

## Confronting the Otherness of the Greeks: Anselm of Havelberg and the Division between Greeks and Latins \*)

In 1136, the German Emperor Lothar III formed a military alliance with the Eastern Empire of John II Comnenus. As part of the negotiations, Lothar sent a delegation to Constantinople. Among its members, quite probably its leader, was Anselm the bishop of Havelberg. In the East, Anselm's discussions with the Greeks branched out beyond military affairs to the problems dividing the Church into Greek and Latin parts. In effect, the bishop of Havelberg confronted the otherness in beliefs and rituals of a people who nevertheless called themselves Christians. It is Anselm's confrontation with this otherness and his attempt to overcome it in order to affirm the one faith of all Christians that I would like to address.

### a. *The context and format of Anselm's written account of his debates with the Greeks*

Anselm was born around 1100 and led an incredibly active life. He was a disciple of Archbishop Norbert of Magdeburg, who founded the Praemonstratensian Order of regular canons. Norbert chose Anselm to be the bishop in exile of Havelberg, a tiny town on the pagan held side of the Elbe River. Unable to get to Havelberg, Anselm served at the courts of three German rulers: Lothar III, Conrad III, and Frederick Barbarossa. He acted as the papal legate of Pope Eugenius III on the Wenden Crusade directed against the pagans who held Havelberg, negotiated the treaty of Constance between Frederick Barbarossa and Eugenius III, and ended his career as archbishop of Ravenna. He died in 1158 at Barbarossa's siege of Milan <sup>1)</sup>.

\*) This article is a revised version of a paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Medieval Academy of America meeting, March 21, 1992, in Columbus, Ohio.

<sup>1)</sup> The most complete biography of Anselm remains Eugen Dombrowski, *Anselm von Havelberg* (Königsberg, 1880). See also Johann W. Braun, "Anselm von Havelberg", *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters, Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd ed., 1 (New York, 1978), 384-391; Kurt Fina, "Anselm von Havelberg: Untersuchungen zur Kirchen- und



Anselm produced several written works. These include the *Epistola apologetica*, which gives a defense of the life of the regular canons. His major work is the *Antikeimenon* or *Book of Antitheses*, often called the *Dialogi* <sup>2</sup>). Written around 1150, this work includes a history of the Church from Abel to the last of the elect. Here Anselm defends a variety of religious life in the one faith by demonstrating that variety to be a constant and revitalizing element of the church as it moves through history. The other part of the *Antikeimenon* is Anselm's account of two debates that he had held with the Greek Archbishop Nicetas of Nicomedia. These debates had taken place on Anselm's trip to Constantinople for Lothar III some fourteen years earlier in 1136. It is on the written version of these debates that I will focus my attention.

Briefly, the format and content of the debates are as follows: Anselm gives both a letter to the entire *Antikeimenon* and a proemium to the first debate in which he says he is writing at the request of Pope Eugenius III and of certain brothers. Eugenius had requested of Anselm a kind of handbook showing how Greek attacks on Latin ritual and theology might be combated; the brothers were interested in knowing why the one faith was divided into two camps, East and West <sup>3</sup>). Anselm then gives a brief description of his opponent Nicetas and of the setting in which the debates took place <sup>4</sup>). The debates themselves are given in the form of a dialogue like the script of a play. This conveys the

Geistesgeschichte des 12. Jahrhunderts", *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 32 (1956), 69-101, 193-227; 33 (1957), 5-39, 268-301; 34 (1958), 13-41. Specifically on Anselm and the Greeks: Johannes Dräseke, "Bischof Anselm von Havelberg und seine Gesandtschaftsreisen nach Byzanz", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 21 (1901), 160-185; Georg Schreiber, "Anselm von Havelberg und die Ostkirche: Begegnung mit der byzantinischen Welt. Morgenländisches und abendländisches Zönobium", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 60 (1941), 354-411; Johannes Beumer, "Ein Religionsgespräch aus dem zwölften Jahrhundert", *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 78 (1951), 465-482; Martin Fitzthum, "Anselm von Havelberg als Verteidiger der Einheit mit der Ostkirche", *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 36 (1961), 137-141; Gillian Evans, "Anselm of Canterbury and Anselm of Havelberg: The Controversy with the Greeks", *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 53 (1977), 158-175; idem, "Unity and Diversity: Anselm of Havelberg as Ecumenist", *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 57 (1991), 42-52; Theodore N. Russell, "Anselm of Havelberg and the Union of the Churches", *Kleronomia* 10 (1978), 85-120.

<sup>2</sup>) *Epistola apologetica*, Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 188: 1117-1140. *Antikeimenon*, Migne, PL 188: 1139-1248. All page references to the *Antikeimenon* and the *Epistola apologetica* are to PL 188.

<sup>3</sup>) The introductory letter is at PL 188: 1139-1142; the proemium to the debates at PL 188: 1159-1162.

<sup>4</sup>) *Antikeimenon* proemium and 2.1, 1162-1163.



impression of an attempt on Anselm's part to recount as accurately as possible what was actually said in Constantinople in 1136. The first debate, comprising Book One of the *Antikeimenon*, deals exclusively with the problem of the *Filioque*: Does the Holy Spirit proceed from the Father alone as the Greeks believed? Or does the Spirit proceed from Father and Son as the Latins would have it? The second debate, Book Three of the *Antikeimenon*, is ostensibly concerned with differences in ritual practice. The debaters discuss whether leavened or unleavened bread should be used in the eucharist; whether water should be mixed with the wine before or after the latter's consecration, and whether the Greeks practice a form of rebaptism. Looming over these issues, however, emerges the further problem of papal primacy: Does the Roman pope have the authority to decide these issues? Both debates result in a mutual desire on the part of the debaters for a general church council to continue the discussion.

b. *Recent contributions to understanding the written account of the debates*

Three historians have recently contributed significantly to a reevaluation of Anselm's account of the debates: Hermann Josef Sieben, Karl Morrison, and Caroline Walker Bynum. Sieben has addressed the issue of the historicity of Anselm's account. Until Sieben, historians often questioned how good Anselm's memory of these events could have been fourteen years later, and they tried to determine whether Anselm had notes of the 1136 debates. While certain doubts were expressed about accepting the debates at face value as historical reporting, there were no doubts that there had been actual debates and that Anselm was in some way writing about those debates. The question was one of the degree to which the historical event and the written account are connected rather than the further and important question of whether this is a work of historical reporting at all. Sieben asked this question and answered in the negative. He demonstrated that Anselm has — without attribution — borrowed from Abelard, St. Augustine, Boethius, the *Historia tripartita*, the *Liber pontificalis*, the *Praefatio Nicaeni concilii* from Pseudo-Isidore, and the *Congratulamur vehementer* of Pope Leo IX for the words of both debaters <sup>5</sup>). To this list I

<sup>5</sup>) Hermann-Josef Sieben, *Die Konzilsidee des lateinischen Mittelalters (847-1378)*, Konziliengeschichte: Reihe B, Untersuchungen (Paderborn, 1984), 153-187.



can add that Anselm has borrowed from himself by adopting a passage from the *Epistola apologetica* into the debates. The fact that this passage has ended up in the mouth of Nicetas <sup>6)</sup> only underscores Sieben's conclusion that the debates are a fiction even if based on a historical event.

While Sieben has pointed out one direction for interpreting the debates by using them to study Anselm's ideas about conciliarism, Karl Morrison has gone much further in dealing with their literary nature. Morrison has used them to show how Anselm wrestles with the hermeneutic predicament of understanding texts and communicating that understanding to others. He warns against the view that Anselm was a champion of either papal primacy or the logical strength of Latin positions on theology and ritual. Rather Anselm shows, says Morrison, that logic leads into dilemmas from which he and Nicetas cannot escape. In the end, Anselm is the champion not of the Latins but of charity <sup>7)</sup>.

While Caroline Walker Bynum has dealt with Anselm only in passing, she has nevertheless provided the context for their reevaluation by pointing out the importance to regular canons of teaching with word and deed. Certainly, this was vitally important for those followers of Norbert of Xanten who served their mentor on the Saxon frontier when Norbert became archbishop of Magdeburg. Anselm is a prime example of this, chosen by Norbert as bishop of Havelberg and serving with Norbert at the court of Lothar III. Anselm's own portrait of Norbert as a man who "multas congregationes instituit, et eas ad perfectionem apostolicae vitae verbo et exemplo informavit" <sup>8)</sup> comes close to Bynum's description of the spirituality of regular canons in terms of "the quality of [the canons] awareness, their sense of responsibility for

<sup>6)</sup> Cf. *Epistola apologetica*, 1119BC: "Quantum vero malum sit, quamvis sacram Scripturam suo sensui emancipare, et non potius divinae Scripturae suum sensum adaptare, nulli incognitum esse debet qui sacris lectionibus vacare consuevit" with *Antikeimenon* 2.14, 1183D-1184A: "Quantum malum sit, intellectum Scripturae, quae divina meruit appellari, ad proprium sensum quasi violenta expositione distorquere, ac non potius proprium sensum omnino divinae Scripturae humiliter mancipare et accommodare, nulli debet esse incognitum qui sacris lectionibus vacare consuevit, et ideo bene monuisti".

<sup>7)</sup> Karl F. Morrison, "Anselm of Havelberg: Play and the Dilemma of Historical Progress", in *Religion, Culture and Society in the Early Middle Ages: Studies in Honor of Richard E. Sullivan*, ed. Thomas F. X. Noble and John J. Contreni, *Studies in Medieval Culture* 23 (Kalamazoo, 1987), 219-256.

<sup>8)</sup> *Antikeimenon* 1.10, 1155A.



the edification of their fellow men" <sup>9</sup>). That definition is, I would suggest, vital for understanding the canon Anselm of Havelberg's literary debates with the Greeks.

To that definition I would add the concept of the other and the alienation of the individual from that which he or she is not. The ultimate Other — God — is separated from the individual by this barrier of alienation which needs to be overcome. There is also the otherness of the world round about, the otherness of one's fellows in that world. The otherness of the world may be viewed as something to reject in the sense that the more one alienates oneself from that world, the more one overcomes the alienation between the self and God. In this view, the individual stands between the poles of divine and worldly otherness. Moving toward the Divine will necessarily mean moving away from the worldly. Bynum's definition of canonical spirituality, however, presents another approach to solving this dilemma, namely that one may reconcile the self with the otherness of God by taking up the task of reconciling the self with one's fellows and of reconciling those fellows with each other.

### c. *Anselm and the reader of the debates*

Anselm's debates would, at first glance, seem to contradict the notion of the canon reconciling the otherness of the world with the otherness of God. Anselm calls his book a book of antitheses. He gives the impression that he will demonstrate to a Latin audience why the positions of the Latins are correct and those of the Greeks wrong. And by doing this in the form of a dialogue between a Latin and a Greek, he gives the impression as well that, at least in the mind of the reader, a Greek is going to be embarrassed by a Latin. The first image that is communicated to the reader is one of combat, not diplomacy. Anselm says that Pope Eugenius made his request for the *Antikeimenon* because a Greek had visited the papal court and disparaged Latin practice and theology <sup>10</sup>). The sense is that the *Antikeimenon* is to be used as a tool of war to turn the tide against the Greeks. Anselm is quite careful about

<sup>9</sup>) Caroline Walker Bynum, "The Spirituality of Regular Canons in the Twelfth Century", in *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1982), 22-58, here quoting from p. 58. Also Bynum, *Docere verbo et exemplo: An Aspect of Twelfth-Century Spirituality*, Harvard Theological Studies 31 (Missoula, 1979).

<sup>10</sup>) *Antikeimenon*, prologus, 1139-1140.



putting this idea of combat into the mind of the reader in the way he sets the stage for the debates. He tells his brothers in the prologue to the first debate:

Since among [the Greeks], Archbishop [Nicetas] was noble in his devout bearing, sharpest in his ability, most learned in the study of Greek letters, most eloquent in speech, and most cautious in giving and receiving answers, he neglected none of these things whether in a disputation or in a quiet deliberation which seemed capable of being turned to the advantage of his opinion and the destruction of ours; and this was especially the case since among the twelve elect *didascalos*, who by custom preside over the schools of the Greeks, he was, at the time, their leader. And from them all, in our disputation he was elected for the task of serving against me <sup>11</sup>).

It would appear that a David is going to meet a Goliath, and that the Latin reader can sit back and enjoy the former's victory. But if Anselm is concerned to teach by example, we should be struck by the image he is projecting here. The image is that of alienation, of lines dividing the faithful, of otherness. Nicetas is learned and devout, but he is also the enemy preparing for a disputation in which he wants to destroy the opposition, namely Anselm. And the tacit hint is that what we will witness is little Anselm turning the tables on big Nicetas.

However, as we shall see, this is not what Anselm does, nor does Nicetas take an approach of destructive aggression. Anselm the writer has heightened a certain expectation in the reader and then he does not deliver. We may well ask to what end Anselm is manipulating the reader. What example does he want us to see in these debates? Why, if Nicetas is not going to be destroyed by the force of Anselm's arguments, does Anselm use the format of a debate at all? Here we must draw back from the literary construct and try to see it not as audience but as author.

First of all, the author has identified his audience in the most general terms: those wondering why there is an East-West division in the one faith. Both Latins and Greeks believe in Christ. In this there is unity.

<sup>11</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 2, proemium, 1162CD: "Praedictus namque archiepiscopus cum esset magnus apud illos religionis typo, et acerrimus ingenio, et eruditissimus Graecarum litterarum studio, et facundissimus eloquio, et cautissimus in dando et accipiendo responso, nihil eorum in disputatione seu collatione tacendo neglexit, quae viderentur posse spectare ad suae sententiae firmitatem, vel ad nostrae sententiae destructionem; praesertim cum ipse inter duodecim electos didascalos, qui studiis Graecorum ex more solent praesse, tunc temporis fuerit praecipuus, et ab universis in officium nostrae disputationis adversum me electus".



But the supposed lack of otherness is belied by divisions among Greeks and Latins. They agree neither on the nature of the God they worship (the *Filioque*) nor on how that God is to be worshipped (sacramental ritual). How can the otherness of Christ, the font of love, possibly be approached by Christians, Greeks and Latins, who show only antagonism toward each other?

For Anselm, the answer is to address the alienation between Christians. The erasure of the line between the individual and the otherness of Christ is to be effected by dealing with the line between believers, precisely what Bynum has pointed to as the defining feature of canonical spirituality. It is in dealing with the alienation between Christians that the Holy, the Divine Other, is reached. The debates are therefore not about showing the Latins to be right, the Greeks wrong. They are about the problem of erasing the line of alienation. This explains the dialogue format. If Anselm saw only theology and ritual as the issues, he need not have introduced individuals in the act of discussion. In the debates, however, the author can, following the lines of canonical spirituality, present an example "in word and deed" to his audience. He chooses the format of the debate. Here we have the words. The words are projected from Anselm to Nicetas; from Nicetas to Anselm; from both to the reader. That the debater named Anselm does not crush Nicetas should warn us that the author is not presenting his audience with the example of one of the debaters as opposed to the other; the example that is projected is that of the debate itself. The author also does everything he can to convince the reader that he, the author, is not conjuring up this debate but rather that he is giving a close proximity to what was actually said in the historical debate of 1136. This is to say that the audience has the sense that it will participate in actual events. Here are the deeds. Through words, Anselm can shape his deeds into a form to be imitated by his audience, a form which will bring them closer to being at one with Christ by moderating the lines of alienation, of otherness, between Christians.

A few more words need to be said here about Anselm's audience. Before having the Latin and the Greek begin their first debate, Anselm is quite careful about heightening the sense of drama. Indeed, the whole format of the debates is theatrical, but this theatrical artifice is hidden by the sense of moving back through time to participate in an actual occurrence. In setting the stage, Anselm takes the reader back to a specific date. April 10, "si tamen bene memor sum", he says. The



place is the Pisan quarter of Constantinople. Judges are there to decide a winner; scribes attend to take down what is said; translators will handle the problem of the two languages. Guards are also in attendance to keep the crowd of onlookers quiet. The crowd mills about until it is called to silence<sup>12</sup>). This crowd deserves our attention. While all the others — scribes, translators, guards, and the judges — are never mentioned again, from time to time the crowd is written into the scripted debate, chorus-like, as it voices its approval of what it sees and hears<sup>13</sup>). Thus, if we draw back from Anselm's stage, we find two audiences. The first is this crowd, implicitly Greek. The second is the reader, implicitly Latin. But as the reader observes what the crowd observes — which is to say observes the deeds through the author's words — the line between reader and crowd becomes very obscure. Already, I would suggest, with the setting of his stage, Anselm is moving toward erasing the line of otherness. And as we shall see, the judgment the crowd passes is the same judgment Anselm would like from the reader.

d. *Anselm's presentation of himself and Nicetas*

If the audience, crowd and reader, are to become one, then the line of alienation between the Latin Anselm and the Greek Nicetas must be erased. And the opening speech of the Latin debater reveals this to be the intention of the author. He has created a dramatic tension, an expectation that forces at odds with each other are moving on a collision course, but then the first view the reader gets of the Latin debater is that of a man moving to relax this tension:

When all was ready, the seats [for the debaters] arranged facing each other, silence imposed, everyone eager and waiting, Bishop Anselm of Havelberg said: 'Reverend fathers, I did not come seeking a quarrel... I came to inquire about and understand the faith, yours and mine and above all because it pleases you'<sup>14</sup>).

It is, then, the Greeks who have come to Anselm, and here he draws them together with his readers who had come to him with their questions. If the questions are to be answered, they must be treated as inquiries posed by the faithful to the faithful. The tension is further

<sup>12</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 2.1, 1163AC.

<sup>13</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 2.1, 1164C; 2.27, 1210B; 3.22, 1248.

<sup>14</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 2.1, 1163C: "Cunctis itaque ordinatis, et sedibus e regione positis, dato silentio, omnibus ad audiendum avidis et suspensis, Anselmus Havelbergensis episcopus dixit: 'Patres reverendi, ego ad contentiones non veni... sed veni ad inquirendum et cognoscendum de fide vestra atque mea, maxime quia vobis ita placuit'".



relaxed by Nicetas' response that he appreciates Anselm's humility because in a humble discussion truth will be arrived at much sooner than "if, in our eagerness to conquer, we dispute arrogantly" <sup>15</sup>). To this Anselm responds that they should accompany each other on the path of truth by avoiding arrogant argument.

All of this good will establishes more than the ground rules for a debate. Anselm draws a circle, the circle of the one faith, "yours and mine", around the debaters, and by implication around the Greek crowd and the Latin reader as well. The alienation between them thus exists within a sense of unity. The question is whether the line of alienation, of otherness, will cut the circle of faith or whether the unity of the faith will be brought to bear on the dividing line of differing beliefs and rituals. It may be added that if this interpretation of the debates is correct, we can assume that Anselm the author, manipulating both debaters as he does, will not allow Nicetas to break the circle. To do so would end in simply blaming the Greeks for divisive problems, and Anselm's reader would learn nothing. At center stage is Anselm the debater. At issue is whether he can maintain the circle he has drawn and eliminate the divisive line by the debates' end.

Let us take a closer look at the presentation of the two debaters. I will try to avoid getting caught up in the specifics of the problems of the *Filioque*, sacramental ritual or papal primacy. My purpose here is not so much to discuss the positions the debaters hold on these issues as to show how they communicate those positions to each other.

Time and again, historians have pointed to these debates as revealing the moderation and diplomacy of Anselm of Havelberg. Perhaps historians have been so taken by the sense of good will at the beginning and end of both debates that they have failed to notice the insults and arrogance which can be found sandwiched in between. Moreover, those insults and that arrogance are to be found almost exclusively on one side: The Latin debater's. In assessing these insults, it is important to bear in mind the fact that the author of the written debates has complete control over the statements of both debaters. Thus we must be careful to distinguish between Anselm the author and Anselm the debater. The fact of the matter is that Anselm the debater hurls insults at Nicetas which militate against the notion that the Latin is motivated purely by

<sup>15</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 2.1, 1163C: "Placet quod dicis, et humilitas tua nobis placet; nam in colloquendo et humiliter conferendo citius elucescit veritas, quam si superbe et ad vincendum avidi contendamus".



Christian charity. In effect, he throws Nicetas' otherness in the Greek's face and, in doing this, demonstrates an arrogance at odds with Nicetas' praise of him. Moreover, the reader becomes acutely aware that this aggressive approach does not work. Why then does Anselm the author have his namesake behave in this way? To help in answering this question, let us consider one blatant example.

The second debate opens on the issue of using leavened or unleavened bread for the eucharist. The Greeks insist on using leaven — *fermentum*; the Latins reject this. Soon, however, the two men turn to the issue of papal primacy, with Anselm the debater insisting that matters of ritual would easily be solved if the Greeks would just pay heed to Rome. And then, in a rather lengthy passage completely overlooked by historians, things begin to get ugly as the Latin debater draws a comparison between Rome and Constantinople. The Roman church, says Anselm, is the chosen and preeminent church of God, the one that has remained firm while others have wavered in heresy. The church of Constantinople, on the other hand, is rife with heresy and schism. With no subtlety at all, Anselm identifies the evil caused by Constantinople and the churches of the East with the words *fermentum* or *fermentare*. Thus Constantinople was often exited (*fermentata*) by innumerable heresies and was polluted "by the very poisonous ferment" (*venenoso fermento*) of Arianism. His first example of an Arian is Eusebius of Nicomedia — the very place where Nicetas is archbishop — who infected Constantinople "by the same ferment" (*eodem fermento*). Of course, *fermentum* in the sense of leavened bread is precisely what is at issue in this debate, and Anselm's use of the word is no coincidence or slip of the pen. In his presentation of the East as a hot bed of heresy and without ever mentioning the kind of bread to be used in the mass, he nevertheless manages to associate heresy with *fermentum* fully twelve times. "Who", he asks, "is able to enumerate all of the heretics and all of their errors which have been in this city and fermented the holy and immaculate church of God with false teachings and attempted to tear the tunic of Christ with impious schism?". Heresies have collected in Constantinople "like bilge water", and sat there "like dirty frogs". "Indeed, from this pool of heresy the multitude of the simple became drunk as if on wormwood wine". He compares Constantinople to Babylon giving drink to the world from a poisoned cup of heresy, and here he calls Babylon "the first and great Babylon", allowing the reader to draw the conclusion that Constantinople is a second (not so



great) Babylon rather than a second Rome <sup>16</sup>). It is difficult to find much charity in Anselm the debater's portrait of the eastern capital. Anselm the debater goes on to say that the Roman church preserves the purity of the faith and is thus the mother of all churches with God as the Father. Those who wish to call themselves sons of God and the church should imitate Rome in sacramental ritual.

Anselm's defense of Roman primacy is, then, purchased at the expense of Constantinople and the Greeks. He has accentuated the strength of the West by holding it up against a colorful backdrop of Greek weakness and, indeed, heresy. Far from maintaining the circle of unity, it is Anselm the debater who, at this point, slashes away at it while building a virtual wall of alienation, of otherness, between himself and Nicetas. And it is worthy of note that Anselm the debater prefaces his defense of papal primacy and his attack on the Greeks by calling himself "the special son of the Roman Church" <sup>17</sup>). It is a phrase historians have often cited in their attempts to portray Anselm as the firm defender of papal primacy. In context, however, what it shows is a debater arrogantly drawing a line between himself and Nicetas and assuming that he is right to the point of endangering the very Christian unity he had affirmed at the beginning of the debates.

When we turn to Nicetas, the distinction between Anselm the writer and Anselm the debater comes clear. For it is Nicetas who dryly points out that the charitable nature of the debate is at risk by telling Anselm the debater:

You have said enough great and sublime things about the dignity and sublimity of the Roman church, but the things which you have added concerning that church, your restraint was able to have said more cautiously.

As he has listened to Anselm, now, he says, Anselm should listen to him. "This, surely, the charity in which we have convened

<sup>16</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 3.6, 1216AC: "Quis denique dinumerare queat omnes haereticos, et omnes eorum errores qui in hac civitate fuerunt, et sanctam et immaculatam Dei Ecclesiam falsis dogmatibus fermentaverunt, et tunicam Christi impio schismate scindere tentaverunt?... haereses... in hanc civitatem quasi in sentinam confluerunt; et hic coadunatae coenosum stagnum fecerunt, in quo quasi lutosae ranae sedentes... De hoc etiam haeresum stagno tanquam absinthio multitudo simplicium inebriata est. ... et hic fermentum malitiae et nequitiae suae miscuerunt..., et calicem mortiferum ab hac civitate, sicut prima et ingens Babylon, imperatoribus, regibus et principibus propinaverunt".

<sup>17</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 3.4, 1213BC: "... sum etenim specialis filius Romanae Ecclesiae, nec erubesco me esse servum ejus, et hoc tu bene nosti".



demands"<sup>18</sup>). Anselm the debater responds with a final uncharitable play on the word *fermentum* which only serves to underscore his arrogance rather than his love:

In pure charity, I have sincerely spoken the pure truth without any ferment of falsity. Respond whatever you wish in this same charity, and may it be with the ferment set aside <sup>19</sup>).

Setting the *fermentum* aside is, of course, exactly what Anselm the debater wants the Greeks to do in their sacramental practice. Heresy and *fermentum* have been implicitly tied together, and the Latin debater is asking for unconditional surrender.

Is this Anselm the writer's message to his brothers and readers? I think not. It is Nicetas who catches the attention here in the measured and thoughtful way he responds. He does not lash out at the Latins as Anselm the debater had at the Greeks. Rather he eloquently expresses the very human fears of the Greeks concerning the implications of a church governed by the Roman bishop alone. And this, I believe, is part of Anselm the author's message to his brothers. In Nicetas' words, Anselm the writer is able to capture the emotions, traditions, and commitments which constitute the otherness of the Greeks. In what must be counted one of the most important passages of the debates, Anselm the writer allows Nicetas to give full voice to Greek concerns about a church ruled by the pope. The Roman church, says Nicetas, has made of her position a monarchical one quite at odds with the nature of her primacy, and this has divided the eastern bishops from the western. How, he asks, can the Greeks be expected to acquiesce to the decisions of councils called by western popes that include only western bishops?

Indeed, if the Roman pontiff, sitting on the lofty throne of his glory, wishes to thunder at us and to hurl his mandates as if from

<sup>18</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 3.6, 1217C: "Satis magna et sublimia de dignitate Romanae Ecclesiae locutus es; sed ea quae de hac Ecclesia subjunxisti, parcius potuerat dixisse modestia tua... ut tu me respondentem ea aequanimitate audias, qua ego te audiui. Hoc enim postulat charitas in qua convenimus".

<sup>19</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 3.6, 1217C: "Ego in mera charitate meram veritatem sincere, et sine omni fermento falsitatis locutus sum, tu quoque in eadem charitate, utinam fermento dimisso, responde quidquid vis". In Migne, these lines come at the end of Anselm's long speech in support of the papacy. In several of the manuscripts of the *Antikeimenon* which I have been able to study, these lines are placed after Nicetas' plea to be heard (n. 18 above): Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Lat. 6488 (anno 1437) aus Freising, fol. 45r; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, 2135 (August. 11.14), saec. XVI, fol. 118v.



on high, and wished to pass judgments on — yea, rule over — us and our churches without our counsel but on his own authority alone and for his own good pleasure, what fraternity or even pater-nity is there in this? Who would ever be able to resign himself to supporting this? Truly, we would then be called — would be! — slaves of the church, not sons <sup>20</sup>).

He goes on to express concern about the fate of the Greeks' knowledge of the Scriptures, their study of letters, discipline, and noble wisdom if Rome were to rule as sole bishop and pastor. Surely, he says, Rome could use assistance with her labors in the vineyard of the Lord and would do better not to condemn her brothers.

*e. Anselm's definition of the perfect mediator between Greeks and Latins*

Later in this debate, Nicetas raises once more the issue of the papacy as the discussion turns to the hopes for a church council. It is not Anselm the debater but Nicetas who tries to define the role of a pope at such a council. This is to say that Anselm the writer gives expression to what he thinks it will take for a pope to win over those who are unwilling to follow Rome's unqualified leadership of a united Christendom. Nicetas makes what amounts to two demands: That there be a council and that the pope listen to him, that is to the Greeks, as Peter was willing to listen to and take advice from Paul. He admits that he is very much the inferior of Paul, but the Roman pope "ought not to be inferior to Peter". Anselm the writer then has his Greek describe the man needed on the chair of St. Peter:

Certainly it could happen that the Roman pontiff, having become all things to all people, a Latin to the Latins, a Greek to the Greeks, could enlighten them all, and by the humble authority of the Apostolic See, bring together the things over which we dispute, either by completely abolishing one interpretation and instituting the other as universal custom, or abolishing the scandal of both by establishing without bias that both of them be allowed <sup>21</sup>).

<sup>20</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 3.8, 1219C: "Si enim Romanus pontifex in excelso throno gloriae suae residens nobis tonare, et quasi projicere mandata sua de sublimi voluerit, et non nostro consilio, sed proprio arbitrio, pro beneplacito suo de nobis et de Ecclesiis nostris judicare, imo imperare voluerit, quae fraternitas, seu etiam quae paternitas haec esse poterit? Quis hoc unquam aequo animo sustinere queat? Tunc nempe veri servi, et non filii Ecclesiae recte dici possemus et esse".

<sup>21</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 3.19, 1241B: "Ita nimirum fieri posset quod Romanus pontifex Latinis Latinus, Graecis Graecus, omnibus omnia factus, omnes lucrifaceret, et humili



I would suggest here that Nicetas' description is one Anselm would apply to more than the pope. It is a description of the man who, through word and deed has the power to reconcile opposing sides, to overcome the otherness of the world by bringing these side together in him, the imitator of the otherness of Christ. It is a description of what Anselm wanted his brothers to become, and it is a description of what Anselm himself wanted to be: all things to all people, the man who imitates Christ the peacemaker. For Nicetas' description of the perfect pope is a reworking of a passage of Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians (9:20-23):

To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews; to those under the law I became as one under the law... that I might win those under the law... I have become all things to all men, that I might at all costs save some.

This is what Anselm the writer has tried to do in the debates, overcome otherness by becoming all things to all men... a Latin to the Latins and a Greek to the Greeks, and he has played both parts as fairly as he was able. This is his definition of the canonical life; it is his imitation of Christ, the Christ who moves the alienated world toward perfection with God, God who in the end of time, as Anselm has said in the first book of the *Antikeimenon*, "will be all things to all men" <sup>22</sup>).

f. *The final issue of the debates: rebaptism and erasing the line of alienation*

My emphasis on Anselm the debater's critique of Constantinople is somewhat unfair, for it may suggest that he demonstrates an uncharitable arrogance throughout the debates. But while this is not true, I would suggest that the real humility is to be found with Anselm the author. He portrays himself not only as teacher but as student, as one who learns from a brother in the faith, one who learns from the Greek Nicetas to face his own arrogance and ignorance. A prime example of this comes at the end of the second debate.

auctoritate apostolicae sedis universa pro quibus discordamus, adaequaret, vel, altero prorsus sublato, et alterum universaliter instituendo, vel sublato utriusque scandalo, utrumque indifferenter instaurando".

<sup>22</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 1.7, 1149B: "Deus erit omnia in omnibus [cf. I Cor. 15:28]". Note also *Antikeimenon* 1.13, 1160C: "Deus qui omnia ad seipsum trahit, hoc eis praestare voluerit [cf. John 12:32]".



The final issue discussed by the debaters is whether the Greeks practice rebaptism. The discussion of this issue has drawn only passing attention from critics of the debates. This is unfortunate, for I would suggest that Anselm has intentionally chosen this particular issue as the means of drawing the debates to a close. It has been Anselm's goal to bring the Latin and the Greek together, that is bring them to a point where the line of alienation, of otherness, between them disappears. With every issue the two have debated, they have perforce ended with the dividing line still there. It is in this context that the last of the issues raised by Anselm the writer should be seen.

Anselm the debater asks whether the Greek custom of pouring sanctified oil over a Latin woman before she marries a Greek is a form of rebaptism. He does not, however, give Nicetas time to answer but launches into a fairly lengthy attack on rebaptism, declaring it to be heretical and giving examples of popes who have opposed it. Nicetas' response is to the point:

If the Latins would acquaint themselves anew with Greek rites, they would not malign them as being so superficial, nor be so easily offended by them <sup>23</sup>).

It is Latin ignorance that has caused the problem. Nicetas goes on to show as much abhorrence of rebaptism as Anselm, saying that neither is sanctification with oil to be equated with baptism, nor is this rite or baptism itself ever repeated where it is known to have already been performed.

In this exchange, Anselm the writer has allowed Anselm the debater to ask a question which turns into an accusation as the debater presents his attack on rebaptism. By itself, the question "Do the Greeks practice a form of rebaptism?" points only to discovering whether there is a line separating Greeks from Latins. The assault on this practice which follows assumes that the line exists. Anselm the writer has nicely — and at the cost of his namesake and the Latins he represents — portrayed that assault as very learned only to have Nicetas show that its foundation is one of ignorance. Ignorance dispelled, there is no line between Greek and Latin.

<sup>23</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 3.21, 1246D-1247A: "Si Latini ritus Graecorum ex integro nossent, non tam faciles eos calumniarentur, nec in eis tam facile scandalizarentur. Sed non est mirandum si de hoc non recte judicant, tametsi rectum sit quod ignorant".



Anselm the writer's choice of rebaptism as the last issue to be discussed is, thus, a very conscious one allowing him to bring his debate to a close with an affirmation of the unity of the church; and it is, perhaps, significant that by expressing his wish that Latins would acquaint themselves "with Greek rites" rather than "with the Greek rites of sanctification and baptism", Nicetas tacitly gives the sense that Latins have still more to learn. "Thanks be to God", Anselm the debater exclaims,

who has cleared this dissension away from me and spared me from dealing the Christian name a reproach which until now I have suspected of the very wise Greek people <sup>24</sup>).

While obviously Anselm cannot solve the problems of the *Filioque*, the place of the papacy in the church, or those of the eucharist, within the parameters of his literary construct he has left his readers with a sense of the possibility of finding solutions. The issue of rebaptism allows him to end by minimizing the differences that remain. Nicetas declares his happiness that the faith and rites of the Greeks might please Anselm the debater and says: "Truly, we seem to differ not in the great things but in the smallest". The problem caused by these differences is not that Latins or Greeks risk their salvation by not adopting the other's beliefs or customs, but that the differences "do not build charity" <sup>25</sup>). It is Nicetas who gives expression to this sentiment rather than Anselm the debater, who makes no such remarkable concession about Latin beliefs and ritual. This makes an offer out of Nicetas' call for a church council to work at erasing all of the lines of otherness. Nicetas says as much by expressing the hope that such a council will form out of Greeks and Latins "one people under one Lord Jesus Christ, in one faith, in one baptism, in one ritual of sacraments" <sup>26</sup>). It is Anselm the writer's Latin readers who must accept or refuse the idea of a council. And it is not the debaters who end Anselm's work, but the crowd, the audience which one may well believe Anselm hoped would include his

<sup>24</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 3.22, 1247B: "Gratias ago Deo, qui et hoc scandalum a me submovit, et opprobrium Christiani nominis, quod hactenus in Graecorum sapientissima gente suspicatus sum, a me abstulit".

<sup>25</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 3.22, 1247B-1148A: "Quia vero non in magnis, sed in minimis aliquatenus discrepare videmur, quae licet salutem animarum non impedian, tamen charitatem non aedificant".

<sup>26</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 3.22, 1248A: "... et tam Graeci quam Latini unus populus sub uno Domino Jesu Christo, in una fide, in uno baptismo, in uno sacramentorum ritu efficeretur".



reader. The crowd ends the debate by shouting: *Calos dialogos* — “Beautiful dialogue”. This would denote two sides speaking well with each other. But Anselm is writing for Latins, and he gives a Latin translation of the Greek which captures far better the intent of the debates’ author to erase the line of otherness. In Latin, the crowd shouts, *Bonus dualis sermo* — “A good dual discourse”<sup>27</sup>). The sense is of two men giving a single speech which captures what is good. The dividing line between them has disappeared.

Department of History  
University of Northern Iowa  
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614  
USA

Jay T. LEES

<sup>27</sup>) *Antikeimenon* 3.22, 1248B.