**History & Theology – Church History**

**Class 4: Developing Doctrine & Making Distinctions: Middle Ages I (800-1274)**

##

## **Main Point:**

* During these years, churches faced a number of changes and challenges to orthodox belief as systems of thought were developed and new religions founded, but a witness was preserved

##

## **Class Goals:**

* Differentiate between three monastic orders and describe their understanding of evangelism
* Summarize the circumstances and differences that led to the schism between East and West
* Describe what led to the Crusades and discuss how Christians should view such events
* Explain the contributions of Anselm, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Thomas Aquinas to Chrstian belief and practice

# Introduction

Good morning and welcome to class 4 in the Church History Core Seminar. Last week, we looked at Augustine and the Fall of Rome. And this week we are going to survey some developments after Augustine through the medieval period, touching on both the Eastern and Western Church.

By way of introduction here are 3 opening contextual comments and 5 reasons to study the Middle Ages as we begin.

**First,** let me overgeneralize: Most broad, sweeping statements about the Middle Ages are overgeneralizations. This is a time period covering close to a millennia across several cultures, languages, and places. This class will primarily look at the *European* Medieval Church, while touching on some theological developments in the near east. If you are interested in learning more about the global church throughout history, we offer a [*Global Christian History core seminar*](https://www.capitolhillbaptist.org/resources/core-seminars/series/global-christian-history/)that explores the church in other parts of the globe.

**Second,** this is not the \*Dark Ages\* as it has been pejoratively called. The Middle Ages boasts of several accomplishments, such as the Magna Carta. Arguments for human rights are being established and articulated. Additionally, this period marks the founding of several prominent universities that are still leading institutions today, such as Oxford and Cambridge. Further, we see the rise of hospitals being established. Thus, we should not consider this the “Dark Ages”[[1]](#footnote-0)

**Third,** the medieval time was the historical context in which some of the most consequential theologians in church history lived: Theologians such as:

* + - Anselm of Canterbury
		- John Wycliffe
		- Thomas Aquinas (1224/25 - 1274)
		- Bernard of Clairvaux
		- Bonaventure
		- Martin Luther?

While each of these theologians are significant, we’ll consider Anselm, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Thomas Aquinas this morning. Next week, we will survey some of those reformational forerunners like Wycliffe, and Hus.

Having provided a few introductory comments and qualifications, let me offer five reasons why you as an evangelical Christians ought to study the European Medieval Church.

First, the Medieval Church, despite several issues, remained steadfastly committed to the authority of Scripture, as seen in the requirements of theologians to comment on the bible. The following observation by Carl Trueman helps elucidate this point:

“It is the ignorance and snobbery of modern Protestantism which derides the middle ages for a failure to engage with the text of Scripture….the average medieval professor was expected to have exegeted his way through more Scripture before he was deemed remotely competent as a theologian than any seminary professor in North America today.”[[2]](#footnote-1)

Second, Hergus Ferr documents that Thomas Aquinas “wrote or dictated over 8 million words,” of which 25% percent of them were commenting on biblical texts.[[3]](#footnote-2)

Third, Continuity with the Reformers. Many arguments developed in the Middle Ages would form the backbone of much Reformed thought. A few examples, theologians in this time defended doctrines of *Divine Simplicity* and God’s *Immesurabiltiy.* Also, continuity with the Ecumenical Creeds were maintained, as was *Augustinian Trinitarianism*.

Fourth, during the Middle Ages many sought to develop doctrinal synthesis. Aiming to systematize beliefs many theologians developed intricate logical systems of belief. To be sure, some such systems led reader away from scriptural belief, but many aimed to draw the teachings of scripture together today. Theirs was the belief that the mind should be used to know God based on his revelation. Contrast this with how emotivist our theology is today.

Fifth, Evangelism & Missions. Many of the Monastic Orders were often fervent Evangelists. A monk named Augustine was commissioned by Gregory the Great to take Christianity with 40 monks to great Britain.

Sixth, theologians in the Middle Ages remained commited to traditional forms of belief and methods of studying theoloy. Such commitments this can thwart reform (as we will see in following weeks), but can also thwart Heresy. Consider a contrasting example of that of a PhD today. In today’s climate a PhD is earned when an novel idea is generated and defended. In Medieval times, doctoral work was considered based on its consistency with tradition and orthodoxy.[[4]](#footnote-3)

These are just a few reasons to study the Medieval Church. Let’s look at a few developments in the West.

# Developments in the West

This class is covering a millennia of church history so we will briefly describe the book ends:

The first is the Fall of Rome, which we covered last week, and then the Reformation which we will cover in a few of weeks. Of all the important developments of that time, for our purposes I want to highlight two developments: the rise of monasticism and the beginning of the Holy Roman Emperor.

## Monasticism & Evangelism

In reaction to both the fall of Rome and further examinations of the spoils of the Roman Empire, many monastic orders developed in the first millennia of the church. Following a version of the Benedictine Rule (5th Century) some these orders were ways to refrain from sinfully engaging in worldly persuits and pleasure and living a life devoted to specifc practices and intellectual pursuits. Not all monastic orders were the same.

The *Cistercians* founded in 1098 grew very quickly. They were a Benedictine movement that aimed to reform the will of adherents. A notable alum is Bernard of Claivaux. Bernard and the *Cistercians* did not live separate from the world, instead they called for political reforms and confronted the poor conduct of bishops and abbots. Bernard wrote the hymn “O Sacred Head Now Wounded.”

The *Franciscans* (1209) or grey friarsaimed to cultivate humility as they were concerned with the pride rampant amongst leaders. Francis of Assisi is perhaps the most popular monk of this period was a member of the Franciscan order. Francis and others took an interest in the evangelization of Muslims.

The *Dominicans* (1216) held that all monks should be preachers. They established an order of preaching brothers, yet they were recognized as Augustinian in their rule rather than Benedictine. In their preaching and teaching they sought to rigourously defend catholic orthodoxy of that period. They would later be placed incharge of the Inquisition. Thomas Aquinas belonged to this order.

## Charlemagne and the Holy Roman Empire (800)

As we discussed last week, the Roman Empire had seen a period of divided rulership. Constantine you’ll remember was crowned sole Emperor and his sons inherited a divided kingdom. Variations of this pattern would play out for several centuries even as the Roman became a pale reflection of what it used to be.

Charlemagne became the sole ruler in 778 and pursued reclaiming much of the land that was lost to the Goths. His plan was to remake the empire under the banner of Christianity. Upon his conquest, many pagan were forced to convert to Christianity and be baptized. Upon his successes after several years and despite protests from “the Greeks in the East, Pope Leo III crowned Charlemagne emperor of the west on Christmas day in the year 800. The east refused to recognize him as emperor.”[[5]](#footnote-4) Upon crowning Charlemagne, Pope Leo III bows prompting the question of who submits to whom. Though it didn’t bear the name in Charlemagne’s day, Charlemange rise as coronation would start what would become later known as the Holy Roman Empire.

# Eastern Orthodoxy and the Growing Schism Between East and West

## East - West Schism

From the 2nd century onward, differences in theology and practice slowly began emerging between the Western Latin speaking part of the church and the Eastern Greek speaking part of the church.[[6]](#footnote-5) From the Fall of the Roman Empire in 410, the Eastern and Western wings of the one universal church began increasingly drifting apart.[[7]](#footnote-6)

1054 is traditionally regarded as the point of division or schism between the East and West[[8]](#footnote-7) Bishop Timothy Ware recounts the events where the schism became formalized:

One summer afternoon in the year 1054, as a service was about to begin in the Church of the Holy Wisdom [Hagia Sophia] at Constantinople [Istanbul, Turkey], Cardinal Humbert and two other legates of the Pope entered the building and made their way up to the sanctuary. They had not come to pray. They placed a Bull of Excommunication upon the altar and marched out once more. As he passed through the western door, the Cardinal shook the dust from his feet with the words: 'Let God look and judge.' A deacon ran out after him in great distress and begged him to take back the Bull. Humbert refused; and it was dropped in the street.[[9]](#footnote-8)

The marriage became irreconcilable in 1204 when Western Troops ransacked, pillaged, and raped and killed during a failed financial agreement by Alexius, son of the Eastern Emperor. The Western Troops set Constantinople on fire.[[10]](#footnote-9)

### Causes of Division Between East & West

What were the causes of the split? A historical assessment leads us to say that there is not one single issue that drove the wedge between the churches in the East and the West. Political and ecclesiastical differences largely caused the schism, although entirely differentiating politics, polity, and theology is almost impossible[[11]](#footnote-10)

#### Politics

The East saw the true Christian Empire centered in Constantinople and rooted in the history of the great Emperors Constantine, Theodosius, and Justinian.[[12]](#footnote-11) Comparatively, the West saw itself as the heirs of the Old Roman Empire.[[13]](#footnote-12) The East saw the Western Pope’s crowning of Charlemagne on Christmas Day 800 as an act of schism.[[14]](#footnote-13)

The fourth major crusade (1202-1204), led by the Western Pope Innocent III, included the conquest and plundering of the Eastern capital Constantinople. Such actions sealed the fate of the schism.[[15]](#footnote-14)

#### Cultural/Linguistic

Reflecting on the causes of the East/West schism, famed 20th century historian of theology Jaroslav Pelikan spoke of “the depths of the intellectual alienation” that had developed over centuries between the two sections of Christendom[[16]](#footnote-15)

[Application to Today] - Eastern Orthodox Bishop Timothy Ware reflects on the schism, writing: “These political and cultural factors could not but affect the life of the church, and make it harder to maintain religious unity. Cultural and political estrangement can lead only too easily to ecclesiastical disputes...”[[17]](#footnote-16)

#### Papacy

The Western Church objected to what it saw as the Eastern setup whereby the Emperor rules the church.[[18]](#footnote-17) The Eastern Church objected to what it saw as the bishop of Rome attempting to rule the church.[[19]](#footnote-18)

The Western Church argued that Matthew 16, Jesus gave the keys of the kingdom to Peter -- and by implication his successor. Thus, Peter is to rule the church.[[20]](#footnote-19)Against such assertions, the Eastern Church argued as a historical fact, the great ecumenical councils had largely been called not by the bishop of Rome but by the emperor of Constantinople.[[21]](#footnote-20)Additionally, the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon in 451 granted Constantinople a special status and privileges on the grounds that Rome had a favored place in the early church due to Rome being the imperial city.[[22]](#footnote-21) Following this, the East argued that Matthew 16:18 -- “And I tell you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church” -- refers not to Peter alone but to all with the confession of Peter.[[23]](#footnote-22)

As the famed 20th century Eastern theologian John Meyendorff said, “The whole ecclesiastical debate between East and West is thus reducible to the issue of whether the faith depends on Peter, or Peter on the faith”[[24]](#footnote-23)

#### Celibacy

The Western church insisted on celibacy for priests while the East resisted compulsive celibacy for priests[[25]](#footnote-24) The East especially objected to the Western practice of dissolving marriages for those entering the priesthood[[26]](#footnote-25)

#### Icons

The early Christian church took a generally negative view of icons, though some practiced the use of icons.[[27]](#footnote-26) Gradually, Christians, especially in the Eastern tradition, began to see a right place for the veneration of religious icons. John of Damascus (c. 650- c. 750) wrote *On Divine Images* to explain and defend the practice of venerating icons against the charge that it constituted the worship of matter instead of the worship of God.

*“I do not venerate matter; I venerate the fashioner of matter, who became matter for my sake and accepted to dwell in matter, and through matter worked my salvation... I do not reverence it as God--far from it!*”[[28]](#footnote-27)

Around 752, a monk from Cyprus named Gregory defended icons by comparing them to Scripture:

*“Just as the person who venerates the sacred words in the Gospel is not honoring parchment pages, but the holy teachings, so in the pictures of the Church we are not venerating the color or the material surface, but a kind of holy explanation and a concise description of his sufferings.”*[[29]](#footnote-28)

The debates about icons became very heated. In response to the objection that venerating icons constituted idolatry, Theodore of Studios (abbot of the Stoudios Monastery in Constantinople; lived 759–826) wrote,“What person with any sense does not comprehend the distinction between an idol and an icon?”[[30]](#footnote-29)

In 726, Eastern Emperor Leo III (717-41) issued a decree ordering the destruction of images in churches.[[31]](#footnote-30) Then in 754, the Eastern Roman Emperor Constantine V called the Council of Hieria which decidedly rejected icons and their use in worship.[[32]](#footnote-31)

The Second Council of Nicea in 789 would challenge this position and strongly favor the use of icons. It held,

“revered and holy images may be set up, whether painted or of mosaic or other suitable material, in the holy churches of God, on sacred vessels and vestments, on walls and boards, in houses and along the roads: images of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ, and of our immaculate Lady the holy Mother of God, of the honorable angels, and of all the saints and holy people.”[[33]](#footnote-32)

Empress Irene had a council summoned from September 24 to October 13, 787.[[34]](#footnote-33) 263 bishops attended.[[35]](#footnote-34) This council would later be received by both the East and West as the 7th Ecumenical Council[[36]](#footnote-35)

The council also anathematized those who refuse to salute images in the name of the Lord.[[37]](#footnote-36) Concluded that you should honor and venerate icons, but not worship them.[[38]](#footnote-37) Then in 794 the Council of Frankfurt provided an occasion for the far West to respond to the Second Council of Nicea rejecting its view and sharply disagreeing with the East on the use of icons.[[39]](#footnote-38)

#### *Filioque*

Now to understand more concretely the controversies of the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries, we must return to a controversy of the 4th century. The Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed of 381 affirmed the divinity of the Father, Son, and Spirit. It further said:

We believe in the Holy Spirit,

The Lord, the giver of life,

Who proceeds from the Father.

With the Father and the Son he is worshiped and glorified.[[40]](#footnote-39)

Notice that the creed affirms that the Holy Spirit proceeds “from the Father” which is what John 15:26 says.

In 589, at the Second Council of Toledo in Spain, the Western church revised this position, which had been articulated by Augustine at to teach that the Spirit proceeds from the “*and the Son*” (Latin: *Filioque*)[[41]](#footnote-40) Note: Augustine is the foremost figure in the Western Church and he clearly taught that the Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son.[[42]](#footnote-41) The Western Church now formally understood the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed (381) to teach that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son[[43]](#footnote-42)

The Eastern church objected to this and argued that the West had unilaterally altered an authoritative Christian creed in a significant theological way, resulting in false belief.[[44]](#footnote-43) The East held that the Western view constituted Subordinationism—making the Holy Spirit lesser than the Father and Son.[[45]](#footnote-44)

## Distinctives of Emerging Eastern Orthodoxy

### Apophatic Theology[[46]](#footnote-45) - “beyond/above words or ideas”

The Eastern Church is known for the “way of negation” in theology. That is, their understanding of God as “the unfathomable mystery” informs how they speak of God. So, rather than positively saying that God is omnipresent or present everywhere at all times, the Eastern Church said that God is “uncontainable” or “unlimited.”[[47]](#footnote-46)

Implications?

### Reverence for the Fathers[[48]](#footnote-47)

While both the Eastern and Western church valued what they perceived as the patristic tradition, the Eastern church saw this as a *sine qua non* for right doctrine. For example, Theodore of Studios (abbot of the Stoudios Monastery in Constantinople; lived 759–826) wrote:

“For the substantiation of what has been said it would be necessary to have the statement confirmed by patristic testimony.”[[49]](#footnote-48)

Eastern authors such as Maximus the Confessor (c. 580 - 662) regularly asserted that both Scripture and the fathers were necessary for orthodox belief.[[50]](#footnote-49)

### Pentarchy

The Eastern Church asserted a Pentarchy[[51]](#footnote-50) or “rule of five.” This challenged the Western organization of churches which asserted the primacy of Rome and it’s bishop (the Pope).[[52]](#footnote-51) Pentarchy is “the theory that the apostolic polity of Christendom would be maintained through the cooperation between the five patristical sees: Rome, Constantinople, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria” (Pelikan)[[53]](#footnote-52)

### Deification (Theosis)

The Eastern Church held a particular view of godliness or holiness referenced as “deification” or “theosis.” Here they are not saying we ontologically become God (i.e., polytheism or more Persons of the Trinity). They mean “that fundamental to salvation and acceptance with God is becoming like Christ through an ever-deepening mystical union with him.” Or as Timothy Ware puts it: Mankind is “called to become by grace what God is by nature”[[54]](#footnote-53)

This idea of deification was at the core of the incarnation: God became man in order that man might become divine.[[55]](#footnote-54) As Athanasius of Alexandria wrote in *On the Incarnation of the Word*, “He was incarnate that we might be made god.[[56]](#footnote-55) One challenge with the Eastern doctrine of salvation through deification is that as even the Eastern theologian Maximus the Confessor (580 - 622) noted, deification is not clearly taught in any of the major ecumenical councils.[[57]](#footnote-56)

# Crusades

Islam[[58]](#footnote-57)

Beyond the split of the East and West, churches would also see new challenges emerge from a new religion—Islam. Founded by Muhammad who began preaching in Arabia in the 7th century.[[59]](#footnote-58) The term “Islam” literally means “submission to God.”[[60]](#footnote-59) Islam requires its adherents to fulfill the so-called “Five Pillars of the Faith”: (1) Profession of faith -- that there is one god, Allah, and that Muhammad was his greatest and last prophet. (2) Prayer -- five daily prayers (3) Almsgiving -- regular giving of money (4) Fasting -- fasting during Ramadan (5) Pilgrimage -- a Muslim makes a pilgrimage to Mecca once in his lifetime.[[61]](#footnote-60)

Islam grew rapidly. It took over majors cities in Byzantine Empire within a decade, including Jerusalem (636). By 644 Islamic empire included all of Arabia, Greater Syria, Cyprus, Persia, and Africa north of the Sahara.[[62]](#footnote-61) And had Muslims not lost two battles—one in France in 732 and one at Amisis in 863—all Europe might have become Islamic.[[63]](#footnote-62)

Crusades

After years of conquest by Isalm, Christian rulers would declare war to take back the Holy Land in what would come to be known as Crusades. Crusades refers to campaigns by Latin Christians against the Seljuk Turks who had conquered the Holy Land in the 11th and 12th centuries.[[64]](#footnote-63)

The First Crusade (1095-99) - Conquered Jerusalem and ruled it for a few decades.[[65]](#footnote-64)

* + Second Crusade (1147-49)[[66]](#footnote-65)
	+ Third Crusade (1189-92)[[67]](#footnote-66)
	+ Fourth Crusade (1202-4) - Attacked Christians and sacked Constantinople, cementing the East-West breech.[[68]](#footnote-67)
	+ Fifth Crusade (1217-21)[[69]](#footnote-68)

Those who participated in a crusade were promised an indulgence, and those who died in a crusade were considered martyrs.[[70]](#footnote-69) The term “Crusade” comes from the old French term, *croisee*, meaning “to be signed with the cross” as each knight who committed to a Crusade had an image of the cross sewn into his clothes.[[71]](#footnote-70) While the first crusade was a success, the other four ended in either failure or a draw.[[72]](#footnote-71)At times, even large groups of children were involved and tragically many died.[[73]](#footnote-72)

[Discussion Question] - How do we respond to people who bring up the crusades as evidence against Christianity?

* Recognize the grave sin of people who claimed the name of Christ and engendered the crusades.
* Recognize the ever-present temptation to confuse the kingdom of God and the kingdom of this world.
* This accusation falsely confuses the actions of sinners with the teaching of Christianity.
* This action falsely assumes Christianity stands or falls by the behavior of people who claim that name instead of the historicity of the resurrection of Jesus.

# Doctrine in the West

# Anselm (1033-1109)

## Monk and Scholastic

Born in 1033 into an Italian noble family in Aosta, Italy (in far North West Italy near the Swiss and French border).[[74]](#footnote-73) Around 1060 after the death of his father, Anselm crossed the Alps and joined the monastery of Bec in northern France.[[75]](#footnote-74) From 1093-1109, Anselm became the Archbishop of Canterbury in Britain.[[76]](#footnote-75) However, he would conflict with the king often in these 16 years leading his exile for a total of 8 years in these years as Archbishop.

## Major Works

Anselm’s aim was to produce a theological synthesis that moved beyond merely citing authorities. He’s called the Father of Scholasticism for his broad and systematic approach to doctrine. “Faith seeking understanding” is an often cited mantra used by scholastics and was coined by Anselm.

Anselm wrote a vigorous defense of the *filioque* in *De Processione Spiritus Sancti.*[[77]](#footnote-76) He also wrote more practical works such as *Monologion* and *Proslogion*, which were not intellectual exercises or academic works but rather meant to assist monks in daily reflection on the faith.[[78]](#footnote-77)

### *Monologion* (1076)

Anselm’s *Monologion* is an attempt to meditate on the essence of God and cultminates in a discussion of God's trinitarian nature.He takes his cue on wanting to meditate on God, then moves to logical reflection upon God; there is no dichotomy between these in Anselm's mind, perhaps even no distinction.

### *Proslogion* (1078)

Anselm’s *Proslogion* has been called the “great charter of medieval Christian Philosophy.”[[79]](#footnote-78)This meditation on God, culminates in the famous Ontological Argument for God's existence (i.e., that God is that than which nothing greater can be conceived).Many people believed in this argument at that time, so it was easy to make. The whole idea of proof was somewhat odd in the 11th century. It has led some to query whether Anselm was really trying to prove God's existence.

It reads very similarly to Augustine’s *Confessions:* “Thou, therefore, fillest and embraces all things; thou are before and beyond all things, for before they were made thou art. But how are thou beyond all things? For in what way canst thou be beyond those things that have no end?”[[80]](#footnote-79)And yet, though theologically rich it was intensely devotional:“I pray, O God, that I may know thee, that I may love thee, so that I may rejoice in thee. And if I cannot do this to the full in this life, at least let me go forward from day to day until that joy comes to fullness”[[81]](#footnote-80)

### *Cur Deus Homo /* “Why God Became Man” (1098)

Another of Anselm’s major works was his *Cur Deus Homo* or “Why God Became Man.) It’s about 33,000 words in length. Structually, *Cur Deus Homo* is divided into two different books. The first book proves “the impossibility that any man should be saved without” Christ (Preface, p. 9). The second book shows “that every man should enjoy a happy immortality, both in body and in soul” but “that it could not be fulfilled unless God became man” (Preface, p. 9)

Here, Anselm makes his arguments largely from reason and not with explicit references to Scripture.[[82]](#footnote-81) Anselm contends that God made man for happiness, yet remission of sin is necessary for reaching this end:

Let it be agreed between us that man was created for a state of blessedness which cannot be had in this life, and that no one can arrive at that state if his sins have not been got rid of, and that no man can pass through this life without sin... The remission of sins, therefore, is something absolutely necessary for man, so that he may arrive at blessed happiness (*Cur Deus Homo*, I.10).[[83]](#footnote-82)

Additionally, Anselm contends that the essence of sin is dishonoring God: “Sin is nothing other than not to give God what is owed him (*Cur Deus Homo*, I.11). [[84]](#footnote-83)He argues that God’s honor requires that sin must be paid for. God cannot simply look the other way. “It it not fitting, then, for God to receive into heaven...a human sinner who has not paid recompense (*Cur Deus Homo*, I.19).[[85]](#footnote-84) “Consider it, then, an absolute certainty, that God cannot remit a sin unpunished, without recompense, that is, without the voluntary paying off of a debt, and that a sinner cannot, without this, attain to a state of blessedness” (*Cur Deus Homo*, I.19).[[86]](#footnote-85)

Since we owe God obedience by nature of being his subjects, our obedience today cannot pay for our sins yesterday. There is no hope of self-salvation: “When you are rendering to God something which you owe him, even if you have not sinned, you ought not to reckon this to be recompense for what you owe him for sin” (*Cur Deus Homo*, I.20).[[87]](#footnote-86) “If, in order that I may not sin, I owe to him my own being and all that I am capable of, even when I do not sin, I have nothing to give him in recompense for sin” (*Cur Deus Homo*, I.20).[[88]](#footnote-87)

In the second part of the book, Anselm reaches the logical conclusion of the book, arguing that the God-Man is necessary for salvation. In a one sentence summary of the book, Anselm writes:

“If, therefore, as is agreed, it is necessary that the heavenly city should have its full complement made up by members of the human race, and this cannot be the case if the recompense of which we have spoken is not paid, which no one can pay except God, and no one ought to pay except man: it is necessary that a God-Man should pay it” (*Cur Deus Homo*, II.6)[[89]](#footnote-88)

“For God will not do it [i.e., redemption] because he will not be able to. In order, therefore, that a God-Man should bring about what is necessary, it is essential that the same one person who will make the recompense should be perfect God and perfect man. For he cannot do this if he is not true God, and he has no obligation to do so if he is not a true man. Given, therefore, that it is necessary for a God-Man to be found in whom the wholeness of both natures is kept intact, it is no less necessary for those two natures to combine, as wholes, in one person (*Cur Deus Homo*, II.7)[[90]](#footnote-89)

Why consider Anselm? As John Stott notes in his book the *Cross of Christ:* “The Greatest merits of Anselm’s exposition are that he perceived clearly the extreme gravity of sin (as a willful rebellion against God in which the creature affronts the majesty of his Creator), the unchanging holiness of God (as unable to condone any violation of his Honor), and the unique perfections of Christ”[[91]](#footnote-90)In other words, Anselm laid some of the key theological concepts that would later be included in the reformational doctrine of penal substitutionary atonement. What we evangelicals today hold near and dear to the gospel. [[92]](#footnote-91)

# Bernard of Clairvaux (1033-1109)

Bernard of Clairvaux was a monk in the Cistercian Order. Luther called him “one of the great doctors of the church” and Luther was not lenient at all on such “Schoolmen.” Also, Calvin frequently quotes him positive in his magisterial Institutes For our purposes we will just briefly look at one major work, *On Loving God.*

## Major Work

As its title indicates, *On Loving God* is a treatise on why and how we should love God. Bernard claims, “God himself is the reason why he is to be loved” (3)*.* Itincludes several scriptural quotations, particularly form the Song of Songs. Bernard warns his audience of loving too much the things of this world or “any kind of material good” (25)

Here, Bernard details four kinds of love. The first love is love of self, whereby man “love himself for his own sake” (25). This is natural love. The second degree of love is where man “loves God...for his own advantage and not yet for God’s sake” (27). The third degree of love is a just love because man “renders what he has received “ (28). This man loves God because God is good, not simply because God is good to him (28). The final degree of love, which Bernard declares impossible in this life (35) is: “Man loves himself for the sake of God” (29). This degree of love is complete self-abandonment where the lover is so “inebriated with divine love” and “hasten[s] toward God” (29).

Bernard’s piety is Godword and affectionate. He is not some cold medieval theologian discussing archaic, mundane, or esoteric doctrines. He writes experientially on God and his worthiness to be loved. In one sense, *On Loving God* is seeking to fulfill Psalm 34:3: “Oh, Magnify the Lord with me, and let us exalt his name together”

# Thomas Aquinas (1224/5-1274)

## Preacher and Scholastic

Thomas Aquinas was born near Naples, Italy somewhere around 1224/25 in the county of Aquino.[[93]](#footnote-92) Around the age of 16, he joined the order of the Dominicans, which was a teaching and preaching order. This therefore committed him to a life of study for purposes of instructing others.[[94]](#footnote-93) He joined after his family kidnapped him and sought to disqualify him by attempting to seduce him with a prostitute! Thomas however, was firm in his commitment to study.

## Major Works

Aquinas wrote several major works of theology, philosophy, and commentaries on the scriptures. He’s well known for his *Summa Theologiae*, a massive work that explores various themes and is a major work in scholastic theology.*[[95]](#footnote-94)* Aquinas is known for his 5 arguments for the existence of God, a theory of natural law, and sacerdotalism. The latter view is the belief that the Holy Spirit infuses grace into Christians through their participation in the sacraments. It’s this view that finds the Roman view of the eucharist.

Though Aquinas’s works are mixed with many errors, many show doctrinal consistency with the scriptures and those who came before. His *Commentary on John’s Gospel* for example shows a theological consistency with Augustine, Nicea, and the rich Trinitarian tradition in the Western Tradition.

# Conclusion

A few reflections on what issues we’ve surveyed and there bearing on us today. First**,** this time marked a period of remarkable changes and new challenges. Misunderstandings and misrepresentations abounded and the rift between East and West grew wider. The rise of Islam had some declare war for religious ends. Second, doctrinal errors developed. In some ways compunded by the East and West schism, new errant theology was introduced and gained ground in many churches. Third, though many factors threatened and diminished the visible unity of the church, this period is not without gospel witnesses. Those such as Abelard, Bernard of Clarvaux, and Thomas Aquinas attested to the truth though not purely. We’ll turn to consider more examples next week as there were many forerunners of reform.
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