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INTRODUCTION

EMOTIONS, HISTORY AND THE MONKS OF SAINT-GERMAIN (AUXERRE)

Throughout the middle decades of the ninth century, a monk named Haimo lived, taught and wrote in the monastery of Saint-Germain, in Auxerre. As he worked on a commentary on the Pauline letters, the apostle’s words inspired him to reflect on the proper way to receive the Eucharist. “We ought,” wrote the Auxerrois master in response to 1 Corinthians 11:29, “to advance to that terrifying sacrament with fear and trembling.”¹ The biblical text mentioned only the discernment of the “body of the Lord.” But for Haimo, what took place at the altar led directly to the experience of an emotion, fear, and the expression of the same by trembling. The Eucharist was not unique in this regard; during the ninth century, Haimo and his intellectual heirs at Saint-Germain described similarly affective aspects of baptism, penance, the mass, and last rites. From birth to death, and indeed even after death, they expected emotions to suffuse the religious experiences of the Carolingian faithful.

¹ The Patrologia Latina remains the only edition of Haimo’s Pauline commentary. Migne mistakenly attributes Haimo of Auxerre’s work throughout to Haimo of Halberstadt. Haimo, In divi Pauli epistolas expositio in Patrologia Latina, ed. Migne [henceforth PL] 117: 574: “Cum timore et tremore debemus accedere ad illud sacramentum terrible.” The biblical verse that generated the commentary of which this sentence is a part is: For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord. (1 Corinthians 11:29). All biblical citations are placed in italics and unless otherwise noted their translations are taken from the Douay-Rheims Bible website (http://www.drbo.org).
This subject – the emotional expectations promulgated by Auxerrois monks over the course of the ninth century – forms the core of my dissertation. The expression of affect was an essential part of medieval religious culture, especially in the context of the experience of the liturgical activity that structured Christian life. I explore the relationship between emotions and the liturgy in the monastery of Saint-Germain, in Auxerre (which lay within the Archdiocese of Sens). I argue that in their exegesis and homilies the Carolingian clerical elite communicated their expectations, idealized to be sure, for emotional experience and expression during the five major liturgical events that structured the lives of the devout: baptism, penance, the mass, the celebration of the Eucharist and last rites. Christians could monitor, assess and adjust as necessary the affective component of their spirituality. This is seen, for example, in Haimo of Auxerre’s admonition that opened this chapter. A communicant should “investigate himself” (discutiat se) to see if he was worthy of receiving the Eucharist. That assessment of worthiness led to a proper interpretation of the fear that Haimo believed inhered in all who took part in the sacrament; but the worthy feared for a different reason than the unworthy. The only way to properly interpret one’s emotional state was to examine how one felt and why that feeling existed.

For the most part, monks made up the intended audience for the communication of these texts. This dissertation, then, is primarily about both the religious culture of monks and about emotions. Interest in the history of emotions is not new but has

---

2 There was no one, unified “emotional style” of liturgical participation. See pp. 23-26 for the details of each author and event.
recently become a popular topic of historical study. In 1941 Lucien Febvre wrote an essay calling for a study of the “emotional life of man and all its manifestations (‘la vie affective et ses manifestations’).” Writing with the memory of the Great War in which he fought and faced with an increasingly aggressive Nazi Germany, Febvre concluded his essay with an impassioned justification for this endeavor:

Sensibility in history, a good subject for eminent amateurs.... Quickly, let us get back to real history – is that not the feeling? To the circumstances surrounding the Pritchard affair. To the question of Holy Places. To the listing of salt stores in 1563. That is history. The history which we should teach our children in the classroom and our students in the universities. But the history of hate, the history of fear, the history of cruelty, the history of love, for goodness’ sake stop bothering us with that empty talk! But the subject of such empty talk, which has so little to do with humanity, will tomorrow have finally made our universe into a stinking pit of corpses.4

Febvre may have been one of the first to call specifically for the study of emotions, but since the early twentieth century historians had included them in their work, however uncritically or unreflectively. Johan Huizinga’s The Autumn of the Middle Ages, written in Dutch in 1919 and appearing for the first time in English in 1924 is a bête-noire for medievalists for numerous reasons, one of which is his treatment of emotions.

Consistent with the scientific thought of his day, saw social organization in biological terms, and since the medieval period was the “childhood” of human social development

---


he believed that during that time “every experience had that degree of directness and absoluteness that joy and sadness still have in the mind of a child.”

The idea that societies came to regulate emotions, to control them and to subject them to reason found overt expression in another work with lasting influence, Norbert Elias’ *The Civilizing Process*. Both the structuralist sociology of the early twentieth century and the psychological theories of Sigmund Freud profoundly influenced Elias. He argued that societies implemented progressively more rigorous behavioral and emotional constraints on the actions of people from the Middle Ages forward. First the court and later the state functioned so as to exert control over those living within them. These external restraints, Elias argues, gradually became internalized, although never to the point of obviating the necessity of some kind of institutional or social regulation.

For Elias the locus of this governance was interpersonal interaction. “No society,” he wrote, “can survive without a very specific control of individual behavior. No such control is possible unless people exert constraints on one another, and all constraint is converted in the person on whom it is imposed into fear of one kind or another.” This control, therefore, is fundamentally emotional; it seeks to restrain emotions (and the behavior that stems from them) but it also engenders one in

---


7 Ibid., 443.
particular, fear. Eventually, fear functions within individual members of society “as inner anxieties which bind them to learned code almost automatically, under the pressure of a strong super-ego, even independently of any control by others.”

In the mid-1980s Peter and Carol Stearns again combined psychology, sociology and history. Their seminal article in the *American Historical Review* represents the beginning of the modern wave of emotions studies. The Stearnses coined the term “emotionology” to describe “the attitudes or standards that a society, or a definable group within a society maintains toward basic emotions and their appropriate expression; [and] ways that institutions reflect and encourage these attitudes in human conduct.” A few years later Peter Stearns followed this article with one explicitly calling for a closer working relationship between historians and sociologists to the mutual benefit of researchers in each discipline. He took his own advice and since has studied the history of changing emotional standards in the United States. He prefers to focus on specific emotions (e.g. anger, fear and jealousy) but also examines the connection between specific emotions and other “traditional” topics in social history (sorrow in the face of death and anxiety over childrearing).

---

8 Ibid., 444.
10 Ibid., 813
The work of Peter Stearns and those who seek to explicate “emotionology” as he defines it frames two traditional approaches to the study of emotions in the past. First, the belief that there are “basic” emotions follows from assumptions about their fundamentally biological nature and from the theorizing of anthropologists about the relative consistency of certain emotions across cultures. Second, studies inspired by emotionology focus specifically and explicitly on the institutionalization of emotions. That is, their emphasis falls not on emotional experience (either self-reported observed in others) but on the way that normative sources both reflect and structure idealized emotional behaviors.

In the late 1990s William Reddy, a scholar affiliated with the departments of Anthropology and History at Duke University, developed an alternative paradigm for the study of emotions. Dissatisfied with the growing trend of seeing affect either as “discursive” or as “constructed,” Reddy proposed instead to investigate “emotives,” a term he coined to more accurately describe the nature of statements about emotions.

Discourse analysis and social constructionism, he believed, both fail because “statements about emotions are neither descriptive (constative) nor performative – they neither adequately represent nor construct (perform) emotions.”12 Reddy focuses on emotives because they “are themselves instruments for directly changing, building, hiding, intensifying emotions.”13 They are active in the sense that they have the capacity to affect

---


13 Ibid.
both the one uttering the emotive and those who encounter that utterance. Reddy explained that these speech acts, more than the physiological changes that some psychologists point to, are common to all human affective experience, regardless of time and culture.

In this universality, Reddy argued, lies the importance of studying emotives (and thereby emotions). Since they are fundamental to human existence they structure all human interaction, and for Reddy foremost among these is political action. In 2001 Reddy fleshed out his theory of emotives and provided a detailed example of its application through a study of the French Revolution and the Terror.\(^\text{14}\) As tools for interpreting emotives, he suggested the concepts of “emotional liberty,” “emotional suffering” and “emotional refuges” for use specifically in evaluating political regimes. People, according to Reddy, seek to experience emotional liberty and therefore will find or (if necessary) create refuges in which to do so when forced to live within a political system that places too many restrictions on their emotions (for Reddy, France during the ancien régime). But escaping from one emotionally repressive political regime did not lead always to a positive situation. The quest for emotional liberty in France led to the Terror, in which people also experienced emotional suffering. The ideal political solution is one that maximizes emotional liberty but at the same time provides protection against emotional suffering. Since emotives have the capacity to alter the circumstances (and

people) that produce them they, Reddy believes, serve as agents of political, and therefore historical, change.

In 2002 Barbara Rosenwein challenged these interpretive approaches, offering “emotional communities” as a new approach to the study and understanding of the history of emotions.15 The study of these, she explained, “seeks above all to uncover systems of feeling: what these communities (and the individuals within them) define and assess as valuable or harmful to them; the evaluations that they make about others’ emotions; the nature of the affective bonds between people that they recognize; and the modes of emotional expression that they expect, encourage, tolerate, and deplore.”16

*Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*, Rosenwein’s 2006 monograph, expanded on this initial call.17 She provided therein a series of case studies, each working through a different evidentiary base or problem. These spanned the sixth and seventh centuries (offering a direct challenge to those who would generalize about medieval emotions) and uncovered a multitude of different communities. The result was not a comprehensive account of early medieval emotional communities – and this is precisely the point. Once divested of the barriers posed by antiquated models of emotional behavior and overly restrictive periodization frameworks, emotions become much more exciting (and challenging) objects of study. They also prove more elusive


16 Ibid., 842.

and volatile. People live within and move between multiple emotional communities, some of which dominate and subordinate others (Rosenwein imagines circles overlapping each other to various degrees). These communities emerge and recede over the longue durée but do so relatively quickly as well. Paying close attention to the language of emotions found in historical sources reveals that “whole systems of emotion – integrally related to the traditions, values, needs, and goals of different groups – could come to the fore or fade away within a short span of time.” Nothing could be further from, or more diametrically opposed to, the emotions of Huzinga’s monolithic, unrestrained middle ages.

**Emotions and Carolingian Religious Culture**

I take something of a hybrid approach in my study of the emotional expectations found in Auxerrois homilies and commentaries. Building on Rosenwein’s challenge to the restrictiveness of the periodization found in the work of Stearns and Elias, I study emotions in the Carolingian period. But this is a study of expectations for emotional experiences that applied to specific sacraments, not of communities. Even though Haimo, Heiric and Remigius almost certainly belonged to a number of different emotional communities, I do not seek to uncover their contours but rather what each monk wrote about emotional experience and expression during specific events.

Following the lead of cognitive psychologists and social constructionists, I believe that

---

18 Ibid., 24.

19 Ibid., 203.
emotions are best understood as rational, goal-relevant assessments informed by socially- and culturally-structured interpretations of the circumstances in which people find themselves on a regular basis.\(^{20}\) Cultural groups develop and impose their own set of appropriate emotional behavior across a range of potential situations, which people can accept or reject as they assess their experiences in relation to their goals (acknowledged or unacknowledged). No matter what the biological underpinnings of emotions, their experience and expression potentially changes over time. As Rosenwein points out, “the ‘physiological’ versus ‘socio-political’ fight is pretty much over by now. Nearly everyone agrees that there is a biological substratum to emotions that simply cannot be denied, but emotions themselves are extremely plastic.”\(^{21}\) Understanding the constructed yet malleable nature of affect allows for studies that more fully explicate the experiences (as they emerge from the sources in their idealized form, at least) undergone by people in the past.

Of the range of these potential experiences, I focus on those aspects of religious cultic activity in the context of which the ninth-century clergy discussed emotions. Important members of the Carolingian church, both bishops and monks, wrote at different times and in different circumstances yet described religious culture similarly.

---


These authors shared the conviction that the most commonly occurring liturgical events should offer those who participated in them a particular affective experience, one that often called for reflection on their emotional state. Historians of Carolingian religious culture, however, rarely highlight the active, participatory nature of ninth-century devotion. They describe instead a religious culture that increasingly sought to separate so-called “elite” and “popular” elements, especially during sacramental occasions such as the celebration of the Eucharist. I reevaluate these conclusions by examining the texts written by the Carolingian clergy, the very people whom scholars assume sought to distance themselves from those to whom they ministered. I focus on their description of baptism, penance, the celebration of the Eucharist, the mass and death. These moments brought the clergy together (potentially with the laity as well), and emotions played an important role in their performance.

Haimo, Heiric, Remigius and other members of the clerical elite, I argue, anticipated that participation by the Carolingian faithful would lead to certain emotional experiences. Most often, this meant their fellow monks in Saint-Germain, but Haimo and Remigius occasionally wrote in such a way that lay participation cannot be wholly excluded. It is entirely possible, for example, that major feast days attracted lay

---

attendees, who would have then heard the homily preached on those occasions. But even biblical commentaries potentially found an audience outside of the monastery. Valerie Garver’s recent work on aristocratic Carolingian women forced her to approach source material in creative ways, and she suggests that “some well-educated elite women and men almost certainly read or heard of exegetical commentaries.”23 For each liturgical event Carolingian clerics held different emotional expectations. While occasionally texts written by the secular clergy from the Archdiocese of Sens appear as points of comparison, mostly I examine the writings left by the three great teachers of Saint-Germain. These can all be classified broadly as “exegetical,” with the homiletic cycle left by Heiric best understood as a spoken form of exegesis.

The Carolingians were prolific exegetes, yet only recently have scholars begun to pay close attention to their exegetical output.24 To study Carolingian commentaries, Beryl Smalley wrote in her deservedly influential The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages, “is simply to study their sources.”25 Smalley’s text, which remains a point of departure for studies of scriptural commentaries, dismisses nearly 200 years of intellectual activity. Her focus on the Victorines and the Schoolmen had the consequence of relegating the

23 Valerie Garver, Women and Aristocratic Culture in the Carolingian World, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009), 39. For her discussion of teasing out gendered attitudes from male-dominated sources, see pp. 5-16.
24 See http://www.tcnj.edu/~chazelle/carindex.htm for a list of manuscripts containing Carolingian biblical exegesis.
Carolingian contribution to medieval efforts to interpret the Bible to a place of tertiary importance, between the two great poles of the patristic era and the university culture of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. While the Carolingians retain their reputation as skilled compilers, in the past fifteen years or so scholars increasingly point not only to the innovative ways in which churchmen in the late eighth, the ninth and the early tenth centuries combined and reconciled the patristic intellectual legacy but also recognize the original contributions made by even those most slavishly dedicated to their sources.

Carolingian commentaries, as Celia Chazelle notes, do more than reveal the sources used in their composition; they “show the skill with which their writers could choose, edit, and arrange borrowings from varied authorities to reflect their own intellectual predilections.”

Carolingian exegesis flourished from the late eighth century, beginning with the commentary on the Octateuch completed by Wigbod “for Charlemagne shortly before the year 800.” Wigbod’s work typifies the approach to biblical scholarship that earns

---


the scorn of scholars of the later middle ages. While his commentary on Genesis draws from a variety of patristic texts, “Wigbod’s commentaries on the other books of the Octateuch, from Exodus to Ruth, were copied verbatim from Isidore’s allegorical expositiones.”

Around the same time or shortly after, another prominent member of Charlemagne’s court, Theodulf of Orléans, directed the production of a commentary on every book of the bible. He too drew heavily upon patristic authors, but rather than adopting Wigbod’s technique of repeating texts in their entirety for most of the books of the bible, Theodulf epitomized the work of earlier scholars, most prominently that of Isidore and Bede.

The process of selecting passages for inclusion shows a thoughtful approach to the production of a commentary, one which even though it depends largely on the work of others arguably results in an “original” text. Theodulf, however, did more than slavishly copy his exemplars. On at least eleven occasions (mostly on books from the


Gorman, “Wigbod and Biblical Studies,” 42. Gorman does not indicate whether these books repeated the entirety of the Isidoran corpus or whether Wigbod copied verbatim, but excerpted passages from Isidore.

Idem, “Theodulf of Orléans and the Exegetical Miscellany in Paris lat. 15679,” Revue Bénédictine 109 (1999): 278-323. Gorman plausibly links the production of this text to Theodulf’s recension of the Bible, which must have been completed before his deposition in 817. Matter must have been unaware of this manuscript when she pointed out that, in contrast to Theodulf, Alcuin (who wrote a few decades before Theodulf and contemporaneously with Wigbod) “complemented his study of the biblical text with a large corpus of commentaries.” Matter, “Exegesis and Christian Education,” 91. In the context of Theodulf’s (and to a certain extent Wigbod’s) activity Alcuin seems a less exceptional figure than Matter describes.
New Testament but including the Psalms as well) Michael Gorman was not able to identify the source upon which Theodulf relied for his commentary. While the existence of texts now lost perhaps explains his inability to do so, it is also possible that Theodulf wrote original material. Beginning in the early ninth century, then, Carolingian churchmen accelerated their efforts to interpret the Bible, some more successfully than others. But even the debate sparked by such authors as Claudius of Turin (over the proper use of images) reveals both the ability of exegetes to move beyond the interpretations offered by patristic authors and, perhaps more significantly, the important place biblical interpretation held in Carolingian religious culture.³⁰

The distinct approach taken by Carolingian intellectuals to their source material is perhaps best illustrated by their use of well-known passages from two letters that Gregory the Great sent to Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, in 599 and 600. These letters exerted a considerable influence on later discourse about the appropriate role and place of imagery in Western Christendom, including the controversy over images that occupied the Carolingians in the late-eighth and early-ninth century.³¹ As Chazelle


notes, churchmen on both sides of the debate culled passages from Gregory’s letters, occasionally citing the same passages in support of opposing positions. So, even though the pontiff served as a source for the Carolingians, “it is evident that to identify later comments as Gregorian, as scholars regularly do, does not tell us everything about the thinking that they present.” The situation is no less complex when patristic authority is explicitly invoked. Even where authors specifically refer to Gregory (instead of simply repeating his words without attribution), this “does not mean they all set forth the same doctrines or even that those [doctrines] they defend necessarily come from Gregory”.

This does not mean that the sources exploited by Carolingian authors do not matter, but it does highlight the importance of paying close attention to the usage – rather than the repetition – of patristic material. This example serves as a reminder that the Carolingians neither merely transmitted nor misunderstood what might be called “Gregorian” thought; they deployed patristic material in contexts and over issues that were specific to their contemporary concerns. Again as Chazelle writes, “how far Gregory could be brought to bear in supporting dissimilar doctrines of images is evidence, too, of the flexibility with which early medieval churchmen regularly handled their sources – not just Gregory but others as well – as they selected material from older texts and shaped it

32 Chazelle, “Memory, Instruction, Worship,” 182.
33 Ibid., 183.
into their own, often quite distinctive teachings.” What matters most is not that the Carolingians used patristic sources, but how they used them.

Other scholars of the ninth century echo Chazelle. Linda Coon, in her study of early medieval monasticism, laments that Carolingian intellectuals “emerge from generations of scholarly investigation as cut-and-paste exegetes or unimaginative plagiarists. As such, the Carolingian contribution to Western civilization supposedly lies more in the transmission of ancient culture and less in the realm of original thought.”

To counter this prevailing assumption, she argues that the term “bricolage” best encapsulates the Carolingian approach to all aspects of the patristic legacy, including but not being limited to texts. The point of what Coon describes as the Carolingian penchant for “collecting” was “not to restore the context of the original artifacts, but to create a new, metaphorical framework for the collection as a whole.” Coon is interested in objects and structures as much as in texts, but she does acknowledge that the Carolingians practiced “literary bricolage” as part of their overall culture of collecting. When discussing texts specifically, Coon sounds very much like Chazelle when she

---

34 Ibid.


36 Ibid., 44.

37 Ibid., 55-60.
discusses the ninth-century context of the production of the commentaries on the Rule of St. Benedict authored by Smaragdus and Hildemar of Corbie.\textsuperscript{38}

Paul Kershaw is even more vociferous in his defense of the Carolingian intellectual project. In his discussion of the poetry of Sedulius Scottus and of the thoughts about peace found therein, Kershaw argued that even though the Carolingian panegyrist “worked through the received forms” of his chosen genre, he nonetheless did so by “deploying very different ideas of peace as circumstance demanded, and with a sense of the immediate audience for his verse.”\textsuperscript{39} Kershaw calls specific attention to this last point about Sedulius’s awareness of audience because of the tendency that he sees in scholarship typically treat the ideas transmitted in the work of Carolingian authors as “historical actors, possessing a degree of independent life verging on the uncanny.”\textsuperscript{40} Kershaw is quick to point out that ideas matter, but he argues, as does Chazelle and Coon, for an acknowledgement not just of the use of older textual material but rather for the creative and flexible deployment of those texts by Carolingian intellectuals whose immediate concerns often differed from those that occupied other authors.

My approach to the sources that informed Haimo, Heiric and Remigius falls along these lines as well. In the chapters that follow I trace the authors whose work influenced Heiric as he composed his homiletic cycle. The choice of Heiric for this task is

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 102-108.


\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., 12
deliberate. The attribution and manuscript transmission of his homilies is more secure than Haimo’s material, and with a critical edition available so too is the identification of passages from other works. In chapters One, Two and Five I demonstrate that when Heiric did utilize material from patristic sources he followed the strategy of his teacher Haimo by weaving the borrowed text into his own prose. Rather than quote his authorities in large blocks of text, he frequently adapted their language to match his own. The one exception to this came when Heiric drew from Hrabanus Maurus. When he cited his near contemporary, Heiric was much more likely to quote him verbatim (or close to it). Heiric’s sources contain familiar and expected individuals: the church fathers Augustine, Bede and Gregory the Great and the Carolingian luminaries Hrabanus Maurus and Haimo of Auxerre, as well as anonymous ninth-century authors. Overall, though, Heiric’s homilies contain much more of his own thoughts than they do prose taken from other patristic or Carolingian authors.

**Saint-Germain (Auxerre)**

The monastery of Saint-Germain, in Auxerre, was an important center of Carolingian religious culture, but until recently the intellectual production of the Auxerrois monks had not received close study. Even though less is known about Haimo, Heiric and Remigius than other important Carolingian exegetes (such as John Scotus Eriugena, Alcuin, Paschasius Radbertus, Hrabanus Maurus and Ratramnus of Corbie)

---

41 This is direct contrast to other Carolingian exegetes, Hrabanus Maurus in particular. The abbot of Fulda not only lifted long passages from his patristic sources but indicated from which author he drew in the margins of his manuscripts. See Coon, 16-29.
the three masters of the school of Auxerre merit more consideration than they have had heretofore received. This scholarly neglect stems in large part from the problematic nature of the extant source material, which survives in numerous manuscripts but suffers from misattribution and lacks modern, critical editions.42

In 1907 Eduard Riggenbach began the difficult task of untangling the confusing skein of the Auxerrois textual tradition by demonstrating that Haimo of Auxerre wrote the Pauline commentary published by Migne in the *Patrologia Latina* under the name of another Haimo, this one a ninth-century bishop of Halberstadt.43 Nearly 60 years passed before Henri Barré next advanced the study of the monks of Saint-Germain. In 1962 he published a study of the homilies attributed to the three Auxerrois monks. His list of those that can be attributed authentically to each remains authoritative and, aside from John Contreni’s identification of a sermon by Haimo on 1 John 5:4-10, exhaustive.44 The mid-60s also saw Riccardo Quadri’s publication of an edition of Heiric’s *Collectanea*, a florilegium of classical, patristic and early medieval thought on a variety of subjects that is also an important source for the connection between Heiric and Haimo.45 Just over

---

42 For the manuscript tradition of Haimo’s biblical commentaries, see #23 on Celia Chazelle’s list of Carolingian biblical commentaries: [http://www.tcnj.edu/~chazelle/carindex.htm](http://www.tcnj.edu/~chazelle/carindex.htm).


thirty years later, Quadri’s efforts also resulted in a critical edition of the cycle of homilies for the liturgical year composed by Heiric, making his corpus the best served of the three in terms of reliable editions. But aside from these two, and Remigius’ commentaries on Genesis and Martianus Capellus (two of twenty exegetical works believed to be his), no other modern edition of the works of the masters of Auxerre exists.

Despite the paucity of modern scholarly resources, however, studies of the monastery of Saint-Germain have flourished over the past two decades. The seminal work of this most recent phase is L’École carolingienne d’Auxerre de Murethach à Rémi, 830-908, which contains essays that both summarize the state of the field and look forward to future avenues of inquiry. Most of the recent scholarship focuses specifically on Haimo, including the 2007 volume edited by Sumi Shimahara, which promised in the near future critical editions of Haimo’s commentaries on Genesis, Deuteronomy and the

---


Song of Songs (by Burton Van Name Edwards), on Isaiah (by Roger Gryson), on Ezekiel (by Michael Gorman) and on Daniel (by Sumi Shimahara).49

Both L’École carolingienne d’Auxerre and Études d’exégèse carolingienne demonstrate, however, that a lacuna exists in the scholarship on the intellectual production of the monks of Saint-Germain, Haimo’s in particular.50 Perhaps because of the imperfect understanding of the manuscript tradition, studies of Haimo’s work still revolve most frequently around issues of attribution and transmission. In fact, Claudio Leonardi’s self-described “brutal” opinion, given in the conclusion to L’École carolingienne d’Auxerre, that the edited texts as they exist today are “unreadable” (“ne sont pas lisibles”) implied that the resolution of these problems should be the sole focus of any future scholarly endeavors.51 Until this work takes place, he warned, all conclusions derived from the present editions “are biased and very dangerous.”52

Leonardi’s was an extreme position, and work has continued despite both his admonitions and the state of the material. Even when scholars attempted to tackle other concerns, though, they tended to focus either on the sources upon which Haimo drew or on a specific issue as discussed in an individual text, rather than attempt a thematic


50 While there is less scholarship in general on Heiric and Remigius than on Haimo, their oeuvres are also comparatively smaller. Also, there is currently no critical edition of any of Haimo’s work, which is not true for Heiric or Remiguis.


52 Ibid., 449: “sont faussés et très dangereux.”
synthesis across all of Haimo’s extant works.\textsuperscript{53} The lack of reliable editions certainly contributed to this avoidance, as does the scope of such a project. This is not to say that studies of attribution, manuscript tradition, sources or individual commentaries are without value. But the scholarly scales are tipped decidedly in their favor, to the detriment of the content of the texts themselves. Alf Härdelin’s lament that “almost nothing” has been done to explicate the “theological and spiritual” content of Auxerrois material still holds true.\textsuperscript{54}

I divide my study of this material into five chapters, each dedicated to a specific ritualized aspect of Carolingian devotional culture. In Chapter One (\emph{De filii irae facit filios dei: Emotional Transformation during Carolingian Baptism}) I argue that baptism effected more than a spiritual cleansing of catechumens, it also cleansed them emotionally by removing anger. As part of their lifelong effort to preserve their spiritual purity, the newly baptized were encouraged to replace anger with other emotions, including hope, fear and rejoicing. The specific emotions, and the relationship between them, changed over the course of the ninth century at Saint-Germain, but the connection

\textsuperscript{53} For example, the issue of reform raised by Sumi Shimahara, which she restricts to the (as yet unpublished) commentary on Daniel. Shimahara presents a finely nuanced interpretation, but only studies one commentary and spends at least as much time talking about the commentary’s influence on later texts. Sumi Shimhara, “Le succès de l’\textit{Annotation brève sur Daniel} d’Haimon d’Auxerre, texte scolaire carolingien exhortant à la reform,” in \textit{Études d’exégèse carolingienne}, 123-164. This is not a criticism of Shimahara’s work or any of the other excellent scholarship on the manuscript transmission, sources and influence of Auxerrois exegesis.

between baptism and the absence of anger remained constant throughout in sources written by both secular and regular clergy.

The next three chapters explore in depth the work of each one of the Auxerrois masters. Chapter Two (*Lacrima non fallit*: Sin and Forgiveness in the Monastery of Saint-Germain [Auxerre]) draws from the liturgical cycle of homilies written by Heiric of Auxerre in order to describe the emotional expectations of those who sought to reverse the spiritual damage caused by a failure to maintain the purity gained through baptism. Heiric preached a penitential system appropriate for a monastic setting that encouraged feelings of love, kindness and hope. He described an ambiguous role for fear and hope, but warned his brethren to avoid always hatred, envy and pride. Furthermore, Heiric expected the monks of Saint-Germain to groan and cry as they sought to cleanse themselves anew.

Spiritual renewal allowed the faithful to receive the Eucharist, the central and most important liturgical event in which the Carolingian faithful could participate. In Chapter Three (*Illud terribile sacramentum*: Haimo of Auxerre’s Eucharistic Theology). I survey the commentaries and homilies of Haimo of Auxerre to uncover his thoughts on the commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice. Haimo described an emotional standard for receiving the Eucharist that depended first on proper discernment and understanding of the celebration. He thought that knowledge of the nature of Christ’s sacrifice, coupled

---

55 Remigius only wrote one extant text of relevance to this project, but a rich one, his commentary on the mass, so that chapter emerged as a case-study of his thought. Haimo receives his own chapter (on the Eucharist) because he wrote at a time of active debate about that subject. A chapter devoted to Heiric balances the other case-studies.
with the consequences of receiving the sacrament improperly, should cause the participant to be terrified and to tremble in fear. Haimo’s triad of knowing, feeling and behaving properly transformed those who approached the altar from passive recipients of the ritual into active participants who controlled their thoughts, their emotions, their actions and thereby the salvific consequences of their involvement.

In Chapter Four (Ardenti affectu: The Emotional Experience of the Mass in Late-Ninth Century Auxerre) I speak to the overall experience of the mass by looking at a single source, Remigius’ commentary on the mass. I demonstrate in this chapter that the emotional experience of the mass in late-ninth century Auxerre took a particular form. The drama of the mass created a devotional moment in which space and time were suspended, where the human congregation joined with their angelic counterparts at a divine, ineffable altar in preparation for Christ’s sacrifice. Not all qualified for fellowship in this manner of worship, but nonetheless the Eucharist was an emotional moment for all in attendance. For sinners, the fear it inspired prevented them from participating, for to do so would be not to their benefit but to their detriment as they compounded their sins. But for those in state of grace, the liturgical drama culminated in their joyful approach to the altar. Their joy took place in conjunction with an angelic “eternal offering of praise.” For those who celebrated it with the proper emotional orientation, the sacrifice enacted during the mass, Christ’s redemptive sacrifice, was the same for humans as that which Remigius described for angels: a hostium jubilatione, a sacrifice of rejoicing.
In Chapter Five (*Hoc ad diem iudicii pertinet*: Emotions, Death and the Afterlife in Ninth-Century Auxerre) I return to the broader view that I took in Chapter One. I essay a description of the emotional climate that surrounded the dying and the dead. Death was an emotionally disruptive event. The Senonais bishops did not mention this in their pastoral writings, but the liturgical texts that guided the ritual apparatus surrounding death described a climate of fear and joy, happiness and hope. So too felt Haimo and Heiric of Saint-Germain. But while they acknowledged this, neither of these two great ninth-century exegetes dwelled for long on the effects that physical death had on the emotions of the bereaved. They did, however, outline an emotional eschatology that described the affective (and related sensory) characteristics of the afterlife, which unlike those on earth perdured for eternity. Haimo’s vision of heaven and hell contained a range of emotional and sensory experiences, while his student Heiric focused on terror and joy, both directly related to the ability (or not) to see God.

The liturgy structured the lives of the faithful from birth until death, lives in which emotions played a fundamental role. After an initial, affective cleansing at the baptismal font, the devotional activities of the faithful elicited emotional reactions. Carolingian clerics such as Haimo, Heiric and Remigius of Saint-Germain described the rich and varied emotional experience of Carolingian religious culture in ways that linked proper emotional comportment to the lifelong quest for salvation.
CHAPTER ONE

DE FILIIS IRAE FACIT FILIOS DEI: EMOTIONAL TRANSFORMATION DURING CAROLINGIAN BAPTISM

The twelfth chapter of the Gospel according to Matthew tells a dramatic story. A crowd brought a man whom demonic possession had made deaf and mute to Jesus, hoping that he could effect a cure. Jesus, after casting out the devil and restoring both hearing and speech to the man, faced the opprobrium and condemnation of a group of Pharisees who had witnessed the exorcism. In response, Jesus berated the Pharisees for their belief that his power to cast out devils originated with Satan instead of with God. As part of this condemnation, he described the recipient of an exorcism as an empty house, but one which was in danger of being reoccupied not just by the original offending spirit but by others as well.¹ This episode, and the metaphor of the empty house contained within it, resonated strongly with Heiric of Auxerre, a monk in the monastery of Saint-Germain in Auxerre in the mid-ninth century and the author of one of the most comprehensive homilies written during the Carolingian period. Rather than adhering literally to the biblical text, Heiric interpreted Matthew 12:43-45

¹ Matthew 12:43-45. And when an unclean spirit is gone out of a man he walketh through dry places seeking rest, and findeth none. Then he saith: I will return into my house from whence I came out. And coming he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. Then he goeth, and taketh with him seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man is made worse than the first. So shall it be also to this wicked generation.
allegorically; instead of referring to the exorcism of a demonic spirit, he felt that the passage described someone who had just undergone the ritual of baptism.

Heiric continued a tradition of at least 50 years of exegetical explanations of the baptismal ritual by clerics working in the Archdiocese of Sens. Theodulf, bishop of Orléans and Haimo, a monk at Saint-Germain and Heiric’s teacher, also understood baptism as effecting both the emptying and the cleansing of the newly baptized. Baptism washed catechumens clean of original sin in preparation for their entry into the church, of course, but Theodulf, Haimo and Heiric all described an emotional cleansing as well, one which specifically removed feelings of anger. The action of the Holy Spirit, as Theodulf wrote and the Auxerrois monks echoed, “made sons of God out of sons of anger.”

But not every Senonais cleric expected baptism to produce the same emotional outcome. Magnus, the Archbishop of Sens (c. 802 – c. 817), spoke of baptism only as an occasion for joy, and even though Theodulf, Haimo and Heiric agreed about the removal of anger each of these churchmen held different thoughts about which emotions should replace it. Theodulf expected Christians to hope to experience perpetual joy and happiness in the afterlife. Haimo told the newly-baptized to hope for an eternal reward but also, in order to guard against an unexpected death, to live with the fear that they

---

\(^{2}\) Theodulf of Orléans, “De ordine baptismi ad Magnum Senonensem liber,” in J. P. Migne, ed. *Patrologia Latina* 105:232: “De filiis irae facit filios Dei.” The phrase “sons of anger” appears only once in the Vulgate, in Ephesians 2:3: *In which also we all conversed in time past, in the desires of our flesh, fulfilling the will of the flesh and of our thoughts, and were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest* (in quibus et nos omnes aliquando conversati sumus in desideriis carnis nostrae facientes voluntates carnis et cogitationum et eramus natura filii irae sicut et ceteri). The transformation that Theodulf and other Carolingian clergy describe does not appear in the biblical text, nor does any connection to baptism.
might behave improperly and suffer eternal punishment instead. Heiric made fear the focus of his interpretation of baptism, urging those who heard his homilies to use it to guard against the omnipresent threat of losing their spiritual purity through demonic incursion.

In the ninth century, baptism was one of the three most frequent points of contact between the clergy and the laity, but unlike the other two (penance and the Eucharist) it was never a contested issue. There was no vitriolic theological controversy, as there was over the nature of Christ’s body contained in the Eucharist, and no conciliar legislation that sought to replace certain ritual forms with others, as the councils held in 813 and 829 did for penitential practice. A lack of controversy, however, is not the same as a lack of concern. Baptism was the ritual that allowed entry into the community of the faithful and, as Susan Keefe suggests, “the Carolingian reform of the whole of society began in a fundamental way with baptism.”3 Additionally, unlike the Eucharist and penance, it was a singular event. As Theodulf of Orléans reminded the priests subject to his jurisdiction, “after baptism a sinner is not able to be baptized anew.”4

The unique nature of baptism afforded it special importance in the ritual life of the Carolingian church. Most frequently, this took the form of statements about the necessity of the proper performance of the ceremony. This concern appeared in canon 70

---


the Admonitio generalis, the document which embodied the goals of the “programmatic effort on the part of Charlemagne and his advisors to reform and improve the quality of the religious life of the Frankish people.”\textsuperscript{5} This canon instructed bishops to conduct rigorous examinations of the priests in their diocese to, among other things, ensure that they “observe catholic baptism.”\textsuperscript{6} The author of the Admonitio did not provide further details on precisely what form “catholic baptism” should take; it was enough to list it as one of the fundamental duties of a priest and leave the implementation of the canon to those working to correct the religious life of the laity in individual churches and monasteries.

The Carolingian reform movement known as the renovatio depended on the translation of the general goals promulgated at the highest level of Carolingian administration into specific and localized approaches to reform. On the episcopal level, baptism also caught the attention of the clergy of the Archdiocese of Sens. Theodulf, bishop of Orléans from approximately 798 until his deposition in 818, elaborated upon this generalized call for correct performance in two different episcopal statues. He intended these documents, the first of which he wrote at the beginning of his episcopate and the second shortly after 800, to instruct and to guide the priests working in the diocese of Orléans.

\textsuperscript{5} Thomas L. Amos, “Preaching and the Sermon in the Carolingian World,” in idem, Eugene A. Green and Beverly Mayne Kienzle, eds. De ore domini: Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1989), 43.

In his first episcopal statute, Theodulf mentioned the importance of baptism in three different capitulae, each time in a practical context. In capitula 17 he not only instructed priests that they should “by no means let the sacrament of baptism be denied” to sick infants, but he also cautioned that if “that little one should die without the grace of baptism, he who did not baptize him shall know that he is going to render an accounting for his [the infant’s] soul.”

Theodulf treated the baptism of infants again, along with adults, in capitula 22. This canon addressed the practical issues of the amount of knowledge expected of a catechumen and the ability to communicate that knowledge at the time of baptism. The bishop of Orléans instructed his priests to remind the members of their congregations that in order to be baptized they must know both the Lord’s Prayer and the Creed, and only “those whose age has not yet taught them to speak” would be exempt from reciting the same to the priest during the ritual. Baptism appeared as a practical matter in Theodulf’s first episcopal statute a third time, but in relation to penitential activity. Capitula 36 treated the importance of undertaking penance in anticipation of the Lenten season. Theodulf underscored the importance of penitential practice by highlighting the difference between the one-time washing of sins which takes place through baptism and the necessity for performing penance regularly.

---

7 Theodulf, “Capitula ad presbyteros parochiae suae” in PL 105:196. “ei baptismi sacramentum nullo modo negetur... ille parvulus absque baptismatis gratia mortuus fuerit, noverit se ille qui eum non baptizavit, pro ejus anima rationem redditurum.”

8 Ibid., 198. “exceptis his quos ad loquendum aetas minime perduxit.”
so that “sins after baptism might be cleansed.” The initial cleansing of baptism involved more than just the washing away of original sin, as the expositions, commentaries and homilies written by Theodulf and other Senonais clergy demonstrate.

**Sens and Orléans: Differing Emotional Expectations**

Taken together, Carolingian discussions of baptism at the end of the eighth century, on both a broad and local level, treated baptism as a practical matter, one to be emphasized but not interrogated. In 811 or 812, however, the focus of Carolingian inquiry changed in response to a letter which Charlemagne circulated to the archbishops of the empire. He sent this document, which survives in three manuscripts, for the purpose of initiating “a conversation concerning the utility of the holy church of God.” The emperor had a specific utility in mind, he explained to the archbishops, one through which “the word of eternal life might spread and thrive, and the size of the Christian population might increase in the praise and glory of God our savior.” The first step towards realizing these goals was to scrutinize how bishops, and the priests under their supervision, both instructed the laity about and guided them through the ritual of baptism. Charlemagne’s missive generated 64 extant responses, five of which both Keefe and Byer assign to the Archdiocese of Sens. Three of these are anonymous and the other

---

9 Ibid. “peccata post baptismum diluantur.”


11 Ibid., 166: “verbum vitae aeternae crescat et currat, et multiplicitur numerus populi christiani in laudem et gloriam salvatoris nostri Dei.”
two come from identifiable authors: Magnus, Archbishop of Sens and Theodulf, Bishop of Orléans. These texts reveal that the archbishop and his suffragan, a renowned and important theologian in his own right, held differing emotional expectations of the baptismal experience. The anonymous author of third response from Magnus’ see agreed with Theodulf.

Not only was Magnus an archbishop, holding metropolitan authority over his suffragans, but since the circular letter was addressed to the archbishops the responsibility of responding to Charlemagne fell to him as well. Magnus’ text, therefore, might be considered the “official” response to the emperor, but his expectations about the emotional experience of baptism differed from that of two of his suffragan bishops. The difference between them lay in the experience of joy (gaudium) and in the absence of fear from those who emerged from the baptismal font. The archbishop described baptism as an occasion for joy, felt by the newly-baptized and broadcast to those who witnessed their initiation into the community of the faithful not through any specific expression or gesture but rather by a change of clothing. In response to a question about the significance of the white clothing provided for the newly-baptized Magnus explained that “after being washed by the holy renewal of baptism, they are dressed in white vestments...on account of the joy of a new beginning and the purity of life and the

---

beauty of angelic splendor.”¹³ These vestments served as the outward manifestation of the joyful state that baptism produced in the participant.

Others in the Archdiocese of Sens, specifically one of the anonymous Senonais responders and Theodulf of Orléans, held that the ritual primarily severed the connection between those being baptized and anger. In the anonymous treatise, the author described baptism as effecting the washing of both body and soul. He inquired rhetorically how the physical washing that took place during the sacrament also cleaned the soul, which was invisible. He responded that “before he is baptized each man (homo) is called a son of anger and of darkness. For this reason the apostle said for you were heretofore darkness (Ephesians 5:8), because of the original sin that we inherited from Adam. But when each one comes to baptism and is baptized, he immediately loses that legacy. He comes to baptism a son of darkness and leaves a son of God.”¹⁴ The author described anger in this case as an aspect of the darkness in which people lived before being baptized. This logic implies that being made a “son of God” not only removed catechumens from darkness, but in doing so cleansed them of anger as well.

Theodulf followed this same formula, wherein the ritual washing reoriented the catechumen towards a heavenly father instead of a diabolical one by removing anger

---

¹³ Keefe, 2: 269: “post sacrae regenerationis lavacrum baptizati candidis induuntur vestimentis, ut surgentis figurent mysticum ecclesiae mysterium, vel propter gaudium novae regenerationis vitaeque castitatem et angelici splendoris decorem.”

along with other undesirable qualities. His response to Magnus contained an elaborate
discussion of the connection between baptism and anger. Tellingly, Magnus, who
incorporated a number of his suffragan’s thoughts in the “official” archdiocesan
response to Charlemagne, did not include any part of Theodulf’s discussion of the
emotional cleansing that the bishop of Orléans described as the consequence of the
ritual. This active editing on the part of Magnus underscored the divergent emotional
expectations each held for the performance of baptism. As Magnus did, Theodulf spoke
of joy (gaudium) as well as happiness (felicitas) when he wrote about the white vestments
given to new members of the Christian community. Magnus thought that those so
adorned felt joy immediately, but Theodulf offered them instead the potential of joy and
happiness in heaven. While they lived, he advised them, they could only hope to earn
this emotional reward. Drawing upon Isaiah 61:10 (I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, and my
soul shall be joyful in my God: for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, and with
the robe of justice he hath covered me), he explicitly linked the affective states of hope, joy
and happiness in the response which he sent to Magnus.15 Theodulf explained that

So that we might rise in Christ, we who should be dead to the world, we
should be clothed in the brightness of good works and should be
confirmed in the hope of heavenly joy. The angel who announced
Christ’s resurrection was said to wear white garments and those who
announced his return appeared in white vestments, and thus after
baptism we are clothed in white so that by keeping both our renewal
and the appearance of angelic splendor we might preserve by good
works the cleanness which we receive through baptism. Each of us are
given white stoles, the hope of immortality and eternal happiness, so

15 Isaiah 61:10: “gaudebo in Domino et exultabit anima mea in Deo meo quia induit me
vestimentis salutis et indumento iustitiae circumdedit me.”
that we might be able to say with the prophet: *I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, and my soul shall be joyful in my God: for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation: and with the robe of justice he hath covered me* (Isaiah 61:10).”

This passage reveals the emotional expectations which Theodulf held for the baptismal ritual. Joy (*gaudium*) and happiness (*felicitas*), along with hope (*spes*), figure prominently, although only the last of these applied to those who participate in the ritual. Magnus thought that baptism was a joyous occasion; Theodulf, a hopeful one. It allowed those who experience it to hope to experience joy and happiness but did not itself inspire or elicit such feelings.

The bishop of Orléans believed that one emotion in particular, anger, characterized the affective experience of the baptismal ritual, but he expected the participants to abandon it rather than to feel it. In his answer to Charlemagne’s question about the nature of the sacrament, Theodulf twice described the cleansing effect that baptism had on the emotional state of the catechumen. In addition to washing away the stain of original sin, baptism also accomplished an affective rehabilitation by removing

---


17 This response is given the heading “De sacramento baptismi” in the defective *PL* edition of the text but not in Keefe’s critical edition, although the apparatus indicates that it is present in two ninth-century manuscripts localized to northeastern France.
anger (*ira*) in order to orient the mind of the newly baptized properly towards God.

Theodulf began this part of his response by casting the ritual in terms of a transition from one set of dispositions to another and highlighted the importance of preserving this mental reorientation. He explained that baptism should be “understood to be a pact in two parts for the believer: one in which he renounces the devil, along with his pomps and all his works; the other in which he confirms his beliefs in the father, the son and the holy spirit. It is fitting, therefore, that these beliefs are held with a firmness of mind which is unable to be shaken.”

The Carolingian church, he explained, depended on the preservation of this “firmness of mind” (*intentio mentis*), in which the absence of any connection to anger played a key role. Through baptism, he said, “those who are born in the world are reborn in God; those who through sin were sons of anger, through grace are made sons of God. Indeed in this baptism and in this washing the Church is invigorated.” Again unlike his archbishop but in accord with the anonymous response, Theodulf described the transformation of catechumens from sinners to saved as a familial reorientation, one which results in their rising from the font *filii dei* instead of *filii irae*. The font effected other transformations as well, but in his description of the benefits incurred through baptism Theodulf consistently juxtaposed the positive outcomes with the negative

---

18 Keefe, 300: “Quia igitur constat pactiones credentium esse duas, unam in qua renuntiatur diabolo et pompis ejus, et omnibus operibus ejus, altera quae se credere confitetur in patrem et filium et in spiritum sanctum, oportet has inconvulse mentis intentione tenere.”

19 Ibid., 301: “qui nascimur mundo, renascimur Deo, et qui per peccatum eramus filii irae, per gratiam efficimur filii Dei. Hac enim tinctione et hoc lavacro Ecclesia vegetatur.”
qualities that the catechumens possessed when they undertook the sacrament. The removal of anger cleared the way for this interior regeneration to take place. Theodulf extolled the virtues of this process, again framing the conversion around the absence of anger, in his response to Magnus: “O splendid and admirable sacrament, which makes sons of God out of sons of anger, which makes the old new and which makes the loathsome illustrious! In this sacrament we are reborn and cleansed and imitate the example of the death of Christ.”

*Exspectationem futurorum bonorum: Haimo of Auxerre*

In the mid- to late-ninth century, Haimo and his student Heiric, monks in the monastery of Saint-Germain in Auxerre, picked up, elaborated upon and further developed the emotional descriptions offered by Theodulf. Bishops and monks shared a common Christian discourse, but one scholar hypothesizes a stronger and more personal connection between Theodulf and Haimo. Johannes Heil posits a Visigothic origin for Haimo based upon a close reading of parts of his commentary on the Pauline Epistles in addition to informed speculation. He suggests that Haimo may have spent time studying with Theodulf in the monastery at Micy, supervised by the Bishop of Orléans. Even if no direct connection existed, the master of Saint-Germain’s monastic

---

20 Ibid., 302-303: “O praeclarum et admirabile sacramentum, quod de filiis irae facit filios dei, de veteribus novos, de fedis pulchros, in quo et regeneramur, et purgamur, et exemplum mortis christi imitamur.”

school shared Theodulf’s opinion of baptism’s ability to sever the pre-baptismal link to anger.

Haimo’s active career stretched from approximately 840 until sometime after 860. He experienced a turbulent period of Carolingian history, for as a youth he lived through the conflicts between Louis the Pious and his sons during the ten or so years before the emperor’s death in 840 and through the dissention between Louis’s sons. Haimo developed emotional expectations for those undergoing the baptismal ritual which stemmed from his conviction that, echoing Augustine in his commentary on 1 Corinthians 10:4, “the time of our life is very short.” He believed that fear, and to a lesser extent hope, informed the lives of the Christians of his day. Throughout those portions of his exegesis and his homilies in which he referenced baptism, he consistently discussed the ritual in terms of the presence of hope and fear along with the absence of any connection to anger. The newly baptized, he felt, should hope for the future rewards which their initiation made available to them and fear lest they live in such a way as to lose those rewards. Both of these affective states filled the emotional void left when the ceremony broke the bond between the catechumen and anger.

---

22 The traditional date of Haimo’s death is 865, based upon the summoning of Heiric to Saint-German in that year. See, however, John J. Contreni, “Haimo of Auxerre, abbot of Sasceium,” in which Contreni demonstrates that Haimo most likely ended his life (as late as 875) as abbot of a small monastery situated south-west of Auxerre.

23 Haimo, In divi Pauli epistolæ expositio PL 117:560: “tempus vitae nostræ brevissimum est.” Augustine used similar language, but to draw a contrast specifically between the fleeting, temporal world and the eternal, spiritual world.
Haimo adhered to a rigid theology of predestination that led him to understand baptism as a particular kind of salvific event, one which initiated a catechumen not merely into the community of the faithful but also, if they numbered among the saved, into the community of the elect. Commenting on the closing line of Hebrews 13:24 (Grace be with you all), he explained that grace conferred multiple benefits, among which were “the remission of sins, which the elect gain at the time of baptism, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, which is given as much in baptism as through the imposition of the hand of bishops, who are given grace by God.”²⁴ Haimo also described the link between baptism and salvation in terms of the crucifixion, consistent with the increased importance which ninth-century churchmen assigned to Christ’s passion.²⁵ He made the connection explicit in his interpretation of the second half of Apocalypse 1:5 (who hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood). After marveling at the “ineffable and incomprehensible” nature of Christ’s sacrifice, Haimo explained that such an offering occurred “so that

²⁴ Ibid., 938: “remissionem quoque peccatorum, quam percipiunt electi tempore baptismatis, donum etiam Spiritus sancti, quod datur tam in baptismate quam per impositionem manus episcoporum, quae omnia gratis a Deo dantur.” The timing of the “imposition of hands” (episcopal confirmation) to which Haimo referred in his explanation of Hebrews 13:24, varied in ninth-century practice. The question did not form part of Charlemagne’s baptismal inquiry, but the practice pervaded the Carolingian church to a sufficient extent that some bishops included it in their response. The baptismal response from the bishop of Auxerre does not survive (or has yet to be identified), but Magnus of Sens included a discussion of the practice in his answer. See Byer, 60-61; Keefe 269-70.

²⁵ On the significance of the crucifixion over the course of the ninth-century, see Celia Chazelle, The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and Art of Christ’s Passion (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
having been baptized in the faith of his death, we might be cleansed from all sins. Hence the Apostle said: *we, who are baptized in Christ Jesus, are baptized in his death.*”

For those who understood the nature and importance of Christ’s sacrifice, the appropriate response was an emotional one, containing both hope and fear. Haimo explained the former in his exegesis of 1 Timothy and the latter in several places throughout his explanation of Hebrews. Paul began his letter to Timothy with a salutation which referred to Christ as the “hope” of Christians. Haimo unpacked this greeting by interpreting it in terms of baptism, specifically the cleansing which took place during the ritual, which resulted in the granting of both health and hope. In his exposition of “our hope” (*spem nostrum*) he explained that “health comes from God the Father; our hope from Christ. God the Father gave us health through his son whom he deigned to send to us, and through the Holy Spirit, which he grants to us at the time of baptism and the imposition of hands.” The health-giving benefits of baptism may have derived from the Father, but he noted also that “through Christ we have hope, that is,

---

26 Haimo, *Expositionis in Apocalypsin PL 117:945-946:* “ut in fide mortis eius baptizati, ab omnibus mundemur peccatis. Hinc Apostolus dicit: *Quicunque baptizati sumus in Christo Jesu, in morte ipsius baptizati sumus* (Romans 6:3).”

27 1 Timothy 1:1: *Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the commandment of God our Saviour, and of Christ Jesus our hope.*

28 Haimo, *In divi Pauli epistolas expositio PL 117:783:* “salutem refert ad Deum Patrem, et *spem nostrum ad Christum: quia Deus Pater dedit nobis salutem per Filium suum quem dignatus est mittere nobis, et per Spiritum sanctum, quem nobis tribuit tempore baptismatis, et tempore manuum impositionis.*”
the expectation of future good things," namely the resurrection of the body, ascension into heaven and the enjoyment of the eternal reward promised to the saved.

Haimo linked hope and baptism once more in his explanation of the Letter to the Hebrews. Once again the biblical text contained the word “hope,” which required Haimo to confront the meaning of this particular emotion. Haimo told his readers that the community of the faithful fulfilled Paul’s instruction contained in Hebrews 10:23 (Let us hold fast the confession of our hope without wavering) “if we do not despair of the heavenly kingdom, and of all which the Lord promised to us, or if firmly we observe that which we have professed in baptism.” Here he described how to hope properly, an emotional state that depended on adhering firmly to one’s baptismal promises while avoiding feelings of despair. Hope was the appropriate response to the promise of heavenly reward which Christ’s passion guaranteed, and keeping the promises made at baptism (and not despairing) in return confirmed the experience of the emotion. But in order for it to do so, those promises had to remain inviolate. Haimo believed that fear, properly felt, ensured that they newly baptized would not fail in their obligations.

This fear stemmed from several sources, the first of which was the impossibility of repeating baptism once it had occurred. Haimo wrote a lengthy interpretation of Hebrews 6:4-6, verses which warned that those who had fallen away from the faith

---

29 Ibid.: “Per Christum autem habemus spem, id est expectionem futurorum bonorum.”

30 Ibid., 894: “si non desperamus de patria coelesti, et de omnibus quae nobis promisit Dominus, vel si firmiter ea observamus quae professi sumus in baptismate.”
could not renew themselves by undertaking penance. Paul’s letter argued that those who attempted such a renewal crucified Christ again in a mockery of the passion.

Haimo stressed the uniqueness of the crucifixion repeatedly in his exegetical writings, in accord with the importance held by that event in mid-ninth century religious culture, but in his interpretation of this particular verse he connected the crucifixion to baptism rather than to penance. In Haimo’s reading these verses referred not just to penance but to the entirety of Christian life:

\[
\text{For it is impossible for those who were once illuminated, understand by this through the grace of the Holy Spirit in the baptism of faith, have tasted also the heavenly gift, that is, they have secured the remission of sins in baptism or they have communicated of the body and blood of the Lord after baptism, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, namely in the distribution of gifts, Have moreover tasted the good word of God, that is they have understood the evangelical teaching, and the powers of the world to come, that is the exaltation of the resurrection and future life, And are fallen away from the faith of Christ by denying him, or else by falling into criminal sins, to be renewed again to penance that is, to be made new through penance, understand from the above, is impossible.}
\]

The monk of Saint-Germain’s distress over Paul’s admonition stemmed from the Apostle’s use of the word “impossible.” Paul did not, Haimo lamented, “say it is

\[\text{impossible.}\]

\[\text{31 Hebrews 6:4-6: For it is impossible for those who were once illuminated, have tasted also the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, Have moreover tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, and are fallen away: to be renewed again to penance, crucifying again to themselves the Son of God, and making him a mockery.}\]

\[\text{32 Haimo, In divi Pauli epistolæ expositio PL 117:860: Impossibile est enim eos qui semel sunt illuminati, subaudis per gratiam sancti Spiritus in baptismate fidei, gustaverunt etiam donum coeleste, hoc est, remissionem peccatorum perceperunt in baptismate, sive communicaverunt corpori et sanguini Domini post baptismum, et participes facti sunt Spiritus sancti, in distributione scilicet donorum, gustaverunt nihilominus bonum Dei verbum, id est doctrinam evangelicam intellexerunt, virtutesque saeculi venturi, id est glorificationem resurrectionis, vitamque futuram; et prolapsi sunt a fide Christi, negando illum, aut etiam ad criminalia peccata prolapsi, renovari iterum ad poenitentiam, hoc est, novos fieri per poenitentiam, subaudis a superioribus, impossibile est.}\]
difficult, but impossible. A difficult thing still is able to be accomplished; but something truly impossible is not able to be done at all. What, then? Is one excluded from penance and from the forgiveness of sins? God forbid!”

To solve the dilemma posed by Paul’s letter, Haimo offered as a solution a nuanced definition of penance (poenitentia) and in doing so underscored the unique nature of the baptismal ritual. He distinguished between the “penance” that catechumens undertook once in preparation for baptism and that which the faithful performed repeatedly in order to expiate their sins. Since baptism could only occur once, he explained, the penitential practice which prepared one for baptism was a unique event as well, and was the type of penance which Paul warned could not be repeated.

Haimo believed that Paul intended his words to frighten the recipients of his letter, and he advised Christians in the ninth-century to interpret them in this way as well. Even though they could seek the forgiveness of those sins that they committed after baptism, Haimo thought that Paul “terrifies all so that they might fear to implicate themselves in more serious sins after the grace of baptism, because a second renewal is not able to take place after the cleansing of baptism.” He repeated this sentiment later in his commentary. Haimo explained Hebrews 10:27 (But a certain dreadful expectation of judgment, and the rage of a fire which shall consume the adversaries) by noting that “the

---

33 Ibid.: “Non dixit difficile est, sed impossibile. Quod enim difficile est, utcunque potest agi. Impossibile vero est quod nullo modo fieri potest. Quid ergo? Exclusa est poenitentia post baptismum et venia delictorum? Absit.”

34 Ibid.: “Terret ergo omnes ut timeant post baptismai gratiam gravioribus peccatis se implicare, quia non potest fieri secunda vice renovatio per lavacrum baptismatis.”
Apostle frightened all so that they might be afraid of falling back into vice after being washed in baptism, because they are not able to be re-baptized.”35

Appropriate feelings of fear stemmed from the unique nature of baptism and the consequences that attended to living improperly after undergoing the ritual. Nonetheless, Haimo offered the faithful a measure of security, based upon his understanding of the change of clothing which took place at the end of the baptismal ritual, when the catechumens received the white vestments suitable for their newly purified state. The Senonais bishops discussed this sartorial change as well. Magnus believed that white garments signified the exterior manifestation of a joyful state and Theodulf spoke of the hope experienced by newly-baptized Christians. The Bishop of Orléans cited Isaiah 61:10 in support of his interpretation of the baptismal vestments, a triumphant verse suitable to his understanding of the hopeful nature of the sacrament. In his commentary on the Book of Isaiah Haimo offered an allegorical interpretation of the same verse, where “the prophet speaks in the voice of the Church,”36 which rejoices in the virtuous behavior of the elect, but unlike Theodulf he did not specifically connect Isaiah 61:10 to baptism. Instead, Haimo mentioned the white baptismal garments instead in his commentary on Apocalypse 16:15 (Behold I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame). Unlike his

35 Ibid., 895: “Terret ergo Apostolus omnes ut metuant post baptismi lavacrum ad vitia relabi, quia non possunt rebaptizari.”

early-ninth century counterparts he did not present them as part of the joyful or hopeful climax of an initiation ritual but rather as items of value that need to be guarded carefully. Haimo offered an allegorical explanation for *vestimenta*, one in which the “garments which he warned should be protected with vigilant attention are the promises of baptism.”

In his biblical exegesis, Haimo described baptism as an event that affected three emotions: anger, hope and fear. The newly-baptized should live both fearfully and hopefully after being cleansed by their immersion in the font. This meant a spiritual cleansing, whereby the waters of the font washed away the stain of original sin. Like Theodulf and the anonymous Senonais bishop, however, Haimo also believed that baptism cleansed catechumens emotionally by freeing them of their connection to anger. In addition to his exegetical writings, Haimo discussed the removal of anger in two of his homilies: one for the fourth Sunday of Advent and the other for the Octave of Pentecost.

As a homilist Haimo ranged across a variety of themes throughout the course of the text and utilized the same variety of interpretive strategies as he did in his exegetical writings. The composition of the audience which heard homilies potentially differed, however, from those who would have read Haimo’s commentaries. While it unquestionably would have included members of both the secular and regular clergy in Auxerre, the laity potentially numbered among its members as well. Haimo interpreted

---

his texts both literally and allegorically, but the language in which he did so in his homilies tended to be more simple and straightforward and his explanations less theologically complex, further suggesting that he had an audience in mind wider than the monks subjected to his instruction and training at Saint-Germain.

Haimo’s discussion of the impossibility of repeating baptism in his homily for the Octave of Pentecost furnishes a good example of the different approach he took when writing this kind of text. His exegesis dwelled on the connection between baptism and the crucifixion, on the divine nature of Christ and the salvific and spiritual consequences of attempting a second baptism. In the homily, however, Haimo taught his audience using a more quotidian metaphor. The pericope for the homily was John 3:5 (Amen, amen I say to thee, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God), the answer which Christ gave to a question asked of him by Nicodemus in the previous verse (How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother’s womb, and be born again?). Haimo’s explanation did little more than repeat the language of the biblical verse. He reminded his audience that while Nicodemus’ question mentioned carnal birth, “we should understand spiritually. Indeed, just as a man is not able to return to the womb of his mother and be reborn, thus one who is baptized is not able to be re-baptized.”

38 Haimo, Homiliarum sive concionum ad plebem in evangelia de tempore et sanctis PL 118:261: “nos de spiritu sentire debemus. Sicut enim homo in ventrem matris suae iterum non potest introire et renasci, sic qui baptizatus est rebaptizandus non est.” Despite the title given by Migne there is no evidence that Haimo wrote specifically for the laity (ad plebem).
The relative lack of theological complexity did not translate to a lack of affective language in Haimo’s homilies. On three occasions he described the emotional transformation that took place during baptism. He agreed with Theodulf that the catechumen who participated therein emerged from the baptismal font cleansed of anger, along with other negative qualities synonymous with that emotion. Towards the end of the homily for the fourth Sunday of Advent, Haimo expanded upon John 1:28 (*These things were done in Bethania, beyond the Jordan, where John was baptizing*). He thought that the name “Jordan” could be interpreted as “a descent,” which led him to explain that therefore “men were baptized in the Jordan because before they came to baptism they were sons of anger and sons of the devil. But when they descended with their sins in baptism they emerged sons of peace and sons of God through adoption.”

As Theodulf did in his exposition on the sacrament, Haimo described baptism in terms of an emotional renewal that changed “sons of the devil” into “sons of God” by removing the association with anger and replacing it with peace.

Haimo knew that some of those who listened to his homilies would not have understood how such a transformation took place. In his homily for the Octave of Pentecost he explained this phenomenon in the simple language that he used throughout the texts which he intended for oral delivery. John 3:5 served as his point of departure, a verse that led him to explain that “both water and the Holy Spirit are

---

39 Ibid., 47: “in Jordane baptizantur homines, quia antequam ad baptismum veniant, filii irae et filii diaboli sunt: sed cum in baptismum descendunt, descendentibus peccatis, filii pacis et filii Dei per adoptionem ascendant.”
placed suitably in the rite of baptism, because water washes the body but the Holy Spirit renews the mind. Indeed the water would be useless if the Holy Spirit did not remit sins. The water, therefore, signifies externally that which the Holy Spirit performs internally, that is, the washing away of sins."  

He continued to expound upon John’s Gospel, explaining that John 3:6 (That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit) signified the invisible working of the Holy Spirit, because “through the spirit of God the spirit of man is renewed.”

The removal of anger, along with the other negative qualities that Haimo associated with it, attended the spiritual cleansing which baptism effected for those who participated in it. Christians emerged from the font both emotionally and spiritually pure. The preservation of this affective state depended on feeling fear properly, which in turn led to the hope of future reward. If Christians abstained from anger, feared to relapse and hoped to join the community of the holy in the afterlife they would achieve the heavenly reward promised by Christ’s passion. This spiritual renewal was also an emotional renewal, and Haimo used it as a criterion by which both he and his audience could distinguish between the faithful and the unfaithful, between the saved and the damned:

---


41 Ibid., 581: “per spiritum Dei spiritus hominis renovatur.”
yet only the minds of the faithful understand this, because when someone comes to baptism he descends a son of anger, and ascends a son of reconciliation; he descends a son of the devil, and ascends a son of God through adoption; he descends a son of discord, and ascends a son of peace. Before the eyes of the rest of the foolish and the unfaithful, who want to believe nothing other than that which they see, all which takes place during baptism appears to be a game. But in the end, when they will see the glory of the saints, they will declare: These are they, whom we had some time in derision, and for a parable of reproach. We fools esteemed their life madness, and their end without honour. Behold how they are numbered among the children of God, and their lot is among the saints.

_De uasis irae_: Heiric of Auxerre

Heiric was an oblate at the monastery of Saint-Germain in Auxerre, where he studied with Haimo as well as with Lupus of Ferrières (either at Saint-Germain or at Fulda). He also spent time with Wulfradus in Soissons, whence he returned to Saint-Germain in the mid-860s, either upon the death of Haimo or, as Contreni suggests, when Heiric’s teacher moved to Sasceium to become abbot. Heiric left a number of important texts, including a metrical _vita_ of St. Germain, a description of the saint’s miracles (_Miraculi sancti Germani_), a florilegium known as the _Collectanea_ and a liturgical cycle of 115 homilies.

---

42 Ibid.: “Solae autem mentes fidelium noverunt, quia cum aliquis ad baptismum venit, descendit filius irae, et ascendit filius reconciliations: descendit filius diaboli, et ascendit per adoptionem Filius Dei: descendit filius discordiae, et ascendit filius pacis. Caeterum coram oculis insipientium et infidelium, qui nihil aliud, quam quod oculis vident, credere volent, totum quod in baptismo agitur ludus esse putatur. Unde in fine, visa sanctorum gloria, dicturi sunt: _Hi sunt quos aliquando habuimus in derisum et in similitudinem improperit: nos insensati, vitam illorum aestimabamus insaniam, et finem illorum sine honore. Quomodo ergo computati sunt inter filios Dei et inter sanctos sors illorum est_ (Wisdom 5:3-5).”

43 The first important study of Heiric’s homilies was Henri Barré, _Les homéliaires carolingiens de l’école d’Auxerre_. Thanks in large part to the efforts of Riccardo Quadri, Heiric’s work benefits from modern, critical editions more than any of the other Auxerrois exegetes. See Heiric of Auxerre, _Homiliae per circulum anni_, ed. Riccardo Quadri CCCM 116A-B (Turnhout: Brepols,
Heiric’s homiletic approach differed slightly from his predecessor and teacher Haimo. He wrote longer texts on average, in a less direct style of composition and with a greater level of theological complexity. Unlike the Haimonian texts, which allowed for the possibility at least of lay attendees, this suggests an exclusively monastic audience. In several of these homilies Heiric explicated the pericope for the day in terms of the baptismal ritual, and offered a slightly modified version of the same emotional expectations as Theodulf, Magnus and Haimo. In doing so, he combined his own thoughts on baptism with those of two other authors, Hrabanus Maurus and Gregory the Great. The inclusion of material from the former resulted from two related factors. When the biblical text upon which Heiric based a homily came from Matthew, the Auxerrois monk turned to Hrabanus’s commentary on that Gospel. From Gregory, Heiric took an explanation of the connection between faith, works and salvation, a pastoral message well-suited to the concerns of that early medieval pontiff.

---


44 Hrabanus was one of three Carolingians to treat this Gospel exegetically. The other two were Claudius of Turin, whose work had been condemned by his contemporaries, and an author known today only as Pseudo-Bede. For a consideration of each commentary, albeit in a different context, see Brigitta Stoll, “Drei karolingische Matthäus-Kommentare (Claudius von Turin, Hrabanus Maurus, Ps. Beda) und ihre Quellen zur Bergpredigt,” Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch 26 (1991): 36-55.
Even though he relied at times on Hrabanus and Gregory, the foundation for the framework within which Heiric understood baptism did not depend directly on patristic or Carolingian source material. Heiric conformed to the underlying theme of this chapter, that baptism cleansed catechumens of anger. But emotions figured less prominently than they did in the works of the other Senonais clergy. Heiric never discussed the presence of either joy or hope in connection with baptism (although he did call for rejoicing) and only once mentioned fear. The one time he did speak of fear, however, held a great deal of significance, for it highlighted the precarious position in which the newly baptized found themselves.

Heiric scattered references to baptism throughout his homilies, and when considered in aggregate these form a coherent picture of the monk of Saint-Germain’s thoughts on the sacrament and those who undertook it. Catechumens underwent a spiritual, moral and emotional cleansing. This new condition of existence, while purified, was nonetheless perilous, constantly threatened both from without and within. The newly baptized had to guard against the active and constant threat of the machinations of the devil while at the same time governing their thoughts and desires so as to avoid relapsing to their previous, sinful state. The knowledge of these threats to the promise of salvation made available through baptism led to feelings of fear. Heiric called for those able to persevere through the difficult course of life to rejoice at the knowledge that their faith had proven sufficiently strong.
Heiric thought of people as vessels (*vasa*) that fell into one of two categories. God, he explained in his homily for *Feria II in Quadragesima* (I,43), “made vessels of opposite types: one kind for honor and the other kind for reproach.”\(^{45}\) These categorizations were not absolute, for “the Holy Spirit by softening in fire turns a vessel of anger into a vessel of mercy.”\(^{46}\) Heiric does not explain the context of this action of the Holy Spirit in Homily I,43 but this same transformation, from anger to mercy, occurs in Heiric’s homily for *Feria V in cena domini* (I,64) specifically as the result of being baptized. In this homily, Heiric associated the movement mentioned in John 13:1 (*That he should pass out of this world to the Father*) with the crossing of the Red Sea, and that passage in turn with baptism. By having their sins cleansed through baptism those involved moved from faithlessness to faith; they are made sons of God from sons of the devil, are made vessels of mercy from vessels of anger; they cross from slavery to the creature to the retinue of the creator, from the tyranny of the enemy to the mercy of the redeemer, from the cruelty of enemies to the goodness of the Father, from wandering lost to the [true] way, from seduction to the teaching of truth, from the devil to God.\(^{47}\)

\(^{45}\) Heiric, I:43, 389: “facit diversi generis vasa, aliud quidem in honorem, aliud vero in contumeliam.” Heiric’s description of people who were made vessels of certain types implicitly references Christ’s description of Paul as a “vessel of election” (*vas electionis*) in Acts 9:15 (In the text I refer to the homilies the first time by both name and number and thereafter only by number. I follow Quadri’s numbering, where the roman numeral before the comma represents the liturgical season (I = *pars hiemalis*, II = *pars aestiva*) and the number after the specific homily.

\(^{46}\) Ibid., “Ipsa etiam vasa irae spiritus sancti igne molliendo, in vasa convertit misericordiae.”

\(^{47}\) Ibid., I, 64, 617: “migrant de infidelitate ad fidem, efficiuntur de filiis diaboli filii Dei, de uasis irae uasa misericordiae, transeunt de seruitio creaturae ad obsequium creatoris, de tyrannide hostis ad clementiam redemptoris, de saeuitia inimici ad pietatem patris, de errore ad uiam, de seductore ad ueritatis doctorem, de diabolo ad Deum.”
In this passage Heiric describes the same transformation from anger to mercy which he credited to the action of the Holy Spirit in Homily I,43. Furthermore, the removal of anger accompanies the removal of other undesirable qualities in a manner that recalls Theodulf’s baptismal exposition but couched in a more expansive list of the negative conditions that prevailed before baptism and the positive changes effected by the ritual.

Heiric described the association between the devil and the unbaptized frequently in his homilies. He provided a more elaborate discussion of this connection in the homily for *Dominica III in Quadragesima* (I,42) in which he built upon the exorcism described in Chapter 12 of Matthew’s Gospel. He began by comparing the demon mentioned in the biblical text to pagans, who “coming to the faith of Christ were blind and mute and possessed by a demon.” Heiric then explained that not only did Christ remove a demon from one man in the past but that “likewise he does this today in the Church. Indeed before a man comes to baptism he is possessed by the devil and is blind and mute, because as yet he does not understand God, nor acknowledge him with his speech.”

The baptismal ritual paralleled Christ’s exorcism not only by freeing catechumens from the possession of the devil but also by opening their ears and eyes:

48 See footnote 39.

49 Ibid., I, 42, 372: “qui ad fidem Christi ueniens caecus erat et mutus atque a daemonio possidebatur.”

50 Ibid., 373: “hoc etiam cottidie agit in ecclesia; prius enim quam homo ueniat ad baptismum, a diabolo possidetur et caecus est et mutus, quia necdum Deum intellegit, nec illum uoce confitetur.”
But then man is freed from the demon when he is breathed upon in baptism, and through the invocation of Jesus Christ the evil spirit is abjured by the priest so that it might leave and recede from that one [the catechumen] and might give the place to the true God. Then to him speech is restored when, being asked by the priest whether he believes in God the all-powerful father and in Jesus Christ his son and in the Holy Spirit, he responds “I believe” and thus in the name of the Holy Trinity he [the priest] purifies him by three submersions in the font. Thus he receives light, when through the contemplation of the mind he begins to see God, whom he had previously ignored.\footnote{Ibid.: “Sed tunc a daemone liberatur homo in baptismo cum exsufflatur, et coniuratur malignus spiritus a sacerdote per inuocationem Ihesu Christi ut exeat, et recedat ab eo et det locum Deo uero. Tunc redditur ei loquela, cum interrogatus a sacerdote utrum credat in Deum patrem omnipotentem, et in Ihесum Christum filium eius et spiritum sanctum, respondet ‘credo’ atque in nomine sanctae trinitatis trina illum submersione fontis purificat. Tunc recipit lumen, cum per mentis contemplationem incipit Deum uidere quem prius ignorabat.”}

Baptism prepared the body and mind of the newly initiated Christian for a life devoted to God, but Heiric warned that despite this one victory over the devil more challenges awaited. The spiritual dangers that he believed surrounded Christians on a daily basis took two forms. On the one hand, he thought that the devil, having been evicted from his place of residence, constantly sought re-entry. But even if Christians were able to thwart these diabolical aspirations Heiric admonished them to believe and act appropriately.

The abjuration of the priest during baptism effected the removal of the devil from the catechumen, but Heiric believed that from that point forward demonic forces actively and continually threatened to return to the place from which they had been evicted. In his homily for \textit{Feria IV in Quadragesima} (I,31), he drew upon Hrabanus Maurus’ commentary on Matthew, wherein the abbot of Fulda compared the actions of
Christ, who desired that people be free from sin, to Satan, who “seeks to defile those cleansed of serious filth.” With only minor modifications to vocabulary (e.g. replacing *fidelium* with *sanctorum*), Heiric followed Hrabanus’s use of the metaphor, developed originally by the author of Matthew, of the newly-cleansed individual as a house from which evil spirits had been forced to leave yet to which they desired to return. Matthew described a spirit thus displaced as walking through “places without water,” which Heiric interpreted to mean that it “circled the hearts of the holy, which are purged of the dampness of unstable thoughts.” Here Heiric described the newly-cleansed thoughts of the *sancti* as “moist” instead of “weak/soft” (as Hrabanus did) perhaps to play off of the biblical language of dry places and to suggest that “moist” thoughts are fertile thoughts (in this case with an undesirable yield), a sense of *umor* found in Gregory the Great.

Matthew continued by explaining that these were spirits “seeking rest, but findeth none,” a result that Heiric credited to successful attempts to maintain mental purity. He warned

---


54 Cited in Brepols’s online Database of Latin Dictionaries: http://clt.brepolis.net.flagship.luc.edu/dld
that “it is not possible to have a place in clean and pure minds; he [the devil] has pleasing rest only in the hearts of the depraved.”

Heiric then made the threat explicit by citing Job 40:16, to which Hrabanus also referred but did not connect specifically to the Old Testament text. He reminded the assembled monks that “the Lord spoke to Job about the devil in the form of a leviathan: *He sleepeth under the shadow, in the cover of the reed, and in moist places,* because without a doubt he rests in the shadows and the simulation of conscience, and delights in the minds of the lustful and wanton.” When the devil finds such a depraved individual he says, again following Matthew 12:44, “*I will return into my house from whence I came out.*” This verse held particular significance for Heiric, who agreed with Hrabanus that it represented the danger that every Christian faced after baptism. He used his explanation of this part of The Gospel according to Matthew to urge his brethren to adopt a fearful emotional state as a means of protecting themselves against demonic incursion. The house to which Matthew referred was the individual “whom I [the devil] released in baptism,” and consequently, Heiric admonished, “this verse should be feared greatly, lest by chance the fault which we believed to be dismissed from us might

---


wickedly oppress us, being carelessly empty of good works.” Heiric modified Hrabanus’s text it two significant ways. Where Hrabanus merely spoke of people who were empty (vacantes), Heiric specified that they were specifically “empty of (that is, lacking) good works.” Additionally, he underscored the manifest diabolic threat by having the devil threaten (speaking for him in the first person) that he will seek out (requiram) those vessels that he was forced to abandon as the result of baptism.

Matthew’s formulation, along with Hrabanus’s exegesis of it, neatly summarized for Heiric the dangers faced by Christians after baptism. The “spiteful spirit,” he explained, “coming to the house, that is the mind, of such men findeth it swept, that is washed from original sin by the grace of baptism, empty from good works, garnished with the simulation of virtues.” Fear of the devil’s return helped the faithful to recognize the danger, but it was then up to them individually to orient their thoughts and their actions in such a way as to rebuff the devil’s advances. The first way in which

---

57 Heiric, I, 31, 265: “Tunc dicit: Reuertar in domum meam unde exiui, hoc est requiram haereticum, quem in baptismo dimisi. Valde autem timendus est iste uersiculus, ne forte culpa quam nobis dimissam credebamus, peius nos per incuriam vacuum a bonis operibus opprimat.” Hrabanus Maurus, Expositio in Matthaem, 370: “Tunc dicit: Reuertar in domum meam unde exiui. Timendus est iste uersiculus, non exponendus, ne culpa, quam in nobis extinctam credebamus, per incuriam nos vaccantes opprimat.

58 Heiric, I, 31, 265: “Veniens enim malignus spiritus domum, id est mentem, talis hominis inuenit scopis mundatam, hoc est gratia baptismatis a peccatis originalibus ablutam, uacantem a bonis operibus, ornatam simulatis uirtutibus.” “hoc est gratia baptismatis a peccatorum labe castigatam, sed nulla boni operis industria cumulatam. Hrabanus Maurus, Expositio in Matthaem, 370: “Vnde bene hic Euangelista hanc domum uacantem, scopis mundatam atque ornatam dicit inuentam: mundatam uidelicet a uitiis pristinis per baptismum, uacantem a bonis actibus per negligiament, ornatam simulatis uirtutibus per hypocrisin.” Heiric specifically referred to the removal of “original sin” as the result of baptism, which could apply to infants or adults, while Hrabanus spoke of being cleansed “of vices,” which seems to apply specifically to adults.
one did so was by acknowledging their inability to maintain a consistently pure state, as Heiric explained (no longer drawing upon Hrabanus or any other earlier author) in Homily I,54. He encouraged his audience to react to their sins as Jesus did to the news of the death of Lazarus, as described in John 11:33-34.59

According to the Evangelist, Christ, when he saw the reaction of Mary and the rest of Lazarus’ household “groaned in the spirit and troubled himself.” Lazarus, Heiric explained, represented sinners and Christ responded as he did to show they that they ought “to groan and to roar with an inner roar of the heart.”60 To explain the genesis of this reaction Heiric spoke in the first person to provide his audience with a suitable lament: “What has happened to miserable me? Baptism removed all sins from me, but behold after that holy washing I am dirtier than ever! After that medicine I am wounded more gravely, I have sinned more gravely, nor did I wish to place any limit on my sins.”61 The proper response to this realization, Heiric repeats, is to groan in imitation of Christ, who acted thus “so that he might teach the sinner to groan and to be obligated to find fault with his sin if he wants to restore life to [his] soul.”62

---

59 John 11:33-34: Jesus, therefore, when he saw her weeping, and the Jews that were come with her, weeping, groaned in the spirit, and troubled himself, And said: Where have you laid him?

60 Heiric, I, 54, 516: “ingemiscere debere atque intimo cordis rugitu fremere.”

61 Ibid.: “quid michi misero contigit? Dimissa erant michi in baptismo omnia peccata, sed ecce post sanctum lauacrum peius sordidatus sum, post medicinam grauius uulneratus peccaui grauiiter, nec umquam peccatis meis terminum ponere uolui.”

62 Ibid., 517: “ut doceret peccatorem fremere et peccata sua accusare debere si uult ad uitam animae redire.”
Of all of the sins that Heiric felt should provoke this response, the one most offensive to him, and most congenial to the return of the devil, was the pretense of virtuous behavior. To communicate this danger he continued to rely on the metaphor of the devil’s desire to return to a newly cleansed house provided by Matthew 12:45 (Then he goeth, and taketh with him seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there). He taught in two separate homilies that the wickedness of these seven spirits lay not in the seven vices which they represented but in the disguising of those vices with a façade of virtue. In Homily I,31 Heiric explained (again, following Hrabanus) that these spirits were able to enter because anyone “who, after securing the remission of sins in baptism, seizes either heretical depravity or a desire for the world, becomes a servant of all vices. Whence the spirits are called well more wicked, because such a person might be filled with the seven mortal vices, yet pretends himself to have the same virtues.”

He returned to this theme in Homily I,42, where he argued that Matthew was correct to call these spirits more wicked than the devil because, while the devil “might be fully evil” (totus malignus sit), those who have succumbed to the allure of vices “are not

---

63 Ibid., I, 31, 265: “quemcumque post perceptam in baptismo remissionem peccatorum, uel haeretica prauitas uel saeculi cupiditas arripuerit, omnium serum facit esse uitiorum; unde bene nequiores spiritus dicuntur, quia tali cum septem capitalibus uitiis plenus sit, ipsas tamen uirtutes se habere simulabit.” Hrabanus Maurus, Expositio in Matthaem, 370: “Quemcumque enim post baptisma siue prauitas haeretica seu mundana cupiditas arripuerit, mox omnium prosternet in ima uitiorum. Vnde recte nequiores tunc eum spiritus dicuntur ingressi, quia non solum habebit illa septem uitia, quae septem spiritualibus sunt contraria uirtutibus, sed et per hipochrisin ipsas se uirtutes habere simulabit.”
merely evil but also strive to display through hypocrisy the appearance of goodness with affected virtues.”

Heiric condemned sinful actions but never more vehemently than when they lay hidden underneath a veneer of virtue. He consistently drew upon his earlier contemporary’s exegesis of Matthew 12 to underscore both the constant threat of demonic influence as well as the importance of keeping the promises made during baptism. That sacrament removed feelings of anger along with a host of other undesirable qualities. Just as virtues should replace sins in a properly led Christian life, fear replaced anger in order to prevent the incursion of the devil. Heiric connected baptism, belief and works explicitly in a homily for the feast of the Ascension (II,13: *In Ascensione Domini*), in which he also described the emotional impact of true faith.

The pericope for this homily came from Mark 16 and as his homily unfolded Heiric took the opportunity offered by Mark 16:16 (*He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned*) to reflect on baptism; indeed, his explication of this verse reads like an abbreviated commentary on the baptismal ritual. He outlined both the fundamental beliefs that the priest conveyed to the catechumens as well as the order in which he did so and also provided a defense of the baptism of infants. But Heiric spent the majority of this section of the homily detailing the obligations incumbent upon those who underwent the sacrament by warning that the performance of the ritual alone did not equate to salvation.

---

64 Heiric, I, 42, 384: “non modo mali sunt sed etiam speciem bonitatis affectatis uirtutibus per hypocrisin ostentare nituntur.”
Mark’s words, Heiric explained to his audience “contain the principle cause of our salvation,” but went on to admonish them that being baptized brought with it an obligation to believe properly, “because without faith the washing of baptism avails nothing (or very little).” This faith took a specific form, which Heiric detailed in a long exposition of the connection between faith and works. Mark truthfully connected belief and baptism, he argued,

if the faith that one acknowledges with [his] mouth he might adorn with the pursuit of good works. Indeed, to believe truly is to acknowledge God in voice and in actions at the same time; whence concerning these things it is said by contrast: They profess that they know God: but in their works they deny him (Titus 1:16); and James: faith without works is dead (James 2:26). Hence John said: He who saith that he knoweth him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar (1 John 2:4)...truly we are faithful, if the faith which we profess in words we carry out in works.

The core of this passage came from one of Gregory the Great’s homilies, although Heiric made more emphatic the connection between speech and action through greater

---

65 Heiric, II, 13, 107: “Haec uerba summam nostrae salutis causamque continent... quia sine fide baptismi tinctio aut nichil ualet aut minimum.” Unlike the rest of the portion of this homily cited, Heiric did not take this opinion from Gregory the Great’s homily on the same biblical passage.

66 Heiric, II, 13, 107: “Verum utique dicit, si fidem quam ore confitetur bonorum operum studiis exornet; credere enim ueraciter est Deum uoce simul et moribus confiteri; unde econtra de quibusdam dicitur: Confiditur se nosse Deum, factis autem negant, et Jacob: Fides sine operibus mortua est. Hinc Iohannes dicit: Qui dicit se nosse Deum et mandata eius non custodit, mendax est...tunc enim ueraciter fideles sumus, si fidem quam uerbi profitemur operibus adimpleamus.” Compare to Gregory the Great, Homiliae in euangelia, ed. Raymond Étaix CCSL 141 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), 246: “Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit salus erit, qui uero non crediderit condemnabitur. Fortasse unusquisque apud semetipsum dicat: Ego iam credidi, salus ero. Verum dicit, si fidem operibus teneat. Vera etenim fides est, quae in hoc quod uerbis dicit, moribus non contradicet. Hinc est enim quod de quibusdam falsis fidelibus Paulus dicit: Qui confidit se nosse Deum, factis autem negant. Hinc Iohannes ait: Qui dicit se nosse Deum et mandata eius non custodit, mendax est...Tunc enim ueraciter fideles sumus, si quod uerbis promittimus, operibus implemus.”
repetition of the relationship as well as by adding the citation of James 2:26, not found in Gregory’s text.

The monk of Saint-Germain did more than just hector his audience. The ability to conduct one’s life in accordance with the promises made during baptism conferred spiritual benefits, the knowledge of which led, as Gregory the Great also believed, to another affective response: rejoicing. Heiric assured his listeners that “at the time of baptism we promise to renounce all the vices and pomps of the devil. If after baptism we remember to keep that promise we ought to rejoice, because truly we are faithful.” He also warned them of the dire consequences of not understanding the threats to their faith (and thereby their actions), of not fearing these threats in a way that allowed them to govern their lives appropriately, of allowing the devil to re-enter the house from which he had been evicted as a result of the sacramental power of baptism. Departing from Gregory’s exemplar, Heiric affirmed the admonition of Mark 16:16 (he that believeth not shall be condemned). He cautioned that just as God promised an eternal reward worthy of rejoicing to those able to keep their faith, to those unable to fulfill their baptismal promises “in another place the Lord said: he that doth not believe, is already

---

67 Heiric, II, 13, 107-108: “tempore baptismatis omnibus uitiis cunctisque pompis diabolicis nos abrenuntiatuso esse spopondimus; quam pollicitationem si post baptismum nos seruare meminerimus, certe de praemio quia fideles sumus ueraciter gaudeamus.” Gregory the Great, Homiliae in evangelia, 246: “In die quippe baptismatis omnibus nos antiqui hostis operibus atque omnibus pompis abrenuntiari promisimus. Itaque unusquisque usum ad considerationem suam mentis oculos reducat; et si seruat post baptismum quod ante baptismum spopondit, certus iam quia fidelis est gaudeat.”
judged (John 3:18), that is damned, because just as the faithful are saved through faith, on account of faithlessness the unfaithful are damned.”⁶⁸

Conclusion

The spiritual renewal conferred in baptism purified the newly baptized in other ways as well. Felice Lifshitz suggests that, in the eastern portion of ninth-century Francia at least, catechumens emerged from the font washed clean of gender roles.⁶⁹ Applying Lifshitz’s approach of paying close attention to texts from a specific region to the treatises, commentaries and homilies written by clergy in the Archdiocese of Sens reveals that baptism provided an emotional cleansing as well. Over the course of the ninth century the emotional expectations of the Carolingian clerical elite for those who undertook baptism underwent significant modification. The core belief (emphasized by all except Magnus of Sens), that catechumens entered the baptismal font burdened by their connection to anger and emerged as emotionally purified Christians, remained the same. But the view of life after baptism taken by the bishops and monks of the Archdiocese of Sens changed. Magnus focused on the joyful nature of the ritual, while his suffragan Theodulf thought that Christians emerged from the font hopeful of experiencing joy and happiness in the afterlife. By the mid-ninth century, baptism no longer occasioned joy. But emotions were still important; the monks of Saint-Germain

---

⁶⁸ Heiric, II, 13, 108: “dominus alibi dicit: Qui non credit, iam iudicatus est, id est damnatus, quia sicut fideles per fidem saluantur, ita infideles propter infidelitatem damnantur.”

expected the newly baptized to adopt affective stances appropriate for their changed spiritual state, suggesting that they expected the faithful to be aware of their emotions. Haimo wanted Christians to replace their anger with the fear that they might sully their newly purified condition; this allowed them to hope that they numbered among the elect. Towards the final third of the century Heiric, Haimo’s student at the monastery of Saint-Germain in Auxerre, modified these emotional expectations once again. Baptism still emptied those who undertook it of feelings of anger, but this placed them in a perilous position. Heiric stressed the fear which Christians ought to have felt throughout their lives, but did not draw the same connection between fear and hope as his teacher. Instead, he encouraged his fellow monks to use the fear of moral relapse to live Christian lives characterized by both proper faith and appropriate actions. If they did so, eventually they could rejoice at the knowledge that they had kept the promises they made at baptism and had been truly changed from sons of anger to sons of God.
CHAPTER TWO

LACRIMA NON FALLIT: SIN AND FORGIVENESS IN THE MONASTERY OF SAINT-GERMAIN (AUXERRE)

There is nothing distinctive, liturgically speaking, about the mass celebrated on the third day (feria) after the third Sunday of Lent (in quadragesima). But in Auxerre on that day in the middle of April 873, the monks of Saint-Germain who gathered in their church would have heard a homily written by Heiric, one of their own, that contained a message about sin and forgiveness, a topic of the utmost importance.¹ As shown in Chapter One, Heiric believed that people were vessels made pure by baptism; but this state was perilous. For those unable to maintain it, penance served as their recourse. Prompted by the teaching of Jesus as related in Matthew 18:15-22, the reading for the third day after the third Sunday of Lent, Heiric shared his thoughts about the nature of sin and forgiveness. Heiric’s brethren would have listened to the master of their school, a monk trained by two Carolingian luminaries (Haimo of Auxerre, his predecessor at Saint-Germain, and Lupus of Ferrières), speak of penance not as a liturgical event but instead as an informal system (albeit one based on the Rule of St. Benedict) better suited

¹ The date is purely speculative, but based on the mid-point of the chronological range for the composition of Heiric’s Lenten homilies given by Quadri in the Corpus Christianorum volume. In 873 Easter would have fallen on 15 April (19 April according to the Julian calendar). Heiric’s work is found in Heiric of Auxerre, Homiliae per circulum anni, ed. Riccardo Quadri CCCM 116A-B (Turnhout: Brepols, 1992).
to a monastic setting. In this lesson, he taught them that forgiveness was reciprocal; brothers should both ask forgiveness of and give forgiveness to each other. He also explained the affective nature of this penitential system, a complex of emotional orientations that involved avoiding pride and hatred at all times and avoiding anger most of the time, fearing or not as the situation demanded, expressing emotions properly by groaning and crying, and being motivated always by love.

The Lenten season was the perfect time to address issues of penitence, of the reintegration of those who had failed to meet the behavioral standards of the community. Since Easter was the “heart of the liturgical year,” the forty-day period that preceded it gained significance beyond that assigned to other periods of fasting on the medieval liturgical calendar such as the three days before the Feast of the Circumcision and the four Rogation days that occurred before Pentecost. Of his thirty-nine homilies extant for the Lenten season (beginning with Quadragesima Sunday (I:28) and ending on Easter Sunday (II:1)), Heiric used a form of the word *paenitentia* in eighteen (46.1%). While sin and forgiveness naturally occupied more of Heiric’s

---


3 Ibid., 290.

4 I draw material for this chapter by searching Heiric’s homilies in the online Corpus Christianorum for *paenit*³. The homilies that include a form of this word are: I:28, 29, 31, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 48, 52, 53, 54, 63, 64 and II:1. Compare this percentage to the period of Advent (3/11, 27.2%).
attention during Lent than at any other time, he also used the pulpit to discuss penitence twenty-three times in the seventy-six homilies that survive from the rest of the liturgical year (30.1%), underscoring the importance of this aspect of Carolingian religious culture.

Heiric’s concern with the forgiveness of sins is not surprising, for the ninth century occupies an important place in the history of penance. According to an earlier narrative, one in which the Carolingian episcopate plays a central role, ninth-century bishops attempted to reinstate an older form of “public” penance in place of the auricular “private” system inspired and instituted by Celtic monasticism. Modern scholars writing on this subject often divided themselves along confessional lines, with Protestants attacking the “abuses” of the medieval church, which resulted in Catholics launching a vigorous defense. Beginning in the 1980s, this construct wilted under considerable pressure. Scholars of penitential literature sought to rescue the texts that structured the penitential process from the opprobrium heaped upon them by the confessional excesses of early-twentieth century scholarship. Some historians questioned

---

the notion that public penance experienced a decline, while others, most prominently Mayke de Jong, took on the narrative in its entirety. As they questioned the established position, scholars of medieval penance concentrated their efforts on studies focused on either a restricted chronological range or a particular set of sources rather than searching for a new, comprehensive narrative to replace the old.⁶

After nearly three decades of revision to the older narrative, the scholarship on penance underwent two significant recent developments. The first was the appearance

of *A New History of Penance*, a collection of essays edited by Abigail Firey that sought to take stock of the state of the literature on penance after decades of revisionist efforts. The contributions to this volume range well beyond the Early Middle Ages, but contained therein is an excellent summary of the historiography of early medieval penitential practice, authored by Rob Meens. He grounds this erudite investigation in the work of those scholars who studied penitential texts, but addresses the public and private aspects of the penitential system as well. Meens calls for closer study of the manuscripts that contain penitential texts in order to understand their cultural significance. He ends his essay by asking specifically for studies of penance to move into the realm of cultural history, concluding that “the role of penance in society at large is still unclear, particularly as far as its importance in the early Middle Ages is concerned.”

Other scholars have sought to address the connection between what might be called a penitential mentality and other aspects of Carolingian society, specifically political culture. Mayke de Jong and Courtney Booker each recently published monograph-length studies of the public penance undergone by Louis the Pious in 833. Their books differ in style, approach and conclusions about Carolingian politics (and

---


8 Ibid., 94.

history), but both underscore the place that penitence occupied in ninth-century society outside of its strictly liturgical context.

In this chapter I seek to add to the cultural aspect of the study of penance not by investigating politics but monastic religious culture. My approach is textual, but my texts are not the penitentials used by priests and bishops (the kind of manuscript evidence used by Meens and others) but instead the homilies written by Heiric of Auxerre for his brethren. In authoring these texts, Heiric naturally drew upon the work of patristic authors as well as his Carolingian near contemporaries; but he did not always depend on others to generate thoughts for him. Of the homiletic material excerpted for this chapter, Heiric borrowed from an identifiable source on twenty-two occasions, or 35% of the time.10 Where he did rely on earlier work, Heiric depended on a limited number of authors: Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great and Bede formed a patristic core, supplemented by the Carolingian luminaries Alcuin (although here only once), Hrabanus Maurus and Haimo of Auxerre. These last two are not surprising, for Haimo was Heiric’s teacher at Saint-Germain and, along with Hrabanus represented “the two most prolific scholars of the Carolingian age.”11 Additionally, Heiric was

10 This count (22/63) includes multiple borrowings for one quote (e.g. notes 23 and 35). I take the following approach to the material: 1) where Heiric adhered closely to his source, or made changes that do not alter the meaning of the original (in particular with respect to penance) I merely indicate the source in the notes and provide Heiric’s text; 2) where Heiric changed substantively the original text with respect to penance or emotional vocabulary, I discuss those changes in the body of the chapter while providing the Latin text for Heiric’s homily and his source; 3) for the remainder of the material, for which no direct source exists, I cite only Heiric.

familiar with anonymous homilies now labeled (following Barré) as those of “pseudo-Haimo.”

Other homilies, both patristic and Carolingian, served as source material for Heiric’s own efforts, but so too did commentaries on the Gospel texts from which the pericope for the day’s reading was taken. This is not surprising, since homilies and commentaries occupy points along the same line of exegetical interpretation of biblical texts. Indeed, on at least one occasion (see note 24) Heiric spoke of the importance of forgiveness between brothers by combining Jerome’s exegetical treatment of the Gospel according to Matthew with one of the pseudo-Haimonian homilies and his own interpretation of Matthew 18:18, the biblical passage for the third day after the third Sunday in Lent. Nonetheless, Heiric did not rely equally on these two types of sources. He found more in the commentaries of Bede and Jerome than in their homilies, for example. This was not the case for Heiric’s use of his teacher’s work; the material that pertained to penance in Heiric’s homilies came from the same genre of Haimo’s work, rather than from his commentaries.

Among the fathers with whom Heiric was familiar, Bede stood out as the most useful when discussing penitence, in particular his commentary on Luke. This was due

12 Not all of the homilies assigned to Haimo by Migne are authentic. The authoritative discussion on this topic is Barré, Les Homéliaires Carolingiens de l’École d’Auxerre, 49-70, with a table of spurious homilies (and, where known, their actual authors) on 51.

13 For a detailed explanation of the dynamic between homilies and commentaries, see Eric Jay Del Giacco, “Exegesis and Sermon: A Comparison of Bede’s Commentary and Homilies on Luke,” Medieval Sermon Studies 50 (2006): 9-29. Heiric used a small part of one of Bede’s Lucan homilies but relied more often on his commentary.
in part to the passages assigned to particular days of the liturgical cycle; apparently Heiric thought the text of Luke lent itself more strongly to discussions of penance than others. But the vagaries of readings only partially explains the affinity that Heiric felt for the work of the monk of Jarrow. Heiric’s overriding concern, seen in Chapter One as well as in this chapter, was to help his brethren reform their lives. In this he matched purposes with Bede, who used exegesis to explore “the core meanings of the Scriptures for the edification and development and maintaining of the spiritual life and, in its later stages especially, for the reformation of the individual and the Church.”¹⁴ Bede’s approach to the interpretation of Scripture also attracted Heiric. Bede’s somewhat famous disdain (echoed by Bishop Acca, at whose request Bede composed most of his exegetical work) for the intellectual capacity of the newly-converted English people led him to attempt to make quotidian the more erudite contributions of his patristic sources; Ambrose’s commentary on Luke certainly falls into the latter category.¹⁵ Bede’s more straightforward exposition and prose served well Heiric’s homiletic purposes.

Bede’s approach to biblical exegesis made his commentaries useful to Heiric, but the same is not true for the themes that mattered most to the Northumbrian.¹⁶ Bede’s

---

¹⁴ George Hardin Brown, *A Companion to Bede* Anglo-Saxon Studies 12 (Woodbridge, England: The Boydell Press, 2009), 34. Begun in 709 but not finished until 716, the commentary on Luke cannot be properly characterized as part of Bede’s “early” or “later” work.


¹⁶ For a brief overview of these themes, see Holder, “Bede and the New Testament,” 149-154. Holder lists as the most important themes across all of Bede’s writing as: “the primitive church,”
occupation with combating heretics, a major theme of his Luke commentary, does not appear in Heiric’s discussion of penance, although perhaps when the former spoke of a “corrupted mind” (mente vitiata) he meant those who held heretical beliefs. Concern over divergent beliefs suffused Bede’s commentary on Luke because of his poor opinion of the ability of the English to resist the influence of heretical beliefs and because he worked at a time of active conflict between interpretations of the Christian faith. Neither of these contexts applied to late-ninth century central Francia, and therefore to Heiric as he composed his homilies.

Heiric used patristic and Carolingian sources somewhat sparingly, and when he did he most often merged their prose with his, instead of lifting long passages in their entirety. In following this approach to his sources, Heiric matched that of his teacher more than Hrabanus, his other important Carolingian source. Haimo “deftly wove his authorities together” while Hrabanus “was more apt to present his sources in great blocks of text, one excerpt following hard upon another.” Even when Heiric took a

“|Apostles, pastors and teachers,” “miracles,” “action and contemplation,” and “True law of history.”|

17 Brown, Bede the Venerable, 60-61. See page 78-79 of this chapter for a discussion of this change. The absence of heresy here is not terribly surprising, since it would be unlikely that heresy would be one of Heiric’s concerns when thinking about the sinful behavior of his fellow monks. This is one of the passages that Heiric changed.


19 Contreni, “Haimo of Auxerre’s Commentary on Ezehiel,” 231. For Haimo, see also Johannes Heil, “Haimo’s Commentary on Paul. Sources, Methods and Theology,” in Études d’Exégèse Carolingienne: Autour d’Haimon d’Auxerre, 103-121, especially 106-108 for a similar comparison of Haimo and Hrabanus and, for a more considered investigation of these two, Idem, “Laborers in
passage word-for-word from a source, he did not refer to the original author. The exception to this is found on page 72 of this chapter, where Heiric indicated that his discussion of the “angelic” nature of John the Baptist differed from Origen’s, whom he named as he criticized.

In the end, while Heiric at times used small parts of texts authored by others when composing his homilies, the result was neither Augustinian nor Bedean nor even Haimoian. He adapted the messages contained in his sources to his own concerns; in this case, he connected emotions to penitence that reflected the combination of the sources that he read and his own thoughts about sin and forgiveness. My goal for this chapter is to explicate the specifics of these connections – both the emotions he thought they should feel as well as those he advised them to avoid – that Heiric communicated to those monks who sought absolution for their misdeeds; for with perhaps the major feast days excepted, his fellow monks made up the audience for his homilies. Heiric spoke both of the formal, liturgical penance performed by the secular clergy (although he did not mention the public/private distinction that has preoccupied scholars) as well as an informal system of penitence more appropriate for a monastic setting. Heiric admonished his brethren always to avoid feeling hatred, envy and pride and he encouraged them to feel instead hope and love. Anger and fear occupied an ambiguous position in the affective cluster that he believed surrounded penance. Penitents also

the Lord’s Quarry: Carolingian Exegetes, Patristic Authority, and Theological Innovation, a Case Study in the Representation of Jews in Commentaries on Paul,” in The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era, 75-95.
inspired divine emotions, either kindness and love or anger, depending on whether or not they properly expiated their sins.

*Ligare non timeant: Penance and the Secular Clergy*

Even though he was a monk, Heiric did address the role that the secular clergy played in penitential activity in his homilies. He spoke of two related issues: the diligence with which priests carried out their office and the appropriateness of the penances that they levied as they did so. He talked about emotions as well. He emphasized the merciful nature of penance and stressed the importance for both the penitent and the confessor of experiencing either the presence or absence of fear as appropriate. As with the majority of the penitential content of his homilies, he did so on days that fell within the Lenten season. The exception to this was his homily for the Nativity of St. Peter, which fell during in Ordinary Time (after Pentecost but before Advent).

The biblical text for the mass for the nativity of St. Peter came from chapter 16 of Matthew’s Gospel. Verse 19 of this chapter contained a justification for clerical authority over sinners: the bestowing of the power of binding and loosing to Peter by Jesus. For Heiric, this was an opportunity to reflect on the responsibility that came with such power. The ability to bind and loose sins, he said, was “indeed an extraordinary honor; but heavy is the weight of that honor.” The gravity of the responsibility that lay upon

---

20 Matthew 16:19: *And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.*

21 Heiric, II:7, 55: “honor quidem eximius, sed graue est istius honoris pondus.”
bishops and priests made it imperative that they perform their office appropriately.

According to Heiric, fear – an emotion that should be avoided or felt depending on the circumstances – was part of clerical performance during the administration of the sacrament.

Depending on what caused it, being able to avoid fear exerted a positive or negative influence on the secular clergy’s performance of penance. Under the proper circumstances, the absence of fear led to a beneficial result. Heiric claimed that “if the priests might see someone remaining in the filth of luxury or the rest of the vices they should not fear to bind [one] of this kind [of sinner].” At other times, however, priests did not fear when (by implication) they should. “Today there are some,” Heiric complained during the mass for the Octave of Easter, “serving here with improper discretion, [who] do not fear to bind or loose some according to their own whims.” The absence of fear was particularly dangerous when combined with the presence of hatred.

Towards the end of the same homily for the Octave of Easter he warned those listening that there were many incompetent (multi inepti) priests. Among their faults, these priests did not perform penance properly; they “often behave contrary to divine law, because of hostility, binding the innocent and presuming to absolve those who are guilty.”

22 Ibid., 54-55: “si quem uiderint sacerdotes in caeno luxuriae uel in caeteris uitiis manere huiusmodi ligare non timeant.”

23 Ibid., 54: “Sed sunt nonulli qui hoc non iusta discretione seruantes, secundum proprium libitum nonnullos ligare uel soluere non uerentur.”

24 Ibid., 55: “saepius contra ius diuinum agunt, ligantes innoxios, et eos qui culpabiles sunt e diueros absoluere praesumentes.”
hostility had an emotional origin. “Roused by hatred,” Heiric explained, “they do not hesitate to condemn close neighbors, however innocent, [and] having been influenced by flattery they do not fear in turn to pronounce another neighbor just, however wicked, however criminal.”

The consequences of failing live up to Heiric’s expectations for fear and hatred fell squarely on the clergy. Those who did not adhere to emotional orientation appropriate to penitence, “rightly are deprived from the deserved reward, since they did not fear to do this in an improper manner.” Those who performed their duties properly followed a different emotional orientation. Rather than not fearing when they should while at the same time feeling hatred, he expected good pastors (those who also did not fear, but in the right way) to treat those under their charge with mercy and kindness. On two separate occasions, once on the feast commemorating St. Peter’s birth and once during Lent, he emphasized the importance of correcting sinners, but of doing so moderately.

Heiric insisted that the judgments handed down by the secular clergy in the form of penances be fair. In his homily for the nativity of St. Peter, he urged that “judicial severity should be weighed fairly with great vigilance and great devotion by

---

25 Ibid.: “stimulati odio, subiectum proximum damnare non dubitant quamlibet innocentem; rursum permoti assentatione aliqua subiectorum, quantumlibet iniquos quantumlibet sceleratos iustos pronuntiare non metuunt.”

26 Ibid., 54: “dum hoc ordine peruerso agere non timent, ipsi dono accepto merito priuantur.”
the shepherds of the holy church.” In another homily, one for the third feria of Lent (feria iii in Quadragesima), he addressed this theme but also provided more detail. His concern in this second homily was that priests not impose penances so severe that they were impossible to fulfill. Expounding on the burdens referenced in Matthew 23:4 (For they bind heavy and insupportable burdens, and lay them on men’s shoulders), Heiric explained to those with pastoral responsibilities that:

indeed if you will place a bundle of firewood on the shoulders of someone who is not strong enough to carry it then it follows that either the bundle falls off of him or he is crushed under the weight. Thus for the man on whom is placed an oppressive weight of pence, it is necessary that either he will reject the penance or, undertaking it while not strong enough to bear [it], having been made to falter he will sin worse.28

He reassured those concerned about being too lenient that “it is better to be judged by God for mercy than condemned for cruelty. Indeed,” he continued, “he who wishes to acquire holiness should be severe concerning his own life, kind concerning others.”29

Both of these passages originated in the commentary on Matthew written by Hrabanus Maurus, another (albeit earlier) Carolingian exegete. Hrabanus, however, only argued

27 Idem, II:23, 218: “Magna ergo uigilantia magnoque studio sanctis ecclesiae pastoribus haec iudiciaria seueritas aeque libranda est.”

28 Idem, I:37, 323: “Si enim fascem lignorum super humeros alicuius qui ferre non ualet posueris, necesse habet ut aut fascem a se reiciat, aut sub pondere ruat; sic et homini cui graue pondus paenitentiae imponitur, necesse est ut aut paenitentiam reiciat, aut suscipliens dum ferre non ualet scandalizatus amplius peccet.” With slight modifications to the vocabulary (e.g. ruat for confringatur), Heiric took this passage from Hrabanus Maurus’ commentary on the book of Matthew, written most likely between 815 and 820. Hrabanus Maurus, Expositio in Mattheum, ed. B. Löffstedt CCCM 174A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 592.

29 Heiric, I:37, 323: “melius est tamen de misericordia a Deo iudicari quam de crudelitate condemnari; qui enim uult apparere sanctus, circa uitam suam debet esse austerus, circa aliorum benignus.”
that it was better “to give a reckoning [i.e. a penance] out of mercy instead of out of cruelty.”

Unlike his earlier contemporary, Heiric thought of the souls of both the penitent, who must be able to perform the penance assigned, and the priest, who must fulfill his office appropriately in order to avoid God’s negative judgment.

Heiric communicated specific emotional expectations for those members of the secular clergy engaged in penitential activity. Some should fear but did not; moreover, their interaction with their flock was motivated improperly by hatred. He counseled others not to fear to impose penances, and encouraged this group to be merciful and kind as they levied sentences upon their charges. But Heiric did not reserve the identification and rectification of inappropriate behaviors using the rhetoric of forgiveness to the secular clergy alone. He believed that the general charge to bind and loose sins found in Matthew 18:18 (*Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven*) applied to monks as well. While he acknowledged that “in another [gospel] the Lord gave to blessed Peter the power of binding and loosing,” Heiric argued that “certainly through Peter (who represents the church) there is no doubt that it had been conceded to all of the faithful.” Heiric did not mean the laity, but the other part of “the church,” the regular clergy, for whom the power of forgiveness

---

30 Hrabanus Maurus, 592: “propter misericordiam dare rationem quam propter crudelitatem.”

31 Heiric, I:44, 399: “dominus alibi beato Petro hanc potestatem ligandi atque soluendi dedit, utique in Petro qui typum gerebat ecclesiae, omnibus fidelibus hoc concessisse non dubitatur.”
(dimmitendi) was not just “a power that is given; nay, it is thrust upon us by necessity.

We should know our debts, which will not be forgiven unless we forgive our debtors.”

**Ad spem ueniae peccatorum: Forgiveness between Brothers**

Heiric did not argue that he and his brethren at Saint-Germain should participate in the same kind of liturgical penitential activities as the secular clergy.

Nonetheless, he believed that the generalized power of binding and loosing authorized by the Gospel according to Matthew, coupled with his typological interpretation of Peter, allowed for a particular kind of penitence, one reserved for a monastic context.

This penance was other-directed; monks were to live lives holy enough to inspire others to do the same while at the same time they bore the responsibility of correcting those whose lives failed to measure up. Heiric’s monastic mechanism for the forgiveness of sins centered on the experience of love, an emotion that led to shame, which in turn led to hope, specifically the hope of forgiveness.

In John the Baptist Heiric found a biblical figure around whom he was able to develop his thoughts about the impact that living properly had on others. The biblical texts read at mass during Advent told John’s story, specifically his message of repentance. On the third Sunday of Advent, Heiric emphasized Matthew’s description

---

32 Ibid., 397: “conceditur potestas, immo ingeritur necessitas, quia aliter nobis nostra sciamus debita non relaxari nisi et nos debitoribus nostris dimiserimus.” Here Heiric draws from two earlier sources: 1) Jerome’s commentary on Matthew, Hieronymus, *Commentarii in evangeliun Matthaei*, ed. D. Hurst and M. Adriaen CCSL 77 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1967), 161; and 2) a homily attributed to “pseudo-Haimo.” For the latter, see Haimo of Auxerre, *Homiliarum sive concionum ad pleben in evangelia de tempore et sanctis*, PL 118, 266. While he based his ideas in this homily about the necessity of forgiveness between brothers on these texts, the connection back to the biblical story of Jesus’s conversation with Peter does not appear in either source.
of the roughness of John’s clothing and the meagerness of his diet, which he compared
to the coarse fabrics and fasting that would have been familiar to his audience as part of
the penitential process. John’s lifestyle reinforced his message for, as Heiric explained,
“because he preached penitence to the people, he first exhibited the same penitence in
diet and in dress.”\textsuperscript{33} On the following Sunday, the biblical text shifted to the Gospel
according to John, but for Heiric the message was the same: “it was proper,” he
reminded his audience, “that he who gave penance to others himself also assumed the
trappings of a penitent.”\textsuperscript{34}

In his role as a preacher, John could be “called an angel, not by sameness of
cracter (as Origin thought, who imagined John the Baptist, Malachi and Haggai to
have been angels in nature) but by dignity of office, because angel in Greek is called
\textit{nuntius} in Latin.”\textsuperscript{35} Heiric went on to explain that priests also could merit the title of
“angel” but, remarkably, so too could ordinary Christians. In so doing he drew, loosely,
on a homily written by his teacher Haimo for the same day (the third Sunday of
Advent). Just as John did, Heiric exhorted, everyone could urge others to penance, and
thereby “each one of the faithful, whether a layman or a woman, receives the dignity of
this name [angel], insofar as divine grace inspires him he recalls his neighbor from

\textsuperscript{33} Heiric, I:3, 32: “Quia enim paenitentiam populis praedicabat, ipse primum eandem
paenitentiam et in uictu et in habitu praetendebat.”

\textsuperscript{34} Idem, I:4, 35: “Dignum enim erat ut qui aliis paenitentiam indicebat, ipse quoque habitum
paenitentis assumeret.”

\textsuperscript{35} Idem, I:3, 33: “Iohannes angelus dicitur, non naturae societate – sicut Origenes arbitrus est,
qui Iohannem Baptistam, Malachiam quoque et Aggaeum naturaliter angelos exstitisse opinatus
est – sed officii dignitate angelus dicitur, quia angelus grece latine nuntius uocatur.”
depravity, if he strives to encourage [them] to work well.”36 Here the student extended the message of his teacher; Haimo compared only the “faithful laity” (fideles laici) to the actions of angels, but Heiric specifically mentioned women. Haimo’s message was specifically directed to those who “will preach to their brothers” (ad fratribus annuntiaverint). Women did not do this, but Heiric’s instruction was not about preaching specifically but about encouraging others to amend their lives, which allowed for the potential of lay activity.37

Inspiring others through the quality of one’s own life was not the only way that Heiric thought his brethren could exert a positive influence on their fellow monks; actively correcting the faults of others was just as important. During both Lent and Pentecost he encouraged the other members of the monastic community at Saint-Germain not only to actively seek to improve each others’ lives but also to acknowledge their own faults and to repair any relationships that had become frayed. This reciprocal penitence resulted in forgiveness. It also restructured the emotional orientation of those involved. Heiric charged his audience to abandon feelings of hatred, envy and pride and (in most cases) anger. And while in some cases he allowed that anger could inspire this kind of penitence, overall Heiric described both correction and forgiveness as acts of love.

36 Ibid., 34: “unusquisque fidelium siue laicus siue femina huius nominis dignitatem accipit, si in quantum ei gratia superna inspirat a prauitate proximum reuocat, si exhortari ad bene operandum curat.”

37 See Haimo, Homiliarum sive concionum, 118, 31: “Et non solum sacerdotes, sed etiam fideles laici, si juxta modulum scientiae suae bonum quod noverunt, fratribus annuntiaverint, ad angelorum consortium pertinebunt.”
The instruction and correction of others was not just a requirement for those monks who wanted to live a charitable and pious life; Heiric thought that it was also a pleasurable experience for those who undertook it. He offered a spiritual interpretation of Christ’s warning to those who did not nourish the hungry and thirsty.\(^{38}\) For those of his brethren who understood the spiritual meaning of this passage as he did, Heiric claimed, “we are able to find something pleasing in the performance of charity, because charity should be exhibited not only towards the flesh of brothers about to die but truly always much more towards the living soul.”\(^{39}\) He specified the nature of this charity by telling his fellow monks that they should nourish each other with the “bread of the word” and the “water of wisdom”\(^{40}\) and also by connecting it directly to penance. One who “revives by sacred rebuke and who recalls into the sacred church through penance someone straying from the way of truth truly does works of piety.”\(^{41}\)

The generally pleasurable experience of charity, achieved through penitential activity, rested on the foundation of the presence or absence specific emotions. Although Heiric usually cautioned monks to avoid anger, his homilies contained a certain ambiguity about the usefulness of that emotion in a penitential context as well. In his

---

\(^{38}\) Found in Matthew 25:42: *For I was hungry and you gave me not to eat; I was thirsty and you gave me not to drink.*

\(^{39}\) Heiric, I:29, 245-246: “Verum si haec spiritualiter acceperimus, gratius aliquid in impletione caritatis intellegere poterimus, quia caritas non solum circa fratris carnem quandoque morituram, urum multo magis circa animam semper uicturam est exhibenda.”

\(^{40}\) Ibid., 246: “pane verbi...aqua sapientiae.”

\(^{41}\) Ibid.: ”qui errantem a uia ueritatis sacra ammonitione reuocat et per paenitentiam in domum sanctae ecclesiae recipit, pietatis opera uericiter agit.”
homily for Holy Thursday (*in cena domini*) he insisted, however, that those who desired to participate in the correction of their brethren must ensure that they were completely free of envy and hatred. The context of the preaching of this homily was penitential; Holy Thursday was an important moment in the reconciliation of those undergoing public penance (although Heiric does not reference this specifically). The pericope around which he structured his homily, moreover, contains the Lord’s Prayer and specifically refers to the forgiveness of others’ transgressions. Heiric explained that the petition found in the Lord’s Prayer to *forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors* enjoined upon the monastic community the responsibility “to purify our consciences from all impurity of body and spirit, lest desire certainly might corrupt our body, [and] the flames of envy and hatred might burn [our] spirit.”

In the homily for Holy Thursday Heiric paired envy and hatred as undesirable emotions. Usually, however, he spoke of hatred and anger together. Generally, he considered both undesirable, but as he parsed the distinction between the two emotions he allowed for a specific, beneficial use of anger: it could spur his brethren to repair their frayed relationships. The reading from Chapter six of the Gospel according to Luke, heard at mass on the fourth Sunday after the Octave of Pentecost, spoke directly (*Forgive, and you shall be forgiven*) and allegorically of sin and forgiveness.\(^43\) For Heiric,

\(^{42}\) Idem, I:64, 638: “emundare conscientias nostras ab omni inquinamento carnis ac spiritus, ne uidelicet corpus nostrum libido inficiat, spiritum uero inuidiae et odii flamma adurat.”

\(^{43}\) Luke 6:37-42: _And he spoke also to them a similitude: Can the blind lead the blind? do they not both fall into the ditch? The disciple is not above his master: but every one shall be perfect, if he be as his master._

_And why seest thou the mote in thy brother’s eye: but the beam that is in thy own eye thou considerest not?_
the meaning of the “mote” and “beam” mentioned in the biblical text was an emotional one. He offered a lengthy allegorical interpretation of verse 42 (Or how canst thou say to thy brother: Brother, let me pull the mote out of thy eye, when thou thyself seest not the beam in thy own eye?), explaining that:

Here the eye is called the intention of the heart and the discrimination of the mind. A mote is anger, excited by an unexpected impulse of the soul. The beam means hatred, which is anger long held in the heart, like a tree nourished by plentiful rain. And the difference between hatred and anger is as great as the difference between the size of a beam and the smallness of a mote; indeed, hatred is inveterate anger, while anger is a sudden perturbation of the soul, which sometimes proves useful.44

This long passage exemplifies the approach that Heiric took to his sources; in it, he added language from Hrabanus Maurus and Bede to a homily preached by Haimo. In Heiric’s definition of oculus Quadri, his modern editor, saw a connection to a discussion of the relationship between penance and blindness in Hrabanus Maurus’ discussion of the same biblical verse that served as the pericope for this day’s mass (although not the same verse). Hrabanus wrote that a priest, by assigning penance, metaphorically led the “blind” sinner “to the light with a serene heart” (corde sereno...ad lumen).45 After defining

---

44 Heiric, II:20, 188: “Oculus hoc in loco intentio cordis et mentis perspicacitas appellatur; festuca uero est ira repentino animi impulsu excitata; trabes autem intellegitur odium, hoc est ira, longa meditatione cordis quasi assiduis arbor pluuiis enutrita. Quantumque distat inter trabis magnitudinem et festucae gracilitatem, quasi tantum interest inter iram et odium: odium enim est ira inueterata, ira uero subita animi perturbation quae nonnumquam etiam utilis esse probatur."

45 Hrabanus Maurus, Homilia C, PL 110: 335: “quia caecum vidente oculo, hoc est, corde sereno ducere curabas ad lumen.”
“eye” through this loose connection to Hrabanus, Heiric turned back to Haimo for inspiration. He more loyally followed his teacher’s discussion of the identification of the emotions of anger and hatred with the mote and beam, respectively, mentioned in the biblical passage. As seen above, however, his formulation is more expansive than Haimo’s terse prose, in which he explains that “sudden anger is a mote; by enduring, however, it becomes a beam.” Not only did the student extend the language of his master in terms of the emotional vocabulary that he employed but, by drawing upon another meaning (to become rooted) of the verb *invetero*, he added a botanical metaphor as well.

Finally, to conclude the passage cited above, Heiric drew a distinction between hatred and anger based on a homily on Luke’s Gospel written by Bede. But where the monk of Jarrow ended by saying only that because of its temporal aspect, hatred “deserved to be called a ‘beam’,” Heiric pointed instead to the potential utility of anger. Penance was the theme that linked these three sources. Penance provided the scenario in which Heiric believed that anger could be useful, and also a context in which hatred must be avoided. “If,” Heiric continued, “we get angry with someone, we want to correct him, yet it never happens that we desire to correct or make better someone

---

46 Haimo, *Homiliarum sive concionum*, 621: “Ira subitanea, festuca est; inveterata autem, trabes efficitur.”

47 Bede, *In Lucae euangelium expositio*, CCCM 120, 158: “merito appelletur trabes.”
whom we hate.” 48 Indeed, he explained, “it is impossible not to be angry, because
natural man is prone to anger; whence we are permitted by apostolic indulgence to be
angry.” 49 In this view of “natural man” (homo natura) Heiric left behind his sources
entirely; neither Bede nor Hrabanus nor Haimo thought that people were “prone to
anger” naturally. But even as he allowed for penitents to feel anger in the service of the
correction of others, Heiric cautioned that “he who bears a beam in his eye is not able to
remove a mote from the eye of a brother, because no one is able to correct someone with
anger who hides hatred in [his] mind.” 50

This discussion of anger must be read in the context of Heiric’s thoughts about
baptism, described in Chapter One. He described catechumens as “sons of anger,”
meaning perhaps that they were not angry themselves. But here, the relationship of
people to anger is clear. Individuals, Heiric believed, were prone to anger by nature.
Baptism may have severed their connection to anger, but just as baptism removed
original sin but not the capacity to sin afterward, this rupture with anger was not
permanent. Moreover, only in this one context – a brief state of anger intended to correct
the sinful behavior of a fellow monk – should anger properly be felt. At any other time,

48 Heiric, II:20, 188: “Potest namque fieri ut si irascamur homini, uelimus eum corrigi, numquam
autem fieri potest ut eum quem odimus corrigi aut meliorari cupiamus.”

49 Ibid.: “non irasci impossibile est, quia irascibilis est homo natura; unde et irasci indulgentia
permittimur apostolica.” Here Heiric used the word natura, but he could be referring to the
commonly held early medieval view of the three parts of the human soul (rationalis,
concupiscibilis, irascibilis).

50 Ibid.: “Non ergo potest, sicut praemissum est, festucam educere e fratri oculo qui suo in oculo
trabem gestat, quia nemo aliquem ab ira potest corrigere qui odium celat in mente.”
however, Heiric found anger as unacceptable as did Bede, who provided the source (but not the exact language) for the monk of Saint-Germain’s explanation of Luke 6:39 (*Can the blind lead the blind? Do they not both fall into the ditch?*). This verse, Heiric said, instructed that “mercy be given to sinners, and [their] offenses be forgiven, as if he [Christ] said: if anger blinded you against [your] enemies, or greed closed you off against those who sought charity from you, is it possible to amend his fault by exhortation, when even your fettered mind is held by the same vice?”51 Some of the changes that Heiric made to Bede’s text were minor, such as collapsing the object of blindness from the Venerable monk’s “violence and blatant greed”52 into the more inclusive category of “enemies” (*inimicum*). Some, however, were more significant. The expanded reference to greed that Heiric inserted into his description of Christ’s instruction has no parallel in the Bedean text that served as his source, for example, and Bede simply referred to someone “with a corrupted mind” (*mente uitiata*) instead. Heiric’s more active description of one “held” (*teneatur*) and “bound” (*obstricta*) by vice. The overall theme of the passage, that one must correct one’s own faults before attempting to correct the faults of others, matches that of Bede, but Heiric did not simply repeat Bede’s language to communicate that message.

51 Ibid., 186: “elemosina tribui et peccantibus offensa remitti, ac si dicat: si te contra inimicum ira caecauerit, aut contra illum qui a te elemosinam petit avaritia obduxerit, numquid eius uitium exhortando curare poteris, praesertim cum et tua mens eodem uitio teneatur obstricta?”

52 Bede, *In Lucae*, 147: “ira contra uiolentum et contra petentem filargiria caecauerit.”
Pride, along with anger, hatred and envy, also prevented the proper functioning of Heiric’s system of monastic penitence. In order to explain Luke 15:1-2 (*Now the publicans and sinners drew near unto him to hear him. And the Pharisees and the scribes murmured, saying: This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them*), which described the critique of Jesus keeping company with sinners, Heiric turned again to the emotional aspects of penance. He complained of those whose emotional orientation caused them to correct others improperly. Such people “boast of false justice; they exhibit no merciful compassion towards sinners and they believe, if they insult sinners or if they publicly disclose their sins or if they ruin their reputation, that by these [actions] they appear to be just. Yet they do this not from the love of discipline but from the swelling of pride.”

This formulation, in which pride replaced love as the motivation for the correction of others, originated with Gregory the Great, but in Heiric’s hands underwent a slight (but important) modification. The sixth-century pope wrote of correction that proceeded “from a swelling of pride” (*typho superbiae*), but instead of contrasting this with exhortations that sprang “from the love of discipline,” as Heiric did, Gregory credited their origin to the “zeal of discipline” (*zelo disciplinae*), which is not explicitly emotional.

Heiric advised that those who wished to correct their brethren avoid hatred, pride and (most of the time) anger. Instead, they should find their motivation in feelings

---

53 Heiric, II:19, 174: “hi qui de falsa iustitia gloriantur, nulla compassione misericordiae peccantibus condescendunt, et per hoc se iustos apparere exsistimant si peccantibus insultent, si uitia eorum in publicum uocent, si personas eorum et nomina publice dehonestent; faciunt autem hoc non amore disciplinae sed tumore superbiae.”

of love in imitation of God and Jesus. In order to explain the reciprocity described in Luke 6:37-38 (*Forgive, and you shall be forgiven. Give, and it shall be given to you*), Heiric promised that “whoever gives temporal or spiritual good to others with divinely-inspired love, whoever grants forgiveness to those sinning against him just as he desires to obtain mercy from the Lord, here without a doubt he is made an imitator of God.”

Love was, as Heiric described it, an emotional state that motivated penitential activity; and such activity fostered it in turn. Christians, he said, could “bring about the love,” as Jesus commanded in John 13:15 (*that as I have done to you, so you do also*), “when we forgive from the heart the neighbors who have sinned against us; then according to his example we wash [their] feet in turn, when we calmly tolerate the excesses of our neighbors, when indeed we bear patiently the injuries they have inflicted and we mercifully forgive those doing penance.”

Heiric expected this correction and forgiveness to take place primarily between individuals, but allowed for the possibility of the involvement of the entire monastic community. The obstacle that he anticipated would require this extension was an emotional one, specifically the absence of shame in a recalcitrant sinner. On the third day after the third Sunday in Lent, Heiric explained this system. “First,” he said, “he

---

55 Heiric, II:20, 185: “Quisquis etiam bona temporalia uel spiritalia aliis amore diuino largitur, quisquis in se peccantibus indulgentiam tribuit sicut ipse a domino ueniam impetrare desiderat, hic procul dubio imitator Dei efficitur.”

56 Idem, I:64, 638: “Hanc autem dilectionem bene perficimus, cum peccantibus in nos proximis ex corde dimittimus; tunc eius exemplo nobis inuicem pedes lauamus, cum excessus proximorum aequanimiter toleramus, cum etiam ab his irrogatas injurias patienter portamus et paenitentibus misericorditer relaxamus.”
who has sinned against us should be corrected separately lest he believe that which he
did was not a sin and thus, without shame, he desires to persist in sin.”

Heiric recognized, however, that private conversation alone might not lead to behavioral
changes. In order to elicit the shame that he believed prevented sin, he allowed for the
gradual increase of the number of people involved in correction. “When,” he advised,
we rebuke a delinquent brother, if he will not hear us one or two [more] brothers are to be invited, so that he who is not able to be corrected by one might be corrected by many, or indeed convicted by their testimony. If after this he will not hear these [brothers], then we are instructed to speak to the church so that he is judged and despised by all; if he does not want to be corrected by shame at least he might be rebuked by the opprobrium of many.

Monks needed to know that they had offended another member of their community for
the sake of their souls, but also so that all could fully participate in the religious life of
the monastery. Matthew 5:23-24 forbade those who were not reconciled to a brother
whom they had offended or harmed in some way from approaching the altar, that is,
from participating in the Eucharistic celebration. Heiric interpreted this passage
broadly, with “gifts” referring to the liturgical celebration, the good works done by

---

57 Idem, I:44, 397: “Prius tamen corripiendus est qui in nos peccat seorsum, ne putet non esse peccatum quod facit, sicque amissa semel uerecundia in peccato permanere uelit.”

58 Ibid.: “Cum ergo fratrem delinquentem corripimus, si nos non audierit adhibendi sunt fratres unus aut duo, ut qui ab uno non potuit a pluribus corrigatur, uel etiam eorum testimonio conuincatur. Porro si nec illos audierit, tunc ecclesiae dicere praecipimur ut ab omnibus detestetur et diiudicetur, quatinus si noluit pudore corrigi, saltem corrigatur multorum opprobriis.” Heiric’s reliance on shame and opprobrium comes from Jerome. Hieronymus, Commentarii in euangelium Matthaei, 161

59 Matthew 5:23-24: If therefore thou offer thy gift at the altar, and there thou remember that thy brother hath any thing against thee, leave there thy offering before the altar, and go first to be reconciled to thy brother: and then coming thou shalt offer thy gift.
monks and the prayers that they offered to God. This expansive definition made reconciliation between brothers a prerequisite for all aspects of monastic life.

Heiric assigned such importance to this penitential system that he even allowed for it to function when the parties involved could not physically communicate with each other. As he explained to his brethren, if when offering a gift “we will remember [that] we have wounded a brother, if he is near let us proceed bodily to him. But if indeed he is absent, and we are not able to put off for a little while the gift that we want to offer, let us proceed to that one mentally and let us ask [him] for forgiveness with a humble spirit.” Here Heiric drew from Augustine’s homily on the Sermon on the Mount. Augustine’s concern in this part of the homily was twofold: first, to tease out the grammatical sense of the passage in order to argue that the “altar” must be understood spiritually instead of literally; and second to explain the importance of the sincerity on the part of the offerant. While doing the latter, Augustine focuses only on the interiority of the one making the offering; those with whom he might have had a quarrel serve only as a vehicle to focus the sincerity of his willingness to end those divisions. Heiric shortened considerably Augustine’s discussion by leaving out the grammatical explanation entirely. He also changed the focus from the inner condition of the one to the reparation of a rift that had grown between brothers. The emotional motivation for

---

60 Heiric, II:25, 232: “meminerimus nos fratrem laesisse, si quidem prope est debemus ad illum corpore pergere, sin autem absens est et munus quod offerre uolumus diu differre non possumus, pergamus ad illum mente et humili affectu ueniam postulemus.” For Heiric’s source, see Augustine, De sermone Domini in monte, ed. A. Mutzenbecher CCSL 35 (Turnhout, Brepols, 1967), 615-626.
this “virtual” penitence was the same as it was for face-to-face interaction; one sought forgiveness from an absent brother, Heiric explained without the help of Augustine, “with the pious intention of thought and with the most lively affection of love.”

Forgiveness between brothers, both virtual and actual, brought with it a diversity of emotional experiences. Heiric charged his monks to avoid hatred, envy, pride and (most of the time) anger as they sought to improve the lives of their brethren. Instead they should feel love, and they could elicit feelings of shame in an effort to restore harmonious relationships. Penance benefited the entire monastic community, for once they accomplished it, all could freely participate in the exercise of the liturgy, charity and prayer. Heiric’s system also offered an emotional benefit. It led, he promised, “to the hope of the forgiveness of sins.”

Heiric, however, communicated the sense of urgency that he thought came with this hope by following this statement with Jesus’ command (found in Matthew 3:2) to do penance: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.

Agite paenitentiam: The Necessity of Penitence

Whether the type performed by the secular clergy or the non-liturgical forgiveness appropriate to a monastic setting, Heiric argued for the importance of penitential activity in two ways: by highlighting the benefits of doing so and by warning of the consequences of not. Heiric believed that penitence was the product of a emotional orientation, albeit a general one; it was something, he said, that “we

61 Heiric, II:25, 233: “pia intentione cogitationis ac celerrimo affectu dilectionis.”

[Christians] should desire” (cupiamus). But even though penitence was something desirable, the nature of sins presented a significant obstacle. As part of his homily for Quinquagesima Sunday he drew from a homily by Bede on the pericope for the day (a text that the Northumbrian monk himself took from one of Gregory the Great’s homilies) in order to explain the story, related in Luke 18, of the blind man who was chastised by a crowd as he sought Jesus’s mercy. He told his audience that the crowd who rebuked Jesus “signifies the uproar of vices and bodily concerns and the carnal thoughts that, while we desire [them] to be directed to God with penitence and by praying, often run counter to our intentions and our prayers.” The first part of this quote follows the source texts used by Heiric closely, but the second summarizes several sentences. Gregory and Bede concerned themselves specifically with praying, in response to sinful behavior certainly but also as an aspect of devotion generally. Heiric’s recasting is more securely penitential; in none of the material summarized did the either the pontiff of the monk of Jarrow use the word “penitence.” Gregory (and, following him, Bede) referred to the mental disturbance caused by vices and carnal thoughts as

63 Luke 18:39: And they that went before, rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but he cried out much more: Son of David, have mercy on me.

64 Heiric, I:27, 226: “significat carnales cogitationes et tumultus uitiorum curarumque carnalium, quae plerumque dum ad Deum converti paenitendo et orando cupimus, intentioni nostrae occurrunt et orationes nostras.” See Bede, In Lucae, 332: “Quid isti designant qui iesium uenientem praecedunt nisi desideriorum carnalium turbas tumultusque uitiorum qui priusquam Iesus ad cor nostrum ueniat temptationibus suis cogitationem nostram dissipant et uoces cordis in oratione perturbant.” The original, which Bede follows more closely than Heiric, is in Gregory the Great, Homiliae in euangelia, 14: “Quid autem designant isti qui iesium uenientem praecedunt, nisi desideriorum carnalium turbas tumultusque uitiorum, qui prius quam Iesus ad cor nostrum ueniat, tentationibus suis cogitationem nostram dissipant et uoces cordis in oratione perturbant?
“images of the sins that we have committed.”65 The persistence of the blind man in the biblical story served as the key to overcoming the impediment to successful repentance presented by these occurrences. If, Heiric explained, “while praying we suffer such images then according to the example of that blind man we ought to increase [our] prayers until we might gain that which we seek.”66 Here again Heiric adhered to the themes developed by the previous authors upon which his exegesis depended, but he specifically called for his brethren to model their behavior upon the “example” (exemplum) of the blind man, a connection to which Bede and Gregory alluded but never stated as directly as Heiric.

Although the impetus to penitence was the product of a general “desire,” Heiric described the emotional implications of failing to move past internal barriers in more specific terms. Basing his argument on Matthew 21:34-36, a text read on the sixth feria in Quadragesima, he again highlighted the importance of persistence, this time meaning the forbearance of God.67 By repeatedly sending servants to the husbandmen, the owner of the vineyard demonstrated “the patience and endurance of the Lord, who repeatedly directed his servants to evil husbandmen, in order that they [the servants] might exact penance from those gathered together; but those [the husbandmen], despising [him],

65 Ibid.: “phantasmata peccatorum quae fecimus.” This language is exactly the same in Bede’s version.

66 Heiric, I:27, 226: “cum inter orandum talia fantasmata patimur tunc ad exemplum huius caeci magis preces multiplicare debemus, donec impetremus quod petimus.”

67 Matthew 21:34-36: He sent his servants to the husbandmen that they might receive the fruits thereof. And the husbandmen laying hands on his servants, beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. Again he sent other servants more than the former and they did to them in like manner.
stored up anger for themselves on the day of wrath.” Sinners who despised the Lord, who did not exhibit patience in penitence in return for God’s patience, did not suffer immediate emotional consequences. Instead, they ensured that they would be the recipients of divine anger at the Last Judgment.

A few lines later in the same homily, Heiric made sure that everyone listening understood the ramifications of this affective orientation. In doing so, he distinguished between two types of sinners, “those who offend Christ by sinning through fragility or ignorance” and “those who deny Christ through pride.” Heiric followed an anonymous homily on Matthew (once thought to be Haimo’s) in distinguishing between two types of sinners, but he did not slavishly copy his exemplar. The original author, for example, claimed only that the second type of sinners denied Christ; Heiric added that they did so “through pride” (per superbiam). Christ ended the parable of the husbandman with a metaphor for the final judgment, which Heiric applied to these two types of sinners. When judging a prideful sinner, he said, God “will dash those stones upon him and thus crush that one with an eternal death, so that not even a shard

---

68 Heiric, I:40, 351: “patientia et sustentatio domini, qui crebro seruos suos ad malos colonos direxit, quatinus ab illis conuenti paenitentiam agerent, sed illi contemnentes iram sibi in die irae thesaurizauerunt.”

69 Ibid., 355: “eum qui per fragilitatem aut ignorantiam peccando offendit Christum, et eum qui per superbiam negat Christum.”

70 Haimo (Pseudo-Haimo), Homiliarum sive concionum, 246: “Quicunque enim Christum negaverit.” This homily on Matthew is credited to Haimo in the PL, but Barré claims it is not authentically Haimonian, although he was not able to identify the author. Barré, 51.

71 Matthew 21:44: And whosoever shall fall on this stone, shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it shall grind him to powder.
might remain in which a small amount of water might be drawn up from a well.”

For the other type of sinner, however, Heiric had a different message. The ignorant or fragile sinner “falls upon the stones and is shattered but not entirely destroyed, because he is spared by penance.” Here too, Heiric adapted his original text. Where before he added an affective reference (pride) in this case he removed one, hope. The text from which he worked acknowledged that the second type of sinner, the one with the potential to be saved, had “the hope of mercy through penance.” For Heiric, this hope was misplaced, and he spoke instead of being “spared” by penance.

In this case, downplaying the hopeful aspect of the original text served Heiric’s admonitory purpose. Heiric encouraged those who sought to be spared in this manner not to delay their penitential activities as he expanded upon John 9:4 (the night cometh, when no man can work). Heiric explained to the monks gathered on the fourth feria after the fourth Sunday in Quadragesima just what Christ meant by “night” in terms of the performance of penance. To do so, he based his explanation on Alcuin’s commentary on the Gospel according to John, although he recast the Northumbrian deacon’s

---

72 Heiric, I:40, 355: “irruet super illum lapis iste et ita conteret eum aeterno interitu, ut ne testa quidem remaneat in qua parum aquae de fouea hauriatur.” Here Heiric alluded to his description of people as vessels (vassae), described in Chapter One, a metaphor found in the Pseudo-Haimonian text upon which Heiric drew for this section of his homily. Haimo (Pseudo-Haimo), Homiliarum sive concionum, 246: “ut non remaneat ex eo testa, unde aqua hauriri possit.”

73 Ibid.: “super lapidem cadit et confringitur sed non omnino conteritur, quia reseruatur ad paenitentiam.”

74 Haimo (Pseudo-Haimo), Homiliarum sive concionum, 246: “spem tamen veniae per poenitentiam.”
interpretation to suit his own purposes. The overall thrust of Heiric’s analysis of John 9:4 is the same as Alcuin’s: that one must perform good works while one can, for at a certain point it will be too late. Whereas Alcuin focused on the ultimate consequences of not working well while alive, Heiric spoke specifically in penitential terms. “This will be night,” he said, “since no place of penance, no opportunity for pardon will remain for all the reprobate found guilty.” Heiric’s warning to his brethren contained a measure of urgency for, once this night had fallen, “once the [heavenly] door has been closed, work is in vain and repentance too late.”

Heiric reinforced this message in his homily for the next day by underscoring the unpredictability of death. He relied on a well-known Christian metaphor of death as a thief, which when it comes “carries off the unknowing and unexpecting soul, and thus we are carried off to judgment guilty and unprepared.” His warning again juxtaposed divine patience with earthly pride. Chastising his brethren, he reminded them that “truly we squander his goodwill and patience in pride; and thus we live secure, as if God either might not see or, having seen, mercifully might forgive our evil [deeds].”

---

76 Heiric, I:52, 483: “nox ista erit, quando damnatis omnibus reprobis nullus iam locus paenitentiae, nulla facultas ueniae restabit.” Nowhere in Alcuin’s discussion of John 9:4 does he use the word *paenitentia*.  
77 Ibid., 484: “clauso ostio, uanus labor est et sera paenitudo.” This formulation also does not appear in Alcuin’s original.  
78 Heiric, I:53, 504: “animam nescientem et improuidam aufert, sicque rapimur ad iudicium rei et imparati.”  
79 Ibid.: “Nos uero eius bonitate et longanimitate in superbiam abutimur, et sic securi uiuimus tamquam mala nostra Deus aut non uideat, aut uisa neglegat, uel misericorditer ignoscat.”
But forgiveness was not a random occurrence, and so Heiric’s proffered solution was to take advantage of the availability of penitential activities while alive. “While we have the time, therefore,” he urged, “while it is permitted let us forestall the anger of the severe judge.”80 Heiric continued his admonition by pointing out that the emotions of the penitent, and their expression, served to accomplish the goal of placating God: “Let us lament the evil that we have done so that by weeping we should not let it happen again, so that at judgment we might not be condemned with the impious but, with all the saints, we might be crowned by the just and mild judge.”81

Heiric connected emotions to the impediments, necessity and benefits of penitence. Penance was desirable. Pride was one of the barriers to performing it, and failing to expiate one’s sins turned the wicked into the objects of divine anger. In order to prevent this, penitents should lament, and weep as they did so. Indeed, Heiric thought that lamentation and crying were the primary characteristics of the emotional experience and expression of penitence.

\textit{Lacrima non fallit: Emotional Expression and Penitence}

Just as he expected priests and monks alike to experience the emotions appropriate for a penitential context (and avoid the undesirable ones), Heiric also thought that the penitents themselves should feel certain emotions and express them in specific ways. Sinners, he thought, should be desperate and remorseful, which they

80 Ibid.: “Dum igitur spatium habemus, dum licet praeueniamus districti iudicis iram.”

81 Ibid.: “defleamus mala quae gessimus, ut deflenda iterum non admittamus, quatinus in iudicio non cum impiis damnemur, sed cum sanctis omnibus a iusto et pio iudice coronemur.”
should show by lamenting, groaning and crying. By doing so, they demonstrated the sincerity of their contrition as well as imitated the activities of Jesus as found in the Gospel according to John. As with his thoughts on the rest of the penitential system, Heiric scattered references to proper affective expression throughout the liturgical year, but he explained them most clearly during Lent.

As the brethren of Saint-Germain ushered in the Lenten season, they heard the master of their monastic school remind them that they began a forty-day period of fasting and repentance. The question at hand was the justification of the duration of the fast. Heiric derived his argument for the necessity of a forty-day fast from Haimo, who had taken it in turn from Gregory the Great. The numerological significance of Matthew 4:2 *(and when he had fasted forty days and forty nights)*, Heiric explained, lay in understanding that the number forty is formed by multiplying four, which represented the four elements that made up the body, with ten, which was the number of commandments given to Moses. The liturgical calendar contained a forty-day period of repentance, then, because collectively Heiric and his brothers “through the body scorn the commands of the law,”82 for which they must make satisfaction using their bodies. Heiric followed Haimo in leaving behind Gregory’s assignation of “pleasure-loving” *(desideria)* for a sinful body. He concluded by exhorting the entire community of Saint-Germain to honor the Lenten season, reminding them that “what we have done negligently throughout the year we take care to purge on these holy days with weeping

---

and with penance."83 This purgation, of which Haimo and Gregory both spoke, took on a different character in Heiric’s homily. Specifically, he specified the characteristics of this purgation, which was penitential and tearful.

Weeping was at the core of penitential practice; by doing it penitents expressed feelings of remorse, avoided the love of sin and made themselves pleasing to God. While Lent furnished an obvious time for tearful repentance, and therefore the homilies preached during that season contain most of the evidence for the emotional aspects of penance, the correction of sinful behavior was just as important during the rest of the year. Towards the end of the liturgical season known as Ordinary Time Heiric turned to an Old Testament example to support an argument about the utility of penitential crying.84 As he discussed the nets mentioned in Luke 5:2 (but the fishermen were gone out of them, and were washing their nets), which he interpreted as an allegory for preaching, he turned his attention to the consciences of those charged with preaching. To justify his contention that preachers ought to ensure that their lives matched that which they preached, he cited the example of Ezekiel, who once he experienced a vision was told to return home. Heiric told his audience that “indeed, to return home after a vision is to return to himself after shattering the intention of sinning, and if he failed anything

83 Heiric, I:28, 230: “si quod per totum annum neglegenter duximus his diebus sanctis flendo ac paenitendo diluere curamus.” Haimo, Homiliarum sive concionum, 193: “ipsam carnem per poenitentiam affligamus.”

84 Heiric cited the New Testament over twice as often as he did the Old Testament. See Quadri, “Index Locorum Sacrae Scripturae,” in Ibid., 477-515.
through excess, to wash [himself] clean with tears of appropriate remorse.”

In a separate homily Heiric spoke of the importance of judging the appropriateness of the behavior of the one doing penance. Those sinners whom priests “saw to atone for committed sins with alms and with tears, and to undertake good works, these they should judge to be loosed [from sin/by penance], because without a doubt through such compunction of heart he [the penitent] is declared to be freed by the Lord.”

As part of the penitential process, tears did more than simply express remorse; they also prevented sinners from loving sinful behavior. When of the warning about behaving improperly, which he found in the words of Proverbs 4:23, at the end of his homily for the fifth Sunday after Easter, Heiric exhorted his brethren: “let us follow carefully this warning, so that if ever through the custom and habit of sinning we might be delinquent in spirit we might cleanse ourselves first with pure and most rapid confession and next with the tears of penance.” Heiric took the essence of this passage from a homily by Bede, but made one significant alteration. This confession, according to Bede, cleansed the transgressor “with fruits worthy of repentance” (dignis paenitentiae

---

85 Heiric, II:21, 194: “post uisionem enim domum reuerti, est post discussas mentes peccantium ad se redire, et si quid per excessum deliquit lacrimis dignae compunctionis abluere.”

86 Idem, II:7, 55: “quem uero perspexerint elemosinis ac lacrimis peccata commissa redimere ac bonis operibus insistere hunc soluendum adiudicent, quia talis per compunctionem cordis a domino procul dubio solutus esse declaratur.”

87 Proverbs 4:23: With all watchfulness keep thy heart, because life issueth out from it.

88 Heiric, II:11, 96: “Cuius monita sequentes agamus solliciti, ut si quando per consensum et propositum peccandi in animo delinquimus, citissima et pura confessione prius ac deinde paenitentiae lacrimis abstergamus.”
For Heiric, this meant something very specific; in his homily, he replaced the “fruits” of Bede’s original with “tears.”

Heiric explained the emotional implications of this tearful penance in the next sentence. He followed Bede’s original text much more closely in this passage and the next, highlighting the significance of his deviation in the previous one. “If we feel ourselves,” he told the monks of Saint-Germain, “tempted by the delight of sinning, we should drive away from us that same noxious delight with assiduous prayers and tears and with frequent recollection of perpetual bitterness.”

He concluded this thought with a reference to the communal nature of sin and forgiveness mentioned above. “If,” he explained, “we are not able to drive away this [noxious delight], let us seek the aid of brothers, that we might secure with their intercession and help that which by our own strength we cannot: for the continual prayer of a just man availeth much (James 5:16).”

Tears, then, related to emotions in two ways: they expressed the emotions of a sinner by indicating heartfelt remorse, or they effected an emotional transformation by

---


90 Heiric, II:11, 96: “Si autem delectatione peccandi nos temptari senserimus, ipsam noxiam delectationem assiduis precibus et lacrimis, et crebra recordatione perpetuae amaritudinis a nobis repellamus.” Compare to Bede, *Homiliarum evangeli*, 266: “Si delectatione peccandi nos temptari senserimus, noxiam delectationem crebris precibus ac lacrimis crebra amaritudinis perpetuae recordatione pellamus.”

91 Heiric, II:11, 96: “et si uiderimus non posse nos sufficere ad hanc repellendam, quaramus auxilia fratrum ut quod nostris uiribus non ualemus, illorum consilio et intercessione percipiamus; multum enim ualeat deprecatio iusti assidua” and Bede, *Homiliarum evangeli*, 266: “et si nos solos ad hanc propulsandam sufficere non posse uiderimus fratrum quaramus auxilia ut quod nostris uiribus nequimus illorum consilio et intercessione sumamus.”
preventing inappropriate delight. They also affected divine emotions by making the penitent pleasing to God. John 8:29 (*For I do always the things that please him*), the biblical text for the second *feria* in the second full week of Lent, allowed Heiric to explain to his congregation how they could please God. In his closing exhortation Heiric encouraged the monks of Saint-Germain to imitate Jesus, whose speech John 8:29 records. In order to accomplish this, he told the members of the monastic community that they should do “those things that are pleasing to God: let us purify our soul from all worldly desires; let us overcome the illicit desires of the flesh; [and] let us wash away the evil that we remembered to have perpetrated with tears of penance.” The tears that streamed from the eyes of penitents did so in a context suffused with emotional implications. They demonstrated the emotional state of the penitent, whose remorse they signified. They affected the emotional state of the penitent by preventing the love of sinful behavior. Penitential tears also affected divine emotions; the crying, remorseful Christian, no longer attached to the love of sinful behavior, was made pleasing to God.

The imitation of the example furnished by Jesus extended beyond simply following him in pleasing God. It involved crying and groaning in response to sinful behavior, as Heiric made clear on the sixth day after the fourth Sunday in Lent, when he discussed the resurrection of Lazarus, found in Chapter 11 of *The Gospel according to John*. The four days that Lazarus spent in the tomb, he explained, signified “a desperate sinner, weighed down by the long custom of sin as if by the rock [over] the grave and

---

92 Ibid.: “quae Deo placita sunt, castificemus animum ab omni concupiscentia, edomemus illicitos carnis appetitus, mala quae nos perpetrasse meminimus lacrimis paenitentiae diluamus.”
stinking and rotten by poor reputation.”

In the reaction of Jesus to Lazarus’s condition sinners found a model for their own response to their fallen state. When Jesus went to the tomb of Lazarus, Heiric explained, “he groaned and troubled himself so that he might show one who is in a similar state that he ought to be disturbed and to groan and to cry with an inner roar of the heart.”

Heiric used this same passage to describe the idealized reaction to the loss of the purity gained through baptism (see Chapter One), but it applied equally to all sinful behavior. Those who internalized this message understood that Jesus “groaned so that he might teach a sinner that he ought to groan and to find fault with his sins, if he wants to return life to [his] soul.”

In the biblical account Jesus also wept, and Heiric reinforced the didactic nature of John 11 by explaining that “the Lord wept at this for the same reason as above he groaned and was troubled: so that he might teach sinners to require weeping and profuse tears.”

But Jesus was not the only biblical figure whose behavior offered a model for sinners who wished to repent. Heiric also pointed to Peter, who in the wake of the execution of Jesus had denied being his disciple. In his homily for Easter Sunday, Heiric used Peter’s story as a metaphor for the repentance of the congregation. Easter was the

93 Idem, I:54, 516: “peccatorem significari desperatum, et longa peccati consuetudine quasi mole sepulcri depressum ac mala opinione fetentem et tabidum.”

94 Ibid.: “fremuit et turbuit se, ut ostendat eum qui talis est perturbari et ingemiscere debere atque intimo cordis rugitu fremere.”

95 Ibid., 517: “fremuit, ut doceret peccatorem fremere et peccata sua accusare debere si uult ad uitam animae redire.”

96 Ibid.: “fremuit et turbatus est, ut peccatores doceret fletibus et lacrimis indigere profusis.”
culmination of the Lenten season, during which time Heiric had encouraged his brethren to adopt a model of penitence that had distinct affective components for both the experience of emotions and their expression. Crying was the most important part of the latter. Jesus wept for Lazarus, and by so doing both wept allegorically for all sinners and taught them how to bemoan their own mistakes. Peter wept in response to his own sinful actions, a gesture that, Heiric explained, applied not just to Peter but to all who came after him (de omnibus sequacibus). Peter’s weeping was significant not just because he did so in response to undesirable behavior but also because he wept instead of verbalizing his remorse in some other way. Heiric pointed out that even though the biblical narrative described Peter’s tears, “it does not report that he also poured out satisfying prayers.” Anticipating a question from his brethren he asked (and answered) rhetorically: “why [was] this, except that prayers of tears are more useful than imploring words.”

Heiric’s elaboration of this claim underscored the connection between the internal state of the penitent and the external manifestation of that state by crying. Tears were desirable “because,” he believed “in praying sometimes speech deceives; tears do not deceive. Indeed speech sometimes does not communicate all [of] the distress of men;

---

97 Idem, II:1, 13: “quod preces quoque satisfaciens fuderit non refertur.” This homily is based on Mark 16:1-7, but the story of Peter’s crying to which Heiric refers does not occur in the pericope. It can be found in Mark 14:72, Matthew 26:75 and Luke 22:62.

98 Ibid.: “Cur hoc, nisi quod utiliores sunt preces lacrimarum quam imploratio sermonum?”
tears always reveal the whole disposition of the one speaking.”\(^9^9\) He closed this section of his Easter homily by returning the discussion to sin and forgiveness. “Therefore,” he concluded, “in everyone guilt comes before weeping, and therefore [before] praying as well; indeed silent tears are, in a certain way, prayers [that] request and earn forgiveness by without speaking.”\(^1^0^0\)

**Conclusion**

For the members of the monastic community of Saint-Germain in Auxerre, the process of identifying, confessing and receiving forgiveness for sins, as Heiric described it, was intensely emotional. The master of the monastic school cautioned against hatred, envy and pride, encouraged hope, love and kindness, argued that fear and anger could be felt both properly and improperly and expected penitents to express their internal distress by groaning and crying. Affective states structured the interaction between priests and penitents during the canonical ritual of penance as well as the efforts to repair the relationships among brethren in the monastery.

As explained in Chapter One, Heiric warned his brethren against sullying the clean emotional slate given to them during baptism. He believed, however, in the fragility that came with being human (humana fragilitas) so he reassured them that when they did soil themselves the system of penance would wash them clean again. At one

\(^9^9\) Ibid.: “Quia sermo in precando forte fallit, lacrima non fallit; sermo enim interdum non totum hominis profert negotium, lacrima semper totum loquentis prodit affectum.”

\(^1^0^0\) Ibid.: “In omni igitur culpa ante flendum est, et sic precandum: lacrimae enim tacitae quodammodo preces sunt, ueniam non loquendo postulant et merentur.”
point he specifically connected this renewal to participation in the Eucharistic ceremony.

Those who, as Matthew 5:23 said, went to offer their gifts at the altar but remembered that they needed to be reconciled with someone should expiate their sins “with the worthy penance of tears and groans.”¹⁰¹ Only then could they approach the altar to participate in the Eucharist, a ritual to which Heiric’s teacher Haimo attached emotional expectations. It is to this matter that Chapter Three attends.

¹⁰¹ Idem, II:25, 234: “digna fletuum ac gemituum paenitudine.”
CHAPTER THREE

ILLUD TERRIBLE SACRAMENTUM: THE EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY OF HAIMO OF AUXERRE

“We ought,” wrote Haimo of Auxerre in his commentary on 1 Corinthians 11:29, “to advance to that terrifying sacrament with fear and trembling, so the mind might know that it ought to exhibit reverence to him whose body it approaches to receive.”¹

The “terrifying sacrament” (sacramentum terribile) to which Haimo referred was the Eucharist, the central moment of the mass and an important feature of the Carolingian devotional landscape. In this passage one of the most important (yet least studied) of the Carolingian exegetes neatly encapsulated the most significant aspects of his Eucharistic theology. Even though he wrote at approximately the same time as others engaged in an energetic theological debate over the nature of Christ’s body, Haimo paid more attention to a related issue, the discernment of that which took place at the altar.² Haimo favored an explanation of the Eucharist that referred to the celebration of the sacrament,

¹ The PL remains the only edition of Haimo’s Pauline commentary. Migne mistakenly attributes Haimo of Auxerre’s work to Haimo of Halberstadt. Haimonis Halberstatensis, In divi Pauli epistolae expositio PL 117: 574: “Cum timore et tremore debemus accedere ad illud sacramentum terribile, ut sciat mens reverentiam se debere praestare ei ad cujus corpus sumendum accedit.” The biblical verse that generated the commentary of which this sentence is a part is: For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord. (1 Corinthians 11:29). All biblical citations are placed in italics and unless otherwise noted their translations are taken from the Douay-Rheims Bible website (http://www.drbo.org).

² This debate is discussed below, beginning on page 116.
concentrating on those who participated therein rather than dwelling on the nature of Christ’s body. In doing so, he treated with equal vigor the themes of worthiness and participation. As a result, his exegetical writing served as a guide, abstract to be sure, for proper emotional comportment by those involved, one which emphasized the implications of the ceremony for salvation and damnation. Throughout his writing, although most directly in his commentary on 1 Corinthians, Haimo redirected the focus of his inquiry into the Eucharist away from rarified intellectual investigation in favor of describing the experience of participating in the sacrament. He explicated the significance of Christ’s sacrifice for those who undertook the commemoration of it, and in doing so offered communicants the potential, through their awareness of their own emotional response to the liturgy, to take an active role in a ceremony that was essential to their salvation.

As Haimo’s explanation of 1 Corinthians 11:29 made clear, he believed that the experience and expression of emotion, specifically fear manifested through trembling, played a significant role in the celebration of the Eucharist. Furthermore, unlike his student and successor at Saint-Germain Heiric who (as argued in Chapter Two) wrote with an exclusively monastic audience in mind, Haimo’s thoughts potentially applied equally well to clerics and the laity. This chapter explores the thematic triad of discernment, worthiness and participation (highlighting the affective nature of the last) present in Haimo’s commentaries and homilies. Haimo believed that all those who took part in the central moment of the mass should be suffused with emotion; the saved and
the damned both understood the terrifying nature of the event and trembled with fear. Haimo spoke of the viewing of what took place at the altar but also directed his readers to turn their gaze inward. He framed the affective experience of those participating in the ritual by linking proper internalization of fear, and its expression through trembling, to worthy participation in the sacrament.

The celebration of the Eucharist was not only the central moment of the mass but perhaps also of Carolingian devotional culture. Celia Chazelle argues that the repeated Christological controversies that confronted Carolingian ecclesiastics “brought Christ’s passion into the focus of Carolingian theological discussion with an intensity that, like so many other phenomena of this era, was unprecedented in the medieval west.” Just as this newly-found prominence requires a reevaluation of the content of both late eighth- and ninth-century theological writing and biblical exegesis, so too the importance of the passion demands a closer look at its commemoration. Haimo offered a theological interpretation of the Eucharistic celebration, but the connection that he drew between affect and participation also allows for his texts to be profitably mined for information about the emotional experiences that he expected the celebration to generate.

Scholars date Haimo’s authentic work to the years 840-860, which coincides with a Eucharistic controversy, one which involved at least four important Carolingian ecclesiastics during the middle of the ninth century. Radbertus and Ratramnus (two monks of Corbie) along with Gottschalk of Orbais and Archbishop Hincmar of Reims

---

participated in an active theological debate, characterized by Celia Chazelle as “the first about the Eucharist recorded in the Latin Church.” Those involved did not question all aspects of Eucharistic theology. Although they agreed about the salvific nature of Christ’s sacrifice and that the Eucharist contained his body and blood, they quarreled over specific aspects of both of those general positions. Their disagreement on the latter centered on what form the body and blood took. Radbertus and Hincmar argued that the Eucharist contained Christ’s historical body and blood, while Ratramnus and Gottschalk believed that it held Christ’s spiritual, or glorified body. As Chazelle has pointed out, arguments about the nature of the Eucharist and questions about predestination took place in parallel during the ninth-century. The concern over corporality related directly to questions about the salvific nature of the sacrifice. No one disputed that Christ’s crucifixion effected salvation, but Hincmar and Gottschalk in particular disagreed over the identification of those thereby saved. Gottschalk’s rigid

4 Chazelle, “Exegesis,” 171. In addition to Radbertus, Ratramnus, Hincmar and Gottschalk Chazelle adds Adrevald of Fleury, Hrabanus Maurus and John Scottus Eriugena to the list of Carolingians whose writings reflect on the debate in some way, however indirectly. She takes a broader view of the Eucharistic controversy than other scholars. Her dating of the Eucharistic controversy to the mid-850s revises the traditional assignation of the late 830s/early 840s. Chazelle also links questions about the Eucharist to other mid-9th century theological quarrels, in particular the one over predestination, which involved many of the same participants. This connection seems most clear in the writings of Gottschalk and Hincmar, who opposed each other over both issues. This chapter addresses only the connection between emotions and the Eucharist. For the traditional view that the Eucharistic debate began in the late 830s between the two monks of Corbie, Radbertus and Ratramnus, see Jean-Paul Bouhot, Ratramne de Corbie: Histoire littéraire et controverses doctrinales (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1976), 77-88.

predestination theology argued that Christ died only for the small number of individuals whom God had already predestined for salvation. The crucifixion, therefore, did not make its salvific benefits available for all, as Hincmar believed. The connection between the crucifixion and salvation made exegesis about the passion both a matter of monastic devotional practice and a pastoral issue; exegesis on the relevant biblical passages held value, therefore, for monks as well as for those charged with communicating a complex theological issue to the laity.

For those directly involved in the Eucharistic debate, the primary point of contention was the nature of Christ’s body and blood contained in the sacrament. As Chazelle points out, biblical exegesis played a key role in the development and articulation of thoughts about the Eucharist on both sides of the controversy. The unique nature of the questions Carolingian churchmen posed about, and the lack of patristic discussion on, the specific issues meant that those involved had to rely to a great extent on their own interpretations of Scripture. In addition to the three Gospel narratives of the Last Supper (Matthew 26: 26-29, Mark 14: 22-25, Luke 22: 14-20), Chazelle has identified 13 other biblical passages which figure prominently in Eucharistic discussions:


---

6 Chazelle, “Exegesis,” 186-87, with the Vulgate text and English translation of each.
important to other Carolingian intellectuals who wrote specifically on the celebration of
the Eucharist and then by noting those aspects of the commemoration of Christ’s
sacrifice that were emotional. 

**Vera est caro: Haimo on the Nature of Christ’s Body**

Haimo of Auxerre did not participate directly in the Eucharistic controversy and
did not author a treatise on the nature of the Eucharist (or any other specific topic). By
beginning with Chazelle’s list of relevant biblical passages it is possible to reconstruct
his thoughts on the key issues based on his interpretation of each text in his
commentaries. Although it is the only way to recover Haimo’s thoughts on the

---

7 The generous support of the Medieval Academy of America’s Birgit Baldwin Fellowship
allowed for a research trip to Paris during the 2010-11 academic year. I was able to examine
nearly two-dozen manuscripts copied (arguably) at Auxerre in the ninth century and housed
currently in Paris. Four of these manuscripts contain Haimonian material: Paris BnF ms. lat. 614a
(homilies), ms. lat. 2452 (commentary on the Pauline Epistles), ms. lat. 9603 (homilies) and ms. lat.
12302 (commentary on Ezekiel). I examined the manuscripts for marginalia, glossing and any
other evidence of use, with negative results. I then compared the text of the manuscript to
Migne’s edition, which has been cited here instead of the manuscripts for ease of reference.

8 Although, Migne attributed one entitled *De corpore et sanguine domini* to him in the PL This
particular treatise, which shares a name with so many others, exists in multiple manuscripts,
one copied earlier than the twelfth century. In many cases, including the manuscript used for
the PL edition (Paris, BnF lat. 12304), authentic Haimonian material, most often his homilies
based on the Pauline letters, surrounds *De corpore*. Marie-Hélène Jullien’s recent discovery of
another manuscript witness (Tours, BM 114) led her to reexamine the question of the treatise’s
attribution. Through an analysis of both the language used and the themes expressed within the
treatise, and a comparison of the same to material firmly attributed to Haimo, she argues
convincingly that *De corpore* belongs to the late-eleventh century or early-twelfth century. Its
author placed it among Haimo’s material, she speculates, in order to lend authority to one side of
the Eucharistic debate, contemporary with the treatise’s composition, between Berengar of Tours
and Lanfranc. Marie-Hélène Jullien, “Le *De corpore et sanguine domini* attribué à Haimon,” in
*Études d’exégèse carolingienne: autour d’Haimon d’Auxerre*, ed. Sumi Shimahara, 23-57 (Turnhout:
Brepols, 2007), esp. 42-49. Jullien’s analysis agrees with an earlier argument made by J. R.
Geiselmann, “Kritische Beiträge zur frümittelalterlichen Eucharisielehre,” *Theologische
Quartalschrift* 106 (1925): 24-52.
Eucharist, any analysis of disparate pieces of Haimo’s writing will not uncover a systematically developed theological argument. His discussion of the relevant biblical passages, however, as well as other instances in which Haimo mentioned the sacrament reveals a consistent position. Despite the controversy among Carolingian intellectuals over the presence of one or another body of Christ in the Eucharist, Haimo did not explicitly address the subject. The closest he came to stating directly that the sacrament of the Eucharist contains the historical body of Christ falls in his explanation of the first sentence of Apocalypse 1:20 (*The mystery of the seven stars, which thou savest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks*). The biblical verse used the word *sacramentum* for “mystery.” Haimo defined this word by relating it to something which his readers would find familiar, a strategy that he featured throughout his exegesis. A sacrament (*sacramentum*), he said, “is a mystery (*mysterium*), where one thing is seen and another thing is understood, just as (by the grace of the word) in the body of Christ, where even though bread is seen, it is truly flesh (*caro*)”.

---

9 While commentaries by Haimo do not survive for every book of the Bible, his commentary on the Pauline letters is extant, although the *PL* remains the only published edition. Michael Gorman attributes a commentary on John, which survives in manuscript but has not been edited, to Haimo. See Michael Gorman, “The Commentary on the Gospel of John by Haimo of Auxerre,” *Revue Bénédictine* 115 (June 2005): 61-111. In this essay Gorman suggests that Haimo also authored commentaries on Matthew and Mark, although again there is no consensus on these attributions. See Alf Härdelin’s critique of those who seek to recreate a “systematic” theology from elements scattered throughout early medieval texts: Härdelin, “Forme littéraire et pensée théologique dans les homélies d’Haimon d’Auxerre,” 253-57. I agree with his critique, but the absence of a full-length treatise by Haimo which discusses his thoughts on the Eucharist requires a cautious use of this approach.

statement is not without problems, since although he used “flesh” (*caro*) instead of “body” (*corpus*) he offered no further detail about the nature of that flesh. In other places he also elucidated his thoughts on the subject. His commentaries on Paul’s letters to the Hebrews and Corinthians both contain statements that, when read alongside Haimo’s Apocalypse commentary, appear to support an interpretation of the body present at mass as historical rather than spiritual or glorified. In both commentaries he consistently compared the flesh and blood into which the bread and wine changes after sacerdotal consecration to the human body that Christ assumed in Mary’s womb and was subsequently crucified, described below.

Haimo alluded to the nature of the Eucharistic body in his commentary on Paul’s letter to the Hebrews when he expounded upon the tension created by arguments supporting the unity of Christ’s body in the face of the reality of multiple contemporaneous sacrifices. As he developed his explanation of Hebrews 10:3 (*But in them there is made a commemoration of sins every year*), Haimo contrasted the multiple, yet ineffective, sacrifices thought necessary for the expiation of sins in biblical time to the singular and effective sacrifice of Christ. As part of this account he addressed the seeming impossibility of many sacrifices of the same body taking place daily. Priests consecrated Christ’s body in churches across the Christian landscape and at the same time exhorted the laity to understand them all as one sacrifice of one body, just as Christ’s sacrifice was a singular event. Haimo argued that God’s nature made such a feat possible, and as part of his response he stated that “therefore, because the divinity of the
Word of God itself, which is one and fills all and is all everywhere, ordained that [the Eucharist] might not be many sacrifices, but one sacrifice, although offered by many; that it might be the body of Christ, one with the one that he assumed in the virgin’s womb, not many bodies.”

First Corinthians is an important text for understanding many of the aspects of Haimo’s Eucharistic theology, including the nature of Christ’s body. Haimo answered in the affirmative in response to the question asked at the end of 1 Corinthians 10:16 (And the bread, which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?), to which he added the clarification that this question referred to the consecration which takes place on the altar, making sure to locate the breaking of the bread mentioned in the biblical passage in contemporary time and space. Haimo was convinced that it was “certainly” (utique) the body of Christ and that “from that bread each who communicates eats the body of Christ.” In his commentary on the first part of the next verse, 1 Corinthians 10:17 (For we, being many, are one bread, one body), Haimo clarified the previous statement. When he and his fellow Christians consumed the bread that the priest consecrates on the altar, he instructed, they consumed “the flesh that the Word of God the Father assumed in the

---

11 Idem, In divi Pauli epistolas expositio, 889: “quia divinitas Verbi Dei, quae una est et omnia replet, et tota ubique est, ipsa facit ut non sint plura sacrificia, sed unum sacrificium, licet a multis offeratur, ut sit unum corpus Christi cum illo quod suscepit in utero virginali, non multa corpora.”

12 Ibid., 564: “Et panis quem frangimus, in altari, nonne participatio corporis Domini est? Utique....Ex quo pane quicunque communicant, corpus Christi edunt.”
Similarly, in his discussion of the last part of 1 Corinthians 11:24 (Take ye, and eat: this is my body, which shall be delivered for you), in which Paul reminded the Corinthians of Christ’s command at the Last Supper, Haimo explained that “just as the flesh of Christ, which he assumed in the virgin’s womb, is truly his body and was killed for our salvation, so the bread which Christ handed to his disciples and to all predestined for eternal life, and which every day the priest consecrates in the church by the virtue of the divinity which fills that true bread, is the body of Christ.”

Manna absconditum: Discernment and the Eucharist

Haimo consistently articulated a position across the corpus of his writing on the nature of the body of Christ contained in the Eucharist, which he describes as being identical to the body that Christ assumed in Mary’s womb. Haimo seemed to have been unwilling to enter actively into the mid-ninth century Eucharistic controversy, perhaps because he believed that the importance of the Eucharist lay in areas other than the nature of the body present after consecration. Alf Härdelin notes the eschatological character of Haimo’s thought, and indeed salvation and damnation featured prominently in his exegesis of the biblical passages that he thought offered insight into

---

13 Ibid. “Quoniam unus panis, subaudis Christi, et unum corpus Christi multi sumus, qui comedimus illum panem, caro quam Verbum Dei Patris assumpsit in utero virginali.”

14 Ibid., 572: “Sicut caro Christi quam assumpsit in utero virginali, verum corpus ejus est, et pro nostra salute occisum, ita panis quem Christus tradidit discipulis suis omnibusque praedestinatis ad vitam aeternam, et quem quotidie consecrant sacerdotes in Ecclesia cum virtute divinitatis, quae illum replet panem verum, corpus Christi est.”
the Eucharistic celebration. Haimo spent more time discussing those aspects of his Eucharistic theology that spoke most directly to the salvation of the communicants, namely discernment, worthiness and participation. He connected these three, which he outlines most clearly and completely in his exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:29, directly to the experience of fear, and the expression of that fear through trembling, by all who participated in the celebration of the Eucharist.

Haimo’s Eucharistic theology demanded a specific type of knowledge and awareness on the part of those who participated in the sacrament. In order to take advantage of the salvific nature of both the crucifixion and its commemoration during mass, communicants must be able to properly understand, or in Haimo’s terms to discern (discernere), that which took place on the altar. Proper discernment of the body of Christ present at the altar was, more than the nature of that body, one of the most important parts of Haimo’s Eucharistic theology. While he rarely stated his thoughts on the nature of Christ’s body directly, preferring to assert that the body on the altar is “truly” Christ, Haimo clearly and forcefully emphasized the need for correctly interpreting the central moment of the mass. As Boucaud points out, the ways in which people understand the events of their lives was a consistent theme in Haimo’s exegesis. He divided understanding, articulated in terms of “vision” in his commentary on Apocalypse, into three categories: corporeal, spiritual and intellectual, which he discussed at length:

---

15 Härdelin, “Forme littéraire et pensée théologique,” 267-68.
The first [way of seeing is] bodily, just as we see through our body’s eyes the sky and the earth, the sun and the moon, and other things of this type. The second [way is] spiritual, which happens in ecstasy, that is by leaving one’s mind, or in vigils, or by sleeping men, when, having seen not bodily things but likenesses of bodily things, thereupon they foretell the secrets of the future. This type of vision is shared by the just and the reprobate, just as Nebuchadnezzar saw rocks having been cut from a mountain without [the use of] hands and just as the Pharaoh [saw] seven fat cows and seven full ears of grain, etc. But each did not understand what he saw, until Daniel revealed the secret of the visions to one and Joseph to the other. It is not strange that the reprobate lacked in understanding regarding these obscure things, when indeed Daniel, not understanding the significance of the four winds fighting in the great sea, approached one of those standing by, and asked him about all these. The third type is intellectual, because it does not happen through bodily things, nor through likenesses; truth itself is revealed in the seeing mind, which rightly belongs to the elect.\(^\text{16}\)

Haimo’s theory of the three different types of vision provided the foundation for his discussion of the Eucharist. While he drew upon all three types, the first and the third were the most important, since the faithful must rely on their intellectual vision to override their corporeal. He declared that while those attending mass might see bread, in fact not only is more than that which is seen corporally present on the altar, but it is truly the body of Christ (and therefore not a likeness [similitudine], the second type). Since it can not be seen, this fact must be understood through the third type of vision, the understanding which took place in the minds of the elect.

Haimo identified the understanding that more than bread was present on the altar after the consecration as the first step towards proper discernment of the Eucharist. He consistently demonstrated the unreliability of the first type of vision, that which is seen with one’s eyes. Apocalypse 2:17 (I give to them the hidden bread) allowed Haimo ample opportunity to discuss the hidden nature of Christ’s body at length. He anticipated potential questioning by posing a rhetorical one to his reader: “And indeed the bread is explained: What is this [explanation]? Indeed we assert nothing other than: What is this [explanation], except a thing which we do not see before us. Indeed that bread now remains hidden, just like that which the Apostle said: That eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them (1 Corinthians 2:9).”

17 Idem, In Apocalypsin, 975: “Manna etenim interpretatur: Quid est hoc? Nos autem nequaquam dicimus: Quid est hoc, nisi de re quam ante non vidimus. Istud enim manna nunc manet absconditum, juxta quod Apostolus ait: Quod oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascendit, quae praeparavit Deus diligentibus se.”
The citation from Corinthians was significant. In his commentary on the Pauline letters Haimo consistently cited that verse in support of statements that pertained to heavenly glory, those things which could not be seen bodily but rather belonged to the afterlife, to the salvation to which the receipt of the Eucharist led as well. His exegesis of that portion of 1 Corinthians also expounded upon the troubles brought about by trusting only one’s bodily vision. Beginning with the first part of 1 Corinthians 2:8

\textit{Which none of the princes of this world knew}, which he connected, as does the biblical verse, to the crucifixion, Haimo explained that Jesus was crucified because “the princes of that time, that is Octavius, Tiberius, Herod, Pilate, the scribes and the Pharisees, and the priests of the Jews did not know Christ to be the Son of God. Seeing him to be a man, seeing him to be fatigued, to thirst, to hunger, they did not believe him to be God.”\textsuperscript{18}

This explanation effectively linked those members of the Carolingian faithful who did not see properly, who trusted only what they saw using the first type of vision, to those in the past who did not see properly as well and thus did not believe correctly. The citation of one passage that pertained to salvation in support of another which did the same not only underscored the consistency of Haimo’s exegetical approach but also strengthened the connection between seeing properly and being counted among the elect.

\textsuperscript{18} Idem, \textit{In divi Pauli epistolas expositio}, 520: “Principes hujus saeculi, id est Octavianus, Tiberius, Herodes, Pilatus, scribae, et Pharisaei, sacerdotesque Judaeorum, non cognoverunt Christum esse Filium Dei, quia videntes illum hominem esse, videntes eum fatigari, sitire, esurire, non putabant esse Deum.”
In his Apocalypse commentary Haimo also described the bread present at mass in terms which forestalled any confusion about whether the sacrifice was the body of Christ or merely a likeness or representation thereof. The bread that was to be understood as the body of Christ is “hidden” in that which appeared, due to flawed corporeal vision, to be merely bread. The communicants performed an act of faith by accepting the bread during the celebration of the Eucharist, with the result that as part of their heavenly reward “that which now remains hidden then will be manifest. Thus to those who will succeed, I give to them the hidden bread, that is after the finished labors of this life I will grant [them] my contemplation.”

For the hidden bread to be contemplated as part of the eternal devotion that awaited those who were saved to be the body of Christ it must therefore not be a mere likeness of that body, since the bread hidden on the altar and the object of contemplation were one and the same. As the body in heaven was the same body that Christ assumed in the womb the “hidden bread” contained within the bread on the altar must be Christ’s historical body. All of this applied only to those who saw properly, who refused to accept the evidence, which their eyes provided, that the host consecrated by the priest during mass remained ordinary bread. The ramifications of seeing, and therefore understanding, incorrectly that Haimo outlined also related directly to perception and the discernment of Christ’s body.

---

19 Idem, *In Apocalypsin*, 975: “et quod nunc manet absconditum, tunc erit manifestum. Qui itaque vicerit, dabo illi manna absconditum, id est, meam post finitos hujus vitae labores contemplationem illi concedam.”
“Indeed,” warned Haimo, “those who understand nothing except that which they have seen, they have died in eternal death.”

Quia omnes communicant: Participation in the Eucharistic Ceremony

Just as Haimo considered it possible to see both correctly and incorrectly, so too he described the conduct of those who received the Eucharist as proper or improper. Haimo believed that participation formed an essential component of the proper experience of the ritual of the Eucharist. While the sacrament held importance for individuals, and he emphasized this in his exegesis, Haimo also described the Eucharist as a communal celebration, a collective effort. He intentionally used the first-person plural throughout those parts of his exegetical works in which he discussed the Eucharist intentionally to signal not only that his thoughts on the verse applied to the wider Christian community (which included himself) but also to highlight that, while each member of the Church received the Eucharist individually, the collective experience also mattered.

---

20 Ibid., “Qui autem nihil aliud praeter quod videbant ibi intelligebant, mortui sunt morte aeterna.”

21 This is not the only devotional practice for which Haimo emphasizes the communal nature. When explaining the Lord’s Prayer he notes “we do not say my Father singularly but Our Father plurally,” and that “all equally say, Our Father, because God is not a respecter of persons. But in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh justice, is acceptable to him (Acts 10:34-35). This leads him to emphasize the importance of spiritual brotherhood among the community of the faithful, based on Christ’s statement of the same in Matthew 23:8. Haimo, Homiliarum sive concionum ad plebem in evangelia de tempore et sanctis, PL 118:801: “non dicimus, Pater meus singulariter, sed Pater noster pluraliter...Omnes aequaliter dicunt, Pater noster, quia non est personarum acceptor Deus, sed in omni gente qui operatur justitiam, acceptus est illi....spiritaliter nos fratres esse debere insinuat, juxta illud quod ipse alibi ait: Omnes enim vos fratres estis.”
Haimo again exploited the opportunity offered by the language of 1 Corinthians, specifically chapters ten and eleven, this time to reinforce the communal nature of the Eucharistic celebration, and his approach included lexical, historical and tropological exegetical strategies. He expanded upon the description of the chalice that appears in 1 Corinthians 10:16 (*The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?*) by describing the collective activity undertaken during the sacrament.

Haimo explained that the chalice “that has been blessed by the priest at the altar is called a benediction, and the same chalice is called a communion, which means a participation, because all communicate from it, and they each take a part of the blood of the Lord which it contains.”

Additionally, the feast was called a supper (*coena*), he said, “by those eating, a gathering in public, with food or refreshment for all.” He continued by explaining the Greek translation of the word “common,” from which “they are called those communicating, because they ate communally, that is equally.”

He further developed this point of view in the context of 1 Corinthians 10:27 (*If any of them that believe not, invite you, and you will be willing to go; eat of any thing that is set before you, asking no question for conscience’ sake*), part of Paul’s chastisement of the Corinthians for not celebrating the Eucharist in proper fashion. Haimo used Paul’s description and admonition as the basis for his own ideas about the proper celebration

---

22 Idem, *In divi Pauli epistolas expositio*, 564: “Calix autem benedictionis dicitur, qui benedicitur a sacerdotibus in altari; appellatur et ipse calix communicatio, quasi participatio, quia omnes communicant ex illo, partemque sumunt ex sanguine Domini quem continet in se.”

23 Ibid., 566: “Unde et communicantes dicitur, eo quod communiter, id est pariter, comedebant.”
of the Eucharistic ritual. Paul taught the Corinthians the tenets of the faith, and as part of that instruction they “also had learned the sacrament of the Lord’s supper.” Their interpretation of the ritual called for the rich and powerful among them to bring food and wine to the church to be consecrated by the priest. Haimo explained that while the intent of this feast was that all should share in the food provided, the Corinthians erred in two specific ways, each the result of misinterpreting the celebration as an individual event. Certain members of the community brought food to the church, “yet after the priest of the Lord consecrated the mystery, each took from the altar that which they had brought and ate [it] silently by themselves, so that those arriving [later] did not come upon that which they had eaten and from which they had communicated; or they took back to their house that which they had brought, so that they might consume it by themselves.”

24 Haimo again echoes this emphasis on ritual activity in which all participate communally in his sermon on the Lord’s Prayer. He reminds his audience that just as Christ taught the apostles to pray in common as a means of fostering communal activity so too should those members of the Carolingian faithful “who indeed invoke one father, they ought to have harmonious brotherhood, following that which is said through the Psalmist: Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell in unity (Psalms 132:1).” Idem, Homiliarum sive concionum, 801: “Qui enim unum invocant patrem, unanimem debent habere fraternitatem, secundum quod per Psalmistam dicitur: Ecce quam bonum et quam jucundum habiitare fratres in unum (Psalms 132:1).”

25 Idem, In divi Pauli epistolae expositioni, 569: “Corinthii (qui et Achaici vel Achaei) venientes ad fidem Christi per praedicationem apostoli Pauli, a quo inter caetera quae Dominus fecit, etiam sacramentum coenae Dominicae perceperant.”

26 Ibid., 570: “Consecratis autem mysteriis a sacerdote Domini, unusquisque quod detulerat accipiebat desuper altari: sumebatque tacite cum suis, ut supervenientes non invenirent quod eiderent, et unde communicarent; aut etiam deferebat omne quod attulerat ad domum suam, ut cum suis illud sumeret.”
Haimo attributed these two mistakes, not waiting and sharing the meal and taking consecrated food home to eat in private, to selfishness. As a result of this fault the rich and powerful, those who had the means to bring food to what Paul intended to be a communal feast, did not share their largesse with the rest of the community. Haimo’s critique was not one of a social system with unequally allocated material resources but rather of access to spiritual goods, since the sharing that he felt should have occurred took place after the consecration. Blame rested not on the clergy or even on the majority of the congregation but squarely on the shoulders of those few participants, since “with one benediction the offerings of all were consecrated, yet each taking his own, which ought to have been communal, brought great shame to those who had not brought anything (as is customary) even though they had [offerings to bring].”

Emotions entered into Haimo’s discussion of the Eucharist here as the shame felt by those who possessed the means to bring offerings to the celebration, but did not. This affective state, however, seems to belong to the past, to the Christians with whom Paul interacted, since it does not appear in the emotional expectations that Haimo communicated to the faithful for the receipt of the Eucharist in his own time. At no point in the course of his discussion of the Eucharist did Haimo criticize either the Carolingian secular or ecclesiastical hierarchy, those who would equate to the rich and powerful of Paul’s letter. Haimo instead envisioned a Eucharistic celebration in which all who were

27 Ibid., “cum una benedictione omnium oblationes consecratae essent, singuli suas accipientes, quae communes debuerant esse, maximam verecundiam inferrent his qui, ut assolet, non attulerant, licet haberent.”
worthy participated; anyone who did not participate had only themselves to blame for their absence from the collective celebration of Christ’s passion.

Haimo insisted that the Eucharist was an event suitable only for those members of the community who conducted their lives in such a way as to merit inclusion therein. Building on the foundation of his discussion of the historical celebration described in 1 Corinthians 10, he alerted his readers in his discussion of verse 33 (Wherefore, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another) to the importance of celebrating the commemorative feast of Christ’s passion as a community. He assumed Paul’s voice as his own, urging his “brethren,” the members of the Carolingian faithful, that when they “come together to eat the body and blood of Christ in the Church,” they should “wait for one another, so that the offering of many might be celebrated at the same time, and all you might share communally from one bread; because that offering is one bread, and it ought to be common to all.”

Haimo may have envisioned a ritual in which all could potentially participate, yet he knew that not all who attended mass were in a state of grace that would allow them to do so. He qualified his discussion of the communal nature of the event by explaining that “the sacrament of the body of Christ is called a feast by the community, because it ought to be common for all faithful and just.”

---

28 Ibid., 575: “Itaque, fratres mei, cum convenitis ad manducandum corpus et sanguinem Christi in Ecclesia, invicem exspectate, ut multitaurum oblatio simul celebretur, et omnes communiter ex uno pane communicetis: quia illa oblatio unus panis est, et communis debet esse omnibus.”

29 Ibid., “Sacramentum igitur corporis Christi a communione coena appellatur, quia commune debet esse omnibus fidelibus et justis.”
point, Haimo implied that while the sacrament was properly received by the “faithful and just” the responsibility for knowing whether one fell into that category rested with each individual communicant as opposed to with the clergy. A priest naturally withheld communion from a member of the laity whom he knew to be performing penance for confessed sins, but otherwise he distributed the sacrament to all, even those he suspected to be in a state of sin yet who had not confessed. Haimo’s evidence for this came from the Last Supper, which served as the model for the liturgical event. Haimo knew the potential recipients of the Eucharist included both sinners and those who had received absolution “because the feast of the Lord was for all reclining communally, not only for the good but also for the traitor Judas.”30 Bringing Judas into the discussion allowed Haimo to tailor his discussion to each of the two groups that comprised the participants in the liturgical sacrifice. While the text of 1 Corinthians spoke of eating both corporally and spiritually, only the latter interested Haimo when speaking of the actions of his contemporaries. While the sacrifice which Christ offered for mankind certainly contributed to the salvation of the just, in Haimo’s interpretation its communal nature meant that it was an event in which all Christians potentially participated. He advised his readers to guard against falling into the wrong category of recipient, “so that

30 Ibid., 571: “quia coena Domini omnibus recumbentibus communis fuit, non solum bonis, sed etiam proditori Judae.”
you come not together unto judgment, that is lest reprehensibly you obtain the body of Christ to your damnation.”

Throughout his commentaries Haimo wrote with a clear sense of the Eucharist as an event with participants, a group that contained both the just and the reprobate. He knew the commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice to be a regularly occurring celebration with salvific consequences in which people participated, and his writings served as a guide to properly doing so, however much idealized. Although he was neither a bishop nor a priest and did not hold a position with any traditional pastoral responsibilities, Haimo wrote with an awareness of the implications which his scriptural interpretations held for all Christians. His work was not “pastoral,” since there is no evidence that he wrote with a lay audience in mind, but unlike his student Heiric, who wrote for the monastic population at Saint-Germain, Haimo’s exegesis offered much to those charged with the care of souls.

The apostle Paul, whose letter to the Corinthians played such an important role in Haimo’s understanding of the Eucharist, again furnished him with the model of an ideal ecclesiastic. He demonstrated this at the end of his discussion of chapter 10 of 1 Corinthians by explaining the admonition found in verses 32-33 (Be without offence to the Jews and to the Gentiles. As I also in all things please all men). Haimo began by resolving the seeming contradiction between this statement and that found in Galatians 1:10, where

---

31 Ibid., “Si quis esurit, domi manducet, id est qui impatiens est nec vult jejunare cum caeteris, domi terreno pane vescatur, ut non in judicium conveniatis, id est ne corpus Christi reprehensibiliter percipiatis ad damnationem vestram.”
Paul stated that one who “serves all men” could not also be a “servant of Christ.” His solution was to parse the meaning of “all;” he argued that it it applied only “to good and religious men” (*bonis et religiosis viris*). It was these men then, and not bad Christians, pagans, Jews and the like, whom churchmen in Haimo’s time ought to please. The support for this comes in the example of Paul, who modeled his own behavior on Christ’s. Just as Christ did not act in his own interests, “because not for himself was he flogged, spat upon, suffered and died, nor did he seek [these things] for himself but for us,” so too was Paul “not satisfied with his own salvation, because he did not seek that which was useful to him alone, but that which [was useful] to others, willingly sustaining many adversities and tests for the salvation of others.” Paul’s selflessness and his orientation to the well being of others served as a model for the monastic and secular clergy alike.

Specifically, he urged those who performed the sacrament to behave in a manner similar to the angels. When explaining his injunction against women with uncovered heads, Paul justified his position by arguing that “the woman ought to have a power over her head, because of the angels.” Haimo eschewed a literal interpretation of this verse in favor of an allegorical one which pertained to the church hierarchy and to belief,

---

32 Galatians 1:10. *Si adhuc hominibus placerem, Christi servus non essem.*

33 Haimo, *In divi Pauli PL* 117: 567: “Sicut Christus non quaesivit sua, quia pro se flagellatus non est, consputus, passus et mortuus, nec quaesivit sua, sed nostra: ita Paulus non erat propria salute contentus, quia non quaerebat quod soli sibi utile erat, sed quod quod aliis, sustinens pro aliorum salute libenter multa adversa et probra.”

34 1 Corinthians 11:9. *Ideo debet mulier velamen habere super caput suum propter angelos.*
for he identified the “men” of the passage as those who behave properly and the “women” as any who needed further instruction, regardless of their sex. ³⁵ Within this framework Haimo interpreted the angels of Paul’s letter as the secular clergy, the priests and bishops who minister at the altar and “who ought to be angels by announcing to the people that which they ought to desire and that which they ought to avoid.” ³⁶ He transformed a passage about proper gender roles into one with pastoral implications, where the “angels” (the priests), served as instructors to the “women” (all those, male or female, who did not behave as they should). Since both men and women behaved improperly, the latter should be covered not necessarily because of their gender. Covered, here, applied to one “who should not be revealed to others in the open, lest he appear imitable.” ³⁷ Instead, said Haimo, “that one ought to cover, and to return to the angels, who are called men, that is to the preachers, so that by exhortation and teaching they are able to be saved; or they ought to cover their foolishness and ignorance on account of the preachers, because they ought to humble themselves to them.” ³⁸

³⁵ There is an obvious underlying misogyny in Haimo’s interpretation, but the point here is that the “men” and “women” in this passage serve as devices for discussing religious culture as a whole and do not refer literally to Haimo’s male and female contemporaries.

³⁶ Haimo, In divi Pauli epistolae expositio, 568: “qui angeli debent esse annuntiando populis quid debeant petere et quid vitare.”

³⁷ Ibid., “quam non debet aliis in propatulo manifestare, ne se imitabilem reddat.”

³⁸ Ibid., “debet illam tegere, et ad angelos (qui et viri appellantur), id est ad praedicatorum referre, ut illorum exhortatione et doctrina salvari possit; vel debet suam insipientiam et ignorantiam velare propter praedicatorum, quia illis se debet humiliare.”
As the previous passage implies, Haimo stressed the important role that preaching, specifically the communication of the proper way to conduct devotional activities, played in Carolingian religious culture. He made the same argument in an explicitly Eucharistic context as well. Just before he launched into his commentary on 1 Corinthians 11:27-31, he mentioned that the clergy commemorated Christ’s sacrifice in one of two ways, “either by celebrating the same mystery, where we repeat his passion, or indeed by preaching to others, because we ought to do both, by obtaining [the sacrament] and by preaching.”

Through this insistence that the clergy communicate to the laity, Haimo’s commentaries contain material relevant to such an activity, including the emotional comportment that he connected to the proper receipt of the Eucharist.

_Cum timore et tremore: The Emotional Experience of the Eucharist_

Haimo integrated emotional language into his discussion of discernment, worthiness and participation in such a way as to make affective experience an integral part of the celebration of the Eucharist. He expected all those who participated in the commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice, whether they did so properly, in a state of grace, or improperly, in a state of sin, through their understanding of the character as well as the consequences of performing it, to tremble in fear at the terrifying nature of the Eucharist.

Haimo described the celebration of the Eucharist, the commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice, as “terrifying” (terrible) on three separate occasions, language that he

---

employed because of the importance of both the historical event as well as the commemoration of it. He rarely used the word *terribile* in his exegesis, yet when he did it almost always related in some way to salvation or damnation. The sacrifice that Christ offered by dying on the cross was the essential moment in the salvation history of the world, and Haimo expected the remembrance of that moment during each mass to inspire the same affective response as did the crucifixion itself.

Just as he used biblical examples to model behavior in his discussion of the importance of participating, Haimo constructed his description of the terrifying nature of the Eucharist by drawing upon scriptural precedents. Instead of the negative example of the Corinthians, he turned to the positive example of Christ’s disciples, and again he relied most heavily on 1 Corinthians. As part of his explanation of 1 Corinthians 11:20 (*When you come therefore together into one place, it is not now to eat the Lord’s supper*) Haimo discussed the disparity between the historic meal and the commemoration of it during mass. The biblical text described Christ’s command to his disciples to feast in his memory as occurring after they had eaten, yet as Haimo noted it was the custom in the Carolingian era instead to break one’s fast with the Eucharist. He explained that the convention with which his audience would have been familiar adhered to the instructions of the apostles who “ordained in honor of so great and so terrible a sacrament, that those of us who fast first be strengthened by the sharing of the passion of the Lord and be consecrated by the spiritual food within and without. After this the
body can be restored by an earthly meal and common food, with the action of grace and with temperance and sobriety.”

Haimo considered the Eucharistic celebration to be terrifying because he believed the same to be true of the event that it commemorated. Just as he did when discussing the communal nature of the Eucharist, he turned to the model furnished by the biblical descriptions of the Last Supper, and argued that Christians in the ninth century should react to Christ’s death in the same way as he believed the apostles to have behaved. This interpretation again allowed Haimo to discuss the event in terms which included all people, both those in a state of grace as well as a state of sin, since the historic event included all twelve apostles. Haimo viewed the Eucharist not only in terms of its potential to save but to condemn as well, with Judas furnishing an example of the latter. Haimo explained that “when the other apostles had taken up that terrifying sacrament for their remedy and salvation, the one [Judas] who was unworthy for so great a mystery received it to his damnation.”

As his commentary on 1 Corinthians 11 unfolded, Haimo moved beyond simply describing the emotions of the Apostles as he narrated the historical event to prescribing the adoption of their behavior. He expounded upon affective state inspired by Christ’s sacrifice in terms that anticipated the performance of the ceremony by outlining

40 Haimo, *In divi Pauli epistolas expositio*, 571: “ordinaverunt in honorem tanti tamque terribilis sacramenti, primo nos jeunos Dominicae passionis participatione muniri, primoque spiritualibus epulis interius exteriusque sacrari, ac deinde terrenis dapibus et vilibus escis corpus refici, cum gratiarum actione et cum temperantia atque sobrietate.”

41 Ibid., 574: “Nam cum alii apostoli sumpsissent illud terrible sacramentum ad remedium et salutem suam, ille qui indignus erat tanto mysterio accept illud ad damnationem suam.”
explicitly the experience of fear and trembling that he believed should take place in recipients of the sacrament. Haimo constructed this part of his exegesis around the concept of memory, a natural thematic choice for a ritual which commemorates an event as important as the crucifixion. He began by reminding his readers (as usual using the plural) of the connection between the Carolingian ceremony and the event that it called to mind, as well as the usefulness of the latter for salvation, noting that

just as that body, which he [Christ] gave up on the cross on account of our salvation and redemption, was killed, so daily for our salvation and redemption this bread is offered to God. Although it may seem to be bread, it is the body of Christ, our Lord and Redeemer. He, considering our fragility (because he knows us to be fragile and likely to sin), gave us this sacrament so that since he himself is not able to die again, and we sin daily, we may have a true sacrifice with which we are able to expiate [our sins].

Haimo expanded this connection by remarking that Christ ordained the Eucharistic commemoration so that his sacrifice might be fixed in people’s hearts (cordibus), and then he once again offered an example to which he must have believed his readers would be able to relate. They should understand Christ’s actions to be equivalent to one who,

approaching death, sets aside a particular precious gift for a certain friend, saying: Keep this with you with all diligence in memory of me, so that every time you see it, you might remember me. The friend who, receiving a gift from his most dear friend, if he loves him with [his]

---

42 Ibid., 572: “Et sicut illud corpus quod in cruce deposuit pro nostra salute et redemptione est immolatum, ita quotidie ad nostram salutem et redemptionem iste panis Deo offertur, qui licet panis videatur, corpus est Christi, Dominus enim et Redemptor noster, consulens nostrae fragilitati, quia cognovit nos fragiles esse ad peccandum, tradidit nobis hoc sacramentum, ut quia ipse jam non potest mori, et nos quotidian peccamus, haveamus verum sacrificium quo possimus expiari.”
whole heart, is unable not to grieve for him and to be sad about the
death of his friend each time he sees the gift given by him.\textsuperscript{43}

But Haimo did not want his readers to grieve or be sad when remembering the death of
Christ, although he expected such recollection to evoke an affective response. Again, as
was his habit when speaking of aspects of religious culture that both he and his
audience would have experienced, he spoke in the first person plural. The Eucharist was
the equivalent of the “costly gift” of his example, given to the faithful by Christ at the
Last Supper as he knowingly approached his own death, a sacrifice that he undertook
“for us,” as Haimo put it. In the case of Christ it is God who loved (\textit{dilexit}, the same verb
which he used in the vignette), and Haimo assigned a different emotional comportment
to the recipients of the “eternal gift.” When they communicate, he instructed, they
“ought to receive [the sacrament] with fear and compunction of heart.”\textsuperscript{44} Haimo did not
elaborate upon the reaction he expected \textit{cumpunctione cordis} to produce, but as with
\textit{terribile}, he did not employ such language often. In the entire published corpus of his
work it occurs on only two other occasions: once in his commentary on Apocalypse and
once in his homily for the feast of the Epiphany. In the first instance Haimo used the
phrase in the context of the confession of sins and in the second he described

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 572-573: “more cujuscunque hominis egit, qui appropinquans morti aliquod munus
pretiosum dimittit alicui amico, dicens: Habe hoc cum omni diligentia penes te in memoriam mei,
ut quotiescunque illud videris, recorderis mei. Qui amicus admittens munus illud amici sui
charissimi, si eum toto corde dilexit, non potest non condolere ei et tristari de morte amici,
quotiescunque munus sibi dimissum conspicit.” See Chapter Five for the implications of this
passage for Haimo’s attitude towards death, dying and the afterlife.

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 573: “cum timore et cumpunctione cordis.”
frankincense as something that “is offered during the sacrifice of God, a pure prayer with compunction of the heart.”

The “sacrifice of God” surely referred to Christ’s passion, and therefore at least indirectly to the Eucharistic ritual, but as Haimo discussed the feeling of fear that he believed that event should inspire he hinted as well at the expected results of *cumpunctione cordis*: the external manifestation of an internal, emotional state. Haimo believed that he and his fellow Christians “ought to advance to that terrifying sacrament with fear and trembling, so the mind might know that it ought to exhibit reverence to him whose body it approaches to obtain.” This formulation, in which *tremore* replaced *cumpunctione cordis*, defined the emotional standard that Haimo created for the receipt of the Eucharist. Knowing the importance of Christ’s sacrifice allowed it to be understood as “terrifying,” and such knowledge led to both the interior affective state of fear and its external manifestation as trembling. Haimo also informed the potential participants in the ceremony that the presence of both aspects of this response held significance, namely

45 Idem, *In Apocalypsin*, 1125: “Fumus quippe multum ignem praecedidit, quia videlicet ex confessione peccati et compunctione cordis nascitur ignis charitatis”; Idem, *Homiliarum sive concionum PL* 118: 114: “Per aurum enim nitor eloquii designatur, Salomone dicente: *Thesaurus desiderabilis requiescit in ore sapientis* (Proverbs 21:10); per thus quod in sacrificio Dei offetur, oratio munda cum compunctione cordis; per myrrham, qua mortuorum corpora conduntur, vitiorum mortificatio exprimitur.” This is the result of a keyword search in the *PL* which, after including all of the orthographic variants for *cumpunctione*, resulted in nine hits. Seven of these occur in works which, despite their attribution, no longer belong on the list of Haimo of Auxerre’s authentic works. Searching for the stem of each word (*cumpunct* and *cord*) returns an additional eight instances, all in the context of penance.

46 Idem, *In divi Pauli epistolas*, 574: “Cum timore et tremore debemus accedere ad illud sacramentum terrible, ut sciat mens reverentiam se debere praestare ei ad cujus corpus sumendum accedit.”
that out of the experience of fear and trembling in the face of the commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice came the knowledge that one had received it properly. Haimo did not command directly but spoke conditionally to indicate the uncertainty of the effects of the celebration. Fear and trembling ought to, but might not, result from participation in the liturgy of the Eucharist. He created an idealized standard of affective comportment, one which allowed communicants to assess their own reaction. In this way he expanded their participation in the commemoration of the most important moment in Christian history.

Haimo certainly understood the importance that both Christ’s sacrifice on the cross and the remembrance of the same during mass held for mankind’s salvation, but he also warned that the latter, if performed improperly, led to damnation as surely as it otherwise did to salvation. In his commentaries on Apocalypse and the Pauline Letters, Haimo consistently argued that one must either be worthy of receiving the sacrament or receive it in a worthy manner. The former referred to the spiritual state of communicants, whether they undertook the ritual in a sinful state or not. The latter pertained to the adherence of participants to the criteria for the proper performance of the ritual including, for Haimo, emotional comportment. By setting forth both of these conditions, Haimo combined interior state with performance, much as he did by pairing fear and trembling. He held those who communicated responsible for ensuring that they
met the criteria of worthiness, and the judgment that Haimo believed would descend on those not doing so contributed to the terrifying nature of the sacrament.\footnote{Haimo uses \textit{terrible} in connection with judgment (or at least a negative divine reaction), although not in a Eucharistic context, in his sermon on the Lord's Prayer, which once again parallels his thoughts on the Eucharist. When explaining the phrase “Hallowed be thy name” Haimo remarks that Christians ought not to profane the name of the Lord “lest to us is directed this terrifying statement, in which it is said: \textit{you have profaned my holy name} (Ezechiel 36:22), but rather we ought to be such, so that to us he might extend, or in us he might complete, that which he himself in another place said: \textit{For I am the Lord your God: be holy because I am holy} (Leviticus 11:44). Idem, \textit{Homiliarum sive concionum}, 801: “ne ad nos illa sententia terribilis dirigatur, qua dicitur: \textit{Vos polluistis nomen sanctum meum} sed potius tales simus, ut ad nos pertineat vel in nobis impleatur quod ipse alibi dicit: \textit{Sancti estate, quia ego sanctus sum Dominus Deus vester.”}}

Once again the First Letter of Paul to the Corinthians furnished Haimo with the majority of the material relevant to his discussion of the consequences of improperly receiving the Eucharist, in particular verses 27-31.\footnote{The biblical text for 1 Corinthians 27-31 reads: Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord. But let a man prove himself: and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice. Therefore are there many infirm and weak among you, and many sleep. But if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged.} His exegesis of 1 Corinthians 27, which addressed explicitly the judgment inherent in the receipt of the Eucharist, set the tone for this section. Despite the importance of the crucifixion to the salvation history of humanity, Haimo believed that it was possible to commemorate it improperly, or as he put it, “unworthily” (\textit{indigne}). “Anyone,” Haimo wrote, “who unworthily obtains the blood and body of the Lord \textit{shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord}, that is he will undergo the eternal penalty, unless he expiates this [sin] with worthy penance or
A communicant was potentially unworthy in one of three ways:

*Unworthily* he [Paul] says, that is when the *ordo* is not observed, namely one who celebrates [i.e. a priest] or consumes [i.e. a communicant] that mystery differently than has been bequeathed by the holy Fathers; or he who believes no difference between the body of Christ and the other food; or he who, being defiled by more serious crimes, presumes to obtain that [sacrament]. He who consumes it [the Eucharist] in that way, as we said, eats and drinks it unworthily and therefore pays the penalty.\(^{50}\)

Aside from the celebration of the “mystery,” which applied exclusively to members of the priesthood, the unworthy behaviors that he listed in this passage pertained potentially to all Christians, whether clergy (secular or regular) or laity. This passage contains an echo of the Eucharistic controversy and at the same time reinforces Haimo’s insistence on the importance of proper discernment. If communicants failed to properly discern what they saw taking place at the altar, in particular failed to understand the nature of Christ’s body, they risked communicating *indigne* and thereby of incurring the consequent *poenas*.

Haimo offered self-examination as a solution for the problem of eating and drinking unworthily, based on his understanding of the command in 1 Corinthians 11:28

---

\(^{49}\) Haimo, *In divi Pauli epistolas*, 573: “quicunque sanguinem et corpus Domini sumpserit indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini, id est poenas aeternas inde exsolvet, nisi poenitentia digna hoc expiaverit, aliisque bonis operibus.”

\(^{50}\) Ibid., 573: “*Indigne* dicit, id est ordine non observato, videlicet qui aliter mysterium illud celebrat vel sumit, quam traditum est a sanctis Patribus, vel qui nullam differentiam credit inter illud corpus Christi, et reliquos cibos, vel qui gravioribus criminibus commaculatus praesumit illud sumere. Qui taliter, ut diximus, illud comedit et bibit indigne, illud sumit, ideoque poenas inde exsolvet.”
(let him prove himself): “Let him prove himself, that is let him investigate himself, and 
whether he might be worthy or not.”\textsuperscript{51} Those who found that they were worthy received 
the Eucharist as a remedy (remedium); these communicants were saved. That which 
functioned as a remedy for some, however, conferred a penalty to others, who “receive 
judgment and damnation, receiving [the Eucharist] unworthily, just as the traitor Judas 
did.”\textsuperscript{52} But Haimo’s message was not completely bleak, for the Eucharist functioned as 
intended for those who heeded his warnings and conducted themselves properly during 
the ritual. Haimo placed the onus squarely upon those who would communicate, whom 
he reminded that “if we would examine and consider our life, whether we might be 
worthy or not, and we would correct ourselves our errors we should not be judged, that is 
we should not be damned by Christ, neither in this age nor in the future.”\textsuperscript{53}

\textbf{Conclusion}

The mid-ninth century was a time of active, vituperative debate over the nature 
of the body of Christ contained in the Eucharist after consecration. The presence of the 
ritual reenactment of Christ’s passion, the foundational event in the history of the 
salvation of the faithful, during mass (coupled eventually with the predestination 
controversy) meant that at stake were the souls of every Christian. Haimo took a

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 574. “Probet se, id est discutiat se, et utrum dignus sit necne, et probabilem se reddat, ne 
forte unde alii sumunt remedium accipiat ille judicium et damnationem, indigne illud percipiens, 
sicut fecit Judas proditor.”

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., “discuteremus et examinaremus vitam nostram utrum digni essemus necne, et 
nosmetipsi errores nostros corrigeremus, non utique judicaremur, id est non damnaremur a 
Christo, neque in hoc saeculo, neque in futuro.”
different approach to the issue than did his Carolingian contemporaries. He was not charged with pastoral responsibilities himself, yet his exegetical efforts demonstrated an approach in which the communicants, whether cleric or lay, played a central role in the performance of the ritual.

Haimo held a clear and firm position on the Eucharist, which he believed to contain the body that Christ assumed in the womb, offered on the cross and which ascended into heaven. His discussion of the sacrament focused on three related themes: discernment, worthiness and participation. Haimo believed that the Eucharist was a judgment, and he connected understanding the truth of Christ’s presence after the consecration with salvation and damnation. Rather than dwell on the nature of the body contained within the Eucharist, however, he focused on the connection between discernment and judgment. Haimo linked discernment and judgment in his interpretation of Scripture in order to link the two as well in the minds of his readers as they participate in the celebration of the Eucharist during mass, or as those with pastoral responsibilities counsel others on how to do so. The consequences of this ritual moment related directly to salvation: either one was worthy and thereby saved or unworthy and thereby damned unless they expiated their sins. Both the internal experience and the external manifestation applied to all who participate in the ritual, whether sinners or not, although each group should fear and tremble for different reasons. Sinners ought to fear the judgment inherent in the sacrament, which consigned them to damnation.
should they participate unworthily. Yet even for those who were not in a state of sin, the sacrament should be terrifying, just as it was for the Apostles.

Haimo charged those communicating, rather than a priest, with the responsibility of assessing their worthiness to communicate, a process that took place under a distinctive set of emotional expectations. Knowledge of the nature of Christ’s sacrifice, coupled with the consequences of receiving the sacrament improperly, caused the participants to be terrified and to tremble in fear. Haimo described a process of self-reflection, where the presence of the appropriate internal emotional experience coupled with the physical manifestation of the same allowed the mind of the one whose salvation was at stake to realize the reverence with which the ritual should be conducted. Haimo’s triad of knowing, feeling and acting properly transformed those who approached the altar from passive recipients of a ritual conducted by a member of the ecclesiastical hierarchy into active participants who controlled their actions and thereby the consequences of their involvement.

Above all, Haimo wrote with an awareness of the importance which his exegesis held for the salvific mission of the Carolingian church. The renovatio rested on a scriptural foundation, and the proper interpretation of biblical texts allowed for the successful navigation of earthly perils, a connection which Haimo understood. At the end of his commentary on 1 Corinthians 10:4, he exhorted Christians with an urgency born of the eschatological language which suffuses his exegesis to work diligently so as to position themselves to be able to receive the reward of eternal life which he believed
should be theirs, to apply their understanding of their faith daily, “because the time of
our life is very short.” Nearly half a century later Remigius, Haimo’s “intellectual
grandson,” wrote a commentary that addressed the emotional nature not just of the
Eucharistic ceremony but also of the mass as a whole. Chapter Four describes the
different set of emotions standards that he expected during the mass.

---

54 Idem, In divi Pauli epistolae expositio, 560: “Quapropter omnibus est vigilandum et laborandum,
quoniam tempus vitae nostrae brevissimum est.”
CHAPTER FOUR

ARDENTI AFFECTU: THE EMOTIONAL EXPERIENCE OF THE MASS
IN LATE-NINTH CENTURY AUXERRE

When Remigius of Auxerre envisioned the celebration of the mass, he thought of a liturgical event that began not with readings or instruction, but rather with singing and psalmody (canendo et psallendo). This, he believed, would “first soften the hearts of those listening” so that they “might receive the healing word of the Gospel with burning desire (ardenti affectu).”¹ This description reveals that the mass, as conceived by the exegete and monk of Saint-Germain, was a salvific event that depended on the proper disposition of those who participated in it. Moreover, this internal state was emotional. Those in attendance at mass took full advantage of the benefits of the celebration only after their hearts had been “softened” and as they participated ardenti affectu.

Throughout his commentary on the mass Remigius clarified this broad statement of the affective quality of late-ninth century liturgical devotion by pointing to the presence of love, of hope, of joy and of a specific type of fear. He also spoke of the absence of hatred as well as of fear (in particular as the cause of trembling during

¹ Remigius of Auxerre, De celebratione missae et ejus significatione in PL 101: 1247: “corda audientium prius demulceat...salutifera Evangelii verba ardenti affectu suscipiat.” Migne places this text in a larger work known as De divinis officiis, which he attributes to Alcuin, although that assignation is no longer secure.
devotional activity, in direct contradiction to Haimo). While he believed that individuals experienced – or not – these emotions, Remigius highlighted the collective experience of the mass as well, one that culminated in an eliding of space and time that allowed those present at mass not simply to commemorate the Last Supper but in a sense be present as it happened. In their devotional activities, wrote Remigius, the Carolingian faithful first imitated angelic praise and then celebrated alongside the heavenly host as they rejoiced at the salvific death of Jesus.

Remigius wrote De celebratione missae, his exegetical treatment of the canon of the mass, at the end of a rich tradition of Carolingian commentaries on the liturgy. The Carolingian period witnessed the production, in Yitzak Hen’s estimation, of “scores” of such works by anonymous authors as well as “by leading Carolingian scholars such as Agobard of Lyons (d. 840), Walahfrid Strabo (d. 849), Hrabanus Maurus (d. 856), [and] Florus of Lyons (d. c.860)” as well as Amalarius of Metz (ca. 775-850).² It was in this immediate context that Remigius of Auxerre penned his commentary on the mass. Remigius was the “last of the grand masters” who taught in the monastic school at the monastery of Saint-Germain in Auxerre.³ He could trace his intellectual heritage back to

² Yitzak Hen, The Royal Patronage of Liturgy in Frankish Gaul to the Death of Charles the Bald (877), (London: Boydell Press, 2001), 7. Hen ends his study before Remigius wrote his commentary, and believes that Amalarius’ work is the “most original” of the Frankish efforts. See Ibid., 8-15 for a review and critique of liturgical studies from Mabillon through the twentieth century as well as an argument for a contextual approach to liturgical evidence. Despite his argument for contextualizing the production of liturgical manuscripts, Hen does not seem to feel the same about their contents, calling Carolingian commentaries “largely repetitive.”

Haimo of Auxerre through the mediation of Heiric, who counted Haimo first among his teachers.\(^4\) As an exegete, however, Remigius ranged beyond the scope of both Heiric and Haimo. He concentrated the majority of his interpretive energy on grammatical texts and works by classical authors, but wrote commentaries on the biblical books of Genesis and Psalms (and perhaps Matthew’s Gospel), and on Boethius’ *Opuscula sacra*, alongside *De celebratione missae*.\(^5\) When writing his liturgical commentary Remigius drew upon at least three different sources: 1) an unedited text titled *Expositio missae*, found in Troyes BM 804; 2) an anonymous commentary entitled *Expositus missae* but better known by its incipit (*Missa, ut beatus Isidorus dicit*); and 3) an unidentified commentary also utilized by Florus of Lyons for his own exegesis of the canon of the mass, written sometime around 825.\(^6\) In his analysis of the sources of *De celebratione missae*, Jean-Paul Bouhot cited a dozen manuscripts that contain Remigius’ work, ranging from Paris to Dijon to Metz. Writing just over a decade later, Colette Jeudy was able to increase this total to twenty-

---


\(^6\) On the first, see Ibid., 131-155; on the second, Ibid., 155-167. On p. 168 Bouhot suggests that the *Expositus* “seems to be the echo of the instruction given at Auxerre around 850-860” (semble être l’écho de l’enseignement donné vers 850-860 à Auxerre).
eight and to document the presence of the commentary in archives throughout Europe and even one in America.\(^7\)

To Bouhot as to so many others who study Carolingian texts, Remigius’ commentary on the mass was “a simple compilation.”\(^8\) Consequently, Bouhot was interested solely in the sources used by the Auxerrois exegete and the fate of the text he produced; his 1980 article remains the most recent investigation that focuses specifically on *De celebratione missae*. The scholarly landscape is equally spare for the mass as an event during the Carolingian period, as few scholars have undertaken a description of the experiences expected as a result of participating in the ritual. Donald Bullough’s 1999 essay “The Carolingian Liturgical Experience” remains the only full-length investigation for the ninth century. In his self-described “traditional and positivist”\(^9\) approach, Bullough cautions against relying on anthropology or what he calls (in quotes) the new criticism. His survey of the extant source material returns a poor harvest, and he concludes somewhat pessimistically that these documents “so often fall silent at the very point at which the historian of worship hopes at least for whispers of past practice.”\(^{10}\)

---

\(^7\) Jeudy, “L’oeuvre de Remi d’Auxerre,” 378-79. All of the manuscripts on Bouhot’s list also appear on Jeudy’s. The single American exemplar is a manuscript dating ca. 1100 housed at the University of Chicago.

\(^8\) Bouhot, “Les sources de l’*Expositio missae*,” 118.


\(^{10}\) Ibid., 61.
Scholars of medieval drama, despite their interest in other texts of this type, have similarly neglected Remigius' contribution in favor of Amalarius of Metz. Amalarius's *Liber officialis*, despite being condemned as heretical by a council held at Quierzy in 838, has received most of the attention from scholars interested in the Carolingian contribution to the history of medieval drama. Karl Young, building upon the earlier analysis of Yrjö Hirn, believed that the mass was "in some sense a dramatic representation of the life of Christ."¹¹ Both scholars pointed specifically to two works by Amalarius. He wrote the first of these, the *Eclogae de ordine Romano* in 813/14, and revised it around 836. The second text, the more important *Liber officialis*, went through three editions for certain (before 823, 827/28, 832/33) and perhaps a fourth, after 835.¹² This author and these works form the centerpiece of the most significant monograph to treat the subject, O. B. Hardison’s *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages*. The dramatic nature of the liturgy, however, argues for an approach that is neither universalizing along anthropological lines nor solely a product of "new criticism."

Scholars writing within this tradition rightly emphasize the dramatic nature of the mass, but frequently operate within a framework that anticipates the representational drama

---


that emerged in the eleventh century with the advent of the reenactment of the visit to Christ’s tomb known as the *quem quaeritis* play.

Cynthia Hahn and Georgia Frank offer an alternative narrative for the history of early medieval drama. Instead of searching for the origins of representational drama, they seek to uncover dramatic modes unique to Late Antiquity and the early middle ages. Hahn suggests that the shrines that form the object of her study were places where “heaven touched earth.” Frank goes a step farther, positing that pilgrims saw with “an eye of faith” whose use transformed “the viewer into a spectator at, perhaps even a participant in, an event from the biblical past.” While both of these scholars focus their attention on pilgrimage, Brad Bedingfield has translated the ideas that underlie their work into a liturgical context. His study of the Anglo-Saxon liturgy outlines the dramatic qualities of early medieval sacred ritualized activity. Those who participated did so within a dramatic structure that was neither representational nor mimetic; instead the liturgy was a “communal reenactment, rather than presentation,” in which “liturgical participants are trained to feel that, for the time of the commemoration, they have some sort of connection with biblical figures, speaking with their voices and relating to Christ

---


as had they, experiencing what those involved experienced, and learning what they
learned.”

Allen Frantzen rightly criticizes the language of Bedingfield’s description of
Anglo-Saxon religious rituals, which he labels “dramatic liturgy” rather than a form of
drama proper. But nonetheless Bedingfield’s concept of early medieval dramatic
reenactment, rather than representation, accords well with the description found in
Remigius’ text. Hahn, Frank and Bedingfield all describe the collapsing of space and
time; this also occurred during the ninth-century mass, at least as Remigius interpreted
it. When describing Christ’s body, for example, Remigius explained that there “are not
many bodies of Christ, and not many cups, but one body of Christ, and one blood with
it, which began in the womb of the Virgin and which he gave to the apostles.” While
this was an expression of the orthodox position on the universality and indivisibility of
Christ’s body, it also implied that the mass did more than simply reproduce the Last
Supper; the faithful celebrated not merely as did the apostles but alongside them.
During the mass, Remigius believed, “already men are joined with the angels” at a
heavenly altar, an emotionally charged devotional moment characterized by joy and

---


16 Allen J. Frantzen, “Drama and Dialogue in Old English Poetry: The Scene of Cynewulf’s

17 Remigius, 1259: “non sunt tamen multa corpora Christi, neque multi calices, sed unum corpus
Christi, et unus sanguis cum eo, quod sumpsit in utero Virginis, et quod dedit apostolis.”

18 Ibid., 1255: “jam nunc homines cum angelis sociantur.”
rejoicing. This shared affective moment represented the emotional culmination of the
drama of the mass in late ninth-century Auxerre.

_Pro vestra vestrorumque salute: The Mass and Salvation_

The faithful attended mass, Remigius wrote at the beginning of his commentary,
in order to “receive the healing word of the Gospel,” an event which took place in the
specific context of the commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice. The ceremony rested on the
foundation of scriptural authority and served as a means for the faithful who joined in
its celebration to achieve salvation. Remigius left the composition of the “faithful”
ambiguous. At the beginning of _De celebratione missae_ he described a priest who
officiated for those who, “being freed from rural labors” (_a ruralibus vacans operibus_),
came to church and received instruction “in the way they ought to live spiritually in the
Lord throughout the week.” Although little is known about the specifics of monastic
practice at Saint-Germain when Remigius was there, this description perhaps applied to
monks. But it is possible that Remigius had the laity in mind. A close variant of this
phrase (_ab operibus ruralibus se abstineant_) appears in canon 50 of the Council of Paris,
held in 829 as part of Louis the Pious’ efforts to reform the religious life of the empire.
This canon falls at the end of a cluster dealing with the proper performance of the mass

---

19 Ibid., 1247: “salutifera Evangelii verba...suscipiat.”

20 Remigius, 1246: “quod pro vestra salute passus sum, ad memoriam revocate, et pro vestra
   vestrorumque salute eadem proferre curate.”

21 Ibid., 1247: “a ruralibus vacans operibus, instruatur quomodo per totam hebdomadam
   spiritualiter Deo vivere debeant.”

and again, while it certainly applied to monks, the text was ambiguous enough to have included the laity as well. Like Haimo, then, the emotional states that Remigius thought resulted from participation in the mass applied to monks but also, potentially, to the entirety of the Carolingian faithful.

The mass, then, was partly didactic; it instructed, as Remigius said, those who participated in that they could attain heavenly reward by focusing on spiritual instead of worldly things. The audience, however, also occupied a role essential to the proper performance of the mass. Whether lay or monastic, they participated with the clergy in the creation of this spiritual meaning and thus participated as well in their own salvific activity. Throughout his commentary, Remigius developed the twin themes of the mass as a vehicle for salvation and the importance of the interactive relationship between celebrant and congregation.

Remigius stated clearly at the beginning of his commentary that the mass should be understood by whomever attended within a salvific framework, a message conveyed by the objects, movements and language employed during the ceremony. The vestments worn by the clergy visually reinforced this message. The dalmatic was in the shape of a cross, which served as a reminder to the "servant of the word of Christ" that, just as Christ was crucified for the salvation of the world, he should crucify himself on account of his vices and desires.23 While Remigius here intended to remind members of the

---

23 Remigius, 1247: “Induit diaconus dalmaticam in similitudinem crucis, ut qui minister verbi Christi, passionem illius ad memoriam revocans, sicut Christus crucifixus est pro salute mundi, ita et minister verbi ipsius semetipsum vitii et concupiscentiis crucifigere non obliviscatur, pro amore Redemptoris.”
clergy to safeguard their purity, a vestment in the shape of a cross would call to mind
the crucifixion for those seeing it as well. The brightness of the dalmatic also both
reminded the celebrant of the importance of remaining pure and chaste and
communicated the importance of that state to the laity. Finally, “scarlet streaks” on the
vestments of the minister proclaimed (declarantes) to all the blood shed by Christ for the
salvation of the world.24

The program of visual instruction continued as the ceremony proceeded through
what Hardison has called “positional symbolism.”25 The celebrant carried the gospel
book to the altar in the wake of the procession of candles, to which Remigius assigned
the meaning of the light of the gospel illuminating a world shadowed in sin. He paid
particular attention to the directions from which other candles approached the altar. As
part of the same procession of the gospel book which opened the ceremony, Remigius
wrote, an acolyte carried candles from the southern part of the church to the northern.
This signified that Christ went to Jerusalem from Bethlehem, which lies to the south, in
fulfillment of the promise found in Habacuc 3:3 (God comes from the south).26 As the

24 Ibid., 1248: “Quod eadem vestis candiditatem habet, ostendit ministrum Christi candorem
castitatis mente simul et corpore habere debere, qui auctoritatem Evangelium praedicandi in
Ecclesia retinet. Habet et coccineas virgulas, sanguinem Christi pro salute mundi effusum
declarantes.


26 Remigius, 1248: “Quod autem eadem processio evangelii ab australi parte fit in plagam
septentrionalem, declarat Dominum Jesum Christum, qui verbum salutis mundo intulit, a parte
meridiana ortum esse. Nam Hierusalem, in qua Dominus Jesus Christus primo verbum salutis
annuntiavit, in meridie habet Bethleem, a quo loco ipse Salvator venit, sicut scripts est: Deus ab
austro veniet (Habacuc 3:3).” Remigius’ interpretation of this passage matched that of another
important Carolingian exegete from the monastery of Saint-Germain, Haimo of Auxerre. In the
deacon intoned the *Kyrie eleison*, the acolyte placed the candles in a row from south to north showing that Christ, the light of God’s mercy, shone on the world “in the north and the south.”

Remigius explained that the hymn that immediately followed, *Gloria in excelsis Deo,* “was sung by the angels at the birth of the Savior.” This reinforced the relationship between the light of the candles present at mass, the birth of Christ and thereby the salvation of the world.

The candles lit during mass continued to play an important role in conveying the salvific message of the ceremony as part of the apotropaic quality of the liturgy. This protection was vital to the ninth-century sense of security, for the Carolingians believed that the devil was everywhere and represented a very real threat. As Mayke de Jong notes, “the Old Enemy and his allies prowled around in monasteries as well as in palaces, looking for victims.”

Before the reading from the New Testament, the acolytes changed the orientation of the candles from north-south to east-west, signifying again that the word of the Lord illuminated the entire world and echoing, as Remigius said, part of his *Enarratio in duodecim prophetas minores* that addressed the Book of Habacuc, Haimo explained that this phrase referred to Bethlehem, “which is situated in the southern region and in which city Christ was born.” Haimo of Auxerre, “*Enarratio in duodecim prophetas minores,*” in *PL*, vol. 117, 189: “Sunt qui hoc quod dicitur, *Deus ab austro veniet,* Bethlehem velint intelligi, quae in australi parte sita est, et in qua civitate natus est Christus.”

27 Remigius, 1248: “Cantore incipiente, Kyrie eleison, collocantur cerei in ordine a parte australi in septentrionem ab acolyto, ostendente hoc facto, quod misertus sit Dominus omnipotens mundo, in meridie et septentrione.”

28 Ibid.: “Incipit deinde sacerdos: *Gloria in excelsis Deo,* hymnum in nativitate Salvatoris ab angelis decantatum.”

the words of Luke 13:29 (And there shall come from the east and the west).\textsuperscript{30} Another
procession of candles, similarly described as indicating a world illuminated by the grace
that comes from the word of God, preceded the Gospel as it was carried to the lectern
(ad analogium).\textsuperscript{31} The reading of the Gospel was an important moment in the celebration
of the mass, one that Remigius described using the common, but nonetheless significant,
trope of the “medicine of salvation.”\textsuperscript{32} Remigius counted the act of reading itself as part
of both the protective and salvific mission of the church. He described the event as a part
of the ongoing struggle against the machinations of the diabolical enemies of the church.
The deacon, who read the text, faced north, showing that he, along with the Holy Spirit,
would forever fight against those who stood against the church as enemies. Speaking
through the words of the evangelists, “the Holy Spirit,” said Remigius, “which is God,
desires to bring together through faith, to drive away the Devil by means of the unity of
the Church and labors for the soundness of belief.”\textsuperscript{33} The northerly orientation of the
deacon recalled that of the candles during the earlier readings, and again referred to the
statement in Habacuc that “God comes from the south.” The Devil, then, comes from the

\textsuperscript{30} Remigius, 1249: “Incipiente autem subdiacono apostolicam lectionem, verso ordine cerei
transferuntur ab oriente in occidentem, ut demonstretur, per vocem et per praedicationem
apostolorum totum mundum gratia fidei illuminatum, non solum a meridie in septentrionem,
se etiam ab oriente in occidentem. Nomine enim orientis et occidentis, omnia climata mundi
comprehenduntur, et quod tot diebus sol sua praesentia ea illustret, sicut ibi: Venient ab oriente et
occidente (Luke 13:29).”

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 1250: “ut ostendatur gratia ipsius mundum illuminatum.”

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.: “medicinam salutis.”

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.: “Quos enim Spiritus sanctus, qui est Deus, ad fidem colligere desiderat, diabolus
dispergere ab unitate Ecclesiae et integritate fidei laborat.”
north, an interpretation which Remigius draws from Isaiah 14:13 (O Lucifer, thou saidst in thy heart: I will sit in the sides of the north).\textsuperscript{34}

The dramatic moment created by the moving of the candles and the lector’s intentional positioning established a relationship between good, evil and directionality. Moreover, these actions clearly situated the mass and the participants alike in the context of an ongoing struggle between God and Satan for the souls of mankind, making its celebration more than just a commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice. The mass furthered the salvific mission of the Church and placed the laity, buttressed by the priest, on the side of those opposing the “hard and cold” (\textit{durus et frigidus}) evil wind that blew from the north. This protection extended to the emotions of those present at mass. This demonic wind, Remigius explained, if left unchecked by the actions of the priest was the vehicle “whereby he [the Devil] makes those whom he will possess cold and numb to the love of charity and delight.”\textsuperscript{35} The heat from candles, much like the singing and psalmody performed by the congregation, thawed those emotions – here love and delight specifically – made torpid by the actions of the Devil.

The celebrant reinforced his role as protector of the faithful by placing a cross in front of the people, which reminded them also of the salvific activity in which they

\textsuperscript{34} Isaiah 14:13: \textit{O Lucifer, qui dicebas in corde tuo: Sedebo in lateribus aquilonis.}

\textsuperscript{35} Remigius, 1250: “qui eos quos possidet, ab amore charitatis atque dilectionis, torpentes et frigidos reddit.” Although Remigius does not make an explicit connection, his use of \textit{possido, -ere} recalls his teacher Heiric’s belief that people were empty vessels in constant danger of being re-occupied by agents of evil. (See Chapter Two).
participated by attending the mass. Only once the deacon (diaconus) had positioned himself and the liturgical instruments properly did he address the people by saying

*Domina vobiscum.* Remigius treated these words as a performative; they effected changes upon the audience in order to maximize the efficacy of the words of the Gospel. The deacon uttered this “so that the Lord might purify their hearts from worldly thoughts and might deign to open [their hearts] to receiving the healing words.” Once God had cleansed the hearts of the congregation from evil thoughts the “pure words of salvation” contained in the Gospel could exert a positive influence.

Expanding on Matthew 3:2, Remigius explained that those listening to the Gospel fulfilled John the Baptist’s command to “do penance” (*poenitentiam agite*), for contained in the text they heard was the message of “the incarnation of the Son of God and of his miracles, preaching, resurrection, and ascension, of the glory of those chosen and the damnation of the reprobate.” To ensure that the benefits accrued by hearing

---

36 Remigius, 1251: “Crucem in fronte ponit diaconus, annuntiaturus verba vitae, ut ostendat se discipulum illius esse, qui crucem pro totius mundi salute sustinuit. Deinde in pectore, ut omnis vana et immunda cogitatio ab ejus corde pellatur.”

37 Ibid.: “Salutat et populum, dicens: *Domina vobiscum*, quatenus corda illorum a mundanis cogitationibus Dominus emundet, et ad suscipienda verba salutifera aperire dignetur.”

38 Ibid.: “Ad cuius salutationem populus crucem in frontibus ponit, ut a malis cogitationibus corda sua emundet, ut ad intelligenda verba salutis pura permaneant.” The deacon (diaconus) appears to be the subject of all of this action, with the reading of the Gospel itself reserved for the priest.

39 Ibid.: “Et quod est melius nuntium, quam istud: *Poenitentiam agite, appropinquabit enim regnum coelorum* (Matthew 3:2); quae in Evangelio dicuntur de incarnatione Filii Dei, et de ejus miraculis, praedicatione, et resurrectione, atque ascensione, de gloria quoque electorum, et damnatione reproborum.” The “melius nuntium” refers to a previous discussion of the comparative merits of Greek and Latin.
the Gospel remained with the audience after they left the church, the deacon made the
sign of the cross. This gesture symbolically transferred the protection implied by the
position of the deacon (imposing himself between the northerly wind of Satan and the
people) to those assembled once they left the church, and ensured that the benefits
derived from their participation in the mass continued after the completion of the
ritual.40

_Ecclesia cum sacerdos et sacerdos cum ecclesia: The Mass as Interactive Event_

Remigius believed that the multiple verbal exchanges between the celebrant and
the audience created meaning for those who attended the mass, and he assigned
generative roles to both the congregation and the clergy in this creation. Remigius
outlined the salvific nature of the mass early in his commentary, during a discussion of
the necessity of performing the mass in its canonical form. Remigius described the priest
in his expected role of mediator (mediatorem) between God and the faithful, but
explained that he occupied this position, in part, because those gathered in church knew
(cognoscit) that this was the proper clerical role. This knowledge led to confidence
(confidens) that, through the prayers and offerings which form part of a properly said

40 Ibid.: “Perlecto evangelio, iterum se signo crucis populus munire festinat, ut quod ex divinis
eloquiis ad salutem percepit, signatum sigillo crucis, atque munitum permaneat, ne a mentibus
eorum diabolica fraude evacuari valeat.” For the protective aspects of the cross (whether as a
material object or the gesture of making the sign of the cross) see in the wider context of
Carolingian religious culture, Chazelle, _The Crucified God_, 135-140 and de Jong, _The Penitential
State_, 260, where she notes that the laywoman Dhuoda advised her son William to protect himself
in this manner.
mass this mediation both led them away from evil and reconciled them to God, with the result that they would be strengthened overall.\textsuperscript{41}

The description of the priest as an intercessor between the needs of the earthly community and the bestowing of heavenly favor is expected, but Remigius did more than posit such a role. His language described the relationship between cleric and worshipper from the point of view of the congregation, using verbs that had the populus fidelis as their subject. Those witnessing the mass must know that the priest is their mediator. Such knowledge then led to confidence in his ability to fulfill that function, which in turn allowed the faithful to entrust him with their prayers which, once transmitted, conferred the desired benefits. Remigius implied that by virtue of his office the priest only potentially performed an intercessory function. This potential was realized once the office of the celebrant and the attitude of the faithful combined to create the proper conditions under which the priest acted as a mediator.

This dynamic between the celebrant and the participants was bi-directional; the priest reacted to the audience in much the same way as attendees reacted to him. They came together, significantly, to act as one just in advance of the Te igitur, a portion of the mass that Celia Chazelle argues “gained new significance” to the Carolingians during

\textsuperscript{41} Remigius, 1246: “Missa autem dicitur, quasi transmissa, vel quasi transmissio, eo quod populus fidelis de suis meritis non praesumens, preces et oblationes, quas Deo omnipotenti offerre desiderat, per ministerium et orationem sacerdotis ad Deum transmittat, quem mediatorem inter se et illum esse cognoscit, confidens per ejus orationem atque intercessionem a malis omnibus liberari, atque creatori suo reconciliari et in omnibus corroborari.”
the ninth century. After the singing of the *Hosanna*, Remigius expected the church, which had recently echoed with this song of praise, to fall quiet. Then, “with the silence of the whole church effected, in which with the cessation of all the din of words, thought alone is directed to God, as is the devotion of the heart; with the desires and vows of all linked to him the priest begins to pour out the prayer by which the mystery of the body and blood of the Lord is consecrated.” The joining together that Remigius described characterized the focal point of the mass. The priest did not act alone, because in the instant before uttering the *Te igitur* “the church with the priest and the priest with the church with spiritual desire all together enter into the eternal and heavenly sanctuary of God: and since God is a spirit; and they that adore him must adore him in spirit and in truth (John 4:24), the same God the Father ought to be entreated: Therefore, most gracious Father, and the rest.” The priest sang the words of the prayer that initiated the consecration of the body and blood of Christ, but he did so, according to Remigius, in conjunction with a devoted congregation; conjoined in particular in what Remigius described as a collective state of spiritual desire, language that echoes, if not exactly mirrors, the *ardenti*

---


43 Remigius, 1256: “facto totius Ecclesiae silentio, in quo cessante omni strepitu verborum, sola ad Deum dirigitur intentio, et devotio cordium, sociatis sibi omnium votis et desideriis, incipit sacerdos orationem fundere, qua ipsum mysterium Dominici corporis et sanguinis consecratur.”

44 Ibid.: “ecclesia cum sacerdote et sacerdos cum Ecclesia spirituali desiderio intret in sanctuariun Dei aeternum et supernum: et quoniam spiritus est Deus, et eos qui adorant eum, in spiritu et veritate oportet adorare (John 4:24), sic eundem Patrem Deum deprecetur: *Te igitur, clementissime Pater, et reliqua.*” Lewis and Short give “ardent desire” as a definition of *desiderium, -ii.*
affectu that he used to describe the general emotional orientation of those who participated in the mass.

Non timoris est sed adoratio: Emotions during the Mass

Remigius expected those gathered in the church to participate in the mass ardenti affectu, an experience that included a number of different emotional states. The presence of love, hope, happiness, delight and the lack of hatred all characterized the emotional experience of the mass. Remigius expected the faithful to feel each of these emotions for specific reasons. He encouraged them to cultivate certain emotions. For those in attendance, feelings of love and hope defined their relationship to God, and during the celebration of the Eucharist the saved felt joy and the damned, fear (although perhaps they were only to recognize it, not cultivate it). Their properly performed devotional activity could also inspire divine emotions in return, in the form of delight. But not all emotions were felt properly; Remigius also warned against feelings of hatred.

Feelings of love underlay relationships between the individual members of the congregation. This love was other-directed and accompanied by a gesture, the kiss of peace, that depended on a proper internal state. Remigius instructed that the kiss was to take place “in peace, in truth, in friendship, not with falseness, not with deceit, like those act who speak peace with their neighbor, but evils are in their hearts (Psalms 27:3). Therefore with a holy kiss they [the congregation] greet their neighbors, who they love not in word nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth (1 John 3:18).” Remigius connected love to proper

45 Remigius, 1270: “pacifico, vero, columbino, non ficto, non subdolo, quali utuntur, qui loquuntur pacem cum proximo suo, mala autem sunt in cordibus illorum (Psalms 27:3). Illi ergo osculo sancto
social relationships, even between those who were otherwise enemies. The love that Remigius expected to be felt by the congregation was a sign of their faith, a connection that he explained as he expounded upon the *Memento* portion of the mass. The text of the canon read: *Remember, O Lord, Your servants and handmaids and all present here, whose faith and devotion are known to thee.* Remigius provided an expanded definition of *fides et devotio*, which he believed meant “that which they [the congregation] should believe correctly, and that which they should love (*diligent*) devoutly. You alone see [this] in the consciousness of those who offer to you.” Here Remigius also clarified the orientation of this emotion: only God needed to be able to detect the love felt by each member of the audience. Nonetheless, the monk of Saint-Germain maintained the communal nature of the Eucharistic offering, which was made “on account of the whole crowd present.”

This private, interior love, which God alone knew, led to the affective state of hope as the portion of the mass that began with the words *Memento, Domine* concluded. The priest and congregation jointly offered this sacrifice, as the canon of the mass stated, “*For themselves and theirs for the redeeming of their souls.*” Remigius explained that the

---

46 Ibid., 1258: “Cum dicitur: *Memento, Domine, famulorum, famularumque tuarum et sic deinde subjungitur et omnium circumstantium...Quorum tibi fides cognita est, et nota devotio.*”


48 Ibid.: “*de omni multitudine circumstantium.*”

49 Ibid.: “*Pro se suisque omnibus...pro redemptione animarum suarum.*”
offering conferred benefits on the individuals who made it as well as their family and friends. He also discussed both improper and proper motivations. The congregation, he warned, should participate in the commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice “not for any earthly desire, nor for temporal gain.” Rather, the offering was something “that they ought to make in hope,” not to achieve an earthly reward but a spiritual one.

The text of the canon of the mass (for the hope of salvation) structured this affective orientation, but Remigius’ explanation ultimately brought together the paired feelings of hope and love:

For the hope of salvation, that is, for eternal life, which is the true salvation. Indeed we are saved by hope (Romans 8:24), not only for the sake of eternal salvation but also for worldly safety, that is, for bodily health. Indeed soundness of health is called safety. Moreover, health, namely either of the soul or of the body, is from that one of whom it is sung in the Psalm: the Lord is health (Psalms 3:9). Who render their vows [canon of the mass], that is, the sacrifice, or the vow of faith and of pious devotion.

Only a few lines before the text quoted above, Remigius had explained that to be devout meant to love properly. The sacrifice that took place during the mass was one of faith and devotion, that is, one of hope and love. These two affective states brought both earthly health and heavenly reward.

---

50 Ibid.: “non pro aliquo terreno appetitu, non pro temporali lucro.”

51 Ibid.: “qua spe faciant.”

52 Ibid.: “Pro spe salutis, id est, pro vita aeterna, quae est vera salus. Spe enim salvi facti sumus (Romans 8:24). Nec solum pro salute aeterna, sed etiam pro temporali incolumitate, id est, corporali sanitate. Incolumitas enim dicitur, sanitatis integritas. Utraque autem sanitas ab illo est, et animae scilicet, et corporis, de quo in psalmo canitur: Domini est salus (Psalms 3:9). Reddunt vota, id est, sacrificia, vel vota fidei et piae devotionis.

53 See footnote 48.
Remigius thought that emotions were positive overall, not only expecting the congregation to experience them but linking such feeling directly to salvation. On one occasion, however, he briefly spoke out against hatred. In his explanation of the *Pater Noster*, he warned that “the devil reigns through extravagance, through drunkenness, hatred and the other evils. Therefore we ask that the Lord might reign in us through righteousness, not the devil through sin.”54 By connecting hatred to the devil (the only “evil” that he listed that was also an emotion) Remigius effectively argued for it to be absent from the emotional palette of the faithful. Such avoidance was another benefit conferred through participation in the mass, facilitated by the recitation of Jesus’ own prayer.

While these affective states of love and hope, and the avoidance of hatred, rounded out the emotional experience of the Carolingian liturgy, fear (*timor*) and joy (*gaudium*) were the two most important aspects of participating *ardenti affectu*. Remigius explained that the actions of the audience held particular significance for the successful participation, and at no time were they more important than during the Eucharistic celebration. He believed that proper feelings of fear and joy were an essential part of the celebration of the Eucharist. By separating the emotional experience of the saved and the damned he modified the emotional expectations of Haimo, who identified fear as an emotion felt by all involved in the commemoration of the crucifixion (see Chapter Three).

---

54 Ibid., 1266: “diabolus regnat per luxuriam, per ebrietatem, odium et caetera mala: idcirco precamur Dominum, ut ipse regnet in nobis per justitiam, non diabolus per peccatum.”
The mass played a critical role in Carolingian devotional culture and the celebration of the Eucharist was the central moment of the mass. Remigius wrote well after the theological controversies of the mid-ninth century, so the disputed nature of Christ’s body, which played such a large role earlier in Carolingian religious culture, did not factor into his commentary. Nonetheless, discernment, which was essential to Haimo’s Eucharistic theology as described in Chapter Two, formed a part of Remigius’ explanation. The body present after the consecration, he said, resulted from the sacrament itself and was not made “from grain,”\(^55\) by which he meant that after the actions and words of the priest the host contained more than the water and flour which came together to make up its physical composition and that the wine contained more than grapes.

His exegetical treatment of the mass also highlighted the role of the priest and of the acceptability of the sacrifice to God, which “although having been made from simple crops of the earth, by the power of the blessing it is made into the body and blood of the Son of God.”\(^56\) Rather than expound upon the theological foundations of the consecration, he explained only that through the actions of the priest the ineffable nature of Christ was made comprehensible as the host was changed into the body of Christ and that this “is a mystery, because one thing is seen, and another understood. That which is

\(^{55}\) Ibid., 1260: “non in spicis.”

\(^{56}\) Ibid.: “Quamvis de simplicibus terrae frugibus sumpta, benedictionis potentia efficiatur corpus et sanguis Filii Dei.”
seen has an earthly form; that which is understood has a spiritual reward.” Remigius concluded by providing a series of patristic and biblical citations in support of the late-ninth-century orthodox position regarding the spiritual nature of Christ’s presence “lest one believe that which is carnally in heaven to be bodily on the altar.”

Remigius differed from Haimo in his understanding of the nature of the body contained in the consecrated host. Also unlike Haimo, Remigius did not dwell on the Eucharist as a judgment for those who received it. Instead, he described the sacrament (which Haimo had understood to be “terrifying” (terrible)) as “so great” (tantus) and “greatest” (ultimum) in order to emphasize the ineffable nature of the passion. The emotional expectations that Remigius held for the Eucharistic celebration that differed from that of his predecessor at Saint-Germain as well, which included both fear and joy, with each emotion properly felt by people in different states of grace.

Remigius believed that both angels and humans praised God in the same way and, during the mass at least, at the same time; the angels worshipped before a heavenly altar just as humans did before earthly altars, and the mass served to unite these two groups for a brief moment. At the singing of the Gloria at the beginning of the mass

57 Ibid.: “Et ille quidem panis, et illud vinum per se irrationabile est: sed orat sacerdos, ut ille rationabiliter tractatus, et ab omnipotenti Deo consecratus, rationabilis fiat, transeundo in corpus Filii ejus, nobis, id est, ad salutem nostram, and Ibid., Mysterium est, quod aliud videtur, et aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur, speciem habet corporalem: quod intelligitur, fructum habet spiritualem.”

58 Ibid., 1263: “Haec ex Patrum verbis posita sunt, ne quis carnaliter aestimet in coelis esse altare corporeum.”

59 The word “terribilis, -e” does not appear in Remigius’ mass commentary.
Remigius pointed to the connection between human and angelic devotion. This hymn, he explained, “was sung by the angels at the birth of the Savior,” and was repeated during the mass “to imitate the angels, so that we show the same Lord to be honored on earth that the angels worship in heaven.”\(^\text{60}\)

Remigius described the *Alleluia* in almost exactly the same language, although unlike the *Gloria* he thought that this prayer had the ability to influence divine emotions. As he interpreted Apocalypse 19:6 (*And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude and as the voice of many waters and as the voice of great thunder, saying, Alleluia*), Remigius explained that “because we knew the angels in heaven to praise God with their voices, it is thought that God is delighted by the sound of that sort of praise.”\(^\text{61}\)

Remigius instructed that “therefore we also sing this, so that we might show the same God to be honored on earth, who indeed is honored by the angels in heaven.”\(^\text{62}\)

By honoring (that is, praising) God in the same way as the angels the voices of the Carolingian faithful elicited the same delight as did the angelic song.

Imitation, however, soon turned to mutual participation as the mass neared the Eucharistic celebration. At the point of the mass when the priest began “*and our voices with these,*” Remigius remarked that “these voices are of the angels in praise of the

\(^{60}\) Ibid.: “hymnum in nativitate Salvatoris ab angelis decantatum... hoc ipsum ad imitationem angelorum, ut ostendamus nos eundem Dominum colere in terris, quem et Angeli venerantur in coelis.

\(^{61}\) Ibid., dicente Joanne: *Audivi vocem in coelo dicentium: Alleluia* (Apocalypse 19:6), et quia hac voce Angelos in coelo Deum laudare cognovimus, hujusmodi voce laudationis creditum est Deum delectari

\(^{62}\) Ibid., Hoc quoque ideo canimus, ut eundem Deum nos colere in terra ostendamus, qui etiam colitur ab angelis in coelo
creator,” Remigius asked: “therefore how should our voices be, we who beg that they [voices] be introduced, that is admitted, into the sight of God with angelic praises? Certainly such voices are not found in the sound of the mouth but in the desire of the heart.”

This reference echoed Remigius’ belief that singing would soften the hearts of those who participated in the mass. Remigius then argued that as the congregation directed these desires, these voices towards God, “because the heavenly cities exist on account of angels and men,” the holy church “which should be united with them [the angels] in heaven, and which will continue with them in praises of God, even now with the very voices with which the holy angels praise him in heaven, it [the church] praises God on earth.” Therefore, he concluded, in the moment just in advance of the Sanctus, “already men are joined with angels, praising from the heavens and the earth.”

The singing of the Sanctus signaled the beginning of the eliding of space and time and the comingling of angelic and human devotion. At this point in De celebratione missae, Remigius remarked that “they [the angels] adore the same divine majesty, just as God is addressed in the hymn of the confession of Esdra: the host of

63 Ibid., 1255: “Cum quibus et nostras voces, et reliqua. Voces angelorum sunt in laude conditoris.”

64 Ibid.: “Quales ergo oportet esse voces nostras, quas in conspectu Dei cum angelicis laudibus deprecamur admitti, id est, intromitti? Utique tales voces non sunt in sono oris, sed in desiderio cordis.”

65 Ibid.: “quia superna civitas ex angelis et hominibus constat, merito sancta Ecclesia, quae illis socianda est in coelo, et cum illis in Dei laudibus permansura, jam nunc ipsis vocibus Deum laudat in terris, quibus eum sancti angeli laudant in coelis.”

66 Ibid.: “jam nunc homines cum angelis sociantur, laudantes de coelestibus et terrestribus.”
heaven adoreth thee (2 Esdra 9:6). Indeed, they [angels] tremble, just as figuratively it is said of them in the book of Job: The pillars of heaven tremble, and dread at his beck (Job 26:11).”67 Despite the dread mentioned in the biblical passage, Remigius told his readers that they should not consider such bodily comportment as a form of punishment. Again he demonstrated his divergence from Haimo’s teaching, since Remigius thought that those in a state of grace would tremble as the result “not of fear, but of wonder.”68 As he elaborated on this part of the liturgy, Remigius again connected the behavior of angels to that of those present at mass. Remigius presented angelic devotion as a model for the laity. He drew upon a passage from Ecclesiasticus to point out that given the admiration, adoration and trembling of the angels, the faithful should not be too proud to follow their example. He meant for those present at mass to not merely celebrate alongside angels, “when they provoke us to the praise of God,”69 but also in the same manner. At the singing of the Sanctus “with praise and with the action of grace people are joined with angels,” a devotional posture in which the adoration of God produced trembling.70

---


68 Ibid.: “non timoris est, sed admirationis.”

69 Ibid.: “quando nos provocant ad laudem ejus.”

70 Ibid., 1255: “laude et gratiarum actione jam nunc homines cum angelis sociantur.”
This joint celebration continued through preparation of the offering in anticipation of the Eucharistic celebration. Here Remigius, who infrequently quoted either biblical or patristic texts in large blocks, inserted a long passage from the *Dialogues* of the sixth-century pope Gregory the Great: “At the time of immolation, he [Gregory] said, who among the faithful is able to doubt the heavens to be opened at the voice of the priest, the choir of angels to be present in that mystery of Jesus Christ, the highest to be joined with the lowest, the earthly to be joined with the heavenly, [and] one thing to be made from the visible and the invisible.” Remigius followed this “ineffable” statement, as he described it, with another passage from Gregory as well as one from Augustine. The former spoke of humans worshipping at an earthly altar, and Remigius used the latter to point to the simultaneous worship of angels and men at a heavenly altar. He concluded this section of patristic citations with a quote from Ambrose that applied to the Eucharistic ceremony that was about to take place: “Do not doubt,” Ambrose said, “that an angel is present when Christ is sacrificed, Christ is right there.”

---


The temporal and spatial elision that Hahn and Frank argue took place during early medieval drama meant that the faithful “were present” as well when Christ was sacrificed again on an earthly altar. The celebration of the Eucharist was the central moment of the mass; moreover, as Remigius described it, was the most emotional moment of the liturgy. Remigius outlined emotional expectations for this rite that included both fear and joy, with each emotion properly felt by people in different states of grace. He explained that in the context of the Eucharistic celebration fear served to prevent sinners from participating in the sacrament. Addressing his audience directly, he cited what he believed to be a text by Augustine (but which he in fact took from De divinis officiis) to reminding them that “your humility is pleasing to me because you fear to approach the body and blood of the Lord; but it would have been better if you had retreated from your iniquities and received the body and blood of the Lord after being cleansed through penance.”

The experience of fear formed part of the emotional experience that Remigius outlined for the receipt of the Eucharist, but it applied only to those who had not confessed and remained in a state of sin. Their fear prevented them from compounding their sins by receiving the Eucharist before they had undergone the cleansing penitential ritual.

But fear was not the only emotion that Remigius connected to the celebration of the Eucharist. He argued that those who were able to participate properly felt joy

---

73 Ibid., 1267: “Placet, fratres, mihi humilitas vestra, quod timetis accedere ad corpus et sanguinem Domini: sed melius esset, ut ab iniquitatibus vestris recederetis, et mundi effecti per poenitentiam, corpus et sanguinem Domini sumeretis.”
(gaudium), precisely because their spiritual cleanliness allowed them to receive the sacrament. Taking Luke 19:5 (for this day I must abide in thy house) as a point of departure, Remigius explained that “there are those who are able to communicate every day. That which the Lord said to Zacheus applies to them: for this day I must abide in thy house. Just as that one [Zacheus] received him [Christ] gladly into his house, those [communicants] ought to take up the body and blood of the Lord with joy.” The Eucharistic celebration, according to Remigius, called for a varied emotional experience based on the state in which particular individuals found themselves, one which required participants to assess their worthiness. Sinners who properly felt fear abstained from the ritual feast, while those who knew themselves not to be in a state of sin participated, and did so joyfully.

**Conclusion**

The emotional experience of the mass in late-ninth century Auxerre, as described by a monk of the monastery of Saint-Germain, took a particular form. The mass began musically, which Remigius expected would prepare the hearts of those in attendance for the salvific exercise they were about to undertake by softening them, something that the candles used during mass did as well. He continued to highlight the role of liturgical singing, first as an imitation of angelic praise and, later, as the Eucharistic celebration drew closer, alongside it. The drama of the mass created a devotional process in which

---

space and time were suspended, where the human congregation joined with their angelic counterparts at a divine, ineffable altar in preparation for Christ’s sacrifice. Not all qualified for fellowship in this manner of worship, but nonetheless the Eucharist was an emotional moment for all in attendance.

By the turn of the tenth century, however, the emotional tenor of the Eucharistic celebration was different than it was in the middle of the century before. Haimo expected all who communicated to fear, albeit not for the same reason. But Remigius thought differently. For sinners, the fear it inspired prevented them from participating, for to do so would be not to their benefit but to their detriment as they compounded their sins. But for those in state of grace, the liturgical drama culminated in their joyful approach to the altar. Their joy took place in conjunction with the praise that the angels offered eternally to God. For those who celebrated it, the sacrifice enacted during the mass, Christ’s redemptive sacrifice, was the same for humans as that which Remigius described for angels. It may have been “an eternal offering of praise” but it was also a *hostiam jubilationis*, “a sacrifice of rejoicing.”

The mass offered those who participated in it a regular chance to share in the hope, the love, the joy and the “burning desire” that Remigius expected the celebration of the liturgy to elicit. It was a collective event, and one that fostered a shared emotional experience among those in attendance. Indeed, as I have argued in the first four chapters, all three Auxerrois masters described the multiple and varied emotional states

---

75 Ibid., 1263: “sempiternum sacrificium laudis et hostiam jubilationis”
in which the Carolingian faithful found themselves (for better or worse) throughout their lives. But all of these emotional experiences were transitory. In the final chapter I turn to the affective nature of eternal punishment and reward. These emotions endured for eternity.
CHAPTER FIVE

HOC AD DIEM IUDICII PERTINET: EMOTIONS, DEATH AND THE AFTERLIFE IN NINTH-CENTURY AUXERRE

In the mid-ninth century, the scholar and exegete Haimo sat in the monastery of Saint-Germain, in Auxerre, working on a commentary on the First Letter of Paul to the Corinthians. When he reached the end of 1 Corinthians 11:24 (this do for a commemoration of me), where Paul communicated Christ’s command to remember the sacrifice he was about to offer on the cross, Haimo sought to explain the connection between memory and death to his readers. Of the options available to him, he chose to compare Christ’s death to the passing of a close friend. When he spoke these words to the apostles, Haimo explained, Christ “acted in the custom of that man who, approaching death, sets aside a particular precious gift for a certain friend, saying: keep this with you with all diligence in memory of me so that every time you see it, you might remember me.”

That this passage exists at all is remarkable enough, for Haimo rarely referred to anything that even potentially reflected contemporary events, attitudes or customs. But

1 Haimo of Auxerre, In divi Pauli epistolas expositio, PL 117:572: “more cujuscunque hominis egit, qui appropinquans morti aliquod munus pretiosum dimittit alicui amico, dicens: Habe hoc cum omni diligentia penes te in memoriam mei, ut quotiescunque illud videris, recorderis mei.”

2 See the anonymous review in The Churchman 55 (1884): 299, which suggests that this comment (misidentified as belonging to Remigius of Auxerre) resembles those of John Chrysostom and Sedulius Scotus. See also John J. Contreni, “‘By lions, bishops are meant; by wolves, priests’:
more noteworthy is his explanation of the emotional implications of such remembrance. The one who received “that gift of his most dear friend, if he loved him with his whole heart, is unable not to grieve for him and not to be sad about the death of his friend each time he sees the gift given by him.” In Haimo’s formulation, the strength of an affective bond while alive (seen through the quality of the love felt for the deceased), mediated through an object, elicited feelings of grief and sadness after the passing of a loved one.

This schema broke with the affective tenor of contemporary discussions of death and dying in the Senonais. In this final chapter I mirror Chapter One by considering the writings of Haimo and Heiric alongside those of their near contemporaries among the secular clergy. Death was acknowledged as an emotional event; but the ninth-century monks and bishops of the Senonais rarely discussed the feelings that surrounded it. The secular clergy, those directly responsible for the pastoral care of the dead, never wrote of the emotions that attended the death of a member of the faithful, although liturgical activity mentioned emotions more explicitly. In contrast, Haimo used affective language regularly, but he preferred to discuss the range of sensory and affective experiences undergone by souls after death rather than the emotions of the bereaved. By the final


3 Haimo, *In divi Pauli epistolas expositio*, 572: “munus illud amici sui charissimi, si eum toto corde dilexit, non potest non condolare ei et tristari de morte amici, quotiescunque munus sibi dimissum conspicit.”
third of the ninth century, his student Heiric described similar experiences, but confined this discussion to a more restricted emotional and sensory range. The Auxerrois monks believed that both the saved and the damned experienced emotions and that these feelings, unlike those experienced while alive, did not change. In this way death was the opposite of baptism; instead of an affective cleansing that allowed Christians to cultivate (or not) proper emotions, salvation and damnation fixed emotional experience for eternity.

On matters of death and dying Haimo and Heiric stood apart from their near contemporaries; their thoughts also defy the interpretive schema adopted by historians. The seminal work on responses to death is Arnold van Gennep’s *The Rites of Passage.*

Van Gennep, an anthropologist, proposed a framework in which the rituals that attended the death of a member of the community fell into one of three categories: those of separation (which he called “preliminal”); those of transition (liminal); and those of incorporation (postliminal). These broad categories applied, van Gennep argued, to many aspects of an individual’s life cycle, including death. He drew upon evidence mostly from non-Western cultures, which led him to stress liminal and postliminal rites instead of the preliminal practices that he expected to find. This led him to conclude that rites of separation played a minimal role. Instead, communities focused on rites that

---


5 Ibid., 1-14.
isolated those closest to the deceased for a period of time (liminal), after which they rejoined the community (postliminal).\(^6\)

Van Gennep’s formulation, even though derived almost exclusively from non-Western examples, exerted a powerful influence on scholars of death and dying in a Christian context.\(^7\) This schema deemphasized the immediate effects that the death of individuals had on those who survived them; indeed in the medieval west the dead arguably never completely left the world of the living. The cult of the saints, which allowed exceptional individuals to “survive” in some ways among the living, and the practice of praying for the deceased (which had both individual and institutional aspects) led scholars such as Phillipe Ariès to posit that an individual’s death in fact did not disrupt the community in any significant way. In *The Hour of our Death*, Ariès described death in the early medieval period as “tame” (*la mort apprivoisée*); that is, death was “close and familiar yet diminished and desensitized.”\(^8\)

Despite their influence on twentieth-century scholarship, neither van Gennep, who did not consider evidence from medieval Europe, nor Ariès, who relied more on a theoretical apparatus and isolated examples that supported it, supply an adequate foundation for this chapter. Rather than relying on theories that may or may not pertain

\(^6\) Ibid., 146-165.


to the Archdiocese of Sens, a localized and contextual study best reveals the peculiarities of the attitude towards death, dying and the afterlife exhibited by Senonais bishops and Auxerrois monks. Theodulf and Walter, bishops of Orléans, and the monks of Saint-Germain (Haimo and Heiric) built their eschatology upon a patristic tradition stretching back to the second century. Christian writers grappled with the question of the afterlife from the earliest years of the faith. Tertullian (ca. 160 – ca. 220) articulated a coherent view of life after death that held, in some form, until at least the seventh century. He lived and wrote in Carthage, was most likely a Berber, the son of a proconsular centurion and, perhaps, a priest. Jerome called him presbyter, but Tertullian never described himself as a member of the clergy of any rank, and indeed twice referred to himself as a layman. Cleric or not, he was well-educated, perhaps trained as a lawyer, and the first of the Christian fathers to write in Latin. He was a prolific author, although a number of his works have not survived and are known only through references in other texts or in catalog entries for manuscripts that are no longer extant.

After they died, Tertullian believed, Christians went to a place that he called an interim refrigerium. As the name implies, this was a shadowy, temporary “rest” stop on the road to final judgment, whose location Tertullian described somewhat ambiguously as “although not in heaven, still higher than hell.” While Tertullian never wrote with

---

9 See the website of the Tertullian Project (http://www.tertullian.org/) for the little that is known of his life.

10 Tertullian, Adversus Marconem, 4:34: “etsi non caelestem, sublimiorem tamen inferis.” Accessed online through Brepolis (http://clt.brepolis.net).
precise detail about the characteristics of what Cyril Vogel terms the “Christian Hades” (l’Hadès chrétien), eventually the *interim refrigerium* came to be understood as a place composed of two distinct regions: “the *refrigerium* in the strict sense, a place of relative freedom and of rest, [and] the *tormentum*, on the other hand, where the most unfortunate and the sinners find themselves in utter destitution.”

Although in Vogel’s periodization this eschatology changes significantly only during the pontificate of Gregory the Great (ca. 540 – 604), a century-and-a-half earlier Augustine of Hippo (354 – 430) addressed the fate of the soul both in terms of the nature of the afterlife as well as the relationship between the living and the dead, an issue on which Tertullian had remained silent. Augustine believed that the souls of the departed underwent two judgments, one at death and one at the end of days. The first affected comparatively few people; the truly good (*valde boni*) received their heavenly reward instantly and the truly evil (*valde mali*) went straight to damnation. But the majority of the deceased were neither truly good (*non valde boni*) nor truly evil (*non valde...\*\*\*

---


mali) and therefore remained in an intermediate state, reminiscent of Tertullian’s interim refrigerium, wherein they awaited the determination of their ultimate destination.  

The uncertainty that surrounded the fate of this middle group led to questions about the ability of the living to positively impact the outcome of their ultimate judgment. In response to a question from his friend Paulinus of Nola about the utility of being buried in close proximity (ad sanctum) to the body of St. Felix, Augustine wrote *De cura pro mortuis gerenda* (On the Care to be Taken for the Dead). While the ostensible subject was burial ad sanctum, the bishop of Hippo quickly answered Paulinus’ question in the affirmative: “[Paulinus asked] is it possible to conclude that it is to the benefit of a man after death if, by the faith of his family and friends, such a place is provided for burying his body in which appears the aid of the saints sought by such a method.”  

Even though he conceded the utility of burial ad sanctum, in *De cura* he consistently downplayed the significance of the fate of physical remains. Augustine believed that, no matter the disposition of the body after death, the prayers of the living brought the greatest benefit to the souls of the deceased. These carried such weight that, Augustine opined, “if these supplications, which are made with proper faith and devotion for the dead, should be

---


lacking there would be no advantage to their souls, I think, howsoever [their] lifeless bodies might have been placed in holy places.”

This intimate connection between the prayers of the living and the fate of the dead found institutional expression in the work of Pope Gregory the Great. The pontiff’s eschatology resembled in broad outline that of Augustine, with a provision for the instantaneous judgment of a few exceptional individuals (both good and bad) and an intermediate place for the majority of souls. Within this framework, however, Gregory deviated from his predecessors on both the place in which souls awaited their ultimate fate and the conditions under which they did so. While Tertullian located the interim refrigerium in some ambiguous place underground and Augustine wasn’t much more specific with regard to the location of those souls that awaited judgment, Gregory’s place “had no longer anything in common with the paleo-christian Hades,” which Vogel argues characterized the thought of earlier patristic authors. At times Gregory spoke of a “lower place” (loca inferiora) that was close to hell (infernum), to which he contrasted the “lofty heaven” (coelum aereum) of the just. The souls of the dead could

---

15 Ibid.: “si autem deessent istae supplicationes, quae fiunt recta fide ac pietate pro mortuis, puto, quod nihil prodesset spiritibus eorum, quamlibet locis sanctis exanima corpora ponerentur.”

16 Vogel, “Deux consequences de l’eschatologie grégorienne,” 268: “ce lieu n’a plus rien de commun avec l’Hadès paléochrétien.”

17 See Ibid. for multiple examples of each in Gregory’s Moralia.
occupy the lower region, but they could also commingle with the living, albeit “invisible to them, in the same places where they worked during their earthly life.”\(^{18}\)

The afterlife envisioned by Gregory was more dynamic as well, in contrast to the stasis described by Tertullian and Augustine. The souls of the dead, even though they had not been consigned to hell, nonetheless endured fiery torments at the hands of demons. It was this eschatological development that led Gregory to emphasize the ability of the prayers of the living to directly and immediately affect the souls for whom they were offered. Prayers mattered for Augustine, but the souls for whom they were offered accrued the benefits that they conferred only at Last Judgment. Gregory’s innovation was, for those prayers offered up for the dead during mass, to “admit that the dead who remained in purgatory were able, before the end of the world, to be free to achieve eternal blessedness, and this due to the masses said for that purpose.”\(^{19}\)

Rather than exhibiting a late Roman period of stability followed by a dramatic shift during Gregory’s pontificate, as an older historiography had argued, early Christian eschatology more accurately “was derived from Augustine and elaborated by Gregory the Great.”\(^{20}\) It was this patristic tradition that informed the views of the

\(^{18}\) Ibid.: “mais invisibles pour eux, sur les lieux mêmes où ils ont travaillé durant leur vie terrestre.”

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 269: “admet que les défunts séjournant au purgatoire puissant, avant la fin du monde, être libérés pour rejoindre la béatitude éternelle, et ceci grâce aux messes dites à leur intention.” Emphasis in original. The use of “purgatory” as a noun is Vogel’s, not Gregory’s.

Carolingian church on the fate of the soul and on attitudes towards the dead. The lasting legacy of the transformation identified by Vogel was not merely Gregory’s departure from Augustine but more importantly the institutional apparatus that developed in response to his changed eschatology. Vogel documents the emergence and proliferation of the private mass (*missa privata*), offered for both the living and the dead. The first recorded instance of this after Gregory’s pontificate fell coincidentally in the foundation charter of the monastery of Saint-Julien (Auxerre) in 634. This text referenced masses that the nuns should celebrate (*missas celebrent*) for the Merovingian king Dagobert and his wife “as much in the past as in the future.”

Vogel suggests that a second, and related, consequence of Gregory’s eschatology was an increase over time in the capacity of monasteries to handle the increased demand for such liturgical services. This took two forms: 1) a greater number of monks who also received ordination as priests; and 2) the proliferation of altars, both fixed and portable, at which these monk-priests offered masses for the souls of the departed.

Vogel’s interest lay primarily in Gregory and the years immediately following his pontificate, but he suggests that as late as the tenth century these celebrations remained the preserve of the regular clergy, while “the parochial clergy, occupied by

---

21 Vogel, “Deux consequences de l’eschatologie grégorienne,” 270, where he gives the date as 635. The text of the charter, dated 634, was accessed online through the *Regnum Francorum* website: http://www.francia.ahlfeldt.se/maps.php?&scale=700&elev=1&border=1&layer1=i10160&city=140: “tam praeterita quam futura.”
other tasks, eliminated themselves by this very fact.”  

While the secular clergy may not have said anniversary masses for the departed in the ninth century, their pastoral responsibilities included rituals for the dying that eventually involved the sick as well. Frederick Paxton documents this change by examining the texts of the *ordo defunctorum* that guided priests through the ceremony.  

Paxton grounds his narrative in van Gennep’s tripartite schema, but acknowledges that it served as a point of departure only. He studies the rituals, and the texts that guided their performance, in the eighth and ninth century, a time that Paxton credits as formative in the history of medieval Catholicism.  

His story is one of Carolingian efforts to control the content of liturgical texts, and thereby to control ritual practices, in order to “create a Christian society united by common forms of worship and a common understanding of the Christian way of life and death.” Despite their efforts, Paxton writes, the Frankish clergy never managed to achieve the unity of text and practice that they sought to impose. Throughout his investigation, Paxton

22 Ibid., 273: “le clergé paroissial, absorbé par d’autres tâches, s’élimine par le fait même.”


25 Paxton, *Christianizing Death*, 201.
documents the tension between centralizing efforts and the persistence of local practices. In this chapter, I hope to add an Auxerrois perspective to the “diversity of ritual responses”\textsuperscript{26} that the best efforts of the Carolingian ecclesiastical hierarchy failed to completely suppress.

\textit{Misericordiae tuae auxilium: The Pastoral Care of the Dying}

The texts written by Carolingian bishops, both the capitularies through which they instructed the priests subject to their authority as well as their pronouncements when gathered in council, expressed a consistent desire to provide those in danger of dying with the Eucharist, called \textit{viaticum} in this context. These records include: one of the two capitularies written by Theodulf of Orléans (ca. 750 – 821); one by his later ninth-century successor Walter (ca. 869 – ca. 891); an anonymous text known as the \textit{capitula Parisiensia}; and the records of the council held at Savonnières (859), the attendees of which included Senonias bishops. These texts, as Carine van Rhijn ably demonstrates, often coincided in more ways than they differed, and their assignation to different genres not only stems from editorial decisions, but often from inconsistent ones.\textsuperscript{27}

Moreover, those who produced these texts “do not seem to draw a clear line between what are nowadays called capitularies and decisions taken during councils or synods.”\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 208. I do this without relying on the problematic language of “ritual.”

\textsuperscript{27} Carine van Rhijn, \textit{Shepherds of the Lord: Priests and Episcopal Statutes in the Carolingian Period}, (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 13-24. Van Rhijn points out in note 6 on p. 15, for example, that the first episcopal statute of Gerwald of Liège already appears in three different volumes of the MGH, and Rudolf Porkorny suggests that it be re-edited in yet another volume.

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 14.
Van Rhijn perhaps overstates the case, for there is no evidence connecting the production of capitular texts to collective action by the Carolingian episcopacy, and councils frequently met to deal with specific, and often divisive, issues. But as documents meant to deal with everyday life, both capitularies and conciliar texts expressed the thoughts, beliefs and interests of the Frankish clergy.

While the authors of all of these texts underscored the importance of attending to those near death, they only rarely did so in emotional terms. The Senonais secular clergy, with two exceptions that have little to do with the ritual proper, described a deathbed ceremony devoid of emotions. The authors of two other capitulary texts wrote about their concern that the dying received the *viaticum*, but did so in an emotionless tone. In chapter ten, the anonymous author of the so-called *capitula parisiensia* discussed the viaticum in relationship to the importance of penance. At the end of this discussion he concluded that “we [the clergy] should have the care of those falling [into sin] and the viaticum for the dying.”29 Walter, a late-ninth century successor of Theodulf in Orléans, instructed that his priests “should always have the Eucharist prepared, so that when someone is dying or a child gets sick, let the priest give him communion, lest he die without the viaticum.”30

29 *Capitula parisiensia*, MGH *Capitula episcoporum 1* ed. Peter Brommer, 32: “Ut et curam labencium habeamus et viaticum moriencibus.”

30 Walter of Orléans, “Capitula,” MGH *Capitula episcoporum 1* ed. Peter Brommer, 189: “Et ut semper eucharistiam presbiter habeat paratam, ut, quando quis infirmatus fuerit aut parvulus egrotaverit, statim eum communicet, ne sine viatico moriatur.”
The Senonais bishops used capitulary texts to express their concern that the faithful receive proper pastoral care, including the *viaticum* when their survival was in question. The same holds true for the other genre of texts produced by the secular clergy, the records of councils. These texts spoke to different concerns, and to a different audience, than episcopal statutes. The Carolingian clergy found a number of different reasons to convene councils, so their records do not necessarily speak to cultic practice in as direct a fashion as the capitularies of bishops such as Theodulf and Walter. But nonetheless the references to the *viaticum* found therein echo the sentiments of more pastorally-oriented texts.

In 859 the Frankish clergy gathered at Savonnières, a villa in the vicinity of Toul, to deal with, among other things, two events of staggering importance: the ongoing debate over predestination, started by the writings of Gottschalk of Orbais nearly thirty years before; and the supposed traitorous actions of Wenilo, Archbishop of Sens.\(^{31}\) While neither of these issues affected the care of the dying directly, the threats they posed to the Franks caused the assembled clergy to declaim at length on the social ills caused by such dissention. Carolingian churchmen consistently connected spiritual troubles, such as the contentious nature of the predestination quarrel, to troubles in the material world. The late 850s were a dangerous and violent time, and councils such as the one held at

\[^{31}\] Peter McKeon, “The Carolingian councils of Savonnières (859) and Tusey (860) and their background. A study in the ecclesiastical and political history of the ninth century,” *Revue bénédictine* 84 (1974): 75-110. Given the serious nature of the issues discussed, there is surprisingly little scholarship on this council. Wenilo had been accused of inviting Louis the German to invade Charles the Bald’s kingdom in 858.
Savonnières spoke to these more general concerns as well as to the specific reason for which they convened.

One of the general social ills that came under scrutiny was murder, and the bishops, abbots and monks gathered outside of Toul warned those who perpetrated this crime of the dire consequences of their actions, which were even more severe than Theodulf’s nineteen-year penance. They called upon the vaguely-described but undeniable authority of “those who governed the church before us” who, they believed, “ordered that those who killed voluntarily should perform penance as long as they might live.”

Part of this judgment included exclusion from the receipt of the Eucharist, but once again only to a certain point, for the clergy still allowed for the viaticum at the end of life.

For all of their concern over the provision of the Eucharist when death was near, however, the bishops of the Senonais did not elaborate upon the emotions that attended the conferring of the viaticum. Instead, the material used by the clergy to conduct the rituals that surrounded sickness and death reveals the affective nature of the imminent departure of a member of the community.

Paxton suggests that the prayers and psalmody called for by the texts that guided the priest through the rituals associated with the sick and dying set the tone for the liturgical experiences associated with death. This ritual structure varied from one

---

32 Council of Savonnières, MGH Concilia 3 ed. W. Hartmann, 484: “qui ante nos ecclesiam rexerunt, eos qui voluntarium homicidium fecerint, poenitentiam quamdiu viverent facere statuerunt.”

33 Ibid.: “ut nunquam acciperent sanctam communionem, nisi in fine pro viatico decreverunt.”
religious house to the next throughout the ninth century, highlighting the need for an
analysis of only those manuscripts copied within the Archdiocese of Sens and
cautionsing against any abstraction from an “ideal” or “complete” sacramentary, the text
that would have contained the specific prayers called for during ritual activity, of any
kind. Only one sacramentary survives from Auxerre: Albi, Bibliothèque municipale
d’Albi, 4 (ix.4/4). The ninth-century portion of the manuscript (1-253) was written in
one hand and is rubricated throughout in rustic capitals. The last four pages seem to be
additions to the original manuscript; not only is the ink darker and the hand later, but
the original manuscript ends imperfectly on page 253 in the middle of a mass to be said
in the house of the sick (in domo infirmor[um]).

The loss of the end of Albi BM 4 is unfortunate, but the extant ninth-century text
still contains material relevant to the rituals surrounding death and dying: a mass for the
sick (missa pro infirmis, p. 209-210); one for the health of the living (missa pro sal[us]
uiuor[um], p. 210-211); and part of a mass for those who have died (missa pro defunctis, p.
223). Only the first two prayers for this final mass survive; a later scribe effaced the end
of the ninth-century text at some point and replaced it with contemporary prayers (in a
hand different from the last four pages of the manuscript). Additionally, Albi BM 4
provides special readings for three masses: for the sick (pro infirmis, p. 238-39); for the
health of the living (pro salute uiuor[um], p. 239-41); and for the dying (in agen[da]

34 Hereafter Albi, BM 4. Available online:
http://www.manuscrits.mediatheque-albi.fr/_images/OEB/RES_MS004/index.htm. The online
version is paginated instead of foliated, and hereafter I cite page numbers. The attribution to
Auxerre comes from the Bischoff/Lobrichon list mentioned in Chapter Three.
mortuorum, p. 247-248), although no corresponding mass exists in the manuscript for the latter, which means perhaps that these readings were meant to go with the missa pro defunctis.

Albi BM 4 presents a simple liturgical approach to infirmity and death, one that required only one mass for each circumstance (health, sickness, dying) in which individuals potentially found themselves. As Paxton found for other Frankish texts of this type, these prayers structured the affective experience of the participants for all of these rituals. They referred to the emotional states of those gathered in prayer as well as divine emotions. Those who were healthy, and sought to continue in this health, sought to avoid God's anger, in return for which they would rejoice. Those who had fallen sick spoke of their fears, but also of the joy that they would experience once restored to health. In all cases the faithful begged God's mercy, but when death was involved they did so hopefully.

The mass celebrated Pro salute vivorum sought to protect those in a state of health. The prayer labeled infra actionem expressed the belief of those assembled that "because of the devotion of their mind" (ob deuotionem mentis eorum), God would accept their prayers "with a kindly countenance" (clementi uultu).\textsuperscript{35} If so, the faithful told God, they would be in turn "always insistently rejoicing in your worship."\textsuperscript{36} One of the readings assigned for this mass, Micah 7:14-20, refers to the mercy of God as well, this

\textsuperscript{35} Albi BM 4, p. 211, lines 18-20.

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., p. 212, lines 1-2: "semp[er] in tua religione laetantes instanter."
time as a sign of his emotional state. God, the prophet said, once he had forgiven the sins of mankind, *will send his fury no more, for he delighteth in mercy* (Micah 7:18). The reading and the prayer together described an emotional exchange between God and man wherein the faithful, through their devotion, solicited the mercy of a God no longer angry but instead delighted. Once received, this mercy in turn influenced the emotions of the congregation, causing them to perform their religious activities happily.

The Carolingian faithful sought God’s mercy when they became sick as well, but with a different set of accompanying emotions. The language, and consequently the tone, of the prayers also differed; where the mass *pro salute viviorum* described people praying humbly (*supplicantes*), on two different occasions the prayers during the mass for the sick (*missa pro infirmis*) used the first-person plural of *imploro* (i.e. *imploramus*)

While the ninth-century text did not refer to the tearful entreaty implied by the classical usage of this verb, the choice of a word with a different valence signals nonetheless a difference in devotional behavior. In the opening prayer of the mass those assembled beg God together (*imploramus*) for the “assistance of your mercy” (*misericordiae tuae auxilium*) in an effort to return health to their sick companion, on whose behalf they offered the mass. The prayer to be said after communion also contained a petition for assistance in the form of God’s mercy, although this time not as something sought from

---

37 The verb does not appear in Niermeyer. See the definition in Lewis & Short: http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0059%3Aentry%3Dimploro

38 Albi BM 4, p. 209, lines 18-19.
God but rather done by him. This prayer asked God that those who were sick might be worthy (*mercantur*) to return to the church (that is, get well) “by the power of your mercy” (*ope misericordiae tuae*).³⁹

While the first prayer described divine emotions, the second of the two prayers that implored God’s aid during the mass *pro infirmis* revealed the emotional state of those gathered to pray for the sick. The faithful begged that God would extend his mercy to the sick “so that we [those praying] might rejoice in the health of those for whom we feared danger.”⁴⁰ They offered this prayer as much for the one in physical distress as for themselves. Sickness led to danger (physical and spiritual), which caused fear; God’s mercy, if extended, not only removed these dangers from those who were sick, but also transformed the emotional state of those concerned about them from fear to joy. One of the readings provided for this mass (2 Corinthians 1:3-5) reinforced the importance of this affective transformation. In this letter Paul, writing to Timothy, reminded him (and therefore the Carolingian congregation as well) that it was the *father of all mercies who comforteth us in all our tribulation*. Therefore, he continued, it was necessary that Christians be able to *comfort them who are in all distress*. While the prayers addressed the emotions of those praying, rather than those for whom they prayed, the reading suggested that a merciful God provided comfort for all, either directly or indirectly, through the actions of the faithful.

---


⁴⁰ Ibid., lines 5-7: “imploramus ut de // quorum periculo metuimus // de eorum salute lætemur”
Those in a state of health sought God’s mercy and when faced with sickness they begged for it; once someone died, however, the surviving members of their community could only hope for the same. They began the mass for the dead (*missa pro defunctis*) by reminding God that they never prayed to him “without hope of mercy” (*sine spe misericordiae*), the same mercy that they sought in their efforts to either remain healthy or return to health once sick. In this instance the result of the mercy they hoped to secure was for God “to include [the deceased] in the rank of the saints.”\(^42\) The two readings that Albi BM 4 provided for the disposal of the dead worked together to elaborate upon the fate of the deceased. The first of these, 2 Maccabees 12:43-46, justified prayer for the dead. These verses explain that Judas (the second-century BCE Jewish leader and warrior, not Christ’s traitorous disciple) correctly offered sacrifices for the dead because *if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead.* Similarly, therefore, the Carolingian church rightly prayed hopefully for its deceased members, as those gathered for this mass from the Albi sacramentary would have done. The second reading, John 6:37-40, served to underscore the object of this hope, the promise made by God that *everyone who seeth the Son, and believeth in him, may have life everlasting.*

Carolingian bishops may not have written much about the emotions experienced by those faced with illness and death in capitularies and conciliar records, but one of the

\(^{41}\) Ibid., p. 223, line 9.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., lines 12-14: “s[an]c[t]or[um] // numero facias adgre(-) // gare”
texts that they would have used to guide the faithful through the liturgical events associated with both of those exigencies revealed their emotional nature. Albi BM 4 juxtaposed divine anger and joy alongside earthly fear, joy and hope, all framed by God’s mercy. But these emotions were not those of the one for whom the faithful offered masses and prayers. The monks of Saint-Germain, however, reversed this approach; they preferred to discuss the affective experiences of the soul after death.

*Beatus, id est felix: The Emotional Eschatology of Haimo of Auxerre*

The secular clergy never wrote in emotional terms about the *viaticum* and the rest of the liturgical apparatus that accompanied the dying, and their monastic counterparts did so only infrequently. A search of the *Patrologia Latina* online database revealed that Haimo of Auxerre never used the word *viaticum* in the entire corpus of his writing. His student Heiric did so only twice, and then in the word’s more classical sense of “journey.” Nor did either write of the *commendatio animae* or the *ordo defunctorum* or any of the other language specific to the liturgy that pertained to death. Although the monk-priest remained a feature of Carolingian religion throughout the ninth century, Haimo and Heiric did not concern themselves with the pastoral care of the dying. But this does not mean that they did not think and write about death. Haimo developed an eschatological framework within which he described the experience of both physical and spiritual death in affective terms.

Haimo, as seen in this chapter’s opening anecdote, certainly thought about the emotions felt by those faced with someone else’s death, where the intensity of the love
between two people while alive inspired feelings of grief and sorrow in those who survived. While in this example Haimo discussed the emotions felt by the survivors after the death of a loved one, elsewhere he referred to the emotional trauma of death itself. Here too the context for this discussion was an explanation of an aspect of Christ’s death, this time the emotional reaction of those who witnessed it. The monk of Saint-Germain believed “without a doubt that the pious and faithful saw him [Jesus] and were moved viscerally by him with the greatest sorrow (\textit{maximo dolore}).”\textsuperscript{43} The only way Haimo knew to convey the experience of being moved “with the greatest sorrow” was to compare it to more quotidian death. Those present at the crucifixion, he said, felt sorrow in such a way that, “just as in the death of an only son, enormous grief is expended by [his] parents during his bitter funeral.”\textsuperscript{44}

The lament of the prophet Hosea over the absence of comfort (\textit{consolatio}) allowed Haimo another opportunity to elaborate upon the emotionally disruptive aspects of death. In response to Hosea 13:14 (\textit{Comfort is hidden from my eyes}), Haimo first described the reaction of God to the violation of his provisions by Adam in Eden but then, as he often did, offered a second interpretation. The prophet, he explained, reflected on the inevitability of death and concluded that “I am not able to be comforted, and I am not able to mitigate my sorrow, whatever I shall have conceived in [my] mind, when I think

\textsuperscript{43}Haimo, \textit{In duodecim prophetas}, PL 118, col. 264-265: “nulli dubium quin pii quoque et fideles eum aspiciebant, et maximo super eum movebantur viscerabiliter dolore.”

\textsuperscript{44}Ibid.: 265: “sicuti in morte unigeniti, cujus acerbo funeri ingens a parentibus luctus impenditur.”
of the inevitable necessity of death.” Haimo “spoke” here in the voice of the prophet. But the semantic slipperiness of the first-person singular, read alongside the other two examples, allowed his voice to come through as well. Haimo saw death as an event that elicited strong feelings of grief and sorrow, emotions that endured even after the practices that supposedly mitigated them took place, as his description of the object left behind by a loved one suggested.

These examples underscore the inadequacy of the investigations characteristic of the scholarly tradition on this topic; this is neither the “tame death” of Ariès nor the fearful attitude described by Delumeau, and rather than the healing event favored by those influenced by van Gennep, Haimo described a funeral as “bitter.” Nonetheless, these passages represent the only instances in which Haimo spoke of the emotional reaction to the death of the body. The reason for this is clear: he thought that spiritual death was much more important than physical death. The death of the body, while of comparatively minimal importance, was nonetheless the starting point for Haimo’s eschatology, for “the death of the body is the exhalation and the passing over of the soul.” Haimo used Hosea 13:14 (O death, I will be thy death; O hell, I will be thy bite) to elaborate on this passing over and to delineate the contours of his conception of the afterlife. Haimo adhered to an Augustinian view, with an indeterminate “lower region”

---


(infernum) in which the souls of the departed awaited their final destination. “The difference,” he wrote, “between death and the lower regions is this: death is where the soul is separated from the body; the lower region is the place in which souls are disposed either to rest, or in punishment, according to the quality of [their] merits.”

Physical death led to either spiritual life or spiritual death, a transition that Haimo addressed on different occasions. In response to the first part of Apocalypse 18:8 (Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death and mourning), he distinguished sharply between the differing experiences of the saved and the damned. He repeated the observation that “the death of the body is the absence of the soul,” and extended the equation further by remarking that “the death of the soul is the absence of God.” He next explained the consequences of the movement of the soul to either spiritual life or death. “The elect,” he encouraged his readers, “having God, have life, in accordance with this: Now this is eternal life: That they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent (John 17:3). And therefore they will live forever, because they will remain in the presence of life.” On the other hand, “when the reprobate will lose the

---

47 Idem, Enarratio in duodecim prophetas minores, PL 117, col. 93: “Inter mortem autem et inferos hoc interest: mors est qua anima separatur a corpore; infernus locus est in quo animae recluduntur sive ad refrigerium, sive in poenis pro qualitate meritorum.”


life that is God, they will incur death.”50 Moreover, the distinction between spiritual life and death was fundamentally emotional. The elect joined with “the saints rejoicing and singing praises to their creator” while the damned “will grieve in eternal mourning.”51 The eternal nature of the emotions of both the elect and the reprobate defined the emotional landscape of the afterlife. Those who ended up in heaven enjoyed the enduring affective states of happiness and joy (expressed through rejoicing) and left behind feelings of sorrow and fear as well as their expression through weeping. The damned mourned and wailed in grief and sorrow, and suffered the absence of hope, in perpetuity.

Haimo read Isaiah 51:11 (And now that they are redeemed by the Lord, shall return and shall come into Sion) to refer either to those who had come “into the present Church or, preferably, into heavenly blessedness, praising that one [God].”52 This encapsulated his vision of the heavenly reward after which every Christian strived; the elect sat eternally before God, blessed, and praised him. Blessedness itself was, in Haimo’s estimation, an emotional state. When he came to “blessed” (beatus), the first word of Apocalypse 20:6, he immediately inserted the gloss “that is, happy.”53

50 Ibid.: “Quam vitam, id est Deum, cum amiserint reprob, mortem incurrunt.” For the post-classical definition of “incurro, -are” as “to incur,” see definition II.A.2 in Lewis & Short.

51 Ibid.: “sanctis gaudentibus et laudes creatori suo decantantibus... luctu perpetuo moerebunt.”

52 Idem, Commentariorum in Isaiam, 978: “in praesentem Ecclesiam, vel, quod melius est, in coelestem beatitudinem laudantes illum.”

53 Idem, Expositionis in Apocalypsin, 1186: “Beatus, id est felix.” I have chosen “happy” instead of “lucky” for felix because blessedness was not dependant on chance.
In the afterlife that Haimo envisioned, joy and rejoicing existed alongside blessedness (= happiness), generally in the context of praising God. Again Isaiah 51:11 served as Haimo’s point of departure, this time providing him with emotional language upon which to elaborate. The verse reads: *And everlasting joy shall be upon their heads,* and Haimo explained that he understood “upon their heads” to mean “in their minds.”

Haimo followed this with a quotation from Psalms 83:5 (*Blessed are they that dwell in thy house, O Lord: they shall praise thee for ever and ever*) that likened this joy to the blessedness (or happiness, since the biblical verse used the word *beati*) of those who stood before the Lord in eternal praise. He repeated the connection between joy, praise and rejoicing later in the same commentary when prompted to do so by the promise found in Isaiah 65:17-18. These verses described the creation of a “new heaven and a new earth,” which Haimo understood to refer to the establishment of a heavenly Jerusalem. Haimo adopted the voice of the divine as he told the elect “you shall be glad and rejoice forever, that is you shall praise me [God] without end in all things.”

Feelings of joy and their expression through rejoicing and praise characterized the experience of dwelling within the heavenly city created by God, and the language of...
the next verse in the same chapter of Isaiah made internal affect synonymous with the
people, and its expression with the place. In Isaiah 65:18 the prophet wrote in God’s
voice: For behold I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and the people thereof joy, and followed this in
65:19 with an expression of God’s emotional reaction to his creation: And I will rejoice in Jerusalem and joy in my people.58 In his explanation of these two verses, Haimo
underscored the affective reciprocity between God and the elect (and angels) who
praised him, but he credited this divine response not to the act of creation itself, as Isaiah
implied, but rather as a response to those who inhabited the heavenly city that God
created: “Behold (he said) I God all-powerful will make from angels and men one
heavenly Church (or Jerusalem), and they will exalt and rejoice so much that I, who am
their creator and fashioner, shall rejoice and exult in them; and not only will they
themselves rejoice, but indeed they themselves will be exultation and joy.”59 As
mentioned in Chapter Four, at the end of the ninth century Remigius of Auxerre posited
the same affective reciprocity but thought that it took place during the mass, which
according to Remigius was characterized by a collapsing of space and time and therefore
equivalent to the afterlife.

Those who achieved heavenly reward became joy its expression through
rejoicing and praising God (they will be exultation and joy). No wonder, then, that their

58 Isaiah 65:17-18: “Quia ecce ego creo Hierusalem exsultationem, et populum ejus gaudium, et
exsultabo in Hierusalem, et gaudebo in populo meo.”

59 Haimo, Commentariorum in Isaiam, 1072: “Ecce (inquit) ego Deus omnipotens faciam ex angelis
et hominibus unam coelestem Ecclesiam, sive Hierusalem, et exsultabunt et gaudebunt intantum,
ut ego qui sum creator eorum et conditor, gaudeam et exsultem in eis, et non solum ipsi
gaudebunt, sed etiam exsultatio et gaudium ipsi erunt.”
affective experience also included the absence of sorrow and the weeping that accompanied it. The continuing description of the “new heaven” found in chapter 65 of Isaiah again provided Haimo with a point of departure. The prophet claimed that in the joyous heavenly Jerusalem the voice of weeping shall no more be heard in her, nor the voice of crying, to which Haimo responded approvingly that “it is not proper that in the heavenly city of Jerusalem the people of the city, who are going to undertake the eternal glory of exultation and joy, should have the voice of weeping and the voice of sorrow.”

Haimo matched the words of Isaiah 65:19 to the sentiment of Apocalypse 21:4 (And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes: and death shall be no more, nor mourning, nor crying, nor sorrow), which he interpreted similarly. The first half of this verse, he explained, “pertain[s] not to the present life, filled with grief and tears, but to the future when all grief will be removed from the faithful, and they will possess perpetual joy, in accordance with this: Blessed are they who mourn: for they will be comforted.” On two other occasions, both of them in his commentary on Isaiah, Haimo also contrasted the nature of affective heavenly experience, specifically the presence of joy and happiness and the absence of tears and weeping, with that of the material world. In chapter 51 of Isaiah, where the prophet promised that those who shall come into Sion would obtain joy and

---

60 Isaiah 65:19: “non audietur in eo ultra vox fletus et vox clamoris.”

61 Ibid., “Neque enim dignum est ut in civitate Hierusalem coelesti populi ejus, qui exsultationis et gaudii aeternam susceputurus est gloriarm vocem fletus et vocem tristitiae habeat.”

62 Idem, Expositionis in Apocalypsin, 1193: “non ad praesentem vitam luctu et lacrymis plenam pertinent, sed ad futuram; quando omnis luctus auferetur a fidelibus, et perpetuum gaudium possidebitur, juxta illud: Beati qui lugent, quoniam ipsi consolabuntur (Matthew 5:5).”
gladness, Haimo reminded his readers that “the holy, being placed in the present world, are not able to have these things.” As, however, the redeemed came into Sion, that is, as they achieved heavenly reward, they not only felt the joy and happiness that they did not experience while alive but, as the end of the verse claimed, they no longer felt sorrow and stopped mourning.

This vision of the spiritual world as the emotional inverse of the physical world accorded with his interpretation of Isaiah 25:8 (And the Lord God shall wipe away tears from every face), in which Haimo understood God to wipe away the tears “of his elect.” Sandwiched between this verse and Apocalypse 21:4 (And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes), which contains the same message, Haimo explained that since “in the present world the holy afflict themselves with tears, therefore in eternal rest they will set aside all crying and tears.” Haimo, as mentioned earlier, thought it proper (dignus) that the saved did not cry or weep. He reserved that for the reprobate. At the end of his explanation of Isaiah 65:19 he asked rhetorically “where will exist the voice of weeping

---

63 Idem, Commentariorum in Isaiam, 978: “Haec non possunt habere sancti in praesenti saeculo positi.”

64 Isaiah 51:11: And now they that are redeemed by the Lord, shall return, and shall come into Sion singing praises, and joy everlasting shall be upon their heads, they shall obtain joy and gladness, sorrow and mourning shall flee away.

65 Haimo, Commentariorum in Isaiam, 838: “subaudis electorum suorum.”

66 Ibid.: “In praesenti siquidem saeculo sancti in lacrymis se affligunt: ideo in aeterna requie omnes ploratus et lacrymas amittent.”
and the voice of crying” if not in heaven? His answer: “among the gathering of the reprobate.”

Haimo wrote comparatively less about the emotional experiences of those souls condemned to eternal damnation, and when he did it was generally by comparing them to the souls of the elect. Just as he did for the spiritual life of the elect, Haimo used affective language to describe the spiritual death of the reprobate. The damned lacked the sensory experience of the sight and sound of God, they were unable to praise him, and they could not feel hope. But they felt and did other things. The eternal punishment meted out to sinners caused them to experience sorrow and grief, and to express those feelings incessantly through howling, wailing and lamenting. All of this would take place when “on the day of judgment, both [the devil] and his servants, and those he deceived, shall fall into the pit of eternal damnation.”

The exclusion of those found to be unworthy from fellowship with the divine began at the time of judgment, when “they will not look upon him [Christ] coming in the glory of his majesty.”

---

67 Ibid., 1072: “Ubi ergo erit vox fletus et vox clamoris? in congregatio reproborum.”

68 Ibid., 841: “In die judicii et ipse et ministri ejus, quosque ipse decepit, concident in barathrum aeternae damnationis.”

69 Idem, Enarratio in duodecim prophetas minores, 264: “non...aspicient ad eum in majestatis suae gloria venientem.” as part of his commentary on Zachariah 12:10.
He adopted the voice of the prophet, who apostrophized God, and proclaimed that on the day of judgment “you will crush them [the damned] and destroy the memory of them from the kingdom and blessedness of the just.” Once condemned to the pit, the damned’s absence from both heaven and God would result in a particular kind of sensory deprivation. Apocalypse 18:8 relates the fall of Babylon, which occurred because God is strong, who shall judge her. As the result of this judgment, “therefore, she will be tormented for eternity, because she will hear nothing of angels or men.” Even though here Haimo responded directly to the description of the fall of Babylon, he extended the punishment visited upon her by explaining in the same passage that God “will give [this] strong sentence of damnation to the reprobate.” Part of the strength of this sentence was auditory deprivation; like Babylon, the damned will “hear nothing.”

The final component of this sensory restriction was the checking of the tongues of those cast into hell. Since he described eternal praise as a hallmark of spiritual life, it followed that Haimo believed the opposite to be true of spiritual death. Isaiah 38:18 (For hell shall not confess to thee, neither shall death praise thee) furnished him with the

---

70 Haimo quoted only part of the end of Isaiah 26:14: “Propterea visitabis eos,” and in so doing changed the tense of the verb from the past (visitasti, Vulgate) to the future, since he wrote of the Last Judgment, which had yet to occur. He incorporated the language of the remainder into his commentary. The second half of the verse reads: Therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and hast destroyed all their memory.

71 Haimo, Commentariorum in Isaïam, 841: “et conteres eos, et perdes eorum memoriam de regno et beatiudine justorum.”

72 Idem, Expositionis in Apocalypsin, 1185: “At idcirco in aeternum cruciabitur, quia nullus angelorum, aut hominum audebit.”
opportunity to explain this aspect of eternal torment. Haimo assigned concrete
categories to the abstractions of hell and death: “By hell in this place we should
understand the reprobate, by death the devil. For in fact those who have descended to
the infernal gate are to be damned without end.”\textsuperscript{73} The Last Judgment was indeed a final
one; once they passed through the gates of hell, the reprobate “are unable to perform
pence there, nor offer praise to omnipotent God, because beautiful praise is not in the
mouths of a sinner.”\textsuperscript{74}

In addition to the occlusion of sight and hearing and the restriction placed upon
speech, damnation also led to a number of tactile, auditory, visual and even gustatory
sensory phenomena. Haimo interpreted the smoke, fire and brimstone, described in
Apocalypse 9:17-18,\textsuperscript{75} that resulted in the deaths of men as the preaching of evil
doctrines, but also as a preview of “the eternal punishment...that is rightly called the
torment of the wicked”\textsuperscript{76} that befell those who listened to such messages. These same
three torments (i.e. smoke, fire and brimstone) furnished Haimo a vocabulary to
describe the overall sensory experience of this torment. Those who suffered it, he said,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{73} Idem, Commentariorum in Isaiam, 905: “Per infernum in hoc loco reprobos intelligamus; per
mortem vero diabolum. Hi namque qui ad inferni claustra descendunt, damnandi sunt sine fine.”
\item \textsuperscript{74} Ibid.: “Non agunt poenitentiam ibi, nec ferunt laudes omnipotenti Deo: quia non est speciosa
laus in ore peccatoris.”
\item \textsuperscript{75} Apocalypse 9:17-18: And from their mouths proceeded fire, and smoke, and brimstone. And by these
three plagues was slain the third part of men, by the fire and by the smoke and by the brimstone, which
issued out of their mouths.
\item \textsuperscript{76} Haimo, Expositionis in Apocalypsin, 1058: “aeterna supplicia...quae recte tormentum impiorum
vocatur.”
\end{itemize}
“will know how bitter death will be: to be burnt always by fire, and not to die utterly; to endure smoke always, [and] in no way to see light; to be filled always with foulness [and] to smell nothing of sweetness.”77 The damned experienced their punishment through the touch of fire, the obscuring effects of smoke and the fetid odor of hell, the collective experience of which Haimo summed up as “bitter” (amara).

The reprobate, once condemned to hell, lacked certain emotions and experienced others in perpetuity alongside this assault on their senses. While they obviously did not experience any of the affective states appropriate to the spiritual life of the saved, Haimo singled out specifically their inability to experience hope. After Christ judged them, “the wicked,” he said, “who were handed over to eternal tortures cannot hope to be recalled to those above, having been placed in desperation.”78 But aside from the hopeless state in which the wicked found themselves, sorrow and grief, expressed by wailing and crying, characterized the emotional context of hell.

As he did for the saved, Haimo contrasted the emotions felt by the souls of the damned with those that they experienced while alive. Building upon Luke 6:25 (Woe to you that now laugh: for you shall mourn), which he cited in his exegetical treatment of Apocalypse 18:8 to describe the fate of the wretched, Haimo explained that “because, indeed, delighting in present delights [and] rejoicing when they do evil things they

77 Ibid: “experientur quam amara mors sit, semper igne cremari, nec funditus mori, semper fumum pati, lucem nunquam videre, semper fetoribus repleri, suavitatis nihil adoleri.”

78 Idem, Commentariorum in Isaiam, 905-906: “Impii autem qui aeternis cruciatibus sunt traditi, non habent spem revocandi ad superos, positi in desperationem.”
refuse to fear future punishment, therefore in a short time descending into hell they will
grieve in eternal mourning.” This passage followed several that described the very
different fate of the blessed, a narrative pattern that Haimo also followed in his
commentary on Isaiah 65:14. He told his readers that crying and howling, the
manifestations of sorrow and grief respectively mentioned by the prophet, did not result
not from any earthly condition. Rather, they were emotions (and their audible
expressions) that occurred “in the punishments of hell,” a contention he supported by
citing Matthew 13:42 (there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth). To reinforce the contrast
between the saved and the damned, Haimo warned that after the Last Judgment “the
saints will indeed then rejoice, and the sinners will wail out of spiritual grief, that is out
of the sorrow of heart that they will feel within.”

In the afterlife, according to Haimo, emotions ossified. Those seated on the right
side of Christ after judgment ceased weeping and never again felt sorrow or fear.
Instead, inspired by the presence of the divine, they rejoiced and praised God eternally
as they felt perpetual happiness and joy. For those sent ad sinistris, however, Haimo
described an inverted affective landscape. Fire, smoke and brimstone assailed their

79 Idem, Expositionis in Apocalypsin, 1156: “Quia enim praeuentibus delecati deliciis nolunt ulterior pavere futuram, laetantes cum male fecerint, ideo in brevi tempore descendentes ad inferos, luctu perpetuo moerabunt.”
80 Isaiah 65:14: Behold my servants shall rejoice, and you shall be confounded: behold my servants shall praise for joyfulness of heart, and you shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for grief of spirit.
81 Haimo, Commentariorum in Isaïam, 1070: “in poenis inferni.”
82 Ibid.: “Tunc autem gaudebunt sancti, et ululabunt peccatores prae contritione spiritus, id est prae dolore cordis quem habebunt intrinsecus.”
senses while at the same time preventing them from seeing or hearing God. They suffered emotionally as well, as their punishment removed hope and replaced it with grief and sorrow, in response to which the damned could only cry and wail for eternity.

**Beata eius visione: Heiric of Auxerre**

Death, it seems, was regularly on the mind of Heiric of Auxerre, a student of Haimo at the monastery of Saint-Germain. Not only did he discuss it in his homilies, he also devoted a significant portion of the florilegium he complied (known today as the *Collectanea*) to physical death, the afterlife and the fate of the soul. Yet his eschatology differed from that of his teacher. In the homilies that he wrote to accompany the liturgical celebrations attended by his brethren, Heiric echoed the themes developed by Haimo but shifted the emphasis by concentrating on the ability or inability to see. He described a more limited range of emotional and sensory experiences, in which he focused on the terror of the inability to see God that he believed formed an essential part of eternal punishment, and on the happiness of experiencing the “blessed vision of him” (*beata eius visione*) forever in heaven.

Heiric thought about the death of the body in the same paradoxical way as Haimo. Physical death was an emotionally disruptive event yet, at the same time was, in the larger context of salvation, irrelevant. Despite this, Heiric expected people to react to the death of a loved one in a particular way; so much so that in his homily for the sixth

---

83 Heiric drew the part of the *Collectanea* that treats death and dying from Julian of Toledo’s *Prognosticon futuri saeculi libri tres.*
day after the fourth Sunday in Quadragesima he criticized someone who did not. The pericope for this homily was John 11:1 (Now there was a certain man sick, named Lazarus, of Bethania, of the town of Mary and Martha her sister), and Heiric built the entire homily around the story of the resurrection of Lazarus. The gospel narrative related that, when Jesus arrived in Bethany, Martha left her sister at home and went out to meet him. When she did, the author of the Gospel according to John reported that she reprimanded him for not being present during the last days of Lazarus’ illness, for if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. This provoked a shocked reaction from Heiric, but not because of the temerity of Martha upbraiding Christ. Rather, he exclaimed, “how she adopts moderate words, she who thus temperately grieves the death of [her] brother!”

Heiric did not dwell long on his disapproval of Martha’s approach to mourning the death of Lazarus; he used Martha’s complaint to explain the nature of Christ’s divine power. But in Mary, Martha’s sister, Heiric found grief properly expressed. The same Gospel text described Mary as weeping and in need of comfort; John 11:31 mentioned that a number of people had gathered to comfort Mary in her house. When Mary left to go meet Jesus at the tomb they believed that she had gone to weep there instead of at home, and followed her there. Even as Heiric pointed out the true nature of their trip to

84 John 11:21
86 John 11:31 The Jews therefore, who were with her in the house, and comforted her, when they saw Mary that she rose up speedily and went out, followed her, saying: She goeth to the grave to weep there.
the tomb (so that they might believe in Christ),\textsuperscript{87} he elaborated on the nature of Mary’s
grief by expanding upon an explanation found in a homily now attributed to Pseudo-
Haimo. In this exemplar, Mary “sought the solace of tears” \textit{(solatium lacrymis quaeret)}
but the point of the biblical episode for the homilist was that the Jews, having followed
Mary, could then serve as “many witnesses” \textit{(plurimos testes)} to the reality of the
resurrection.\textsuperscript{88} While the conversion of Jews to belief in Christ certainly mattered to
Heiric, for him Mary’s tears represented more than a vehicle to lure to the tomb those
who could witness, and thereafter report, Christ’s resurrection. Heiric spoke of Mary’s
tears as an aspect of her grief, explaining that she left because she was “going to seek the
solace of tears and, by weeping, to satisfy her sorrow.”\textsuperscript{89}

In his homily for the sixteenth Sunday after the octave of Pentecost, Heiric used
a different New Testament story of death and resurrection to convey the same message.
This time, Luke 7:11-14 provided the narrative point of departure for the monk of Saint-
Germain’s discussion of the emotional effects that physical death exerted on the living.\textsuperscript{90}
The Luke text described Jesus and his disciples coming upon a funeral in progress as

\begin{quote}
And it came to pass afterwards, that he went into a city that is called Naim; and there
went with him his disciples, and a great multitude. And when he came nigh to the gate of the city, behold a
dead man was carried out, the only son of his mother; and she was a widow: and a great multitude of the
city was with her. Whom when the Lord had seen, being moved with mercy towards her, he said to her:
Weep not. And he came near and touched the bier.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{87} Heiric, I, 54, p. 515: “sicque in Christum crederent.”

\textsuperscript{88} (Pseudo)Haimo, \textit{PL} 118, 319: “doloris sui solatium lacrymis quae
reret, secuti sunt eam, ut tam grande miraculum quadriduani mortui resurgentis testes plurimos inveniret.” See Barré, \textit{Les
homéliaires carolingiens de l’école d’Auxerre}, 51.

\textsuperscript{89} Heiric, I, 54, p. 515: “lacrimis solatium quaesitura et dolori suo fletibus satisfactura.”

\textsuperscript{90} Luke 7:11-13 \textit{And it came to pass afterwards, that he went into a city that is called Naim; and there went with him his disciples, and a great multitude. And when he came nigh to the gate of the city, behold a dead man was carried out, the only son of his mother; and she was a widow: and a great multitude of the city was with her. Whom when the Lord had seen, being moved with mercy towards her, he said to her: Weep not. And he came near and touched the bier.}
they approached the city of Naim. A crowd accompanied a widow and her dead son, who was carried on a bier that Jesus touched once the procession had stopped. Heiric used this episode as metaphor for the elaborate relationship he felt existed between sin and the senses, but before launching into that discussion he spoke of the distress that the death of an only son caused for his mother. Even though the biblical text only referred to the widow’s reaction indirectly by saying that Jesus commanded her to stop weeping, Heiric explained that “this woman did not feign the anxiety of pain. She was a widow. She had been left without the comfort of her son, whose death she might have endured more lightly had he who had died not been her one and only, if another [son] who could have mitigated the grief of the parent might had survived.”

After explaining the sinful nature of the senses, Heiric returned briefly to his discussion of Jesus’ reaction to the widow’s grief. By telling her to cease weeping, along with touching the bier to stop the funeral procession, Jesus sought to give her a “sign of his mercy” (signum clementiae suae) through which “he might raise the dejected spirit of the widowed mother from sorrow.” Even though sorrowful and dejected, she “was blessed, because by the pity of Christ she was going to recover soon that which the harshness of human fate had taken away.”

---

91 Heiric II, 37, p. 350-51: “Non simplex hanc mulierem doloris anxietas simulabat: uidua erat, filii solatio destituta fuerat, cuius utcumque mortem leuius tolerasset si non unicus fuisset ille qui mortuus fuerat, si alter qui parentis dolorem leniret superfuisset.”

92 Ibid., p. 353: “matris uiduae deiectum maerore animum erigeret.”

93 Ibid., p. 351: “beata erat, quod Christi mox pietate receptura erat quem sortis humanae inclementia amiserat.”
served as Heiric’s source for this part of the homily, the mother represented “mother Church” (*mater ecclesia*) and, although the biblical text reported that upon seeing the woman Jesus “was moved to mercy” [*misericordia motus*], it was Heiric and not Bede who explained the effect that this mercy had on the emotional state of the widow.  

Through his discussion of the biblical figure of the bereaved widow, Heiric revealed his expectations for the appropriate reaction to a similar death among his contemporaries. Sorrow and pain, grief and dejection all attended the death of a close relation. Others could, in fact should, mitigate these feelings by feeling pity and thereby provide comfort to the one who suffered such a loss. The widow was exceptional in having her son restored to her, yet nonetheless Jesus performed this miracle, Heiric explained, so that “in the compassion with which he was merciful to the widow he might allot to us an example of pity to be imitated.”  

Here Heiric did follow Bede by telling his congregation that they could profitably imitate the behavior of Jesus, but he elided the second half of Bede’s interpretation, underscoring the importance in his mind of extending compassion, mercy and pity to the bereaved.

Physical death, Heiric reminded the monks of Saint-Germain, was the “universal debt of all men,” and while he expected it to elicit certain internal feelings (and the external expression of the same) he spoke more often about the afterlife throughout his

---


96 Idem, I, 54, p. 514: “uniuersale cunctorum hominum debitum.”
homilies. Indeed, this reminder came in the context of explaining the ending of John 11:25 (he that believeth in me, although he be dead, shall live), for which he relied once again on the homilist known as Pseudo-Haimo (who in turn relied on Alcuin’s commentary on the Gospel according to John). 97 Heiric repeats much of the language used by these two authors, with the exception of the passage quoted above. Just as his teacher did, he adhered to an Augustinian view of the fate of the soul, with some going straight to reward or punishment upon death and the majority waiting until the time of judgment to learn their ultimate fate. 98 His eschatology resembled Haimo’s in that Heiric believed that both the damned and the saved underwent sensory and affective experiences, and in that he more extensively elaborated the fate of the saved. The range of experiences that he described, however, was both more restricted and more sharply focused. The damned experienced the terror of both judgment and fiery punishment along with the inability to see God, while the saved felt joy and happiness, rejoicing eternally as the divine presence filled their eyes and ears.

Haimo warned of a hell characterized by the absence of hope and the presence of sorrow and grief, but Heiric wrote only of the terror experienced by those condemned to eternal punishment. Terror was an emotional state that began at judgment; Heiric encouraged his brethren to emend their lives in order to avoid this fate, consistent with

97 See (Pseudo)Haimo, PL 118, 319 and compare this to Alcuin, “Commentaria in S. Ioannis euangelium,” PL 100, 900.

98 Idem, I, 29, p. 243-44, in which Heiric discusses what he calls the “four-fold” (quadrifariam) division of good and bad souls.
his focus on the correction of sinful habits outlined in Chapter Two. They should seek
the mercy of God (*misericordia Dei*), he advised, to avoid being sent to Christ’s left “upon
the judgment of the terrifying examination.” The terror of the examination led, for
those whom God condemned, to what Heiric described generally as the terror of both
their fate and their punishment. Again, however, he spoke to the living in an effort to
dissuade them from charting a course that would lead them to these terrifying
experiences. When commenting on Matthew 25:37-39, verses in which the “just” (*iusti*)
expressed their astonishment when Jesus accused them of not acting charitably towards
him, Heiric explained the metaphor and then warned that no matter how much good
they might do, at the end there was a danger that it would “seem the least and the most
small, before the greatness of the terrors and the abundance of inestimable retribution
which will then be.” He preached a similar message, with similar intent, in response to
Luke 7:16 (*God hath visited his people*). As he listed the myriad ways in which he believed
this occurred, Heiric followed the “administration of the holy spirit” with the “terror of
eternal punishment.” That he prefaced this part of the homily by explaining that God’s
visit occurred “to each one of the elect” (*unicuique electorum*) served to reinforce his use
of the terrors of eternal punishment as a means to goad his brethren to live more godly
lives on earth.

100 Ibid., p. 246: “minimum et perbreuissimum uidebitur pro magnitudine terroris qui tunc erit,
siue pro abundantia inaestimabilis retributionis.”
101 Idem, II, 37, p. 358: “per amministrationem sancti spiritus, uel terorem aeterni supplicii.”
Heiric told his fellow monks that, if found lacking on the day of judgment, they would experience terror both during judgment and after being consigned to hell. He also described two of the sensory experiences of the damned. The evil ones (mali) were “chaff collected in bundles and burnt together in fire.” Describing the sensation of burning furthered his admonitory purpose, for these “damned,” Heiric continued, “therefore are ordered to depart into the eternal fire so that those who were not willing to extinguish the fire of vices in themselves in the present might burn in that place without end.” But the effect of condemnation on the tactile senses of the reprobate was not the most significant experience for Heiric, for damnation also brought with it a type of blindness.

This consequence of judgment was bi-directional; not only could those consigned to hell not see God, but they were hidden from him as well. Again the story of the resurrection of Lazarus provided Heiric with a mechanism for discussing this aspect of the Last Judgment. John 11:34 (Where have you lain him?) reported Jesus’ query upon seeing the grief that the death of Lazarus had caused his sister. Heiric responded with a rhetorical question of his own, wondering aloud how it was possible that Jesus had to ask something that in his divine omniscience he should have already known. He found his answer in the tropological significance of the Gospel text. Lazarus, as he had already explained in the homily, stood for all sinners, and therefore Jesus “did not know the


103 Ibid.: “discedere ergo maledicti in ignem aeternum iubentur, ut ibi sine fine ardeant qui in praesenti ignem uitiorum in se extinguere noluerunt.”
sinner because he sinned.” He then turned to both the book of Genesis and the Gospel according to Luke to support this interpretation. Jesus’ question was just like that which “was said to Adam after having sinned: Where art thou? (Genesis 3:9), [and] to the reprobate in judgment it was said: I know you not, whence you are (Luke 13:25). This is indeed to say: I do not know you, not unless I recognize you in the light of justice.”

Here Heiric modified and expanded upon an earlier homily (again Pseudo-Haimo). His exemplar used this passage to emphasize God’s mercy. Heiric, in a manner consistent with his emphasis on the importance of the avoidance of sin, focused on the condemnation of the reprobate instead. Just as Adam’s sin hid him from God and Lazarus represented sinners whose fallen state removed them from divine awareness, so too will those deemed unworthy be absent from the sight of Christ in majesty at the time of their judgment.

Heiric believed that the reprobate suffered from ocular occlusion as well, although of a different type than the blindness described by Haimo. They underwent one visual experience during judgment and another after it. Heiric communicated this distinction in two of his homilies for the Lenten season. As he related and interpreted

---


105 Ibid.: “ad Adam post peccatum dicitur: Vbi es?, et reprobis in iudicio dicturus est: Nescio uos unde sitis; quid est enim dicere: nescio uos, nisi non uos in luce iustitiae recognosco.”


107 “Feria II in Quadragesima” and “Sabbato in Quadragesima.”
the significance of the story of the transfiguration, Heiric reminded his audience (following Hrabanus Maurus again rather closely) that not all would experience the same sight as did Peter, James and John on Mount Tabor. After judgment Christ would appear to the elect (electis apparebit) in the same form as he did to the Apostles during the transfiguration, but “during the same judgment he will be seen in the form of a servant, which he assumed for us, by the good and the wicked at the same time, so that they [the wicked] might see him whom they have pierced.”

In the next sentence Heiric clarified that Christ appeared in his incarnate (instead of glorified) form just in advance of rendering judgment specifically so that the damned, that is “indeed the Jews who denied him, the soldiers who crucified him, Herod and Pilate who sentenced him [and] finally all of the reprobate who despised him might see [him].”

This would be the last time the wicked experienced a vision of the divine, as Heiric explained in another Lenten homily. Jesus’ description of eventually coming in majesty, found in the Gospel according to Matthew, provided the pericope for the homily Heiric wrote to be preached on the second feria in Lent. When Christ will come in majesty, “he will judge the human race, returning rightly rewards to those meriting

---

108 Heiric, I, 34, p. 293: “in ipso autem iudicio in forma serui quam pro nobis suscepit, a bonis simul et malis uidebitur, ut uideant in quem compunxerunt (Zachariah 12:10).”

109 Ibid.: “Videbunt enim Iudaei quem negauerunt, milites quem crucifixerunt, Herodes et Pilatus quem iudicauerunt, postremo omnes reprobi quem contemptserunt.” For the source of this and the citation above, see Hrabanus Maurus, Expositio in Mattheum, ed. B. Löffstedt CCCM 174A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 474: “Nam in ipso tempore iudicandi et bonis simul et malis in forma serui uidebitur, ut uideliciet impi quem spreuerre, Iudaei quem negauere, milites quem crucifixere, Pilatus Herodesque quem iudicauerre, queant agnoscre iudicem.”

110 Beginning with Matthew 25:31 (When the Son of man shall come in his majesty).
[them and] worthy punishments to the wicked and sinners. According to that which was said the reprobate will never be able to see him.”¹¹¹ At the end of the passage just quoted Heiric referred to Isaiah 26:10 (The wicked has been destroyed, he shall not see the glory of God), which he had just quoted in the previous sentence. Even though the damned saw Christ in his incarnate form at the time of judgment, being forbidden from seeing Christ in majesty (the “glory of God”) was one of the “worthy punishments” that they would suffer eternally after he rendered his verdict.

Those whom Christ judged to be worthy also underwent specific affective and sensory experiences as part of their heavenly reward. They received God’s “kindness” (bonitate), rejoiced and felt joy in response to undergoing the “internal sweetness” (dulcedinem intrinsecus) that attended to achieving salvation. Heiric linked these emotions to the senses of hearing (but only once) and vision. The ability to see God, denied to the damned as part of their eternal punishment, brought with it feelings of joy, happiness and rejoicing.

Heiric encouraged his brethren throughout his homilies to reform their lives in order to make them more pleasing to God in pursuit of the reward given to those whom Christ found worthy on the day of judgment. But he did not promise them that living properly would ensure their salvation; rather, eternal life was something granted to the elect by a merciful and kind God. In his homily for Sepuagesima, Heiric interpreted the

¹¹¹ Heiric, I, 29, p. 242: “genus humanum iudicabit, bene meritis praemia, impiis et peccatoribus digna rependens supplicia, secundum id quod dictum est numquam eum reprobi uidere poterunt.”
story found in Matthew 20:9-12 of the laborers who all received the same wages no matter how many hours of the day they worked as an allegory for the rewards that awaited the elect. He told his brethren that the “fathers of old” (antiqui patres), the saints and the doctors of the Church, certainly would not murmur when they saw the more recently (and less saintly) departed admitted to paradise alongside them. While no one who lived improperly would be allowed to pass to Christ’s right, when Jesus concluded the story by having the master of the house say *I will give to this last even as to thee* (Matthew 20:14) to those who had worked the entire day for the same wage as those who worked for an hour, Heiric explained that when “he said ‘I will’ he showed that the kingdom of heaven is granted to us not by our merits but by the kindness of the will of God.”\(^\text{112}\)

Heiric described God’s particular emotional orientation towards those who merited his kindness. This select group also experienced emotions of their own, both during and after judgment. The description of Christ coming in majesty and separating the sheep from the goats found in Matthew 25:31 served as the pericope for Homily 29, in which Heiric explained that “by the sheep the holy are designated, rejoicing with simplicity and innocence, who will be set to the right of the Lord because they will be

---

\(^{112}\) Heiric, I, 25, p. 209: “dicit ‘uolo’, ostendit quia perceptio regni caelestis non nobis nostro merito, sed bonitate voluntatis Dei tribuitur.” Lewis and Short defines *bonitas, -atis* as “goodness” as a quality of concrete objects but in definition II an affective state/orientation for abstractions (in this case, the will of God).
gathered together in the hope of eternal happiness.” Even though he based this part of the homily loosely on Jerome’s exegetical treatment of Matthew 25 (Hrabanus was his usual source for commentary on that Gospel), the affective component of Heiric’s ninth-century text is completely absent from that of his fourth-century model. Here Heiric indicated the hopeful state of those assembled for judgment as well as the affective aspect of the reward they would receive once Christ found them worthy. Elsewhere he described the joy that accompanied this happiness. In narrating the same story of the workers that he used to speak of God’s kindness, Heiric described everyone who died before Jesus came to redeem mankind as “those who after the long period of time in hell arrived at the joy of the [heavenly] kingdom.” Finally, when unpacking the meaning of Luke 7:16 (God hath visited his people), Heiric contrasted the emotional terror of damnation with the “the internal sweetness of the heavenly country” that the saved would experience instead.

In heaven, thought Heiric of Saint-Germain, those whose lives earned them the kindness of positive judgment rejoiced at the joy and happiness of the internal sweetness that came with salvation. He also described the emotional implications of the auditory and visual experiences that characterized membership among the elect. Heiric referred


114 Idem, I, 25, p. 209: “qui post longa inferni tempora ad gaudia regni peruenerunt.”

115 Idem, II, 37, p. 358: “dulcedinem caelestis patriae intrinsecus.”
to auditory experiences only once, in his interpretation of the description of the Last Judgment found in Matthew 25. This gospel presaged some of the words Christ would speak to those he saved, whom he invited to possess you the kingdom prepared for you (Matthew 25:42). After reassuring his brethren that this speech applied to them, he characterized the voice of Christ as an object of desire (vox desiderabilis), reinforcing the hope felt by at least some of those who stood before Christ to be judged.

Heiric may have felt that Christ’s voice was desirable, but he considered the things that the saved would see to be much more important. Unlike both hope and desire, which occurred concurrently with judgment, visual experiences belonged solely to those who entered the heavenly kingdom. Heiric made this clear as he explained the story of the transfiguration. When this occurred, Christ’s face, according to Matthew 17:2, did shine as the sun, and Heiric explained that by this “the divinity of him [Christ] is understood, because it was written: the head of Christ is God (1 Corinthians 11:3); in which [divinity], once judgment is over, he is to be seen by the elect.”\footnote{Idem, I, 34, p. 294: “diuinitas illius intellegitur, quia scriptum est: Caput Christi Deus; in qua peracto iudicio ab electis uidendus est.”} This kind of seeing could only take place after judgment, for Heiric believed that the earthly senses were corrupt by nature. Consistent with the threat of demonic action under which he believed the faithful lived (see Chapter One), Heiric likened the senses to the gates of a city that needed to be constantly guarded against enemy incursion.\footnote{Idem, II, 37, p. 351-53.} After they passed through judgment, however, the senses of the saved no longer allowed for invasion. Once this
occurred “after judgment, he [Christ] will appear in his divinity to the elect alone, because it is written The wicked has been destroyed, he shall not see the glory of God (Isaiah 26:10); for the clean eyes of the saints alone will see the king of the world in his glory.”

The ability to see God, brought about by admission into the group of the elect, elicited feelings of happiness in those able to experience it. Three times in Homily 34 (for Quadragesima Sunday) Heiric drew this connection between vision and happiness, all in the context of his exegesis of the story of the transfiguration. At the beginning of the homily he linked the quality of one’s life to salvation. Those among them, he told the assembled monks, who managed to “preserve the faith of the holy trinity with an incorrupt mind” would later “merit to rejoice in the blessed vision of him [God].” As he frequently did when the pericope for the homily came from Matthew, Heiric followed Hrabanus Maurus’s interpretation of that text. Here, he deviated slightly but perhaps significantly by replacing Hrabanus’s “eternal vision” (aeterna...visione) with “blessed vision” (beatus visione) as the object of rejoicing. This rejoicing was an aspect of the afterlife that occupied Heiric’s teacher Haimo much more than it did the student. Nonetheless, when he unpacked Peter’s comment to Jesus that it was good for the apostles to have witnessed the transfiguration, Heiric explained that “to be present,

---

118 Idem, I, 29, p. 242: “in diuinitate sua solis post iudicium apparebit electis, quia scriptum est: Tollatur impius, ne uideat gloriem Dei; soli autem regem saeculorum in decore suo uidebunt oculi mundi sanctorum.”


120 Matthew 17:4 Lord, it is good for us to be here.
among the chorus of angels, to the vision of all-powerful God, to discern that boundless light, is great happiness and the highest blessedness.”¹²¹ The happiness (and perhaps the related blessedness, although Heiric did not explicitly indicate that these two words were synonymous, as Haimo did) led the saved “to rejoice in eternal imperishability and immortality,”¹²² the closest he came to echoing the emphasis that Haimo placed on the eternal expression of emotions.

Heiric closed his homily on the transfiguration by returning to the importance of living properly in order to reinforce the link between vision and joy. In doing so he explicitly contrasted the eternal, desirable joy of heaven with the imperfect joy found on earth. In his closing exhortation to those listening on Quadragesima Sunday, Heiric spoke for the monastery as a whole: “Let no earthly desires, no joy of the fleeting world shackle us. Let us cast down all impediments of mortal vice and, with the desires for ineffectual things having been devalued, let us ascend together on the mountain of virtue with the Lord where, with his help, we might deserve to come to that most happy conviviality of divine vision.”¹²³

¹²¹ Heiric, I, 34, p. 296: “magna felicitas summaque beatitudo est uisioni omnipotentis Dei inter angelorum choros adesse, lumen illud incircumscriptum cernere.”

¹²² Ibid.: “de aeterna incorruptione et immortalitate gaudere.”

¹²³ Ibid., p. 301: “Nulla igitur nos terrena desideria, nulla saeculi labentis gaudia praepediant, abiciamus omnia uitae mortalis impedimenta, et posthabitis infirmarum rerum cupiditatibus in montem uirtutum cum domino conscendamus, quatinus ad illam felicissimam diuinae uisionis festiuitatem ipso opitulante peruenire mereamur.”
Conclusion

Throughout the ninth century, both the secular and regular clergy of the Senonais treated the fate of the souls of those under their care, but they differed about the place and importance of the emotions that surrounded death and dying. Bishops, whether they wrote individually for their diocesan priests or pronounced their conciliar decisions collectively, consistently underscored the importance of providing the *viaticum* for the dying. But they did not acknowledge the emotions that attended the liturgy that accompanied this action. The sacramentaries, however, the texts that guided priests through the performance of masses for the dying, as well as the sick and even those healthy but concerned about potential illness, spoke of the fear, joy and hope felt by those in attendance. By everyone, that is, except the sick individual for whom the mass was said.

The exegetical writings of two monks of the monastery of Saint-Germain in Auxerre differed from that of the Senonais bishops in two respects. Unlike their secular counterparts, both Haimo and Heiric acknowledged the emotional disruptions caused by physical death. More frequently, though, they told the other half of the story; rather than the emotions of the living they wrote of the affective experiences of souls after death. In the middle of the ninth century Haimo developed an emotional eschatology that included fixed affective states that he linked to sensory experiences. Once they were able to see God, the saved ceased to feel sorrow and fear and stopped weeping; instead, they expressed their eternal happiness and joy through unending praise and rejoicing.
The sensory occlusion experienced by the damned, on the other hand, caused grief and sorrow to fill the void left by the hope that they would never again experience, emotions that they expressed by crying and wailing perpetually.

Heiric, Haimo’s student, also linked the sensory and affective characteristics the afterlife, but his eschatology contained a more narrow range of experiences. Damnation removed God from the sight of the reprobate, which led in turn to terror. Salvation, conversely, kept the vision of God always before the elect, causing them to feel joy and happiness. While both monks certainly meant for their vision of the afterlife to have an impact on those who read or heard it, Heiric explicitly admonished the monks who heard his homilies that their eternal reward or punishment, including the affective components of each, depended on the way that they passed the fleeting time of their lives, on how well they preserved, or renewed once sullied, the cleanliness they achieved at baptism.
CONCLUSION

Throughout the five chapters above I have documented the varying emotional experiences and expressions that three Carolingian monks expected to attend to the performance of the most important liturgical events that occurred throughout the lifecycle of ninth-century Christians. From their initiation into the Christian community at baptism, the faithful experienced liturgical events suffused with emotional experiences. In their exegetical and homiletic writings, the three monks of Saint-Germain in Auxerre (Haimo, Heiric and Remigius) described their expectations, which thereby served as a guide for those who participated in the liturgy. The Auxerrois monks wrote in such a way as to make the proper affective experience of baptism, penance, the mass and the celebration of the Eucharist an active part of the performance of the liturgical event. There existed an expectation of a religious culture that contained common emotional experienced, shared by the community of the faithful without distinction. These experiences also changed over time; that is, emotions in the Carolingian period have a history.

Affective devotion began at baptism, as I describe in Chapter One. In the early ninth century, baptism occasioned joy, although not all of the Senonais clergy agreed that this was the case. Magnus, the Archbishop of Sens, thought that it was, but Theodulf, one of the bishops in his archdiocese, thought that joy (and happiness) existed
in the afterlife. For Theodulf, the newly-baptized could hope to experience those emotions at some point. In the aftermath of serious internal division and under the threat of foreign incursion, the mid-to-late ninth century was a more anxious time. The monks of Saint-Germain, who knew all too well the dangers of their time, wrote of neither joy nor hope in connection to baptism. Both Haimo and Heiric expected those who had been baptized to live in fear, but for different reasons. Haimo thought that fear of sin would lead to hope of salvation. Heiric was more focused on earthly concerns; for him, fear of spoiling the pristine condition conferred during baptism led to proper living.

But their belief in the fallibility of mankind meant that the Carolingian clergy had to make allowances for the inevitable lapses after baptism. The emotional nature of monastic penance, as found in the homilies of Heiric, forms the bulk of the subject matter of Chapter Two. For the Carolingians, achieving monastic harmony was sometimes a difficult proposition. The early-ninth century conflict between Eigil and Ratgar over the abbacy of Fulda is one of the most famous examples of internal dissention. There is no manuscript evidence that connects knowledge of this episode to Auxerre, but closer to home Lupus of Ferrières, one of Heiric’s mentors, had his own

---

1 In 853 the relics of St. Martin were taken to Auxerre (not to be returned until 887) to secure them in the face of repeated Viking incursions into the Loire valley.

2 Brun Candidus, “Vita Eigilis abbatis Fuldensis,” in MGH SS 15 (Hanover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1887), 221-233). See the recent discussion of this work in Coon, Dark Age Bodies, 144-164.
share of problems with the monks under his charge.\(^3\) One of the ways of diffusing conflicts before they escalated too far was through a type of penitential practice that was appropriate for a monastic, rather than secular, setting. But the Auxerrois master did not restrict himself to monastic practice alone, and so I compliment this discussion with a summary of his thoughts on the emotional nature of secular penance as well.

Heiric told the monks who made up the audience for his homilies that their penitential efforts should flow from feelings of kindness and love for their brethren. At the same time, he cautioned that they should never seek to correct the behavior of another monk because of hatred, envy or pride. Anger, somewhat surprisingly given that Heiric believed that baptism emptied the catechumen-\textit{vasa} of it once they undertook the sacrament, played a limited but positive role in monastic penitential practice. The utility of anger also complicates any effort to match up the vocabulary of emotions with that of the virtues and the vices. In this limited, penitential context at least, anger was certainly not a vice.\(^4\) If it was momentary (perhaps, then, not “contained” in a post-baptismal monastic “vessel”), Heiric argued, it could prove beneficial. But if it endured for any length of time it turned into hatred, which was on Heiric’s list of forbidden emotional motivations. The emotions that Heiric assigned to penance were, after a


\(^4\) Untangling the connections between Carolingian thoughts about virtues, vices and emotions deserves an entire study of its own.
fashion, communal. Not in the sense that the brothers of Saint-Germain shared them in common, but that the feelings of one monk helped to structure his relationship with his brethren, with the goal of strengthening the monastic community by rectifying the failings of individual members.

Penance temporarily restored the same pristine spiritual state in which the newly-baptized had emerged from the font, and this purity allowed the faithful to participate in the celebration of the Eucharist, the most important aspect of ninth-century devotion. In Chapter Three I explained Haimo’s thoughts on the Eucharist as it was experienced by communicants, which included knowing, feeling and acting properly. Here the expectation held by Carolingian authors that the faithful could be present to their own emotional states during the liturgy seems the most clear. Haimo expected those who stood before the altar to discern and understand what took place during the Eucharistic celebration and to assess their own worthiness to participate in it. When they did approach, they should fear, and tremble as a result. But their own self-monitoring dictated why they were afraid. If they were worthy, they feared as a result of the majesty of Christ’s salvific sacrifice; if unworthy, they feared damnation. Only those who communicated could properly assess their own worthiness, and therefore properly interpret their own affective experience.

The mass, during which the celebration of the Eucharist took place, was also an emotional experience. In Chapter Four I unpack Remigius’s exegetical interpretation of the canon of the mass with an eye to revealing the affective states of those who attended.
Love, hope, joy and fear were all present. At two specific times during the liturgy, Remigius pointed out specific emotional experiences: during the reading of the Gospel he expected the congregation to attend with burning desire (ardenti affectu) and, more importantly in the context of this dissertation, the celebration of the Eucharist elicited feelings of either joy or fear. By the early tenth century, the expected affective experience of communicants had changed. Haimo spoke of universal fear, felt equally (although interpreted differently) by all who communicated. Remigius agreed that those unworthy to receive the sacrament should fear, but the same was not true of those who did so in a state of grace did so joyfully.

The clergy of Auxerre (and the Senonais) expected the faithful to feel some emotions and to avoid others in the context of their participation in the sacraments. They also expected them to pay attention to their emotions, with the implication that they should judge what they felt in relationship to how they should feel. When death came, however, the Carolingian faithful lost the opportunity to assess and then to adjust their emotional responses. As Chapter Five explains, being saved or damned brought with it specific, and enduring, emotional states. Here again the passage of time brought with it differing ideas about the affective nature of the afterlife. Haimo described a range of affective experience, linked to the senses. But his focus was squarely on the afterlife. Heiric talked about emotions after death as well, but he concentrated on the punitive

---

5 An exploration of the relationship between sensory and affective experience drawn by Carolingian authors seems like a profitable future line of inquiry.
aspects of damnation in order (just as he did when talking about baptism) to encourage his brethren to amend their lives so as to avoid the punishments that he described.

By way of conclusion I would like to think about the implications of the Auxerrois masters’ discussion of emotional expectations through a different frame of reference; rather than think about emotions from the birth through the death of individuals (the device that I used to frame the dissertation) I would like shift the discussion to the authors. Focusing comparatively on Haimo and Heiric reveals that these two Carolingian exegetes developed systems of emotional management, centered on the liturgy, which they expected would help guide the faithful as they progressed throughout their lives towards salvation. These emotional management strategies depended on a range of affective experiences. Both encouraged their audience to feel fear. For Haimo, though, fear was secondary in importance to hope, an emotion that Heiric did not mention in connection to life after baptism. Instead, he dwelled extensively on fear, which ultimately led to rejoicing.

Haimo believed that catechumens came to the baptismal font connected to a host of undesirable attributes and influences. One of these was anger. Influenced (although never explicitly stated) by Ephesians 2:3 (In which also we all conversed in time past, in the desires of our flesh, fulfilling the will of the flesh and of our thoughts, and were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest), Haimo wrote that those who came to be baptized did so as “sons of anger and sons of the devil.”6 This formula gave anger a negative valence,
defined it as an emotional state associated with sinfulness. Baptism solved this problem by severing the connection between the newly baptized and the devil, and thereby anger. The implication was that just as the spiritual cleansing of baptism purified the souls of catechumens, so too it positioned them to feel emotions suitable for Christians.

For Haimo, the two most important of these emotions were hope and fear, which he thought were intimately connected. Haimo believed that once they had been initiated into the community of the faithful, Christians should live hopeful lives because they had lost their connection to the devil and replaced it with one to God. Haimo did not believe that earthly existence brought about this emotional state; rather, hope was based on the promise of salvation that Christ’s crucifixion offered to those who had been baptized. Haimo wrote in the middle of the ninth century, at a time when there was an increased emphasis on the crucifixion, and he called hope in the salvific consequences of Christ’s death the “expectation of future good things.”

While Christ’s sacrifice made salvation available to those who were baptized into the church, availability was not the same thing as a guarantee. Haimo therefore advised his readers to feel fear as well as hope. The point of this second, complimentary emotion was to prevent Christians from reverting back to their previous sinful state, thereby abrogating the salvation given to them through the crucifixion. Once they understood the importance that baptism held for their salvation, and the impossibility of repeating such an important event, the faithful should hope to achieve heavenly reward and at the

---

"Idem, In divi Pauli epistolas expositio PL 117:783: “Per Christum autem habemus spem, id est exspectationem futurorum bonorum.”
same time fear losing it. These two emotions, hope and fear, worked together in the minds and lives of the faithful. They helped them navigate the difficulties and temptations of life and directed them towards the goal of salvation.

Heiric, Haimo’s student at Saint-Germain, also offered advice about managing emotions to those who listened to his homilies. But in the latter third of the ninth century, when he composed his liturgical homiletic cycle, Heiric’s advice differed from that of his teacher. He still believed in a relationship between baptism and anger. But he did not speak of hope, preferring to dwell on the importance of fear and, ultimately, rejoicing. Heiric’s exposition of baptism recast the relationship between those who underwent the ritual and anger. He followed his teacher in describing anger as a characteristic of the devil, and thereby also of people before their Christian initiation. But where Haimo used anger almost as a synonym for the devil, Heiric thought that it was present in those who came to be baptized. He called catechumens “vessels of anger” (uasa irae) that the Holy Spirit changed into “vessels of mercy” (uasa misericordiae) during baptism. Heiric’s formulation located anger not just with the devil, but within those who had not yet been baptized. Even more directly than it was for Haimo, baptism as Heiric understood it was an emotional cleansing as well as a spiritual one, an event that purified catechumens by emptying them of anger.

---

8 Heiric used this language in two separate homilies. Heiric, I:43, 389: “Ipsa etiam vasa irae spiritus sancti igne molliendo, in vasa convertit misericordiae” and idem, I, 64, 617: “migrant de infidelitate ad fidem, efficiuntur de filiis diaboli filii Dei, de uasis irae uasa misericordiae.”
Heiric advised his “vessels” that, thus emptied, they should “fill” themselves with fear. Haimo also counseled the cultivation of this emotion, but here again the writings of the student evinced differences from those of his teacher. Heiric thought that the newly baptized lived under the imminent danger of demonic incursion. To counter the threat of being reoccupied by the malevolent forces that baptism had exorcized, the faithful should live in fear. The point of this emotional orientation was the same for both monks, however: to structure the lives of the faithful. Fear that the devil might return, Heiric thought, should result in the desire to live properly, for it was the performance of good works and the adoption of virtuous behavior that rebuffed the devil’s advances.

The constant monitoring of one’s life that Heiric advised led to a second emotional experience: rejoicing. This came from successful efforts to keep the promise made during baptism to renounce the “vices and all the pomps” (uitiis cunctisque pompis) of the devil. The threats just discussed made this difficult, but “if,” Heiric preached, “after baptism we remember to keep that [baptismal] promise let us rejoice, because truly we are faithful.”9 For Heiric, as for Haimo, emotions and goals intersect. Fear, the specific fear of the failing to maintain the purity conferred by baptism, forced Christians to be aware of the quality of their lives. Failure to do so meant damnation. Success meant that they would earn their eternal reward, and the realization that this goal had been met led them to rejoice.

Haimo and Heiric communicated the importance of emotional awareness and management to the Carolingian faithful (certainly to their brethren at Saint-Germain, and perhaps Haimo had the laity in mind as well) in light of their concern with progress towards salvation. Cultivating the proper emotions while alive was important, for as I demonstrated in Chapter Five, both believed that after death emotions became fixed in reference to the spiritual state (salvation or damnation) in which souls found themselves. In the dissertation I have shown that the monks of Saint-Germain expected specific devotional moments – the liturgical events that characterized the lives of the faithful – to produce certain emotions and emotional expressions. This brief excursus on emotional management is meant to point to future research, in particular a more wide-ranging investigation of Heiric’s homilies. In assessing the affective nature of Carolingian religious culture, I believe that it is important not to separate formal, liturgical practices from devotion and piety in general.

As I suggested above, Heiric (and Haimo) thought that certain emotional orientations attended to the lives of Christians after they had undergone the liturgy of baptism. Exploring further the connections that Heiric drew between emotions and Christian life, and then contextualizing that thought within that of his Carolingian contemporaries, should offer new insights into the affective nature of religious devotion in the ninth century. Piety, that is devotion to God and to the dutiful observance of religious tenets, was always affective.
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