

Anselm of Havelberg's «Banishment» to Havelberg

Bishop Anselm of Havelberg (ca. 1095-1158) was the close advisor of three German rulers, Lothar III, Conrad III, and Frederick Barbarossa. The list of services he rendered to the empire and the church is long. A close confidant of Norbert of Xanten and a member of the Premonstratensian Order of canons regular, he assisted in the establishment of that order in Magdeburg, went with Norbert and Lothar III on Lothar's first Italian expedition against Roger of Sicily, served as Lothar's *apocrisarius* on a diplomatic mission to Constantinople, assisted Queen Richenza in governing northern Italy on Lothar's second expedition, served Conrad III as an emissary to Pope Eugenius III, served that pope and Conrad on the Wenden Crusade, helped negotiate the treaty of Constance between Frederick Barbarossa and Anacletus IV, carried out a second diplomatic mission for Frederick to Constantinople, and served pope and emperor as exarch and archbishop of Ravenna from 1155 until his death in 1158 at the siege of Milan.

Looking at this life of such dutiful and loyal service, historians have been puzzled by the fact that when Conrad III returned from the Second Crusade in 1149, Anselm was forced out of court and spent something over a year in Havelberg (summer 1149 to August 1150) only to return to the court of the same king. Why was he banished? Why did he return?

A.F. Riedel, the earliest serious biographer of Anselm, thought that perhaps the failure of the Wenden Crusade had dulled Conrad's opinion of Anselm. One might expect a bit more sympathy on Conrad's part for he had himself endured a much more serious failure on the fiasco of the Second Crusade at that same time. Riedel also guessed that the close relations Conrad established with the eastern emperor during the crusade and his suspicion of the pope and German bishops had something to do with Anselm's fall from court. As will be seen, there is some truth to this, but Riedel confessed that the reasons for the banishment remain under «ein dichter Schleier»¹⁾.

¹⁾ A.F. Riedel, «Nachrichten über den Bischof Anselm von Havelberg, Gesandten der Deutschen Kaiser Lothar und Friedrich I. am kaiserl. Hofe zu Konstantinopel, nachmalig

In his 1880 dissertation *Anselm von Havelberg*, Eugen Dombrowski also fell back on the idea that Conrad had turned on the German bishops, but in explaining the particular disgrace suffered by Anselm, he could only say, «Wann und bei welcher Gelegenheit der Bruch geschah, ist nicht zu sagen»²).

Wilhelm Bernhardt, in his detailed biography of Conrad III, placed Anselm with other churchmen like Abbot Wibald of Stablo and Chancellor Arnold of Wied who also felt Conrad's anger, and made no case for any particular reason why Anselm should have been singled out for banishment. But Bernhardt did deliver a sarcastic blow in explaining Anselm's later return to court. While in exile, Anselm wrote his friend Wibald of Stablo saying that he had found peace in «the cradle of Havelberg» which was so much better than what he found at court. Bernhardt therefore viewed his return as gross hypocrisy: «[Anselm] sein geliebtes Havelberg, wo er sich so wohl gefühlt haben wollte, verliess, um das Verderben des Hofes aufzusuchen»³).

Other historians have either continued to explain Anselm's exile in terms of Conrad's mistrust of the German bishops and friendship with the Greek Emperor Manuel I Comnenos⁴), taken the position that the cause is not known⁵), or simply mentioned a period of disgrace with no further comment⁶). And one historian, Gottfried Wentz, sided with Bernhardt's feeling that Anselm was more interested in court affairs than lowly Havelberg:

gen Erzbischof und Exarchen von Ravenna», *Leopold von Ledeburs Allgemeines Archiv für die Geschichtskunde des Preussischen Staates* 8 (1832), p. 248.

²) Eugen Dombrowski, *Anselm von Havelberg* (Königsberg, 1880), p. 39.

³) Wilhelm Bernhardt, *Konrad III., Jahrbücher der Deutschen Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1883), pp. 775-776.

⁴) Johannes Dräse, «Bischof Anselm von Havelberg und seine Gesandtschaftsreisen nach Byzanz», *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 21 (1901), pp. 168-169; Albert Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands IV* (Leipzig, 1925), p. 193, speaking of Anselm's «Bedientenübermut»; Wilhelm Berges, «Anselm von Havelberg in der Geistesgeschichte des 12. Jahrhunderts», *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands* 5 (1956), pp. 44-44; Martin Fitztum, «Anselm von Havelberg als Verteidiger der Einheit mit der Ostkirche», *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 36 (1961), p. 139.

⁵) Martin Grabmann, «Anselm von Havelberg», *Neue Deutsche Biographie I* (Berlin, 1953), p. 309; A. Bayol, «Anselme de Havelberg», *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* 3 (Paris, 1924), p. 458; Karl Pfändtner, «Ein Brief des Prämonstratenserbischofs Anselm von Havelberg», *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 7 (1931), p. 109.

⁶) Johann Braun, «Anselm von Havelberg», *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon I* (New York, 1978), p. 385; Johannes Spörl, *Grundformen hochmittelalterlicher Geschichtsanschauungen: Studien zum Weltbild der Geschichtsschreiber des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1935), p. 23.

Die Beteiligung Anselms an der Begründung des Havelberger Domkapitels 1148-1150 ist weniger einem starken Interesse an der Missionsbewegung im kolonialen deutschen Osten zuzuschreiben als vielmehr dem erwähnten Umstande, dass eine gerade damals eingetretene Veränderung in der von König Konrad verfolgten Politik eine diplomatische Verwendung des Bischofs nicht zuließ, wodurch dieser sich gezwungen sah, vorübergehend seinen entlegenen Bischofssitz aufzusuchen⁷⁾.

Recently one can see this judgment in Dietrich Claude's *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg*⁸⁾, though others have come to Anselm's defense⁹⁾. But whatever these historians have said about Anselm and what happened to him in 1149-1150, all of them have relied at best on a selective group of sources for the bishop's life during that time. A broader examination of the sources may give us some answers.

When Emperor Lothar III died in December 1137 in Tirol on the return from his second Italian expedition, Conrad of Hohenstauffen was elected king in the face of strong opposition from Henry the Proud of Bavaria. Those who had served the Saxon Lothar and wanted to continue in the service of the Hohenstauffen had to make their loyalty clear. Churchman like Abbot Wibald of Stablo and Arnold of Wied, provost of Cologne, did just that. These two were very close to Anselm¹⁰⁾, yet the bishop of Havelberg witnessed no royal charters from September 22, 1137, when he was with Lothar in Aquino some two and one half months before that ruler's death¹¹⁾, to May 28, 1139, when he was present at the royal court in Strassburg one year and three months after Conrad's election¹²⁾. In all probability Anselm stayed in Italy,

⁷⁾ Gottfried Wentz, *Das Bistum Havelberg, Germania sacra* 1.2 (Berlin, 1933), p. 35; also p. 192.

⁸⁾ Dietrich Claude, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg bis in das 12. Jahrhundert* 2 (Cologne, 1975), p. 49: «Anselm scheint allerdings nicht mit gleichen Intensität wie Wiger [bishop of Brandenburg] auf die Wiederherstellung seines Bistums hingearbeitet zu haben».

⁹⁾ Pfändtner's article (note 5 above); Kurt Fina, «Anselm von Havelberg: Untersuchungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte des 12. Jahrhunderts», *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 33 (1957), 293-294. See also Berges, «Anselm von Havelberg in der Geistesgeschichte», p. 44.

¹⁰⁾ Wibald of Stablo, *Epistolae*, ed. Philip Jaffé, *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum* 1, *Monumenta Corbeiensia* (Berlin, 1864), 150, p. 241.

¹¹⁾ *Urkunden Lothars III. und der Kaiserin Richenza*, ed. Emil von Ottenthal and Hans Hirsch (1957), 119-120, *MGH Diplomata* 8:190-202.

¹²⁾ *Die Urkunden Konrad III. und seines Sohnes Heinrich*, ed. Friedrich Hausmann (1969), 21, *MGH Diplomata* 9:35-37.

possibly at the papal curia, during this entire period¹³), but the important point to be made in this context is that Anselm did not make a rapid transition from advising one ruler to serving the next. Nor did his meeting with Conrad in Strassburg mean that he became a part of Conrad's entourage. During Lothar's last expedition to Rome, Anselm had served as advisor to Queen Richenza¹⁴), Henry the Proud's mother-in-law. She forcefully defended Henry's opposition to Conrad and, after Henry's death in October 1139, took the side of her grandson Henry the Lion. Anselm's position was therefore somewhat more complicated than Wibald's or Arnold's. Though he attended a *Reichstag* early in 1140¹⁵) and was again at court in October of that same year¹⁶), he does not appear as a witness to any more royal charters until December 1144¹⁷), and then it was because Conrad was on his way to Magdeburg, not because Anselm had gone west to meet the king.

The sources for Anselm's life during these years away from court are few, but most of them place him in the company of Archbishop Henry of Mainz. He visited Henry in Mainz in March 1143¹⁸); accompanied him to Erfurt in June¹⁹); was again with Henry in February 1144²⁰); in Erfurt in June²¹); and in Heiligenstadt in July²²). While relations between Henry of Mainz and Conrad III seem to have been fairly cordial²³), Henry was often in the camp of Henry the Lion, and in

¹³) Anselm says he saw Bernard of Clairvaux in Rome (*Epistola apologetica*, PL 188:1128B). Bernard only visited Rome from December 1137 to June 1138. See E. Vacandard, *Vie de Saint Bernard Abbé de Clairvaux* 2 (Paris, 1895), p. 21. A *privilegium* of Innocent II places Anselm in Rome in April 1139. Innocent II, *Epistolae et privilegia* 343, PL 179:451.

¹⁴) *Urkunden der Kaiserin Richenza* 1-3, *MGH Diplomata* 8:227-231.

¹⁵) *Regesten zur Geschichte der Mainzer Erzbischöfe* 1, *Von Bonifatius bis Arnold von Selehofen 742?-1160*, ed. Johann Friedrich Böhmer and Cornelius Will (Innsbruck: 1877), 21, p. 311. Anselm is not a witness to any royal charters issued at the *Reichstag*.

¹⁶) *Urkunden Konrads III.* 51, *MGH Diplomata* 9:85-87.

¹⁷) *Urkunden Konrads III.* 121-122, pp. 215-218, dated December 29 and 31, 1144.

¹⁸) *Mainzer Urkundenbuch* 2, *Die Urkunden seit dem Tode Erzbischof Adalberts I. (1137) bis zum Tode Erzbischof Konrads (1200)* 1, ed. Peter Acht (Darmstadt, 1968) 36-39, pp. 64-76.

¹⁹) *Mainzer Urkundenbuch* 2.1.40, pp. 76-78; *Notae dedicationum Montis S. Petri Erfordensis*, ed. O. Holder-Egger (1846) *MGH Scriptores* 30.1:483.

²⁰) *Mainzer Urkundenbuch* 2.1.48, pp. 93-95. No location given.

²¹) *Mainzer Urkundenbuch* 2.1.53, pp. 101-102.

²²) *Mainzer Urkundenbuch* 2.1.57, pp. 110-111.

²³) Before he went on the Second Crusade, Conrad placed his son Henry under the archbishop's care. Archbishop Henry's career was, however, a checkered one, and he ran

traveling with him Anselm was not accompanying a member of Conrad's *Hofkapelle* or *Reichskanzlei*. In short, Anselm was very far from what one could call a member of Conrad's court before 1145.

There is little documentation for Anselm's dealings with his diocese, but what does remain shows him working to further his order west of the Elbe. In 1144 Hartwich, the cathedral provost of Bremen, and his mother Richarda donated or sold lands around the town of Jerichow as well as the town itself. The town went to the archdiocese of Magdeburg, but the church and some land nearby were given as a foundation for regular canons in memory of St. Norbert²⁴). Jerichow was under Anselm's jurisdiction as bishop of Havelberg; and when the Church of Our Ladies (a Norbertine foundation since shortly after Norbert of Xanten became archbishop of Magdeburg) purchased the village of Wulkau, it turned it over to the Norbertines in nearby Jerichow. Anselm in turn gave Our Ladies two *mansos* in the village of Erxleben²⁵). The documents concerning this foundation are dated only 1144, but we may guess that the purchase of Wulkau antedates the foundation charter of Jerichow. For in the foundation charter, Wulkau is listed among the gifts of Hartwich, and it would be odd for him to sell the village after «donating» it. This is to say that there were some dealings concerning the Norbertine foundation in Jerichow before Hartwich's donation, dealings in which Anselm's hand can be seen as he concerned himself with how the brothers of his order would support themselves.

It was only with Conrad III's visit to Magdeburg to confirm Hartwich's gifts that the possibility was open for Anselm to get to know the king. Since the ruler was then engaged in negotiating the marriage of his sister-in-law, Bertha of Sulzbach, to Emperor Manuel I Comnenos, he may have asked him about his diplomatic mission to Greece in 1136. At any rate, Anselm was at court in Worms in May 1145 and was than with

into problems with Pope Eugenius III and Frederick Barbarossa, whose election he opposed. In 1153 Frederick had him removed from office. See Heinrich Büttner, «Erzbischof Heinrich von Mainz und die Staufer (1142-1153)», *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 69 (1958), 247-267.

²⁴) The foundation charter is found in Georg Winter, *Die Prämonstratenser des zwölften Jahrhunderts und Ihre Bedeutung für das nordöstliche Deutschland. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Christianisierung des Wendenlandes* (1865; reprint: Aslen, 1966), pp. 349- 352.

²⁵) *Urkundenbuch des Klosters Unser Lieber Frauen zu Magdeburg*, ed. Gustav Hertel (Halle, 1878), 15, pp. 14-15.

it fairly constantly from August of that year until early 1146²⁶). After this, however, he returned to Magdeburg and in December donated lands in the possession of Havelberg to Jerichow²⁷).

Anselm's real service to Conrad came after Bernard of Clairvaux called upon the king to join the new crusade to the Holy Land at Speyer in December 1146²⁸). It was Anselm and Wibald of Stablo whom Conrad chose to visit Pope Eugenius III in Dijon in March 1147 to explain why the king had decided to go on the crusade rather than help the pope in Italy²⁹). Successful in this, the two men returned to court³⁰) and then accompanied the Wenden Crusade against the barbarian tribes east of the Elbe while Conrad went off to fight in the Holy Land³¹).

This then is the sum total of Anselm's involvement with Conrad before their meeting after the crusade and Anselm's banishment to Havelberg. He can only be placed with the court on a fairly constant basis for five to seven months in 1145-1146 and for four more in 1146-1147. That is for less than one of the first eight years of Conrad's rule.

After the failure of the Wenden Crusade, Anselm returned to work in Magdeburg and Havelberg. Early in 1149, Conrad, lord of Meissen, asked him to go to Italy to get papal confirmation of the transfer of the cloister of Niemeck (founded by Conrad's parents and in financial distress) to the jurisdiction of Monte Sereni. Anselm accepted and made the trip, meeting with the pope in Tusculum in March 1149³²). He obtained the desired *privilegium* from Eugenius III on May 3³³). Two days earlier Conrad III landed in Aquilia, returning with his crusader army from the East.

²⁶) *Urkunden Konrads III.* 133, 135-137, 139-141, 143, 148, pp. 241-247, 249-255, 257-260, 270-272. The last of these (148) is dated April 3, 1146. Both Bernardi and Dombrowski feel this is an error and date the document respectively January 3 and March 5. Bernardi, *Konrad III.*, p. 449; Dombrowski, *Anselm von Havelberg*, p. 31.

²⁷) *Hamburgisches Urkundenbuch*, ed. Johann Martin Lappenberg (Hamburg, 1907), 180, pp. 169-170. For the dating of this document to December 1146, see Dombrowski, *Anselm von Havelberg*, pp. 31-32.

²⁸) *Urkunden Konrads III.* 164-165, *MGH Diplomata* 9:295-300; *Sancta Bernardi vita* 6.5.19, *PL* 185:384.

²⁹) Peter Acht, «Die Gesandtschaft König Konrads III. an Papst Eugen III. in Dijon», *Historisches Jahrbuch* 74 (1955), 668-673.

³⁰) *Urkunden Konrads III.* 189, *MGH Diplomata* 9:342-345.

³¹) *Annales Magdeburgenses*, ed. Georg H. Pertz (1859), *MGH Scriptores* 16:188; *Annales Palidenses*, ed. Pertz (1895), *MGH Scriptores* 16:82; *Chronicon Montis Sereni*, ed. Ernst Ehrenfeuchter (1874), *MGH Scriptores* 23:147.

³²) Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi*, prologus, *PL* 188:1139B.

³³) Eugenius III, *Epistolae et privilegia* 348, *PL* 180:1390-1391.

Conrad had fought long and hard if not always wisely in the Holy Land in alliance with the army of Louis VII of France. He had fulfilled his crusader's vow to visit Jerusalem, but then had suffered the ignominy of having to beat a hasty retreat from the walls of Damascus as the alliance withered in charge and counter-charge of treachery and deceit. If he could claim to have won anything, it was the friendship of Manuel I Comnenos. For soon after arriving in Asia Minor, Conrad had fallen ill and returned to Constantinople to convalesce under the caring eyes of the Byzantine emperor himself. Then, after Conrad's defeat at Damascus, Manuel drew him into an alliance against their mutual enemy Roger of Sicily³⁴).

Roger had taken advantage of the crusade to move his own army across the Adriatic to plunder Greece. Manuel would have liked nothing better than to see Conrad attack the Norman kingdom, and Conrad himself had little sympathy for Roger and his support of Welf pretensions in Germany. The German king had in fact thrown caution to the wind in going on the crusade by removing royal impediments to the growth of both Norman and Welf power³⁵). Moreover, Pope Eugenius had originally been unsympathetic to Conrad's desire to go on the crusade, hoping that the German ruler would do as his predecessor and help the papacy in its struggles against Roger and the city of Rome, where ever increasing republican sentiment had forced him on more than one occasion to flee the city. What better way for the German ruler to snatch victory from disaster than to move his army into Italy in the service of the pope? Conrad's hopes must have been high as he allied himself with Manuel in the Treaty of Thessalonica as well as with Louis of France and set out with the idea of attacking Roger.

What seems to have escaped Conrad is that the West would not go into a state of suspended animation while he was in the East. While he was being wooed by the Byzantines, Eugenius was facing increasing difficulties in establishing himself in Rome. The impassioned Arnold of Brescia had seized the popular mood and was proclaiming the college of cardinals a den of thieves and the pope a greedy oppressor of the

³⁴) Virginia G. Berry, «The Second Crusade», *A History of the Crusades*, ed. Kenneth M. Setton, 1 (Madison, 1969), pp. 498-499.

³⁵) In his *Roger II. (1101-1154) und die Gründung der Normannisch-Sicilischen Monarchie* (1904; reprint: Darmstadt, 1968), p. 375, Erich Caspar comments, «Die Teilnahme Konrads am Zweiten Kreuzzug war die grösste Torheit seiner wenig glücklichen Regierung».

innocent³⁶). The city of St. Peter was, in short, rapidly becoming an heretical stronghold. In March, Eugenius moved from Viterbo to Tusculum and raised money and arms to take Rome by force.

Conrad arrived in Italy on the first of May³⁷), and Eugenius sent several cardinals to greet him in Aquilia. The cardinals were, however, too late and found that Conrad had already left for Germany. It was not until June 24, that Eugenius wrote the German ruler to welcome him home. In this letter, the pope expresses his sympathy for Conrad's failed crusading effort and mentions the cardinals he had sent to greet him in Italy «as we related through our venerable brothers Archbishop Hartwich of Bremen and Bishop Anselm of Havelberg»³⁸). This would indicate that sometime between the failure of the cardinals to find Conrad and June 24, Anselm and Hartwich (who was at the papal court to receive the archbishop's pallium) were sent off to explain things to the king.

And what did they have to explain? At the very least, Hartwich had to justify his acceptance of the archbishop's pallium without royal approval. But there is every indication that there were far more serious matters to explain to the king. In relating the pope's actions after he had moved from Viterbo to Tusculum, John of Salisbury says, «Mustering his forces, he ordered an attack on Rome... Auxiliaries were received from the lands of the king of Sicily, but the fighting was unsuccessful³⁹). In his desperation to deal decisively with Rome, Eugenius had turned for help to his former and Conrad's present enemy, Roger of Sicily, the very man Conrad was on his way to fight. This was a turn-about bound to baffle and infuriate the German ruler.

When exactly Eugenius made his overtures to Roger and attacked Rome is difficult to say. As has been mentioned, John of Salisbury says the pope was in Tusculum when he assembled the army. Eugenius moved to Tusculum no earlier than March 25, 1149⁴⁰). He remained there until

³⁶) John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, trans. Marjorie Chibnall (London, 1956), 31, pp. 64-65.

³⁷) Wilhelm von Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit* 4 (Leipzig, 1877), pp. 294-295, 483.

³⁸) Eugenius III, *Epistolae et privilegia* 354, PL 180:1383-1394. Fina («Anselm von Havelberg», p. 213) is wrong in saying that Anselm and Hartwich delivered this letter. The pope refers in the letter to a man named Guido as the one who took it to Conrad.

³⁹) John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis* 27, p. 60.

⁴⁰) Jaffé-Löwenfeld, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* 2, 2nd ed. (1888; reprint: Graz, 1956), 9330-9331, p. 62.

November when, under a nominal truce with the republican government, he moved back into Rome⁴¹). This gives a time frame of April–November 1149 for the attack. Both John of Salisbury and the *Annales Cassinensis* mention the attack on Rome before mentioning the visit of Louis VII to Roger of Sicily on the French king's return from the crusade at the end of July; and John says that Louis was taken by the Normans to the border of the papal lands to meet the pope, showing at least some good relations between the pope and the Sicilian ruler⁴²). Moreover, Conrad came back with full intentions of attacking Roger of Sicily. He made, however, not the slightest gesture in that direction but immediately turned north for Germany. Now this is understandable. Welf of Bavaria had raised the standard of rebellion and this demanded Conrad's immediate attention⁴³). What is striking is that he made no effort to explain his actions to the pope or even to report on the crusade and the possibility of a joint Greco-German venture in southern Italy. It was Eugenius who was left in the position of having to explain something, and the something that would certainly have turned Conrad away in disgust would have been a papal-Norman alliance.

The probability that this is in fact what happened is strengthened by a letter which Wibald of Stablo wrote to Anselm after the bishop had returned to Havelberg in disgrace. Telling Anselm that he has little hope of reingratiating himself at court, Wibald says, «Your very fault, if indeed it is a fault, is also shared with you by us and certain bishops»⁴⁴). That is to say that Anselm's offense was not a personal one but one shared by other German bishops. Wibald, as Conrad's advisor and an abbot of strong religious conviction and sympathy for the difficulties of Pope Eugenius' dilemma, was in a very difficult position. He could hardly support an attack on Roger of Sicily when Roger was an ally of the pope. At the same time he had to work to avoid an alliance between Conrad and the Roman commune which was working hard to get the king as an ally against the pontiff. All this strained his relations with Conrad, though he could well ask if what he was doing was «indeed a

⁴¹) *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* 9359, p. 64.

⁴²) John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis* 27, p. 60; *Annales Cassinenses*, ed. Georg Pertz (1864), *MGH Scriptores* 19:310.

⁴³) Welf, who had gone with Conrad on the crusade, returned early and visited Roger on his way home. Caspar, *Roger II.*, pp. 397–398.

⁴⁴) Wibald, ep. 211, p. 330: «Vestra siquidem culpa, si tamen culpa est, nobis quoque vobiscum et quibusdam episcopis communis est».

fault» as he saw himself working in Conrad's best interest whether the king realized it or not⁴⁵).

Anselm's position was far worse than Wibald's. As far as can be seen, he provided the only communication between king and pope for almost two months after Conrad's return from the East, and apparently he was not sent with a written message but was left to explain this very messy situation as best he could. Along with the fact that Anselm witnessed no charters for Conrad for over a year after the ruler's return, a further indication that his banishment was linked with his arrival at court as the messenger of the pope is the fact that the letter Wibald wrote Anselm concerning his and other bishop's «fault» was in response to one Anselm had sent Chancellor Arnold of Wied asking about the possibilities of receiving the king's forgiveness. Arnold had passed it on to Wibald⁴⁶). That Anselm chose to write Arnold instead of Wibald, with whom he had had far more contact, suggests that the chancellor was more involved with Anselm's banishment than was the abbot, that is that he was present when Anselm was sent from court and Wibald was not, which would have been the case when Conrad returned. Also, since Arnold had accompanied Conrad on the crusade, Anselm may have written him because he stood outside the churchmen whom Conrad suspected of supporting the pope's policies while he was away. In this context, it should be noted that historians tend to lump Arnold and Wibald together as receiving the disapprobation of Conrad and reflecting the ruler's general distrust of the German episcopacy. While Wibald's influence at court waxed hot and cold and was very much tied to his political views, Conrad's anger — or perhaps better said, frustration — with Arnold was the result of the chancellor's withdrawal from court after the crusade to Cologne where he was the provost and his refusal to abandon this beleaguered episcopate in spite of constant requests from the king⁴⁷). It was the churchman who had stayed to attend to affairs at home while the king was away who lost his trust, and Anselm became the scapegoat.

Anselm gives a good idea of what his reception by the king was like in

⁴⁵) Friedrich Hausmann, *Reichskanzlei und Hofkapelle unter Heinrich V. und Konrad III.*, *Schriften der MGH* 14 (Stuttgart, 1956), pp. 210-216.

⁴⁶) Wibald, ep. 211, p. 330: «Legimus litteras, quas pro excusatione vestra de offensa domini nostri regis nostro communi amico miteratis». That this friend is Arnold is clear from Anselm's references to him in ep. 221, pp. 39, 41.

⁴⁷) Archbishop Arnold I had been suspended from office by the pope, and Cologne was in serious need of ecclesiastical leadership. See Hausmann, *Reichskanzlei*, pp. 107-113.

another letter written directly to Wibald. Comparing his present life in Havelberg and his reception at court to Christ in the cradle and Christ before Pilate, he says:

There, that is lying in the cradle, the angels sing praise. There, standing before the prince, the Jews cry, «Crucify Him! Crucify Him!» ... Believe me, dearest brother, it is better and safer to lie with Christ in the cradle and to bewail the misery of the human condition, with the new star shining above, the angels singing the *Gloria*, and the kings offering their various gifts, than to stand in the palace with mocking soldiers, whipping, spitting, and beating one down with insults, and fashioning a crown of thorns. Thorns! Yes, thorns! Withered thorns! Slanderous barbs! The sun of divine contemplation darkens; the foundation of the body trembles, the rock of the faith splits, the veil of the temple is rent. Believe me, dearest brother, it is safer in the cradle than in the palace. Consolation in the one, terrors in the other. Enough of this⁴⁸⁾.

Understood in the context of Anselm trying to explain the turn about in Eugenius's policy, this passage makes clear both Conrad's anger and that Anselm, unfortunately having been in the wrong place at the wrong time, caught the brunt of the ruler's wrath.

It is, however, the sentence which leads into Anselm's comparison of life in the cradle and at court which has caught the attention of Anselm's detractors. «We've played around long enough,» he says, «for the rest let serious matters receive our attention»⁴⁹⁾. A number of nineteenth-century historians who dealt with this passage saw at least a hint of humor in it⁵⁰⁾. Others, as mentioned at the beginning of this article, have pointed to this passage as indicative of an insincere determination on Anselm's part to turn his back on life at court. And Anselm does say:

⁴⁸⁾ Wibald, ep. 221, pp. 340-341: «Ibi, id est in presepio iacenti, angeli laudantes concinuerunt; ibi, id est in pretorio ante principes stanti, acclamaverunt Iudaei: 'Crucifigatur, crucifigatur'. ... Crede mihi, frater karissime, melius et tutius est cum Christo iacere in presepio et vagire miseras humanae conditionis, stella nova desuper lucescente, angelis gloriam concinentibus, regibus diversa munerum exenia offerentibus, quam stare in pretorio, irradientibus militibus, flagellantibus, conspuentibus, alapis verborum caedentibus, coronam spineam, spineam, vere spineam, vere aridam, vere suco vitae aeternae carentem, vere spineam, pungitivam, aculeos detractationis post laudes habentem, plectentibus, sole contemplationis divinae obscurato, terra corporis tremiscente, petra fidei scissa, velo templi diviso. Crede mihi, frater karissime, tutius est in presepio quam in pretorio. Ibi consolationes hic terrores. Sufficit».

⁴⁹⁾ Wibald, ep. 221, p. 340: «Satis lusimus; de reliquo seria res agatur».

⁵⁰⁾ Pfändtner, «Ein Brief», pp. 97-98.

I have withdrawn again into the depths of my heart, nor for my own part have I sought to overflow my course as if I would gather mud like a torrent and throw myself into it, and as I have often experienced, sink into filthy confusion⁵¹).

And:

I remain a poor man in Christ with my brother poor men in Christ in my cradle of Havelberg⁵²).

Is Anselm joking here? Or is this indicative of self-imposed austerity against which his later return to court can be termed hypocrisy?

While Karl Pfändtner has tried to dispel the notion that there is anything humorous behind Anselm's «Satis lusimus...»⁵³), one may note in Anselm's words a vague echo of Horace:

Lusisti satis, edisti satis atque bibisti; tempus abire tibi est, ne potum largius aequo rideat et pulset lasciva decentius aetas⁵⁴).

But it is difficult to believe that Anselm was trying to amuse Wibald. If there is any humor here, it is the kind which comes with frustration and resignation.

What Anselm had lost was not just the opportunity to travel with the royal court but the king's favor entirely. While these could obviously go hand in hand, they are not exactly the same thing, and the suggestion can be made that it was the loss of the latter, the king's favor, which upset Anselm most. In the first place, Anselm had spent very little time actually traveling with the king before the crusade. When he did begin to play some role at court, his time was nevertheless very much shared with his diocese. Also Anselm stood highest in Conrad's favor after the delegation to Dijon on which he helped to win the pope's support for the crusade. It is difficult to believe that, had he wished it, he could not have accompanied his king to the East. His services in that direction would not have been without value as he had already been to Constantinople

⁵¹) Wibald, ep. 221, p. 340: «Ego quidem iterum iam in alveum cordis mei regressus sum, nec sponte mea de cetero adeo supereffluere disposui, ut ad instar torrentis lutum colligam, quo innovar, et cenulentam turbationem, quam sepe passus sum, iterum paciar».

⁵²) Wibald, ep. 221, p. 340: «In presepio meo Havelberch pauper Christi cum fratribus meis pauperibus Christi maneo».

⁵³) Pfändtner, «Ein Brief».

⁵⁴) Horace, ep. 2.2.214-216. Anselm does borrow a line from Horace, ep. 1.1, in a later letter to Peter the Venerable. *Recueil des chartes de l'Abbaye de Cluny*, ed. Auguste Bernard and Alexandre Bruel, 5 (Paris, 1894), 4176, p. 527.

and apparently made a good impression on the Greeks. The fact that he went instead with the Saxon army to fight the Wends is some indication that he felt that affairs east of the Elbe were just as important to him as staying close to the king.

If Anselm desired the king's favor it was not because he sought the pleasures of court life. His hopes of a papacy and an empire working hand in hand were the same as Wibald's. He, like Wibald and as his life of service to popes and rulers demonstrates, was one of those who, since the Concordat of Worms, had not so much taken one side against the other but had acted on the conviction that such a choice was destructive to the unity of Christendom⁵⁵). A king who had turned his back on the pope must have horrified Anselm, and yet he found himself powerless to do anything. In his letter to Wibald, he by no means abandons his concern for the king. «Diligently guard my and your august and most humbled lord [Conrad] whenever you are near him», he tells his friend, «and because God has made you humble and wise, do what is in your power and ability to accomplish as much as is permitted you»⁵⁶). There was little more he could do, and it was not until August of 1150 that he was again at court⁵⁷). The reason for this probably rests with Wibald who recaptured the king's trust and steered him back toward the papacy⁵⁸). For by July 1150, Conrad was responding to Eugenius' pleas for help in Italy⁵⁹), and Anselm's reappearance at court followed shortly thereafter. But saying that, in Bernardi's phrase, Anselm abandoned Havelberg to return to «das Verderben des Hofes» is to misread the sources entirely. The fact of the matter is that Anselm never again became a regular member of Conrad's court after the Second Crusade. It was not until December 3, that he again met the king, and then it was to receive a royal grant of protection for the church in Havelberg. In this *privilegium*, Conrad shows no animosity toward Anselm but describes him as «both devoted to the ascetic life and steadfast and true in his

⁵⁵) See Peter Classen, *Gerhoch von Reichersberg* (Wiesbaden, 1960), p. 150; Hausmann, *Reichskanzlei*, p. 220.

⁵⁶) Wibald, ep. 221, p. 341: «Dominum meum ac tuum augustum humillimum, dum circa ipsum es, diligenter custodi; et quia Deus fidelem te et sapientem fecit, fac quod potes et scis, quantum tibi permittitur».

⁵⁷) *Urkunden Konrads III.* 237, *MGH Diplomata* 9:415-416, given at Rothenburg on the Tauber.

⁵⁸) Hausmann, *Reichskanzlei*, pp. 216-217.

⁵⁹) Eugenius III, *Epistolae et privilegia* 395, *PL* 180:1422; *Urkunden Konrads III.* 236, *MGH Diplomata* 9:414-415.

loyalty to us and our kingdom⁶⁰). While this can be ascribed to the rhetoric of a formal document, it is just possible that this is a sincere feeling. For this is the only charter issued by Conrad to which the date is given not only in the traditional manner but also as «Anno II postquam reversus est [Conrad] a civitate sancta Iherusalem» — a possible indication that the memories of the disasters of the crusade and its sequel had been set aside as the king reconciled himself with the church and its servants such as Anselm. More importantly, this document shows that Anselm's dealings with the king concerned Havelberg and he treated with the king as bishop of that town, not as a royal advisor. As far as the evidence shows, he did not return to court for almost a year after this but rather worked to strengthen his diocese by gaining the support of Albrecht the Bear, margrave of Brandenburg, for building a church in Havelberg⁶¹). It was not until November 1151 that he was again at Conrad's court in Altenburg to witness a grant of protection for the Premonstratensian cloister of Gratia Dei⁶²). This was apparently the last time he saw the king who died in February of the following year.

In a life of unselfish service such as Anselm's, it is unfortunate that the incident of his banishment to Havelberg has cast a shadow on his character. Circumstances forced him and virtually him alone to explain and defend a major turn in papal policy to the king that shift in policy was bound to offend. Anselm was the messenger with bad tidings who got the blame and became the scapegoat. There is nothing in the evidence that permits us to assume that he saw service in Havelberg as onerous or that he sought the king's favor to escape it. Throughout Conrad's reign, Anselm of Havelberg juggled devotion to his diocese with service to the high powers of pope and ruler. This is no less than can be seen in the lives of a Bernard of Clairvaux or a Norbert of Xanten.

311 Himes Hall

Jay. T. LEES

Department of History

Louisiana State University

Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

U.S.A.

⁶⁰) *Urkunden Konrads III.* 241, *MGH Diplomata* 9:420: «Eum et in religione diu devotum et in nostra ac regni fidelitate firmum et stabilem experti sumus».

⁶¹) *Regesten der Markgrafen von Brandenburg aus Askanischem Hause*, ed. Hermann Krabbe and Georg Winter (Berlin, 1955), 190, p. 37.

⁶²) *Urkunden Konrads III.* 265, *MGH Diplomata* 9:458-460.