivan et al., Cistercian Fathers 33 (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1977), esp. 86. On the conservative Benedictine attitude toward the reform movements with specific reference to Norbert and Anselm see John Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 323–34.

God and in holy profession on account of one apostate, so ignoring the gospel text: *The kingdom of heaven is like to a net cast into the sea, and gathering together of all kind of fishes, which, when it was filled, they drew out, and sitting by the shore, they chose out the good into vessels, but the bad they cast forth* (Matt 13:47-48). And the parable of the cockle: *Suffer both to grow . . . lest perhaps gathering up the cockle, you root up the wheat also together with it* (Matt 13:29-30). In truth all those issues pointed out by men who dispute in this way about religious life, slandering it on account of its variety, might serve for their reform and improvement if they truly wished to be numbered among religious people.¹⁴ As is written: *Much peace have they that love thy law, and to them there is no stumbling block* (Ps 118:165), and again, for the saints *all things work together unto good* (Rom 8:28).

Chapter 2

That the one body of the church is ruled and governed by one Holy Spirit, and manifests varied kinds of grace.

May the many such skeptics cease their amazement about variety within the church of God! May their irksome and importunate questions no longer find a place! Still more, may they—setting aside their duplicitous claim of scandal and recognizing the true way of the religious life—be misled about its variety no longer! And as for us who are truly religious, when we find others like us, may we recognize them inside, among us, rather than outside, against us! 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 multiform 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!¹⁵ For the voice of the Spouse

¹⁴ See 2 Corinthians 10: 8.

¹⁵ As the notoriety of Bernard's commentary on the Song of Songs has affirmed for modern readers, Solomon's poem was beloved of medieval spiritual authors, especially the major voices of the twelfth-century reform. The Premonstratensians shared the Cistercians' strong interest in this text. Anselm's contemporary, the Premonstratensian abbot Philip of Harvengt—also Norbert's immediate disciple—wrote one of the longest of extant Song commentaries and, as Rachel Fulton has