

“TO KNOW CHRIST IN THE FATHER, CHRIST IN THE
FLESH, AND CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST”:¹
THE COMPREHENSIVE SCOPE OF CLASSICAL
CHRISTOLOGY IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY

BOYD TAYLOR COOLMAN

*Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts*

SCHOLARLY INTEREST in the theology of the “long twelfth century” shows no signs of abating.² On the contrary, the ongoing conversation has reached the point where revisionist approaches now question earlier commonplaces.³ At the same time, despite agreement about the existence of this distinct era in the High Middle Ages, little consensus exists about how best to characterize its chief concerns, characteristics, and accomplishments. Indeed, a remarkable variety of “theological styles” coexists in a century that includes figures as diverse as Anselm of Canterbury, Peter Abelard, Hugh and Richard of St. Victor, Bernard of Clairvaux, William of St. Thierry, Hildegard of Bingen, Peter Lombard, and Peter Comestor—to name only the more well-known.

In the mid-twentieth century, one historian characterized this period as “the most uncompromisingly christocentric period of

¹ Baldwin of Ford, *De sacramento altaris*, ed. and French trans. J. Morson, E. de Solms, and J. Leclercq, *Sources chrétiennes* 93-94 (Paris, 1963).

² “Long” reflects a consensus that a unity encompasses the forms of theological discourse that flourished in the period between (roughly) the Eucharistic debates in the 1050s and the Gregorian reforms of the 1070s, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the formal incorporation of the universities (especially at Paris), the fuller assimilation of Aristotle, and the appearance of the Mendicant Orders in the first three decades of the 1200s.

³ Rachel Fulton Brown, “Three-in-One: Making God in Twelfth-Century Liturgy, Theology, and Devotion,” in *European Transformations: The Long Twelfth Century* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2012), 468-97.

Western civilization.”⁴ Since then, a cottage industry has focused on the twelfth-century “discovery” of and devotion to the humanity of Jesus.⁵ Yet, recently the Dominican scholar Gilles Emery has argued that “the Trinitarian question constitutes the great theme of twelfth-century theology,”⁶ which inaugurated the “golden age of Trinitarian reflection in the West.”⁷ Yet again, if one considers the Eucharistic debates between Lanfranc and Berengar in the 1050s and the pronouncements of Lateran IV in 1215, and then observes in between the avalanche of treatises with the words “body and blood” in their titles, one could also claim the twelfth as the century of the Eucharist. So—Christ, Trinity, Eucharist—which is it?

Or is this a false question, created by problematic assumptions of modern historians? Recently, Rachael Fulton Brown, a leading religious historian of the twelfth century, has

⁴ Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study of Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1957), 61. More precisely, Kantorowicz intends “roughly, the monastic period from 900 to A.D. 1100” (ibid.). That the scope of his observation deserves to be extended somewhat will be borne out below.

⁵ The literature on this theme is vast. In the middle of the twentieth century, R. W. Southern observed: “This power of St. Anselm and St. Bernard to give varied and coherent expression to the perceptions and aspirations which they shared with their contemporaries is most clearly seen in their treatment of the central theme of Christian thought: the life of Christ and the meaning of the Crucifixion. The theme of tenderness and compassion for the sufferings and helplessness of the Saviour of the world was one which had a new birth in the monasteries of the eleventh century, and every century since then has paid tribute to the monastic inspiration of this century by some new development of this theme” (R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* [New Haven: Yale University, 1953] 231). See also Rachel Fulton, *From Judgment to Passion: Devotion to Christ and the Virgin Mary, 800–1200* (New York: Columbia University, 2002). For later developments, see Ellen M. Ross, *The Grief of God: Images of the Suffering Jesus in Late Medieval England* (New York: Oxford University, 1997); and Paul Gondreau, *The Passions of Christ's Soul in the Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, n.s. 61 (Münster: Aschendorff, 2002).

⁶ Gilles Emery, O.P., *Trinity in Aquinas* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2008), 2.

⁷ Emery, *Trinity in Aquinas*, xxviii. Peter Gemeinhardt speaks of “a new period of the development in trinitarian thinking in medieval western Europe” (“Logic, Tradition, and Ecumenics: Developments of Latin Trinitarian Theology between c. 1075 and c. 1160,” *Trinitarian Theology in the Medieval West*, ed. Pekka Kärkkäinen [Helsingin Yliopisto, Finland: Luther-Agricola-Society, 2007], 10–68, at 10). Even earlier, the great historian Josef Jungmann argued that “in religious writings of the high Middle Ages, Trinitarian principles assumed an almost disproportionately great importance” (cited in Brown, “Three-in-One,” 472).

acknowledged that, due to certain Enlightenment/Romantic assumptions regarding the priority of interior religious experience (i.e., spirituality) over its “petrified and mechanized” theological and liturgical expression, modern scholarship on the twelfth century has tended artificially to isolate certain themes, attitudes, or contexts for analysis, in a compartmentalizing and thus reductionistic fashion:

If we have been blind to the actual contours of the [twelfth century], it is not because we did not have the evidence we needed, but rather because we, that is, the historians, have persisted in seeing one aspect of this culture (“devotion”) as something necessarily separate from another (“theology”), and a third (“liturgy”) . . . as somehow only incidentally involved in the devotional and theological concerns of the day.⁸

Though not precisely the topical set of concerns noted above, Fulton’s triptych of “devotion,” “theology,” and “liturgy” can be broadly aligned, respectively, with twelfth-century interest in the humanity of Jesus, Trinitarian speculation, and Eucharistic piety. Her concern about scholarly “compartmentalization,” accordingly, corresponds with a similar intuition animating the present investigation, namely, a concern about overly narrow analyses of discrete theological topics or themes that obscures the more profound, well-integrated theological intuitions of this era. To illustrate how poorly such isomorphic strategies serve the study of twelfth-century theology and to introduce what follows, I consider the author quoted in the title above, namely, Baldwin of Ford (d. 1190), a late twelfth-century Cistercian monk, who was made archbishop of Canterbury in 1185.

I. BALDWIN OF FORD:

FAITH OF UNITY, FAITH OF UNION, FAITH OF COMMUNION

Christ’s words in John’s Gospel—“I am the living bread come down from heaven” (6:51)—prompt Baldwin in his commentary on the Eucharist to see a profound link between Trinity, Incarnation, and Eucharist:

⁸ Brown, “Three-in-One,” 468-69.

By faith we feed upon the Only-begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father [Jn 1:18], sent to us from heaven, and incarnate for our sakes, the living bread, which came down from heaven. Recognizing through faith the flesh received for us, we eat the flesh of Christ given to us as food. There is therefore the faith of *unity*, the faith of *union*, the faith of *communion*. (Emphasis added)⁹

Baldwin elaborates:

By the faith of *unity* we believe the Son to be one with the Father, just as the Son himself said: *I and the Father are one* (Jn 10). [This] is the faith of the Trinity, for one does not have fully the faith of unity in God, that is, of the one divinity, unless he believes each of the three Persons to be one God, and all three simultaneously to be only one God.¹⁰

“By the faith of *union*,” he continues,

we believe that the only-begotten Son of God has united to himself human nature in the unity of person through the mystery of the Incarnation. The faith of unity [i.e., Trinity] is thus joined to this [faith of union], by which we believe him to be one person in two natures. For one does not have the full faith of this union, who believes that the two natures were not united in one person or that one person is divided by two natures.¹¹

“By the faith of *communion*,” thirdly,

we believe the most holy life-producing, sanctifying flesh of Christ to be given to us and to be communicated for the remission of sins; for [Christ] willed

⁹ Baldwin of Ford, *De sacramento altaris* (SC 93:268; PL 204:694C-D): “per fidem Unigenitum, qui est in sinu Patris, de coelo ad nos missum, et propter nos incarnatum, panem vivum, qui de coelo descendit, manducamus. Cognoscentes per fidem carnem pro nobis acceptam, nobis in cibum datam, carnem Christi manducamus. Est ergo fides unitatis, et fides unionis, et fides communionis.”

¹⁰ Ibid. (SC 93:268; PL 204:694D-695A): “Fide unitatis credimus Filium unum esse cum Patre, sicut ipse dicit: ‘Ego et Pater unum sumus (Jn 10).’ Huic fidei adjuncta est fides Trinitatis. Non enim fidem unitatis in Deo, id est unius divinitatis, plene habet, nisi qui credit, singulas trium personarum esse unum Deum, et omnes tres simul non esse nisi unum Deum. Mysterium enim unitatis in Trinitate continet mysterium Trinitatis in unitate. Et sine fide Trinitatis fides unius Dei plena non est; quia Trinitas unus [695A] Deus est.”

¹¹ Ibid. (SC 93:270; PL 204:695A): “Fide unionis credimus, quod unigenitus Filius Dei humanam naturam in unitate personae per mysterium Incarnationis sibi habet unitam. Huic fidei adjuncta est fides unitatis, qua credimus, unam esse personam in duabus naturis. Non enim plenam fidem habet hujus unionis, qui credit duas naturas in una persona non uniri, vel personam in duabus naturis dividi.”

that the very thing which he willed to be assumed for us and from us, be eaten by us in food.¹²

He then offers the summary found in the title, while at the same time gesturing quite explicitly at its overarching goal:

This is the sum total of our faith: to know Christ in the Father, Christ in the flesh, Christ in the participation of the altar. All the mysteries of the faith are gathered together in this summation, and whatever was written in the law, the psalms, and the prophets was directed toward this end, that Christ is known, and when he is known, he is loved.¹³

For Baldwin, this is the “one Catholic faith,”¹⁴ and he integrates these three doctrinal loci, these three “mysteries of the faith”—Trinity, Christ, Eucharist—within a comprehensive Christological framework.

Baldwin affords a point of departure (and an organizational framework) for what follows. His integrated summary of Catholic faith is quite obviously Christocentric, not in a general or vague sense, but rather informed by and articulated in a doctrinal, even dogmatic idiom, which is quite clearly classical, even “Chalcedonian” in a broad and general sense. When he refers to one person and two natures, he is clearly deploying the dogmatic formula ratified in 451 as the orthodox resolution of the fifth-century debates, even if he is not explicitly adverting to the councils of Ephesus or Chalcedon or citing their *acta* directly.¹⁵ The claim advanced here is that for many twelfth-

¹² Baldwin of Ford, *De sacramento altaris* (SC 93.270; PL 204.695A-B): “Fide communionis credimus sacrosanctam Christi carnem vivificatricem et sanctificatricem nobis dispensari, et communicari in remissionem peccatorum, Deo mirabiliter dispensante; qui hoc ipsum a nobis voluit in alimoniam sumi, quod a se voluit pro nobis, et de nobis assumi.”

¹³ *Ibid.* (SC 93:270; PL 204:695B): “Summa autem fidei nostrae haec est, cognoscere Christum in Patre, Christum in carne, Christum in altaris participatione. Omnia autem fidei mysteria ad hanc summam colliguntur, et quaecunque scripta sunt in lege et psalmis et prophetis, ad hunc finem diriguntur, ut Christus cognoscatur, et agnitus diligatur.”

¹⁴ *Ibid.* (SC 93:270-72; PL 204:695C): “there is one Catholic faith, containing the mysteries of the divinity of Christ, of the Incarnation, and of holy communion” (“quia una est fides catholica mysteria continens divinitatis Christi et Incarnationis, et sacrae communionis”).

¹⁵ The argument advanced here is entirely independent of the question of whether, how, and to what extent twelfth-century theologians knew the official *acta* of the

century writers, including Baldwin, the faith of the Incarnation, articulated in classical (generally Chalcedonian) terms, was not an isolated dogma—to be learned, affirmed, and perhaps defended if challenged, but otherwise ignored; it was not “simply another item in the list of Christian beliefs.”¹⁶ Rather, classical Christology anchored, organized, and “colored” everything else. It offered insight into the very mystery of God, the wisdom of the divine economy in salvation history, and the ultimate relationship between God and humanity, as mediated by sacrament and liturgy. Indeed, the twelfth-century texts considered below reflect what has been called the “systematic scope” of Christian doctrine. For the twelfth century, as for the fourth, “Christology” was not cordoned off from the rest of Christian doctrine, nor indeed from practice and experience. Christian doctrines about the nature of the triune God and the God-man were not “arcane speculations” isolated from the rest of the Christian life, but rather they “expressed coherent construals of the entirety of Christian existence”¹⁷ and afforded “a global interpretation of Christian life and faith.”¹⁸

The goal in what follows, accordingly, is to trace the presence of classical Christology in the twelfth century, not in the narrow, technical sense of an analysis of the God-man’s composition, but rather in the wider view of its broader implications for the believer’s existence as a whole and as holistically conceived, fostering not just speculative insight but also wonder, devotion, prayer, and praise. Accordingly, I will

Council of Chalcedon or related patristic texts. The simple fact that twelfth-century authors used Chalcedonian teaching and terminology suffices to show that they were “Chalcedonian” in a broad sense of the term, even if they did not explicitly cite the conciliar *acta* or Leo’s Tome and even if they struggled (as they most certainly did) to avoid both “Nestorian” and “Monophysite” interpretations or appropriations thereof (as did patristic thinkers themselves in the centuries following the Chalcedon). On the topic of twelfth-century knowledge and reception of Chalcedon, see Ludwig Ott, “Das Konzil von Chalkedon in der Frühscholastik,” in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon* (Würzburg: Echter-Verl., Bd. 2 [1953]), 873-922.

¹⁶ Khaled Anatolios, *Retrieving Nicaea: The Development and Meaning of Trinitarian Doctrine* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2011), 7.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 18.

consider Christ in the Eucharist, Christ in the Incarnation, and Christ in the Father.

II. CHRISTOLOGY IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY: A BRIEF OVERVIEW

It is useful at the outset to say something briefly regarding twelfth-century awareness of the Christological debates of the early Church. The literature of this period suggests that twelfth-century authors had some acquaintance (however mediated) with the main issues and protagonists of the Christological controversies in the fifth century. Writing at mid-century, the popularizing theologian Honorius of Autun (d. 1154), rehearsed them thus:

The Nestorians are so called from Nestorius the bishop of Constantinople. They preach that Mary is not the mother of God but only of a man. Making one person of the flesh, another person of the deity, they affirm not one Christ in Word and in flesh, but one Son of God, another son of man. The Eutychians are so called from Eutyches, abbot of Constantinople. They deny that there are two natures in Christ, but preach only the divine in Christ after the assumption of flesh, namely, flesh converted into deity.¹⁹

Not that these were merely academic matters of dusty dogmatic history, settled once and for all in the fifth century. About the same time, Gerhoh of Reichersperg (d. 1169) wrote:

And concerning the eternal divinity of the Word, only a few have doubted, except the Arians. But concerning the man united to the divinity in the Word,

¹⁹ Honorius of Autun, *De haeresibus* (PL 172:239B-240A): “Nestoriani a Nestorio Constantinopolitano episcopo nuncupati. Hi sanctam Mariam non Dei sed hominis tantum genitricem praedicant; aliam personam carnis, aliam deitatis facientes, nec unum Christum in verbo et carne, sed alium Filium Dei, alium filium hominis, affirmant. [240A] *Eutychiani* ab Eutychete Constantinopolitano abbate ita nominati. Hi negant in Christo duas naturas esse, sed solam divinam in eo post assumptam carnem, scilicet carnem in deitatem versam praedicant.” My thanks to an anonymous reviewer for noting that Honorius’s text comes virtually verbatim from Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiarum* 13.5 and a very similar text appears in Iohannes Tomitanus (sixth century), *Disputatio Nestorianis et Eutychianis*, CCSL 85A (ed. F. Glorie, 1985). Again, that Honorius’s knowledge of fifth-century Christological debates and their resolutions is derived from these intermediate sources, rather than from direct contact with the original texts, does not in any way diminish the fact that he does know them.

not only did Nestorius and his accomplices doubt, but until even today many doubt, who affirm that that man should be called God, not properly but only figuratively.²⁰

Who are these twelfth-century neo-Nestorians? Though Indian Nestorianism engaged the twelfth-century imagination in the figure of Prester John, supposedly a Nestorian ruler of India who held the offices of both king and priest,²¹ more likely Gerhoh has in mind Gilbert of Poitiers, Bishop Eberhard of Bamberg, and especially Peter Abelard,²² whose approach to the matter earned him the label “Nestorian” (despite his own vociferous disavowals), and eventually a condemnation from Pope Alexander III.²³ However that may be, for his own part, Gerhoh offered an elegant statement of classical Christological orthodoxy:

not that there are two sons, God and man, but one Son, the God-Man, who is by nature divine from the Father and by nature human from his mother. For both divinity is given to humanity and humanity thus united is given to divinity, that the same is man who is God, and the same God who is man: the same Son of God, who is Son of the Virgin, and the son of man, who is Son of God the Father.²⁴

²⁰ Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Commentarius aureus in Psalmos et cantica ferialia* (PL 193:1494C-D): “Et de Verbi quidem aeterna divinitate pauci unquam, [1494D] exceptis Arianis, dubitaverunt. De hominis autem Verbo uniti divinitate non solum Nestorius cum suis complicibus olim dubitavit, sed usque hodie multi dubitant, qui Hominem Deum non proprie, sed figurative dici affirmant.”

²¹ See Nicholas Jubber, *The Prester Quest* (London: Doubleday, 2005).

²² On the various views of Abelard’s Christology, both then and now, see Marcia Colish, *Peter Lombard* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 1:409-10, and the literature cited.

²³ See Lauge Olaf Nielsen, *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century: A Study of Gilbert Porreta’s Thinking and the Theological Expositions of the Doctrine of the Incarnation during the Period 1130-1180* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 360ff.; Robert Somerville, *Pope Alexander III and the Council of Tours (1163): A Study of Ecclesiastical Politics and Institutions in the Twelfth Century* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California, 1977), 62-63.

²⁴ Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Commentarius aureus in Psalmos et cantica ferialia* (PL 193:1494D): “non quod sint duo Filii Deus et homo, sed unus Filius Deus Homo, cui et ex Patre naturalis est divinitas, et ex matre naturalis humanitas. Nam et humanitati data est divinitas, et divinitati sic unita est humanitas, ut idem sit homo, qui Deus, idemque Deus, qui homo: idem Filius Dei, qui Filius Virginis, et Filius hominis, qui Filius Dei Patris.”

Lastly, mention must be made of the three so-called “Christological opinions” listed by Peter Lombard in his *Sentences*. In book 3, distinction 6 of the *Sentences*, the Lombard lists and describes three current views regarding the composition of Christ: (1) the *homo assumptus* view, (2) the “composite man” theory, (3) and the *habitus* theory. This produced an enormous amount of Scholastic discussion (and confusion) in the century that followed.²⁵ Central to this more technical Scholastic debate was the question of how, on the one hand, one can affirm an actual, particular, and complete human nature in the Incarnation without, on the other hand, having a genuine human hypostasis (à la Nestorius). If, in an attempt to avoid the latter, one denied actual existence or reality to Christ’s humanity to the point of saying that “Christ as man is not something,” one could be accused of “Christological nihilism.”²⁶

III. TO KNOW CHRIST IN THE PARTICIPATION OF THE ALTAR

As is well known, the Eucharist acquired a heightened prominence in the Middle Ages, often associated with flashpoints of debate and conciliar decrees: Radbertus and Ratramnus in the ninth century, Berengar and Lanfranc in the

²⁵ Here, as above, the question of twelfth-century knowledge of the texts of Chalcedon and the proper interpretation thereof should be noted. A long tradition of twentieth-century scholarship has argued that the Lombard’s opinions reflect a general lack of understanding of the issues at stake in the fifth-century debates, as well as of their orthodox resolution. For discussions of St. Thomas Aquinas’s retrieval of Chalcedonian Christology in comparison with his twelfth-century predecessors, see I. Backes, *Die Christologie des hl. Thomas v. Aquin und die griechischen Kirchenväter* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1931); G. Geenen, “The Council of Chalcedon in the Theology of St. Thomas,” in *From an Abundant Spring*, ed. the staff of *The Thomist* (New York: P.J. Kenedy and Sons, 1952), 172-217; J. A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas D’Aquino* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1983), 164; É.-H. Wéber, *Le Christ selon Saint Thomas D’Aquin* (Paris: Desclée, 1988).

²⁶ For discussion of “Christological nihilism” in the twelfth century, see Nikolaus Häring, “The Case of Gilbert de la Porree Bishop of Poitiers,” *Mediaeval Studies* 3 (1950): 1-40; Nielsen, *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century*; Marcia Colish, “Christological Nihilism in the Second Half of the Twelfth Century,” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 63 (1996): 146-55; and, most recently, Clare Monagle, *Orthodoxy and Controversy in Twelfth-Century Religious Discourse: Peter Lombard’s “Sentences” and the Development of Theology* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013).

eleventh, Lateran IV's use of "transubstantiation," the Feast of *Corpus Christi*, the late-medieval controversies over *utraquism*, etc. Scholarship tends to isolate this topic from other theological issues. A striking feature of the twelfth-century explosion of Eucharistic discussion, however, is the link forged with classical Christology.²⁷

On one hand, this link emerges in relation to the theory of impanation. As the twelfth-century Eucharistic discussion became increasingly sophisticated regarding the relationship between Christ's presence and the status of the elements after consecration, a theory emerged that was called "impanation" but could have been called "Chalcedonian consubstantiation." Just as in the Incarnation, the humanity assumed by the person of the Word remains fully human, such that Christ is both fully divine and fully human, so (this theory reasoned) in the Eucharist, Christ assumes bread (*panis*), becomes "embreaded" such that the bread remains fully bread—that is, Christ becomes "impanate," just as the Word became incarnate. To develop a theory of Eucharistic presence that is consistent with the classical conception of the Incarnation, it seems that one should affirm the substantial co-presence of bread in the Eucharist, just as one affirms the substantial co-presence of human nature in the Incarnation. But this theory was rejected, and arguably on classical grounds. If bread is assumed directly by the Logos (independent of the human nature), a second divine assumption, now of bread, emerges, which could not really be called the "body of Christ" but only his bread, so to speak. If, on the other hand, bread is assumed by the whole incarnate Christ, then it must be assumed by the human nature too, in which case it would seem to become an accident of the humanity of Christ, and thus no longer substantially bread.²⁸

At the same time, various twelfth-century theologians recognized that the specter of neo-Nestorian Christologies had profoundly negative implications for the Church's Eucharistic

²⁷ For example, in Jaroslav Pelikan's *The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300)*, vol. 3 of *The Christian Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), there is no mention of this connection at all.

²⁸ See Pelikan, *Growth of Medieval Theology*, 201.

faith. It is impressive that they reached back to the fifth-century Christological debates for resources. In his *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*, William of St. Thierry (d. 1148) noted that “among the diverse heresies [of the patristic age], no mention was made of this question, except in the Nestorian heresy alone.” William here refers to the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus in 431, where the bishops addressed the implications of Nestorian Christology for the Eucharist:

And not as common flesh do we receive [the Eucharist]. God forbid! Nor as of a man sanctified and associated with the Word according to the unity of dignity, or as having a divine indwelling, but as truly the Life-giving and very flesh of the Word himself. For he is the Life according to his nature as God, and when he became united to his Flesh, he made it also to be Life-giving, as also he said to us: *Verily, verily, I say unto you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his Blood.* For we must not think that it is flesh of a man like us (how can the flesh of man be life-giving by its own nature?), but as having become truly his own, who for us both became and was called Son of Man.²⁹

As William reminds his readers, the Nestorians had insisted that John 6:53—“Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man”—be understood as distinguishing the human Son of man, whose flesh could indeed be eaten, from the divine Son of God, who could not. For

²⁹ *The Epistle of Cyril to Nestorius with the XII Anathematisms*, NPNF, 2d series, 14:203-4. William’s Latin version of this conciliar statement (PL 180:361A-B) reads as follows: “non ut communem carnem percipientes; quod absit! nec ut viri sanctificati et Verbo conjuncti secundum dignitatis unitatem, aut sicut divinam possidentis habitationem; sed [361B] vere vivificatricem, et ipsius Verbi propriam factam. Vita enim naturaliter ut Deus existens, qui propriae carni unitus est; vivificatricem eam professus est esse. Et ideo quamvis dicat ad nos: ‘Amen amen dico vobis: nisi manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis, et biberitis ejus sanguinem,’ non tamen eam carnem hominis unius ex nobis aestimare debemus. Quomodo enim hominis caro juxta naturam suam vivificatrix esse poterit? Sed ut vere propriam ejus factam, qui propter nos filius hominis et factus est et vocatus.” See also the Council of Ephesus, Anathema XI: “Whosoever shall not confess that the flesh of the Lord gives life and that it pertains to the Word of God the Father as his very own, but shall pretend that it belongs to another person who is united to him [i.e., the Word] only according to honour, and who has served as a dwelling for the divinity; and shall not rather confess, as we say, that that flesh giveth life because it is that of the Word who giveth life to all: let him be anathema.”

if they confess that to be the body of the Lord, they will contradict themselves, recognizing there to be in Christ, God and man, the unity of person. Therefore they said that it is the flesh of the sanctified man, and he was conjoined to the Word according to a unity of dignity, or as possessing divine inhabitation.³⁰

What both fifth- and twelfth-century adherents to classical Christology understood was that on Nestorian terms the body of Christ received in the Eucharist was, in the words of Gerhoh of Reichersberg, “the flesh of a [mere] man,” which even though it may well be “sanctified by the indwelling of God,” had “little power of its own to give life to the one eating it.”³¹ After quoting at length the above-noted text from the Council of Ephesus, Gerhoh stated his own view:

The one who eats the flesh of the Son of Man, therefore, eats the Son of Man: he eats the bread which came down from heaven . . . since *the Word became flesh* (Jn 1). He who eats the flesh of the Word, therefore, also eats the Word in his flesh. Any other flesh would be without benefit, since it does not have life and life-giving power in it.³²

In effect, the claim made here is that only *God’s* human body (and blood) can nourish, give life to, and ultimately save human beings. As Gerhoh put it: “that which the Church receives on the sacrosanct altar is not the body of a man, as the heretic

³⁰ William of St. Thierry, *De corpore et sanguine domini* (PL 180:360D-361A): “si illud Domini corpus confiterentur esse, contra se loquerentur, consentientes in Christo Deo et homine [361A] unitatem esse personae. Dicebant ergo carnem illam esse viri sanctificati, et Verbo conjuncti secundum dignitatis unitatem, aut sicut divinam possidentis habitationem.”

³¹ Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Epistola VII* (PL 194:498B): “For thence the heresiarch Nestorius drew out the venom of his error hence, that he denies that the flesh, which is eaten upon the altar, is life-giving, in as much as it would be the flesh of a man, sanctified by the indwelling, as it were, of God; but it had little power of its own to give life to the one eating it” (“Nam et Nestorius haeresiarcha inde hausit venenum sui erroris, ita ut carnem, quae in altari sumitur, negaret esse vivificatricem, pro eo quod esset hominis caro, inhabitatione quasi Dei sanctificata; sed minime potens manducantem se vivificare”).

³² Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Epistola VII* (PL 194:498C-D): “Manducans igitur carnem Filii hominis, manducat Filium hominis: manducat panem qui de coelo descendit, [498D] quem Pater signavit Deus, non materiali sigillo, sed summae divinitatis indelebili signaculo; quia *Verbum caro factum est* (Jn I). Et ideo qui carnem Verbi manducat, Verbum quoque in sua carne manducat. Alioqui caro non prodesset quidquam, si non haberet in se vitam et vivificandi efficaciam.”

Nestorius wished, but it must be called the body of the Lord.”³³ That is, a Eucharist grounded in a Nestorian Christology would contain only empty Eucharistic calories!

Lingered briefly here in the Eucharistic context, another aspect of classical Christology connected with liturgy emerges. In the liturgical assembly, twelfth-century Christians not only received the Lord’s Body and Blood; they also worshipped and adored their God. The Christological issue emerges here too. After noting that Nestorianism denies to Jesus the proper name “God,” permitting it only figuratively and improperly, as befitting one indwelt by God, Gerhoh of Reichersberg retorts with a “Chalcedonian” doxology, borrowing a refrain from Psalm 55:11, “In God will I praise the Word, in the Lord will I praise his speech”:

*I will praise the humanity of God and the divinity of man. I will praise the God-man, the mediator of God and man. . . . In God will I praise the Word incarnate, I will praise the divine humanity and the human divinity, I will praise the divinity immutably humanized; I will praise the humanity divinized or deified, not by the changeability of nature, but by the commutation of qualities, which is signified in the titular inscription, when the man, reckoned among sinners, was called *Jesus Nazarenus Rex Judaeorum*.*³⁴

Gerhoh insists that, rightly understood, the inscription on the cross means that “that man is one person of the Trinity,” who “is to be adored in the glory of God the Father.” The inscription applies “equally to the crucified man as to the impassible God.”³⁵ In his criticism of Abelard’s apparent Nestorianism,

³³ Gerhoh of Reichersberg *Opusculum de gloria et honore filii hominis* (PL 194:1118D): “Unde id, quod in altari sacrosancta percipit Ecclesia, non corpus hominis, ut Nestorius haereticus voluit, sed corpus Domini est nominandum.”

³⁴ Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Commentarius aureus in Psalmos et cantica ferialia* (PL 193:1687D-1688A): “Ego autem cum populo [1688A] sancto in Deo laudabo Verbum, in Domino laudabo sermonem. Laudabo Dei humanitatem et hominis divinitatem. Laudabo Deum hominem Dei et hominum mediatorem. . . . in Deo laudabo Verbum incarnatum, laudabo divinam humanitatem et humanam divinitatem, laudabo divinitatem humanitatem sine sui mutabilitate; laudabo humanitatem divinam seu deificatam, non naturae versibilitate, sed qualitatum commutatione, quae significata est in tituli inscriptione, dum homo cum iniquis reputatus Jesus Nazarenus Rex Judaeorum est nominatus.”

³⁵ Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Commentarius aureus in Psalmos et cantica ferialia* (PL 193:1689A): “quod homo unam Trinitatis personam divina conceptione, in totam totius

William of St. Thierry sharpens the point: If Abelard worships the whole Christ, but in effect divides him into two persons, he is an idolator, worshipping a mere man; if he does not worship the whole Christ, he is not a Christian!³⁶ Here, classical Christology is the very basis of Christian worship.

IV. TO KNOW CHRIST IN THE FLESH

Baldwin himself fittingly provides the transition from knowing Christ in the Eucharist to knowing Christ in the flesh:

Christ's assuming of our nature is not unfittingly understood as a reception of bread. He himself assumed that from which he feeds us, when through the mystery of the Incarnation, he united man to himself, turning the hay (*fenum*) of our nature into grain (*frumentum*), so that he might feed us from the fat of the grain, and satiate us from the kernel of the wheat. . . . He was made to be bread for us, which strengthens the heart of man; bread in the food of teaching, bread in the example of life, bread in every gift of spiritual grace, bread in every consolation of our misery; bread sustaining our life, and strengthening us in the labor of our life, so that by its strength, we might arrive at the mount Horeb of God.³⁷

Trinitatis gloriam divina post mortem glorificatione assumptus in gloria Dei Patris est adorandus. . . . quod homini crucifixo aequae ut Patri Deo impassibile congruit hujus tituli significatum.”

³⁶ William of St. Thierry, *Disputatio Catholicorum patrum adversus dogmata Petri Abelari* (PL 180:299C-D): “If then Peter worships the whole Christ, that is, both as man and as God, that Christ, whom Peter fashions for himself, in as much as he is man, is not one of the Trinity: since he worships such a one, because he adores a creature, Peter is an idolater. But if he does not worship the whole Christ, both as man and as God, Peter is not a Christian” (“Si igitur Petrus totum Christum adoratur, id est, et secundum quod homo est, et secundum quod Deus est; quia Christus, quem Petrus sibi fingit, secundum quod homo est, in Trinitate non est: qui talem adoratur, quoniam creaturam adoratur, Petrus idololatra est. Si totum Christum non adoratur, id est, [299D] et secundum quod homo est, et secundum quod Deus est, Petrus Christianus non est”).

³⁷ Baldwin of Ford, *De sacramento altaris* (SC 93:128; PL 204:656D-657A): “Naturae nostrae susceptio non incongrue intelligitur quasi quaedam panis acceptio. Accipit Christus, unde nos pasceret, cum per Incarnationis mysterium hominem sibi uniret, nostrae carnis fenum vertens in frumentum, ut nos cibaret ex adipe frumenti, et satiaret de medulla tritici. Nobis factus est granum tritici in corde bono seminandum [657A] et uberius multiplicandum. Factus est nobis panis, qui cor hominis confirmaret; panis in cibo doctrinae panis in exemplo vitae, panis in omni dono spiritualis gratiae, panis in omni consolatione nostrae miseriae; panis vitam nostram sustentans, et in labore viae nos confortans, ut in ejus fortitudine perveniamus ad montem Dei Horeb.”

The ease with which Baldwin weaves together Eucharistic and incarnational images betokens the profound link his era sensed between the two. Turning to knowing Christ in the flesh, much could be said, but for our purposes three subthemes present themselves: salvation, *meditatio*, and *devotio*.

First, it is well known that the twelfth-century theologians saw clearly, as did their patristic forbearers, the crucial link between Christology and soteriology. In *Cur Deus Homo*, Anselm anchored his account of satisfaction in the classical paradigm: only one who was fully human *should* render satisfaction to God; only one who was fully divine *could* so satisfy. But it was not only satisfaction theories that required a Chalcedonian Christology. The Premonstratensian Adam the Scot (d. ca. 1180) sounds several soteriological notes, under the heading of mediator, in his rehearsal of a one-person-two-natures Christology, including intercession and assistance, compassionate identification and powerful remedy, imitation and fulfillment of desire:

since one person is God and man, in that he is man, he intercedes for us; but in that he is God, he assists us. In that he is man . . . he is close to us out of compassion for our misery . . . in that he is God, when through the union of our nature assumed by him he is not far from us, he also confers on us an efficacious remedy. As man, he is what we imitate; as God he is what we desire. Yet . . . it is not one person and another of which we speak, but *one and the same mediator of God and man, God and man, our Lord Jesus Christ* (1 Tim 2:5).³⁸

In a similar vein, writing at the turn of the thirteenth century, Absalon of Springiersbach (d. 1203) argued that only divine power could heal human frailty, but only if God, “as an expert doctor,” assumed the “form of compassion, so that the suffering might be relieved”:

³⁸ Adam of Dryburgh, “Sermo IV,” in *Sermones* (PL 198:119A-B): “in eo vero quod Deus, dum per unionem nostrae in eo assumptae naturae a nobis non remotus est, etiam [119B] efficax nobis confert remedium: in homine, quod imitemur; in Deo quod desideremus. Cum tamen non sit alius, et alius, de quo loquimur: sed unus idemque mediator Dei et hominum, Deus, et homo, Dominus noster Jesus Christus (I Tim. 2:5).”

For the form of majesty is terrible, and a sign of the exacting of vengeance; [but] the form of humility is a sign of tender compassion. And compassion flows naturally from the fount of the mercy of God; but vengeance comes forth from the justice of God, as if far away. And therefore the Son, who appeared in the flesh for the purpose of exhibiting compassion not administering vengeance, wished to show us more a humble than a terrible form.³⁹

The Benedictine Franco of Afflighem (d. 1135), for his part, sounds the patristic note of deification: “But marvelous and ineffable *dignatio*, incomprehensible to all understanding, that God would become man. . . . But why was this? So that, assumed by God, man might become God.”⁴⁰

Second, twelfth-century theologians often cultivated a *habitus* of meditative theological thought, which might best be called meditative *speculatio* or speculative *meditatio*—a soul-forming activity that at its best was a synthesis of what we now often distinguish as “Scholastic” and “monastic” theology.⁴¹ Not surprisingly, excellent examples of this, centered on the Incarnation and trading deeply, if sometimes only implicitly, on the classical paradigm, abound. Abbot Absalon of Springiersbach describes this Christological *meditatio* thus:

The Word is said to have been made flesh, since the humanity of Christ nourishes and feeds in the likeness of flesh: for the conception, nativity, passion, resurrection, and ascension are so many morsels of that flesh, by which the soul is spiritually fed, as long as the faith of the nativity, passion and the others . . . is retained in the mind. That flesh, namely the humanity of

³⁹ Absalon of Springiersbach, “Sermo VII,” in *Sermones* (PL 211:54B-C): “Sicut peritus medicus qui ad visitandum aegrotum ingreditur, formam assumit compatiens ut aeger relevetur. . . . Forma siquidem majestatis terribilis est, et signum exigendae ultionis. Forma vero humilitatis signum est piae compassionis. Sed compassio de fonte misericordiae Dei naturaliter procedit: ultio vero de justitia Dei tanquam [54C] a remoto provenit. Et ideo Filius qui non ad exercendam vindictam, sed ad exhibendam compassionem in carne apparuit, magis formam humilem quam terribilem nobis voluit exhibere.”

⁴⁰ Franco Afflighem, *De gratia Dei Libri XII* (PL 166:743B-C): “Mira autem et ineffabilis atque omni sensui incomprehensibilis [743C] *dignatio*, ut Deus homo fieret. . . . Sed cur hoc? Ut a Deo assumptus homo Deus fieret.”

⁴¹ Boyd Taylor Coolman, *The Theology of Hugh of St. Victor: An Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 163-91.

Christ, as long as it is spiritually consumed, offers to us the taste and food of diverse kinds of flesh.⁴²

Such meditations often afford speculative theological insight. Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153) is typical. In his *The Steps of Humility and Pride*, the great Cistercian makes adroit use of the classical paradigm to navigate the tricky shoals of divine and human suffering. Two texts from the Epistle to the Hebrews are his starting point: Hebrews 5:8, “[Christ] learned obedience from the things he suffered,” and Hebrews 2:16-17, “it was fitting that he should become like to his brothers in all things, that he might become merciful.” Bernard’s question is: How can we understand Christ *learning* obedience and *becoming* merciful?

The blessed God, the blessed Son of God, in that form in which he did not think it robbery to be equal with the Father, was without doubt impassible before he emptied himself taking on the form a slave. Thus he had no experience of misery and subjection, he did not know mercy and obedience by experience. He knew by the knowledge natural to him, but not by experience. . . . [H]e came to take our form in which he could do what he could not do before, suffer and be subject to authority and learn by experience the mercy of a fellow-sufferer and the obedience of a fellow subject. . . . Therefore . . . there is no contradiction in saying that something he knew from all eternity by his divine knowledge he now began in time to learn by human experience. . . . You see, then, that Christ in his one Person has two natures, one eternal, the other beginning in time. According to one he knows all things eternally; according to the other there are many things he first experienced in the course of time. . . . [So] when I say he became merciful I am not speaking of the mercy that was his in the happiness of eternity; but of the mercy that sprang from sharing in our misery. . . . In the impassibility of eternity he had an infinite compassion for us, but we could never have fully realized it except for the Passion we saw him suffering. . . . He did not lose anything of his eternal mercy but he added a new note to it.⁴³

⁴² Absalon of Springiersbach, “Sermo VIII,” in *Sermones* (PL 211:54D): “Dicitur etiam Verbum caro factum, quia nutrit et pascit humanitas Christi ad similitudinem carnis: et sunt morsus quidam istius carnis conceptio, nativitas, passio, resurrectio et ascensio, quibus anima spiritaliter pascitur, dum fides nativitatis passionis et caeterorum, quae diximus, mente retinetur. Ista caro, videlicet humanitas Christi, dum spiritaliter comeditur, carnum diversi generis nobis saporem et esum praetendit.”

⁴³ Bernard of Clairvaux, *De gradibus humilitatis et superbiae* III.6-12 (*The Steps of Humility and Pride*, trans. M. Basil Pennington [Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1989], 34-41).

Of many possible observations, space allows one: For Bernard, the one-person-two-natures dogma not only negotiates the issue of divine impassibility, but also, perhaps more importantly, allows God's humanity to be the revelation of God's divinity: in the Passion, God's human passibility reveals paradoxically God's impassibile and infinite compassion.

Beyond speculative insight, though, Christological *meditatio* was also a source of endless intellectual wonder and amazement. Unabashedly, our authors revel in the kenotic mystery of divine self-abasement made possible by the union of the two natures in one person. After reveling in venerable paradoxes with deep patristic roots, paradoxes that only work in a classical Christological framework, Franco of Afflighem exclaims:

How marvelous that God became man, that fullness emptied itself, that bread hungered, that power was weakened, that life died! Why? So that assumed by God, man might become God; that one emptying himself might fill up the empty; that one hungering might feed the famished; that one exhausted might strengthen the weak; that one who died might vivify the dead. Great full grace, marvelous worthiness, so great a self-emptying of so great a majesty. How do you suppose that immensity was emptied out into the most small and enclosed in the most pure womb of one little virgin? How was Omnipotence emptied out in the tender age of an infant, and into the impotence of his members. How was one singularly wealthy and alone self-sufficient emptied out: such that he who adorned the heavens in light is wrapped in swaddling clothes? How was that ineffable joy of the angels emptied out, when he wails in a cradle . . .? How finally was that majesty emptied out, which should be adored by the powerful and shuttered at by the mighty, mocked by sinners and smeared in the face with spit? But let no one think that there was an emptying out of the power of the divine majesty in the assumption of man, such that in our infirmity the omnipotence of God failed or was immune in some part of it. But rather let him so distinguish the properties of both natures united in the same person, that he understands the infirmity of man to be attributed to the divine God. [That emptying out therefore of the Son of God is to be believed to be nothing other than the administered hiddenness of the divine majesty in the Son of Man].⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Franco Afflighem, *De gratia Dei Libri XII* (PL 166:743B-744A): "Mira autem et ineffabilis atque omni sensui incomprehensibilis [743C] dignatio, ut Deus homo fieret, plenitudo se exinaniret, panis esuriret, virtus lassaretur, vita moreretur. Sed cur hoc? Ut a Deo assumptus homo Deus fieret, ut exinanitus exinanitos impleret, esuriens jejunos pasceret, lassus dissolutos confortaret, mortuus mortuos vivificaret. Magna plene gratia, mira dignatio tanta tantae majestatis exinanitio. Quantum putas exinanitus erat immensus brevissimo atque mundissimo unius virgunculae utero inclusus? Quantum

Typically medieval, carefully distinguishing the two natures united in one person facilitated, rather than hindered, edifying *meditatio*.

Such examples of Christological meditation could be easily multiplied; they reflect the sensibilities of the age. In the end, these practices not only fostered speculative insight, intellectual nourishment, and wonder; they also—and this was the goal—moved faith to love, changed the water of theological speculation into the wine of spiritual *devotio*.

Perhaps nowhere is twelfth-century Christological devotion more evident than in allegorical interpretation of Scripture, which so captured the Middle Ages (and so repulses the modern!). Examples taken almost at random and easily multiplied: Rupert of Deutz's claim that the wedding feast at Cana shows that the Incarnation is indeed what the Old Testament prophets and patriarchs prefigured: "that the two natures, namely the divine and the human, would converge in the one Christ";⁴⁵ Ivo of Chartres: "the two he-goats signify the two natures in Christ: the human, in which he suffered for our reconciliation, which the goat sacrificed for sin signifies; the divine, which the goat signifies, which . . . is sent alive into the desert, in which, leaving behind the ninety-nine sheep, the good

exinanitus erat Omnipotens, in teneris infantiae annis, et membris, etiam sui impotens? Quantum exinanitus erat ille singulariter dives, et solus sibi sufficiens: ut qui coelos luce induerit, pannis involutus sit? Quantum exinanitum [743D] erat illud angelorum ineffabile gaudium, cum in cunis vagiret, ac primi parentis aerumnae causam defleret? Quantum demum exinanita erat majestas illa virtutibus adoranda, potestatibus tremenda, a peccatoribus irrisa, ac facie sputis illita? Ne quis autem existimet ita exinanitam in assumpto homine divinae majestatis potentiam, quasi in infirmitate nostra omnipotentia Dei defecerit aut ex aliqua sui parte imminuta sit. Ita vero in eadem persona utriusque naturae proprietatem distinguat, ut infirma homini, divina Deo attribuenda intelligat. Ipsa igitur Filii Dei exinanitio nihil aliud esse credenda est [744B] quam dispensatoria in Filio hominis divinae majestatis occultatio."

⁴⁵ Rupert of Deutz, *Commentaria in evangelium S. Joannis* (PL 169:285A): "Nuptiae, inquit, factae sunt in Cana Galilaeae." Hoc magnum et multis prophetarum praeconiis praenuntiatum, atque patriarcharum factis fuerat praefiguratum, quod duae naturae, divina scilicet et humana, conventurae essent in uno Christo." According to Abigail Ann Young, the modern critical edition of Rupert's commentary, *Commentaria in euangelium sancti Iohannis*, ed. Rh. Haacke, CCM 9 (Turnhout, 1969), "has been marred by typographical and other printing errors, so that it is still necessary to consult the older edition in PL 169.201-826" (Abigail Ann Young, "The Fourth Gospel In The Twelfth Century: Rupert Of Deutz on The Gospel Of John," online at <http://chass.utoronto.ca/~young/text.html> [accessed October 10, 2014]).

shepherd came to seek the one that was lost.”⁴⁶ A text which often elicited Christological allegory was Isaiah 7:15: “[Emmanuel] will eat butter and honey, until he knows how to refuse evil and choose the good.”⁴⁷ Abbot Absalon does what many did when he correlates the butter and the honey with the divinity and humanity of Christ: “Christ was made Emmanuel, that is, God with us, showing himself [to be] equally God and man: God, in as much as he ate butter by assuming human nature, and man, in as much as he ate honey by receiving the sweetness of divinity in himself.”⁴⁸ He then pursues the allegory:

Therefore, just as in honey the divinity of Christ [is signified], so also in butter his humanity is signified. And perhaps by a fitting similitude is the human nature in Christ figured by butter. For butter is rich, suave, liquefied and nourishing. The richness of butter pertains to the mystery of his conception; sweetness to the humility of his nativity; liquefaction to the bitterness of his passion; nourishment to the sacrament of our redemption.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ Ivo of Chartres, “Sermo V,” in *De ecclesiasticis sacramentis et officiis ac praeceptis per annum festis Sermones* (PL 162:554C): “Duo quippe hirci duas significant in Christo naturas: humanam, in qua passus est pro reconciliatione nostra, quam significat mactatus hircus pro peccato; alteram divinam, quam significat hircus, qui per hominem paratum, id est per seipsum mittitur vivens in desertum illud scilicet, in quo relictis nonaginta novem ovibus, bonus pastor unam venit quaerere, quae perierat (Lk. 15).”

⁴⁷ On Richard of St. Victor’s Christological interpretation of this text, see Boyd Taylor Coolman, “Harmony of Similar and Dissimilar Things in Richard of St. Victor’s *De Emmanuele*,” in *Transforming Relations: Essays on Jews and Christians throughout History in Honor of Michael A. Signer* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010), 125-49.

⁴⁸ Absalon of Springiersbach, “Sermo VII,” in *Sermones* (PL 211:51B): “et Christus factus est Emmanuel, id est, nobiscum Deus, Deum pariter et hominem se demonstrans, ut in eo quod Deus butyrum comederet naturam humanam assumendo, et in eo quod homo mel comederet, divinitatis dulcedinem in se suscipiendo.”

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* (PL 211:49A-B): “*Butyrum et mel comedet, ut sciat reprobare malum et eligere bonum* (Is. 7). Quia tamen Emmanuelis nostri cibus spiritalis est, videamus quid significant ista fercula, [49B] quorum alterum, id est butyrum, de uberibus, reliquum, id est, mel, de floribus elicitor. Sicut ergo in melle Christi divinitas, ita et in butyro ejus humanitas significata est. Et congrua fortassis similitudine, per butyrum humana natura in Christo figuratur. Est enim butyrum pingue, suave, liquefactivum et nutritivum. Pinguedo itaque butyri refertur ad mysterium conceptionis, suavitas ad humilitatem nativitatis, liquefactio ad amaritudinem passionis, refectio ad sacramenta nostrae redemptionis.”

The frequent use of metaphors of food and eating, as Caroline Walker Bynum noted long ago, was meant to facilitate spiritual devotion to and intimacy with Christ. On this score, Bernard's friend and eventual fellow Cistercian, William of St. Thierry, sums up the point:

Afterwards however, when faith becomes a movement of love, and they embrace Christ Jesus in the midst of their hearts with love's sweet embrace, wholly man because of the human nature he took to himself, wholly God because it was God who took the nature, they begin to know him no longer according to the flesh, although they are not yet fully able to conceive of him in his divinity.⁵⁰

Here, loving devotion to the God-man begins a movement that begins with his humanity and moves toward and culminates in his divinity, a movement begun in this life but only completed in the next.

V. TO KNOW CHRIST IN THE FATHER

With a slight shift in metaphor, the sensory language found in Richard of St. Victor's account of Christological *meditatio* in this life could be deployed to speak of the Christological experience of beatitude in the next. Early in the period, Peter Damian (d. 1072) compared Christ's two natures to the milk and honey of the Promised Land:

For undoubtedly that is the land for which the blessed patriarchs and prophets longed, namely, that flowing with milk and honey. Milk, of course, flows from fleshly breasts, but honey comes from above. And, since the substance of the Lord's body came forth from the womb of the Virgin, but the divinity descended from the paternal majesty, rightly the body of the Savior is called the land of promise. That land is said to flow with milk and honey, since in the body of our Redeemer is the true and sweet substance of the ineffably deity. *For in him*, as the Apostle said, *dwells all the fullness of divinity bodily* (Col 2); and again: *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself* (2 Cor 5). To this land of the living he, who did not despise to tolerate the mortality

⁵⁰ William of St. Thierry, *Epistola ad fratres de Monte Dei* 1.43.175 (*Golden Epistle: A Letter to the Brethren at Mont Dieu*, trans. Theodore Berkeley, O.C.S.O. [Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1980], 69).

of our land, deigns to lead us, where, in as much as we are fed by milk and honey, so we will be satisfied by the presence of our Savior and by the honey-flowing sweetness of his divinity, he who forever lives and reigns with God the Father and with the Holy Spirit. Amen.⁵¹

Deftly, Peter moves from the milk and honey of the literal Old Testament Promised Land, to the allegorical milk and honey in the Incarnation, and finally to the eschatological milk and honey of the next life. Throughout is the consistent pairing of the two natures, which Peter refuses to separate even in the next life. And, there is more than mere homiletical convention at work in the way the Christological vision expands and flows into the Trinitarian doxology, Christ's humanity leading to the divinity he shares with the Father and the Spirit. Picking up this same image, while also invoking the venerable image of Christ the good shepherd, "who leads us into the true land of promise . . . which flows with milk and honey," Richard of St. Victor elaborates on this eschatological dimension by linking the milk and honey of the promised land with this text from John's Gospel: "we will go in and go out and find pasture" (John 10:9). By this he means that:

we will *go out* through the physical senses, and we will find pasture in the milk of the humanity of Christ; we will *go in* through the rational senses, and we will find pasture in the honey of his divinity. In this, there will be eternal satiety, the fullness of joy which no one takes from us.⁵²

⁵¹ Peter Damian, "Sermo II," in *Sermones* (ed. E. Lucchesi, CCCM 57 [1983]; *PL* 144:517B-C): "Illa nimirum est terra cui tum beati patriarchae atque prophetae suspirabant, lacte scilicet et melle mananti. Lac siquidem de carnis uberibus profluit, mel vero de superioribus venit. Et quia substantia Dominici corporis ex Virginis visceribus prodiit, divinitas autem ex paterna maiestate descendit, recte corpus Salvatoris terra dicitur repromissionis. Quae nimirum terra lacte, simul ac melle fluere dicitur, quia in Redemptoris nostri corpore, et substantia vere et dulcedo est ineffabilis deitatis. In [517C] *ipso enim*, sicut Apostolus ait, *habitat omnis plenitudo divinitatis corporaliter* (Col. 2): et alibi, *Deus erat in Christo mundum reconcilians sibi* (II Cor. 5). Ad hanc viventium terram ille nos dignetur inducere, qui terrae nostrae mortalia non dedignatus est tolerare, quatenus sic ibi lacte et melle vescamur ut Salvatoris nostri praesentia et melliflua divinitatis ejus dulcedine satiemur. Qui cum Deo Patre, et Spiritu sancto vivit, et regnat per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen."

⁵² Richard of St. Victor, *Sermo in die paschae* (*PL* 196:1074A-B): "Et nos egredientes et ingredientes pascua inveniemus. [1074B] Egrediemur per sensum carnis, et pascua inveniemus in lacte humanitatis Christi. Ingrediemur per sensum rationis, et pascua

After making the same point, an anonymous Victorine secures the classical Christological logic behind the claim:

For God is honored on this account: that in himself he will beatify the whole man; that the whole conversion of man will be toward God himself, that the whole love of man will be in God himself. For if the Creator of man is God, and God is not man, it would be God himself that is seen by the senses of the mind, but what the senses of the body perceive would not be God; and it would endure perpetual reproach in the senses of the flesh by the absence of the Creator, and it would always be wandering in poverty among creatures, and never attaining to its Creator. Therefore, lest the senses of the flesh in man carry that reproach perpetually, such that it would always rightly be asked of them, *where is your God* (Mic 7:10), never being admitted into the contemplation of its Creator, the Creator assumed flesh; which by the senses of the flesh, through the flesh, God would be seen in it, so that the food of the flesh would be milk in the contemplation of the flesh, that the food of the mind would be honey in the contemplation of divinity. And *he will go out and go in and find pastures* (Jn 10). External pastures in the flesh of the Savior, internal pastures in the divinity of the Creator. And the one Savior and Creator will be the one joy, both in the milk of the flesh and in the honey of the divinity.⁵³

Despite the sharp distinction between physical and spiritual sensation in these texts, a deeper classical intuition is manifold. First, eternal beatitude is profoundly embodied—the bodily senses must be included, and they find their eternal fulfillment

invenimus in melle divinitatis ejus. Ibi erit aeterna satietas, gaudium plenum quod nemo tollet a nobis.”

⁵³ Anonymous Victorine author, *Elucidationes variae in scripturam moraliter* (PL 177:523A-C): “Sic enim demum demonstrabitur nobis terra visionis a Domino, in qua ipse videbitur Dominus, quam in repositionem posuit filiis, lacte et melle manantem: lacte in contemplatione [523B] humanitatis, melle in contemplatione divinitatis. Propterea enim Deus honorificatus est, ut totum hominem in se beatificaret, ut tota conversio hominis esset ad ipsum, et tota dilectio hominis esset in ipso. Si enim Creator hominis Deus esset, et Deus homo non esset, esset in ipso, quod sensu mentis videretur, sed quod sensu corporis perciperetur, non esset; et sustineret sensu carnis perpetuum opprobrium absentiae Creatoris, et esset in abjectionem semper oberrans in creaturis, et non attingens ad Creatorem suum. Ne igitur sensus carnis in homine opprobrium istud in perpetuum portaret semperque merito illi diceretur, Ubi est Deus tuus (Mich. 7), si nunquam ad Creator is sui contemplationem admitteretur, assumpsit Creator carnem; [523C] quae a sensu carnis in ipso videretur per carnem, ut carnis cibus esset lac in contemplatione carnis, mentis cibus mel in contemplatione divinitatis. Et egrederetur et ingrederetur, et pascua inveniret (Jn 10). Pascua foris in carne Salvatoris, pascua intus in divinitate Creatoris. Et Salvator et Creator unus unum gaudium esset et in lacte carnis, et in melle divinitatis. Quod, etc. Amen.”

in the vision of the humanity of Christ. This is itself a function of a twofold Christological insistence, namely, on the real assumption of the whole of human nature in the Incarnation and on the inclusion of the body in his resurrection, and, by derivation, the anthropological affirmation of a general resurrection of the body and its legitimate inclusion in eternal beatitude. Second, the beatitude of the spiritual/rational aspect of the human person is also ineluctably Christological. The *visio Dei*, as it is traditionally termed, is a *visio* of the divinity of Christ. Twelfth-century theologians consistently construed the beatific *visio Dei* in classical terms. It is the eternal vision of the God-Man, who, precisely because of his one-person, two-natures composition, can be the beatifying vision of the whole person: God's human nature seen by glorified physical eyes, his divine nature seen by glorified spiritual eyes.

But this insistence on a Christological beatitude harbors an even more fundamental principle. In John's Gospel, Nathanael says to Jesus: "Show us the Father and it is enough for us" (John 14:8). Perhaps the most profound Chalcedonian intuition evident in the twelfth century is that only if Christ's humanity is God's own, only if the divine Word is the sole person hypostasizing the humanity of Jesus, can Jesus' reply to Nathanael—"he who sees the Son sees the Father as well"—be justified. On this verse, Gerhoh of Reichersperg comments:

the true humanity and true divinity suffices for my soul . . . the manna, the food of angels, suffices for it, whose taste is like honey and olive-oil bread [*quasi panis oleati*]; for the likeness of the most pure humanity with honey and with the oil of divinity is to be so tasted that from the two and in the two natures the one bread of Emmanuel is understood, in whom there is nothing more which the angels desire to look at, since beyond him there is nothing, in whom there is also the Father and the Holy Spirit, each of which is one God.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ Gerhoh of Reichersperg, *Commentarius aureus in Psalmos et cantica ferialia* (PL 193:1495A): "Sufficiat animae meae veneno serpentino intoxicatae antidotum de vera humanitate veraque divinitate confectum, sufficiat ei manna cibus angelorum, cuius est gustus quasi similiae cum melle vel quasi panis oleati, quia similia mundissimae humanitatis cum melle vel oleo divinitatis ita est sapienda, ut ex duabus, et in duabus naturis panis unus Emmanuel intelligatur, in quem, non ultra quem desiderant angeli prospicere, quoniam ultra ipsum nihil est, in quo et Pater et Spiritus sanctus est, quique unus Deus."

For Gerhoh, as for many of his contemporaries, one finds “in the two natures” ultimately and beatifically “the one bread of Emmanuel,” a single fulfillment of every aspect of human nature. There is nothing more to see, nothing more even for the angels to desire, since in him “there is also the Father and the Holy Spirit.” This is what it means to know Christ in the Father: it is to know the Father, and indeed the whole Trinity, *in and through* the incarnate Christ. “Whoever has seen the Son, has seen the Father.”

CONCLUSION

Writing at the end of this long century, a generation after Baldwin, William of Auxerre (d. 1231), secular master at Paris, brings Baldwin’s three modes of faith (of unity, union, and communion) together in a fitting *conclusio*, even as he inhabits the newly consolidated Scholastic ethos of the university. The inextricable twelfth-century linking of Eucharist, Christ, and Trinity is apparent in William’s treatment of the Trinity in his *Summa Aurea*.⁵⁵ As he concludes, he poses a question that is only intelligible in light of this constellation: “Are the Father and Son . . . a singular bread?” What he means is: Is the Trinitarian “goodness and attractiveness and sweetness, which nourishes us,” a “single reality”?⁵⁶ After all, does not “beatitude . . . consist in knowing the Trinity?”⁵⁷ Or, in light of the Incarnation, are there not “several breads,” an irreducibly manifold source of delight and refecation, since the incarnate Christ “delights us in as much as he is God, but also in as much as he is man”?⁵⁸ In response, William refuses the dilemma: “the Trinity . . . is a singular bread,” for “the human nature of Christ delights rational creatures because of its union with the divine nature”; through the Incarnation, we find refecation and

⁵⁵ William of Auxerre, *Summa Aurea*, ed. Ph. Pigouchet (Paris, 1500 and 1518 [repr. Frankfurt: Minerva, 1964]); ed. Fr. Regnault (Paris, 1500; Venice, 1591); ed. J. Ribaillier (*Spicilegium Bonaaventurianum*, vols. 16-20 [Paris and Grottaferrata, 1980-87]).

⁵⁶ *Summa Aurea* I, tract. 8, c. 8, q. 3, a. 4 (Ribaillier, ed., 171.4-5).

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* (Ribaillier, ed., 171.11-13).

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* (Ribaillier, ed., 171.6-7).

nourishment in the single “goodness or suavity of God.”⁵⁹ But posed strikingly (at least to us!) in terms of “bread,” the question is unmistakably Eucharistic. In Baldwin’s terms, it is by knowing “Christ in the Eucharist” that we know “Christ in the flesh” and thus come “to know Christ in the Father.”

So what should be said on the basis of this “sampling” of classical Christology in the twelfth-century? Though this era contains impressive examples of technical Christological analysis, deploying precise philosophical conceptions as would later, high Scholastics, what appears here is the deep sensibility of the epoch, which arguably provides the impetus and context for such Scholastic endeavors. What emerges in this “long twelfth century” might best be called a “Chalcedonian state of mind”—a hue, cast, or ambiance, which prompts these theologians to do theology broadly in classical Christological terms, to forge and cultivate links between this dogma and others, the Eucharist and the Trinity, for example, and to pursue an integrated experience of all three. In the end, for these believers, the one-person, two-natures doctrine was not finally a puzzle to be solved or a problem to be resolved—though those aspects are not absent—rather, it offered a site for speculative *meditatio*, for deep theological exploration, that involved the pursuit of a precise *intellectus fidei* certainly, but also led on to wonder, marvel, and delight, as well as ultimately to praise, worship, and love. Fittingly, as the last word, Baldwin of Ford intones the Trinitarian, incarnational, and Eucharistic notes thus:

God, who is goodness, whose substance is charity, whose essence is benignity, wishing to reveal his substance which is a sweet nature . . . sent his Son, the bread of angels, into the world: *For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son* (Jn 3:16). . . . He himself alone suffices and satisfies every pious desire; and has in himself every delight and condiment, and all sweetness of taste.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Ibid. (Riballier, ed., 171.15ff.).

⁶⁰ Baldwin of Ford, *De sacramento altaris* (SC 94:564-66; PL 204:768C-D): “Deus qui bonitas est, cujus substantia charitas est, cujus essentia benignitas est, volens substantiam suam ostendere quam dulcis naturae est. . . . Filium suum panem angelorum in mundum, misit: *Sic enim Deus dilexit mundum, ut unigenitum suum daret* (Jn 3). . . .

Perhaps scholarly investigation of the long twelfth century should follow Baldwin by not sundering what he and his contemporaries united.

omnibus piis desideriis solus ipse sufficit et satisfacit; et habens in se omne delectamentum et condimentum, et omnis saporis suavitatem.”