



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Medieval History

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jmedhist



Intentional ethics and hermeneutics in the *Libellus de symoniacis*: Bruno of Segni as a papal polemicist

Leidulf Melve

Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Bergen, P.O. Box 7800, N-5020 Bergen, Norway

A B S T R A C T

Keywords:

Bruno of Segni
Investiture Contest
Hermeneutics
Ethics
Textual criticism

The Investiture Contest has at regular intervals been considered as a 'revolution', largely because it contributed forcefully to the reorganisation of the Church in the centuries to come. But the Contest has also been seen as heralding a new and more critical way of thinking, in which the traditional reliance on authorities was giving way to new approaches to the textual past. These new approaches are best evident in an extensive polemical literature that accompanied the struggle. From the 1030s and until the end of the Contest with the Concordat of Worms in 1122, a number of contending issues were discussed by contemporary churchmen. One issue scrutinised was that of simony and the validity of sacraments of simoniacs. In the following, the *Libellus de symoniacis* of Bruno of Segni will be analysed in order to address several aspects. First, the *Libellus* shows a new and more critical approach to the textual past, foreshadowing the juggling with *auctoritas* of the twelfth century. Second, Bruno's analysis is a witness to the efforts taken to justify papal reform in the last decades of the eleventh century.

Introduction

The Investiture Contest has at regular intervals been considered as a 'revolution', largely because it contributed forcefully to the reorganisation of the Church in the centuries to come.¹ But the Contest has

E-mail address: Leidulf.Melve@cms.uib.no

¹ The most extensive claims are put forward by Harold J. Berman, *Law and revolution. The formation of the western legal tradition* (Cambridge, MA, 1983). See also R.I. Moore, *The first European revolution, c. 970-1215* (Oxford, 2000).

also been seen as heralding a new and more critical way of thinking, in which the traditional reliance on authorities was giving way to new approaches to the textual past.² These new approaches are best evident in an extensive polemical literature that accompanied the struggle. From the 1030s and until the end of the Contest with the Concordat of Worms in 1122, a number of contending issues were discussed by contemporary churchmen. The first issue scrutinised was that of simony and the validity of sacraments of simoniacs. Introduced in a polemical context by Guido of Arezzo in the early 1030s, the ascendance of the first reform pope, Leo IX (1049–54), in 1049 contributed to the elaboration of the subject by Peter Damian (1007–72) and Humbert of Silva-Candida (1010–61). In contrast, the public debate under the great reform pope Gregory VII (1073–85) was so dominated by subjects relating to the struggle between the king and pope that little attention was paid to the question of the validity of sacraments. Only in the late 1080s and 1090s does this issue return to the centre of the polemicists' attention. Along with the *De excommunicatis vitandis* by Bernold of St Blasien, Deusdedit's *Libellus contra invasores et symoniacos*, and a bit later, Alger of Liège's *De misericordia et iustitia*, the *Libellus de symoniacis* of Bruno of Segni (1045–1123) reflects this renewed concern with sacramental validity.³

In the following, the *Libellus de symoniacis* of Bruno will be analysed in order to address two aspects. First, the extent to which the *Libellus* shows a new and more critical approach to the textual past, foreshadowing the juggling with *auctoritas* of the twelfth century. Second, how Bruno's analysis is a witness to the new efforts taken to justify papal reform in the last decades of the eleventh century.

The life and works of Bruno

Bruno was born in 1045 and received his education in the monastery of St Perpetuus, and later in Asti and Bologna. Bruno preferred exegetical studies, and seems to have possessed a more rudimentary knowledge of philosophy and canon law.⁴ In the heat of the struggle between King Henry IV and Pope Gregory IV, ignited by the pope's excommunication of the king in 1076, Bruno was ordained bishop of Segni by Gregory in 1079 or 1080, perhaps in an attempt to secure the loyalty of the gifted Bruno. This loyalty was certainly needed as the papacy experienced some rough times after the second excommunication of the German king in 1080, manifested in the sacking of Rome in 1080 by Henry IV and the subsequent enthroning of Archbishop Guibert of Ravenna as anti-pope Clement III. Bruno's readiness to support the Gregorian cause is evident from his participation in a 'gathering' (*conventus*) of Roman clergy in 1082. The aim of the meeting was to discuss the legality of mortgaging church property to pay for mercenaries to fight the anti-pope⁵

² See Karl Leyser, 'On the eve of the first European revolution', in: *Communication and power in medieval Europe. The Gregorian revolution and beyond*, ed. Karl Leyser (London, 1994), 1–19; Kathleen G. Cushing, *Papacy and law in the Gregorian revolution. The canonistic work of Anselm of Lucca* (Oxford, 1998).

³ Bruno of Segni, *Libellus de symoniacis*, ed. E. Sackur, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (hereafter MGH), *Libelli de lite*, 2 (Hannover, 1892), 546–62. For an English translation of the *vita*, see I.S. Robinson, *The papal reform of the eleventh century. Lives of Pope Leo IX and Pope Gregory VII* (Manchester, 2003). The entire *Libellus* is translated by W.N. North, see <<http://www.acad.carleton.edu/curricular/MARS/Libellus.pdf>>; [accessed 4 April 2008]. I have consulted both these translations. I have also used the English translation of the letters of Peter Damian.

⁴ See Bernhard Gigalski, *Bruno, Bischof von Segni, Abt von Monte-Cassino (1049–1123). Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Münster, 1898), 25–49; G. Grègoire, *Bruno de Segni: exégète médiévale et théologien monastique* (Spoleto, 1965), 16–41.

⁵ For comments on this gathering, see I.S. Robinson, *Authority and resistance in the Investiture Contest. The polemical literature of the late eleventh century* (Manchester, 1978), 45; H.E.J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII 1073–1085* (Oxford, 1998), 220; Uta-Renate Blumenthal, *Gregor VII. Papst zwischen Canossa und Kirchenreform* (Darmstadt, 2001), 322; William L. North, 'Polemical, apathy, and authorial initiative in Gregorian Rome. The curious case of Bruno of Segni', *The Haskins Society Journal*, 10 (2001), 117–8.

Bruno also fostered a close friendship with Popes Victor III (1086–87) and Urban II (1088–99),⁶ being created cardinal-legate by one of them, probably by Urban.⁷ However, he did not attend the ordination of Paschal II (1099–1118).⁸ In 1102 he became a monk of Monte Cassino, and was elected abbot in 1107.⁹ The struggle between *regnum* and *sacerdotium* which raged in the 1080s subsided in intensity in the 1090s, resulting from the more pragmatic and mediating approach of Urban towards King Henry. This was not to last, however, shattered by the so-called *privilege*-schism between Paschal II and Henry V in 1111; in a dramatic incident, Paschal was forced to concede the right of investiture to Henry V, thus undermining the prohibition of lay investiture from 1078. The incident ignited a stream of polemical literature, including an epistolary campaign in which Bruno criticised the pope. As a result of this criticism, Bruno was forced to give up his position at the abbey and return to his episcopal see.¹⁰

In addition to the *Libellus* and the four letters relating to the *privilege*-schism — defined as polemical literature and thus included in the Monumenta Germaniae Historica (MGH) edition of the *Libelli de lite*¹¹ — Bruno was the author of numerous other works, including commentaries on the Pentateuch, the Book of Job, the Psalms, the four Gospels and the Apocalypse. With regard to the *Libellus*, neither the exact date nor the context of its composition is known. What we know, however, is that it was written between 1085 and 1109, most likely in the 1090s.¹² As such, the tract is probably influenced by the papal propaganda of the period 1089–95, a propaganda which concentrated almost exclusively on the question of the sacraments of excommunicates.¹³ Although it is not out of the question that the *Libellus* might be a response to anti-pope Clement's encyclical of 1089,¹⁴ the fact that the anti-pope is not mentioned by Bruno renders this suggestion less viable. The same could be said of the suggestion that it is a retort to the criticism of Pope Urban II and his supporters following the council of Piacenza at which the pope favored the reinstatement in the clerical office of members of the Guibertine party: neither Pope Urban nor the council is mentioned. Rather than viewing Bruno's treatise as related to a particular incident, it makes more sense, I think, to see the *Libellus* as spurred on by the ferocious public debate on the subject in the early 1090s.¹⁵

Scholarly evaluations of Bruno often distinguish between the author's skill as a biblical exegete and as a polemical writer.¹⁶ Reginald Grégoire's study of the whole corpus stresses his skill as a theologian and biblical scholar,¹⁷ and is representative of the positive evaluation of Bruno's exegetical skill in

⁶ See Alfons Becker, *Papst Urban II. (1088–1099). Teil 1. Herkunft und kirchliche Laufbahn der Papst und die lateinische Christenheit* (Stuttgart, 1964), 171; Becker, *Papst Urban II. (1088–1099). Teil 2. Der Papst, die griechische Christenheit und der Kreuzzug* (Stuttgart, 1988), 43; G.R. Evans, 'St Anselm and St Bruno of Segni: the common ground', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 29 (1979), 132.

⁷ Max Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters. Dritter Teil (Band): Vom Ausbruch des Kirchenstreites bis zum Ende des Zwölften Jahrhunderts* (München, 1931), 49; Klaus Ganzer, *Die Entwicklung des auswärtigen Kardinalats im hohen Mittelalter. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kardinalkollegiums vom 11. bis 13. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 1963), 59.

⁸ Carlo Servatius, *Paschalis II. (1099–1118). Studien zu seiner Person und seiner Politik* (Stuttgart, 1979), 42.

⁹ The career of Bruno illustrates how a figure formed by Gregorian reform and with extreme views was able to settle in at Monte-Cassino and finally become abbot; see H.E.J. Cowdrey, *The age of Abbot Desiderius, Montecassino: The papacy, and the Normans in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries* (Oxford, 1983).

¹⁰ According to G.A. Loud, 'Abbot Desiderius of Montecassino and the Gregorian papacy', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 30 (1979), 325, Bruno resigned from his post to avoid sowing dissent between the brothers and the Roman Church.

¹¹ MGH, *Libelli de lite*, 2, 563–5. A longer version of the letter to the Roman bishops and cardinals is edited by Gérard Fransen, 'Episcopis et cardinalibus Romanae ecclesiae exponit quid de investiturae quaestione inter se et Wibertinos distet', *Studi Gregoriani*, 9 (1972), 528–33.

¹² Bruno refers to Hugh of Cluny's old age (died 1109). Gigalski, *Bruno*, 160, 191–2 contends that it was most likely written in the period between 1094 and 1101, probably in 1094. F. Pelster, 'Die römische Synode von 1060 und die von Simonisten gespendeten Weihen', *Gregorianum*, 23 (1942), 84 claims it was composed in the pontificate of Urban II (1088–99). Stephan Freund, *Studien zur literarischen Wirksamkeit des Petrus Damiani* (Hannover, 1995), 51–2 narrows the period to 1089–1102. North, 'Polemic', 118 finds that the *vita* was written in 1094/95.

¹³ Robinson, *Authority*, 174. Robinson thus concludes that the *Libellus* is composed before 1095.

¹⁴ *Decretum Wiberti vel Clementis papae*, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH, *Libelli de lite*, 2 (Hannover, 1891), 621–6.

¹⁵ The question of audience will be addressed in more detail in the conclusion below.

¹⁶ See North, 'Polemic', 118: 'Yet in his literary endeavours, it was to the explication of the Bible rather than to the excavation and organisation of canon law or the elaboration of pro-reform polemics that Bruno devoted the majority of his time and attention. Whence his general neglect in the scholarship on the 'Gregorian reform' circle.'

¹⁷ Grégoire, *Bruno de Segni*.

scholarship. Consequently, the *Libellus* has been lauded for its clear discussion of the sacraments, honest approach and pragmatic orientation.¹⁸ The MGH edition of the treatise consists of two works. The first (cc. 1–9), which contains a brief *vita* describing several miracles of Leo IX, was probably intended as a sermon on St Leo IX's feast day. The *vita* has largely been neglected in scholarship,¹⁹ and has not received systematic analysis.²⁰ The second part (cc. 10–16) contains the discussion of simoniacal ordinations.²¹ Although the formal division is clear — the two parts also appear independently in the manuscripts — there are several connecting threads between the two parts. These threads relate to the overall theme of the polemic — the restructuring of the 'right order' by the reform papacy. In the following, the first part will be dealt with only rudimentarily, focusing on those aspects that are vital in order to understand Bruno's analysis of simoniacal ordinations in the second part.

A sermon on Pope Leo IX

Pope Leo IX is usually described as the first reform pope of the eleventh century. Early on contemporaries noted the reforming zeal of Leo, clearly expressed in his *vita* from c.1060 as well as in the polemical literature of the 1080s. Bruno's sermon on Pope Leo IX is part of this appraisal. However, the sermon is also an argumentative preparation for his discussion of simoniacal ordinations in the second part of the treatise:

But what is even worse — hardly anyone was found who either was not a symoniac [himself] or had not been ordained by simoniacs. As a result, to this very day, there are some people who, because they argue wickedly and do not understand the dispensation of the Church, contend that from that time the priesthood has failed in the Church. For they say: 'If all were like this, i. e. if all either were symoniacs or had been ordained by symoniacs, you who are now [priests], how did you come to be here? Through whom did you pass, if not through them? There was no other way. Hence, those who ordained you received their orders from none other than those who either were symoniacs or had been ordained by symoniacs.' We shall address these people later, since this question requires no small discussion.²²

¹⁸ Gigalski, *Bruno*, x calls Bruno the most influential exegete in Italy in this period, based on his contribution to the development of the theological science of the twelfth century. Following Evans, 'St Anselm and St Bruno', 130, Bruno displays a number of similarities to his contemporary, Anselm of Canterbury, arguably the greatest theologian of the period, in terms of his exposure of methods and principles. According to I.S. Robinson, "'Political allegory'" in the biblical exegesis of Bruno of Segni', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 50 (1983), 69, the use of 'political allegory' — expositions of a biblical text by reference to current political affairs — is a characteristic trait of Bruno's style, although the method was relatively common among papal writers at the end of the eleventh century. Becker, *Papst Urban II*, Teil 2,43 regards Bruno as one of the most prominent exegetical writers of the period. Jean Leclercq, 'The renewal of theology', in: *Renaissance and renewal in the twelfth century*, ed. Robert L. Benson, Giles Constable and Carol D. Lanham (London, 1991), 68 counts Bruno, along with Peter Damian, as the two most important theologians coinciding with the Gregorian reform. Giles Constable, 'The ideal of the imitation of Christ', in: *Three studies in medieval religious and social thought*, ed. Giles Constable (Cambridge, 1995), 180 claims that his work shows a concern for the 'imitation of Christ' in the period. Others claim that the exegetical work reveals methodical affinities with scholastic theology (Erich Meuthen, *Kirche und Heilsgeschichte bei Gerhoh von Reichersberg* (Leiden, 1959), 116; Irven M. Resnick, *Divine power and possibility in St Peter Damian's 'De divina omnipotentia'* (Leiden, 1990), 56).

¹⁹ The scholarly neglect of the *vita* of Leo IX is due to its reliance on contemporary accounts such as that of Libuin, subdeacon of the Roman Church. Consequently, it offers little new information (North, 'Polemic', 118).

²⁰ Johannes Drehmann, *Papst Leo IX. und die Simonie. Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung der Vorgeschichte des Investiturstreites* (Leipzig, 1908), 4 notes the emphatic character of the *vita*. See also Hayden White, 'The Gregorian ideal and Saint Bernard of Clairvaux', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 21 (1960), 332: 'At the beginning of Paschal's pontificate the curia made known its views in Bruno of Segni's life of Leo IX, a work which was little more than a restatement of Humbert's *vita*'.

²¹ Manitius, *Geschichte*, 49; White, 'The Gregorian ideal', 332.

²² Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 547: Sed quod his omnibus deterius est, vix aliquis inveniebatur qui vel symoniacus non esset vel a symoniacis ordinatus non fuisset. Unde etiam usque hodie inveniuntur quidam qui male argumentantes et aeclesia dispensationem non bene intelligentes, ab illo iam tempore sacerdotium in aeclesia defecisse contendunt. Auint enim: Si omnes tales erant, id est, si omnes vel symoniaci erant vel a symoniacis ordinati (erant), vos, qui nunc estis, unde huc venistis? Per quos, nisi per illos transistis? Non fuit via aliunde. Ergo illi qui vos ordinaverunt, ab illis et non ab aliis suos ordines susceperunt, qui vel symoniaci erant vel a symoniacis ordinati erant. His autem potestea respondebimus, quoniam haec quaestio non parvam quaerit disputationem.

Bruno continues to establish the contrast between the sordid period, in which even the Roman pontiffs showed lax discipline,²³ and the reforming impetus that started with Pope Leo IX.²⁴ He borrows from the *Vita Leonis IX*²⁵ in order to sketch the virtues of the pope, before underlining them: 'And at such a moment, such a teacher, who was going to have such disciples, was truly necessary'.²⁶ The author focuses next on the early stages of the career of Hildebrand (the later Pope Gregory VII), presenting him in similar terms as those used to describe Leo: a man of noble disposition, with a zeal for religion and learning, who had served as a Benedictine monk.²⁷

Addressing a contemporary audience, Bruno, then, attempts to escape the accusation of 'innovation' that frequently was levelled at the Gregorian reform papacy in the royal letters as well as by royalist polemicists. In short, the royal party argued that Gregory's zeal for innovation — primarily in the form of the excommunication of King Henry and the release of the oath of his subjects — was the cause of the struggle between the two powers and thus the reason for the shattering of the 'right order of the world'. In an effort to come to terms with these accusations, Bruno first stresses that at this particular point in time (*tali tempore*), there were no other solutions. Hence, the reference to the canon-law notion of 'necessity' to justify the new legal rulings — often invoked in the papal letters — is juxtaposed to the previous description of a 'world in wickedness, without sanctity and justice'. Second, the use of the phrase 'a teacher was necessary' (*magister necessarius erat*) accentuates the responsibility of popes to act as 'teacher' and 'doctor' which is incorporated in the mandate of the vicar of St Peter. This notion, which is based partly on a reference to Matt. 10:24 ('A pupil does not rank above his teacher') and partly on Pope Gregory I's notion of 'doctor', was used by the Gregorian reform papacy for legitimating Church reform.²⁸ It is noteworthy that Bruno only mentions election by the 'clergy and people' and stops short of addressing the question of the consent of the emperor — probably an effort to justify the irregular election of Pope Gregory VII in 1073 by the *exemplum* of the first reform pope.²⁹

The praise of Pope Leo IX

It is only at this point that Bruno returns to his primary intention, namely a praise of Leo IX. The author explains the innovations of the papacy in light of the upheaval in the preceding period. In particular, Leo reformed four aspects of the right order, as he 'terrified the sacrilegious, upset the

²³ While there is no question about the widespread occurrence of simony in the last half of the tenth and first half of the eleventh centuries, there is less clarity as to the extension of simony in the second half of the eleventh century; see Rudolf Schieffer, 'Spirituales latrones. Zu den Hintergründen der Simonieprozesse in Deutschland zwischen 1069 und 1075', *Historische Jahrbücher*, 92 (1972), 19–60. See also Hans Meier-Welcker, 'Die Simonie im frühen Mittelalter', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 63 (1953), 61–93.

²⁴ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 547.

²⁵ Klaus Herbers, 'Zu Mirakeln im Liber pontificalis des 9. Jahrhunderts', in: *Mirakel im Mittelalter. Konzeptionen, Erscheinungsformen, Deutungen*, ed. M. Heinzelmann, K. Herbers and D. R. Bauer (Stuttgart, 2002), 133 notes that the *vita* of Leo is exceptional because the miracle section is separated from the rest of the narration and given its own structure. Different perspectives on the *vita* include Henning Hoesch, *Die kanonischen Quellen im Werk Humberts von Moyenmoutier. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der vorgregorianischen Reform* (Köln, 1970); Hans-Georg Krause, 'Über den Verfasser der *Vita Leonis IX papae*', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 32 (1976), 49–85; I.S. Robinson, 'Introduction', in: *The papal reform of the eleventh century. Lives of Pope Leo IX and Pope Gregory VII*, ed. I.S. Robinson (Manchester, 2003), 17–36.

²⁶ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 547: Et talis quidem magister necessarius erat, qui tali tempore et talis discipulos habiturus erat.

²⁷ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 547: nobilis indolis adolescens, clari ingenii sanctaeque religionis. Iverat autem adolescens illuc tum discendia gratia, tum etiam, ut in aliquo religioso loco sub beati Benedicti regula militaret. Bruno is a witness to the discussion addressing the monastic vocation of Pope Gregory VII. Although the case has yet to be settled, the majority of recent opinions have concluded that Hildebrand was not a monk.

²⁸ In Gregory VII's letters, the phrases *beatus Gregorius doctor sanctus et humilissimus, doctor dulcifluus, doctor egregius, doctor mitissimus*, are recurring. Gregory VII's denunciations of simony are supported by books IX and XII of Gregory I's Register; see Robinson, *Authority*, 31–2. The Matthew-passage was also a part of Guido of Arezzo's attack on simony, referring to how simoniacal priests had Simon Magus as 'teacher'.

²⁹ The irregularities in the election of Gregory VII were even acknowledged in the pope's first letters, and the royal publicists Guido of Osnabrück, Guido of Ferrara, and the author of the *Dicta cuiusdam* used them for all their worth. The importance of Leo IX to Gregory VII as an example of a reform pope has recently been underlined by Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII*, 25–6, 685–6; North, 'Polemic', 120–1. See also the biography of Drehmann, *Papst Leo IX*.

symoniacs, and wounded the army of married priests [...] He also confirmed the ancient canons so that the order of clerics might live chastely and religiously'.³⁰ The lines of continuity between the Popes Leo and Gregory VII are further stressed in the next section describing the miracles of Leo — a section introduced by Bruno addressing another set of reasons for writing the praise: 'Nor even now would I have written these things, if I had not been forced (*coactus*) in a certain way to write them, as I shall make clear in what follows'.³¹ Bruno then states that Gregory demanded that the deeds of Leo be written down in order to 'serve as an example of humility to the many who listened (*multis audientibus*)'.³² Furthermore, the author excuses himself for not writing down the miracle stories as Gregory, the source of these miracles, did.³³ According to Bruno, the pope did not speak to anyone in particular, but addressed a gathering of people (*in commune*).³⁴

How is the *coactus*-phrase to be interpreted? Is the sermon simply propaganda ordered by the Gregorian papacy? The presentation of the reform papacy as a unified movement might point in this direction.³⁵ The fierce attacks on the Gregorian papacy after the pope's death in 1085 also lend credence to the view that the sermon is part of a propagandistic attempt to reconstruct the image of the pope. This brings us to Bruno's reflections on the subject of diffusion and audiences. The problem with these reflections is that they refrain from specifying the audiences. Oral or aural delivery of sermons was the common form of communication in the period, regardless of the type of audience. The reference to 'oral delivery to a gathering' can thus refer to any type of audience. This being said, the first passage perhaps addresses one of the intended audiences of the praise, namely an audience outside the inner circle of the papal party, and perhaps even one including 'simple men'.³⁶ Such an interpretation is further strengthened by juxtaposing this with the second passage, which clearly addresses an audience consisting of the inner circle of the papal party.³⁷

Miracles and their function

Bruno's description of miracles in the following section is meant to confirm Pope Leo IX's central role³⁸ in establishing the holy cults of the reform papacy.³⁹ The first recounted miracle is set in the

³⁰ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 548: Cuius quidem rugitus mox terram commovit, terruit sacrilegos, turbavit symoniacos et coniugatorum sacerdotum exercitum vulneravit [...] et, ut clericorum ordo caste et religiose viveret, antiquos canones confirmavit.

³¹ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 548: Nec ego quidem nunc ea scripsissem, nisi quodammodo, ut ea scriberem, coactus essem, sicut in sequentibus manifestabo.

³² Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 548: et quod ea non scriberemus quae Romanae aeclesiae ad gloriam et multis audientibus forent ad humilitatis exemplum.

³³ I.S. Robinson, 'The friendship network of Gregory VII', *History*, 63 (1978), 7 underlines the pope's fondness of miracle stories, both those dealing with his own sanctity and those describing other supporters of papal reform. Both Peter Damian and Desiderius, in addition to Bruno, evidently were told miracle stories by the pope.

³⁴ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 548: Sed quia in commune verba fundebat, et nulli nostrum specialiter hoc agere videbatur.

³⁵ Later in the treatise, Bruno returns to his literary intentions for writing, stating that he would not have dictated these words without being ordered to do so (*sine imperio*). The phrase in this context resembles a well-known rhetorical *topos* used to address the literary patron.

³⁶ In dealing with his exegetical writings, G.R. Evans, *Anselm and a new generation* (Oxford, 1980), 147–53 stresses Bruno's communicative skill as manifested in a concern for the fact that the expositions should be understandable to the simpler men in the community as well as in an effort to write clearly and simply and to keep his readers' interest.

³⁷ Bruno's association with the inner circle of the reform party, along with the description of the precise circumstance of Gregory's praise, indicates that the intended audience probably consisted of this inner group of reformers. The pope's exhortation to members of the curia to write something commemorating Leo resonates with Damian's memory of the young Hildebrand's exhortation to compile a collection of canons in support of the Roman primacy. Thus, Bruno's text offers testimony which confirms that Gregory VII viewed the curia as a scriptorium of reform for the production of reforming texts; see North, 'Polemic', 120.

³⁸ Leo IX was the only pope who was canonised during the Middle Ages. See Bernhard Schimmelpfennig, 'Heilige Päpste — päpstliche Kanonisationspolitik', in: *Politik und Heiligenverehrung im Hochmittelalter*, ed. J. Petersohn (Sigmaringen, 1994), 87.

³⁹ Cyriacus Heinrich Brakel, 'Die vom Reformpapsttum geförderten Heiligenkulte', *Studi Gregoriani*, 9 (1972), 242–311; Hans-Werner Goetz, 'The concept of time in the historiography of the eleventh and twelfth centuries', in: *Medieval concepts of the past. Ritual, memory, historiography*, ed. G. Althoff, J. Fried and P.J. Geary (Cambridge, 2002), 221 notes that the miracles-sections often have a public or a quasi-public function. This surely seems to be the case here.

context of the fight against simony. Bruno states that Leo was celebrating councils in Gaul.⁴⁰ Several bishops were accused of simony, but one particularly grave case was difficult to prove. Leo asked the accused to say 'glory to the Father, to the Son and to the Holy Spirit' as a final test of his innocence. The bishop was unable to utter these words and, according to Bruno, it became clear to all present that he had sinned against the Holy Spirit.⁴¹ The next miracle exemplifies the supernatural powers of the pope, who fitted together a broken wooden cup considered to be very precious.⁴²

From the early middle ages to the twelfth century,⁴³ stories of miracles permeated almost every type of literature, having clear didactic and edificatory aims. In the theoretical understanding of miracles, going back to Augustine, miracles were seen as part of the Creation, and subdivided into three classes.⁴⁴ Bruno's conception is part of this heritage and the first example, in which the judgment is derived from divine signs rather than legal procedure, serves to cause 'wonder in the ignorant', both for their edification and as a manifestation of the divine working through the reform pope.⁴⁵ By distinguishing between the adherents of the divine 'right order' and the enemies of Christ, the author is thus able to present the reform papacy's work as the reinstatement of the 'right order', a fact proven by the divine blessing through miracles.⁴⁶ As such, Bruno's praise serves to 'terminate unsanctioned oral tradition and coalescences the myth-making powers of the community'.⁴⁷

Compared to Peter Damian's approach to miracle stories, Bruno's conception appears narrow and perhaps 'primitive'. First, while Damian has a theoretical conception of the function of miracles in relation to different audiences, Bruno takes their didactic value for granted. Hence, Bruno does not seem to acknowledge the more critical approach to miracle stories emerging during the late eleventh century.⁴⁸ Furthermore, although Damian employs miracle-stories quite extensively, not only in the discussion of simony but also in other letters of theological-exegetical character, he criticises certain miracles on the basis of a set of criteria for evaluating historical veracity. In a letter to Pope Nicholas and

⁴⁰ The reforming councils of the late 1040s and 1050s were of great importance in the institutionalisation of the early reform movement. It is perhaps strange that Bruno does not deal more in detail with these, as information on them could be found in the *vita* of Leo IX.

⁴¹ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 549: Cumque ille dixisset: 'Gloria Patri et Filio', quamvis multum conaretur, nullo modo 'et Spiritui sancto' dicere valebat. Atque id ipsum sepius repetens, cum aperto ore Spiritum sanctum nullatenus nominare potuisset, omnibus qui aderant manifestum apparuit in Spiritum sanctum eum deliquisse, cuius nomen dicere non valeret.

⁴² Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 549.

⁴³ For views on the function of miracles and 'holy men' in antiquity and the early Middle Ages, see Peter Brown, 'The rise and function of the holy man in late Antiquity', *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 61 (1971), 80–101; Arnold Angenendt, 'Der Heilige: auf Erden — im Himmel', in: *Politik und Heiligenverehrung*, ed. Petersohn, 11–53; Hans-Jürgen Becker, 'Der Heilige und das Recht', in: *Politik und Heiligenverehrung*, ed. 53–73; Rajko Bratož, 'Der "heilige Mann" und seine Biographie', in: *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. A. Scharer and G. Scheibelreiter (Wien, 1994), 222–52; Marc Van Uytvanghe, 'Die Vita im Spannungsfeld von Legende, Biographik und Geschichte', in: *Historiographie*, ed. 194–221; Thomas J. Heffernan, 'Christian biography: foundation to maturity', in: *Historiography in the middle ages*, ed. D.M. Deliyannis (Leiden, 2003), 115–54.

⁴⁴ Benedicta Ward, *Miracles and the medieval mind. Theory, record and event 1000–1215* (Aldershot, 1987), 3–4: 'There were three levels of wonder: wonder provoked by the acts of God visible daily and discerned by wise men as signs of God's goodness; wonder provoked in the ignorant, who did not understand the workings of nature and therefore could be amazed by what to the wise man was not unusual; and wonder provoked by genuine miracles, unusual manifestations of the power of God'.

⁴⁵ See Stephanie Coué, *Hagiographie im Kontext. Schreibenlaß und Funktion von Bischofsviten aus dem 11. und vom Anfang des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1997), for an analysis of the function of hagiography in the *vitae* of bishops in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

⁴⁶ Thus, the miracle-section is a witness to the extent to which the saint was conceptualised in terms of the society in general and the reforming project in this case. In recent research there has been a trend to consider the hagiographic tradition in terms of the social context. The production of biographies was precipitated by a specific need external to the life of the saint, a need external to the intertextuality of the work itself which would render the text comprehensible; see Patrick J. Geary, *Living with the dead in the middle ages* (Ithaca, 1996), 13–23. Thomas J. Heffernan, *Sacred biography. Saints and their biographies in the middle ages* (New York, 1992), 19, thus claims that the author of a sacred biography is the community. The function of the text was not only to document the miracle, but also to interpret for the community what was only partially understood and buried in the public record and the ideal of sanctity.

⁴⁷ See Heffernan, *Sacred biography*, 35.

⁴⁸ The last half of the eleventh century witnessed a more critical attitude to the divine. For different perspectives on this transformation, see Charles M. Radding, 'Superstition to science: nature, fortune, and the passing of the medieval ordeal', *American Historical Review*, 84 (1979), 945–69; Robert Bartlett, *Trial by fire and water. The medieval judicial ordeal* (Oxford, 1986); Ward, *Miracles*.

Hildebrand from 1058, for instance, Damian discloses a critical approach to miracles. Not only is he naming the sources for his stories, but he is also leaving the final judgment of their truthfulness to the reader precisely because he questions their veracity.⁴⁹ In contrast, Bruno is not critical, and although he remarks that he had heard many of the miracle stories told by Pope Gregory VII himself, these references are not intended as a check for historical veracity.⁵⁰ Thus, Bruno employs miracle stories for edificatory and didactic purposes, as both sides in the Investiture Contest did.⁵¹ As will be seen, this quite traditional approach to miracles points to a characteristic trait of Bruno's intellectual outlook, namely the not always predictable combination of traditional and innovative approaches.

After having described the battle of Civitate in 1053 — ignoring the accusations of the pope's involvement in the atrocities⁵² — Bruno reminds his audience of his earlier promise to explain in greater detail what is implied by the statement that he was 'forced to dictate these words' — referring to the praise — at the demand of Pope Gregory. Bruno outlines a story of John of Tusculum's dream. In this dream, the pope appeared and asked John to ask the bishop of Segni for one hundred thousand *solidi*.⁵³ Bruno wonders how to interpret this message, and he recounts the vision to the clerics. The clerics interpret the 'money' (*pecunia*) as a metaphor for another sort of payment, namely a payment for writing something about Leo which befits his memory: 'Truly this is your money'.⁵⁴

These passages redirect the emphasis from Pope Gregory as the literary patron, to the intellectual prudence of Bruno as the justification for writing the praise. Not only is this stress on individual intellectual abilities at odds with the literary *topos* of humility. Moreover, the literary effect of this authorial placement is particularly noteworthy in relation to the formalised rules pertaining to the *vita*-genre. The rhetorical strategy is simple, but effective; because Bruno himself has not voiced the equation of money to knowledge, he can attribute it to the clerics of Segni and retain a certain air of humility. The effect on the audience, however, is quite the opposite: the attestation from the author's environment aggrandises the impression of intellectual prudence. The same rhetoric is applied by other polemicists as well, including Peter Damian and Guibert of Ferrara.⁵⁵ Bruno's use of rhetoric attests to his intellectual position and abilities within the inner circle of the papal party, as well as within the monastic environment at Segni and possibly also at Monte Cassino.⁵⁶

In conclusion, the *vita* of Leo betrays the same characteristics that Kathleen G. Cushing has underlined in the *Vita et passio sancti Arialdi* and the *Vita Anselmi*: these hagiographers tied sanctity to events rather than deeds and by this means attempted to sanctify the reform movement.⁵⁷ Similarly, Bruno, by first presenting Leo's sanctity as resulting from his specific reform measures — the holiness

⁴⁹ Peter Damian, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. K. Reindel, MGH, *Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit*. Teil 1–4 (München, 1983–93), n. 57, 178. For the English translation, see Owen Blum and Irven M. Resnick, *Peter Damian. Letters*, vol 1–7 (Washington, 1983–2005).

⁵⁰ Criticism could have jeopardised Bruno's intention of presenting the reform movement as unitary and hence legitimising the Gregorian papacy on account of a 'virtuous' beginning.

⁵¹ Despite the use of miracle stories in the papal letter to Hermann of Metz (1081), this device never made a great impasse in the polemical literature. The learned character of the polemics probably explains the lack of concern for this predominantly edificatory device. Hugh of Fleury's use of miracles is thus an exception, and can be explained by the aim of the writer to repudiate the letter to Hermann, including its use of miracles.

⁵² The involvement of the pope led to criticism from Damian and a subsequent justification by the subdeacon Libuin in the *De obitu sancti Leonis* (Robinson, *Authority*, 98).

⁵³ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 553.

⁵⁴ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 553.

⁵⁵ Damian uses this rhetoric in an effort to justify the discussion of the validity of the sacraments of simoniacal priests in the *Liber gratissimus* (Damian, *Die Briefe*, n. 40). Guido of Ferrara tells how he had to be consulted in order to resolve a dispute among the brethren about Pope Gregory (Guido of Ferrara, *De scismate Hildebrandi*, ed. R. Wilmans, MGH, *Libelli de lite*, 2 (Hannover 1891), 532–3).

⁵⁶ For Bruno's relationship to Monte-Cassino, see Gigalski, *Bruno*. Perspectives on the contemporary position of Monte Cassino include Hartmut Hoffmann, 'Zur Geschichte Montecassinis im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert', in: *Montecassino und die Laien im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1979), 1–20; Loud, 'Abbot Desiderius', in: *Monte Cassino in the middle ages*, ed. Herbert Bloch, 3 vols (Rome, 1986), vol. 1.

⁵⁷ Kathleen G. Cushing, 'Events that led to sainthood: sanctity and the reformers in the eleventh century', in: *Belief and culture in the middle ages*, ed. R. Gameson and H. Leyser, (Oxford, 2001), 187–96.

of which are proved by the miracles stories — the entire reform movement and its ‘innovations’ are sanctified and hence justified.

Sacramental theology and simoniacal priests

While the sermon has barely been noted in previous scholarship, the theologian Bruno has not gone unnoticed. As Bernhard Gigalski observed, Bruno shows independence in arranging his sources, although noting his dependence on Humbert’s polemic and perhaps also on that of Deusdedit.⁵⁸ Jean Leclercq counts Bruno, along with Damian, as the two most important theologians of the Gregorian reform period.⁵⁹ According to G. R. Evans, Bruno tried to avoid polemics in an attempt to make the treatise brief and orderly, and to present it in vivid language.⁶⁰ More to the point, Carl Mirbt stresses Bruno’s clarity in the treatment of the sacraments,⁶¹ Alois Fauser mentions his objective approach,⁶² and Frans Pelster claims that his sacramental theology foreshadows the theory of the *obex sacramenti*.⁶³

Bruno starts by repeating the opposition’s accusation as it appeared in the *vita*-part: if all priests either were simoniacs or had been ordained by simoniacs, then all priests today would necessarily have to be either simoniacs or ordained by simoniacs.⁶⁴ Dialectical reasoning is conducive to the opponent’s argument, and Bruno is challenged to reply in the same vein. The premise to the reply is that simoniacal priests were a historical fact, a point confirmed by Bruno in the *vita*-section. Given the relatively short time span of only one generation — from the mid-eleventh century to the heyday of the Gregorian reform movement in the 1070s and 1080s — there is a logical conclusion to this argument: if the Church was corrupted in the 1050s, the heritage of that generation of priests would still make its presence felt. Although Bruno does not identify his opponents, the focus is on the view of simoniacal ordinations that has been called the ‘minority view’, as opposed to the ‘majority view’.⁶⁵ Whereas representatives of the ‘minority view’ did not accept the validity of sacraments of ministers ordained by simoniacs, those advocating the ‘majority view’ accepted these sacraments because the sacraments were transferred irrespective of the status of the performing minister. In the early phase of the discussion over simoniacal priests in the 1050s, Damian has been considered the main representative of the ‘majority view’, perhaps arguing against the main proponent of the ‘minority view’: Humbert of Silva-Candida. Needless to say, these are categories invented by later historians and thus would have been alien to the contemporary participants in the debate. Still, they address fundamental differences between the two parties.

An adherent of the ‘majority view’ himself, Bruno has to face two challenges. One of these challenges is the notion of simony as outlined by the earliest defender of the ‘minority view’, Guido of Arezzo, in around 1031. Guido introduces his discussion by paraphrasing a hypothetical objection basic to the ‘majority view’: ‘But if someone objects on the grounds that it is not the consecrations but the

⁵⁸ Gigalski, *Bruno*, 198.

⁵⁹ Leclercq, ‘The renewal’, 68.

⁶⁰ Evans, ‘St Anselm and St Bruno’, 134.

⁶¹ Carl Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII* (Leipzig, 1965), 71.

⁶² Alois Fauser, *Die Publizisten des Investiturstreites, Persönlichkeiten und Ideen* (Würzburg, 1935), 72–4 claims that, in his effort to display proper behaviour in office, Bruno is forced to treat the sacrament in an objective way. Although the author fails to reach a final solution, Bruno is not so much to blame. Rather, the failure has more to do with the fact that the dogmatic and the disciplinary sides to the problem had never clashed in earlier discussions and Bruno thereby had to stake out an entirely new course. In general, and following Fauser, the tract displays an honest and almost idealistic intellectual approach, devoid of propagandistic tendencies.

⁶³ Pelster, ‘Die römische Synode’, 86, n. 53 claims that Bruno hints at the theory of the *obex sacramenti*: ‘Die Handauflegung ist ihm nicht nur rekonziliatorisch, sondern auch irgendwie ergänzend konsekratorisch. Er übertreibt auch das Prinzip: extra ecclesiam nulla salus, so dass er daran zweifelt, ob Kinder, die von Häretikern getauft sind und vor der Rekonziliation sterben, gerettet werden’.

⁶⁴ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 554.

⁶⁵ For an outline of the ‘majority’ and the ‘minority’ view, see John Gilchrist, ‘*Simoniaca haresis* and the problem of orders from Leo IX to Gratian’, in: *Proceedings of the second international congress of medieval canon law*, ed. S. Kuttner and J. Joseph Ryan (Rome, 1965), 209–35. See also Richard Kay, ‘The patristic and medieval tradition of commentary on Matthew 10.8–10’, *Traditio*, 11 (1955), 195–235.

things that themselves stem from the consecration that are sold, the person is claiming something, but he does not really know what'.⁶⁶ Following this view, reordination would be the means to overcome the heritage of the sordid ministers — later advocated by Humbert. However, there is also a second challenge facing the 'majority view': although it acknowledged the necessity of identifying criteria for distinguishing between valid and invalid ordinations, none of the advocates of the 'majority view' succeeded in producing a systematic scheme for doing this. As will be seen, Bruno attempts to come to terms with these challenges by presenting a theory of intentional ethics.

At the outset, Bruno is aware of the futility of trying to deny the existence of simoniacal priests. Instead, another approach is chosen; he uses the *vita*-part, with its strict distinction between a pre-reform period and a reform period, as a historical backdrop and structuring device. In general, the treatment of simony is characterised by a dialogical style in which the intellectual opponents are addressed at regular intervals.⁶⁷ Although different forms of dialogue are quite common in the polemical literature — usually applied for rhetorical entrapment — Bruno's use of dialogue is less a rhetorical strategy than a device in which his own voice resounds, giving the handling of simony a peculiarly individual flavour.

According to Bruno, 'There is a big difference between simoniacs and those who have been ordained by simoniacs but who did not know that their ordinands were simoniacs. For if one is ordained by a bishop whom one knows is simoniacal, little separates him in status from the one by whom he is ordained'.⁶⁸ From the familiar example of Simon Magus — 'Simoniacs are those who try to buy the gift of God'⁶⁹ — Bruno introduces the aspect of intentionality as part of the formal definition of simony: 'For Simon himself did not buy anything because there was no one who would sell. Yet because he wanted to buy, he is cursed nonetheless'.⁷⁰

Consequently, an effective answer to the claim that 'all are either simoniacs or have been ordained by a simoniac' is premised on the fact that the reform period entailed a reconstitution of the social fabric. By juxtaposing Catholic/non-Catholic and simoniac/non-simoniac, and linking these to the pre-reform/reform period distinction and to intentionality as the criterion for evaluating simony respectively, Bruno adds an eschatological dimension to the historical period of reform. Moreover, as a contemporary observer, Bruno's views are of historical interest. They pay due attention to the profundity of the reform movement and the epochal changes instigated by Pope Leo; as a retort to those insisting on the continuance of the simoniacs' heritage, Bruno needs to argue for a 'break' in the historical development starting with the reform-papacy of Leo. As such, the first part of the polemic — the *vita*-part — is closely connected to the treatment of simony as it posits a clear break between the pre-reform period dominated by simoniacs and the subsequent reconstitution of the 'right order'. To Bruno, then, the movement was not restricted to the four reform issues mentioned in the *vita*, but included a resultant change in world-view. At the same time, his notion of reform integrates a moral-philosophical element. By taking an intentional ethic as the point of departure, the entire argument comes to depend on relocating intentions as the epistemological source. Now, Bruno does not refer to the term *intentio* and his notion of intention is much closer to that of Augustine than it is to Abelard's stress on the fact that only the intention of the actor makes action right or wrong — actions in

⁶⁶ Guido of Arezzo, *Paschasius papa ad Mediolanensem ecclesiam*, ed. J. Gilchrist, *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 37 (1981), 595: Si quis autem obicerit non consecrationes sed res ipsas que ex consecratione proveniunt, vendunt, videtur quidem aliquid dicere, nihil autem penitus sapere.

⁶⁷ In evaluating Bruno's literary style Evans, 'St. Anselm and St. Bruno', 132 remarks correctly that: 'Bruno, like Anselm, makes a point of talking openly in his treatises about the purpose of his writing, and about the principles he has borne in mind as he worked'.

⁶⁸ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 554: Deinde vero, quia multum distat inter symoniacos et eos qui ordinantur a symoniacis, si tamen non eos symoniacos esse cognoscunt. Qui enim episcopum aliquem symoniacum esse non dubitat, si ab eo ordinatur, parum quidem in ordine distat ab eo, a quo ordinatur.

⁶⁹ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 554: Sunt igitur symoniaci, qui donum Dei, id est gratiam Spiritus sancti, emere contendunt.

⁷⁰ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 554: Nam neque ipse Symon aliquid emit, non enim fuit qui venderet, sed tamen, quia emere voluit, maledictus est.

themselves are indifferent.⁷¹ Still, there are good reasons for claiming that Bruno's approach anticipates Peter Lombard's use of intentionalism in ethics:⁷² by considering intentionality to be the essence of the moral act and a description of the moral status of the agent, the Lombard disposes of the private theory of evil and in its place proposes a notion of moral deprivation that is rooted in man's will.⁷³ Consequently, Bruno is able to counter one point in the opponent's claim: whether all priests today are simoniacs is not a fact that can be established *a priori*, but only by an investigation of intentions.

From these deliberations, a new question follows: how can intentions be evaluated? Bruno addresses this problem in the discussion of baptism. Basically, the dichotomy of Catholic/non-Catholic is related to the function of baptism: 'But where there is no Catholic faith, baptism does not work. Consequently, whoever is baptised outside the Church is not released from sin before he returns to the Church'.⁷⁴ Bruno, next, advocates the possibility of being baptised outside the Church if the person is 'inside the Church in his mind': If the person has pure intentions and is thus within the Church in his mind, he would necessarily return to the Church in his body as well. If the person is baptised outside and remains outside, he obviously lacks the right intention and the remission of sins is not effective.⁷⁵ In conclusion, Bruno notes: 'Moreover, the body of Christ is not outside the Church. Otherwise the Church itself would be outside itself — since the Church is the body of Christ — and this is impossible'.⁷⁶

It seems as though Bruno is complicating the matter: if intention is the determining factor, then the inside-outside placement is not relevant given that the intentions of the receiver are pure. But, in an argumentative twist, the author introduces a functional criterion for evaluating intentions without contradicting the premise of the argument, namely that there is not necessarily a one-to-one correlation between intentions and external manifestations. Thus, Bruno adheres to the Augustinian weight on how *intentio* is an autonomous force that mediates physical information so that the different parts function in one coherent whole.⁷⁷ The approach is also an example of the extent to which pre-scholastic dialectic becomes a part of the revitalised sacramental theology in the latter part of the eleventh century.⁷⁸ Like Damian, Bruno expresses a profound ambivalence regarding the new intellectual methods associated with the cathedral schools.⁷⁹ On the one hand, the knowledge of Berengar of Tours

⁷¹ On Abelard's ethics in general and his notion of intention in particular, see M.T. Clanchy, *Abelard. A medieval life* (Oxford, 1997), 129, 278–81. See also John Marenbon, *The philosophy of Peter Abelard* (Cambridge, 1997), 325, 253–4 who has underlined the need to analyse Abelard's notion of intention in terms of his entire social philosophy, not only in relation to logical distinctions.

⁷² On Bruno's political ethics, see István Bejczy, 'Kings, bishops, and political ethics: Bruno of Segni on the cardinal virtues', *Mediaeval Studies*, 64 (2002), 267–86. Bejczy accentuates the importance of the cardinal virtues in Bruno's sermons. In the *Libellus*, however, the cardinal virtues do not play a significant role, save perhaps in the presentation of the ideal-pope in the *vita*-part of the treatise.

⁷³ For an analysis of the Lombard's intentionalism in ethics, see Marcia L. Colish, *Peter Lombard*, 2 vols (Leiden, 1994), 473–515. Following Colish, Peter desired to moderate Abelard's teaching and incorporated more of an objectivist strain into the prevailing intentionalist consensus.

⁷⁴ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 555: Ubi autem fides catholica non est, ibi baptimus non operatur. Unde et qui extra aeclesiam baptizatur, priusquam ad aeclesiam redeat, non solvitur a peccatis.

⁷⁵ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 555: Potest tamen fieri, ut aliquis fidelis quacunquē occasione extra aeclesiam baptizetur, qui, quoniam mente in aeclesia est, extra quoque remissionem accipiat peccatorum. Sic tamen, si corpore quoque et conversatione ad eam redeat, a qua mente non recesserat. Alioquin, si extra baptizatur et extra maneat, et cum baptizatur, redeundi voluntatem non habeat, huic tali homini nec ad momentum quidem fit remissio peccatorum.

⁷⁶ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 556: Si enim separetur a corpore Christi, iam non est membrum Christi. Corpus autem Christi extra aeclesiam non est. Aliquin ipsa aeclesia esset extra ipsam, — si quidem ipsa aeclesia est corpus Christi — quod est inconveniens.

⁷⁷ On Augustine and intentionality, see V. Caston, 'Connecting traditions: Augustine and the Greeks on intentionality', in: *Ancient and medieval theories of intentionality*, ed. D. Perler (Leiden, 2001), 23–48.

⁷⁸ In this sense Gigalski, *Bruno*, x is correct when he refers to Bruno as a transitional figure between two periods, one in which the opinions of the Church Fathers were collected, and another characterised by the use of dialectical methods.

⁷⁹ Evans, 'St Anselm and St Bruno', 137 notices this ambivalence and refers to Bruno's hierarchical subordination of dialectics to theology in his approach to substances and theology.

and the heretical implications of the dialectical method,⁸⁰ coupled with a monastic habit of mind made Bruno sceptical about the use of this method in the field of sacramental theology. On the other hand, his own use of dialectics attests to how tempting the prospect of dialectical reasoning was, even for conservative theologians.

Bruno goes on to discuss baptism as sacrament within the scheme of Catholic/non-Catholic in terms of the validity of the sacrament: 'For although baptism which is given outside the Church has the form of the sacrament, it does not have the virtue of the sacrament'.⁸¹ This separation of 'form' and 'virtue' — also used by Deusdedit⁸² — has an important function in the overall argument. It serves as a further concretisation of the general treatment of simony in which intentionality has a prominent place. In the analysis of the sacrament, the external or visible element, the water, is connected to the form, while the intentional side, the virtue of the Holy Spirit, is linked to the virtue of the sacrament: 'The form of the sacrament can be given both inside and outside the Church, but the virtue of the sacrament is not given unless the person is inside the Church'.⁸³

Thus, Bruno presents an argument that develops logically from an abstract theological reasoning centred on the Augustinian themes of Catholic/non-Catholic, through the discussion of simony within the confines of a distinction between a pre-reform and a reform period, to conclude with a final concretisation of these issues in the analyses of baptism and the sacramental side of baptism. At this point, a comparison with Damian's argument in the *Liber gratissimus* is illuminating. To Damian, the 'innermost parts' are the point of departure for a moral evaluation. Although an unworthy minister cannot influence the ministry in itself in any way — because the sacraments are not tainted by sordid priests — the sordid priest's capacity to perform in office is influenced by the extent of his 'holiness': 'the words of an 'evil preacher' do not bear fruit in the minds of his hearers'. In other words, Damian distinguishes between the 'private' (epistemological) and 'public' (ontological) aspects of the office. From this basis, Damian provides an external criterion by which to judge intentions: a priest is evil when his words have no effect.⁸⁴

Bruno's contribution to the development of the 'majority view' is then twofold. First, he extends the external basis for evaluating intentions beyond Damian's concern with the effect of the sacrament by remarking that the voluntary return back inside the Church is a sign of right intention. Second, Bruno specifies Damian's argument, capitalising on the theological vocabulary of 'virtue' and 'form' to establish the external criterion of evaluation. At the same time, Bruno undermines the orthodoxy of the 'minority view'. By using the same scheme as Guido of Arezzo (and Humbert of Silva-Candida) — 'inside'/'outside' the Catholic Church — defined in ontological terms, and by specifying how those ordained by simoniacs become Catholic, the focus on the inseparability of the body of the Church from external matters⁸⁵ is cancelled out since this is an arrangement effective 'inside' the Church and hence free of simony and heresy. Or in Bruno's dialectical terms, if the body of Christ was outside the Church,

⁸⁰ Bruno refers to a philosophical dispute where Berengar led his audience to impossible conclusions: 'Berengar [...] who in disputing in philosophical fashion the subject of the body and blood of Christ, was drawing us into impossibilities [...]. In cases in which we cannot resist heretics by reason and arguments, we resist them by faith and authority and the fire of charity' (*Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne, 221 vols (Paris, 1844–64), vol. 164, 404). However, when Berengar mentioned who agreed to his view of the Eucharist, Bruno was amongst them: Bishop John of Porto, Bishop Bruno of Segni, Bishop Ambrose of Terracina, Cardinal Atto of Milan, Cardinal Deusdedit, Peter the papal chancellor, the French clerk Fulco, the learned Tethbaldus, and a monk named Bonadies, and many others. See H.E.J. Cowdrey, 'The papacy and the Berengarian controversy, auctoritas and ratio', in: *Studien zu Berengar von Tours*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens and F. Niewöhner (Wiesbaden, 1990), 126–7; Charles M. Radding and Francis Newton, *Theology, rhetoric, and politics in the Eucharist controversy, 1078–1079* (New York, 2003), 100.

⁸¹ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 556: Baptismus inim, qui extra aecliesiam datur, formam quidem sacramenti habet, virtutem autem sacramenti non habet.

⁸² Deusdedit, *Libellus contra invasores et symoniacos et reliquos schismaticos* ed. E. Sackur, *MGH, Libelli de lite*, 2 (Hannover, 1892), 324.

⁸³ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 556: Forma sacramenti et intus et extra dari potest; virtus autem sacramenti non nisi intra aecliesiam datur.

⁸⁴ Damian, *Die Briefe*, n. 40, 418–27.

⁸⁵ Guido of Arezzo, *Paschasius papa*, 595: 'For because the body of the Church, either the bishop or the abbot or something different, is devoid of value altogether without corporal or external matters — in the same way that a soul cannot exist without a body — anyone that sells one of the parts, without which one cannot have the other part, does best abstain from selling any of these parts'.

it would be outside itself — since the Church is the body of Christ — and this is impossible. Consistent with the above interpretation of ‘money’ as ‘intellectual capital’, Bruno shows a strikingly objective and autonomous way of arguing.

Bruno’s hermeneutical method and the question of rebaptism

In contrast to the analysis of the sacrament of baptism, authorities are cited more extensively in the discussion of the repeatability of the sacrament. Basically, Bruno is forced to address authorities because they are considered to lack clarity and because they are contradictory. Initially, the author links the more general treatment of baptism as a sacrament to the question of repeatability by referring to the fact that Roman pontiffs had ordered that heretics should not be rebaptised because they already had the form of baptism, but lacked the virtue.⁸⁶ The distinction between the ‘form of baptism’ (*formam baptismi*) and the ‘virtue’ (*virtutem*) is thus used as a structuring device, connecting the discussion of repeatability to the theological scheme. Bruno then explains the introduction of authorities: ‘Indeed, this is truly necessary because all do not seem to agree on this judgment, that those who come from the heretics should not in fact be rebaptised but should rather be confirmed again with sacred chrism’.⁸⁷

This passage is of interest as it allows for a differentiated view on the polemical writer’s use of authorities. First, it reflects Bruno’s ambivalence with regard to authorities. While authorities are necessary, they have to be interpreted and this introduces ambiguity. This ambiguity grew mainly because the period lacked a common interpretative model.⁸⁸ Second, the existence of a plurality of interpretive schemes was further complicated by a concern with the relationship between ‘reason’ and ‘faith’. As will be shown, Bruno is another witness to the complexity of their relationship and to the resultant methodical elaborations as to how ‘reason’ could illuminate ‘faith’.⁸⁹ Third, the approach to the textual past is complicated when subjective influences on the interpretation are acknowledged. In the 1080s and 1090s, other polemicists’ concerns with ‘argumentative rules’ — for instance Wenrich of Trier, Gebhard of Salzburg and the author of the *Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda* — point to an acknowledgement of these subjective aspects and a readiness to remedy the problem.⁹⁰

Bruno’s interpretation begins with comments on a passage of Augustine: ‘injury should be done to no sacrament’.⁹¹ After mentioning that ‘In this matter, he [Augustine] seems to differ greatly from others’⁹² Bruno continues to include the opponents in a dialogue with Augustine, progressing in two steps. First, the notion of ‘repeatability’ is differentiated on the basis of the ‘form’ of the sacrament: ‘Yet we have abundant examples and authorities that demonstrate that certain sacraments are repeated’.⁹³ Bruno acknowledges the danger of a head-on confrontation, since this would probably have jeopardised the argument. Instead, he attempts to sort out the definitional problems in Augustine’s general statement as a first step. Bruno then — as a second step — engages Augustine in a discussion of baptism that addresses other authoritative sources. Bruno juxtaposes a canon from the Council of Carthage, which states that rebaptisms, reordinations and translations of bishops are not allowed, with canon sixteen from the Council of Nicaea, concerning the Paulianists: ‘Those coming to the Church should be

⁸⁶ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 556.

⁸⁷ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 556: Queris fortasse auctoritatem? Dabitur tibi. Et hoc quidem necessarium est, quoniam in hac sententia non omnes concordare videntur, videlicet ut qui ab hereticis veniunt rebaptizari quidem non debeant, sacro autem chrismate confirmari iterum debeant.

⁸⁸ On this point, see Brian Stock, *The implication of literacy. Written language and models of interpretation in the eleventh and twelfth centuries* (New Jersey, 1983).

⁸⁹ The ‘faith-reason’ question is discussed by several polemical writers, including Peter Damian, Manegold of Lautenbach, Peter Crassus, Guido of Ferrara, and the author of the *Liber de unitate*. Common to all these discussions is an ambivalence regarding the use of ‘reason’ as it pertains to questions of faith.

⁹⁰ On this, see Leidulf Melve, *Inventing the public sphere. The public debate during the Investiture Contest (c. 1030–1122)* (Leiden, 2007).

⁹¹ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 556: quod nulli sacramento iniuria facienda sit. The source is letter 87 to Emeritus; see Augustine, *Letters 1–99*, ed. J.E. Rotelle (New York, 2001).

⁹² Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 556.

⁹³ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 556: Quod autem quaedam sacramenta reiterentur, et exemplo habundamus et auctoritatibus.

baptised again and their clerics ordained again if they are found worthy'.⁹⁴ This contradiction between two authorities is resolved by stressing that the exception only applies to the Paulianists.⁹⁵ The Paulianists were not baptised in accordance with the 'form of the Church', and in this respect they differed from other heretics:

For if they had been baptising according to the form of baptism which we just mentioned, obviously such a law would not have been specially promulgated concerning them, especially since it is said with regard to all the other heretics, that those coming to the Church are neither rebaptised nor reordained but are reconciled to the Church by the imposition of the bishop's hand alone. Furthermore, the entire Church agrees that these two sacraments, i.e. baptism and the sacred orders, should not be repeated.⁹⁶

In short, the author distinguishes between different types of heretics, and further relates this differentiation to the overall theological scheme in which the 'form' is separated from the 'virtue' of the sacrament. This threefold dialogue illuminates one basic feature of Bruno's argumentative approach: the acknowledged need to contextualise isolated passages, in this case Augustine's. Instead of simply citing authorities regardless of historical context, or alternatively, applying authorities in relation to an *a priori* defined hierarchy of authorities, Bruno mediates between different authorities on the basis of his general understanding of sacramental theology. Dialectical reasoning is once again central to the argument. If rebaptism is considered generally valid, 'a law specially promulgated concerning them' cannot exist; but because such a law does exist, and because 'other heretics are neither rebaptised nor reordained', it follows that rebaptism and reordination are not valid. In short, the conclusion follows logically from two mutually exclusive premises and this implies that Bruno's resort to 'reason' is the main ingredient in the harmonisation.

In the next paragraph (12), Bruno continues the effort to demonstrate that certain sacraments can be repeated. Not satisfied with evidence that refers solely to examples as indicators of general truisms, the author develops an additional argument based on the agreement between the above theoretical discussion of repeatability and the actual practice in the Church: 'But the fact that it is permissible to repeat certain sacraments is demonstrated most plainly by the frequent practice (*usus*) of the Church and one example of the blessed Gregory'.⁹⁷ This reference to practice and the mentioning of Gregory prepares for the second confrontation between authorities, involving Augustine and Gregory I. Using the *vita* of John the Deacon, Bruno describes how Gregory consecrated a certain church in Subura in Rome that had been held by the Arians, before claiming that the validity of the consecration was confirmed by the virtues and miracles the Lord performed during the consecration.⁹⁸ Once again, Bruno attempts to mediate between these authorities — with reference to the legality of repeating the consignation of the chrism and the imposition of hands among heretics.⁹⁹ The first step is to contextualise these events in relation to a further arsenal of authorities, including various statements of the Popes Eusebius, Sylvester, Siricius, Leo I and the Council of Laodicea.¹⁰⁰ In the end, Bruno returns to the passage from Augustine and reinterprets the phrase 'injury should not be done to any sacrament':

⁹⁴ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 556.

⁹⁵ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 557: In quo manifeste ostenditur hoc in his tantum et non in aliis fieri debere.

⁹⁶ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 557: Si enim secundum hanc formam, quam modi diximus, baptizati essent, non tique talis lex de eis specialiter promulgata esset, praesertim cum de aliis omnibus hereticis dicatur, ut ad aeclesiam venientes nec rebaptizentur nec reordinentur, sed sola episcopalis manus impositione aeclesiae reconcilientur. Quod autem haec duo sacramenta, id est baptismus et ordines sacri, reiterari non debeant, tota aeclesia idem sentit.

⁹⁷ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 557: Quod vero quaedam sacramenta reiterari liceat, et frequens usus aeclesiae et unum beati Gregorii exemplum apertissime manifestat.

⁹⁸ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 557.

⁹⁹ The interpretation of the 'imposition of hands' as a means for reconciliation has theological as well as canonical implications. Theologically, it signifies a restoration to mercy, while from a canon law perspective the *potestas* that was earlier used illegally now became legal; see Gilchrist, 'Simoniaca haeresis'.

¹⁰⁰ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 557–8.

One may doubt it, however, when the blessed Augustine says ‘injury should not be done to any sacrament’ since elsewhere he himself says that those who come to the Church from the heretics are received into the Church through the imposition of the bishops’ hands, lest perhaps they think that the Church has conferred nothing which they did not have outside the Church. He also defines what the imposition of hands is, saying: ‘What is the imposition of hands, if not a prayer for a person? Hence, if the prayer of this sacrament is repeated for a man, the imposition of hands itself is repeated: for the imposition of hands is nothing other than a prayer for a person [...] Therefore the prayer for a person shall not be repeated in those sacraments which are not allowed to be repeated’.¹⁰¹

Bruno’s approach relies on contextualisation and is largely concerned with the content and how to establish a unitary view out of apparently contradictory material. By referring to ‘frequent practice’, Bruno invokes a version of the ‘good, old law’ argument in which the antiquity of ‘custom’ justifies societal arrangements.¹⁰² Most basic to the argument, however, is his comparison of the contended passage ‘injury should not be done to a sacrament’ with another passage from Augustine which stresses that heretics are received back into the Church by the imposition of the hands. In line with Bruno’s concern with clarification of terminology, the subsequent quote from *Against the Donatists*¹⁰³ defines imposition of the hands as a ‘prayer for a person’. The author can thus, like Augustine, conclude that a prayer for a person shall not be repeated in those sacraments which are not allowed to be repeated. Bruno ends the discussion by again assuring his audience that his case ‘has been proven using authorities’.¹⁰⁴

Hence, the concern with balancing ‘faith’ and ‘reason’ resurfaces. As in the first part of the encounter with Augustine, Bruno uses his own intellectual position as a final confirmation of the authoritative nature of an interpretation that has supplemented the purely literal interpretation of the textual past.¹⁰⁵ Forty years earlier, Damian also had to confront authorities in dealing with sacramental theology and does so in two ways. First, although Damian shows self-confidence by setting himself next to Augustine,¹⁰⁶ the authority of the Church Father is taken for granted and never questioned. Thus, Bruno has more in common with Rupert of Deutz, showing a new self-assertiveness in his conviction that he can address the Church Father as an equal.¹⁰⁷ Second, while Damian applies contextualisation as well, its *ad-hoc* character is a result of a need to come to terms with the problem of

¹⁰¹ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 558–9: Dubitari autem potest de eo, quod beatus Augustinus ait: ‘Nulli sacramento iniuria facienda est’, cum idem ipse alibi dicat eos, qui ab hereticis veniunt, ideo per manus impositionem episcoporum in aeclesiam recipi, ne forte sibi ab aeclesia nichil collatum putarent, quod extra aeclesiam non haberent [...] Non igitur reiteretur oratio super hominem in illis sacramentis, quae reiterari non licet.

¹⁰² For the classical presentation of this issue, see Fritz Kern, *Gottesgnadentum und Widerstandsrecht im früheren Mittelalter. Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Monarchie* (Leipzig, 1914).

¹⁰³ Augustine, *The writings against the Manichaens, and against the Donatists*, ed. P. Schaff (Peabody, MA, 1995). For recent views on Augustine’s theology, see Dennis R. Cresswell, *St. Augustine’s dilemma. Grace and eternal law in the major works of Augustine of Hippo* (New York, 1997); Robert Dadaro, *Christ and the just society in the thought of Augustine* (Cambridge, 2004).

¹⁰⁴ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaciis*, 559: hoc quidem auctoritatibus probatum est.

¹⁰⁵ Previous research has on several occasions addressed Bruno’s opposition to the literal sense. Robinson, ‘Political allegory’, 69 stresses the adoption of the Church Father’s preferences for the spiritual in contrast to the literal sense of the scripture. See also Resnick, *Divine power*, 12: ‘For Bruno of Segni, those who find only the literal sense are the unclean animals described in scripture. True Christians, who discover both the literal and spiritual sense, are the ruminant animals who twice digest this food for the soul, the *lectio sacrae*’.

¹⁰⁶ In the *Liber gratissimus*, Damian posits the Church Father against his opponents who represent ‘human curiosity’, see Damian, *Die Briefe*, n. 40, 414: ‘The words of this blessed man are, therefore, so plain and clear that anyone, after once he sees them, and in his stubbornness is still ready to oppose them, is guilty of defying not Peter, who counts for nothing, but instead the great Augustine’. The mere fact that Damian sets himself next to the great Church Father points to an intellectual self-confidence. A letter to Pope Alexander II from 1063 contains the same juxtaposition of Augustine and Damian, see Damian, *Die Briefe*, n. 98, 87: ‘Perhaps I have been somewhat excessive in extending the quotation from this blessed doctor. But I should very much like to have him believed, for in no way does his statement differ from what I have been saying’.

¹⁰⁷ For an analysis of Rupert’s self-assertiveness, see John H. Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Philadelphia, 1983), 342–52. See also Maria Lodovica Arduini, *Rupert von Deutz (1076–1129), und der ‘Status Christianitatis’ seiner Zeit. Symbolisch-prophetische Deutung der Geschichte* (Köln, 1987).

simoniacal ministers. In contrast, Bruno's effort to mediate discordant authorities in terms of a set dialectical approach can actually be considered a method.

New interpretative problems: ordination by simoniacs

As soon as the question of baptism has been solved, Bruno considers another vexing problem in the contemporary discussion, namely that of simoniacal ordinations:

But you say: 'Why then are heretics received in their orders, when simoniacs are not received? Are simoniacs any worse than Arians, Novatians, Donatists, Nestorians and Eutichians? For we read that both bishops and priests from all these heresies were received and were not deprived of their dignity'. To this I respond: 'Whether simoniacs are worse or not, I do not know; I do know, however, that it is a great crime to sell or buy the Holy Spirit. The Lord cast out both the seller and the buyer from the temple'.¹⁰⁸

Bruno is careful about jumping to conclusions in terms of evaluating the degree of sin pertaining to heretics versus simoniacs. Once again, the 'minority view' seems to be the target of his discussion, perhaps Guido of Arezzo's juxtaposition of all types of heresies.¹⁰⁹ Instead of plunging into a quarrel over semantics, Bruno's approach is problem-oriented or pragmatic,¹¹⁰ forcing him to make a detour in order to answer the question regarding historically known heresies: 'Many things, of course, are done in the Church through dispensation because of the needs of the moment and the nature of business, which clearly would not be done if they were done according to the strict judgement of the canons'.¹¹¹ This reasoning is the basis for a consideration of the historical heresies of the Arians, Novatians and Nestorians. To Bruno, the Arians erred not in their episcopal dignity, but in their beliefs about the trinity. This also applies to other heresies in which members erred in their beliefs, but the simoniacs were alone in committing sin by buying orders.¹¹² The result of an intentional sin amounts to a denial of the right of dispensation.¹¹³ Bruno then proceeds to explain that other sinners besides the heresiarchs were also received into their orders, citing canon eight of the Council of Nicaea — in which Novatians were received through the imposition of hands — in light of what Pope Gregory I says about the Nestorians: they had to confess their sins before being received into the Church.¹¹⁴

Although Bruno calls this a digression (*digressi*), it has a definite argumentative function. Given his abstract criterion, Bruno is thus able to label simoniacs as 'worse sinners' because they sin within their orders, which in turn implies a denigration of the virtue of the Holy Spirit. In the wider context of the polemic which contrasts the reform-period with the pre-reform era, it is important to demonstrate that there is a general criterion for differentiating between degrees of heresy, thus justifying the

¹⁰⁸ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 559: Quare ergo alii heretici in suis ordinibus suscipiuntur, symoniaci non suscipiuntur? Numquid symoniaci sunt peiores quam Arriani, quam Novatiani, quam Donatiste, quam Nestoriani, et Euticiani? Ex his enim in ordinibus suis omnibus et episcopos et presbyteros susceptos legimus, nec propria dignitate privatos. Dico ergo: Utrum symoniaci peiores sint, nescio: unum tamen scio, quia magnum scelus est vendere vel emere Spiritum sanctum. Si enim magnum peccatum fuit vendere vel emere Christum, magnum utique peccatum est vendere vel emere Spiritum sanctum: equales enim sunt et Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus. Iudas est qui vendit, Iudeus est qui emit. Utrumque autem, et vendentem et ementem de templo Dominus eiecit.

¹⁰⁹ Guido of Arezzo, *Paschasius papa*, 595–6: 'If the anathematised and the excommunicated and the true heretical simonists and neophytes are separated from our faith and the Church, who does not see how the masses and prayers of these priests and clerics provoke God to anger at the people whom should have been placated by these?'

¹¹⁰ Former scholarship has stressed Bruno's pragmatic approach, but not analysed the approach in detail. Gigalski, *Bruno*, 188–9 notes the practical tone. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik*, 71 underlines the practical results that the author deduces from the treatment, while Freund, *Studien*, 56 only refers to the pragmatic orientation of Bruno.

¹¹¹ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 559: Et multa quidem dispensatorie in aeclesia fiunt pro temporis necessitate et negotii qualitate, quae utique non fierent, si districtio canonicoque iudicio fierent.

¹¹² Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 559–60: Arriani vero non in episcopali dignitate, sed in fide Trinitatis errabant et peccabant, et alii heretici similiter, unusquisque in sua heresi. Soli autem symoniaci in emendis sacris ordinibus peccant.

¹¹³ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 560: Unde et merito ipsi soli nulla aeclesiastica dispensatione in his, quibus peccaverant, ordinibus suscipiuntur.

¹¹⁴ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 560.

historically specific dispensations. The criterion is, of course, that of intentionality, and the requirement is pure virtue or remission of sins before entering the Church order.

Bruno's approach is particularly interesting in relation to the heated discussion in the 1050s. Canon eight is problematic because it can easily be interpreted as evidence supporting the necessity of reordination.¹¹⁵ Humbert of Silva-Candida interpreted the canon in this way,¹¹⁶ probably because he had a different understanding of the sacramental aspects of the 'imposition of the hands'. On the other hand, Damian compares the Novatians and the Arians: although the Novatians without doubt offended against the faith, the offence was not so serious that they should have been deprived of the office of priestly orders when they returned to the faith.¹¹⁷ In contrast, the Arians stand firmly opposed to the Holy Spirit and cannot be allowed to continue in the orders.¹¹⁸ The difference between those who sin against the faith (Novatians) and those who turn their backs on the faith (Arians) is that while the power of the Holy Spirit, including the sacraments, still has meaning for the Novatians, the Arians stand outside of Christian society so ordinations performed by them are invalid.¹¹⁹ Thereafter, Damian quotes from a decree by Pope Innocent I which states that, because the founders of Arianism abandoned the Catholic faith, they both lost the Spirit and were unable to transmit the gifts of the Holy Spirit through ordination.¹²⁰ Now, a literal interpretation of this decree would only partly serve Damian's purpose because it simply refers to how a collective group gave up the faith and thus excluded themselves from the performance of the sacraments, including ordination. The decree is silent on two points that are important to the defense of the legality of simoniacal ordinations. First, the decree fails to mention that the gifts of the Holy Spirit are transmitted uninterrupted to the office rather than to the person ordaining, and this is a fundamental aspect of Damian's sacramental theology. Second, the decree refers to a collective fall from faith, and is silent regarding how this affects the individual. Damian's reading, however, reintroduces both these aspects to the debate, since the decree is interpreted as stating that the faith of the person who ordains is important in the promotion of clerics.

To return to the *Libellus*, Bruno now tackles the announced problem of how to deal with those who have been ordained by simoniacs: God is not concerned with the external form, but with the faith and devotion of the man who is subjecting himself — whether the hand of the bishop is simoniacal or Catholic. As a result, the blessing of a simoniacal is turned into a curse for a sinner, and a blessing for a supplicant of pure faith.¹²¹ Nevertheless, one qualification is introduced: that the ordination has to take place within the Church.¹²² By reintroducing the argument from the *vita*-part — that Pope Leo IX was the inaugurator of this 'right order' — Bruno portrays the period of the reform papacy as a new start in relation to the external institutional aspects, as well as in terms of an ethical purification of the priesthood: simony is to be gradually eradicated from the purified Christian body as a result of the true faith and pure intentions of the Catholic society. Bruno next specifies the external criteria employed in order to be able to evaluate individual intention: 'In fact, after such an invasion, we see such men

¹¹⁵ *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils. Vol 1: Nicaea I to Lateran V*, ed. N.P. Tanner S.J. (London, 1990), 9:8. 'Concerning the so-called Cathars. Concerning those who have given themselves the name of Cathars, and who from time to time come over publicly to the catholic and apostolic church, this holy and great synod decrees that they may remain among the clergy after receiving an imposition of hands'.

¹¹⁶ Humbert of Silva-Candida, *Libri III adversus simoniacos* ed. F. Thaner, *MGH, Libelli de lite*, 1 (Hannover, 1891), 112.

¹¹⁷ Damian, *Die Briefe*, n. 40, 456.

¹¹⁸ Damian, *Die Briefe*, n. 40, 456–7.

¹¹⁹ Damian, *Die Briefe*, n. 40, 457: Quia igitur virtutem Spiritus sancti in fide non habent, qua videlicet omnis ecclesiasticae dignitatis ordo perficitur, apud eos ordinatio facta canonicis sanctionibus irrita iudicatur.

¹²⁰ Damian, *Die Briefe*, n. 40, 457. For a discussion of the source, see Friedrich Seeke, *Geistige Grundlagen Petrus Damians untersucht am liber gratissimus* (Berlin, 1933), 7; J. Joseph Ryan, *Saint Peter Damiani and his canonical sources. A preliminary study in the antecedents of the Gregorian Reform* (Toronto, 1956), 40.

¹²¹ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaco*, 547: Dum symoniacus catholicum se esse fingens catholico benedicit, quamvis eius benedictio maledictio sit, omnis tamen eius maledictio in benedictionem convertitur.

¹²² Bruno, *Libellus de symoniaco*, 561.

pushing their way into sacred orders as quickly as possible with much greater insistence than those who are canonically elected. In this behaviour, they reveal their intention most plainly and show what that purchase meant.¹²³ This external sign of individual intentions contrary to the ‘right’ Christian morality is the proof of simony. While the same criterion and practical logic apply in this discussion of simony, Bruno has no clear answer regarding how to evaluate those who do not come to consecration but still do penance and lack wicked intentions.¹²⁴ In the last chapter of the *Libellus*, Bruno addresses the punishment for simonists by paraphrasing the second canon from the Council of Chalcedon, which outlines the legal consequence in terms of placement in the church hierarchy, namely deposition.¹²⁵

This last part of the *Libellus* is highly indicative of Bruno’s intellectual approach. Basically, by referring to the second canon of Chalcedon — part of the argumentative arsenal of the ‘minority view’¹²⁶ — Bruno is able to reinterpret the canon to suit the ‘majority view’ because he has situated it within his general theological scheme. In contrast to Guido of Arezzo’s tedious discussion of semantics, Bruno focuses on the ‘problem’ in terms of its moral-theological, philosophical, and historical consequences. Hence, the contemporary debate is contextualised in relation to previous discussions of simony. This enables him to relate the authoritative past to a ‘problem’, and the authorities are thereby not adapted uncritically, but pragmatically modified. A comparison with Alger of Liège’s discussion in *De misericordia et iustitia* written before 1101 accentuates Bruno’s pragmatism. Whereas Alger — similar to Bruno — takes the discussion of the 1050s as a point of departure, his contribution to the debate is basically to specify the cases in which the sacraments performed by a priest ordained by a simoniac remain unimpeded. However, these two cases — when the priest does not know that the one who ordains is a simonist and when the ordination is forced upon the priest — hardly solve the problem. Although Alger’s view is basically a defence of the ‘minority view’, it offers no constructive answers to how Christian society can be cleansed of this heresy, given the tiny number of reordinations in the period where ‘hardly anyone was found who either was not a simoniac or had not been ordained by simoniacs’.¹²⁷ Alger’s criteria for distinguishing between those ‘inside’ and those ‘outside’ Christian society are problematic as well; the first criterion, in particular, begs the question: how is this ‘knowledge’ to be verified? At some point, this inevitably leads back to the questions of intentions and ethics — exactly the aspects which Bruno discusses in his pragmatic approach to the issue. Another trait of Bruno’s approach is his willingness to share argumentative shortcomings with the audience, something rarely seen in the polemical literature.¹²⁸ This may be a reflection of Bruno’s ‘non-hierarchical nature’.¹²⁹ It may also result from the lack of authoritative precedents for his reasoning, thus necessitating a more humble presentation, including comments about weak points.

Conclusion: Bruno and the polemical discussion of discordant canons

There is good reason for considering the treatise as a unitary work. The opening praise of Pope Leo IX is not only frequently invoked throughout the second part, but the outline of the reform movement is also a vital premise for solving one of the most urgent theoretical problems inherent in the ‘majority

¹²³ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 561: Multo enim instantius hos tales, quam eos qui canonicè eliguntur post hanc talem invasionem instare videmus, ut quantotius ad sacros ordines pervenire valeant. Qua in re suam intentionem apertissime manifestant, et quid illa emptio significaverit, ostendunt.

¹²⁴ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 561: Quodsi ad consecrationem non venerint, sed prius penituerint, et illa tam prava existimatione caruerint, dubitari quidem potest, solvi autem facile non potest, an in aliis aecliesiis praeponi aliquando debeant.

¹²⁵ Bruno, *Libellus de symoniacis*, 562. The canon is regarded as the first legal invective against simony; see Joseph Weitzel, *Begriff und Erscheinungsformen der Simonie bei Gratian und den Dekretisten* (München, 1967), 11.

¹²⁶ See Guido of Arezzo’s use of this argument, Guido of Arezzo, *Paschasius papa*, 595: ‘For the sacred canon completely destroys this objection when it forbids the procurator or the defender of the Church or anyone subjected to the rule to be ordained through money, and also those who are involved in this serious crime fall to the sharp edge of anathema’.

¹²⁷ The two criteria are found in III, 27 and III, 28 of the *De misericordia: Quod ignoranter ab hereticis baptizati non debent ab ordinibus repelli* and *Quod violenter ordinate ab hereticis aliquem colorem excusationis habeant* (Alger of Liège, *De misericordia et iustitia*, ed. R. Kretzschmar (Sigmaringen, 1895), 333–4).

¹²⁸ Another example of an open acknowledgement of weak spots in the argument is found in the anonymous *Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda*, most likely from the beginning of the 1090s.

¹²⁹ Mirbt, *Die Publizistik*, 71.

view': how to separate simoniacal ordinations from valid ordinations. Bruno was the first to establish a theoretical basis for an intentional ethics — an ethics that should constitute the basis for a restructured Christian unity free of simoniacal elements. Thus, the outline of the restructuring of the societal fabric in association with the reform movement is related to a new emphasis on the individual emerging in the period — a different approach to the moral aspect of the human being.¹³⁰ The immediate result in terms of sacramental theology is to add a new dimension to Damian's earlier reflections, thus 'enriching the spirituality of the Church'.¹³¹ However, Bruno only solves part of the problem of the 'majority view', leaving it to the systematic theology of the twelfth century to contribute the last pieces of the puzzle.

For whom did Bruno write? Needless to say, the question is fledged with uncertainty, partly because of the problems of dating the *Libellus* and partly because it is difficult to connect the treatise to a specific incident. Rather, and as discussed above, it probably makes more sense to view the text as a result of the heated public debate on the issue in the first part of the 1090s. With this in mind — and given the objective approach of the author, eschewing *ad hominem* rhetoric — I would suggest that Bruno addressed two audiences. One consisted of papal supporters in the environment of Pope Urban II — an audience whom Bruno saw in need of being enlightened on a subject that cut across the traditional party-lines. A second audience consisted of segments outside the inner circle of the papacy: groups that still wavered between the two parties, moderate royal supporters, and perhaps also anti-pope Guibert of Ravenna and the schismatic cardinals. With regard to this audience, Bruno deals with the reputation of the reform Pope Gregory VII after his death in 1085; by presenting the entire movement for church reform — starting with Pope Leo IX — as unitary in nature, Bruno tries to salvage the reputation of Gregory from the accusations of 'innovation' and hence of shattering the 'right order'. In this, he is part of a wider public debate of which other important contributions include the royalists polemics *Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda*, *De investitura episcoporum*, and *Orthodoxa defensio imperialis*.

Was Bruno's approach to discordant authorities unique? In general, the polemical writers of the Investiture Contest only rarely addressed the problems of discordant canons, an issue that would be taken up further in the emergent canon law science of the period. Damian is one exception, as he deals with discordant canons as well as reflects on methodical principles.¹³² Alger of Liège also addresses the question of the validity of simoniacal priests and thus has to face the problem of discordant canons.¹³³ Alger, however, does not apply a method of concordance in any systematic fashion, but rather chooses a practical point of departure in the fact that the faulty canons can be discovered by applying the notions of *miser cordia* and *iustitia* as a comparative basis.¹³⁴ In the same period, Bernold of Constance explicated a rather different hermeneutical approach, the central tenets of which consist of contextualisation, comparison, intention and authenticity.¹³⁵

¹³⁰ For a discussion of 'individualism' and the 'birth of the individual' with references, see Leidulf Melve, "'The revolt of the medievalists". Directions in recent research on the twelfth-century renaissance', *Journal of Medieval History*, 32 (2006), 232–52.

¹³¹ The debates over sacraments did not reach a solution in this period, but they did enrich the spirituality of the Church by raising normative questions: the role of sacraments in building up the body of Christ; analytical definitions on the nature of sacraments and their effects; the legal and moral capacities of ministrant and recipients; a juridical apparatus for overseeing the exercise of spiritual faculties; see Karl F. Morrison, 'The Gregorian reform', in: *Christian spirituality. Origins to the twelfth century*, ed. B. McGinn and J. Meyendorff (New York, 1985), 192.

¹³² See for instance Damian's letter to Pope Leo IX from 1049, advising the pope to 'see whether these documents agree with canonical authority and demonstrate textually and in real life whether they should be accepted or rejected' (Damian, *Die Briefe*, n. 31, 301).

¹³³ Different views on Alger include A.J. Macdonald, *Berengar and the reform of sacramental doctrine* (New York, 1977), 380–98; Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, 143–58; Robert Kretschmar, *Alger von Lüttichs Traktat 'De misericordia et iustitia'. Ein kanonischer Konkordanzversuch aus der Zeit des Investiturstreits. Untersuchungen und Edition* (Sigmaringen, 1985).

¹³⁴ Kretschmar, *Alger*, 60–5.

¹³⁵ Bernold of Constance, *De Sacramentis excommunicatorum*, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 148, 1214: 'Take the total context into account. Compare different decisions with each other. One is often explained by another. Take account of the period and the environment, the people the regulations refer to and the reasons for making it. Make a clear distinction between discretionary directions which apply until further notice and universal and eternal regulations. Examine the authenticity of a text carefully and whether it has perhaps been falsely ascribed to an author or has been inserted spuriously in a genuine text'. See Wilfried Hartmann, 'Autoritäten im Kirchenrecht und Autorität des Kirchenrechts in der Salierzeit', in: *Die Salier und das Reich. Band 3. Gesellschaftlicher und ideengeschichtlicher Wandel im Reich der Salier*, ed. Stefan Weinfurter (Sigmaringen, 1991), 435.

Bruno's uniqueness resides in the fact that he plunges into the discussion as it originated in the 1050s and is thus forced to deal more systematically with the principles of interpretation. Contradictions among the Church Fathers heightened the recognition that these writings were part of a larger system of doctrinal authority,¹³⁶ and the accomplishment of Bruno lies in developing a hermeneutical approach based on this recognition. Basically, this approach includes: 1) definition of terms, 2) contextualisation, 3) harmonisation by reason and 4) confirmation by authorities. Along with this focus on interpretation, a new critical tenor emerges, as exemplified in the scrutinising of certain authorities, the validity of which had previously been taken for granted.¹³⁷ The key to explaining this new critical approach is, however, provided by Honorius Augustodunensis, who employed the very same faculty as Bruno to interpret canons, namely reason: 'It is only by the use of reason that the truthfulness of authorities can be evaluated'.¹³⁸

At the end of the day, it is important not to make Bruno too modern. As we have seen, the intellectual outlook of Bruno is characterised by the not always predictable combination of innovative and traditional aspects. He shares this outlook with the majority of the polemical writers of the Investiture Contest, the intellectual innovations of whom were mainly results of conservative defenses of the 'right order'. Consequently, Bruno's approach to miracles is traditional and he applies historical examples for demonstrative purposes. He is ambivalent with regard to the use of dialectics, in relation to the question of the extent to which 'reason' can illuminate questions of 'faith', and in terms of the argumentative force of authorities. Perhaps it was these uncertainties that led to Bruno's most innovative contribution, namely what I have called his 'hermeneutical method'; as such, a contextualised and problem-oriented approach became the solution for dealing with the pangs of doubt resulting from the Investiture Contest and its concomitant public debate.

Leidulf Melve has published on several themes within medieval studies such as the Investiture Contest, the twelfth-century renaissance, state-formation and literacy-studies. He has also published on more theoretical subjects such as the history of ideas, historical theory and method and historical sociology.

¹³⁶ According to Jaroslav Pelikan, *The growth of medieval theology (600–1300)* (Chicago, 1978), 221, this acknowledgement was mainly reserved for the theologians of the twelfth century.

¹³⁷ For instance, the scrutinising of Pseudo-Clement's letter on account of a suspicion of falsification by Bernold of Constance, Deusdedit, the Norman anonymous, and Honorius Augustodunensis, see Horst Fuhrmann, 'Kritischer Sinn und unkritische Haltung. Vögratianische Einwände zu Pseudo-Clemens-Briefen', in: *Aus Kirche und Reich. Studien zu Theologie und Recht im Mittelalter*, ed. Hubert Mordek (Sigmaringen, 1983), 81–95.

¹³⁸ Honorius, *Libellus octo quaestionum de angelis et homine*, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 172, 1185b: *Nihil aliud est auctoritas quam per rationem probata veritas.*