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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: GUIBERT OF NOGENT

The historian of theology and religious life in the Middle Ages cannot help but be attracted to Guibert, a Benedictine monk and the Abbot of Nogent. (1053-1125). If largely unnoted by his contemporaries, modern historians have admired Guibert's thematic diversity, his critical mind, and

1 The dates for the life of Guibert of Nogent remain somewhat disputed, for he left no clear record of his birth, and we can estimate his death by the cessation of his writing and the mention of a new abbot of Nogent in 1127. Guibert says he was born the day before Easter (vigilia Paschalis), at a time iuduo ferme aprili. Mabillon established Guibert's birth date in 1053 because Easter fell on April 13 that year. Edmond-René LaBande suggested a date of 1055, and John Benton argued for a birth year of 1064. The majority of scholars accept the 1053-1125 range as established by Mabillon in the eighteenth century. For the fullest discussion of the dates of Guibert's life, see Appendix I in John F. Benton, Self and Society in Medieval France (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 229-236; see also Guibert de Nogent, Autobiographie, ed. and French trans. Edmond-René LaBande (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1981), ix-xii; and Georges Bourgin, ed. Guibert de Nogent, Histoire de sa Vie (Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1907), i-li.

2 Guibert's theological tracts and commentaries, at least, seem not to have gone beyond Nogent. Mention of Guibert in the contemporary literature is quite rare. The exceptions include Guibert's Gesta Dei per Francos, which exists in multiple manuscripts. The earliest remaining copy dates to the seventeenth century. His work was not as frequently used as other contemporary histories of the First Crusade as a source for later historians. Additionally, Guibert's commentary on the minor prophets has been found copied in the thirteenth century. See Beryl Smalley, "William of Middleton and Guibert of Nogent," Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale (RTAM) 16(1949), 287-290; Jonathan Riley-Smith, The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading (London: Athlone Press, 1986), 135-152; Benton, Self and Society, 7.
his acute observations of life in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries. Guibert was a historian, a moralist, and a Biblical exegete. He lived during the First Crusade and may have been present at Pope Urban II's speech at Clermont. He recorded his travels as including trips to Laon, Beauvais, Soissons, Amiens, and Langres. He may have met Popes Urban II and Pashcal II and King Louis VI. He dedicated many of his works to


5 Guibert, *Autobiographie*, ed. LaBande, III,4,6,14,15. All citations to Guibert's *Monodiae* in this paper will be to LaBande's critical edition, with Roman numerals indicating the book number and arabic numerals, the chapter.

6 Ibid., III,4,7.
churchmen in Northern France, and mentioned his acquaintance with both Anselm of Bec and Anselm of Laon, the theologian and Biblical commentator of the school of Laon. Yet, studies of Guibert have remained fragmentary and rather focused.

Guibert of Nogent's *Monodiae*, or *Memoirs*, composed in 1115, have received the most attention from scholars. The *Memoirs* have been acknowledged as the first "comprehensive autobiography in medieval Latin." Although Guibert fails to record in his autobiography when and where he was born, the work does give a chronological sketch of the rest of his life. His father died when he was less than a year old, and Guibert, the youngest child, was reared under the close watch of his mother. She arranged for

---

7 Guibert describes Anselm of Laon as the light of the Latin world in matters of liberal arts, "magister Ansellus, vir totius Franciae, immo latini orbis lumen in liberalibus disciplinis. Ibid., III,4,p.284-285. Anselm of Bec became abbot of Bec in 1078, archbishop of Canterbury in 1093, and died in 1109. Guibert became acquainted with him while he was at the monastery at Fly, and Anselm was at Bec. Guibert says he received special encouragement from Anselm, who was a familiar visitor at the abbey of Fly. Ibid., I, 17, p.138-141. See also Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (2nd ed. Oxford, 1952).

8 In addition to the editions and translations of the *Monodiae* cited in n.1 above, see Bernard Monod, *Le moine Guibert et son temps* (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1905). As noted above in n.5, the LaBande edition is the best critical edition to date. Migne reprinted the Latin text in *PL*, col. 837B-962A.

9 Georg Misch, the historian of autobiographical writing, cited by Benton, *Self and Society*,7.

Guibert's education under a private resident tutor, but at about age eleven, and at his own initiative, Guibert entered the monastery of St. Germer de Fly probably in 1064. \(^{11}\) In 1104, Guibert was elected abbot of the small monastery of Nogent-sous-Coucy near Laon. \(^{12}\)

Guibert lived at St. Germer for most of his adolescence and young adulthood. His childhood tutor had also entered the monastery at Fly and Guibert described in his Memoirs his continued study and "love for learning" while at St. Germer. \(^{13}\) A great part of the library at St. Germer had been a bequest of Ansegis, the ninth-century Abbot of the monastery of Fontenelle. \(^{14}\) The gift of books to Fly included works of history, Latin poets, Fathers of the Church and conciliar texts. \(^{15}\) It is quite possible that Guibert still had access to these works in the eleventh century. While a monk at St.

\(^{11}\) Ibid., I,15. For the origins of the monastery of St. Germer see Joseph Depoin, "Le vie de St. Germer," Congrès archéologique de France 72(1905), 392-406.

\(^{12}\) Guibert, Autobiographie, I,19.

\(^{13}\) Ibid., I,15, p.112-113.


\(^{15}\) Gesta sanctorum, 107-110.
Germer, Guibert began writing, starting with the *Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debeat* and the Biblical commentary, *Moralia in Genesim*.\(^{16}\)

Guibert composed most of his works while abbot at Nogent, from 1104 until his death about 1125. The *Epistola de buccella Judae data* was written for Siffroi, prior of St. Nicolas-aux-Bois, near Laon.\(^{17}\) Perhaps in 1108, Guibert wrote his chronicle of the First Crusade, the *Gesta Dei per Francos*, a history based on the narrative of the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*.\(^{18}\) The *Tractatus de Incarnatione contra Judaeos* was completed by 1111, and Guibert’s *Monodiae* in 1115.\(^{19}\) Between 1118 and 1121 Guibert finished the *Liber de laude Sanctae Mariae*, and two commentaries on the minor prophets, *Tropologiae in Osee, Jeremiam, et Amos* and *Tropologiae in Abdiam, Jonam, Micheam, Zachariam, Joel, Nahum, Habacuc, et Sophoniam*.\(^{20}\) Finally, assumed to be Guibert’s last work, *De pignoribus sanctorum* has been dated to 1119-1120.\(^{21}\) This last work, the *Treatise on the*


17 *PL* 156, col.527-538.

18 *PL* 156, col.683-838. See also Riley-Smith, *First Crusade*, 136.

19 *PL* 156, col. 489C-528C and 837B-962A, respectively.

20 Following the order in the text, *PL* 156, col. 537-578; col. 337D-488C; Benton, *Self and Society*, 238.
Relics of Saints, has been the center of a century of scholarship which has labelled Guibert, somewhat incorrectly, as possessing intellectual abilities and insights unusual to the twelfth century. Indeed, some would designate Guibert as unmedieval.22 It is towards correcting and modifying this characterization of Guibert that the balance of this thesis is directed.

21 Monique-Cécile Garand successfully argues for a date of 1119-1120 based, among other things, upon a textual analysis of the manuscript. This date seems to be the most generally accepted by current scholars. Monique-Cécile Garand, "Le Scriptorium de Guibert de Nogent" Scriptorium 31(1977), 3-29, especially 26.

22 For a full discussion of this issue, see Part II of this paper, "Document and Tradition." Abel LeFranc characterized Guibert, in the context of nineteenth-century scholarship, as almost a "modern man." LeFranc, "Le Traité des Reliques," 285.
CHAPTER II

DOCUMENT and TRADITION.

Guibert of Nogent's De pignoribus sanctorum, or The Treatise on the Relics of Saints,23 written around 1120,24 while the Benedictine monk spent the last years of his life as abbot of the small monastery at Nogent-sous-Coucy in the diocese of Laon, has often attracted the attention of medieval historians.25 The original treatise appears to have had little, if any, circulation, and was preserved only at Guibert's own monastery at Nogent.26 In the introduction to his 1907 edition and French translation of


24 See n.21 above.

Guibert's *Memoirs*, Georges Bourgin stated that the archives of the abbey of Nogent were dispersed by the Calvinists in the sixteenth century. The works of Guibert, including *De pignoribus sanctorum*, were saved and placed in the Bibliothèque du Roi. Using these manuscripts, Luc d'Achery of St. Germain-des-Prés published the complete works of Guibert in 1651. D'Achery's compendium was reproduced in 1880 by J.P. Migne as volume 156 of the *Patrologia Latina*. While many of the manuscripts have since been lost, the signature copy of *De pignoribus sanctorum* survived the centuries and is currently listed as ms. lat. 2900 in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.

---


29 Le Franc, "Les Traité des Reliques,"

30 The comments of d'Achery are preserved in the Migne edition, *PL* 156, col.1017-1202.

31 I would like to acknowledge the Bibliothèque Nationale for their prompt handling of my request for a microfilm copy of this manuscript. Although I have utilized the manuscript microfilm as a resource, particularly when the Migne rendition of a word or phrase seems questionable, I have relied most heavily on the Migne edition.
Guibert wrote *De pignoribus sanctorum* in response to a pamphlet circulated by the monks of the nearby monastery of St. Médard at Soissons. The pamphlet exalted the relics held in the collection of the monastery of St. Médard. Particularly acclaimed was the milk tooth of Christ and the miracles attributed to it. Guibert addressed his work to Abbot Odo of St. Symphorien in Beauvais and stated his clear and immediate goal of attacking the authenticity of this relic of Christ. Guibert also acknowledged in his introduction that his treatise would often stray from the central concern and address related topics. Because the principal point of the abbot's treatise was to refute the existence of the milk tooth - a relic of the body of Christ - much of the work was devoted to the cult of relics in general, and to a doctrine of the body of Christ in particular. Guibert's initial statements of purpose, contained in the *epistula nuncapatoria* dedicated to Abbot Odo, were actually written as an introduction after Guibert completed the main body of the treatise which consisted of four books.

---

32 PL 156, col.607D-612C.

33 Ibid., col.607D-609A.

34 Ibid.

35 Ibid., col.629B-650C. The second book of the treatise, *De Corpore Domini Bipertito Principali Scilicet ac Mystico* reveals most clearly Guibert's conception of the body of Christ and his Eucharistic theology. See also Garand, "Le Scriptorium."
In the first book of Guibert's treatise, *De sanctis et eorum pignoribus*, the abbot dealt with the character of sanctity and the cult of relics. He spoke of criteria to authenticate saints' cults and to establish the validity of relics. Guibert expressed concern about contemporary practices that he perceived to be abusive to the faith, such as the institutional sponsorship of uncertain cults and relics.

Guibert's second book, *De corpore Domini bipertito, principali scilicet ac mystico*, was essentially a tract on the doctrine of the Eucharist. Clearly for Guibert, if he was to argue against the existence of a bodily relic of Christ, it was necessary to establish his theological conception of the nature of Christ. The question of the unity of the incarnate Christ with the divine Christ that figured so prominently in the intellectual thought of this period led Guibert to speculate that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist remained as the only relic of Christ's body with which no other 'relic' could compete.

---

36 *PL* 156, col. 611D-630A.

37 Ibid., col. 621.

38 Ibid., col. 629.

were intimately bound up with his conception of the nature of Christ as he set it out in the second book.

In the third book, *Contra Sancti-Medardenses, qui dentem Salvatoris habere se asserunt*, Guibert applied his theological stance pertaining to the Real Presence in the Eucharist to the problem at hand.\(^{40}\) Guibert objected for theological and practical reasons to the assertions of the monks of St. Médard. Aside from the contradiction implied by the existence of a bodily relic of Christ and the true bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, Guibert also argued for the incompatibility of a relic of Christ with the doctrine of a resurrected Christ. If any particle of the earthly Christ remained on earth, then Christ could be said to be only partially resurrected. If Christ was thus displayed as risen not in His entirety, then the promise of man's resurrection, of the life eternal promised with Christ, was compromised.\(^{41}\) To Guibert, the issue was that of man's salvation. On a more mundane level, Guibert cast doubt on the existence of the tooth by contending that no one from Christ's childhood would have thought to save the tooth. Guibert further thought it doubtful that a tooth could have survived the centuries without rotting.\(^{42}\)

\(^{40}\) *PL* 156, col. 652B, 652D, 654D.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., 611D, 659B.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., col.658D, 659 A,C,D.
These three books form the core of *De pignoribus sanctorum*. A fourth book, *De interiori mundo*, was completed by Guibert prior to the other books of the treatise.\footnote{Ibid., col.665B-680A; LeFranc, "Le Traité des Reliques," 304.} The contents of this book, dealing with Guibert’s concept of religion as an interior state, appeared somewhat enigmatic to early scholars, in relation to the rest of the treatise. Abel LeFranc suggested that Guibert added this earlier work as the fourth book of *De pignoribus sanctorum* to soften somewhat the blow made by his more polemical tone in the first three books of the treatise.\footnote{Ibid.} In this more mystical tract, Guibert discussed visions and apparitions and upheld the ideals of the spiritual world, of contemplation, against superstition.\footnote{PL 156, col 670-678; See also Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse Médiévale*, 2 vols.(Aubier: Editions Montaigne, 1959), 150.} Guibert promoted his personal religious ideal in this tract, that of the contemplation of God, and praised the achievement of personal piety in a saint. The attributes of piety and contemplation, however, were more difficult to certify, and less likely than exterior signs, such as visions or apparitions, to be recorded in written accounts of a saint.\footnote{PL 156, col.669-677.}
The traditional interpretation of Guibert’s *De pignoribus sanctorum* has focused on Guibert as a rather extraordinary critic of contemporary religious practices. Guibert has been called "*moderne dans sa critique,*" 47 "*fort en avancé sur son siècle,*" 48 and the author of work "*absolument unique*" 49 in the literature of the twelfth century. The tendency has been to speak of Guibert as the author of a 'Treatise on Relics' that implicates Guibert as a critic of the religious and social practices of the cults of saints and the veneration of relics so prevalent to his generation. This point of view is rooted in the early commentary and scholarship on Guibert’s treatise.

The first negative reaction to Guibert came as a Catholic response to Guibert’s questionings of some saints. The Benedictine scholar, Luc d’Achery, in notes added to his 1651 edition of the complete works of Guibert, reflected a certain embarrassment towards this work that he considered at some points misguided. 50 Concerning Guibert’s treatment of


the relics of St. Firmin, d'Achery's comments were expressly unfavorable. 51 Abel LeFranc noted an 1890 work by Beissel, written with a particularly Catholic point of view, that condemned Guibert as dangerous and embarrassing. 52 These authors labelled Guibert as a critic of essential points of the Catholic faith. By far the most significant work to brand Guibert with the designation of 'critic' was the first scholarly article directed primarily towards an interpretation of De pignoribus sanctorum; Abel LeFranc's 1896 essay, "Le Traité des Reliques de Guibert de Nogent." 53

Abel LeFranc determined that Guibert's treatise possessed a method, a clairvoyance, and a spirit of criticism more akin to the work of a 'modern' man than one of the twelfth century. 54 He thought that Guibert's perceptions of the world around him were particularly astute, such as the abbot's description of Laon in Book Two of De vita sua. 55 LeFranc reasoned from such evidence that Guibert possessed an aptitude for critical thought. 56 While LeFranc recognized that Guibert might have been


51 PL 156,n.12, col.1027-1029.


53 Ibid.

54 Ibid., 285, 286.

55 Ibid., 292, 293.
influenced by the works of Berenger of Tours (d.1088), Anselm (d.1109) and Abelard (d.1142), the French historian emphasized that Guibert was the first to express a rational and systematic view of the cult of saints and their relics.\textsuperscript{57} LeFranc's overall assessment accentuated Guibert's uniqueness in the twelfth century and underscored his role as a precursor of Jean Calvin.\textsuperscript{58} This characterization of Guibert has endured as the predominant portrayal of the twelfth-century monk in historical scholarship.

Indeed, few medieval historians do not know Guibert as the monk who found ridiculous the assertions of Constantinople and the monks of St. Jean d'Angely that each possessed the head of St. John the Baptist. How absurd, Guibert exclaimed, to believe that so great a man had two heads!\textsuperscript{59} One student of Guibert, Marie-Danielle Mireux, has used this example to point to Guibert's originality among his contemporaries, for apparently, she says, others accepted the existence of two heads.\textsuperscript{60} More likely, those aware

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid.
\item Ibid., 298.
\item Ibid., 304.
\item PL 156, col.624.
\item Mireux, "Guibert," 298.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
of the multiplicity of certain relics regarded only one of them as the true relic, and denied the authenticity of the rival relic. 61

A second example, often cited, is Guibert's story of the young man from a village near Beauvais who died on Good Friday, and on account of the holy day on which he died, was venerated by the rustici as a saint. 62 Colin Morris argued that this identified Guibert as a man of critical spirit, with a far keener sense of evidence than most abbots and bishops of his day. 63

Finally, there is the example of the tooth of Christ, claimed by the monks of the monastery of St. Medard in Soissons as part of their relic collection. The assertion of the monks of St. Medard was the raison d'être of Guibert's treatise, which was written to refute it. 64

Guibert has been variously characterized because of his argument. Mireux said that he simply could not accept that the tooth could last that


62 PL 156, col. 621.


64 See in particular, Guibert's open letter of introduction, PL 156, cols. 607 D-612 C.
many centuries without rotting. Hence, Guibert has been seen as a better judge of historical evidence than most of his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{65} As part of his psychoanalytical approach to Guibert, John Benton concluded that Guibert had a deep fear of sexual mutilation and thus was possibly motivated to write a treatise against all the relics of Christ's body.\textsuperscript{66} In reaction against the tendency to view Guibert as possessing advanced critical abilities, some have dismissed Guibert altogether as a critic, arguing that the treatise was "inspired by institutional rivalry rather than intuitive skepticism."\textsuperscript{67}

Recently, scholars have examined Guibert's writings, especially the \textit{De pignoribus sanctorum}, as a source for knowledge of popular spirituality and lay devotion in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries. Some have been struck by the evidence for a gulf between the educated churchman and the ordinary faithful, basing their views on Guibert's skepticism concerning

\textsuperscript{65} Mireux, "Guibert," 298.


popular expressions of piety.\textsuperscript{68} Certainly, this treatise is rich with examples of popular religious practice. Guibert has also attracted the notice of historians of theology, particularly because his autobiography mentioned his studying with Anselm of Bec, with whom he came in contact in his earlier years while a monk at the monastery of St. Germer in Fly.\textsuperscript{69}

Indeed, Guibert does question and criticize. Those who have looked at Guibert’s treatise have not necessarily misread him, but their emphasis has been superficial. The focus has been aimed towards the critical parts, rather than towards the whole, and what it may reveal about the fully-articulated thought of Guibert. The reasons that underlie his statements have rarely been examined, and the contours of Guibert’s faith, amply illustrated throughout De pignoribus sanctorum, rarely discovered. Rather than focusing on the Treatise as an unusual example of medieval writing, and on Guibert as a man far in advance of his century,\textsuperscript{70} the treatise should be evaluated in

\textsuperscript{68} See in particular, Morris, "Critique"; Mireux, "Guibert"; and E. Nortier, "Guibert de Nogent," 63-77.

\textsuperscript{69} For Guibert’s contact with Anselm see Guibert de Nogent, Autobiographie, 138-143. For studies comparing the theologies of Guibert and Anselm see, in particular, Edmond-René LaBande, "Guibert de Nogent, disciple et témoin de saint Anselm au Bec" in Les Mutations socio-culturelles au tournant des Xie-XIe siècles; études anselmiennes. Actes du Colloque International du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. (Paris: CNRS, 1984),229-236; and Jaroslav Pelikan, "First Generation Anselmian, Guibert of Nogent" in Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History; Essays Presented to George Huntston Williams, eds. F. Forrester Church and Timothy George (Leiden: E.J. Brill,1979), 71-82.

\textsuperscript{70} Guibert "est fort en avance sur son siècle," LaBande, ed. Autobiographie,xiv; "Il fait preuve d’un esprit critique assez rare à l’époque,"
terms of Guibert’s theology and spirituality, within his contemporary context, and within his vocation as a monk.

Guibert had great sympathy for the spiritual renewal that followed the Gregorian reform, and exemplified in his thought and writings what has been called by Ernst Kantorowicz the "uncompromising christocentric period of Western civilization."71 Guibert wrote his Memoirs for the edification of his readers and to achieve greater personal faith and self knowledge.72 Guibert expressed support for the newly developing veneration of the Virgin Mary in his De laude sanctae Mariae.73 His Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debeat set out guidelines for the purification and teaching of the Catholic faith.74 In all his works, Guibert reveals a moralist's concern for the salvation of his fellow


72 Guibert, Autobiographie, I,2, p.6-9.

73 Guibert de Nogent, De laude sanctae Mariae, PL 156, cols.537 B-578 D.

74 Guibert de Nogent, Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debeat, PL 156, cols.21 B-32 C.
Christians and for the teaching of the correct expressions of veneration to the Lord. 75

The key to a greater understanding of Guibert and his *Treatise on the Relics of Saints* lies in placing Guibert in his cultural, historical and religious context. As one example, we may draw from Guibert's *Treatise* the virtues and attributes that, for Guibert, constituted sanctity and the proper veneration of the saints and their relics. If we analyse Guibert's concept of sanctity, we find views that do not seem quite so rare in the twelfth century as those who stress his uniqueness would have us believe. Guibert was a theologian and exegete whose perception of faith was deeply rooted in patristic and Scriptural sources, and in lively contemporary debates over sanctity, relics, and authority.

CHAPTER III
INTERPRETATION

A. Determining the Authenticity of Saints and their Relics

Guibert’s treatise, especially Book One, De sanctis et eorum pignoribus, defines Guibert’s thoughts on the criteria that defined sanctity and the proper veneration of the saints and their relics. Concerning relics, Colin Morris has pointed out that Guibert "did not object in principle to their veneration, but he was profoundly uneasy about some features of the developing cult." The same may be said about Guibert’s view of those honored as sancti. Guibert certainly did not deny or minimize the role of the saints in the church, but he worried about veneration given to false saints. He stated that the saints were for our example and protection. Saints were

76 PL 156, cols.611D-630A.

77 Morris, "Critique," 56.

78 PL 156: "Qui Ecclesiae falsa tribuit, ipsum dedecore afficit," col.611 D; and "Quid dicam de iis sanctis, quorum aut finis est in malo propatulus, aut latet utrum bonus an malus, aut inter utrumque fit scrupulus?" col.615 A; "Antequam quis invocetur de ipsius debet constare sanctitate," col.615 A.

79 Ibid., "Haec nobis sunt reverentiae ac honorii, pro exemplo praesidioque eorum." col.613 D.
divine, they were one with (unicorpores) with God. For this reason, errors concerning sanctity were errors made against God. It was clearly crucial to Guibert that sanctity be verified, not simply because he was critical of abuses, but because for Guibert, the theologian and the moralist, the very fact of personal eternal salvation was at stake.

In this vein, it was more against the laxity of fellow churchmen than against the devotees of popular cults that Guibert aimed his comments. Guibert's story about the young boy who died on Good Friday and was honored as a saint by the surrounding country folk demonstrates Guibert's consternation with a local abbot, a supposedly wise man, who let this cultic veneration have his blessing. In essence, Guibert said elsewhere, the

80 Ibid., col.625 C.

81 Ibid., for example "Quid enim magis sacrilegum quam pro divino excolere non divinum?" col.625 C; and "Et quid eo funestius, desperatius, damnatus, qui ipsum totius puritatis Deum fontem solo ambitu foedissimae voluntatis attaminat?" col. 621 A.

82 For example, in this passage, Guibert uses symbolic language to demonstrate how errors in faith detract from the well being of the whole Church. Ibid., "Si enim pro singuli Ecclesiarum suarum excellentia sibi ascribunt, unde potissimum fidei nostrae jura succumbunt, omnino hic honor detestabilis aestimandus, qui spebus universorum parturit declinationes et lapsus...sicut ex emergentium frequentia surculorum interitus accidit ramo, imo in arboris corpore toto." cols. 611 D-612 A. Nortier emphasizes that Guibert saw no less than the authenticity of the Christian religion at stake. She says Guibert's goal was to use his savoir for the benefit of his Christian brothers. Nortier, "Guibert de Nogent,"67,71.

83 Ibid., "Quid facit modestus et sapiens, qui praefert propositum sanctitatis, dum fautorem se praebet in talibus?" col.621 B.
and their beliefs were one matter, and, indeed, the church in all places had various customs, some of which were taught and some of which were not. These diverse practices did not detract from the catholic faith. But when the Church's leaders, the abbeys and bishops, who should know better, allowed the veneration of spurious saints, they were endangering their souls and those of the people entrusted to them. Guibert argued that the priests held the chief responsibility to set the people straight, and to regulate the cult of the saints.

Guibert had other complaints against the abbots and bishops who sponsored cults; particularly the fact that the veneration of saints' relics often brought offerings that benefitted the local institution financially.

84 Ibid., "sed iis, quos sui ipsorum auctoritas exauktorat, omissis, eos, quos certitudo fidei exsequitur attingamus." col.624 D.

85 Ibid. "Sunt etenim quaedam, quae tenentur, sed non docentur, sicut sunt consuetudines aut jejunandi, aut psalliendi;" col. 612 D.

86 Ibid., "Ecclesiæm consuetudines diversae nil officient fidei catholicae." and "Quae etsi diversa sunt actu, nusquam tamen discrepant a fidei sensu, . . ." col. 612D.

87 Guibert was particularly concerned with the relic tours to seek donations, and, in the case of the monks of St. Medard, with their pamphlet advertising their relics, as if seeking visitors to the collection, and, hence, donations. For Guibert, it was a mixed issue of impious greed and the fact that such quests could facilitate the traffic of false relics. Apparently, Guibert was not alone. Nicole Herrmann-Mascard suggests that preparing the way for the thirteenth-century synodal and conciliar statutes against such quests were such figures as Peter the Chanter, Hugh of Fouillou and Alexander Neckham. Organized arguments against quests came from the Cistercians in 1195. Herrmann-Mascard, Les Reliques, 307. For Guibert's accusation of greed against the monks of St. Médard see PL 156, cols.649 D-666D.
story of the young man who died on Good Friday, the abbot was apparently won over by the numerous donations the cult of the young boy inspired.88

Guibert was also aghast at the lengths to which some would go to acquire a relic, even a false one. Guibert relates the story of Odo, Bishop of Bayeaux (1050-1097), who longed to have the relics of one of his predecessors, St. Exupéry. He paid to have the bones exhumed, and when he asked the one who turned over the body if it in fact was the body of the saint, the man replied that the name Exupéry was common, and it definitely was his name, but whether he was saintly or not, was anyone's guess. Odo of Bayeaux took the body anyway, and, Guibert says with some sarcasm, he was made famous by having made merchandise of his patron.89

Guibert examined further the issue of false verification in relating the process of authenticating the relics of St. Firmin by Bishop Godfrey of Amiens. Although Godfrey could find no documentation to certify the relics, he had a plaque made that declared the reliquary to hold 'Martyr Firmin,

88 Ibid., "Videbat haec ille sapientissimus abba cum suis religiosis monachis, et munerum comportatorum blandiente frequentia, infecta miracula fieri supportabat." col. 621 B.

89 The story takes up nearly an entire column of the Patrologia edition. Key passages are cited here: Concerning the questionable sanctity; "Hoc, inquit, jurejurando tibi asseverabo, quod corpus Exuperii sit, de sanctitate autem nunquam, quia multis id praenomen ascribitur, quorum sententia longe peregrinatur a sancto. Igitur hoc modo episcopus aequivocatus a fure quievit. Oppidanis autem mercimonium de patrono suo quod fecerat custos inclaruit." col.625 D. and "Ecce quantum religionis dedecus coemption episcopalis evaluit, ..." col. 625 D.
Bishop of Amiens.\textsuperscript{90} The claim was made all the more suspect because the
monks of St. Denis also claimed to have the body of St. Firmin.\textsuperscript{91} Guibert
was more inclined to concede that St. Denis held the true body, for a
parchment in the nostril of the relic located there identified the body as
Martyr Firmin.\textsuperscript{92} Guibert believed that it was a sin to honor \textit{knowingly} a
false or uncertain relic, or a false or uncertain saint.\textsuperscript{93}

Thus, for Guibert, the verification of a relic was the fundamental
issue. Guibert was explicit about how to determine the authenticity of a saint
and his/her relics. Guibert demanded a long-standing tradition or written
record, and clear miracles.\textsuperscript{94} Guibert disapproved of the contemporary

\textsuperscript{90} Godfrey, Bishop of Amiens (1104-1115). Ibid.,"Qua de re urbis
episcopus plumbeae laminae mox inscrisit, quod illic conderetur: 'Firminus
martyr Ambianorum episcopus.'" col. 625 A.

\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., "Nullum de corporis S. Firmini existentia in Ambianensi
Ecclesia, sed in Dionysiano monasterio evidens testimonium reperitur." col.
625 A.

\textsuperscript{92} Ibid., "...membranula in martyris naribus ...." col.625B.

\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., "Quem sanctum nescit cum quis orat, peccat." col.622 D.; "Et
oratio illa quid valet, ubi orantis animum ejus quem Deo pro se praetendit
omnimoda incertitudo remordet? Quid, inquam prodest, quae sine peccato
numquam est? Si enim oras quem sanctum nescias, in eo ipso peccas, quo
veniam impetrare debueras, quia non recte dividis cum recte offeras. In quo
plane orans dubitas, Deum nullatenus placas; sed dum de tua petitione
diffidis, irritas, ad ejus namque injuriam respicit, ad quem is prolocutor
dirigitur, quem non novit." col. 623 B.

\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., "In quibus equidem sola authentica ratio habenda esset, ut is
duntaxat diceretur sanctus, quem non opinio, sed vetustatis, aut scriptorum
veracium traditio certa firmaret. Is enim quomodo putas, ut ita dicam,
practice of writing a *vita* long after the fact to attribute or validate sanctity.\(^95\) He himself had been asked to write such lives, but he had always declined.\(^96\) For what, he asked, am I able to say about someone I do not know, about whom I am uncertain? If he were to write such a life for the sponsors of the *sanctus*, he and the sponsors would equally be worthy of public condemnation.\(^97\) Guibert clearly saw as critical the actual life of a saint. It should be known as a holy life, a life spent in the footsteps of Christ.\(^98\) Like

\[\text{sancituir, cujus auctoritatis memoria ulla nescitur, nedum quod nec litteris, aut aperta miraculorum experientia solidatur?} \] col. 613 D.

\(^95\) Clearly, up to the twelfth century, the public cult of a saint normally preceded the *Vita*. The *Vita* was not exclusively used to justify the elevation, or formal recognition, of a saint. In the later eleventh century a trend began that utilized the *Vitae* as preparatory documents to the declaration of sainthood. This coincided with the eleventh and twelfth century concern with proper authority regarding canonisation, earlier traditionally in the hands of the bishops. The twelfth century witnessed a decline in the number of elevations by bishops, and the increased involvement of the church hierarchy, culminating in the papal monopoly specified at the Fourth Lateran council in 1215. It appears that Guibert reflects this shift in the application of the *Vitae*. He specifically would not write a *Vita* to support an already existing cult, the 'saint' of which he knew nothing. For a discussion of the changing role of the *Vitae* see Herrmann-Mascard, *Les Reliques*, 89-91. For Guibert, *PL* 156; "Recusat auctor incerta atque incognita sanctorum acta conscribere." col.624 B.

\(^96\) Ibid., "Quod a me profecto saepe petitum est. Ego autem in his quae obtutibus subjacent, fallor." col.624 C.

\(^97\) Ibid., ". . .et de iis quae nemo unquam viderit, quid veri profiteor? Si dicerem quae dici audivi, et etiam sum rogatus ut super laude horum tam ignobilium dicerem, quin etiam ad populum declamarem; et ego, si quaesita dicerem, et illi, qui talia suggerebant dicere, publico pariter cauterio digni essent." col.624 C.
contemporary theologians and patristic sources, Guibert identified a saint as a hero of the faith, pure in thought and holy in activity.\textsuperscript{99} If the saints’ footsteps were to be imitated and followed, if their close identification with God made possible their intercession, then Guibert felt a need to identify with certainty those who deserved this reverence.

This led Guibert to distinguish between the types of saints: Apostles, martyrs, and confessors.\textsuperscript{100} For the sanctity of the Apostles, he pointed to the undeniable authority of the Scripture.\textsuperscript{101} The lives of martyrs were not questioned because they had given testimony to the faith with their blood.\textsuperscript{102} 

\textsuperscript{98} Ibid.,"...sancto deinceps opere se ei incorporantes, ...sanctificati sunt." col. 613 B. Guibert consistently maintained the theme that something must be known of the life. See cols. 613 D, 614 C, 615 A, 622 D, and 623 B. For Guibert, this emphasis excluded even the accepted Donatist martyrs. Col. 622 C.


\textsuperscript{100} \textit{PL} 156; "Certe cum pro sanctis habeamus apostolos, et quos pro martyrribus tuto probavit Ecclesia, certe super confessoribus serior sententia ferri potest." col.622 A. The cult of the saints had begun with the veneration of martyrs. The decline of martyrdom led to new definitions of sainthood as early as the second century. A confessor, in the earliest usage of the term, appears to be one who suffered for the faith, but was not killed, or martyred, in the name of the faith. Ultimately, the categorization of confessor meant saints who were not martyrs. See Éric Waldram Kemp, \textit{Canonization and Authority in the Western Church} (London: Oxford University Press, 1948),17-19.

\textsuperscript{101} \textit{PL} 156; "Et nisi ex evangeliis, et suis ipsorum actibus nostrae insignirentur notitiae, aliquorum animos talium figmenta turbarent." col.614 B.
The confessors remained the most difficult group to validate. Guibert pointed to the examples of St. Martin and St. Remigius, whom he regarded as well attested by the universal church, and wondered how the local recent cults of saints could compare. 103 Guibert declared that before he would ask a saint for intercession with God, he would certainly want to be sure that the sanctitas of the object of his veneration had been substantiated with the truth. 104

It must be pointed out at this juncture that Guibert's arguments for a solidly established sainthood are quite traditional and well within orthodox belief. God was the creator of the saints, and in His divine wisdom, he chose the saints who served him. With the decline of martyrdom in the fourth century, veneration turned to a new form of sainthood, the confessor. Defining the status of confessor had inspired some of the best minds of the patristic age to refine a theoretical basis for the cult of saints and their

102 Ibid., "Martyres plane etsi scripta conticeant, solius praerogativa sanguinis extulit, nec quae erit in martyre quae vita praecesserit." col. 622A. "Quis reperiatur idola destruens, et pro hoc ipso eum contingat interimi, ut non pro tali occubito martyr habeatur et certe hic bona causa vedetur." col. 622B.

103 Ibid., "Si in Martino, Remigio, ac similibus totius Ecclesiae sensus adaequitatis, quid de eis proferam, quos praefatorum aemulum per villas ac oppida quotidiem vulgus creat?" col. 622 C.

104 Ibid., "Cujusmodi sanctus cujus finis constat ambiguus? Antequam ergo eum deprecer, necesse est ut de veritate sanctis [sanctitatis?] ejus altercer." col. 615 A.
Guibert was also reflecting a contemporary concern for more disciplined authentication of the saints. He spoke himself of the Church's unwillingness to recognize the assumption of the Virgin Mary, because of lack of evidence. Proponents of Guibert's rationality have obviously not sensed the inherent illogical trend of his argument that spoke from Guibert's conservatism. He emphasized a certified sainthood for his own age. For the established cults, he required no such strictures. For Guibert, they were acceptable simply because of tradition.

105 Early martyrdom had been defined by death in the face of persecution of the faith. It was more difficult to define the veneration of those who had suffered, but had not died. The ancient church, thus, came to distinguish between confessors and martyrs. The earliest extension of the idea of sainthood to others came with the association of the ascetic life as a substitution for martyrdom. See Sumption, Pilgrimage, 22-24; Herrmann-Mascard, Les Reliques, 74; Kemp, Canonization, 17-23; and W.H.C. Frend, The Rise of Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 708-710.

106 PL 156, col.623-624. For the beginnings of the discussions of the age concerning authenticity and the origins of irregular attempts at some kind of control over canonization, see Kemp, Canonization, 44-56; Klaus Schreiner has discussed the issue of criticism of saints' lives in the middle ages and traces the development from simple acceptance of miracles based on Biblical proof, to moral or theological criticisms, to the twelfth century when there began to be a demand, in all areas, for historicity. Guibert fits well within this characterization of an age concerned with ratio. I would like to thank Dr. Joseph H. Lynch for his help in translating Schreiner's argument from the German. See Klaus Schreiner, "Discrimen veri ac falsi," Archiv für Kulturgeschichte. 48(1966), 1-53.
B. Proper Veneration of Saints and Their Relics

Once Guibert had spelled out his arguments concerning the authenticity of a saint, he addressed the issue of the proper veneration of the saint. Guibert harkened back to the Scripture as a source, and to Gregory the Great, whom he admired as an exegete and bishop.\(^{107}\) Guibert disapproved of contemporary custom in the translation and dismembering of saints’ bodies, and turned back to Gregory for support for the concept of leaving the saints’ bodies buried and intact.\(^{108}\) Guibert felt that the body of a saint should not be disturbed.\(^{109}\) He recommended veneration of the saint, but wanted the buried body to rest in peace. He cited the reply of Pope Gregory in 594 to the Empress Constantia when she had asked for the head of St. Lawrence. Pope Gregory had declined to honor the request

\(^{107}\) Guibert, *Autobiographie*, I, 17, 138-139.

\(^{108}\) For the circumstances that led to the custom of transferring saints from their tombs, and the dismembering of the bodies, see Herrmann-Mascard, *Les Reliques*, 49-70; For a noteworthy discussion of late Roman practices, the cult of saints during the time of Gregory the Great, and issues concerning the dismemberment of the bodies see John M. McCulloh, "The Cult of Relics in the Letters and 'Dialogues' of Pope Gregory the Great: A Lexigraphical Study" *Traditio* 32 (1976), 145-184.

\(^{109}\) *PL* 156; "nos eorum busta suffodimus, membra dividimus, quos sane plurimis documentis super hac motione irasci comperimus." col.628 A; "Dum omnes in sibi attributa terra immoti quiescerent, fraud [ ]s, quas praelibavimus, super eorum multifida distributiones non fierent, nec indigni dignorum loca tenerent." col. 628 C.
because the bodies of the saints were not to be disturbed, and it was not the Roman practice to provide corporeal relics.\textsuperscript{110}

The weight of the evidence suggests that translations were quite common from the seventh century onwards throughout the medieval period.\textsuperscript{111} Guibert's insistence that "all the evils of contention [over relics] would be avoided if we permitted the saints to enjoy the repose of a proper and immutable burial place," seems at odds with practices that had become customary.\textsuperscript{112} Yet, Guibert's reaction, rather than being interpreted as a

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., "Apud splendissimum papam Gregorium, hi qui corpora Pauli apostoli, Laurentique martyris insci conspexere gravissime sunt puniti." col. 627 B; "Plane Gregorius, ... se prorsus id non audere respondit." col.628 B. For a full discussion of this letter and Gregory's response see McCulloh, 147-150. For Gregory's letter see Gregory the Great, Registrum Epistularum, in Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, ed. D. Norberg (1982) vol.140, IV,30, pp. 248-250. Pope Gregory was not the first to refuse the transfer of relics from Rome to Constantinople. Pope Hormisdas in 519 rejected the request from the emperor for the bodies of saints Peter, Paul, and Lawrence, also stating that translation of bodies was not Roman custom. See Hormisdas, Ep. 77 in Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae a S. Hilario usque ad Pelagium II, ed. A. Thiel. Volume 1 (461-523) (Brunsberg, 1868), 874-875. While, in the context of requests from Constantinople to Rome, it might be inferred that these decisions had a certain political basis, McCulloh's article seems to show conclusively that, in fact, noncorporeal relics were the norm in the West in the sixth century.

\textsuperscript{111} Given Guibert's own testimony as seen throughout De pignoribus sanctorum. Literary genres arose, within hagiography, to support the translation and theft of relics, including the common image of a saint, through his relics, allowing himself to be moved, or forbidding the translation. See Patrick Geary, Furti Sacra (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978).

\textsuperscript{112} Guibert, Gesta Dei per Francos, PL, "Quod totum contentionis malum inde sumit originem quod sancti non permittuntur habere debiteae et immutabilis sepulturae quietem," col.695.
more "modern" assessment, 113 should be seen in the context of his role as a Scriptural exegete, with its consequent emphasis on tradition. 114

Guibert claimed the Scripture supported his contentions. Guibert said the saints did not want to be disturbed, as shown in the anger of the spirit of Samuel when he was called forth. 115 A more recent example, Guibert maintained, sustained his argument. In England, the blessed martyr [King Edmund] had been a great miracle worker, and had "suffered himself to be seen by no one," a condition Guibert wished would be respected for other saints. 116 One day, an abbot of St. Edmund's monastery wanted to


114 In fact, one of the main themes of the ancient church was the inviolability of the saints. Translations were approved primarily to give the saint a more dignified resting place. Given Guibert's admiration for Gregory the Great, who wrote against the transfer of bodily relics (n.110), it seems that Guibert rejects especially the dismemberment of saints' bodies. This is reflected, as well, in Guibert's arguments concerning reliquaries. This would be a traditional stance, based on the authors of the ancient church. On the inviolability of the saints, see Herrmann-Mascard, Les Reliques, 26–28. Jacques Chaurand argues that Guibert exhibits the skills, not of a critical historian, but of a Biblical exegete. Chaurand, "La conception de l'histoire," 381–395.

115 Samuel 28:15. Guibert, PL 156, "Spiritus Samuelis, qui, ut spiritus naturali alacritate vigebat, per Pythonissam inquietari se quia evocabatur, queritur." col.627 C.

116 Ibid., "Eadmundus apud Anglos non ignobilis gloriae rex et martyr existit, cujus in sui tuitione corporis zelum vellem sancti aemularentur caeteri, qui in statu dormienti simillimo huc usque persistens a nmine videri se dignatur aut tangi." col. 628 B.
ascertain if the king's head, which had been cut off at his martyrdom, had been reunited to his body, for this had been the rumor. The abbot uncovered the body and with another monk stationed at the foot of the body, the two men pulled to see if the head was attached. The body was determined to be solid, but the abbot, for the impiety of deigning to disturb the rest of the saint, lost the use of both of his hands.\textsuperscript{117} Proof enough, Guibert intimated, that the bodies of the saints should be left alone.

In addition, Guibert declared that the practice of putting relics of saints in richly decorated reliquaries should cease.\textsuperscript{118} This practice disturbed the quiet repose of the saints, it was contrary to Scripture which taught that man came from earth and should return to the earth, and, Guibert said, this custom ran the risk of offending the Lord.\textsuperscript{119} For why

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid., "Abba quidam ejus loci plus aequo curiosus, utrum, uti vulgabatur, caput ejus post abscissionem corpori esset utinam, praemissis jejuniis cum quodam suo monacho adniterate tentavit; sed tentationem illam tanta confestim punivit infirmitas ut in neutro utra deinceps remaneret manuum utilitas." col.628 B. Guibert relates the same story in his memoirs. Guibert, \textit{Autobiographie}, III,20,p.460-461.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{118} \textit{PL} 156; "Defuncta sanctorum corpora non auro aut argento inclusi debent." col. 626 B.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid., "Sed haec omnia a perversitate radicis emergunt, quae non est alia quam quod eisdem adimitur quod communi sorte debuerat omnis commereri humana natura. Si enim cerno certius de terra hominis origo consistit, et persoluto mortis debito in eamdem ex primae damnationis legibus recidit, praeertim cui dictum est : 'Terra es, et in terram ibis': Deus, mea sententia, nec praeenti, nec secuturo cuipiam dixit: 'Autem vel argentum es, in aurum vel argentum ibis.' Ut quid, precor, homo a sua natura, ino a Dei imperio eruitur, ut quod conditionaliter nulli competit, aureis vel argentis conchulis inseratur." col.626 B. See also n.114 above.
\end{flushright}
were saints encased in gold and jewels, when the Lord was buried behind a very ordinary rock. 120

The veneration of the saints was always to be held in line with proper veneration of the Lord, reflecting the canonical notion prevalent since Augustine that saints may be honored, but adoration was to be reserved for the Lord. 121 In particular, Guibert referred to the practice of placing the relics of a saint on an elevated altar. Guibert maintained that nothing should be displayed on the altar that held the most esteemed relic of all, the Eucharistic Host. 122 Even worse was the sacrilege when saints of uncertain origin or unclear validity were displayed. 123 These pernicious errors would

120 Ibid., "Et quae dignitas ut quis au ro argentov e claudatur, cum Dei Filius saxo vilissimo obstruatur?" col. 626 D.

121 Augustine, De Civitate Dei, translated as The City of God by Henry Bettenson (New York: Penguin Books, 1972), I,13; VIII,17,27. Jerome reflected this as well in his refutation to Vigilantius in which he defended the cult of saints with the view that the martyrs themselves were not worshipped. Worship, which is paid to God alone, was far different than the reverence given to the martyrs. Jerome, Contra Vigilantium, PL, volume 23, col.353ff. English translation in Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, volume 6, pp. 417-423.

122 Guibert’s lengthy exposé on the Eucharist as the true presence, hence, the true relic, of Christ is found in the second book of his treatise. PL 156, especially cols. 630-631. On the issue of competition or rivalry of the bodies of saints with the body of the Lord on the altar see Pelikan, Growth of Medieval Theology, 184.

123 Guibert, De pignoribus sanctorum, PL; "Illud dicere audebo profanum, quod ararum pone sacraria altissimos tribunalium instar thrones obtinent, quorum tempus, natalis, ac vita, dies quoque et qualitas mortium in nullius viventis memoria resident." col. 615 B.
not be made, Guibert stated, if the saints were allowed the peace of their sepulchre. Ultimately, the bodies of the saints ought not to be disturbed except by God, who would call them back to life at the end of time.\textsuperscript{124} 

Guibert believed the identity of the saint must be a certainty. He demanded that honor be rendered unto those worthy of the appellation of sanctus. By what authority should the church command proper practices? Guibert stated that the bishops, the protectors (custodes), should determine the proper devotion to the cult of saints.\textsuperscript{125} The authorities should determine that the saint was justly deemed sanctus, and that the devotion to the saint strengthened and did not disrupt the faith.\textsuperscript{126} Guibert’s emphasis here reflected his concern, shown in many of his writings, for the exercise of leadership and the care of souls by abbots and bishops, and his acknowledgement of the bishops’ traditional role in authenticating saints. The next generation would witness an acceleration of attempts by the popes

---

\textsuperscript{124} Ibid., "Si hujusmodi vocat Apostolus dormientes, ego tales existimo inquietare nefarium, præsertim cum in hac ipsa quiete neminem qui evigilare compellat alium praestolentur, nisi eum qui faciat de mortuis viviscientes." col. 627 D.

\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., "Sic itaque videre pontificum. sit Dei populi videre custodum." col. 615 C; and "Ecclesiae praelatorum est, ut debite cultui incumbat populus invigilare." col. 615 C.

\textsuperscript{126} Ibid., ". . . ut si aemulationem Dei habent, hanc duntaxat habere sinantur secundum scientiam, ne pecent, si recte offerant, et recte non dividant." col. 615 C.
and other authorities to control canonization. Yet ecclesiastical control over the cult of saints was not a new issue. The Fifth Council of Carthage in 401 had clearly placed the primary responsibility for the authentication of saints with the diocesan bishop. Intervening developments had reduced the bishops' control, although concurrent synodal and canonical decrees continued to uphold the bishops' authority.

For Guibert, the ultimate problem, which he clearly recognized, was the application of theory to practice. As a moralist, a monk, and a theologian, Guibert perceived the dangers inherent in improper veneration of the saints. Guibert recognized that the status quo was quite different from his views, and he admitted that on one occasion he had failed to defend his own principles. Guibert reported that he was in a crowd listening to a spokesman (prolocutor) hired by a very renowned church to display its relics,

127 Herrmann-Mascard attributes the new emphasis on episcopal control to the Gregorian Reform. Eleventh century canonical collections clearly held that the bishop had the authority to approve cults of new saints and to uproot superstitious cults. The eleventh century witnessed the earliest papal canonizations and authorizations for elevations. By the twelfth century, papal involvement multiplied, consolidating under Alexander III, whereby the right to canonize was reserved to the papacy. Herrmann-Mascard, Les Reliques, 88,94-97. See also Kemp, Canonization, 66-106.

128 Ibid., 15, 42.

129 Ibid., 24-66; Herrmann-Mascard, Les Reliques, . That the reality seemed to supersede the authority of the bishops in the early middle ages might have repercussions for Peter Brown's argument that the relic and the shrine were the central base of the bishops' rise to power in the middle ages. See Peter Brown, The Cult of Saints, esp. chapters 1 and 2.
including a piece of the bread which the Lord himself had chewed with his teeth. Guibert blushed with shame to recall that the spokesman had singled him out to uphold the truth of what was being spoken. Guibert declined to offer his enlightened and scholarly opinion in the face of the crowd of believers, and in the presence of those by whose authority the spokesman operated. 130 The scene was a relic tour, a quaeestus, a circumvagatio. These tours epitomized for Guibert the possibility of the abuse of relics and the deception that originated by disturbing the sepulchres of the saints. 131

130 The church was most likely the cathedral of Laon. PL 156; "Celeberrima quaedam Ecclesia hujušmodi circumvagationes agebat, et ad sui reparationem damni quaeestus adhibitum prolocutora quaerebat. Cumque super reliquis suis sermonem plus aequo extuberat, prolato phylacterio ait: [Ego autem impresentiarum] Scistiis, inquit, quod intra hanc capsulam de pane illo, quem propriis Dominus dentibus masticavit, habetur, etsi minus a vobis creditur, ecce heros, ait [iste de me autem dicebat], quem vos in litteris plurimum valere testamini, verbo meo si necesse fuerit testis assurgat. Fator, erubui, cum audisset, et nisi eorum praesentia, quos ille auctores habere videbatur, reveritus essem, ut pace ipsorum potius quam illius qui loquebatur, agam, falsarium ostendere debuissem." col.621 D.

131 Ibid., "Per hoc enim quod e tumulis eruuntur, membratim huc illucque feruntur, et cum pietatis obstentu occasio circumlationis exteterit, ad hoc subeunte nequitia detorqueri coepta est intentionis rectitudo, ut pene quae simpliciter fieri consueverat corrumpert universa cupido." cols. 626 D-627 A. For a fine discussion and analysis of these quests, see Pierre Héliot and Marie-Laure Chastang, "Quêtes et voyages de reliques au profit des églises Françaises du moyen âge," Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique 59(1964), 789-822, and 60(1965), 5-32. The authors date the origins of the quests to c.1050. Guibert may have been witnessing and reacting to a new phenomenon in his lifetime. B. Monod, Guibert's biographer, makes reference to a council at Poitiers in 1100 where legates of Pope Paschal II made an edict against clerics who carried relics about for the sake of profit. Monod, Le moine, 307.
Guibert thought greed stimulated others to tolerate popular devotion and the falsification of relics. The blame was firmly placed at the feet of the officers of the church. Guibert absolved the ordinary faithful, and popular devotions, with his doctrine of faith. In the end, faith and repentence brought salvation. Even that crowd of believers in something Guibert saw so foolish, a surviving piece of bread that the Lord had chewed upon, could be saved by their faith. For just as Guibert saw it as a sin to venerate knowingly a saint whose sanctity was uncertain, so Guibert believed that honest devotion towards a relic or a saint which was not truly sanctus, but truly believed to be sanctus, would be recognized by God. If the individual believer esteemed the saint, and if with heartfelt faith he asked for intercession with God, the true object of his devotion, then the divine ear would not reject such an honestly felt prayer. However, one is left to

132 Ibid., "Unde et ad multos ejus familiare verbum est. 'Fides tua te salvum fecit.' Quod est dicere: In tantum mihi placet fidei vestrae importunitas ut mei vice vestra ex vobis pendeat sanitas. col. 618 A; “Ecce quid valuit fides in poenitentia. Ecce quid valuit in intentione corrigendi perseverantia. Ille fidem habet in poenitentia, qui post confessionis gratiam ex securitate emendationis conceptae nunquam diffidit de venia.” col. 619 B; "Fides saepius causa miraculorum." col. 663 C; and "Si certe nullius sancti esset, vel fides plane credentium exigeret ut quod speraretur obtinigeret." col. 663 C.

133 Ibid., "Qui certe sanctum existimat, colitque, quamvis talis non sit, fructum recipit orationis apud Deum. Sed ad haec forsitan quisquis quae utrum Deus simplices quosque exaudiat, cum per eos invocatur quos esse sanctos non constat. Cui respondendum, quia sicut Deum, qui eum, de quo est incertus exposcit, irritat; ita eum si fideliter sanctum illum credens, qui non est sanctus exor et, placat." col. 628 D.

134 Ibid., "Ita plane si sanctum quis aestimet, quem sanctum quidem dici audiat, sanctum vero esse non constet, si eum praecordialiter, et
wonder about Guibert’s anxiety for historical reliability if honest intentions were what counted.

C. Relics of Christ

Bodily relics of Christ remained the unequivocal exception to the boundaries set by Guibert for the veneration of relics. Guibert expressed his views on the tooth of Christ, supposedly held by the monks of St. Médard, in a series of *objectiones.* To be practical, Guibert argued, a small tooth could not have survived the centuries. Further, when Christ lost the baby tooth, no one would have thought to save it because His work as the Son of God would not yet have been known. Finally, he added, the Jewish faith prohibited the handling of the dead, thus the collection of relics at the time of Christ was essentially prohibited, and virtually unheard of.\(^{136}\)

\[\text{secundum fidem interpellat, apud Deum, qui causa et fructus est orationis, intentio deprecantis tota defigitur, quocunque modo animus per simplicitatem super suo intercessore errare videatur, et quod sub spe boni honoratur, nunquam a boni remuneratione cassatur.}^{*}\text{ col. 629 A; and "Non est Deus grammaticae curiosus; vox eum nulla penetrat, pectus intendit." col. 630 A.}\]

\(^{135}\) In the third book of *De pignoribus sanctorum, PL,* col.649D-680A.

\(^{136}\) This briefly summarizes a rather lengthy segment. See the pertinent sections, *Ibid.,* col.658D, 659A,C,D. Mosaic Law as contained in Numbers:19 prohibits the touching of a dead man, or the bones of the dead.
Paramount in Guibert's denial of the existence of bodily relics of Christ was the issue of the resurrection of Christ and the Bodily Presence in the Eucharist. Guibert's argument revealed his concern that any particle of the earthly Christ left on earth exposed a Christ only partially resurrected. If Christ was risen not in His entirety, if He did not fulfill the promise of His own resurrection, then the promise of man's resurrection would be rendered invalid. Guibert's doctrine of the resurrection depended upon his conception of the substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharistic elements. Hence, as Jaroslav Pelikan has stressed:

When it came to relics as these [of Christ], the basic issue was no longer merely the question of credulity or even of superstition. For if there was somewhere an authentic relic of the historical body of Jesus Christ, this would constitute a threat to the belief that in the consecrated bread and wine of the Eucharist the church possessed the true (and historical) body of Christ.

137 Ibid., "Si igitur capilli dentes, aquae fluxus et sanguinis quadrifidi vulneris cuor, qui induhie ad terram usque distillare potuerit, in terrenis ruderibus in finem corrumpenda desiderint, resurrectionis humanae status, ac nostrae promissio ex ore Domino ad sui similitudinem conformitatis, non video quomodo constare sine enormi fallacta possint," col.659B. See also col.611D.

138 Ibid., col. 631B, 650 A; see also Guibert's Epistola de buccella Judae data for treatment of the Eucharist, especially PL 156, col. 534 C,D. Macy has pointed out that there is also a seemingly unique contribution to Eucharistic theology by Guibert; the notion of three bodies of Christ, (earthly, heavenly, and that of the Eucharist) derived from and identified with each other. See Macy, Theologies, 82.

139 Pelikan, Growth of Medieval Theology, 185. See also Idem,"First-Generation Anselmian," 74.
For Guibert, the idea of a bodily relic of Christ would undermine the
salvation promised in the resurrection, and would relegate the Eucharist to a
mere figural status, along the lines of a memorial to a saint. In the final
analysis, Guibert again placed a larger emphasis on the power of faith. Faith
in the sanctity of the tooth, like honest faith regarding the relic of a saint,
could bring about a miracle or the answer to a prayer. 140

Thus, to his conventional theological arguments, Guibert added
historical ones. Guibert found the veneration of saints and their relics
entirely justifiable. His objections to bodily relics of Christ were based on his
perception of man's salvation as promised in the doctrine of the resurrection.
His dispute with certain manifestations of the cult was based on the excesses
of the cult which led to the veneration of saints about whom nothing was
known. Against the popular piety which he perceived as based on the cult of
saints and their relics, Guibert offered a theology of devotion to the inner
and spiritual life. Marie-Danielle Mireux suggested that the monks of St.
Médard read Guibert's treatise, and responded with a poem which again
promoted the miracles of the tooth of Christ. 141 There is no other evidence
that contemporaries took note of Guibert's De pignoribus sanctorum.

140 PL 156, "Fides saepius causa miraculorum. Hoc enim, cui signum
ascibitur, sanctum aliunde esse potest; hoc autem quod dicitur, esse non
potest; et si esset talium signorum testimonio, quia dens sit Dominicus,
potendi non posset. Sancti ergo cujuspiam dens ille creditur, cujus merito
forsitan tale quid concedatur; et si certe nullius sancti esset, vel fides plane
credentium exigeret ut quod speraretur obtingeret," col. 663C.

141 Mireux, "Guibert de Nogent," 300.
CHAPTER IV

GUIBERT IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH CENTURIES

In my own reading of Guibert's *De pignoribus sanctorum*, I have tried to place the emphasis on Guibert the monk and theologian, rather than on Guibert the "modern" critic. If Guibert is critical, he is certainly not skeptical in any modern sense of the term. I think that the uniqueness of Guibert's treatise has been exaggerated.\(^\text{142}\) *De pignoribus sanctorum* as a treatise may be unparalleled in the medieval world, but the themes contained within it have many echoes in earlier and contemporary writing. Theological concerns about the verification of saints' cults and relics were not unique to Guibert.

The danger of false relics had been pointed out by Augustine and Gregory the Great.\(^\text{143}\) The practice of dividing bodies, and removing saints from their tombs, had not evolved by the design of ecclesiastical authorities. Beginning with the barbarian invasions, and culminating in the desire of local churches to benefit under the protection of saints, the translation and

\(^{142}\) See, in particular, LeFranc, "Le Traité," and more recently, Klaus Guth, *Guibert von Nogent*.

division of bodies of the saints grew to be a customary practice, not without occasional ecclesiastical resistance.\textsuperscript{144} Gregory of Tours had noted with some distaste the activities of Syrian merchants selling bodily relics.\textsuperscript{145} Before 1215, bishops held the right to identify and authenticate relics, a responsibility that could be misused by making false identifications when the wrong motives were attached to the acquisition of a relic.\textsuperscript{146} Guibert was expressing ancient concerns, as well as commenting on contemporary abuses.

The canon law, as well, had long been concerned with saints and relics. Legislation concerning the veneration of the saints and their relics originated in the fifth century \textit{Concilium Africanum}, during what Eric Kemp called the first principal period of legislation regarding the veneration of


\textsuperscript{145} Although this might reflect a abhorrence with the bold sales technique, it does not necessarily reflect hesitation concerning corporeal relics. Gregory of Tours, \textit{Historia Francorum}, translated as \textit{The History of the Franks} by Lewis Thorpe (New York: Penguin Books, 1974), VII,31.

\textsuperscript{146} Herrmann-Mascard, \textit{Les Reliques}, 49-70, 106-126; Patrice Boussel, \textit{Des Reliques et de leur bon usage} (Paris: Balland, 1971),31-48; Klaus Schreiner, "Discrimen veri ac falsi," 1-53. It also must be taken into account that the mere possibility that the relic was genuine may have led to firm convictions as to its authenticity. See H. Delehaye, \textit{Les légendes hagiographiques}, 4th ed. (Brussels, 19550; English trans., Donald Attwater, \textit{The Legends of the Saints} (London, 1962). For Catholic doctrine on relics and a brief history of the development of the cult see Eugene Dooley, "Church Law on Sacred Relics" \textit{Catholic University of America Canon Law Studies} 70(1931).
saints. The African canons, directed against the veneration of false martyrs, were adopted and extended during the ecclesiastical legislation of the reign of Charlemagne. The Carolingian legislation, directed against devotion to false martyrs and unknown saints and forbidding the translation of saints' bodies without proper authorization, may well have been directed against the misuse of the cult of saints for financial profit. Both the African decree against disturbing the repose of the saints, copied into the Admonitio Generalis (789) of Charlemagne, and canon 51 of the Council of

147 See Kemp, Canonization, 16-17. Canon 50 of the 401 Council of Carthage read "...ut falsa nomina martyrum et incertae sanctorum memoriae non venerentur." Ibid., 36. Herrmann-Mascard says the legislation was stimulated in part to protect the faith against the Donatists. Herrmann-Mascard, Les Reliques, 77.

148 A concern that Gui bert would have been sympathetic to. Carolingian ecclesiastical legislation regarding the saints began with the Admonitio Generalis (789). Canon 42 of this legislation was the same as canon 50 of the Council of Carthage. "Episcopus. Item in eodem, ut falsa nomina martyrum et incertae sanctorum memoriae non venerentur." See Kemp, Canonization, 36; The Council of Frankfort (794) specified the cult of a martyr or saint must be preceded by an ecclesiastical judgement on the revered's sanctity. Herrmann-Mascard, Les Reliques, 84; A capitulary of 801 formalized the ecclesiastical sanction on cults. "De ecclesiis, sive sanctis noviter sine auctoritate inventis, nisi episcopo probante, minime venerentur." G. Mansi, Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio 13 (Florence and Venice, 1757-98; revised Paris, 1903-27.), col.1067; Finally, canon 51 of the 813 Council of Mainz: "Deinceps vero corpora sanctorum de loco ad locum nullus transferre praesumat sine consilio principis vel episcoporum sanctaeque synodi licentia." Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Capitularia,I, 272. See also Kemp, Canonization, 38-39; Herrmann-Mascard, Les Reliques, 84-85; For further development of the ecclesiastical legislation as a central part of Carolingian politics see Geary, Furta Sacra 45-47, and Patrick Geary, "The Ninth Century Relic Trade: A Response to Popular Piety?" in Religion and the People 800-1700, ed.James Obelkevich (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 13-15.
Mainz (813) concerning the transfer of corpora sanctorum, found their way into the codifications of canon law in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, including the Decretum of Burchard of Worms (c.1012) and the Decretum of Gratian (1140).¹⁴⁹

But it was not only the canon law which attempted to define the cult of saints. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, there were concurrent debates by bishops, theologians, and the papacy and its legates on the nature and procedures of canonization. Prior to the eleventh century, despite church legislation specifying episcopal control, the designation of sainthood lay primarily with the popular, or at least local, initiative.¹⁵⁰ During the eleventh century, the episcopal role in the sanctioning of cults, the confirmation of sanctity by way of elevatio or translatio, and the petitioning to councils for support of canonization increased.¹⁵¹ Awareness of their responsibility led the more conscientious bishops to refuse to sanction a cult without safeguards. Lanfranc hesitated in his confirmation of the cult of a doubtful martyr in 1078.¹⁵² Anselm of Bec refused to endorse an


¹⁵⁰ This local initiative existed despite the canonical and synodal legislation specifying episcopal control. See Herrmann-Mascard, Les Reliques, 70-75.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 73-89; Kemp, Canonization, 36-81.
individual honored as a saint without sufficient cause. Pope Urban II, in 1088, refused a petition to canonize St. Urloux of Brittany without the testimony of miracles and the assent of a council.

The uncertainty about canonization was also evinced by the deliberations of bishops gathered at a synod in Beauvais in 1120. The occasion was the proposed translation of the body of Arnulf of Pamèle, a former bishop of Soissons. The discussion centered on whether *elevatio* was the decisive act of canonization. Among those gathered were Lambert, bishop of Noyon-Tournai (the diocese where Arnulf had died and been buried), and Lisiard, bishop of Soissons. Also in attendance was Hariulf, abbot of Oudenburg, with a *Vita* as testimony in support of the canonization. In the end, those gathered sought confirmation for the elevation from the Archbishops of Reims, and Tours, and a papal legate. This example


155 The *Vita* was written in 1114 by Hariulf and at some time after 1121 Lisiard of Soissons added a third book and a prologue which recounts the translation. *PL*, volume 174, col.1368-1439. See also S. Kuttner, "La réserve papale du droit de canonisation" *Revue historique de droit Français et étranger* 17(1938), 186; Herrmann-Mascard, *Les Reliques*, 91; and Kemp, *Canonization*, 71-73.
serves as illustration that increasingly, by the early twelfth century, the confirmation of a new saint required testimony of the proposed saint’s life and synodal approval.

The framework of Guibert's argument against bodily relics of Christ was rooted also in contemporary controversy concerning the nature of Christ. The eleventh and twelfth-century concern to define the mysteries of Christ are reflected in numerous works of the "Cur Deus homo" genre, including treatises by Guibert, Rupert of Deutz, Odo of Cambrai and Herman of Tournai. 156 Theological disputes over the Eucharist, rooted in the ninth century, and reopened in the eleventh century, noted particularly in the great controversy of Berengar of Tours and Lanfranc, focused on the nature of Christ in the sacrament of the Mass, and the proper celebration and understanding of the Eucharist. 157 Even when the Eucharistic controversy involving Berengar of Tours came to a close in the late eleventh century, no particular formula to define the Real Presence held general approval until the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 established transubstantiation as doctrine. 158 Thus, eucharistic theology remained a central concern.


158 Pelikan, Growth of Medieval Theology, 185.
Not suprisingly, Guibert was influenced by the debate, for as John Van Engen has stated:

Flourishing schools and a mobile population of student-clerics carried those arguments and the ensuing debate to all parts of Europe. Nearly every aspiring theologian and many canonists as well gathered texts which reflected upon and reached to . . . the issue. 159

The question of the unity of the incarnate Christ with the divine Christ that figured so prominently in the Eucharistic controversy led Guibert to speculate that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist was the only true relic of Christ. 160

Guibert’s argument that the existence of a tooth of Christ would invalidate the doctrine of the resurrection reflected the concerns expressed on the nature of Christ by a near contemporary, Rupert of Deutz. Rupert had reasoned that if the Son of God was divided from the Son of Man, then "what possible hope of ascending into heaven and becoming like gods had any of us lesser sons?" 161 Thus, Guibert was not issuing random criticisms or exercising 'modern' critical judgement. His arguments were intimately bound up with contemporary theological questions. 162

159 Van Engen, Rupert, 135.

160 See n.39 above.

161 Van Engen, Rupert, 109.

162 In fact, Guibert was one of the earliest in a long line of theologians who were concerned with the authenticity of bodily relics of Christ. Thomas Aquinas displayed doubts concerning the blood of Christ at Bruges. Innocent III avoided a direct judgement and said of the foreskin
Finally, doubt is most readily cast on Guibert's advanced critical abilities by the evidence of Guibert himself. Fully in harmony with modern perceptions of medieval spirituality, Guibert accepted some evidence on faith, not modern concepts of historical reliability. He supported the claim of the monks of St. Denis to have the true body of Martyr Firmin because of a parchment in the nostril of the body, a traditional form of verification.\textsuperscript{163} He was not discriminating in the choice of relics he upheld. Guibert wrote, without malice, of the relic collection at Nogent.\textsuperscript{164} He recorded that a priest in the district of Beauvais, who was poisoned by a toad put into jar that held the wine for the mass, was saved from death by dust from the tomb of St. Marcel.\textsuperscript{165} He rejected "certain grammarians" who attempted to understand the mysteries of God and the ways of faith with reason.\textsuperscript{166}

\textsuperscript{163} n.92 above.

\textsuperscript{164} Guibert, \textit{Autobiographie}, II,1.

\textsuperscript{165} Ibid., III,18. This is just one of the miraculous stories that Guibert recounted.

\textsuperscript{166} Guibert, \textit{Tropologiae in Osee, Jeremiam et Amos}, \textit{PL} 156, col.378. E. Nortier suggests this is a reproach to the scholastics. Nortier, "Guibert de Nogent," 69.
Guibert was a traditionalist who, disturbed by errors which he perceived as harmful to Christianity, sought to provide an instructional guide to the cult of saints and their relics.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

In his return to ancient sources, and in his appeal to reason and patristic authorities against customary practices, Guibert of Nogent reflects the principles of the Hildebrandine Reform and the theological anxieties of his day with regard to the legitimization of the cult of saints. Termed a "first generation Anselmian," Guibert followed the principles of Anselm in condemning practices which he discerned as unfitting to God.\footnote{167 Pelikan, "First Generation." 79; Gerald B. Phelan, The Wisdom of Saint Anselm (Latrobe, Pennsylvania, 1960), 30-31; Benedicta Ward, "Anselm of Canterbury and His Influence" in Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century, eds. Bernard McGinn, John Meyendorff, and Jean Leclercq (New York: Crossroad, 1988), 196-205. On Anselmian elements in Guibert, see also Guth, Guibert von Nogent, 47, 75; and LaBande, "Guibert de Nogent disciple et témoin de saint Anselm."} In his denunciation of decorated reliquaries, Guibert revealed his admiration for the simplicity of the Carthusians, and anticipated the similar admonishment of Bernard of Clairvaux.\footnote{168 Guibert openly admired the Carthusian order in his memoirs. He recounted the founding of the order by Bruno, and the establishment of La Chartreuse. Guibert does not specifically admire a lack of reliquaries, but respected the lack of gold, silver, and ornaments in their church. Guibert, Autobiographie, I, 11, 62-74. Bernard of Clairvaux, Apologia ad Guillelmum, PL, vol. 182, col. 915.} Guibert's De pignoribus sanctorum points to a concept of sanctity and a concern with the proper veneration of the saints that was certainly not unique in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. His treatise offers an individual view of contemporary theological questions and
should be appreciated within this context. Future studies of Guibert must take into account his standing as an exegete and moralist and interpret Guibert within the context of the entirety of his writings, and contemporary theological concerns.
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