

Durham E-Theses

*In the Spirit of Salvation: William of St. Thierry's
Theological Treatment of Salvation in light of his
Pneumatology*

O'LEARY, DEVIN,JAMES

How to cite:

O'LEARY, DEVIN,JAMES (2016) *In the Spirit of Salvation: William of St. Thierry's Theological Treatment of Salvation in light of his Pneumatology*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/11671/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP
e-mail: e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

ABSTRACT

While desire for salvation forms the foundation of all Christian investigation, the modes through which salvation is explored vary between different theologians. William of St. Thierry, while leaving behind a wealth of extant sources, is frequently overlooked in the academic and theological investigation of the subject. This study undertakes an in-depth investigation of William's writings, focused on pneumatological soteriology and an explanation of the characteristic elements which made up his thinking on this core. William investigates the Holy Spirit through three major identities: Will, Love and Unity. As a result of the fact that these characteristics also exist within humanity, and of the intimacy of the subject matter, this study is informative both to those studying historical theology, and to those seeking the spiritual origins of western anthropology and identity. In order to reveal the particular contours of William's theology, it is important to compare him to the theologians on which he drew, and to those in whose company he was writing. This study compares William with the two patristic thinkers who exerted the greatest influence on his work: Origen of Antioch and St. Augustine of Hippo. It also draws comparison with four of William's contemporaries, each representing different intellectual communities of the time: St. Anselm of Canterbury, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Hugh of St. Victor, and Peter Abelard. This comparison is important in order to appreciate William's theology in light of its own principles.

**IN THE SPIRIT OF SALVATION
WILLIAM OF ST. THIERRY'S THEOLOGICAL
TREATMENT OF SALVATION IN LIGHT OF HIS
PNEUMATOLOGY**

DEVIN JAMES O'LEARY

PHD

THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY AND RELIGION

DURHAM UNIVERSITY

2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

List of Abbreviations	4
Statement of Copyright	10
Acknowledgements	11
Chapter One: William's Worth	13
Chapter Two: Critical Assessment of the Evidence	44
Chapter Three: Will	96
Chapter Four: Love	141
Chapter Five: Unity	183
Conclusion	221
Bibliography	234

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- Aenigma* William of St. Thierry, *Aenigma fidei*, in *Opera omnia V. Opuscula asversus Petrum Abaelardum et de fide*, ed. P. Verdeyen, CCCM, 89A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 129-191.
- Arbitrii* St. Anselm of Canterbury, *De libertate arbitrii*, in *Opera omnia S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi*, ed. F.S. Schmitt, 6 vols. [vol. 1 printed at Seckau 1938; vol. 2. at Rome 1940, all reset for the Nelson edn] (Edinburgh 1946–1961), reprinted with new editorial material as *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart-Bad-Cannstatt 1968-1984)], Vol. I, pp. 205-226.
- Arbitrio* St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Liber de Gratia et de libero arbitrio* in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, ed. J. Leclercq and H.M. Rochais, (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1963), vol. 3, pp. 165-203.
- Canticum* Origen of Alexandria, *Commentarium in Canticum Canticorum*, [Latin, trans. Rufinus] in *Origenes Werke* vol. 8, ed. W.A. Baehrens, Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, 33 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1925), p. 61-241.
- CCCM Corpus christianorum continuatio medievalis
- Charity* Hugh of St. Victor, ‘On the Praise of Charity,’ in *On Love: A Selection of Works of Hugh, Adam, Achard, Richard, and Godfrey of St. Victor*, ed. Hugh Feiss, trans. Franklin T. Harkins (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011).
- Choice* St. Anselm of Canterbury, ‘Freedom of Choice,’ in *The Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000) pp. 191-213.
- Contemplating* William of St. Thierry, ‘On Contemplating God,’ in *On Contemplating God, Prayer, and Meditations*, trans. Penelope Lawson (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1970), pp. 36-66.

- Contemplando* William of St. Thierry, *De Contemplando Deo: La Contemplation de Dieu: L'oraison de Dom Guillaume*, ed. and trans., Jacques Hourlier (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1959).
- Concordia* St. Anselm of Canterbury, *De Concordia praescientiae et praedestinationis et gratiae dei cum libero arbitrio* in *Opera omnia* [as *Arbitrii* above] vol. II, pp. 245-288.
- Collationes* Peter Abelard, *Collationes*, eds. and trans. John Marenbon and Giovanni Orlandi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)
- Cur Deus* St. Anselm of Canterbury, *Cur Deus Homo*, in *Opera Omnia* [as *Arbitrii* above] , vol. II, pp. 39-133.
- 'Cur Deus' St. Anselm of Canterbury, 'Cur Deus Homo,' in *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, [as *Choice* above], pp. 295-389.
- Days* Hugh of St. Victor, 'On the Three Days,' in *Trinity and Creation: Victorine Texts in Translation, Exegesis, Theology and Spirituality from the Abbey of St. Victor*, eds. Boyd Taylor Coolman and Dale M. Coulter, trans. Christopher P Evens (Hyde Park: New City Press, 2011).
- Didascalicon* Hugh of St. Victor, *Didascalicon de studio legendi*, ed. Ch.H. Buttimer (Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1939), pp. 1-133.
- Didascalicon: Guide* Hugh of St. Victor, *The Didascalicon of Hugh of St. Victor: A Medieval Guide to the Arts*, trans. Jerome Taylor (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968).
- Diebus* Hugh of St. Victor, *De Tribus Diebus*, ed. D. Poirel CCCM, 177 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.)
- Diligendo* St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Liber de diligendo Deo*, in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, [as *Arbitrio* above], vol. 3, pp. 119-154.
- Enigma* William of St. Thierry, *The Enigma of Faith*, trans. John D. Anderson (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1973).
- Epistle* William of St. Thierry, *The Golden Epistle*, trans. Theodore Berkeley (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1971).
- Epistula* William of St. Thierry, 'Epistula ad fratres de Monte Dei,' in

- Opera omnia III. Opera didactica et spiritualia: De Sacramento Altaris; De natura corporis et animae; De contemplando Deo; De Natura et dignitate amoris; Epistula ad fratres de Monte Dei*, eds. Stanly Ceglar and Paul Verdeyen (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003).
- Ethics* Peter Abelard, *Ethics*, trans. J. Ramsay McCallum, (Merrick: Richwood Publishing Co., 1976). Volume used with amendment where necessary.
- Expositio Canticum* William of St. Thierry, ‘Expositio super Cantica canticorum,’ in *Opera Omnia II, Expositio super Cantica canticorum; Brevis Commentatio; Excerpta de libris beati Ambrosii super Cantica canticorum; Excerpta ex libris beati Gregorii super Cantica canticorum*, eds. Stanly Ceglar and Paul Verdeyen (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997).
- Free Choice* St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Grace and Free Choice*, trans. Daniel O’Donovan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1988).
- Meditations* William of St. Thierry, ‘Meditations,’ in *On Contemplating God, Prayer, and Meditations*, trans. Penelope Lawson (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1970), pp. 89-190.
- Meditativae* William of St. Thierry, *Meditativae orationes: Oraisons méditatives* ed. and trans., Jacques Hourlier (Paris Éditions du Cerf, 1986).
- Mirror* William of St. Thierry, *The Mirror of Faith*, trans. Thomas X. Davis (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1979).
- Monologion* St. Anselm of Canterbury, *Monologion* in *Opera omnia* [as *Arbitrii* above], Vol. I, pp. 5-122.
- ‘Monologion’ St. Anselm of Canterbury ‘Monologion,’ in *The Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, [as *Choice* above], pp. 1-87.
- Natura* William of St. Thierry, ‘De Natura et dignitate amoris,’ in *Opera omnia, III. Opera didactica et spiritualia: De Sacramento Altaris; De natura corporis et animae; De contemplando Deo; De Natura et dignitate amoris; Epistula*

- ad fratres de Monte Dei*, eds. Stanly Ceglar and Paul Verdeyen (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003).
- Nature* William of St. Thierry, *The Nature and Dignity of Love*, Thomas X. Davis (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1981).
- Origen, Song* Origen of Alexandria, *The Song of Songs Commentary and Homilies*, trans. R. P. Lawson (Mahwah: The Newman Press, 1957).
- Principiis* Origen of Alexandria, *De principiis (Periarchon)*, ed. P. Koetschau, *Greichischen Christlichen Schriftsteller*, 22 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913), pp. 7-364.
- Principles* Origen of Alexandria, *On First Principles*, trans. G. W. Butterworth (Notre Dame: Christian Classics, 2013).
- Processione* St. Anselm of Canterbury, *De processione spiritus sancti in Opera omnia* [as *Arbitrii* above], vol. II, pp. 177-219.
- Proslogion* St. Anselm of Canterbury, *Proslogion* in *Opera omnia* [as *Arbitrii* above], vol. I, pp. 93-122.
- ‘Proslogion’ St. Anselm of Canterbury, ‘*Proslogion*,’ in *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, [as *Choice* above], pp. 88-112.
- Romans* William of St. Thierry, *Expisition on the Epistle to the Romans*, trans. John Baptist Hasbrouck (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1980).
- Romanos* William of St. Thierry, *Opera Omnia I: Expositio super Epistulam ad Romanos*, ed. Paul Verdeyen (Turnhout: Brepols, 1989).
- Scito* Peter Abelard, *Scito te ipsum*, ed. R. M. Ilgner, CCCM, 190 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001).
- Sentences* Hugh of St. Victor, ‘Sentences on Divinity,’ in *Trinity and Creation: Victorine Texts in Translation, Exegesis, Theology and Spirituality from the Abbey of St. Victor*, ed. Boyd Taylor Coolman and Dale M. Coulter, trans. Christopher P. Evens (Hyde Park: New York City Press, 2011).
- Sententiae* Hugh of St. Victor, *Sententiae de Divinitate*, in A. M. Piazzoni, ‘Ugo di San Vittore ‘auctor’ delle *Sententiae de*

- diuinitate*’, *Studi Medievali*, 23 (1982), pp. 861-955, at 912-955.
- Sermones Cantica* St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super Cantica Cantorum*, in Sancti Bernardi opera [as *Arbitrio* above] vols. 1-2.
- Song* William of St. Thierry, *Exposition on the Song of Songs*, trans. Columba Hart (Kalamazoo: Cisterstian Publications, 1968).
- Song I* St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs I*, trans. Kilian Walsh (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1971).
- Song II* St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs II*, trans. Kilian Walsh (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1983).
- Song III* St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs III*, trans. Kilian Walsh and Irene M. Edmonds (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1979).
- Song IV* St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs IV*, trans. Irene M. Edmonds (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1980).
- Substance* Hugh of St. Victor, ‘On the Substance of Love,’ in *Love: A Selection of Works from Hugh, Adam, Achard, Richard and Godfrey of St. Victor*, ed. Hugh Feiss, trans. Vanessa Butterfield (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012) pp. 143-149.
- Subantia* Hugh of St. Victor, *De substantia dilectionis*, in *Six opuscules spirituels*, ed. R. Baron Sources Chrétiennes, 155 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1969), pp. 82-92.
- Speculum* William of St. Thierry, *Speculum fidei: Le Miroir de la Foi*, ed. and trans., Jean Déchanet (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1982)
- Theologia* Peter Abelard, *Theologia christiana*, ed. E.M. Buytaert, CCCM, 12 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), pp. 71-372.
- Theology* Peter Abelard, *Christian Theology*, trans. J. Ramsay McCallum (Oxford: Basil Blackwell & Mott Ltd., 1948)
- Trinitate* St. Augustine of Hippo, *De Trinitate*, ed. W.J. Mountain, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 50, 50A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1968).
- Trinity* St. Augustine of Hippo, *On the Trinity*, trans. Edmund Hill (Hyde Park: New York City Press, 2012)

Verbo

Hugh of St. Victor, *De verbo dei*, ed. R. Baron Souces
Chrétiennes, 155 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1969), pp. 60-
80.

Statement of Copyright

“The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.”

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am extremely lucky to have received a wealth of assistance, support, and forgiveness over the course of producing this thesis, and I owe gratitude to a number of individuals. First and foremost, I would like to thank my one and only, Nikki Chiampa. Her love, patience, and encouragement have seen me through this process. I am absurdly fortunate to have her as my partner in all things mundane and spiritual.

I am grateful to Dr. Giles Gasper, sine qua non. I can say with confidence that any academic successes I have achieved are the result of his patience and encouragement. I am also thankful to the members of the Ordered Universe Project for welcoming me into their discussions and opening my eyes to the infinite interconnectedness of the world's knowledge. I owe thanks for inspiration, advice, and admonition to Professor Clifford Backman, Dr. Jay Diehl, Dr. Nicole Reibe, Dr. Charlie Rozier, Dr. Sigbjørn Olsen Sønnesyn, and Dr. Justine Wolfenden.

I owe immeasurable thanks to my family for their support. My two mothers have worked hard to enable me to pursue this education and I have no words to express my gratitude. Their sacrifice has made the privilege of learning possible for me, and their encouragement has made it a joy. My sister Madison is responsible for countless laughs, and for demonstrating to me that when told we cannot do something, we must show that we can.

I am fortunate to have a braintrust the likes of which rivals the greatest monastic populations in history, and I would like to thank those individuals who made it possible for me to survive the PhD process: Hazim Al-Eryani, Daniel Blair, Alice Burgess, Danny Buzzin, Isnard Dupoux, Alex Gargett, Thomas Hughes, David J. Gorton, Eve Friedman, Paul Pollack, Geovanni Rubio, Tudor Skinner, Carlo Vigliani, and Veronica Wells. Thanks to David Burke for keeping the dark lord at bay. Finally, thanks are due to my brothers in love and chaos, Oliver J. W. Burnham, and Andrew J. N. Stephenson, whose generosity and friendship are unrivalled.

*For Nikki
Whom my soul loves*

Chapter One: William's Worth

William of St. Thierry (1085-1148) is one of the most overlooked and under-researched thinkers of the medieval era. Investigation of William's thought reveals a complex, compelling, and creative theory of salvation that rests on an innovative understanding of pneumatology. William emerges as a significant twelfth century thinker; he produced a wealth of literature, much of which is extant, and had a significant impact on his immediate intellectual climate. Nonetheless, his status has been diminished in the historical record. As will be outlined below, in modern historiography William has been repeatedly misread and misinterpreted. It is the aim of this thesis to demonstrate the ingenuity and significance particularly of his theory of individual salvation through the Holy Spirit. In so doing, the study will examine William's unconventional account of the ascent of man, it will augment the current academic understanding of twelfth century humanism and anthropology, and it will contribute to debates within medieval and pneumatological studies in both history and theology.

William of St. Thierry's approach to the theology of salvation focuses on the Holy Spirit as the mechanism through which man is enlightened, and emphasizes the ascent of the individual rather than the holistic salvation of mankind.¹ This is in broad contrast to both the work of the patristic authors that William esteems and that of the majority of his contemporaries, in which a pervasive and overriding Christology is clear. Particularly in the twelfth century, the Son is consistently emphasised as the cause of both redemption and salvation. William's theology of salvation, while not diminishing in any way the agency of the Son as redeemer, emphasizes more distinctly the action of the Holy Spirit as saviour. William's theology of human experience depends on the constant reinforcement of the Holy

¹ In many places this thesis will refer to man or mankind. The intention is not to perpetuate antiquated gender inequality, but rather because in the theology of William of St. Thierry, his notions of salvation and union apply exclusively to the monk. Therefore, it is because of the nature of the texts that this theology is seemingly exclusively male. Sexism and misogyny are historical facts of the monastery and while they should not be ignored, they will not be given significant attention in this thesis.

Spirit, Who was sent to ‘illuminate their whole creation.’² William favours the Holy Spirit in his theology because he believes that He³ is the member of the Trinity that is present and involved in man’s earthly spiritual fulfilment and eventual salvation. Therefore, for William, salvation is made *possible* because of the sacrifice of Christ, but it is the Holy Spirit Who allows it to be achieved.

William’s description of the process through which salvation is reached is extremely personal. It relies on meditation, solitude, and self-improvement on the part of the believer as well as divine intercession. In some ways, this makes his choice to emphasise the Spirit more natural. God the Father acts as a distant Creator, God the Son engaged in the historical act of incarnation and redemption, but God the Spirit is the constant mediator who brings comfort and guidance to individuals on earth. William’s theology makes evident the distinction between redemption and salvation. It accentuates the active and on-going intercession of the Spirit as a source of steady elevation to the soul. Man was redeemed by Christ’s sacrifice, but he will be saved because the Spirit nurtures and sustains him on a continuing basis.

The remainder of this introductory chapter will establish the grounds on which William’s theology of salvation is constructed, his pneumatology and its implications, followed by considerations of appropriate vocabulary between Latin and English and the twelfth and twenty-first centuries. William’s theology of salvation is distinguished by two predominant characteristics: his belief that the Holy Spirit causes salvation, and his focus on salvation as an individualized experience. In order to identify the defining attributes of William’s thought on this topic, it is necessary to consider a number of factors. William considers the Holy Spirit’s place within the Godhead as a part of the Whole and acting as a singular Person. He uses a distinct tripartite taxonomy with which to approach both the Holy Spirit and the attributes of the human spiritual experience. His approach emphasizes the *imago dei* and the process through which humans increase in likeness as it pertains to the Spirit. In William’s metaphysics, the mechanism through which the Spirit imparts influence is grace. While grace is by nature mysterious, he does interpret the impact

² *Aenigma*, par. 85 p. 182: ‘illustrandam omnem creaturam suam.’ English translation from: *Enigma*, 75, p. 105.

³ In keeping with William’s theology the Holy Spirit will be referred to with the male pronoun and capitalized.

of grace, even though he cannot define it outright. Examination of William's thought in this regard has implications for his place and importance in his intellectual community and his role as a teacher. In so doing, it unearths a potential source for medieval and early modern spirituality and anthropology, and provides insight into a fresh theological and intellectual outlook.

The Place of William's Soteriology

In articulating a detailed Trinitarian theology, William is partaking in a greater twelfth-century trend. The high medieval era marked a rise in interest in clearly defining the Trinity and the relationship between the Persons of the Godhead.⁴ In this sense, William can be seen as partaking in a greater theological movement, however his treatment of the Trinity stands out from his peers. Study of the Spirit cannot be divorced from study of the Trinity, however,

In the broad central tradition, the significance of the person and mission of the Son is rarely impoverished, but we cannot say this of the Spirit, because pneumatology has not been integrated in an organic way into the whole theological process.⁵

Although William fits with his theological context in that he investigates an interactive understanding of the Trinity for didactic purposes, he also stands out in both his context and the greater Christian tradition for the pneumatological focus within his Trinitarian thinking.

Three major historical factors contributed to the formation of William's soteriology: the rise of scholasticism, a cultural focus on intellectual community, and the

⁴ Dominique Poirel, 'Scholastic Reasons, Monastic Meditations and Victorine Conciliations: The Question of the Unity and Plurality of God in the Twelfth Century' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, eds. Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 168. Gilles Emery, points out that the twelfth-century Trinitarian theology was particularly concerned with the way in which the Trinity relates to itself in *Trinity in Aquinas* (Ypsilanti: Sapientia Press, 2003), p. 16. For more on differing ways of defining the Trinity see Declain Marmion, and Rik Van Nieuwenhove, *An Introduction to The Trinity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 96-98.

⁵ Kilian McDonnell, *The Other Hand Of God: The Holy Spirit as the Universal Touch and Goal*, (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2003), p. 205

increased significance of individual spirituality within monastic instructive writing.⁶ In each of these categories, William's writing reveals greater significance. William expressed fears of a cultural decrease in zeal in monastic rule and study.⁷ As a result of William's position as a leader within the monastery, he applied his concerns beyond his own soul, to his spiritual sons and brothers. William is known as a monastic reformer and condemner of some scholastic thinkers, but this characterization is limited. Although William did combat his fears by attacking some scholastic writing, the more important and long-term way in which he opposed the threat to his faith was through providing clear spiritual guidance in the form of his didactic writing. William protected his community more often by correcting the spiritual misguidance that he perceived around him than by attacking scholastic thinkers. In this way, William's writing is formed by his distrust of certain intellectual trends, but it is revealing for understanding the broader intellectual culture in which he developed. Unpacking his theology sheds light on his context in terms of pedagogical, intellectual, and theological trends, and contributes to identifying the Holy Spirit and His relationship to humanity.

The Holy Spirit and the CoInherence

One of the most pivotal aspects of the catholic faith is the Unity and Oneness of the three persons that make up the Holy Trinity. While Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are

⁶ These trends are well-documented but for exemplary explorations of these themes see M-D Chenu, *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century* (London: University of Toronto Press, 1997) and Taylor, Henry Osborn, *The Medieval Mind: A History of the Development of Thought and Emotion*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949) on scholasticism, Caroline Walker Bynum's brilliant retort to the Collin Morris's arguments on individuality in the twelfth century, 'Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?' in *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982). pp. 82-110, which sparked a new understanding of the place of community in the twelfth century, and Diehl, Jay, 'Masters and Schools at St.-Laurent: Rupert of Deutz and the Scholastic Culture of a Liègeois Monastery,' in *Medieval Liege at the Crossroads of Europe: Monastic Society and Culture, 1000-1300*, ed. Steven Vanderputter, Tjamke Snijders, and Jay Diehl (Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming) and Susan Boynton, 'Training for the Liturgy as a Form of Monastic Education,' *Medieval Monastic Education*, eds. George Ferzoco and Carolun Muessig (London: Leceister University Press, 2000), pp. 7-20, who consider the place of teaching in spirituality.

⁷ Although this is a common theme in William's writing, he states this fear directly in the introduction to the *Epistle*, 1-40 pp. 3-24. It is also abundantly evident in his condemnations: William of St. Thierry, *Disputatio aduersus Petrum Abaelardum*, in *Opera omnia V.Opuscula asuersus Petrum Abaelardum et de fide*, ed. Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 89A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007) pp. 13-59 and William of St. Thierry, *Epistula de erroribus Guillelmi de Conchis*, ed. Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 89A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 61-71.

each unique, they are indivisible and cannot be seen as complete without their relationship to the Whole. It is challenging and potentially inaccurate, therefore, to depict William's pneumatology as isolated from his understanding of divinity.⁸ The Holy Spirit, as He is described in this thesis, must be understood as both those signs and represent Him within the Godhead, and by which He makes Himself known to the created order, but he must equally be understood as perpetually linked to the Father and Son. The Father, Son, and Spirit are not only United into the Godhead, they are united because they dwell within each other.⁹ It is essential to understand this doctrine, referred to often as co-inheritance, in order to understand William's theology.¹⁰ Although he specifically refers to the Holy Spirit as being the mechanism of salvation, because the Spirit is united to, and possesses within Him, the other Persons of the Trinity, it is the Whole of the Godhead that saves.

As a result of the co-inheritance in act, although he is specifying the Spirit, William does not contradict doctrine, nor does he counter his contemporaries. Although his articulation of salvation is distinct, as is his emphasis on the Holy Spirit, William is not heretical or heterodox. In describing the Spirit, William includes the Whole of the Godhead; he implies that God is working through the Spirit, because it is the Spirit Who is most capable of interacting with Man. This is partially a result of his understanding of the Persons of the Trinity through concepts and names.¹¹ The medieval understanding of the Trinity hinges on these categorical, thematic approaches to the Persons.¹² Barbara Newman argues that medieval metaphor allows for a richer, more sensual approach to intellectual theology than other forms of

⁸ As Kilian McDonnell points out over the course of the first chapter of his *Other Hand Of God*, pneumatology can scarcely be divided from theology of the Trinity as a whole.

⁹ George Leonard Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1952), pp. 280-300.

¹⁰ Coinherence is most associated with the 19th and 20th century poet and theologian Charles Williams, however he himself developed in from Patristic theology. (Barbara Newman, 'Charles Williams and the Companions of the Coinherence,' *Spiritus*, vol. 9, 1 (2009), p. 6.) Williams extended the indwelling of God to include humanity, which bears some similarity to William's understanding of salvation. (Newman, 'Coinherence,' pp. 8-10.)

¹¹ For concrete evidence that William saw this as an important way of expressing the Trinity see his section on divine names in the *Enigma*, 40-73 pp. 71-104.

¹² For more on this see for example, Elizabeth A. Dreyer, *Holy Power Holy Presence: Rediscovering Medieval Metaphors for the Holy Spirit*, (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2007), p. 242 and Henri de Lubac's masterful investigation *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*, two volumes, trans. Mark Sebanc and E. M. Macierowski, (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1998 [1959]), which considers the place of allegory and deific expression extensively

theological investigation.¹³ She developed this concept in her later writing, and coined the term ‘imaginative theology’ to describe how allegory and metaphor are used in the medieval era to describe theological experiences and, more pertinently, the Persons of the Trinity.¹⁴ William’s excavation of the Trinity, and specifically the Holy Spirit, through the use of metaphorical identities and signifiers, is an example of how this ‘imaginative theology’ works. In order to understand his classification of the Persons, therefore, it is necessary to remove oneself from the modern theological approach and consider the Trinity on William’s terms.¹⁵

Ascribing attributes to the Persons of the Trinity is not meant to divide them or undermine the co-inheritance, it simply serves to simplify the meaning of the Trinity so that, at least to a limited degree, the human mind can conceive of It. This is still done to a limited degree in theology that describes the Son as the Word, or the Holy Spirit as the Love of God. This is an understanding of the Godhead that is upheld by William, and is pervasive throughout the medieval era. Although William and his contemporaries were both drawing on the same Trinitarian understanding, however, William chose to discuss the work of the Spirit more frequently than is common in his era.

Whereas the theology of the authorities that William tended toward a Christological basis for Christian salvation the cornerstone of his own theology was pneumatology. William could not have genuinely considered the Holy Spirit superior to the other members of the Trinity without being heretical. The unity and equality of the Persons of the Trinity is absolute and William validates it consistently. However, each of these Persons also has individual qualities that identify them within the One, and the characteristics that have been assigned to the Holy Spirit over the course of early

¹³ Barbara Newman, *Saint Hildegard of Bingen: Symphonia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), p. 41.

¹⁴ Barbara Newman, *God and the Goddesses: Vision, Poetry, and Belief in the Middle Ages*, (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2003), p. 292.

¹⁵ Ted Peters illustrates how an understanding of the Trinity as three Persons, as was ubiquitous in the medieval era, is no longer as relevant in modern theology in *GOD as Trinity: Relationality and Temporality in Divine Life* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), p. 35. More famously, Karl Barth questioned the place of the term ‘Persons’ in current theology, arguing that the humanism of the modern age has made it so that that term comes with too much anthropological baggage to be appropriate in modern discourse in *Church Dogmatics*, vol. I (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1936), pp. 1:411-413. Within this thesis, however, the Trinity will be conceived and articulated as William saw it, therefore his Persons, terms, and categories will be accepted although this means that one must divest oneself of modern associations to a certain degree.

Trinitarian theology were of greater concern for William. William was well read and respectful of authoritative writers. It follows, therefore, that much of what William wrote and believed was reiteration either directly or implicitly of some other churchman's thought. However, at the times in which Augustine, Origen and William's other major influences were writing, the Holy Spirit's existence and procession were being defended; the elementary questions on which they focused already had absolute answers in William's twelfth-century. Therefore, whereas William's forbearers were defending the being of the Spirit, William was contemplating His nature.

Among the most common definitions historically applied to the Holy Spirit is that of the teacher or guardian. William views the Spirit's instructional role as being a source of encouragement and stamina to mankind. In *Meditations* he writes, 'teach me then, Holy Spirit, to pray without ceasing, that you may grant me to rejoice unceasingly in you.'¹⁶ William calls upon the Spirit frequently when he is experiencing doubt or lack of zeal. When his own soul fails him, William relies upon the gifts and involvement of the Spirit to support and guide him out of his own weakness. The Spirit is intimately involved in improving William's spiritual resilience. Through the Spirit man learns to recognize his heavenly Father before his earthly one. The Holy Spirit is, therefore, portrayed by William as a source of both specific knowledge and general instruction towards man. His involvement in man's welfare is, at least in William's hands, more interpersonal and consistent than that of the Father or Son.

Will, Love, and Unity

It is of primary importance to establish William's own definition for the Holy Spirit.¹⁷ While William does refer frequently to the Holy Spirit by name: Spiritus

¹⁶ *Meditationes*, ch. 4:19 p. 26: 'Doce ergo {me,} sancte Spiritus, sine intermissione orare, ut des mihi sine intermissione gaudere in te.' English translation from: *Meditations*, 4:13, p. 117. See also 11:2 p. 157, where he refers to the Holy Spirit as a 'scribe.'

¹⁷ It is worth noting some other significant pneumatological metaphors in which William seems uninterested. Explorations of the Holy Spirit as He moves over the water are numerous in the medieval era. Very early in the patristic era, Tertullian explained the importance of baptism through the Spirit as water (Tertullian, *Homily on Baptism*, ed. and trans. Ernest Evans (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1964), ch. 3-4). In his treatise *The Holy Spirit*, Ambrose explores how, through the metaphor of water the Holy Spirit can be said to flow as a fecund river. (Ambrose, 'On the Holy Spirit,' in *Dogmatic Works*, trans. Roy J. Deferrari (Washington: The Catholic

sanctus, he also employs a variety of titles through which to refer to Him, which are useful in outlining William's understanding of the Spirit's role.¹⁸ A proper examination of the Holy Spirit's place within William's theology is only possible by establishing what other titles might be assigned to Him. In his early meditative work, *On Contemplating God*, William provides the following concise description:

Your Holy Spirit, who is called the Love, and the Unity, and the Will of the Father and the Son, dwells in us by his grace and implants in us the charity of God; and through that charity he reconciles God to us.¹⁹

This statement sums up the most important aspects of the Spirit that are to be explored in order to understand why William sees the Spirit as so essential to the post-lapsarian human condition. By way of the agency of grace, the Holy Spirit both embodies His own, and affects the individual's own Will, Love, and Unity and it is therefore these three titles that are most fit to describe the Spirit.

Each of the three appellations, Will, Love, and Unity, are intrinsic to the Holy Spirit's own identity. The Spirit Himself represents and acts as the Will, Love, and Unity of the Godhead. Whereas the Father and the Son have distinct identities within

University of America Press, 1987), p. 90-97). The Venerable Bede, whom William would have valued as an authority, wrote that the Holy Spirit's role in creation was his movement over the waters, all other aspects of creation were accomplished through the Father and Son (Bede, *On Genesis*, trans. Calvin B. Kendall (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008), p. 73). From the Greek tradition, Cyril of Jerusalem explored the water metaphor in the form of a series of liquids in his 'Catechetical Oration 16,' in *The Holy Spirit: Classic and Contemporary Readings*, ed. Eugene F. Rogers Jr. (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2009) pp. 131-135, as did Gregory of Nyssa in 'On the Holy Spirit against Macedonius,' in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, eds. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Grand Rapids: W. M. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), p. 315. More contemporary to William, Rupert of Deutz explores the Spirit's identity in water as a metaphor for baptism (Rupert of Deutz, 'The Spirit Hovers over Baptism,' in *The Holy Spirit: Classic and Contemporary Readings*, ed. Eugene F. Rogers Jr. (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2009) pp. 177-179 William's individual and salvation-oriented theological priorities are evidenced by the fact that, while he is a well versed pneumatologist, he ignores these metaphors that have less relevance to individual salvation.

¹⁸ In each of the body chapters, Will, Love, and Unity, these terms will, at different points be either or lower case. Each of these terms refers both to an identity of the Holy Spirit and their corresponding faculty within the human mind. If a term is capitalized this signifies a formal title for the Spirit, whereas the lowercase refers to the mundane human equivalent. Similarly, words such as oneness and trinity will be capitalized only when they signify the Godhead. Capitalized pronouns refer exclusively to God. With the obvious exclusion of starts of the sentence, all capitalizations are deliberate and significant, and should therefore be observed.

¹⁹ *Contemplando*, p. 163: 'Sic enim ipse Spiritus sanctus tuus, qui amor dicitur Patris et Filii, et unitas, et uoluntas, per gratiam suam nobis inhabitans, et Dei in nos caritatem commendams.' English translation from: *Contemplating*, 11, p. 54.

the Oneness of the Godhead, the Holy Spirit, as He who proceeds from both, represent those things that they share. He is the Will of God in that He possesses and embodies all of God's desires. He is the Love of God because He embodies both the love that the Father and Son have for each other, and the love that God radiates on His creation. He is the Unity of God because it is through the Holy Spirit that the Godhead is made One. Unlike paternity or historical incarnation, these three characteristics are universal to the whole of God and they must therefore be the dominion of the Holy Spirit. They are also essential to William's pneumatology because they are the three characteristics by which God saves fallen man.

Will, love, and unity, along with being deific attributes, are also aspects of the human soul. William portrays these attributes as being the most central to man's relationship to God: they comprise the *imago dei*. Man has will, which has the potential to choose good or evil.²⁰ Man is able to love and, although this love is weak, he is capable of trying to aim that love at God. Unity is the most complex attribute of humanity; it represents man's potential to reunite with his creator if he is chosen for salvation. Each of these faculties is a weaker form that has the potential to be conformed and made more similar to God through a combination of individual effort, and graceful intervention on the part of the Holy Spirit. While this transformation unites man to the whole of the trinity, the union is accomplished through the Holy Spirit. This is both because guidance is the natural role of the Spirit as the paraclete and because, as custodian of God's Will, Love, and Unity, it is natural that He enlighten man's shallower forms of those same attributes.

Each of these three faculties are held in the divine as well as the human mind, however there is an innate hierarchy between the three. Will and love are both powerful mental and emotional dispositions: they are both affecti.²¹ Will, however, is still subordinate to love. Will is the first part of the soul that the Spirit visits and advances, because will is the easiest to change. As a man's will changes and is changed it comes closer to matching God's will. Through this improvement, will

²⁰ This, as shall be explored later, should not be construed as Pelagianism. Man's will comes encumbered with original sin, tainted by the fall, and can only truly be healed through grace. However, on the spectrum of good to evil man is able to move himself in either direction to a limited degree.

²¹ See vocabulary section later in this introduction for an exploration of the meaning of affectus in William's work.

develops into the stronger affectus, which is love.²² Love is a more powerful emotional quality and through the increase of love, man is made more and more good, but loving, even in its highest form, still pales in comparison to unity. Unlike will and love, unity is not an emotion, it is a state of being. The nucleus of unity exists within the soul in the same way that weak will and love do, and to that extent their identities are all connected, however the purpose of improving one's will and love is so as to *accomplish*, rather than improve, unity. Unity, therefore, requires a slightly different line of analysis than love and will. All three however, are identities of the Spirit that also occur in their shadow form in the human soul, and all three are aspects of the self which are elevated by the Spirit in order for the soul to be saved.

William insists on the absolute unity of the Godhead. Although each of the qualities that will be discussed here distinguishes the Holy Spirit, they do not separate Him. Similarly, to imply that William favoured one of the Persons of the Trinity over the others is extremely presumptuous and unlikely. William repeatedly emphasizes the Oneness and equality of the Trinity throughout his work.²³ The Holy Spirit, however, contributes a greater and more direct role to William's soteriology than do the other members of the Trinity. Additionally, this emphasis of the Holy Spirit is particular and, as such, allows analytical isolation of William's position on the matter as derived from his own, personal, contemplation, and point of view. His pneumatological thought is more independent than other subjects, on which he tends to abide by the conceptual parameters of the authorities consulted. A large and important section of William's writing is dedicated to the process through which the soul goes in order to become closer to God, and the process through which God's image can be recognized within the human-self. The Holy Spirit is absolutely essential to that process, and establishing His identity is essential to understanding both William's view of the Trinity, and his understanding of salvation.

Image and Likeness

Salvation is achieved on an individual level through realizing similarity to God in each of the established three categories of the soul that are held within the *imago dei*.

²² See for example, *Speculum*, ch. 19, and *Natura*, ch. 4.

²³ This is ubiquitous, but particularly evidenced in his section of *Enigma* on divine names and on contemplating the mystery of the trinity, 40-90 pp. 71-117.

This is only possible with the aid the Holy Spirit. Although an explanation of the image of God in man is absent from scripture, it is an indispensable aspect of Christian theology, and is a much-travelled line of inquiry in twelfth-century thought. William, like many of his contemporaries, establishes a disparity between image and likeness in the relationship between man and God. Image is the mere stamp of God upon the human soul: the place in which the emotional qualities are held. By supplying man with reason and attributes of Himself, God implanted in him a natural reflection of what God is.²⁴ Likeness is something far more malleable. Although by virtue of having the image within him, man has some similarity to God, it is the duty of man, with the help of the Spirit, to increase that similarity over his lifetime so as to become more alike to God. Salvation comes at the height of this experience, when man, with God's grace within him, has achieved perfect likeness. A significant portion of this improvement is achieved over the course of a monk's life, but the realization of that likeness comes in the life thereafter.

In William's theology it is clear that the human soul is aided, guided, and even carried in the journey to similitude, by the Holy Spirit. William writes extensively on this increase in similarity in his *Golden Epistle*, in which he outlines the levels of likeness that must be achieved. William explains that the first kind of likeness is the one with which post-lapsarian man is born, and that, 'as far as merit is concerned this likeness to God in man is of no importance to God, since it derives from nature, not from will or effort.'²⁵ Likeness in this sense is not an accomplishment: this nascent form of likeness is simply received in man because of the presence of the image. The

²⁴ This is *not* a physical image. In the *Enigma*, William writes 'But who would be so very foolish as to say that we shall be like God in a bodily way? For, it is in the inner man that that likeness exists by which man is renewed day by day in the knowledge of God according to the image of him who created him.' 5, pp. 38-9.

²⁵ *Epistula*, ch. 260 p. 95: extended Latin quotation: 'Haec similitudo Dei in homine, quantum ad meritum eius, nullius est momenti apud Deum, cum naturae, non uoluntatis eius sit uel laboris. Sed est alia Deo magis propinqua, in quantum uoluntaria, quae in uirtutibus consistit; in qua animus, uirtutis magnitudine, summi boni quasi imitari gestit magnitudinem, et perseuerante in bono constantia, aeternitatis eius incommutabilitatem. Super hanc autem et alia adhuc est Dei similitudo; haec de qua iam aliquanta dicta sunt, in tantum proprie propria, ut non iam similitudo, sed unitas spiritus nominetur; cum fit homo cum Deo unus spiritus, non tantum unitate idem uolendi, sed expressiore quadam ueritate uirtutis, sicut iam dictum est, aliud uelle non ualendi. Dicitur autem haec unitas spiritus, non tantum quia efficit eam, uel afficit ei spiritum hominis Spiritus sanctus, sed quia ipse est Spiritus sanctus, Deus caritas.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 260, p. 95.

presence of the image, however, does allow man to reach for greater likeness: ‘the fact that it is his image enables us to cling to him whose image it is.’²⁶

According to William, good men will begin their journey of self-improvement independently, because their will ‘consists in the virtues and inspires the soul as it were to imitate the greatness of Supreme Good by the greatness of its virtue and his unchangeable eternity by its unwearrying perseverance in good.’²⁷ At this stage, man strives toward God, and through striving becomes more similar. Will, as it strengthens, transitions into love, which reinforces man’s ability to cling to the divine. Finally, through the perseverance of the soul, as fortified and guided by the Spirit, man achieves a perfected form of likeness. Of this, William writes, ‘it is so close in its resemblance that it is styled not merely a likeness but a unity of spirit. It makes man one with God, one spirit.’²⁸ By achieving this supreme level of likeness, man has achieved salvation in God. Salvation, therefore, is the increase in likeness through the qualities that have been established in the image, which is made possible by the Holy Spirit.

The image of God was inserted into the created order because it was God’s way of making provision for the soul. By having the image within him, man has a natural tendency and ability to reach towards better things. Over the course of his life, man’s goal should be to privilege the inclinations of his soul over his carnal impulses. The soul, which is the rational seat of the image within man, has a natural predisposition toward better things. However, because man is weak and easily confused, often he will not be able to discern which of his desires or inclinations are those which will be pleasing to God, and which are the base perversions of his carnal form. The Holy Spirit is, therefore, necessary as the paraclete. He teaches the individual to recognize the good things within oneself, while also operating within that soul to pour His own grace into it. He brings believers closer to that state of holiness and happiness both by acting as a leader to that soul, and by providing a means by which it can be actively improved.

²⁶ *Epistula*, ch 209 p. 272: ‘per hoc quod imago eius est, intelligibile ei fit et posse se, et debere inhaerere ei cuius imago est.’ English translation from: *Epistle*, 209, p. 82.

²⁷ *Epistle*, 261, p. 95. Latin included in the above extended quotation in footnote 13.

²⁸ *Epistle*, 262, p. 95. See Latin above in footnote 13.

Grace

Throughout the spiritual and emotional development that William perceives the Holy Spirit engendering in man, the means by which the Spirit affects man is grace. Grace is first and foremost a mystery: as an agent of God it cannot and should not be understood by man. As in the case of the nature of the Trinity, however, William does consider potential definitions and these merit a brief review. The Holy Spirit, as gift of God, imparts grace onto the worshipper, and it is by grace that he is able to enter the soul and guide the will towards love and eventual unity. The continual grace provided by the Holy Spirit also gives the endeavouring soul the strength required to continue seeking God even though man does not have that ability within himself. Grace applies both to the eventual goal of unity with God, and to the distress and weakness that marks the earlier portions of a believer's life. William speaks of his own experience with grace in his meditations:

I could not exist in any way at all, either in body or in soul, save by your constant power, I could not desire you, nor seek you save by your ever present grace; and I could never find you, did not your mercy and your goodness run to meet me on my way.²⁹

Whereas the Father is associated with creation, and the Son with redemption, it is the Holy Spirit who is present at all times throughout life. He gives the day-to-day strength, and he is the teacher who eventually leads the soul towards salvation.³⁰

For William, the bestowal of grace is constant and reinforces man's strengths while implanting new ones. The reception of grace is a contemplative act on the part of the believer. While the Spirit bestows grace constantly wherever he desires to do so, the individual must search within himself to recognize that the gift of grace has been granted. He describes the soul's struggle to seek and recognize God in his commentary on the Song of Songs:

²⁹ *Meditatiuae*, ch. 2 p. 6: 'Et uae mihi, quotienscunque tecum non sum, sine quo nunquam esse possum. Non enim haberem subsistere, quouis modo subsistendi, siue in corpore siue in anima, nisi praesente uirtute tua; non desiderarem, no quaerarem te, nisi ex praesente gratia tua; nunquam inuenirem te, nisi occurreret mihi misericordia et bonitas tua.' English translation from: *Meditations*, 2:2 p. 96.

³⁰ See the previous section on the Holy Spirit and coinherence for more on these roles.

The Bride says: I was seeking him outside myself, as if he were absent, whereas I already possessed him reposing and feeding within me. The devotion of goodwill gave proof of his repose within my heart; and the outpouring of confession, pleasing to God, bore witness that he was feeding me interiorly by operating grace.³¹

It is this interior grace that gives the believer the inclination to endeavour to move towards God. Much of William's writing describes the experience of loneliness and alienation from God. It seems that his own life was marked by frequent pitfalls of depression and despondence and he often describes the sensation of desertion.³² This passage, speaks to William's darkest fears, he reminds himself and his reader that even when the soul feels alone, the grace of God is still within him: the Holy Spirit, is the answer to his loneliness as well as the fuel through which he endeavours to improve.

In his *Meditations*, William once again describes the experience of isolation and respite through grace. He describes bouts of tremendous sadness, which led to spiritual lethargy until eventually

I hear your Spirit's voice, and, though it is no more than as a whistling of a gentle air that passes me, I understand the message: "come unto him and be enlightened." I hear, and I am shaken. Arising from sleep and shaking off my lethargy a certain wonder fills me I open my mouth and I draw in my breath; I stretch my spiritual muscles and rouse them from their sloth.³³

At the lowest points in an individual's life the Spirit either internally or supernaturally fortifies him. The Spirit of Grace calls upon the lethargic soul, and

³¹*Expositio Cantica*, 'Quaerebam ergo, ait sponsa, extra me quasi absentem, quem intra me iam habebam accubantem ac pascentem; cuius cubitum in corde meo manifestabat pietas bonae uoluntatis, pastum uero interius operantis gratiae, eructatio placitae Deo confessionis' English translation from: *Song*, 78, p. 65.

³² Both his *Meditations* and his *Song* feature lengthy expressions of emotional angst and turmoil.

³³ *Meditatiuae*, ch. 2 par. 6: 'Audio quidem nonnunquam uocem Spiritus tui, sed pertranseuntem quasi sibilum aurae tenuis, et intelligo dicentem: Accedite ed eum, et illuminamini. Audio et concutior, surgensque quasi a somno et excutiens meipsum, aliquatenus destupesco, os meum aperio, et attraho spiritum; distendo sensus animae meae ut depigrescant; egredior de interioribus nocturnae conscientiae meae; exeo ad lucem orientis mihi solis iustitiae.' English translation from: *Meditations*, 2:6, p. 97-8.

strengthens the weak so that even when a monk wavers from the path set out by God, there is a member of that Triune God guiding him back towards salvation.

Through the investment of grace, a soul becomes stronger. Although grace continues to be the means by which the Spirit moves man, the first movements of grace are what kindle in the soul the desire to seek God further. Here, the grace ceases to be a mere effect and becomes an agent of affect.³⁴ Through grace, the Holy Spirit prompts His tutee towards more virtuous qualities. This has very little to do with man's own effort, it is rather a further gift associated with the Spirit's grace; because this individual has strived to love God 'therefore much is granted or forgiven in him.'³⁵ Grace is, therefore, the means by which the Spirit affects man, the strength by which man assumes the affect, and the purpose for God's forgiveness of man.

It cannot be emphasised enough that, for William, although it is the responsibility of man to strive toward good things, it is entirely by the benevolence of the Holy Spirit that man is able to take these further steps. Without the initial and the continual investment of grace from the Spirit, man would not be capable of willing good, loving God, or of striving toward union with Him. As William writes in *On Contemplating God*, 'by your grace, I do have in me the desire to desire you and the love of loving you with all my heart and soul.'³⁶ Grace as a theme can no more be isolated from the path to salvation than can the Holy Spirit be isolated from the Godhead.

Grace and Free Will

One well-travelled theological problem that affects William's soteriology is the apparent dichotomy between man's freedom of will and God's ubiquitous power. Although St. Augustine and, much later than William, St. Thomas Aquinas are probably the best known sources on the subject of grace and concurrence, William also engages in some limited considerations of this topic. Situating him between these two leviathans is informative for understanding William's place in the

³⁴ Meaning that where as originally, grace was something that effected human behaviour, now grace causes active improvement.

³⁵ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. 3:14 lin. 66: 'ideo praestatur uel dimittitur ei multum.' English translation from: *Song*, 16, p. 13.

³⁶ *Contemplando* par. 5 p. 156: 'per gratiam tuam desiderium desiderii tui, et amorem amoris tui habere me in toto corde et in tota anima mea,' English translation from: *Contemplating*, 4, p. 41.

theological framework and for unpacking his thinking on this complex and sometimes controversial concept.

To summarize Augustine's thinking on so complex an idea as freedom and grace would be impossible. This is partially because of the sheer magnitude of his work and partially because Augustine himself is not always consistent in his answer. The central ethos of relevance to this thesis that Augustine seems to be imparting, however, is that in creating humanity, God created a being that was free, but that possessed a great enough intellect that it could thereby be guided and swayed. Augustine considers this issue of freedom in his *Admonition of Grace*. Augustine makes it clear that the potential for freedom does not contradict guidance of grace: grace reinforces and strengthens man's free will.³⁷ In his *City of God*, Augustine repeatedly attests that man is conformed God's path because God lights the way by engaging man's intellect. He writes that because man is 'naturally capable of reason and intelligence,' God is able to shine 'His unchangeable light, until it [the mind] has been gradually healed, and renewed, and made capable of such felicity, it had, in the first place, to be impregnated by faith, and so purified.'³⁸ Man's freedom is preserved, but because man has the guiding light of God, he naturally tends toward the things that God has demonstrated are good. Man is able to recognize these things because of the light that God shines on his intellect, and he is able to pursue them because of the reinforcement of grace. God's power does not limit man's freedom, therefore, but rather expands and instructs it.

William espouses an understanding of freedom in the face of God's power that closely mirrors Augustine's. He writes man's only immediate freedom is the freedom to sin, but that through grace God liberates will so that man's freedom extends good

³⁷ Augustine, 'Admonition of Grace,' in *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation Volume 2* trans. John Courtney Murray ed. Joseph Deferrari (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1966), p. 291. Augustine reiterates this point in *On The Spirit and the Letter*, 12:20

³⁸ Augustine, *De ciuitate Dei*, eds. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, CC SL, 47; 48 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), book 11 ch. 2: 'sed quia ipsa mens, cui ratio et intellegentia naturaliter inest, uitiiis quibusdam tenebrosis et ueteribus inualida est, non solum ad inhaerendum fruendo, uerum etiam ad perferendum incommutabile lumen, donec de die in diem renouata atque sanata fiat tantae felicitatis capax, fide primum fuerat inbuenda atque purganda.' English translation from: *City of God*, trans. Marcus Dods (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2009), p. 311. See also 11:26, where he reiterates that this is the way in which God guides man's freedom and emphasizes that only God could have created and then enkindled man's action.

abilities as well.³⁹ William continues that once God's grace has liberated the will and lead the way, man's freedom will increasingly tend to follow in the direction that grace guides.⁴⁰ Like Augustine, William emphasizes that way in which man's freedom is reconciled with God's will is through intellect. He writes in the *Epistle*, that reason and choice were left in man as a sign of the fact that God would eventually direct man's will.⁴¹ Reason, therefore, is the way in which God leads choice: 'reason us truly reason that is a disposition of the mind ready to conform to the Truth in all things.'⁴² Ultimately, for William, while man's freedom to act remains, God, in His interminable power is so persuasive and awe inspiring that, once He has revealed what he desires, no man would ever contradict God's Will. In this way, man's freedom is retained, as is God's strength and the rectitude of Grace.

Although he was writing nearly a century after William's death, St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) should be looked to as an expert authority on the concurrence of grace and freedom, both for his precision and for his conclusiveness. He serves as an informative conclusion for this discussion. Thomas maintains both the existence of free will, and the conviction that everything happens as a result of God's will. Thomas is clear that, although man is not divine, he is the most heavenly of all lower bodies.⁴³ He explains that one of the results of this heavenly likeness in an earthly form is that mankind is intelligent. Thomas explicates that, whereas animals are moved in their will by force of nature, humans are moved by their intellect.⁴⁴ Intellect is fluid; it moves as it develops, and it is moved by the teacher as it is taught. In this way, although man has the freedom to draw his own conclusions, that freedom is influenced as learning sways the intellect. God, explains Thomas, is the teacher of all knowledge, and he teaches through intellect.⁴⁵ Through teaching, God

³⁹ William, *Mirror*, 5 p. 13.

⁴⁰ William, *Mirror*, 6 p. 17.

⁴¹ William, *Epistle*, 200 p. 80.

⁴² William, *Epistula* 201 p. 271: 'Et tunc ratio uere est ratio, hoc est habitus mentis per omnia conueniens ueritati.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 201, p. 80.

⁴³ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles Book II: Creation*, trans. James F. Anderson (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975), ch. 70:6. See chapters 64-71 for his more full description of the soul and free will.

⁴⁴ Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, book II ch. 47. Thomas attests that free will and free choice are the same in Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Blackfriars, 1964), ch. 83:4.

⁴⁵ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles, Book III: Providence*, trans. Vernon J. Bourke, Part I (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975), ch. 75:5.

sways human thought.⁴⁶ Thomas articulates this view of God's participation in will in a way that is similar to William's interpretation of the Spirit as Will. He writes that, just as a musician creates music, but through the mechanism of his instrument, God is able to will through humanity: 'among spiritual things, also every movement of will must be caused by the first will, which is the will of God.'⁴⁷ Together, intellect as taught by God, and will as given by God, sculpt man's will, so that while it maintains its freedom, it gains integrity.⁴⁸

In the spiritual infrastructure of all three of these theologians, man acts freely, but his actions are caused by God's shepherding. God gave man intellectual tools at his creation. He continually gives man grace through the Holy Spirit. The freedom of man's will remains intact, but God's grace has created such a clear and well structured path that there is no reason for man to deviate from it.⁴⁹ Aquinas and Augustine both make clear and precise statements regarding God's governance and relationship with man's will. Although William is slightly less explicit, he falls well within the school of thought that they articulated.

Vocabulary

In order to provide an affective and comprehensive discussion, consistent terms must be established. This is both with regard to translation and with current terms that have precarious meanings in the context of this study. Will, love, and unity will be used as umbrella terms that refer to greater concepts that might encompass a selection of Latin equivalents. The Latin word *affectus* has no satisfactory English equivalent and it will therefore also be explored. The meaning of analytical concepts such as 'originality,' as they pertain to the context of the twelfth-century monastery will also be raised.

⁴⁶ Thomas reiterates this in the *Summa Theologiae*: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* vol. 42 (Cambridge: Blackfriars, 1964), ch. 105:3

⁴⁷ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, ed. Marietti Textus Leonitus (1961), book III ch. 89.6: 'Oportet igitur quod et in spiritualibus omnis motus voluntatis a prima voluntate causetur, quae est voluntas Dei.' English translation from: *Summa Contra Gentiles, Book III: Providence*, trans. Vernon J. Bourke, Part II (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975), ch. 89.6, p. 36.

⁴⁸ Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles III*, ch. 89:7-90:8. For an excellent and detailed analysis of will and freedom in Thomas's thought see: Norman Kretzmann, *The Metaphysics of Creation: Aquinas's Natural Theology in Summa contra gentiles II* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), pp. 244-256.

⁴⁹ As Thomas Aquinas points on in his *Summa Contra Gentiles III*, 89:1, this is different from Origen's interpretation, with implies that God's only influence on man's will was creating it (Origen, *Principles*, book II ch. 1). William is distinctly in Augustine's camp on this subject, as is Aquinas.

Vocabulary of Will

Will, as a concept, envelops a number of more specific terms. Will incorporates a range of emotional experiences from ill will, to desire, to choice, to good will. This is, in part, a result of the nature of human freedom: although man is encumbered with original sin and can be elevated by the Spirit's grace, the decisions and desires between sin and salvation are a results of man's own free will. The Latin word most frequently used to express human will is 'voluntas,' and William uses it almost exclusively. His contemporaries, however, are more selective in their lexicon and sometimes specify 'arbitrium' or 'desiderium' as specific forms of Will. In order to augment the discussion, these terms are worth some brief consideration, but it is important to remember that William does not burden himself or his readers with semantic considerations. What is important to William is that man without will has no control over his character. Man's will is one of the ways in which he can appeal to the Holy Spirit by trying to choose to make himself more worthy of His grace.

Whereas William favours the use of 'voluntas,' many of his contemporaries, especially Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) and St. Bernard (1090-1153), favour 'arbitrium.'⁵⁰ While these words are close to synonyms, the difference is revealing. Anselm's and Bernard's word choice highlights the work of decision and, therefore, conjures concepts of consequence and action, William's vocabulary is softer, instead evoking a sort of tenderness of desire. William's locution refers abstractly to the entire concept of will. As shall be seen, Anselm tends to cycle between the two depending on the demands of the context and Bernard emphasises the concept of consent.⁵¹ William's decision to be consistent in his use of 'voluntas' allows for the broader spectrum of categories of will that he considers within his discussion of the topic. By choosing the least specific of the potential terms, William is able to be liberal in defining what will is or is not.

⁵⁰ This is particularly true in Anselm's thesis on the topic, *arbitrii*, in which it is used almost exclusively, as well as his more complex *De Concordia praescientiae et praedestinationis et gratiae dei cum libero arbitrio*. Bernard's preference of this term is most evidenced by his *arbitrio*.

⁵¹ In *Free Choice*, Bernard writes that 'where consent is, there is will.' (Bernard, *arbitrio*, ch. 2:3 p. 167: 'Ubi ergo consensus, ibi voluntas.' Self translated) This cements will's definition as extending beyond desire, to include conscious concession.

Anselm also has a different understanding of what ‘freedom’ means in the context of will. William and many other twelfth-century thinkers consider freedom of will to be the source of the power to sin, and as the seat of decision making, will is often found culpable for all bad action in man.⁵² Anselm, on the other hand, considers such a definition of free will problematic and even ‘blasphemous.’⁵³ If free will has the power to sin, Anselm explains, this must imply either that God can act sinfully or that God is not free.⁵⁴ This predicament is unacceptable, and Anselm concludes that freedom of will can be equated to rectitude of will: sin leads to damnation, but good will is a road to deliverance.⁵⁵ This aspect of Anselm’s argument is closer to what can be seen later in William’s theology, and is probably a point from which William derived inspiration. Although to William, there are distinct differences between divine will, which is naturally good, and human will, which is naturally tainted, William’s conclusions about the importance of good will are perfectly accordant with Anselm’s interpretation of rectitude in will leading to salvation.

Whereas Anselm’s vocabulary for will differs from William’s, Abelard, like William, generally approaches the topic of will using the term ‘voluntas.’ Despite

⁵² William’s definition of free will seems to be the more common one, in which freedom allows the ability for both good and bad behaviour.

⁵³ Anselm, *Arbitrii*, ch. 1 p, 207: ‘Nefas.’ English translation from: *Choice*, p. 192. He writes in his dialogue on will that ‘freedom of choice is the ability to sin and not to sin.’ (Anselm, *Arbitrii*, ch. 1 p. 207: ‘Libertatem arbitrii non puto esse potentiam peccandi et non peccandi.’ English translation from: *Choice*, p. 192.)

⁵⁴ In an attempt to resolve the apparent contradiction caused by free will existing in both God and man, the student suggests that perhaps mundane and divine freedoms are different, but Anselm rejects this hypothesis with the response, ‘the definition of this freedom ought to be the same in both cases, in accordance with the name “freedom.”’ (Anselm, *Arbitrii*, ch.1 p. 208: ‘Quamvis differat liberum arbitrium hominum a libero arbitrio dei et angelorum bonorum, definitio tamen huius libertatis in utrisque secundum hoc nomen eadem debet esse.’ English translation from: *Choice*, p. 192. William is not as concerned as Anselm with defending God’s Will as being free. This is not to say that he does not share the conviction, but perhaps rather that he finds it self-evident.) This statement is useful in establishing an understanding of Anselm on two levels. It both crystallizes his belief that free will in man is the same as it is in God, and it clarifies that he does not believe there to be a variation in metaphysical definitions between worldly and divine. William would likely have concurred with Anselm on these points.

⁵⁵ Anselm, *Choice*, p. 192. Anselm logics that, because damnation is the most extreme and undesirable form of slavery, although a superficial consideration makes a will that is capable of any mode of behaviour appear to be more free than one only capable of goodness, will that is limited to rectitude is the freer will. The result of this understanding of freedom, one that is limited to goodness, is that the flawed human will, which has the potential for goodness but not always the aptitude, is not entirely free. Humanity was granted free will by God at its creation, and man therefore is able to will good things, however the will that is led away from right behaviour cannot properly be called free. Anselm writes, ‘Accordingly, since all freedom is ability, that freedom of choice is the ability to keep uprightness-of-will for the sake of this uprightness itself.’ (Anselm, *Arbitrii*, ch. 3 p. 212: ‘Ergo quoniam omnis libertas est potestas, illa libertas arbitrii est potestas servandi rectitudinem voluntatis propter ipsam rectitudinem.’ English translation from: *Choice*, p. 197.)

this semantic agreement, Abelard's definition of will is more stagnant, and does not involve the progressive motion that is characteristic of William's. In his discourse on human morality and self-awareness, *Ethics*, Abelard investigates will almost exclusively with regards to its relationship to sin. In defining will, Abelard writes, 'Where there is desire, there, without doubt, will exists.'⁵⁶ Abelard's use of 'will,' when referring to humanity not the divine, is admittedly intended to encapsulate both good and bad aspects of desire. Lascivious desire, therefore, fits within the same sphere of will, however, Abelard's exclusively negative understanding of will is different to William's view of the matter. Despite using the same word as Abelard, William's definitions and philosophy of will are less hinged on sin and allow for greater potential for improvement.

In the context of twelfth century anthropology will has a dual meaning. It refers both to action and to a specific location that the mind was understood to contain. William adheres to this understanding, which had been discussed in greatest detail by Anselm. Anselm explains that 'voluntas' refers to both the active desire that is the process of *willing*, and to a passive location in the mind from which willing stems. Although they are homographs, this second will is frequently overlooked because of its comparative irrelevance when not active. He writes,

Will is said to be the instrument-for-willing, which is in the soul and which we direct towards willing this or that thing, even as we direct sight towards seeing various objects. Moreover, will is spoken of as the use of the will which is the instrument-for willing.⁵⁷

The distinction of the two meanings of will is beneficial in terms of understanding concurrent philosophies of will, because much of the discussion will applies to the concept of will as an abstract faculty, rather than as a proactive emotion. The will that is a location in the soul is a part of man's image of God, but the will that changes

⁵⁶ Abelard, *Scito* ch.1:9, p. 9: 'Vbi autem desiderium, ibi procul dubio uoluntas consistit.' English translation from: *Ethics*, p. 23.

⁵⁷ Anselm, *arbitrii*, ch. 7 p. 219: 'Eodem modo dicitur voluntas ipsum instrumentum volendi, quod est in anima, et quod convertimus ad volendum hoc vel illud, sicut visum ad videndum diversa convertimus; et dicitur voluntas usus eius voluntatis, quae est instrumentum volendi, sicut dicitur visus usus eius visus, qui est instrumentum videndi.' English translation from: 'Choice,' p. 204.

and acts is related to the likeness. The notion of will as a location within the soul that can be stirred to reacting underpins twelfth century discussions of the topic.

There are a number of Latin terms applied to the concept of will, and from these same terms a number of definitions can be excavated. William's choice to deploy the same simple term to apply to the whole array of subdivisions of will was consistent. Despite the fact that will can be applied sinfully, it is also the very thing that makes good in man possible. William writes that 'The will, in itself, is a simple *affectus* rooted in a rational soul that she may be capable of good as well as evil.'⁵⁸ Will is essential to salvation because it gives man the aptitude to be good, despite his negative inclinations. Without this ability, there could be no reason for forgiveness, because man would be deplorable by nature. However, the mere potential to desire good does not imply the implementation of goodness. It is the Holy Spirit that ignites that potential into actual behaviour. It is the importance and function of will with which William was concerned, not parsing its terminology. The same approach will be taken in this study.

Vocabulary of Love

Out of the three fundamental terms to be considered, love incorporates the most complex and extensive vocabulary.⁵⁹ For that reason, despite the fact that William takes a similarly anti-semantic approach to love as he did with will, it is worth taking some time to explore the diversity in terminology. Although words like 'amor,' 'delecto,' and 'caritas' all fall into the realm of love, they should not be mistaken for full synonyms, each have specific applications.⁶⁰ The definitions, although largely inherited from the patristic tradition, are used to his own ends by William.

⁵⁸ *Natura*, ch. 4 p. 180: 'Per se enim uoluntas simplex est affectus, sic animae rationali inditus, ut sit capax tam boni quam mali.' English translation from: *Nature*, p. 56. The definition of affectus will be examined further on within this chapter.

⁵⁹ For a more detailed study of the place and importance of love see: Martha G. Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity: Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098-1180* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996) and the recently released Thomas Merton Collection, *Charter, Customs, and Constitutions of the Cistercians*, ed. Patrick F. O'Connell (Kalamazoo, Cistercian Publications, 2015), which features the *Carta Caritatis*, from Cîteaux. There are also briefer articles that explore the topic, for example: Constant J. Mews, 'Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter Abelard and Heloise on the Definition of Love,' *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia*, vol. 60 (3) (2014), pp. 633-660.

⁶⁰ Another category of love that was often explored theologically was eros, but William never references it, and the current discussion will be limited to Latin terms.

The majority of William's description of love comes after his conversion to the Cistercian order. In itself this is not particularly remarkable, as the majority of his writing overall was composed after that date. In this context, the work in which he set out to discuss love, *On the Nature and Dignity of Love*, is among the least useful for this examination. This treatise was early in William's career, and is one of the few that he wrote while still acting as abbot at St. Thierry. In this treatise, William outlines a division of human love that, while interesting on a scholarly level, and while it does contribute to the definition of love, is pneumatologically insubstantial. Love is clearly a topic that William contemplated throughout his life, however, it is in his later works of holistic theology, where his doctrine is more complete, that the meat of his thinking on the topic can be found.

William is quite liberal and inclusive in his use of the concept of love. For him, amor is applicable in a variety of contexts. Other medieval theologians are stricter, and William varies in the degree to which he adapts their definitions. William incorporated Origen's (d. 254) distinctions within the category of love, for example, whereas Hugh of St. Victor's (1096-1141) stratification of the term far exceeds William's inclination to be pedantic. The context in which Origen discusses love in a constructive fashion is that of his commentary on the Song of Songs.⁶¹ In introducing his commentary, Origen deliberates on the meaning of love and the distinction, to the extent that one might be made, between love and charity.⁶² William follows Origen's definitions given here quite closely. Origen makes the point that charity and love are not entirely distinct as faculties. However, within the hierarchy of that one feeling, charity strongly outranks love, and, 'the height of perfection consists in charity.'⁶³ 'Caritas' is, for Origen, as it would later be for William, a heightened and enlightened form of 'amor.' He writes that,

⁶¹ That being said, it is worth noting that many of the significantly love-relevant writing even in this text comes from the prologue, where Origen is establishing contexts rather than analyzing scripture.

⁶² Amor and Caritas in Rufinus's Latin, which is what William would have been reading. For more on Rufinus's translations see Chapter 2.

⁶³ Origen, *Canticum*, ch. 2 p. 112: 'Quia ergo summa 'perfectionis' in 'caritate' consistit, caritas autem nihil iniquitatis admittit -ubi autem nihil iniquitatis est, ibi sine dubio est aequitas -, merito ergo 'aequitas' esse dicitur, quae 'diligat' sponsum.' English translation from: Origen, *Song*, p. 89.

It makes no difference, therefore, whether the Sacred Scriptures speak of love, or of charity, or of affection; except that the word ‘charity’ is so highly exalted that even God Himself is called Charity.⁶⁴

Here, William deviates from Origen in that he applies both ‘amor’ and ‘caritas’ to the identity of God, and certainly to that of the Holy Spirit. That said, the conceptual unity of love, and its scriptural centrality is retained, as well as charity’s role as the height of that affection.

William’s contemporary, Hugh of St. Victor provided more forensic analysis of man’s own power to love in his brief treatise, *On the Substance of Love*. Hugh expounds two categories of ‘amor,’ which are ‘cupiditas’ and ‘caritas.’ There are, however, three avenues or ‘streams,’ which employ these loves. Worldly love is made entirely of cupidity, love of God is strictly charity, but the love of man lingers in between the two, and exercises use of whichever form of love is appropriate to the object of that love.⁶⁵ In this way, man is able to act as partially carnal and partially divine depending on what he loves. William describes the peculiar place that man’s love holds: above the world because it contains such potential but below God because it remains humane. He also articulates a contrast between types of love that are variant according to the object to which they are applied. Aside from reserving charity for Godly things, however, William does not make the same distinction within terms as Hugh. As far as William’s works, ‘amor’ can be applied in most cases and he scarcely mentions the term ‘cupiditas.’ Additionally, Hugh expresses these differing forms of love as simultaneous, with carnal and celestial love existing within man interchangeably over time. William sees divine love as a spiritual impossibility to man until the Holy Spirit has emancipated him from his carnal distractions. Love for William is more progressive than for Hugh. William seems to have been more inclusive with his amorous terms than his peers, and while

⁶⁴ Origen, *Canticum*, prolog. p. 69: ‘Nihil ergo interest, in scripturis divinis utrum amor dicatur an caritas an dilectio, nisi quod in tantum nomen caritatis extollitur, ut etiam Deus ipse ‘caritas’ appelletur, sicut Iohannes dicit: “carissimi, diligamus invicem, quia caritas ex Deo est, et omnis, qui diligit, ex Deo natus est et cognoscit Deum; qui autem non diligit, non cognoscit Deum, quia Deus caritas est.”’ English Translation from: Origen, *Song*, p. 32. Origen later defines, ‘true and perfect love,’ as the keeping of the two amorous commandments: to love God and to love one’s neighbour. p. 37.

⁶⁵ Hugh of St. Victor, *substantia*, ch. 1 p. 82: ‘riuos.’ English translation from: *Substance*, p.143.

terminology was of great concern to most, William focused almost exclusively on concept.

The diversity of ways in which William expresses love allows for a wider range of applications for that love. In one of the prayers that he records in his *Meditations*, for example, William describes the fiery zealotness of soul that has been kindled by Love. The damage that can be caused by this burning passion when it is applied carnally can be harnessed productively when the same human's love is gracefully inspired. He writes, 'O holy Love; come, O sacred Fire! Burn up the concupiscences of our reins and our hearts.'⁶⁶ The same destructive powers of burning love are now seen as rejuvenating.⁶⁷ The fire of holy love annihilates burning lust and replaces it with burning passion for God. Love is appropriated from its carnal focus to a divine one. The Holy Spirit enacts this change in man; He saves man's love so that his soul may be made worthy of saving.

Despite the nuanced differences between apparent synonyms within the realm of love, William believed that the key concept to draw from all terms is the importance of the emotion itself. In his *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, William writes that, although there are many words with which to express the love of God, 'all these things are one and the same Spirit works in the love of Bridegroom and Bride.'⁶⁸ The purpose for choosing the word love or 'amor,' therefore, is that, while there are many virtuous acts that lead one to come closer to God, all of these will eventually give way, because acts are earthly. Most frequently, whether he is referring to human or divine love, William uses the term 'amor.' Charity, however, is eternal in God.⁶⁹ 'Caritas,' writes William, is just another expression of enlightened love, and of the

⁶⁶ *Meditatiuae*, ch. XII, 30 p. 210: 'Adesto ergo, adesto, sancte amor, adesto sacer ignis; ure delectationes renum et cordium.' English translation from: *Meditations*, 18 p. 177. These words, Love and Fire are clearly titles for the Spirit in this context.

⁶⁷ William shares this concept, and its association with the Holy Spirit with the founder of the Carthusian order, Bruno of Cologne (Ian Levy, 'Bruno the Carthusian: Theology and Reform in His Commentary on the Pauline Epistles,' *Analecta Cartusiana* 300, (2013), p. 52).

⁶⁸ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. II, 5 p. 22: 'quae tamen Omnia in amore sponsi et sponsae unus atque idem Spiritus operator.' English translation from: *Song*, 6 p. 8. The specific section lists synonyms as amor, dicatur, and caritas.

⁶⁹ *Song*, 6 p. 8.

Holy Spirit: ‘a love from God, in God, for God is charity. Yet, charity is God.’⁷⁰ All of these words and emotions are ways by which the Holy Spirit expresses the love of God for man. William writes that ‘sometimes your Spirit blows where and when he will and breathes on us the favour of your love. We hear his voice because we receive the feeling of love,’⁷¹ and despite differing appellations of this love, they are all merely inadequate human attempts at describing the sweetness, which is Love: the Holy Spirit.

Vocabulary of Unity

Unity is the most succinct and specific of the three terms that William applies to the Spirit. In almost all cases unity is expressed with the Latin word ‘unitas.’ Occasionally unity is expressed in terms of oneness. In this case the term used is ‘unus.’ Oneness and unity, however, are not particularly distinct from each other: unity is the state of being one, rendering an extensive examination of the vocabulary within this concept unnecessary. The process through which the human spirit bonds with the Holy Spirit is a process of becoming *unus spiritus* with God, and the words used to describe that are consistent.

While unity remains consistent, there are some subcategories of unity that provide a more diverse lexicon with which to discuss the concept. A part of becoming unified, for example, is increasing in similitude or likeness to God. The Latin term for this likeness is ‘similitudo.’ As shall be seen in the chapter devoted to the concept, it is the argument of this thesis that, within William’s perceived process of unification there are three types: adoption, matrimony, and participation. Adoption is consistently the translation for the Latin term ‘adoptio.’ Matrimony, on the other hand, is expressed in a variety of terms. The union between Bridegroom and bride is often described in terms of an embrace or a kiss: ‘amplexus’ and ‘osculum’ respectively.⁷² In discussing that matrimony, William occasionally deviates from his

⁷⁰ *Natura*, ch. 12 p. 186-187: ‘Amor a Deo, in Deo, ad Deum, caritas est. Caritas autem Deus est.’ English translation from: *Nature*, p. 67. Charity is the chief manner in which to worship God although Faith and Hope are also applicable according to *Nature*, 12 p. 68.

⁷¹ *Meditatiuae*, ch. XII, 11 p. 194: ‘Aliquando uero Spiritus tuus ubi uult et quando uult spirat, et amoris tui gratiam nobis aspirat, et uocem eius audimus, quia sensum amoris accipimus.’ English translation from: *Meditations*, 7 p. 171.

⁷² The embrace, along with uniting humanity to divine also unites divinity to itself, so amplexus is in some ways a synonym for unitas.

consistent use of 'unitas' and refers to the unity between the lovers as 'coniunctio.' This, in some ways, specifies the difference between the union of matrimony, in which the lovers are made one through their commitment to each other, and that of participation in which the human soul is subsumed within the greater whole. Unity of participation, while called 'unitas' when referred to simply as unity, is often given the signifiers of 'in consortium' or 'participatio' so as to distinguish it from the other forms of unity.

William is consistent with his language and seems largely uninterested in synonyms. Based on the pattern established with will and love, where William was methodical but his contemporaries were varied, it is unsurprising that unity is the quality with the least multiplicity of terms. While some other theologians flirt with the concept of deific unity it is, over all, William's concept. He was the medieval theologian who most expanded the theory of pneumatological union, and he defines salvation itself in terms of union. It is logical that the concept that is most individually William's relies on the most succinct terminology.

Anachronistic Terminology

In attempting to demonstrate the value of examining William's thought, the argument will be made that William presents 'original,' 'creative,' or 'innovative' ideas. All of these terms are precarious and ill advised within the subject of medieval history, and are used in this case largely for lack of a better term. William respected all forms of authority whether they were patristic, scriptural, or local. He in no way sought to be perceived as original or unique. That said, as will be demonstrated, William developed traditional modes of thought and proposed conclusions that, while their foundations are well rooted in convention, are fundamentally results of his own contemplation. Terms such as 'original' are not intended to imply that William's theology was completely independent of influence, but simply that the significant differences between him and his contemporaries make him all the more worthy subject of study.

Describing different forms of theology often requires the ahistorical application of terms. William's theology is regularly described as 'mystical,' despite the fact that

that term was not applied in the twelfth century monastery and would have been meaningless to William. Furthermore, mysticism in its rawest form eschews doctrine in favour of personal interaction with the divine, making ‘mystical theology’ something of an oxymoron. That said, the concept of mystical theology is both standard in the study of historical theology and necessary in order to properly describe certain forms of historical worship.⁷³ William describes personal interaction with the divine, and he emphasises contemplation even before scripture as a source of authority.⁷⁴ In this way, the title of ‘mystic’ is appropriate for William even if it is not how he would have self-described.

Affectus

William often uses the Latin word ‘affectus’ to describe the emotional faculties that he perceives being affected by the Holy Spirit. Affectus is a complex term the meaning of which is not always clear, and which contemporary scholarship still debates.⁷⁵ It is commonly translated as affection, will, love, passion, or disposition, but none of these words sufficiently explain its meaning. The most responsible option for translation is to leave the word un-translated, but this leaves open the

⁷³ Examples of historiographic application of the term ‘mystic’ are too numerous to attempt to list, however, for some of the most respected and relevant works on medieval mysticism see: Bernard McGinn’s seminal four volume work *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1994) particularly Volume II: *The Growth of Mysticism: Gregory the Great Through the Twelfth Century*, as well as its primary source collection, *The Essential Writings of Christian Mysticism* (New York: Random House Ltd., 2006) for an introduction to the concept see: Hollywood and Beckman, *The Cambridge Companion to Christian Mysticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) or Mark MacIntosh’s *Mystical Theology: The Integrity of Spirituality and Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Limited, 1998) or the essay collections *Vox Mystica: Essays on Medieval Mysticism in Honor of Professor Valerie M. Lagorio*, ed. Anne Clark Bartlett (Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1995) and *Late Medieval Mysticism*, ed. Ray Petry (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957). In addition, Ben Morgan’s *On Becoming God: Late Medieval Mysticism and the Modern Western Self* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013) is interesting in terms of its modern applications.

⁷⁴ See for example, *Epistle*, 15 p. 14. This type of learning became more popular in the thirteenth century, but William, along with Rupert of Deutz, was one of the first to emphasise contemplation as a higher authority than learning. (Jay Diehl, *The Grace of Learning: Visions, Education and Rupert of Deutz’s View of Twelfth-Century Intellectual Culture*, *Journal of Medieval History*, 39:1, p. 21).

⁷⁵ For examples of this on-going discussion see: Elizabeth Dreyer, “‘Affectus’ in St. Bonaventure’s Theology,” *Franciscan Studies*, vol 42 (1982), the essay collection, *Aspectus et Affectus: Essays and Editions in Grosseteste and Medieval Intellectual Life in Honor of Richard C. Dales* eds. Gunar Freibergs and Richard C. Dales (New York: AMS Press Incorporated, 1993), Jay Rubenstein’s *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York: Routledge, 2002), Robert Davis’s doctoral dissertation, *The Force of Union: Affect and Ascent in the Theology of Bonaventure*. Harvard University, (2012), and the forthcoming edition of Robert Grosseteste’s *Treatise on the Liberal Arts* by the Ordered Universe Project.

problem of interpretation. What follows, therefore, is a brief explanation of this term as it is found in William's theology.

There is, to some degree, a dichotomy between attributes of the mind that are either affective or cognitive. Both types of mental faculty can have religious or intellectual capabilities, however, the cognitive functions naturally for man whereas the affective must be developed. Elizabeth Dreyer, in her examination of affectus writes, 'the cognitive precedes and directs the affective, as knowledge precedes will.'⁷⁶ Knowledge, for example, is cognitive, whereas its elevated and Spiritually endowed counterpart, wisdom, is affective. William did not delve into this dichotomy to any great extent, but it is useful in understanding how affecti are distinguished from other functions of the mind.

In the context of William's theology, affectus can be regarded as a general term for the most powerful attributes or qualities of the human soul. It refers to parts of the self that are non-physical but are of a higher quality than mere emotion or sensation. Good will, for example is an affectus, but physical desire is not. Affecti can be understood as being man's emotional super-powers: they are the parts of the soul endowed by God and housed within His image in man. This term is pertinent to William's description of pneumatological salvation because the mechanisms of the soul through which it is accomplished, will,⁷⁷ and love⁷⁸ both fall within the realm of affecti. The mind also possesses lesser intellectual capacities in order to absorb and analyze data from the surrounding world, but it is the role of the affectus to engage spiritually.

The Structure to Follow

The ensuing discussion takes as its guide William's three fields of Spirit and spirit: will, love, and unity. Having established the framework and historiography in this and the next chapter, William's theory of individual salvation through the Holy Spirit will be explored through his own chosen topics: each forming a chapter in which

⁷⁶ Dreyer, "Affectus," p. 13.

⁷⁷ *Nature*, 4 p. 56.

⁷⁸ William writes that reason develops into the affectus of love (*Nature*, 21 p. 78.) It should be remembered that this excludes unity not because it is a lesser form than the affecti but because it is a state of being not a spiritual power.

William's theories of deific and humane will, love, and unity will be examined. The degree to which these understandings are original shall be demonstrated, and the manner in which they relate to salvation clarified. These three faculties will be tied together and the importance of William's theory of Spiritual salvation historiographically, theologically, and philosophically will be established.

Previous to the three body chapters that consider the Holy Spirit's three identities, there will be a chapter establishing the evidence with which William's life and work can be understood. Chapter Two will consist of an overview of the events surrounding his life that are especially relevant to the development of his theology. A survey and summary of his treatises and their chronology and relevance to this thesis will follow. Subsequently, the historiographic context for William and his work will be established, in order to demonstrate the fact that this study of William's pneumatological salvation will contribute critically to several fields of academic study. The current state of studies on William will be established, followed by an overview of the theological and historical topics that will be most advanced by this research. Finally, the six principal theologians, patristic and medieval, with which this thesis seeks to compare William will be introduced: Origen of Alexandria, St. Augustine of Hippo, St. Anselm of Canterbury, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Hugh of St. Victor, and Peter Abelard.

Chapters Three and Four examine William's theology on Will and Love respectively, and will follow the same line of investigation as each other. This is because both will and love fall into the category of affecti, which William also perceives to be aspects of the Holy Spirit, therefore investigation of both of them will require the same tools. In these two chapters, the subject affectus will first be considered in its historical context, and its relationship to man's ability to increase in likeness to God will then be expounded. In these chapters there will be two sections appraising the place of will or love Spiritually: one considering the Holy Spirit's identity as Will or Love and the other examining how He affects man's mundane version of that quality.⁷⁹ Each faculty will then be examined with regards to three major theological topics: sin, reason, and mysticism. Finally, these chapters will be concluded by an

⁷⁹ It should be noted that the capitalization of 'Spiritually' is intended to indicate the Holy Spirit not man's spirit.

explanation of the transition and interaction between the subject affectus and its subsequent mental faculties.

Unity, as a result of its distinction as a state of being rather than an emotion, requires a slightly different structure than was appropriate for Will and Love. Once again, the chapter will be introduced by establishing unity's centrality, and its relationship to man's increase in Spiritual likeness. Again, two sections will be dedicated first to contemplating the Holy Spirit's role as Unity and then to expounding the Holy Spirit's potential to affect human unity. However, since in the development of his philosophy of unity William relied less on authority and more on the guidance of his own spirit, the unity chapter will then diverge from the established framework. It is evident from William's writing on the topic that he perceives there to be three forms of unity: adoptive, matrimonial, and participatory, and a section of the unity chapter will be dedicated to each of these forms. By way of conclusion, it will be demonstrated that unity is itself salvation in William's theological outlook: William understands eternal life to be the enduring experience of perfect unification with the divine. Therefore, salvation is entirely a process of the Holy Spirit in William's theological metaphysics.

In concluding this study, William's place in the historical record will be revisited and his importance as a stand-alone figure, rather than appendage to his relationships with Bernard and Abelard, established. Possible lines of transmission for William's thought shall be considered in light of a heightened understanding of his pneumatology. The implications of his theology and his influence will be analyzed with regards to academic reception of the twelfth century and traditional views of the Trinity. This study contributes both to the ongoing dismantlement of a number of academic myths, such as the dichotomy between monastic and scholastic, and it augments the state of understanding for topics such as the role of eastern thinking in the western church, twelfth century understandings of the economy of salvation, and monastic Christology. The conclusion will demonstrate that this examination of William's pneumatological soteriology provides new evidence for studies in twelfth century intellectual culture, monasticism, and theology.

Chapter 2: Critical Assessment of the Evidence

In order to assess the characteristic elements of William's theology of pneumatological salvation, a number of evidential and contextual points require consideration. These include the historiographical premises for this analysis. First, it is important to establish the evidence available to reconstruct William's intellectual biography; in common with most medieval thinkers the evidence is patchy at best. Second, all of William's extant works should be introduced so that their content can be understood in subsequent analysis without interruption for context. Third, the issue of heresy needs to be raised: the question whether William's theology approaches heretical positions is important not only in terms of historiographical treatments but also in terms of an assessment of what it says for the development of twelfth century theology. Fourth, and flowing from this, the current historiographical context should be considered in order to situate the remarks that follow in their scholarly context and to pursue particular lines of enquiry that question traditional and recent frameworks. Fifth, since William's writing will be compared with the work of six other medieval theologians, each of these figures should be introduced with regards to their relevant writing in order to contextualize William in his own terms, and so as to underscore the positions that he adopts.

William's Biography

William of St. Thierry's origins are challenging to uncover. Although many events in his life can be placed in chronological order as a result of their proximity to more significant medieval events, precise dating is difficult. The substantive records for William's career all have their limitations. Some years after his death, though still within the twelfth century, a monk at Signy wrote the anonymous biography, the *Vita antiqua*.¹ While a contemporary recording of William's narrative is valuable and its author is adamant that his information on William came second hand from an older monk who knew William personally, the value of the biography for his intellectual

¹ David Bell, 'The *Vita Antiqua* of William of St. Thierry,' *Cistercian Studies* 11 (1976): p. 246. Unfortunately the author provides his reader with no specific dates.

life is limited.² What the *Vita* does make clear is how central the concept of personal spiritual development was to William's ethos and the theme retains its centrality throughout.³ Although few of William's letters survive, those that do tend to surround well-known events the importance of which explains their preservation, such as those concerning the accusation of Peter Abelard. These letters, as well as some of the better-preserved responses, are useful in forming a sense of chronology for William's life.⁴ Finally, William left sixteen extant pieces of philosophical and theological writing, although the fact that immediately after William's death some of his most important works were misattributed to St. Bernard makes it difficult to trace their reception. Nonetheless, his works are indispensable in establishing his biography, particularly the self-reflective *Meditations* and the introduction to his *Golden Epistle*, in which he lists his life's works.

William was born in Liège, and although romantic speculation regarding peasant roots has persisted, the *Vita* states unambiguously that he came from a noble family.⁵ The exact year of his birth is unknown, but 1085 has been widely accepted.⁶ Liège was a significant intellectual centre of the time, and William began his education early.⁷ It has been hypothesized that William first left Liège to study with Anselm of Laon.⁸ Although this is unsubstantiated, it is plausible, and the *Vita* indicates that

² Bell, 'The *Vita Antiqua*', p. 247.

³ The author writes that the most important thing to learn from William is how better to know oneself. *Vita Antiqua*, p. 252.

⁴ A significant collection of St. Bernard's letters remain, and a number of those were either written to William or about events that concerned him (Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letters*, trans. Bruno Scott James, (London: Burns Oats, 1953)).

⁵ *Vita Prima*, p. 248. See also: Ludo Mills, 'William of St. Thierry, His Birth, His Formation and His First Monastic Experiences,' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry* trans. Jerry Carfantan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), p. 15.

⁶ For a dizzying discussion of the likelihood of a wide range of dates see Mills, 'Experiences,' pp. 16-20.

⁷ For more detailed considerations of the intellectual atmosphere in Liège in the high middle ages, see Jay Diehl's forthcoming article 'Masters and Schools at St.-Laurent: Rupert of Deutz and the Scholastic Culture of a Liègeois Monastery' and C. Renardy, 'Les écoles liégeoises du IXe au XII siècle: grands lignes de leur évolution' *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, lvii (1979), pp. 309-328. In *Meditations*, pp. 111, 148, William himself refers to a wayward and sinful childhood marked by weakness both spiritual and physical. This regret, and the autobiographical format, may have been inspired by Augustine's *Confessions*.

⁸ See for example: *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité: Ascétique et Mystique Doctrine et Histoire: Fascicules XXXIX-XL* Bariel-Dodet des Marais Beauchesne: Paris, 1965, p. 1242, Piero Zerbi, 'William of Saint Thierry and his Dispute with Abelard,' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry*, trans. Jerry Carfantan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), p. 183, Anne Hunt, *The Trinity: Insights from the Mystics* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2010) p. 3, and David Tracy, 'Trinitarian Theology and Spirituality: Retrieving William of St. Thierry for Contemporary Theology Towards a Trinitarian Theology Centred on Love' in *Rethinking Trinitarian Theology: Disputed*

William and his relative, Simon, studied as close as Reims before joining the order.⁹ William's dialectic and analytical approach bear the characteristics of many of Anselm's confirmed students.¹⁰ Probably around the year 1113, William joined the Benedictine monastery of Nicaise in Reims, however after only six years he was called to the abbacy of neighbouring St. Thierry.¹¹

William's early years in the monastery were marked by turmoil both from the outside world and within. Although the monks attempted to live away from the lay community, this was not always their choice to make, and in the years immediately after the beginning of his abbacy there were many violent clashes and attacks on the abbeys in Reims both from local lords and from the king of France.¹² The constant

Questions and Contemporary Issues in Trinitarian Theology eds. Robert J. Woźniak and Giulio Maspero (London: T and T Clark, 2012) p. 411. The proposal that William would have chosen to study with Anselm of Laon has reasonable grounds. As Lesley Smith points out in her work on the *Glossa Ordinaria*, it was common at the time to travel great distances to study with a master in person, so that they could transmit not only the factual knowledge that a book provided, but also the wisdom that only their presence conveyed. (Lesley Smith, *The Glossa Ordinaria: The Making of A Medieval Bible Commentary*, (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2009), p. 9) Also, it is all but proven that Anselm is the author of the glosses on Paul's Epistles, which are among William's favourite scriptural sources (Smith, *Glossa*, p. 22).

⁹*Vita Antiqua*, p. 248.

¹⁰ Such as Geoffrey of Auxerre, (Smith, *Glossa*, p. 2) Hugo Metellus who shared William's adoration for Bernard, and spiritual scientia, and who made similar complaints about the loss of the great theological masters (Albert Victor Murray, *Abelard and St. Bernard: A Study in Twelfth Century 'Modernism'*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967), p. 23) Gilbert the Universal, who shared William's passion for the Song of Songs (Gunilla Iverson, 'From *Jubilus* to Learned Exegesis: New Liturgical Poetry in the Twelfth-Century Nevers' in *Sapientia et Eloquentia: Meaning and Function in Liturgical Poetry, Music, Drama and Biblical Commentary in the Middle Ages* eds. Gunilla Iverson and Nicolas Bell (Brepols, 2009), p. 206) and, paradoxically, Rupert of Deutz and Peter Abelard, whose work William heavily criticized, yet often parallels.

¹¹This date is difficult to prove, however it has become the accepted assumption. See for example: *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, p. 1242, and Jean Marie Déchanet, *William of St. Thierry: The Man and his Work*, trans. Richard Strachan (Spencer: Cistercian Publications, 1972), p. 7. If William was in fact studying at Laon that gives this date more significance because it aligns with Abelard's departure from Laon. It has been suggested that this was not his first role as abbot, but remains unproven (Mills, 'Experiences,' p. 26).

¹² For more on this period of his life see: Jean Leclercq, 'Towards a Spiritual Portrait of William of Saint Thierry,' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry* trans. Jerry Carfantan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), p. 207. William's neighbouring Abbot, Sugar of St. Denis writes that, although his abbacy took place after the greatest period of sovereign weakness, he still chose to hide his most cherished relics in the treasury, 'for fear of the Franks, lest through the rash rapacity of a stupid few the partisans of the Greeks and Latins, called upon the scene, might suddenly be moved to sedition and warlike hostilities' (Sugar, 'Liber de rebus in administratione sua gestis' ch. XXXIII, p. 64: 'quod timore francorum ammiranda quæ antea audiamus caute reposita essent, ne stultorum aliquorum impetuosa rapacitate Graecorum et Latinorum ascita familiaritas in seditionem et bellorum scandal subito moveretur.' English translation from: *On the Abbey Church of St. Denis and Its Art and Treasures*, ed. and trans. Erwin Panofsky (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946), p. 65).

threats to his house, community and person may have helped to inspire William to focus his theology on personal perseverance.

It is to this period that a meeting can be ascribed, which would exert a powerful and life-long influence on William. It was in his early years as abbot that he first encountered Bernard of Clairvaux, and the two formed a strong intellectual friendship that was instrumental in keeping William's legacy alive for contemporary study.¹³ Bernard served as a source of spiritual inspiration for William, while William acted as a 'theological advisor' to the younger and less educated Bernard. William introduced Bernard to a wide range of patristic texts with which he had not been familiar and ignited Bernard's famous infatuation with the Song of Songs.¹⁴

After a surprisingly short time as abbot of St Thierry, William began to express a desire to leave. This can be attributed with a high level of confidence to his acquaintance with Saint Bernard. William, it would appear, no longer considered the devotional practices of the black monks spiritually rigorous enough. He expressed, both in his *Meditations* and to Bernard, a desire to change orders. In response, Bernard chastised William, admonishing him to remember the benefit that he served to his spiritual sons, and insisting that he 'not shirk the burden of abbacy.'¹⁵ Despite his desire to leave St. Thierry, William nevertheless attempted to encourage a stricter adherence to the Rule of St Benedict in the community. In 1131, William's allies in Reims succeeded in amending their lenience by slowing the office, shortening the psalmody, changing the liturgy, restricting the diet, and eliminating conversation 'unless appropriate and necessary' for pedagogical purposes.¹⁶ These changes were

¹³ This thesis will include significant reference to this friendship, but for further analysis see E. Rozanne Elder, 'Bernard and William of St. Thierry' in *A Companion to Bernard of Clairvaux*, Ed. Patrick McGuire (Danvers: Brill Publishing, 2011) or Adriaan H. Bredero, 'William of Saint Thierry at the Crossroads of the Monastic Currents of His Time,' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry* trans. Jerry Carfantan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987).

¹⁴ Elder, 'Bernard and William,' p. 122.

¹⁵ Bernard, *Letters*, 88, p. 128. It has been suggested that Bernard did this with the ulterior motive of retaining William as a spy. (Bredero, 'Crossroads,' p. 116) If this is the case, William received little thanks for the job as Bernard continued his sarcastic vilification of the Benedictine order even in the *Apology* that he wrote at William's request (Bernard, *Apologia*, trans. Michael Casey (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1970).

¹⁶ Molinier, *Obituaires français au moyen âge* (Paris, 1890), pp. 289: 'silentium tenaetur, nisi congrua necessitas impedierit et eis possibile fuerit, lectiones habeant.' Self translated from Molinier's record of the twelfth-century 'Act of the Spiritual and Temporal Association between Several Abbeys in the Province of Reims' in that same volume. For greater detail see: 'Prima capituli provincialis ordinis S.

indicative of a wider monastic reform across Western Europe, and the emergence of a reform network. William was instrumental in this victory for the reformers, however it seems not to have diminished his desire to become a Cistercian. In the mid 1130s William relinquished his appointment and joined a new Cistercian monastery in Reims: Signy.¹⁷

William's egress from the abbacy was not smooth, as was recalled by the author of the *Vita*.¹⁸ William was confronted by his former sons: the abandoned monks of St. Thierry brought a case before the Archbishop of Reims insisting that the harm that the monastery endured as a result of the loss of their leader was too great to be allowed. The Archbishop Renaud sided with these monks and ordered William to return to St. Thierry, but William, reinforced by a vision of the Virgin Mary, chose to remain resolute in his decision to leave the Benedictine order.¹⁹ Despite William's refusal to acquiesce these pleas, the overwhelming response from his former monastery, along with the commands of the Archbishop Renaud are evidence of how well respected William was in his own era. While he may have a diminished place in current historiography, William was clearly an esteemed leader of the time.

Benedicti Remis A. D. 1131 Habiti' in Stanley Ceglar, 'William of Saint Thierry and His Leading Role at the First Chapters of the Benedictine Abbots (Reims 1131, Soissons, 1132),' pp. 51-63 as well as David Knowles, 'Cistercians and Cluniacs: The Controversy Between St. Bernard and Peter the Venerable' in *The Historian and Character and Other Essays Collected and Presented to Him by his Friends, Pupils, and Colleagues on the Occasion of his retirement as Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 67. Some of the pertinent documents are also recorded in Berlière's *Documents inédits per servir a l'histoire ecclésiastique de la Belgique*, (University of Toronto: The Internet Archive, 2011) reference URL: https://archive.org/stream/documentsindit00berl/documentsindit00berl_djvu.txt Stanley Ceglar also recorded other pertinent documents as appendices to his article, 'Chapters,' pp. 34-112.

¹⁷ Again this date is difficult to pin down. The standard date given in current scholarship is 1135 (see: Déchanet, *William*, p. 42, Emero Stiegman, 'Bernard of Clairvaux, William of St. Thierry, The Victorines,' in *The Medieval Theologians*, ed. G. R. Evans (Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), p. 140) There are some contextual pieces of information which can help to pinpoint a date: Bernard's early letter advising William not to leave St. Thierry provides one bookend (Bernard, *Letters*, 88 p. 128) Another letter from Bernard (letter 89, p. 129) assures its recipient that he is still theirs in friendship despite the disregard of his wishes. There is strong evidence that this letter was written to William after his departure for Signy, but no proof. For dating, it also helps to know that the Archbishop of Reims at the time of William's transition, who is referred to in the *Vita Antiqua* (p. 249), was Renaud de Martigné, who Archbishop for ten years spanning 1128-1138. Finally, as evidence for dating, there is William's condemnation of Abelard, which was written to St. Bernard from Signy. (William, *Disputatio aduersus Petrum Abaelardum*, in *Opera omnia V. Opuscula asversus Petrum Abaelardum et de fide*, ed. Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 89A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), p. 13).

¹⁸ In addition to *Life*, William records the struggle in his *Meditations*.

¹⁹ *Vita Antiqua*, p. 249. (See also Déchanet, *William*, p. 44) As a result of his old age, William also struggled to keep up with the stricter rules of Cistercian life. William continued to express self-doubt and feelings of insufficiency throughout his writing, (See for example: *Meditations*, pp. 97, 158, 186 or *Epistle*, p. 5).

William spent his early years at Signy writing scriptural commentaries and building up its library holdings, activities that offer a plausible context for the broad range of sources and influences in his writing but also for his exposure to works of scholastic theology, which he found problematic. William's zeal for monastic reform was accompanied by a developing critique of scholastic authors, whom he admonished fiercely.²⁰ It was during this time of increasing alarm and aggression with regards to scholastic theology that William came across the latest theological discourse of Peter Abelard. William was probably already familiar with Abelard's earlier works as they appear to have been friends at some point in their careers: William writes of Abelard that 'I love him, and I choose to love him, God is witness to it.'²¹ He may have been present for Abelard's 1121 condemnation at the Council of Soissons.²² In 1139, William wrote a letter denouncing Abelard's writing, and in 1140 he forwarded the offending *Theologia* to St. Bernard.²³ After distributing his accusation, William recused himself and Bernard lead the charge against Abelard. Nevertheless this interaction coloured William's work thereafter.²⁴ He perceived, in Abelard and other

²⁰ Leading up to 1139, William rebuked three other 'doctrinal affirmations' but none garnered the same attention as Abelard's, and this act became the one for which William was most frequently remembered. (Jean Châtillon, 'William of St. Thierry, Monasticism, and the Schools: Rupert of Deutz, Abelard, and William of Conches' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry* trans. Jerry Carfantan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987) p. 154.) This is likely because his admonition of Abelard was so much harsher. William had previously expressed belief that Rupert of Deutz's work on the liturgy disempowered transubstantiation, yet he merely wrote to Rupert correcting it, rather than calling for a full-scale attack as he did with Abelard. (Nils Holger Petersen, 'Biblical reception, representational ritual, and the question of 'liturgical drama'' in *Sapientia et Eloquentia: Meaning and Function in Liturgical Poetry, Music, Drama and Biblical Commentary in the Middle Ages* eds. Gunilla Iverson and Nicolas Bell (Brepols, 2009), p. 181).

²¹ William, *Petrum*, ch. 4 p. 14, Full quotation: 'Dilexi et ego eum, et diligere uellem, Deus testis est; sed in causa hac nemo umquam proximus mihi erit uel amicus.' Self translated. See also: Zerbi, 'Dispute,' p. 183.

²² Déchanet, *William*, p. 53. William's first answer to Abelard in his *Disputatio aduersus Petrum* is to invoke authority and quote Augustine's definition of faith. William, *Petrum*, ch. 1 p. 17. At the 1121 trial Abelard's treatise on the Trinity was prosecuted primarily by the Archbishop of Reims. (Michael Clanchy, *Abelard: A Medieval Life*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), p. 300).

²³ William, *Petrum*: chapters 1-13 contain his actual attacks on Abelard, but it is affixed with a four part forward for St. Bernard, which is also illuminating. For more on the dates and outcome of this Disputation see: Constant J. Mews 'The Council of Sens (1141): Abelard, Bernard, and the Fear of Social Upheaval' *Speculum*, 77 (2002), pp. 346, 360, Zerbi's 'Dispute,' Châtillon's 'Schools,' and Odo Brook's 'The Speculative Development of the Trinitarian Theology of William of St. Thierry in the <<Anigma fidei>>' *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 28 (1961). Clanchy's sections on the topic from his *Abelard* are also of use in rounding out an understanding of the outcome of this epistle.

²⁴ Bernard was hesitant when William first sounded the call. He replied to William that, while the expressed concerns are valid, he would rather not respond to the situation until after lent, lest the argument interrupt such a holy time of year (Bernard, *Letters*, 236, p. 314). With lent over, Bernard travelled to Sens to defend the faith on the eighth day of Pentecost, according to his letter to the

scholastics of the time, a real threat to the frail and corruptible spirituality of the novices, and it was to that spirituality that the majority of his future work would respond.

The response to Abelard was, in many ways, uncharacteristic of the otherwise gentle William. Primarily, this attack serves to demonstrate how seriously William took his role as teacher. Perhaps William's most telling complaint about Abelard comes from his *Mirror*, in which he writes that dangerous and uninformative theologians 'do not say: *yes, yes, no, no*, but whisper: *maybe, maybe!*'²⁵ William was frustrated that Abelard exposed the already malleable and confused minds of novices to dizzying, circular arguments that only exacerbated their bewilderment. William's condemnation was largely a reaction to the consequences that William feared if Abelard's mercurial thinking was to become popular. William considered Abelard a serious threat, and believed that his theological treatises jeopardized the church's very unity. This was the impetus that inspired his wrath, but also inspired the pedagogical bent to his writing from this point forward. It is important to note that, while William began the attack on Abelard, he did not pursue it. His role in this debate was to sound the alarm, but once Bernard had taken over as prosecutor, William immediately turned himself to correcting the problems that he had seen in Abelard's theology. William set about producing a body of work that could replace Abelard's teaching with his own. It is thanks, in many ways, to Abelard that William chose to try to provide his spiritual sons with a guide to enlightenment.

During his later years at Signy, probably in 1144, William visited the monastery of Mont Dieu, which belonged to the relatively new order of the Carthusians.²⁶ The

Bishops there. (Bernard, *Letters*, 237, p. 315) Bernard's hesitation was justified. His consummate victory over Abelard is well recorded, and Pope Innocent II clearly sided with Bernard: Innocent called for Abelard's imprisonment after the trial, (Innocent II ed J Leclercq, in *Revue Bénédictine*, 79 (1969), p. 379) but 1143 saw the election of Pope Celestine II. Celestine, formerly Guy, had once studied under Abelard and had refused to burn his copies of Abelard's books when Innocent demanded it. (Clanchy, *Abelard*, p. 313) In a letter to Guy, Bernard expresses fear that he is not going to support the unity of the church. (Bernard, *Letters*, 246, p. 326) This delicate political environment made the attack on Abelard a risky one, however it also demonstrates why William believed the attack was so important.

²⁵ *Speculum*, ch. 31 p. 94: 'non dicentes: Est, est; non, non, sed forsitan et forsitan susurrantes.'

English translation from: *Mirror*, p. 28.

²⁶ The Carthusians were founded by William's fellow one-time schoolman of Reims, turned austere monastic zealot—Bruno of Cologne. Bruno's influence on the order may have inspired William's visit. (C. H. Lawrence, *Medieval Monasticism Forms of Religious Life in Western Europe in the*

order sought to adapt the desert ideal for the context of the European monastery.²⁷ As a result, Carthusians spent the great majority of their time involved in solitary contemplation. Although they did engage in labour, this tended to be smaller projects executed alone and intended to keep the hands busy while the heart prayed.²⁸ William dedicated the remainder of his theological treatises, three in total, to this order, which seems to have inspired in him a greater desire for contemplation and to rekindle his zeal for spiritual poverty.²⁹ The visit to Mont Dieu is particularly relevant when considering William's understanding of the human soul: he emphasized the spiritual significance of the cell and the importance of solitary contemplation for cultivating a personal relationship with the divine. In order to be saved, man must strive to increase his own piety while appealing to the Holy Spirit for a personal investment on an individual level. The kinship that William felt for the Carthusians was probably the result of his own Spiritual proclivity: while William's thought is isolated from the majority of his contemporaries, the Carthusians consider themselves to be 'living in the school of the Holy Spirit.'³⁰

Middle Ages (New York: Longman, 1996), p. 160.) Bruno's story has several parallels to William's. Both were highly educated publicly before withdrawing to a more isolated contemplative life. Both men had high regard for authority and avoided conflict. Both men found themselves in positions in which they were forced to dispute members of the church because they perceived a threat to the faith, and both felt the need to live under a stricter monastic rule than that the Benedictine order provided. (A Carthusian, *The Call of Silent Love: Carthusian Novice Conferences*, trans. an Anglican Solitary (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1995), p. 2-10). Although Bruno's writing is limited, there are also theological similarities between him and William. While discussing predestination, Bruno writes that the process of being saved involves a balance between good will on the part of the believer and grace on the part of the Spirit: God chooses his selected in two ways, through Loving him, and through filling him with the Spirit, See: Levy: 'Bruno,' p. 40.

²⁷ Lawrence, *Monasticism*, p. 159. For more on Carthusian spirituality see the rest of the Cistercian Studies series on the topic: CS volumes 149, 157, 164, and 172, all by anonymous Carthusians: *The Freedom of Obedience: Carthusian Novice Conferences* trans. an Anglican Solitary (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1998), *Interior Prayer: Carthusian Novice Conferences*, trans. Sister Maureen Scrine (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1996) *The Wound of Love: A Carthusian Miscellany*, (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1994) *The Way of Silent Love: Carthusian Novice Conferences*, trans. an Anglican Solitary (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1993) See also *Carthusian Spirituality: The Writings of Hugh of Balma and Guigo de Ponte* trans. Dennis D. Martin (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1997), particularly the sections on Guigo.

²⁸ Lawrence, *Monasticism*, p. 161.

²⁹ These being *The Mirror of Faith*, *The Enigma of Faith*, and *The Golden Epistle*.

³⁰ A Carthusian, *Silent*, pp. 84-85. The *Carthusian Statutes* reference the Holy Spirit frequently and there are some similarities between its treatment of the Holy Spirit and William's. In Book 4, Chapter 35, the *Statutes* invoke the power of the Spirit to give life, while the letter is unsatisfying, clearly derived from one of William's favourite scriptural references, 2 Corinthians 3:6. That same book of the *Statutes* says, 'it is not, indeed, enough to obey the commands of our superiors and observe faithfully the letter of the Statutes, unless, led by the Spirit, we savor the things of the Spirit.' (*Statutes*, 4.33.2) Again, this is a quotation that describes authority as only a limited source of wisdom that must be augmented or even disregarded as a result of the influence of the Spirit: this is a very similar approach to faith and spiritual development to William's.

William's longing to join the Carthusian order is indicative of a lifelong desire for stricter monastic discipline. This desire persisted in spite of the fact that he found the requirements of his own order almost too much to bear. In fact, the self-reflective quality of his writing allows an insight into the vicissitudes of monastic life in the first half of the twelfth century not often afforded by his contemporaries. William continued to struggle with his own resolve throughout his monastic career. Despite assuring his audience that the yoke of the Lord was easy,³¹ he wrote of his own experience, 'where is that pleasantness? Where is that lightness? Already I grow weary of the yoke, already I am fainting beneath the burden.'³² Between the despair and loneliness recorded in all aspects of his corpus, and his seeming transience with regard to religious order, William leaves the modern biographer with impression of a man who never reached the zenith that he sought.³³ The union with God, the route to which William so clearly laid out for his students, seems to have remained, for him, aspirational rather than achieved.

In the early autumn of 1148, after some struggle with illness and frailty, William died.³⁴ His own self-doubts were not reflected in his legacy, and despite the misattribution of some of his finest works, William's manuscripts were widely copied. Although Bernard sometimes received credit for William's writing, the ascription of treatises to his name helped those treatises to survive and flourish in the high medieval era due to Bernard's fame.³⁵ The result is that William's spiritual thought was more influential than William's name was remembered.³⁶ Despite this setback to his legacy, by the mid-seventeenth century, even the *Golden Epistle* had

³¹ See for example: *Nature*, 12 p. 68.

³² William, *Oratio vel Meditatio*, p.171: 'Vbi est illa suavitas? Vbi est illa leuitas? Iam lassesco sub iugo; iam sub onere deficio.' English translation from: *Meditations*, 13 p. 186. This quotation comes from the thirteenth meditation, more on which can be found in the section on William's corpus in footnote 56 of this chapter.

³³ Indeed, his monastic biographer confirms as much both in describing his death and thereafter, when he describes William appearing to a brother at Signy, this brother asks William if he is well and William answers that it *will* be. The brother and biographer both interpret this answer as meaning that William has not yet fully attained the salvation that he sought, but that he has confidence that he will be able to at some point (*Vita Antiqua*, p. 254).

³⁴ Déchanet, *William*, p. 108. His biographer writes that he left this world full of charity and passed into the next in hope (*Vita antiqua*, p. 254) Several years thereafter, his body was exhumed and repositioned in a place of honour within the monastery of Signy (Hunt, *Insights*, p. 4).

³⁵ See footnote 5 of this chapter for a selection of manuscripts that bore Bernard's name.

³⁶ It is hard not to wonder whether this was not intentional. He states in his prefatory letter to the *Epistle* (p. 6) that he does not care for his name to be remembered and only hopes that he can be of some spiritual use.

been returned to William's name.³⁷ Starting in the 1950s and carrying on through the 1980s William's works experienced a revival, as modern critical editions were produced in a number of languages. Cistercian Publications has now introduced English-language critical editions of eight of William's theological treatises.³⁸ Despite this fact, and the intellectual wealth therein, many aspects of these texts have yet to be thoroughly investigated.

Brief Overview of William's Treatises and Their Chronology

The core corpus for the following study is William's sixteen extant works. Of these the theological works are, naturally, of greater relevance to the topic of pneumatological soteriology. William's later works will be given greater focus because, although William is appreciably consistent in his ideology, they represent his most mature demonstration of thought. The two scriptural commentaries and his three final heuristic treatises are most conspicuously relevant.³⁹ Nonetheless, the whole of his oeuvre will be visited and their content, context, and relevance are useful to outline. What follows will consider the state of the manuscript evidence followed by a list intended to present the treatises in chronological order, to the extent that this is possible, so that they may be associated with the established events in William's life, the ordering, in this sense, should in no way be seen as a reflection of their importance. As with William's biography, precise dating is impossible, and all dates provided are those reflected in the current secondary scholarship, rather than being original suggestions.

The misattribution of William's works lead significant confusion both during the early transmission of those works and in the scholarship following. William's most popular and widespread work, the *Epistle* written to the Carthusians at Mont Dieu lost his name almost immediately. Although the brothers who received his *Epistle*

³⁷ Bernard Tissier in the preface his 1662 edition of the volume, *In opera beati Guillelmi praefatio*, *Patrologia Latina*, 180, 202-206 (Originally: *Bibliotheca cisterciensium*, 4:1-2). For a detailed examination of the phases of alleged authorship through which this text has gone, see Déchanet's 'Introduction,' to the *Epistle*, pp. ix-xviii.

³⁸ These being *Exposition on the Song of Songs* (1968), *On Contemplating God, Prayer, and Meditations* in one volume (1970), *The Golden Epistle* (1971), *The Enigma of Faith* (1973), *The Mirror of Faith* (1979), *Exposition on the Epistle to the Romans* (1980), *On the Nature and Dignity of Love* (1981).

³⁹ These being his commentaries on the Song of Songs and Romans and his *Mirror* and *Enigma*, as well as his *Epistle*.

were certainly aware of its author, even during his own lifetime other copyists were attributing it to Bernard. The origin of the association with Bernard may well be Bernard's own brethren, as the earliest manuscript to ascribe one of William's works to Bernard comes from a subsidiary of Clairvaux in Trèves.⁴⁰ The remainder of the manuscripts from this era still bear William's name.⁴¹ Outside of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, however, nearly all references to William disappear, and the majority of the manuscripts that survive to the modern era were copied thereafter.⁴² In addition to the *Epistle*, William's earliest treatise, *Contemplating*, was also wrongfully attributed to Bernard, in many cases after having had its original authorship scratched off.⁴³ Although those two manuscripts most extensively bore

⁴⁰ This being the Berlin Ms Goerres 71, fol. 62^r (Déchanet, 'Introduction,' in *Epistle*, p. ix)

⁴¹ This includes *Charlesville 114* 12th c s., Fos 1-37 (Province and Origin: Signy), *Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale IV-187*, 12th c s Fos 43-80 (Provenance: Pontigny), *Rouen, Ms. 21* 12th c, fos 61-116, *Heilingenkreutz, Ms. 222* 12th c fos 1-31 (written at Heilingenkreutz), *Lilienfeld, Ms. 96*, 12th c and 13th c fos 98-126 (Lilienfeld).

⁴² This includes the German *Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale de Dijon, Ms 183*, 14th c fos 122-162v (Cîteaux), *Seville, Bibliotheca Columbina, Vitr. V 10* 15th c, fo I-XXIII (German origin), the Italian *Monte Cassino, Ms. 184*, 14th c. fos 163-184 (Lombard), *Paris, B.N. Ms. Lat 1727* 14th c fos 72-82v, the Moravian *Prague, Metropolitan Chapter 151* 15th c fos 1-9v, *Prague University, 635* 14th c fos 153-169 and the Carthusian *Bruges, Bibliothèque de la Ville, Ms 115* 14-15th cs fos 13-45, *Liège, Bibliothèque du Séminaire, 6 G 12* 14-15th c fos 1-45v *Troyes Bibliothèque Municipale., Ms 2051* 15th c fos 77-169 (Clairvaux), *Paris, B.N. Ms. Lat 2042* 14th c fos 153-159, *Paris, B.N. Ms. Lat 13822*, 14th c (dated 1357) fos 138v-166, *Paris, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal, Ms. 273*, 14th c fos 97v-174v (Convent of the Celestins of Paris), *Paris, B.N. Ms. Lat. 14876* 15th c fos 3-10 (Mutilated. Origin: St. Victor), *Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, 162*, 15th c, fos 1-58 (Chartreuse Saint-Sauveur d'Utrecht), *Brussels, B.R. Ms. 2037-48*, 14th c fos 48-72 (Rouge-Cloître), *Brussels, B. R. Ms. 1373-1381*, 14th c fos 109v-138v. There is also a series of manuscripts to come out of Clairvaux itself and these include *Paris B. N. Ms. Lat 2944* xIle s. fos 1-31 (Saint-Germer-de-Fly), *Paris Bibliothèque Nationale Ms lat. 2945* xii s fos I-XLI (Foucarmont), *Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. Lat. 9574* xii S. P. 250-324 (Longpont), *Bruges, Bibliothèque De la Ville Ms. 131* xii s. fos 55-83 (Les Dunes), *Bruges, Bibliothèque de la Ville, Ms. 126* xiii s. fos 49-63 (Les Dunes), *Leuven, Bibliothèque de l'abbaye du Mont Cesar*, xive s. fos 1-26v (Cistercian original a community of Cambrésis, France).

⁴³ Hourlier, 'Introduction,' in *Contemplating*, p. 18. Ten modern translations have been made of this work and more than twice as many manuscripts survive including: *Barcelona, Arxiu General de la Corona d'Aragó, Ripoll 56*. 13-14th c fo 1., *Bruges, Bibliothèque de la Ville 126. Notre-Dame des Dunes* 13th c fo 73, *Bruges. Bibliothèque de la Ville 128. Notre-Dame des Dunes*, 12th c fo 51 v=D, *Brussels, B. R. 596-600 number (no 1436 of catalogue) Corsendonk* 13th to 14th c fo 65=C, *Brussels, B. R. 1373-81 (no 1465 of catalogue) Leuven, Chartreuse St. Martin* 15th c fo 72., *Brussels, B. R. 11-1058 (no 1449 of catalogue) Notre Dame d'Aulne* 13-14th c fo 78., *Cambridge, Peterhouse 201*. 14th fo 172, *Douai, Bibliothèque Municipale 372, t Anchin, a. 1165* fo 127v=K, *Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conventi Soppressi 599*. 15th c fo 1, *Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, XVI, cod. I 15th c n. VIII p. 149, Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana XVI cod. III 15th c. n III p. 47 n., Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, XIII Dext cod. VIII Santa Croce di Florence* 13th c n. XXIC p. 150, *Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana XXI Dext cod. IV Santa Croce di Florence* 13th c n. V p. 45, *Florence, San Marco 652*. 14th c fo 84, *London B. M. 5F VII 12th c fo 48=F, London, Lambeth Palace 238*. 13th c fo 218, *London, Lambeth Palace 437*. 13th c fo 111, *Oxford. Bod. Laud. 368*. 12th c fo 88, *Oxford, Jesus College XXXV 12th c fo 1-O., Oxford, Merton College XL 13th fo 83, Padua, Chapter Library A. 58*. 14th c, *Paris, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal 324 (504 T. L.) Paris, Grands-Augustins 14th c fo 90=S., Paris, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal 502 (514 T. L.) 14th c fo 121=s, Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 630 (1114) 13th for Franciscans in Paris in 1717 fo 39=M, Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 739 (954) 13th fo 144=m., Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 776*

Bernard's name, their connection with other treatises meant that almost William's entire corpus was, at varying points, perceived as Bernard's. William's manuscripts were often copied in groups, with the *Epistle*, the *Mirror*, and the *Enigma* circulating together, and *Contemplating* being consistently followed by *Nature*.⁴⁴ This gives an idea of how William and his contemporaries considered his works to be related, of dating, and also of reception. It seems likely that even in William's own Signy, many of William's manuscripts were quickly lost because while William lists a complete bibliography of his works in the introduction of *Epistle*, two generations later, when his anonymous *vita* was composed, his biographer was only able to name ten of the seventeen that are known to have existed.⁴⁵

The secondary literature regarding the manuscript tradition is also complex and more work must be done before the subject is sufficiently explored. William's works were circulated and read under Bernard's name until the fifteenth century at which point Bernard Tissier transcribed the *Epistle*, and included an introduction arguing for William's authorship.⁴⁶ Thereafter, the authorship and manuscript evidence was debated continually until it was definitively proved to be William's by André Wilmart in 1924.⁴⁷ The cause of the substitution of authors has also been debated historiographically. Wilmart led an early school of thought, which considered the assignment of these texts to Bernard to be a scribal mistake that spread from one

(575) 12th a Rueil in 1636 fo 24=R, Paris. B. N. lat 1727 origin Italian 14th c fo 102=n, Paris B. N. lat. 10.621. Burgundy, 13th c fo 143=N., Vatian Library, Vat lat 663. 14th c fo 127, Vatian Library, Vat. Lat. 666. Santa Maria di Florence, 14th c fo 229 v., Vatian Library, Urbino. 90. 15th c fo 177, Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale 557(A. 536). Jumièges 13th c fo 26=J, Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale 558(A. 557). Jumièges 13th c fo 48=j, Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale 2051. Le Jardin, 1428 fo 1=T, Turin. 222. 14th c fo 191, and Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek 161 13th fo 69.

⁴⁴ Hourlier, *Introduction*, p. 11.

⁴⁵ *Epistle*, pp. 6-7. *Vita Antiqua*, pp. 251-253. Although he does not always use the common name of these works, the biographer successfully lists the *Vita of Bernard*, *Against Abelard*, *Enigma*, *Mirror*, *Exposition Song*, *Nature*, *Enigma*, *On the Nature of the Body and the Soul*, *Contemplating*, and *Meditations*, in that order. The author admits that William likely wrote more than those treatises, but that those are the only ones with which he is familiar, and that he has only had access to read a few of them.

⁴⁶ This can be found reprinted in the *Patrologia Latina*: Tissier 'In Opera beati Guillelmi prafatio,' *Patrologia Latina*, 180, pp. 202-206. This later edition contained all of William's extant works, so by attaching this preface, Jean Paul Migne, who famously compiled the *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, spread awareness of and gave credibility to, William's authorship.

⁴⁷ Wilmart, André, 'Les écrits spirituels des deux Guigues,' *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*, 5 (1924) pp. 59-79. This article came at the head of a number of lesser articles published by Wilmart on the same topic.

manuscript.⁴⁸ Déchanet convincingly refutes this, however, by pointing out that such an extensive tradition, which spans regions and applies to more than one piece of William's work, cannot possibly all originate from one lazy scribe.⁴⁹ Currently, the literature that examines manuscripts of William's work is limited to considerations of how and why these works came to bear Bernard's name.⁵⁰ Less contentious texts are, therefore, overlooked. More work is needed in order to excavate the lineage of extant manuscripts and confirm their integrity. The bulk of the *Enigma*, for example, survives from only one manuscript originating in Signy and bearing multiple hands.⁵¹ This is in strong contrast to *Contemplating*, of which manuscripts exist in some form in 'all the countries of the Latin Church.'⁵² This thesis will not examine the manuscript tradition to any extent, however it is worth noting that, although they are not always identical, many sources exist for William's works. The debate over authorship is now over, however there is more paleography to be done.

William's earliest treatise seems to have been *On Contemplating God*, [*De Contemplando Deo*], henceforth *Contemplating*, which he wrote having already spent considerable time as a Benedictine monk, and almost certainly after having left Nicaise.⁵³ *Contemplating* was one of William's most popular works, partially because it was one of those attributed to St. Bernard, with multiple manuscripts spreading across mid-western Europe, certainly reaching as far south as Florence and as far west as Oxford, conceivably within his lifetime.⁵⁴ It is a short treatise but valuable in that provides a description of William's own mystical experience, and his

⁴⁸ The earliest scholar to assert this was André Wilmart in *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du Moyen âge latin*, Etudes d'histoire littéraire (Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1932), pp. 251-252.

⁴⁹ Déchanet, 'Introduction *Epistle*,' p. x.

⁵⁰ The exception to this being the debate over whether the earliest manuscript of the commentary on *Romans*, which contains extensive revisions, bears William's actual hand. For more on this see Déchanet, 'Un recueil singulier d'opuscules de Guillaume de Saint-Thierry: Charville 114,' *Scriptorium* 6 (1952), p. 201, and Anderson, 'Introduction *Romans*,' p. 5.

⁵¹ This being Charville 114: Déchanet, 'Un recueil singulier,' *Scriptorium* 6 (1952), p. 201. See also the John Anderson introduction to *Enigma*.

⁵² Hourlier, 'Introduction,' p. 13.

⁵³ This is based on several pieces of evidence, most notably William's own list of his works in the *Epistle*, in which his ordering heavily implies that *Contemplating* was his first piece of writing. In the modern introduction to *Contemplating* by Jacques Hourlier, Hourlier points out that *Contemplating* is often partnered in manuscripts with *Nature*, and that when this is the case *Contemplating* is always put first. (Hourlier, 'Introduction to *Contemplating*,' p. 11 fn 15).

⁵⁴ See footnote 43 of this chapter for a list of contemporary manuscripts.

experience with loving God, both of which are central themes in discerning his understanding of personal salvation.⁵⁵

At a date close that of *Contemplating*, although precisely when is unknown,⁵⁶ William also completed his lengthier *On the Nature and Dignity of Love* [*De Natura et Dignitate Amoris*], henceforth *Nature*. Although this treatise is useful for an early view of William's beliefs regarding love and charity, it is surprisingly devoid of pneumatological discussion. It is nonetheless worth recognizing the centrality of love to William's theology from the start of his career.

Thereafter, William wrote his short treatise on the sacraments, *De Sacramento Altaris*. This book was arguably inspired by St. Bernard's *On Grace and Free Will*, as William dedicated *Sacramento* to Bernard shortly after the saint's request for William to evaluate *Free Will*.⁵⁷ This is one of his least examined works, and a comprehensive English translation has yet to be completed. While this treatise has little relevance to the central arguments pursued here, it demonstrates the fact that St. Bernard was entreating theological advice from William, reinforcing the impression that Bernard was often the recipient of spiritual guidance in their friendship. Additionally, because it is widely considered the first Cistercian text to approach the concept of the Eucharist as an aspect of the mystical experience, it is indicative of the William's influence on the increase in mystical spirituality following the first half of the twelfth century.⁵⁸ William's theology is distinctive for its emphasis on the individual and the expression of sacrament in terms of individual experience.

Between the years of 1135 and 1145, after William's entry into the Cistercian order at Signy, William's theological body of work expanded rapidly. Among other things,

⁵⁵ It is in this work that William seems the most confident about his relationship to the deity, and his ability to love Him.

⁵⁶ The year 1122 is suggested in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualite*, p. 1242.

⁵⁷ William, *De sacramento altaris De sacramento altaris*, ed. Stanley Ceglar and Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 88 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), prol ad Bernardum Claraeuallensem, p. 53. Déchanet regards it as 'the first medieval work to use the method of patristic study and criticism which Peter Abelard advocates in his celebrated *Sic et non*,' (Déchanet, *William*, pp. 34-5) one of the works which William would later so ardently condemn. Although this is, perhaps, hyperbole on the part of Déchanet, it remains an interesting stylistic observation.

⁵⁸ C. M. A. Caspers, 'The Lord's Supper and Holy Communion,' in *Religious Identity and the Invention of Tradition: Papers Read at a NOSTER Conference in Soesterberg January 4-6, 1999* eds. Jan Willem van Henten and Anton Houtepen (Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2001) p. 260.

William seems to have been consumed with contemplation of the Song of Songs. In this period William compiled a selection of excerpts from St. Ambrose's writing on the Song, and one from Gregory the Great's.⁵⁹ He also composed his own *Brevis Commentatio in Canticum Canticorum*. These works are best characterised as laying the groundwork for his later masterpieces; accordingly they will not form a major focus of the analysis to follow.

Sometime probably before his more popular writings but after settling into Signy for some years, William wrote his *On the Nature of the Body and the Soul* [*De natura corporis et animae*.] Divided into two books, the first section of *Nature* is an intensive and detailed outline of the scientific and medical workings of the human body featuring references to Arabic medicine.⁶⁰ Book two describes the origins and nature of the soul through both technical and spiritual evidence. In the preface to this book, William emphasizes that much of the writing is taken verbatim from other authors.⁶¹ It is therefore an interesting piece both because it is so out of character for William, and because it reveals a number of sources to which readers might not have otherwise known William had access. It is the earliest place that William concisely elucidates his understanding of man as a microcosm, which proves useful in considering his metaphorical comparisons between the Trinity and the human mind.⁶²

During these years the first ten years at Signy 1135-1145, William composed the first of his two major scriptural commentaries, *Exposition on the Epistle to the Romans* [*Expositio super Epistulam ad Romanos*], henceforth *Romans*. This exposition is

⁵⁹ William, 'Excerpta de libris beati Ambrosii super Cantica Canticorum,' in *Opera Omnia II, Expositio super Cantica canticorum; Brevis Commentatio; Excerpta de libris beati Ambrosii super Cantica canticorum; Excerpta ex libris beati Gregorii super Cantica canticorum*, eds. Stanly Cegljar and Paul Verdeyen. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997) and William, 'Excerpta de libris beati Gregorii super Cantica Canticorum,' in *Opera Omnia II, Expositio super Cantica canticorum; Brevis Commentatio; Excerpta de libris beati Ambrosii super Cantica canticorum; Excerpta ex libris beati Gregorii super Cantica canticorum*, eds. Stanly Cegljar and Paul Verdeyen (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997).

⁶⁰ William of St. Thierry, *On the Nature of the Body and the Soul in Three Treatises on Man: A Cistercian Anthropology*, trans. Benjamin Clark ed. Bernard McGinn (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1977), p. 116.

⁶¹ William, *Body*, p. 103.

⁶² William, *Body*, for exaple, pp. 103, 109. This text is not nearly as frequently copied as some of his other treatises, and yet reflects a remarkable level of research on the part of the author. In addition, 'it is in the course of this discussion that the Abbot first introduced the distinction between he soul in general (*anima*) and the intellectual soul (*animus*),' (McGinn, 'introduction *Body*,' p. 37.) which would later become a topic of great importance to the abbot.

rather unlike the bulk of William's writing: it follows scripture line by line, and therefore stands out from William's more speculative and meditative theology. It also reserves a great deal of its focus for the analysis of Christian and Jewish law and the notion of judgment; it approaches the scripture with a good deal of attention to its historical sense, which is largely dismissed by William in many of his other works. An exact date for the completion of this text is unknown, and indeed only one twelfth-century manuscript even survived to the modern era,⁶³ but it seems likely that it was written sometime before 1138, in William's earliest Cistercian years.⁶⁴ It reveals William as a skilled and well-read scriptural critic, and is important for revealing his awareness of, and sympathy towards, Origenist concepts.⁶⁵ The eighth chapter of Romans is among William's favourite pieces of scripture to reference in supporting some of his most profound pneumatological claims, and the commentary is indispensable in this regard.

Sometime shortly after, or perhaps concurrently with *Romans*, William's interest in the Song of Songs finally bloomed into his masterful *Exposition on the Song of Songs* [*Expositio Super Canticum Canticorum*.] William writes that his work on this was interrupted by his dispute with Abelard, it is therefore safe to assume that it was written somewhere around 1138-1140.⁶⁶ The themes of spiritual improvement and union are of central importance to theological interpretations of the Holy Spirit, and they comprise the majority of this commentary.

William's complaints that he was forced to cease work on his commentary on the Song raise the issue of his literary output connected to that dispute. Two major pieces emerge: in 1139 the *Disputatio adversus Petrum Abelardum* in which William

⁶³ John D. Anderson, 'Introduction,' in *Exposition on the Epistle to the Romans* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1980), p. 4.

⁶⁴ This is based largely on the fact that its composition was not interrupted by the clash with Abelard.

⁶⁵ Earlier readers, most notably Déchanet, have argued that this work represents an intentional synthesis between the thoughts of Origen and Augustine. Although more recent historians have convincingly dismissed this stance to some extent, for example Arthur Anderson in both the introduction to his translation of this text and in his article in *One Yet Two*, (John D. Anderson, 'The Use of Greek Sources by William of St. Thierry Especially in the Enigma Fidei,' in *One Yet Two: Monastic Tradition East and West*, ed. Basil Pennington (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976). *Romans* nonetheless remains theologically consistent while drawing on the commentaries of both men. This makes it a strong example of William's favouritism of both Origen and Augustine, as well as his ability to build original theology while using evidence from his preferred authorities. Stiegman argues that *Romans* contains the first examples of his 'mystical doctrine flourishing in many other works' (Stiegman, 'Bernard,' p. 140).

⁶⁶ *Epistle*, pref. p. 6.

appeals to St. Bernard to join in his condemnation of Abelard's scholastic theological approaches.⁶⁷ The year after that, perhaps still enflamed by his successful defeat of Abelard, William launched a second attack in *Epistula de erroribus Guillelmi de Conchis*. His complaints regarding William of Conches never became a significant issue. The dispute with Abelard, however, had a significant impact on William of St. Thierry's place within the Benedictine order. It is important to this thesis for two reasons. First, because William's attack on Abelard was motivated by divergent Trinitarian understandings, it is worth considering the differences in the two approaches to the Holy Spirit.⁶⁸ Second, William's frustration with what he perceived to be the spread of false and malicious theological untruths led to a change in the nature of his writing thereafter. From the time of William's dispute with Abelard his writings take on a decidedly more pastoral voice and his considerations of the process through which an individual can be saved became more central to his work.

William's semi-autobiographical *Meditations* [*Meditativae orationes*,] takes the form of thirteen deliberations confessing the faults of his earlier life. William wrote *Meditations* later in his life, but is difficult to date because it references aspects from when he remained abbot, and is not necessarily in chronological order.⁶⁹ Déchanet has suggested, convincingly, a completion date of 1145, with notes and sections of it having been completed over the course of many years until he compiled them into one piece while at Signy.⁷⁰ This text helps to unfold William's personal spiritual experience, despite being in a mode less theologically oriented. William's *Meditations* were among his more popular works immediately postdating his death,

⁶⁷ William, *Petrus*, ch. 1 p. 13 William writes that a continued silence on Bernard's part would represent a threat to the church: 'Dico uobis, periculose siletis, tam uobis quam Ecclesiae Dei.'

⁶⁸ In a letter that Bernard later writes laying out his complaints about Abelard's *Theology*, the majority of his complaints centre on Christ, and his only problem regarding the Holy Spirit is Abelard's description of the procession. (Bernard, *Letters*, 238, 2 p. 316) Pneumatological comparison is not as controversial as Christological, therefore.

⁶⁹ The final meditation in this collection, the thirteenth, is often found separately from the original twelve under the individual title *Oratio vel meditatio*, or *Seduxisti me*. It is formatted slightly differently from the other twelve in that it involves a dialogue with God, and William accuses God of leading him into a struggle that he cannot win. Despite its frequent separation and unorthodox format, William's biographer confirms that there are thirteen meditations in the *Vita antiqua*, and these texts do belong together. (For more on this see Déchanet's separate introduction to the thirteenth meditation in *Meditations*, pp. 181-185).

⁷⁰ Déchanet, *William*, p. 41.

and were generally perceived as a spiritual pedagogical tool. William's anonymous biographer records his own admiration of the *Meditations*, writing:

In this work most especially, we may witness this man's passion—not just his love—for God, and it truly seems to me that anyone who reads it piously and prudently, however devout or enlightened he may be, will make progress⁷¹

Despite being, overall, an expression of William's struggles, *Meditations* was, according to his biographer, perceived by contemporaries as a work of heuristic spirituality.

After his enlightening visit to the Carthusians in 1144, William wrote two treatises, *The Mirror of Faith* [*Speculum fidei*], henceforth *Mirror*, and the *Enigma of Faith* [*Aenigma fidei*], henceforth *Enigma*, in rapid succession, dedicating both works to the brothers at Mont Dieu.⁷² In the *Mirror*, he encourages the reader to seek a personal knowledge of, and acquaintance with, God. He also begins to assert the importance of cultivating 'saving acts,' in which a man can partake to advance his own salvation.⁷³ The *Enigma*, on the other hand, is a technical evaluation of Christian truths, the mystery of the Holy Trinity, and proper manner of addressing God.⁷⁴ In his own review of his bibliography, William writes that, although these two books go together, the second is far more difficult and relies far more heavily on the authority of the church fathers.⁷⁵ These contrasting but complimentary treatises are essential to the assessment of William's understanding of religious truths both on the part of the spiritual mystic and from the view of the educated theologian.

⁷¹ *Vita Antiqua*, p. 253. William himself must have been particularly pleased with this work because, although usually supremely humble, he describes his *Meditations* as 'Not entirely useless for forming novices' minds to prayer.' (*Epistle*, p. 6).

⁷² John D. Anderson, 'Introduction,' in *The Enigma of Faith*, (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1980) p. 9. These works, like his most famous one, the *Epistle* are often wrongly attributed to St. Bernard in manuscripts starting as early as William's lifetime.

⁷³ *Mirror*, p. 3.

⁷⁴ Although manuscripts did not last beyond the twelfth century, William also wrote a smaller work called *Sententiae de Fide*, in which he considered similar subjects. Its existence is known only because he lists it among his accomplishments in the prefatory letter of his final work, where he describes it as being a compilation of Augustinian quotations, and 'akin,' to his later *Enigma*. (*Epistle*, p. 7).

⁷⁵ *Epistle*, p. 5.

William's most famous and certainly most copied work is his *Epistula ad fratres de Monte-Dei*, commonly called *The Golden Epistle*. This work, also dedicated to the Carthusian brothers, is an account of the way in which a novice ought proceed through the spiritual life.⁷⁶ This provides evidence both of William's interpretation of the ideal monastic life and, more importantly, of the attributes that he considers necessary in order for a monk be considered for salvation.

In addition to his theological works, William composed an admiring biography of St. Bernard, the *Vita Primi Bernardi*.⁷⁷ Despite being written with Bernard's imminent canonization in mind, the *Life* is useful for having William's own account of some of the events in his time.⁷⁸

With this source overview in mind, a discussion of William will prove more fruitful. The entire body of William's work will be considered in this thesis, however his final three theological works, the *Mirror*, *Enigma*, and *Epistle*, demonstrate a more consistent methodological approach to the process by which the Holy Spirit causes salvation. It is significant that throughout the trajectory of William's writing, ranging from medical to spiritual, he demonstrates persistent interest, differently expressed and expounded, in themes that he identifies as pneumatological.

⁷⁶ Jacques Chaurand suggested that this could be seen as William's own form of the *Apologia* defending the Carthusian way of life to other coenobitic orders in 'William of Saint Thierry's Aspirations to the Simple Life: A Study in Vocabulary.' In *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry*, trans. Jerry Carfantan. (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987) p. 148. (A similar description is adopted by Patrick Ryan in 'The Witness of William of St. Thierry to the Spirit and Aims of the Early Cistercians' in *The Cistercian Spirit: A Symposium in Memory of Thomas Merton* ed. M. Basil Pennington. (Washington: Cistercian Publications Consortium Press, 1973) p. 236).

⁷⁷ William, *Vita prima sancti Bernardi Claraevallis abbatis*, ed. Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 89B (Turnhout, Brepols, 2011). William wrote only one brief book on Bernard and the work was taken over by a number of other monks, most notably Geoffrey of Auxerre, who was trained by Anselm of Laon: another connection between the William and Anselm's students. A critical edition of the *vita* has yet to be produced, however Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker produced the small volume *St. Bernard of Clairvaux: the Story of His Life as Recorded in the Vita prima Bernardi by certain of his contemporaries, William of St. Thierry, Arnold of Bonnevaux, Geoffrey and Philip of Clairvaux, and Odo of Deuil* (Westminster: Newman Press, 1960).

⁷⁸ For a more detailed examination of this piece of writing see A. H. Bredero's thesis *Études sur la Vita prima de saint Bernard* (Rome, 1960) or E. Vacandard, 'L'histoire de saint Bernard, critique des sources,' in *Revue des questions historiques* XLII, 1888, pp. 337-389.

The Pelagian and Adoptionist Borders of William's Theology

None of William's contemporaries ever accused him of heresy, despite his enthusiasm in accusing Aberlard and William of Conches, but his application of specific identities to the three persons of the trinity has led some historians to suggest that his writing involves some heterodoxy.⁷⁹ It is possible that William's more precarious claims went unnoticed because by the twelfth century the church was concerned with more widespread heresies such as the Waldensians and the Cathars, which were of institutional significance.⁸⁰ William himself did not express any concern that his beliefs were divergent to the teaching of the church. While any accusations against William have been dismissed, it is important to underline that the current analysis of his works does not intend to implicate him in two different heresies: Pelagianism and Adoptionism.

William makes some theological claims about personal improvement that sometimes make him seem sympathetic to the Pelagian point of view.⁸¹ Like the Pelagians,

⁷⁹ According to Jacques Delesalle, he was once bizarrely accused of pantheism because of the great detail he used in describing the specific persons of the Trinity, Delesalle, 'On Being 'One Single Spirit' with God in the Works of William of Saint-Thierry,' trans. Brian Kerns, *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, V. 33.1 (1998), p. 21. This accusation was clearly a misunderstanding of the foundations of Trinitarian theology. For other accusations see Pierre Pourrat, *La Spiritualité Chrétienne*, vol. II: *Le Moyen Age* (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1924), pp. 193-194.

⁸⁰ It is worth noting, however, that Catharism preserved elements of Pelagian heresy and would therefore still have been of popular concern. (Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2002) p. 129) For a more detailed study see: *The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy, and Religious Life: Essays in Honour of Gordon Leff*, eds. Peter Biller and Barrie Dobson (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer Ltd., 1999), R. I. Moore, *The War on Heresy: Faith and Power in Medieval Europe*, (London: Profile Books, 1996) Lambert, *Heresy, and Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy* eds. Caterina Bruschi and Peter Biller (York: York Medieval Press, 2003) and *Heresy in Transition: Transforming Ideas of Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, eds Ian Hunter, John Christian Laursen, and Cary J Nederman (Hants: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2005) as well as Claire Taylor, *Heresy in Medieval France: Dualism in Aquitaine and the Agenais, 1000-1249* (London: The Royal Historical Society, 2005).

⁸¹ The Pelagian heresy was most prominent in the early years of the church; it was recorded most notably both by St. Augustine in a series of attacks, and by St. Bede, who describes the danger it posed to the early English church in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*. (The Venerable Bede, *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, trans. and ed. Judith McClure and Roger Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992)) The heresy apparently originated in Rome in the 380's when its founder, Pelagius, emigrated from Britain and befriended his fellow ascetic and heretic-to-be, Caelestius (Dominic Keech, *The Anti-Pelagian Christology of Augustine of Hippo, 396-430* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 38.) Despite being separated when Pelagius left for Palestine in 411, the two founded a fast growing community of ascetics who believed in an empowered mentality for humanity. Pelagians believed that humanity possessed absolute freedom to be good or evil. The consequences of this belief are the rejection of original sin because every man, including Adam, sins only for himself, as well as the rejection of salvation through grace because not even God has the power to override man's freedom in order to make him good. The Pelagians even rejected the influence of the Holy Spirit through the sacrament of baptism (Stephen F. Brown and Juan Carlos

William champions man's free will as a strength through which man can improve himself. That said, William always qualifies his praise of man's ability with an assertion of man's reliance on the Spirit for enlightenment and elevation. The greatest persecutor of the Pelagians was William's favourite authority, St. Augustine.⁸² According to Augustine, Pelagius's greatest fault was that he diminished Christ's superiority to man, as well as the extent of man's relative depravity in the face of God. The Pelagians encouraged Adam and Christ, who should be viewed as the downfall and saviour of man respectively, to be viewed as contextually similar: both important Christian fathers. Augustine counters the Pelagian claims by deemphasising free will in the path to salvation. In his writing against Pelagius, he devalues all human agency and insists that spiritual improvement is exclusively the result of divine intervention.⁸³ Here, William diverges from Augustine and presents a median view. Like Augustine, William insists that all human struggle is fruitless without divine elevation, but he also emphasises the importance of individual commitment to perseverance, and personal rejection of sin. William is able to emphasise human agency without being guilty of Pelagianism because of this balance in his philosophy: he champions self-improvement with the caveat that self-improvement is rewarded and aided by the Holy Spirit.

William's theory of salvation relies, at specific points, on the notion of the individual believer embracing an adoptive relationship with God the Father. As a result, there is extensive description and exploration of the concept of spiritual adoption, and the

Flores, *Historical Dictionary of Medieval Philosophy and Theology* (Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2007), p. 210.) Gordon Leff writes that, 'Pelagianism, with its belief in man's inherent goodness and the sufficiency of his free will, was perhaps the most dangerous' of all medieval heresies (Gordon Leff, 'St. Augustine's Concept of Man,' in *Essays in Honor of Edward B King*, ed. Robert G Benson and Eric W. Naylor (Sewanee: The University of South Sewanee, 1991), p. 93. Leff also describes Cluny and Cîteaux's reform movements as heretical so his views should be considered extreme.) Augustine brought Pelagius before a council for heresy in 417 (Keech, *Anti-Pelagian*, p. 38.) It is likely that Augustine exaggerated degree to which Pelagius's teaching was heretical, however, for the purposes of William's understanding, Augustine should be assumed accurate (Keech, *Anti-Pelagian*, p. 40. Keech suggests that the reason that Augustine reacted so strongly was the disassociate himself from his Origenist leanings, p. 40).

⁸² Arthur McGrade points out that Augustine's extensive writing against the Pelagians both sealed their fate as heretics, and his reputation as an exhaustive persecutor. (Arthur Stephen McGrade, 'The Medieval Idea of Heresy: What are We to Make of It?' in *The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy, and Religious Life: Essays in Honour of Gordon Leff*, eds. Peter Biller and Barrie Dobson (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer Ltd., 1999), p. 121).

⁸³ Leff, 'Concept,' p. 182.

use of this term makes it necessary to clarify and distance the Adoptionist heresy from William's thinking. Adoptionism in the western church stretches back to a heretical shoemaker in the second century.⁸⁴ It was rediscovered in an eighth century Spanish heresy, followers of which preached a duality of Christ's being: God the Son exists eternally, but Jesus the man had to adopt God as his Father before he could take on the role of Son.⁸⁵ William's use of 'adoption,' is entirely unrelated to this heresy. William describes not Christ's act of adoption, but man's, and his description is far closer to a form of adoption scripturally evidenced in the writing of St. Paul than the form of adoption popularized by the Eighth century heretical group. Paul described adoption in terms of both the familial nature of the Trinity and as an explanation of man's role in Christianity.⁸⁶ Adoption, as a metaphor, appeals to Paul and William for the same reason: it implies initial alienation between parent and child, who then develop a close familial bond.⁸⁷ William depicts man's adoption as a form of *imitatio Christi*, however it is the filial relationship and not the adoption that engages the act of imitation.⁸⁸ While William draws upon terms and concepts that

⁸⁴ Adoptionism was first expounded by Theodotus of Byzantium. Theodotus travelled to Rome, where he declared that Jesus, while perhaps more holy than most of humanity, was still a man. He believed that Jesus had communicated with Christ at his baptism, but not that Jesus was himself the Son of God. (Sharon Watters Conrad, *Adoptionism: The History of a Doctrine*, The University of Iowa (1999), p. 117)

⁸⁵ Adoptionism was reignited in the Eighth Century as a response to a more extreme heretical movement, which removed the trinity from the divine entirely. In an attempt to reject this human trinity, while preserving Christ's personhood, Bishop Elipandus of Toledo argued for a duality in Christ wherein his divine self is the eternal Son of God, but his mundane self had to adopt God as his father. (Joseph R. Strayer and William C. Jordan, *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, vol. 1 (New York: Scribner, 1989), p. 57. The authors suggest that Elipandus was following evidence from Hilary of Poitiers and Isadore of Seville) Elipandus's disciple, Felix of Urgel, attempted to propagate this belief and even unsuccessfully defended it to the court of Charlemagne. (Edward Peters, *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe: Documents in Translation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980), p. 52 The heresy largely died with Felix, and it does not constitute a major movement against the Church, however it was revisited in the twelfth century as a complaint against Peter Abelard's excessive distinction of the divine and humane within Christ. (Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, p. 32) William could potentially be seen as dismissive of the tenets of Alcuin's attack on Adoptionism, in which he proclaims that adoption is a synonym for false: for William man's adoptive relationship with God is very real. However it is very unlikely that William would have been familiar with Alcuin's, *Against the Adoptionist Heresy*, in order to deny it. (Alcuin of York, 'Against the Adoptionist Heresy of Felix' in *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe: Documents in Translation* ed. Edward Peters (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980), p. 56.

⁸⁶ Trevor J. Burke, *Adopted into God's Family: Exploring A Pauline Metaphor* (Downers Grove: IntraVarsity Press, 2006), p. 22.

⁸⁷ Burke, *Adopted*, p. 27.

⁸⁸ In modern theology, depicting human adoption of God as a step toward salvation is regarded as highly problematic, and on this front William's theology stands slightly outside the standard dogma. (Burke, *Adopted*, p. 23) However, there has been a recent increase in interest within New Testament scholarship in the relationship between the adoptive metaphor and the doctrine of salvation. (Burke, *Adopted*, p. 37) In this regard, William's view on adoption can certainly contribute a great deal to the

have superficial similarities to heresies, in his actual theological claims he proves to be a doctrinal adherent.

Critical Overview of Current Historiography

Since his rediscovery in the first half of the twentieth century, William has attracted some attention within historical studies, but the overall treatment of his life and thought remains patchy. A particularly significant gap remains over William's Spiritual theology.⁸⁹ In this respect William has, on the whole, been interpreted within the context of the longer reception of the Church Fathers in the West, principally the question of his debt to Greek patristic theology, and to the influences of Augustine. While comparison with authority will constitute an important part of this thesis, the major argument will question and reassess the existing scholarly frameworks, and in so doing, emphasise the independent value of William's thought and its characteristic elements, in particular those related to the theology of salvation.

Existing Scholarship on William

Current historiography specifically germane to William is limited, but can be divided into three main factions. The earliest are the franco-centric profiles, which start in the mid twentieth century. Thereafter are the major English-language volumes, which tried, generally, to establish William's place with regard to his patristic sources. Finally, there are a number of scattered but important articles on William's faith, which are the most accurate investigations of William's thought, but are limited in scope by their small size. As a result, although there are a variety of sources detailing aspects of William, there are significant gaps in the historiographical record.

Étienne Gilson's celebrated *The Mystical Theology of St. Bernard*, first published in 1939, had attached to it the much less celebrated short essay entitled 'Notes on William of St. Thierry.' In this essay, Gilson expressed his admiration for William of St. Thierry and his desire to bring the monk's work into greater focus in the academic world.⁹⁰ Gilson's call to attention did not go unnoticed, and that article

discussion. Despite the fact that William's description of adoption as it relates to salvation may not have been strictly orthodox, it is still far from what could be considered Adoptionism.

⁸⁹ It should be remembered that capitalization is intentional, and is intended to signify the Holy Spirit.

⁹⁰ Etienne Gilson, 'Notes on William of Saint-Thierry,' Appendix V, in *The Mystical Theology of Saint Bernard* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1940), pp. 198-214.

engendered a body of French scholarship on William. Within this the most widely published of William's biographers is Jean Marie Déchanet, who was instrumental in reviving William's legacy in the modern era.⁹¹ Déchanet, who was fond enough of conjecture that his accuracy must be questioned, focused a great deal of attention on William's use of 'Greek' patristic sources. Around the same time, Marie-Madeleine Davy translated a number of William's works into French, and also produced an abundance of biographical and theological articles on William.⁹² Gilson, Déchanet, and Davy form the foundation of modern French scholarship on William, however, partially due to their early place in the scholarship, all three suffer from inaccuracies.

English-language treatment of William has become more extensive recently, especially since the 1970s when translations of William's works into English became more common. Much of this scholarship is targeted at countering Déchanet's emphasis on Greek influence, and highlighting William's intellectual debts to Augustine. David Bell has made valuable contributions to understanding William's theological roots not least in his *The Image and the Likeness*, in which William's adherence to Augustine is emphasised.⁹³ More recently, Carmen Cvetkovic also wrote a compelling analysis of William's Augustinian roots.⁹⁴ These two provide the most in-depth English analyses of William's thinking. Nonetheless, their Augustinian emphasis limits the extent to which they are able to grapple with William's thought in light of its own principles.

Despite the general lack of in-depth analysis of William's thinking independent of its relationship with its sources, there are a number of shorter studies in which William's spirituality is explored and accurately depicted. John D. Anderson, who is also one of William's greatest translators, has all but liberated William from his

⁹¹ Jean Marie Déchanet, *William of St. Thierry: The Man and his Work*, trans. Richard Strachan (Spencer: Cistercian Publications, 1972).

⁹² Amongst the most prominent: 'Les trois étapes de la vie spirituelle d'après Guillaume de Saint-Thierry,' *Recherches de science religieuse* 23 (1933), pp. 569-588, 'L'amour de Dieu d'après Guillaume de Saint-Thierry,' *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 18 (1938), pp. 319-346, 'La Connaissance de Dieu d'après Guillaume de Saint-Thierry,' *Recherches de science religieuse* 28 (1938), pp. 430-456, and her book *Théologie et mystique chez Guillaume de Saint-Thierry*, (Paris: Vrin, 1954).

⁹³ David Bell, *The Image and Likeness: The Augustinian Spirituality of William of St. Thierry*, (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1984).

⁹⁴ Carmen Angela Cvetkovic, *Seeking the Face of God: The Reception of Augustine in the Mystical Thought of Bernard of Clairvaux and William of St. Thierry* (Turnhout: Brepols: 2012).

association with the Greek Fathers.⁹⁵ Odo Brooke wrote a number of expositions of William's spirituality in which he recognises the importance of William's pneumatology as well as his theological creativity.⁹⁶ Robert Thomas's article argues that William promoted a view of the Trinity in which man was able to participate in divinity to an extent; Thomas accurately identifies some of the identities of the Holy Spirit and discusses William's theological reliance on likeness.⁹⁷ Emero Stiegman, during his two pages on William in the midst of his brief overview of a number of twelfth century theologians, manages to identify several of William's most significant 'bold tenet's,' including the Holy Spirit's identity in love, and the radical centrality of pneumatology in his thought.⁹⁸ It is unfortunate that these authors were limited by length, because their observations regarding William's theology are apt. Nevertheless, what this literary survey reveals a significant lacuna in medieval monastic studies: a satisfactory, in-depth review of William's spiritual theology has yet to be attempted.

The Influence of the Greeks

One of the most widespread and contended historiographical misconceptions about William of St. Thierry is that his work relied heavily on Greek sources. The question of William's eastern theological leanings that will be outlined below has implications for his soteriology. Whereas William is fairly isolated in the Latin world for his focus on the Spirit, there is more extensive writing on the topic in the Greek tradition. Similarly, Greek theology engages for more extensively with the notion of a confluence of man and God, which is a key facet of William's soteriology. While William's use of Greek Fathers is certainly exaggerated, his incorporation of these texts is more complex than has been traditionally been understood. William did have familiarity with some Greek authors, however, he may not have been as aware of them as earlier scholarship had postulated. Since the 1930s Déchanet has been the most prolific source of scholarship on William of St. Thierry's Greek influences.

⁹⁵ Most prominently in Anderson, 'The Use.' Anderson also wrote the introduction to Cistercian Publications' translation of William's *Romans*, and to the *Enigma*, which he also translated.

⁹⁶ Odo Brooke, 'The Trinitarian Aspect of the Ascent of the Soul to God in the Theology of William of St. Thierry,' in *Studies in Monastic Theology* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1980) See also: Odo Brooke, 'Speculative.'

⁹⁷ Robert Thomas, 'William of St. Thierry: Our Life in the Trinity' *Monastic Studies* 3 (1965) pp. 139-164).

⁹⁸ Emero Stiegman, 'Bernard,' p. 141.

Déchanet relies heavily on William's phrase *orientale lumen* as evidence that William read and intentionally incorporated Greek texts in his theological writing.⁹⁹ Led by John D. Anderson, more recent scholars have argued that William was not only illiterate in Greek, but in fact, took everything he knew of eastern sources secondarily through Augustinian and other Latin texts.¹⁰⁰ These authors are incredulous that the Abbot would have had access to many of the Greek texts that he references and even claim that William was unaware that many of these quotations took their roots in the east at all.

Despite the unlikeliness of William having secret Greek learning or leanings, William did have some access to Greek Patristic thought. Signy already possessed an impressive library by the time William transferred there, and he did a great deal to expand that collection upon his arrival. Along with traditional Latin sources, the library possessed many major Greek authors in Latin translation.¹⁰¹ Rozanne Elder writes that,

If, without checking the manuscripts one takes the catalogue listings of the library holdings which survived William's abbeys and compares the works listed with printed editions, one finds that William could conceivably have had access to more than twenty Greek authors, all of whom had been translated into Latin well before the twelfth century.¹⁰²

If the postulations that William studied at Laon before taking monastic vows are true, then William's access to sources expands significantly: Laon possessed a collection of Greek sources in translation unparalleled in northern Europe.¹⁰³ Moreover,

⁹⁹ The title of the first Chapter of William's *Golden Epistle*. Aelred Squire argues, rather convincingly, that William chose this title as a sign of respect to his desert contemporaries rather than to their patristic predecessors. (Aelred Squire, 'The Cistercians and the Eastern Fathers,' *One Yet Two: Monastic Tradition in the East and West* ed. Basil Pennington (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), p. 173).

¹⁰⁰ Anderson, 'The Use.'

¹⁰¹ Déchanet, *William*, p. 47.

¹⁰² E. Rozanne Elder, 'William of Saint Thierry and the Greek Fathers: Evidence from Christology,' in *One Yet Two: Monastic Tradition in the East and West* ed. Basil Pennington (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), p. 258. This is a standard selection of writers as Gasper's survey of later eleventh and early twelfth century patristic holdings in Normandy and Cluny demonstrates: Giles E. M. Gasper, *Anselm of Canterbury and his Theological Inheritance* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), pp. 45-68.

¹⁰³ Smith, *Glossa*, p. 23.

William's travels and intellectual exchange with Benedictines at Cluny, Cistercians at Clairvaux, and Carthusians at Mont Dieu meant that he would have been able to access a variety of sources outside of his own collections. It is clear that William would have had at least some access to Greek texts, and given his early dedication to patristic readings he would probably have been familiar with them. However, this does not prove that William had eastern theological leanings. Similarly this does even less to substantiate claims that William was literate in Greek: with such access to texts in translation he would easily have been able to familiarize himself with Greek concepts without any awareness of the language.

With Greek texts being so readily available in translation, the very definition of what it means for a theologian or body of work to be 'Greek' must be considered. Many Patristic authors whose origins were Greek were translated so successfully that they were nearly as available as Latin sources in the west. Similarly, many Greek authors were quoted and plagiarized to the extent that they were subsumed into the greater Latin tradition.¹⁰⁴ This occurrence can be found even at the origins of contemporary monasticism: Benedict's Rule features direct quotations from St. Basil.¹⁰⁵ Over the course of translation some of these texts undergo changes from their original form. Rufinus, for example, the well-known fourth century translator who brought Origen's works to the west, writes in his introduction to Origen's *De principiis* that he edited and omitted parts of Origen's writing to make them more palatable for a Latin audience.¹⁰⁶ The distinction of 'Greek' is more complex and nuanced than

¹⁰⁴ For an irrefutable example of this, compare Ambrose's *Hexameron* with Basil's: the two can hardly be distinguished from each other. See also W. Berschin, 'Greek Elements in Medieval Latin Manuscripts' in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, eds. Michael W. Herren and Shirley Ann Brown (London: Boydell and Brewer, 1988), pp. 85-104.

¹⁰⁵ St. Benedict of Nursia, *Regula*, ed. A. de Vogüé, Sources Chrétiennes, (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1972) cap. 72 verse 5. For further discussion see Terrance Kardong's detailed commentary and critical edition: *Benedict's Rule: A Translation and Commentary* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996) both his transcription and translation of the chapters and his analysis thereof, or Benedicta Ward, 'Desert Myth: Reflections on the desert ideal in early Cistercian monasticism,' in *One Yet Two: Monastic Tradition in the East and West* ed. Basil Pennington (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), p. 185.

¹⁰⁶ Rufinus, *Praefationes in libros Origenis Periarcho*, ed. P. Koetschau, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 20 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1968), ch. 3 lin. 51: 'Sicubi ergo nos in libris eius aliquid contra id inuenimus, quod ab ipso in ceteris locis pie de trinitate fuerat definitum, uelut adulteratum hoc et alienum aut praetermissum aut secundum eam regulam protulimus, quam ab ipso frequenter inuenimus adfirmatam.' English translation from: 'Preface of Rufinus,' in *On the First Principles*, trans. G. W. Butterworth (Notre Dame: Christian Classics, 2013), p. lxxix: 'Wherever, therefore, I have found in his books anything contrary to the reverent statements made by him about the Trinity in

mere language, and the assignment of a certain Patristic Father to the category of ‘Greek’ is often an over simplistic, dichotomous view of a more complex intellectual and cultural identity. If William’s alleged favouritism of Greek sources is to be given any weight, therefore, this must be done with the consciousness that the Greek texts, as he received them, had already been made a part of the greater Latin tradition to a significant extent.

One theory of Dom Déchanet’s that has consistently been upheld is his conception of William as one of the few thinkers skilled enough to undertake a synthesis of Latin and Greek traditions.¹⁰⁷ In this regard, his commentary on Romans stands out as a masterpiece. Anderson’s treatment of this work as purely Augustinian falls short.¹⁰⁸ As Thomas Scheck demonstrates, in his exposition of Origen’s *Commentary on Romans*, Origen emphasises that knowledge of God is the source of faithful justice, and while Augustine describes the layers of personal improvement that lead to salvation as simultaneous, it is Origen who describes them as linear.¹⁰⁹ On both of these fronts William takes the side of Origen rather than Augustine. Although Déchanet undeniably exaggerated William’s love for, and familiarity with, the theology of the Greek Fathers, and probably exaggerated William’s desire to reconcile the traditions, it is evident that William was drawing on more than just Augustine as a source, and that at least one of his preferred authorities was Origen.¹¹⁰

other places, I have either omitted it as a corrupt and interpolated passage, or reproduced it in a form that agrees with the doctrine; which I have often found him affirming elsewhere’. See Thomas P. Scheck, *Origen and the History of Justification: The Legacy of Origen’s Commentary on Romans* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008), p. 104 for greater exploration. Rufinus himself was an important character and was the translation source of a number of authorities: he provided his Latin audience with translations of Gregory of Nyssa, Origen, St. Basil, and Euseius of Caesarea. Although Origen is of greatest importance to this study, Rufinus’s translations have been given some deserved attention of their own: M. M. Wagner, *Rufinus the Translator: A Study of his Theory and his Practice as Illustrated in his Version of the Apologetica of St. Gregory Nazianzen* (Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1945) and C. P. Hammond, ‘Notes on the Manuscripts and Editions of Origen’s Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans in the Latin Translation by Rufinus’ in *The Journal of Theological Studies* XVI, (1965), pp. 338-357.

¹⁰⁷ First postulated in Déchanet, *William*, p. 62.

¹⁰⁸ Anderson’s scholarship on William is exemplary and this claim is not intended as an attack against his work. The historical community that was writing about William had gone so far in the direction of claiming Greek fluency that it was necessary for Anderson to shut down that line of thinking in order to counteract it. It is now possible to approach the topic with more nuance and concede a limited amount of Greek influence, but only because scholars like Anderson had already done the work to amend the mythography surrounding William and the Greeks.

¹⁰⁹ Scheck, *Justification*, pp. 110-111.

¹¹⁰ In translation from Rufinus.

Although it seems very probable that William did have some interaction with the Greek texts, however these are to be defined, his interaction with these texts has been exaggerated.¹¹¹ Despite paying frequent tribute to the Latin sources from which he borrows, William almost never mentions a Greek source.¹¹² In addition, John Anderson compiled a convincing deconstruction of references attributed by Déchanet to ‘Greek’ authors in which many of the quotations can be traced to William by way of extracts employed by Augustine. Furthermore, Anderson illustrates that some of the quotations that Déchanet highlights are excerpts from well-known Latin authors that are either mistakenly or intentionally misattributed.¹¹³ Even disregarding Déchanet’s mistakes, it should be recalled that Greek sources are scattered through many of the great western works. Basic knowledge of Greek Patristic writing does not prove William to be an Eastern devotee.¹¹⁴ Nevertheless, while William certainly did not read Greek, his pneumatological focus did force him to consider some themes that are traditionally associated primarily with the Greek Church, and Origen was the eastern theologian from which he drew the most.

Pneumatology Past and Present

In order to demonstrate both that William’s theology is overtly pneumatological, and that his pneumatology is theologically valuable, it is necessary to introduce both the Trinitarian culture at the time of his writing and the place and importance of the Holy Spirit in the current theological climate. Despite the predominance of pneumatology in William’s thinking, he is almost completely overlooked in modern examinations of Spiritual theology. Within the larger theological and historical sources on the

¹¹¹ William’s early education may have included some introduction to the language and sources. Greek grammars, at the very least were fairly available in the west, as demonstrated by A. C. Dionisotti, in the article ‘Greek Grammars and Dictionaries in Carolingian Europe,’ in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, eds. Michael W. Herren and Shirley Ann Brown (London: Boydell and Brewer, 1988), pp. 1-56). In chapter II verses 14-16 of his *Exposition on Romans*, William spends a tantalizing paragraph discussing Greek grammar, and reveals at least some structural familiarity with it, however this section, like so many others, is also included in Rufinus’s translation of Origen’s commentary and therefore should not be considered very seriously.

¹¹² See: Elder, ‘Evidence,’ p. 254.

¹¹³ Anderson, ‘The Use,’ p. 251. In several cases the quotations are actually from St. Ambrose. In another case, while William is attesting to the Oneness of the Trinity he considers the meaning of Personhood. Déchanet attributes the concept to Basil, however William’s actual interpretation is clearly gleaned from Boethius. (Anderson, ‘Use,’ p. 252) William’s definition of personhood follows the one that Boethius provides in chapter V of his *De Trinitate*, (Boethius, *De Trinitate*, p. 8) wherein he establishes that, although there is one God, He is made up of three distinct but united Persons.

¹¹⁴ See: Ward, ‘Myth,’ p. 185.

Spirit, William is generally relegated to footnotes or factual, rather than intellectual, references.¹¹⁵ In most major examinations of historical pneumatology he is overlooked completely.¹¹⁶ For both theological and historical augmentation an in-depth examination of William's understanding of the work and significance of the Holy Spirit is necessary.

Despite the unlikelihood of William having been significantly familiar with Greek writing in its original form, his focus on pneumatology is one area in which some influence from the Greek tradition is possible, or even likely. Unlike in the western tradition, pneumatology is omnipresent in the eastern Christianity. Whereas treatises dedicated expressly to the Holy Spirit were infrequent in the early Latin Church, along with Origen, St. Basil of Caesarea, his brother, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory Nazianzen all composed and completed works on the Spirit.¹¹⁷ *Theosis*, the Greek concept of partaking in spiritual divinity, is in many ways close to William's understanding of salvation. William's perception of salvation relies on human participation in the Holy Spirit. While in his description, this does not entirely

¹¹⁵ For example: Stanley M. Burgess, *The Holy Spirit: Medieval Roman Catholic and Reformation Traditions*, (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc, 1997) in which Anselm, Bernard, Abelard, whom he admits cannot be considered a great pneumatologist, (p. 48) and Richard of St. Victor are each dedicated an entire chapter but William is only mentioned three times, and Elizabeth A. Dreyer, *Holy Power Holy Presence: Rediscovering Medieval Metaphors for the Holy Spirit*, (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2007) in which William is only mentioned with regards to his relationship to Bernard.

¹¹⁶ For examples in which this is the case, see: Alasdair I. C. Heron, *The Holy Spirit: The Holy Spirit in the Bible, the History of Christian Thought, and Recent Theology*, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1983), *The Holy Spirit: Classic and Contemporary Readings*, Ed. Eugene F. Rogers Jr. (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2009) as well as *Holy Spirit and Salvation: The Sources of Christian Theology*, ed. Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010) and *Christian Peoples of the Spirit: A Documentary History of Pentecostal Spirituality from the Early Church to the Present*, ed. Stanley M. Burgess (New York: New York University Press, 2011) all of which examine the individual participants in medieval pneumatology at length and completely omit William's contribution.

¹¹⁷ All of these have now been translated into English: Basil the Great, *On the Holy Spirit*, trans. David Anderson (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980), Gregory of Nyssa, 'On the Holy Spirit against Macedonius,' in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church V. VL Greg of Nyssa Dogmatic Treatises etc.*, eds. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956) pp. 315-326. Despite the fact that William does borrow from Gregory's *Commentary on the Song*, William's pneumatology bears little resemblance to this text. As Harriett points out, Gregory of Nyssa borrows a great deal of his Trinitarian thought from his brother, but his desire to write an independent analysis still reveals the importance of pneumatology. (Francisco Bastitta Harriett, 'Human Communication and Difference in Gregory of Nyssa: From Trinitarian Theology to the Philosophy of Human Person and Free Decision' in *Gregory of Nyssa: The Minor Treatises on Trinitarian Theology and Apollinarism*, eds. Volker Henning Drecoll and Margitta Berghaus (Leiden: Brill, 2011), p. 339). Finally, Gregory Nazianzen wrote 'The Fifth Theological Oration (Oration 31) On the Holy Spirit,' in *On God and Christ: The Five Theological Orations and Two Letters to Cledonius*, trans. Lionel Wickham (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002), pp. 117-149.

constitute deification, it leans quite heavily toward the Greek tradition, albeit probably as derived from Latin translations.¹¹⁸ William's pneumatology provides evidence for development of these concepts in the west. In addition, these similarities call into question the legitimacy of the stratification of theologies of salvation as perceived in the east and west in the context of the schism.¹¹⁹

Modern scholarship investigating Trinitarian theology in the medieval era often identifies two predominant models of the trinity. The terms often applied to these are the 'intrapersonal' and 'interpersonal' models. The 'intrapersonal' trinity is based largely on observation from intellect and emotion.¹²⁰ To a certain degree William conforms to this model in that he applies emotional identities to the Spirit, he often describes the Trinity in terms of metaphorical cerebral triads, and he describes the way in which the Holy Spirit interacts with man in terms that are predominantly psychological. The second Trinitarian prototype, the 'interpersonal' model, describes the Trinity 'in terms of the loving encounter of three 'Persons''¹²¹ Again, William investigates a similar understanding of the Trinity, notably in his repeated allusions to the trinity in terms of an 'embrace.' He frequently describes Oneness of the divine by first establishing the three persons and then explaining that they are bonded together through the Holy Love and Unity of the Spirit.

Both the intra- and inter- personal models of the Trinity are relevant; William seems to indulge them both equally. Depicting them as opposed, therefore, creates a dichotomy that, at least in the context of William's theology, is false. Stanley Burgess suggests that the theological development and expansion of these two

¹¹⁸ Kärkkäinen observes that 'deification means partaking in the very energies of the Spirit even though a finite human being can never be part of God's essence. Consequently, the nomenclature "deifying" appears frequently in talk about the Holy Spirit.' (Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *The Holy Spirit: A Guide to Christian Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012) p. 33).

¹¹⁹ While 1054 is generally accepted as the date for the schism, members of both religious communities at the time did not take the separation seriously, and the extent of the divide only unfolded in the aftermath in which William lived. (Louth, *The Greek East and the Latin West*, (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2007) p. 271.) The Schism will be explored, to a limited degree, elsewhere in the thesis, however for a useful scholarly introduction to the Schism and its causes and consequences see: Louth, *Greek East and Latin West*, Steven Runciman, *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XIth and XIIIth Centuries*, (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2005), and Henry Chadwick, *The Making of a Rift in the Church, From Apostolic times Until the Council of Florence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

¹²⁰ Declain Marmion and Rik Van Nieuwenhove, *An Introduction to The Trinity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010) p. 96. This is also known as the psychological model of the trinity.

¹²¹ Marmion and Nieuwenhove, *Introduction*, p. 96.

Trinitarian models are exclusively the results of the work of Richard of St. Victor and St. Augustine respectively.¹²² This is yet another over simplistic way of considering medieval Trinitarian thought: William predates Richard and probably had no familiarity with his material, yet when discussing the relationship of God with Himself, his vocabulary is distinctly interpersonal. William's isolation of the Holy Spirit's divine responsibilities relies on both the emotional insignia that is distinctive to intrapersonal Trinitarian theology and the independent interaction of the Persons that comes from the interpersonal interpretations. William's pneumatology can provide a lens through which to consider historiographical models of Trinitarian theology, which helps to dismantle excessively simplistic approaches and demonstrates that there is greater fluidity between theological tropes than current scholarship often acknowledges.

Even within simplistic theological models, however, pneumatology is particularly complex. This is because the Holy Spirit is the most difficult to define of the members of the Trinity. The roles of the Father and the Son are obvious within the economy of salvation, but the Spirit remains elusive. William's theology is illuminating even to the modern theologian in that he provides such a well-defined portrait of the Spirit, who is commonly described only in nebulous terms. For all the detail in the portrait that William provides of the Spirit, the central characteristic that he emphasises is the Spirit's individualised presence: the Spirit is involved in the unique spiritual growth of each Christian. This intimate relationship between Spirit and human has flourished in modern theology. In his account of the role of the Holy Spirit, Eduard Schweizer writes that one of the theological unifiers between sects of Christianity is the desire for a human relationship with the Spirit.¹²³ This understanding of the Spirit, while drawn from a variety of sources in Christian history, has strong roots in William's writing. William is one of the most extensive early promoters of pneumatology, and he sets up a definition for the Spirit in which His relationship to humanity is familiar and of central importance to faith.

¹²² Burgess, *The Holy Spirit*, p. 67.

¹²³ Eduard Schweizer, *The Holy Spirit*, trans. Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), p. 5. Schweizer is concerned, however, that Christians want to control the Spirit.

Within modern theology, pneumatology occupies an important place, however, it is a topic that is growing, rather than established.¹²⁴ Consideration of William's theological interests adds depth to this current debate.¹²⁵ Early Medieval explorations of the Holy Spirit generally were written in response to the imminent threat of heresy or schism. William wrote about the Spirit not as a reaction, but as a choice. His interpretation of the Spirit represents one of the earliest forms of a theology based on personal meditation on, and interpretation of, the Holy Spirit rather than born from necessity. Interpretation of William's pneumatology advances both the current theological understanding of the Person of the Spirit, and the study of soteriology, because William depicts the Spirit as so essential to salvation. Exposition of his writing on this topic is valuable to any theologian examining pneumatology either for its historical roots and importance or for the advancement of personal spirituality.

Twelfth Century Intellectual Trends

Given William's theological focus on the individual and the human condition, consideration of wider twelfth-century trends and the notion of the human is apposite. An influential scholarly position, represented by Southern, Knowles, and Morris argues that twelfth-century philosophy witnessed a proliferation of humanist thought.¹²⁶ While these arguments are increasingly regarded as problematic, the language and study of humanism provides important avenues through which William's thought can be discussed. Human identity itself, and the isolation of individual experience as unique from the whole, became subjects of increasing focus as the twelfth century went on.¹²⁷ More recently, there has been exploration of

¹²⁴ For further discussion see: Kärkkäinen, *Guide*, p. 1.

¹²⁵ This is also valuable to historians that seek the origins of Pentecostal and spiritual theology as well as those interested in the rise of the personal experience being viewed as a legitimate form of spiritual endeavour.

¹²⁶ See: Morris, Colin, *The Discovery of the Individual 1050-1200* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972) Richard Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe*, vol. I (Oxford, Blackwell Publishers Limited, 1995, as well as Richard W. Southern, 'Medieval Humanism,' in *Medieval Humanism and other Studies*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970), and David Knowles, 'Humanism in the Twelfth Century, in *The Historian and Character and Other Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.) As Richard Southern points out in his seminal essay on the topic, 'As a general rule medieval historians do well to avoid words which end in "ism."' That said, humanism requires an obvious exception to this rule. (Southern, 'Humanism,' p. 29).

¹²⁷ There are a number of useful studies on the medieval notion of self. Perhaps most relevant are Morgan's *On Becoming God* and Michael T. Clancy's, 'Documenting the Self: Abelard and the Individual in History,' *Historical Research*, vol., 76 (193), (2003). For comparable explorations focussed on medieval England see: Katherine C. Little, *Confession and Resistance: Defining the Self in Late Medieval England* (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006), Jennifer Bryan, *Looking Inward Devotional Reading and the Private Self in Late Medieval England* (Philadelphia:

another form of individuality that finds its roots in the twelfth century: the development of distinct pedagogical approaches in spiritual settings.¹²⁸ Understanding William's views as they pertain to both his identity as a human, and to the concept of the individual serves to augment the modern reader's understanding of medieval anthropology and some early views of the meaning of life and personhood.

It is widely accepted that the twelfth century was a period of intellectual growth, yet William is regularly ignored as being a leader, or even a participant, in this fluctuation of thought. Despite the fact that its legitimacy is increasingly questioned, there is no shortage of scholarship on the topic of twelfth century humanism, however, William is almost universally unmentioned.¹²⁹ This is a significant oversight for several reasons. William fits the identity of twelfth century humanist that has been articulated by its historiographical architects in both his education and his writing style.¹³⁰ He felt the need to record his personal experience in his

University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008) and Derek G. Neal, *The Masculine Self in Late Medieval England* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2008). An interesting study of the self in the eastern church was conducted by Stratis Papaioannau, in 'Byzantine Mirrors: Self-Reflection in Medieval Greek Writing,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 64, (2010).

¹²⁸ Diehl, 'Masters and Schools.'

¹²⁹ See for example: Richard Southern, *Scholastic*, vol. I, which has no mention of William although it dedicates significant sections to his two intellectual enemies: Peter Abelard and William of Conches, as well as Gerald Groveland Walsh, *Medieval Humanism*, (New York: Macmillan Company, 1942) who fails to mention William despite an extensive list of 'all' humanist thinkers on p. 64. See also the entirety of the essay collection *Christian Humanism: Essays in Honour of Arjo Vanderjagt*, ed. Alasdair A. MacDonald, Zweder von Martels and Jan R. Veenstra (Leiden: Brill, 2009). David Tracy goes so far as to outright deny that William is a humanist in 'Trinitarian Theology,' p. 394.

¹³⁰ In his article on the topic, originally published in 1941, David Knowles outlines several characteristics, which he feels define an intellectual movement that he identifies as humanist at the height of the twelfth century. Although aspects of this article are certainly outdated, his general argument can help to explain what is meant by 'humanism' in an era that predated the term. Following from Knowles's definition, William can be placed within that philosophical milieu. Knowles writes that the first attribute shared what he identifies as twelfth-century humanists is 'a capability of self-expression based on a sound training in grammar and a long and often loving study of the foremost Latin writers.' (Knowles, 'Humanism,' pp. 19-20) William continually reveals himself as a paradigm of this trait. His Latin is poetic and close to classical in terms of its grammatical accuracy. (Gilson also points out that no one develops this level of rhetorical and literary skill 'by chance.' (Gilson, *Mystical*, p. 63.) The second aspect that Dom Knowles distinguishes is 'a personal devotion to one or more of the great figures of the distant past.' (Knowles, 'Humanism,' p. 21.) William relies heavily on the teachings of the Church Fathers and he proves intimately familiar with his favoured authorities. Finally, Knowles writes that these thinkers can be identified by 'the importance which all attached to their personal emotions.' (In this aspect Knowles specifically identifies Heloise, Abelard, and Aelred of Rievaulx as examples, however William is equally worthy of inclusion in this category, and his application of Aelred shows that Knowles is in no way excluding the Cistercian mystic from this analysis.) Allusions to his experience with sadness, heartbreak, and hope permeate William's theology. Based on the characteristics that Dom Knowles considers illustrative, William has a strong claim to being a significant example of the burgeoning humanism of the time.

autobiographical *Meditations*, revealing his desire to express his emotional identity.¹³¹ Most importantly, in describing what it means to be saved, William focuses on each individual's experience. While the reality of 'twelfth century humanism' is probably exaggerated, William's theology repeatedly and insistently emphasizes the monastic spiritual experience as both personal and humane, and this has significance for understanding what those concepts meant in the High Middle Ages.

William's spirituality centres on personal elevation and individual interaction with the divine. In order to guide his readers on their path towards improvement, he repeatedly encourages them to forge a personal relationship with God, and urges them to trust their own instincts, as guided by grace, to map their particular road of ascent. Isolation is very important to William. When monks are relentlessly surrounded by their community, they are easily misguided and distracted: the noise of human interaction drowns out God's quiet invitations. William exhorts the importance of the individual cell as the place where the earliest flames of faith and goodness can be sheltered, as from the wind, so that they are able to grow strong and steadfast. Like the soul, explains William, the cell is a peaceful and safe place for divine communication and contemplation. When an individual is left to his individuality his spirit is allowed to blossom, because it is at that time when he is most in the company of God: 'the man who has God with him is never less alone than when he is alone.'¹³² William explains that, because the monastic cell is the place where individuals are able to shut out the mundane and let in only God, it is in many ways a microcosm of heaven: solitude of the individual is a taste of salvation to come.¹³³

¹³¹ For useful consideration of contemporaneous autobiographical writing see Eileen Sweeney's article 'Abelard's *Historia Calamitatum* and Letters: Self as Search and Struggle,' *Poetics Today* 28 (2008), pp. 303-336. Although William's writing lacks the 'episodic' quality that Sweeney points out in Abelard's, he shares Abelard's desire to align his two selves: in William's case, the moral self which desires monastic strictness, and the outer one which struggles to keep up with that harsh way of life.

¹³² *Epistula*, ch. 30 p. 234, 'Cum quo enim Deus est, numquam minus est solus quam cum solus est.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 30 p. 19. William's praise of the cell takes up 14 chapters of this letter.

¹³³ *Epistle*, X.31 p. 20: William explains that this is why the two words, 'cella' (cell) and 'celum' (heaven) are so similar.

William's attitude towards solitude and personal contemplation is indicative of a trend in William's thought: the focus on individual human closeness to God. From William's soteriology two things become clear. First, it makes evident that, with regards to the most important aspect of Christianity, salvation, the individual must be divided from the community: he must progress alone, for he sins alone, and shall be saved alone. Second, the human self, while tainted, has inherent worth spiritually. When man is alone, he is capable of communicating with God. Humans contain God's image, and they are able to learn from Him, and through this learning become similar to Him, improved by Him, and eventually united to Him. While the degree to which an individual was 'discovered' in the twelfth century has been exaggerated, the individual is isolated and emphasised in William's theology. Similarly, while the form of humanism that divested God of His importance, and championed the primacy of man, was certainly not a dominant philosophy in the twelfth century, William's thought reflects an anthropological fascination, and a genuine interest in recognizing man's identity, clarifying his role, and even praising his spiritual ability as the greatest creation of God.

In recent historical writing, a new approach to medieval texts has been taken, most notably by Jay Diehl and Susan Boynton, which focuses on the pedagogical implications of these texts for the writers and their context.¹³⁴ Whereas the traditional approach questions the plain text meanings of medieval writing theologically, as well as their consequences historically, there is an increase in historiography, which considers the implications of these texts' contents for the learning culture in which they were used and written.¹³⁵ This study contributes significantly to this new genre of scholarship. From the time of William's clash with Abelard onward, William produced a body of work, which includes the majority of his corpus, that was intended instructionally. Much can be gleaned from both the content and tone of these texts, which is informative for understanding both how and what William

¹³⁴ Diehl, 'Masters,' Susan Boynton, 'Training for the Liturgy as a Form of Monastic Education,' *Medieval Monastic Education*, eds. George Ferzoco and Carolun Muessig (London: Leceister University Press, 2000), pp. 7-20.

¹³⁵ Along with Diehl and Boynton, other prototypical examples of this line of inquiry include Diane J. Reilly, 'Education, Liturgy and Practice in Early Cîteaux,' in *Understanding Monastic Practices of Oral Communication*, ed. Steven Vanderputten (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), pp. 85-114, and Sally Vaughn, 'Anselm of Bec: the Pattern of his Teaching,' in *Teaching and Learning in Northern Europe*, eds. Sally N. Vaughn and Jay Rubenstein (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), pp. 99-127.

believed was important for his students to learn, and the learning atmosphere within his monasteries. Two things become clear when William's work is viewed through the lens of his didactic intentions: first that he considered rational education to be a useful and necessary forerunner to a spiritual one, and second that he believed this mundane education provided only a platform, which could be shed once the Spirit has taken over as teacher. William sought to act as the first teacher to his spiritual sons, so as to guide them towards the heights from which the Spirit could take over.

Evidence of William's distinct teaching style can be found across a number of his treatises, and the ascent of knowledge that he devises is inextricable from the ascent to salvation that he perceives. William describes the process of learning as a progression from a life based largely on instinct, to one guided by the acquisition and tuning of reason, and finally to one in which knowledge of God is achieved.¹³⁶ William explains that the novice monk, who is only beginning to learn, is confused by his own will: his confusion and lack of experience lead him into sinful behaviour.¹³⁷ When the Spirit chooses, the combination of intellectual curiosity and the imbue ment of grace nudge the monk towards an incipient use of reason. Although the rational state is nurtured by personal perseverance, it does require a divine gift in order to prompt man to seek it: the Spirit plants an enigmatic concept of what He is in the psyche of the believer. This gift, the 'first fruit of the Spirit,'¹³⁸ represents the beginning of man's awareness of God's image in him, and the magnitude of this gift can be increased throughout this stage because knowledge is increased through practice. As man approaches this point, he relies less on earthly teaching: having reached certain heights of spiritual awareness he no longer has use for the ladder, which brought him there. The third and final stage of this process, the 'spiritual' stage, is both the goal and reward of a spiritual life well lived. Now, man

¹³⁶ The most explicit example of this is book one of *Epistle*, especially 41, p. 25.

¹³⁷ William writes in the *Epistle* that in the first stage the soul is only concerned with its body. (*Epistle*, 44 p. 26) This first state is guided largely by fear, either of God or of one's surroundings from which God might provide protection. In this state man is concerned only with being itself. Animal man will pray only to ask for selfish favors, or because it senses some imminent danger, but never out of devotion. (*Song*, 14 p. 12.) William emphasizes that all prayers for mundane things are a part of this stage, and that for this reason weak and selfish prayers must be avoided vigilantly.

¹³⁸ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. 3:17: 'primitiae Spiritus.' English translation from: *Song*, 20 p. 15.

is elevated out of speculative knowledge and transcends human awareness to achieve the true wisdom that is granted with salvation.¹³⁹

William's pedagogical approach is distinctly spiritual. In all aspects of instruction, William sees the acquisition of knowledge as feeding spiritual development. For William, the combined use of *ratio* and *amor*, results in a very specific kind of knowledge: the knowledge of God. This distinctive didactic approach can only be understood if it is coupled with an understanding of William's parallel ascent to salvation, because William's view of wisdom and salvation are simultaneous. As this study will reveal, rational knowledge is a consistent part of the Holy Spirit's interaction with man. By studying William's application of it, more can be learned about twelfth century pedagogy, the role of learning in spirituality, and the rise of individual didactic philosophies.

To those who view the medieval intellectual climate through the false binary of scholastic versus monastic, rational anthropology and the idea of self-worth or individuality have been associated all too often with the medieval schools and universities rather than the monastery. By demonstrating that William can rightly be seen as a contributor to the intellectual climate of the twelfth century, that misconception can be challenged effectively. Although William's focus was pneumatological, and the ambition of all of his writing was to help his audience navigate towards salvation, he did this by encouraging reason and rationality, and his theology is, at times, empirical and measured. William taught self-reliance and critical thinking as a means of personal improvement. By improving the self, individuals made themselves more inviting vessels for the Holy Spirit. William's goal may have been super-human, but he saw human struggle as a part of achieving that goal.

¹³⁹ There is a clear parallel between these stages and the persons of the Trinity, because traditionally, God the Father is associated with being, the Son with reason, and the Holy Spirit with unity and love. Therefore, in William's progression, man moves through the persons of the Trinity toward the Holy Spirit. Although His gifts are present throughout, it is the final stage in which He is intrinsic. Connecting these concepts to their signifiers in the Trinity reveals a statement of salvation and spiritual improvement that is made possible *because of* the Son, but *by* the Holy Spirit.

Concluding the Historiographical Review

A study of William's thought, particularly with regards to his view of individual spiritual advancement and the Holy Spirit, is needed in order to ascertain his true contribution to the current historical, theological, and philosophical climate. While William's legacy has been revived, to a certain degree, in recent years, the breadth of his significance has yet to be explored. Although originality was not a desirable title in the twelfth century, the degree to which William's creativity has been disregarded borders on the ahistorical.¹⁴⁰ William is not considered seriously in many of the major volumes on Trinitarian, pneumatological, or mystical theology of the medieval era.¹⁴¹ If William's exploration of the pneumatological salvation of the individual is carefully unpacked, a wealth of creative and captivating thinking can be discovered, and its importance to the modern reader can be revealed.

William's Theological Inheritance: Models Patristic and Medieval

Patristic:

William's engagement with authoritative Christian texts was profound. According to Déchanet, Signy's library possessed,

The works of St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Bede the Venerable, and other Latin Doctors, some of Origen's books, the works of Evagrius Ponticus, St. John Chrysostom's Sermons of St. Matthew, various shorter works by St. Basil, St. Macarius, St. Gregory Niziansen, St. Athanasius, Didymus the Blind, and others. In the section devoted to philosophy and grammar, Aristotle, Boethius, Seneca, and Priscian also appeared.¹⁴²

¹⁴⁰ Knowles, for example, writes that, 'William of St. Thierry has numberless echoes of Augustine in his phrases and rhythm, Bernard, for all the similarity of subject matter, created a new style.' (David Knowles, 'Bernard of Clairvaux: 1090-1153,' in *The Historian and Character and Other Essays Collected and Presented to Him by his Friends, Pupils, and Colleagues on the Occasion of his retirement as Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963) p. 40).

¹⁴¹ Anne Hunt complains in her overview of twelfth century mystical Trinitarian theology that William left no 'personal account of his mystical experience,' thus ignoring the wealth of experience that William described in his *Meditations*, both of his commentaries, and mystical guides such as the *Mirror*, Hunt, 'Insights,' p. 8. One noteworthy exception to this claim is McGinn's *Presence*, vol. II, in which he recognizes William's contribution.

¹⁴² Déchanet, *William* p. 47. As has already been discussed at length, William had access to significantly more than Signy's library alone. Although contemporary library catalogues do not exist, Clairvaux's expansive fifteenth century catalogue gives some idea of the wealth to which William had easy access (*La Bibliothèque de L'abbaye de Clairvaux*, eds. Jean-Paul Bouhot and Jean-Francois Genest (Paris: CNRS Editions, 1997) and, if their English brothers hold reasonable comparison, David

William had no shortage of authorities from which to seek instruction. Although it would be impossible to construct a completely accurate bibliography of what William read, it is possible to draw conclusions about which works were most important by analysing his favoured quotations, vocabulary, and themes. This thesis will concentrate on the two most significant authorities that can be demonstrated as influential on William's work: Origen of Alexandria and St. Augustine of Hippo.

Origen

William draws obvious inspiration from Origen of Alexandria (184-254). William parallels and directly quotes Origen's views often, particularly with regard to such topics as the *imago Dei*, the nature of grace, and the spiritual progression of a developing Christian. For William to consider Origen an authority was potentially contentious: Origen's status as a heretic remained intact.¹⁴³ There was admittedly an increasing trend of Origenism in the twelfth century,¹⁴⁴ however William was markedly prolific in his use of Origen.¹⁴⁵ Origen and William both emphasize similar themes as being central to spiritual progression. Despite Origen's overriding Christology, William shares much of his vocabulary in providing identities for the Holy Spirit and in describing individual relationships with God.¹⁴⁶

Bell's survey of the libraries there demonstrate the vast collections that could be found in even the smallest of monasteries (*The Libraries of the Cistercians, Gilbertines and Premonstratensians*, ed. David N. Bell, 12 vols. (London: The British Library, 1992)).

¹⁴³ Origenism was condemned in the 6th century at the fifth ecumenical council of Constantinople. Louth, *Greek*, p. 320.

¹⁴⁴ Jean Leclercq, 'Origene au XIIe siecle,' in *Irenikon* 24 (1951), p. 425. See also: M-D. Chenu *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century* (London: University of Toronto Press, 1997), p. 123, and Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*, vol. 1, trans. Richard Strachan (Spencer: Cistercian Publications, 1972), p. 164. This new attention to Origen's work actually found its roots in the 9th century, however by the 12th it had developed a firm foot hold. Other examples include Bernard of Clairvaux, (Pranger, p. 170) Nicolas of Clairvaux, and Geoffrey of Auxerre (de Lubac, *Exegesis*, v. 1, p. 175).

¹⁴⁵ William's inclusion of Origen is often cited by Déchanet as evidence of his affinity for Greek sources, however, all of the works of Origen with which William would have been familiar were translated nearly eight centuries before him by Rufinus.

¹⁴⁶ This should not be taken to mean that William does not directly repurpose block quotations of Origen's in many places. The semantic choice of 'vocabulary' here is a tenuous one as the two were writing in different languages. However, as has been stated, the only way in which William (and indeed modern readers, for much of Origen's original work has been lost: see R. P. Lawson, 'Introduction,' in *Origen on the Song of Songs Commentary and Homilies*, (Mahwah: The Newman Press, 1957) p. 3) would have been interacting with the texts is in translation. William and Rufinus's mutual use of, for example, *caritas* should therefore be considered as important as if Origen had used it himself in terms of depicting the reliance of one on the other. William's understanding of Origen, and not Origen's actual intent is what will be sought in this thesis.

The most important of Origen's texts with regards to their influence on William are his *De Principiis*, his *Commentary and Homilies on the Song of Songs*, and his *Commentary on Romans*. *De Principiis* is a summation of the values and truths that Origen views as being the most foundational to Christian faith. This work features two lengthy sections on the Holy Spirit, which are invaluable for understanding how and in what ways William's pneumatology developed from Origen.¹⁴⁷ The sections of *De Principiis* on the Holy Spirit are widely considered the earliest major work of pneumatology.¹⁴⁸ Although William draws heavily on these sections, it is Origen's *Commentary on the Romans* and *Commentary on the Song of Songs and Homilies* that William the most directly quotes, partially as a result of the fact that they are the only two scriptural books on which William also commented. In the case of *Romans*, William copies large sections from Origen's commentary directly into his own.¹⁴⁹ *The Song* is widely regarded as Origen's masterpiece.¹⁵⁰ Although Origen's interpretation of *the Song* is more Christocentric than William's, it is here that the greatest overlaps can be found, both in terms of descriptions of the mystical experience and of the crucial importance of love to the development of Christianity.

The core of William's pneumatology lies within the three identities that he ascribes to the Holy Spirit, and on this topic Origen's influence is both present, and insufficient to account for William's advanced theory. Origen determines that, although man's will is always *free*, it is not *good* until it has been influenced by the divine.¹⁵¹ Within the context of will Origen seems to believe that it is the role of the Spirit to look after and comfort the earthly soul.¹⁵² These are both fundamental aspects of William's understanding of will. However, in the category of love, the degree to which William's thought agrees with Origen's is significantly subdued.

¹⁴⁷ Origen depicts the Spirit as the highest gift, which can only be enjoyed by those in an elevated spiritual state, (Origen, *Principles*, p. 37) while simultaneously being 'the Paraclete,' in that he is a comforter of man. (Origen, *Principles*, p. 117.) William, too, struggles with aligning these two converse views of the Spirit as both the harbinger of true faith, and as being a constant source of strength to even the weakest of Christians. *Principles* is thematically very influential on William, however, like many other early examinations of the Holy Spirit, it often proves more confused and defensive than instructional.

¹⁴⁸ For more on this see: Heron, *Holy Spirit in the Bible*, p. 69 and Kärkkäinen, *Guide*, p. 14.

¹⁴⁹ this could result from the fact that St. Jerome had expressed approval of Origen's Pauline commentaries. (Scheck, *Origen*, p. 104.)

¹⁵⁰ According to Rufinus, the Bishop of Damascus once expressed that reading Origen on the Song feels like being let into the King's bedchambers. (Rufinus, 'Prologue Principiis,' p. vii) It is often considered 'first great work of Christian mysticism.' (Lawson, 'Introduction,' *Song*, p. 6.)

¹⁵¹ Origen, *Principles*, p. 221.

¹⁵² Origen, *Principles*, p. 139.

Origen's two extensive sections on the Holy Spirit, both in *De Principiis*, are entirely devoid of amorous application of the Spirit.¹⁵³ Similarly, Origen never defines the Holy Spirit as Unity. While William is in agreement with Origen with regards to earlier, adoptive stages of unification, he diverges from Origen entirely as he describes the highest forms. William seems to reiterate Origen frequently in establishing his theological definitions, however, William's professed identities for the Holy Spirit constitute a radical departure from Origen's understanding of the Spirit's Person.

Augustine

St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430) unarguably is the most significant patristic influence on all of twelfth-century thought. More concretely, however, he was certainly the author that William referenced most frequently.¹⁵⁴ William draws significantly on Augustine across all of the themes that are most central to his own writing. Most significantly, the metaphors that Augustine uses as didactic tools with which to approach the concept of the Trinity clearly resonated with William, and he adapts them to his own purposes often. The three identities that William ascribes to the Holy Spirit all can be found, to varying degrees, at places within Augustinian texts. That being said, William always uses Augustine's theories as a foundation from which to expand, and despite strong Augustinian influence, William's conclusions consistently push beyond Augustine.

Augustine's bibliography is almost as weighty as his influence, and it is too vast to detail.¹⁵⁵ What is more, unlike with some less-frequently transmitted authors, a vast selection of those works would have been readily available to William either in one of his own monasteries, or through his travels and friends. Despite this daunting selection, a few of Augustine's works stand out as particularly important and

¹⁵³ Interestingly, the one point at which Origen does equate the Spirit to love is in quotation. In the context of explicating that the phrase 'the Spirit' in cases without the title of 'Holy,' should still be taken to mean the Holy Spirit, Origen chooses to demonstrate his point using a Galatians quotation (5:22) that refers to one of the Spirit's fruits as love. While it is curious that this should be the quotation that he chooses to utilize, and while his observation regarding the identity of the Spirit without its qualifier is worth noting, this reference hardly establishes a relationship between the Spirit and love in Origen's understanding. (Origen, *Principles*, p. 42).

¹⁵⁴ This fact is evident even to the novice reader of William's texts, however it has also been conclusively demonstrated by Bell in *Image* and Cvetkovic in *Seeking*.

¹⁵⁵ David Bell's thesis and Cvetkovic's book did focus exclusively on the relationship between Augustine and William, and can be looked to for greater detail on this point.

relevant for this discussion. Certainly Augustine's most essential work for this thesis is *De Trinitate*.¹⁵⁶ The allegories that Augustine applies to the Holy Spirit in this treatise factor heavily into William's conception, most notably those of love¹⁵⁷ and will.¹⁵⁸ Some of Augustine's shorter texts are also worth mentioning with regard to their influence on William. For example, his 'Faith, Hope, and Charity,' contains important definitions for the vocabulary that William inherits. His dual treatises 'The Immortality of the Soul,' and 'The Magnitude of the Soul,' are essential for understanding Augustine and Williams's shared dichotomy of the Soul and the Spirit, and Augustine's vision of the path to spiritual improvement. Despite William's lack of focus on creation scripture, even Augustine's two commentaries on Genesis have a clear impact on William in that they define Augustine's understanding of what defines humanity, and the significance and place of the *imago Dei*.

Within the realm of Spiritual identity Augustine is an important source. Augustine repeatedly claims that the Will is an aspect of the Holy Spirit's Person. In so doing, he establishes a direct connection between the Spirit and salvation.¹⁵⁹ God's Will determines which of his creations should be saved, and if the Holy Spirit is related to God's Will, then salvation is intertwined with the Spirit's actions. Augustine was also among the most prominent of early Christians to identify the Holy Spirit as Love. William reiterates Augustine in that he stresses love's centrality theologically, however he ultimately deviates from Augustine with regards to the potency of human love. Despite being perhaps the most prevalent influence on William's first two identities of the Holy Spirit, with regards to Unity, Augustine is silent. This is the

¹⁵⁶ William draws heavily on this treatise, and it provides the skeleton of his *Enigma*, which can in many ways be seen as a condensed version of *Trinitate*. Although *Trinitate* is not Augustine's most mature work, having been completed in 419, he did compile it over the course of twenty years, making it exhaustive. (Heron, *Holy Spirit in the Bible*, p. 88).

¹⁵⁷ Augustine, *Trinity*, VIII:14, IX:2, IX:4, IX:6-8, IX:15, IX:18, XIV:4, XIV:11, XIV:13-14, XV:10, XV:39, XV:42-43.

¹⁵⁸ Augustine, *Trinity*, IV:30, X:17-19, XI:6, XI: 11-12, XII:25, XIII:26, XIV:5, XIV:8, XIV:10-13, XV:38, XV:41.

¹⁵⁹ It is obvious that no one is saved without God's will, but for the sake of complete incontrovertibility, in *Against Julian*, Augustine makes this candid with the statement: 'all are saved...at His willing it.' (St. Augustine of Hippo, *Contra Iulianum*, Patrologia Latina, 44, 641-874, ch. 4, p. 760: 'Omnes ergo qui alui fiunt, et in agnitionem ueniunt ueritatis, eo uolente sali fiunt, eo uolente ueniunt.' English translation from: *Against Julian*, trans. Matthew A. Schumacher (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1957), p. 207.)

most significant divergence of William from Augustine, and it is a crucial characteristic of William's thought.

Exclusions

Comparison with other patristic sources is not the main emphasis of the current discussion, which is rather to consider what was characteristic about William's modes of thought. Other comparisons could be made, or might be thought likely. Gregory of Nyssa (335-395), for example, is listed particularly by authors keen to prove William's proficiency in Greek. Textual evidence for this influence is sparse, although, unlike many authors of his time, William was almost certainly reading the 864 Eriugena translation of Gregory's *On the Making of Man*, under the title *De imagine* rather than the Rufinian *De opificio hominis*, which has some implications for the scope of sources that William was able to access.¹⁶⁰ Admittedly, there is a greater parallel between William's writing and this text, but William's use of it is largely in the context of his *On the Nature of the Body and the Soul*, which does not contribute to an understanding of his pneumatology. Although Gregory may have had some technical influence on William, there are few spiritual, mystical, or pneumatological connections between the two men.

Of Latin fathers, Hilary of Poitiers (300-368), might be thought a natural comparison, but is, in fact of limited relevance to this thesis because his work has no pneumatological focus, even in the *De Trinitate*, where the Spirit is only given any direct analysis in the final of the twelve books.¹⁶¹ A different case is represented by St. Ambrose (337-397). Ambrose explored the development of the soul in similar terms to William in his *On Isaac or the Soul*, and he is one of the few Latins to have written an extensive treatise on the Holy Spirit.¹⁶² While William shows signs of familiarity with Ambrose, Ambrose's writing is not extensively referenced in his substantive or speculative work. It is to Augustine that William turns most consistently.

¹⁶⁰ Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body: In Western Christianity, 200-1336* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995) p. 166 or McGinn, 'Introduction *Body*,' p. 35.

¹⁶¹ St. Hilary of Poitiers, *The Trinity*, trans. Stephen McKenna (New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc. 1954) pp. 19-33.

¹⁶² St. Ambrose 'The Holy Spirit,' in *Theological and Dogmatic Works*, trans Roy J. Deferrari (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1987) pp. 35-217.

Contemporary

Along with the two major Patristic influences, William's work will be considered in light of four of his contemporary theologians. These will both help to reveal the intellectual world of which William was a part, and to illustrate his own position within it. William knew two of these individuals intimately: his friend, St. Bernard, and his nemesis Peter Abelard. The other two, Anselm of Canterbury and Hugh of St. Victor should be viewed as exemplars of their time, highly influential on the formation of the twelfth century theological investigation, and writers with whom William was familiar. For that reason, a brief introduction to their relevance is helpful for placing William contextually.

Anselm of Canterbury

Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) was one of the most formative thinkers of the later eleventh and early twelfth century. Born in modern-day Italy, Anselm spent most of his adult life in Normandy, later becoming an Archbishop in England. Anselm is a likely influence on William both because of his eminence and because of his extensive use of Patristic scholarship.¹⁶³ Comparison between Anselm and William's work reveals a trend, however: William consistently utilizes Anselmian arguments to build the foundations of his own arguments, and then sharply deviates from them in analysis. Despite shared interests, Anselm does not investigate the Holy Spirit's role in the development of the individual, and analysis of the substantial incongruities between William and Anselm's thinking is useful in order to demonstrate how William stood apart from his peers.

The likelihood of William having access to Anselm's texts is high, but the degree to which William used them varies.¹⁶⁴ Despite the fact that Anselm was one of the few high medieval thinkers to complete both a dialogue and a treatise devoted entirely to the concept of free will: *De Libertate* and *De Concordia*, Anselm did not connect

¹⁶³ Gasper has demonstrated Anselm's familiarity with Greek theological concepts. Gasper, *Inheritance*, pp. 13-32.

¹⁶⁴ Judith Dunthorne and Mark Clavier have demonstrated Anselm's availability to the Victorines at the very least. (Judith Dunthorne, 'Anselm and Hugh of St. Victor on Freedom and the Will,' and Mark Clavier, "'Oro, Deus, cognoscam te, amem te, ut gaudeam de te'" Rhetorical Theology and the Influence of Anselm on Richard of St. Victor,' in *Saint Anselm of Canterbury and His Legacy*, eds. Giles E. M. Gasper and Ian Logan (Durham: Institute of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2012) pp. 114-133, and 133-155.

this human faculty to the Holy Spirit. Although Anselm wrote a lengthy treatise on the Spirit, *De Processione Spiritus Sancti*, contemplation of pneumatological identities is not one of its themes. The text's purpose is to defend the procession of the Spirit in the face of the Orthodox Church, and it therefore focuses almost exclusively on the Holy Spirit's place within the Trinity. The text of the earlier *Monologion* firmly roots love into Anselm's theology, despite its absence from some other key texts, and is also a useful source when considering the Spirit's role in salvation. Perhaps most influential was Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, which is in many ways theologically distant from this thesis because of its focus on Christ, however it provides a framework for the relationship between divinity and humanity, and the rules that apply to the economy of salvation.¹⁶⁵

Whereas William's theological interests can be described as emotional, Anselm tended to take a far more pragmatic approach to similar themes.¹⁶⁶ In *De Libertate*, Anselm does espouse an explanation of a process of the improvement of will that is contingent of grace, and therefore reliant on the Spirit. However, the majority of this treatise focuses on the definition of freedom within will, and excludes any investigation of will's relevance to the Holy Spirit. On the topic of love, Anselm is remarkable for his relative silence: over all it constitutes only a minor theme in his theological writing, although it features strongly in his letter collection.¹⁶⁷ That being said, unlike in the case of will, Anselm explicitly intertwines Love and the Holy Spirit. He also provides a direct assertion of love as not only imperative in the ascent to salvation, but in fact the very purpose of creation itself. However, Anselm does not make any overt statement of the Love of the Spirit as a guiding force for the love of the human soul. Out of the three major pneumatological themes, Anselm writes the least about Spiritual unity with God. Anselm does investigate some of the methods with which William sees unity achieved, as well as some of the themes that provide William with foundation for his claims of unification. However, whereas

¹⁶⁵ Although the transmission of this text was limited in the early twelfth century, it was known in Laon early on, so William would have had access to it. Gasper, *Inheritance*, p. 152.

¹⁶⁶ Within that analysis, however, some important themes can be isolated. Anselm's methodical discussion of the intersection of divine and human as it existed in Christ provides an important platform from which to investigate divine interactions with normal man. Similarly, his belief that man is capable of drawing a comparison between himself and God so as to self-edify proves an important part of William's understanding of spiritual actualization.

¹⁶⁷ This is particularly curious considering what a major theme it is for other monks at the time.

William's writing looks persistently to spiritual journey and salvation, Anselm's focuses more strictly on analytical theology. William's emotional pleas for adoption and jubilant expressions of unified ecstasy have little place in Anselm's more sober, more academic treatises. Anselm proves a significant influence on the mechanisms of William's theology, but the ways in which the two men apply their thought are distinct.

Bernard of Clairvaux

Bernard of Clairvaux (1190-1153) is one of the names most commonly associated with the twelfth century, particularly with regard to the monastic revival of which William was an important part. Even if their personal history were disregarded, it would hardly be possible to discuss William's monastic trajectory without acknowledging Bernard as instrumental in the popularization of the Cistercian movement.¹⁶⁸ Bernard also had intellectual influence on William, who writes that Bernard's scriptural commentaries were the most illuminating, and that he was able to form a deeper understanding of scripture through those commentaries.¹⁶⁹ Bernard was influential on William intellectually and spiritually, but it is important to remember that the reverse was also true. Many concepts that are attributed to the more famous of the two monks, Bernard, clearly originated in the writing and prayer of his older friend, William.

William would have had access to the majority of Bernard's work due to their friendship and correspondence. Bernard's greatest work is his commentary on the *Song of Songs*, which takes the form of 86 sermons, which he edited and compiled up until the date of his death.¹⁷⁰ Although William's commentary shares some

¹⁶⁸ Bernard is often accredited with singlehandedly saving the order. While this may be an exaggeration, it must be acknowledged that, along with his obvious impact on William, between Bernard's conversion and his death Cistercian monasteries increased from three to three hundred. (John Sommerfeldt, 'Bernard of Clairvaux,' in *The Spirituality of Western Christendom*, ed. Rozanne Elder (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), p. 72.) William informs his reader that the reason Bernard was so easily able to convince this vast number of men to join an unpopular monastic order was that his speech was made convincing by the Holy Spirit (William of St. Thierry, *Vita prima sancti Bernardi Claraevallis abbatis Vita prima sancti Bernardi Claraevallis abbatis*, ed. Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 89B (Turnhout, Brepols, 2011), ch. 1 p. 77).

¹⁶⁹ William, *Vita*, ch. 1 p. 51.

¹⁷⁰ Duncan Robertson, 'The Experience of Reading Bernard of Clairvaux "Sermons on the Song of Songs,"' *Religion and Literature* 19 (1) (1987): p. 4. After that time, this sermon series was taken up by two other Cistercian writers, Gilbert of Hoyland (d. 1172) and John of Ford (1140-1214), and the

themes with these sermons, an examination of the two works shows that a true comparison is strained. Whereas Bernard presents the union between the bride and Bridegroom as relatively attainable, and almost certainly something in which the Saint has partaken, William's discussion is predicated far more on the experience of loneliness on the part of the bride. He seems less assured that his longing will be rewarded, and the lessons which he draws are ascetic.¹⁷¹ Four-hundred-and-sixty-nine of Bernard's letters are extant, and while very few of William's letters to Bernard survived, the responses from the saint can help to develop an understating of their exchanges.¹⁷² Bernard dedicated his brief treatise *On Grace and Free-Will* to William; in it he explores pneumatological will in a way that is quite uncharacteristic. Both the dedication and the unusual subject matter indicate William's strong influence.¹⁷³ Two of his other minor treatises, *The Steps of Humility* and *On Loving God*, are also relevant to the discussion: they are both are moral treatises meant to guide spiritual renewal.

Despite the fact that the two abbots had a considerable exchange on the topic of free will, the connections that Bernard draws between free will and the Holy Spirit do not feature as a dominant element in his thinking on the subject. In the cases in which Bernard does relate the Spirit and Will, it is in ways that are subtle and implicit. Similarly, while love is a central theme in Bernard's writing, his theology of love is less Spiritually oriented than William's. This should not to any degree be taken to imply that William loved the Son any less, nor Bernard the Spirit. The two men hinged their mystical experiences with God on different members of the Trinity, and whereas for Bernard, his source of comfort was the vision of matrimonial unification with the Son, for William it was the consistent intercession of the Spirit in supporting his piety toward salvation. Bernard typically saturates his teachings in Christology. This is palpably present in his discussion of Unity, however, he also incorporates

themes that Bernard had established: love and fear, diaspora, longing, and mystical union, were expanded upon.

¹⁷¹ This is perhaps further proof of Bernard's centre being Christ while William's is the Spirit. Bernard *is* united with Christ, while William is only able to continue because of the more consistent strength given to him by the Spirit, and through the Spirit he can maintain piety in pain.

¹⁷² The fact that they are quite often Bernard's feeble apologies for ignoring William's many solicitations is, however, tantalizing as it reveals how much more of William's writing once existed.

¹⁷³ Bruno Scott, 'Introduction,' in *The Letters of St. Bernard* (London: Burns Oats, 1953), p. 125. Watkin Williams, 'Introduction,' in *Concerning Grace and Free Will* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1920) p. iv. Bernard's *Apologia*, too, has specific import to the life of William, as it was written at William's request. (Bernard, *Apologia*, p. 6.) See also: *Vita Antiqua*, p. 249.

notes of a Spirituality that is patently William's own. In many ways Bernard comes closer than any of William's other contemporaries to replicating William's thinking, however there are still drastic differences between the two.

Hugh of St. Victor

Hugh of St. Victor (1096-1141) provides a point of comparison for one of the other major intellectual powerhouses of the twelfth century: the Victorines. Hugh was the father of the spiritual and intellectual tradition that would be carried out by his progenies such as Richard and Achard.¹⁷⁴ While there are some similarities between Hugh and William, Hugh's work is more academically oriented. Whereas William is fixed on salvation through unity, Hugh's spiritual goal is wisdom. Hugh explains that, as a result of man's carnal conscription, he is easily led astray from achieving higher levels of contemplation, however, man is imbued at his creation with the ability to move past those distractions.¹⁷⁵ His continued insistence and emphasis on the importance of wisdom solidifies its connection to salvation in his eyes. In addition, his description of the pursuit of wisdom as bringing man closer to realizing his ideal form makes clear the parallel between divine wisdom and divine unity: he shares William's interests but his emphasis is fundamentally different.

Hugh of St. Victor left no shortage of treatises and several larger works, most of which are extant. The *Didascalicon*, widely regarded as his masterpiece, is a scholastic handbook outlining the place and importance of the liberal arts both intellectually and spiritually. Hugh wrote a series of brief treatises on love and, while it may not have been a major theme in many of his more prominent works, those treaties document considerable thought on the topic. His treatise, *On the Three Days*, is of greatest significance in the present context, since it is there that Hugh outlines his Trinitarian theology. He describes the development of the human soul, and how each stage of that development aligns with a person of the Trinity. It is relevant both

¹⁷⁴ Richard, for example, along with developing significant Trinitarian theories, wrote no less than forty-two treatises on the subject of deific love.

¹⁷⁵ Hugh writes of the human state: 'For the mind, stupefied by bodily sensations and enticed out of itself by sensuous forms, has forgotten what it was, and, because it does not remember that it was anything different believes that it is nothing except what is seen. But we are restored through instruction, so that we may recognize our nature and learn not to seek outside ourselves what we can find within. "The highest curative in life," therefore is the pursuit of Wisdom: he who finds it is happy, and he who possesses it, blessed.' (Hugh, *Didascalicon: Guide*, p. 47.)

for its evidence of Hugh's view of individual salvation and because in it Hugh recognizes the final stage as being associated with pneumatological themes.

Over the course of his works, Hugh of St. Victor ruminates frequently on the topic of will, both human and divine. Although he never overtly states the Will of God as belonging to the Holy Spirit, his divisions of divine will are directly compatible with the two roles of the Holy Spirit within will described by William. Nonetheless, Hugh does, in many treatises, set out titles and roles for the persons of the Trinity.¹⁷⁶ Therefore, his silence on the matter of will within the Trinity can be taken as significant, and it seems that for whatever reason, Hugh did not see the Holy Spirit as governing God's Will. Theologically, Hugh depicts love as an essential aspect of the deity. For Hugh, revelation itself was a form of love, and all Christian awareness develops from interaction with love.¹⁷⁷ Hugh rarely relates love explicitly to salvation, however, salvation can only come from the instruction and reorientation that charity provides. Similarly, Hugh does not state that it is the work of the Spirit to instruct and enforce human love for God, however, he does overtly define the Spirit as God's Love, thus making concrete the connection between the work of the Spirit and the love of the soul. Unity is widely overlooked in Hugh's theology, and although he provides a distinct description of the Oneness of the Godhead in his *On the Three Days*, this passage does not emphasize the Spirit any more than the other persons.¹⁷⁸ Additionally, Hugh's conception of deific unity with man, to the extent that it exists at all, differs significantly from William's in definition and process.

Peter Abelard

Partially because of their proximity in time and career and partially because of their well-documented disagreement, Peter Abelard (1179-1142) is worth comparing to William. Despite their disputes there are many topics on which Abelard and William come close to agreement. William obviously had a broad familiarity with Abelard's work, given his virulent denouncement of it, and it is distinctly possible that William initially undertook that reading with a curious rather than condemnatory intention. Given the evidence for an early friendship, it is possible and even likely that William

¹⁷⁶ In *Days*, for example he comes dangerously close to dividing the trinity in a manner similar to that for which Peter Abelard received retribution: for example, p. 91.

¹⁷⁷ Hugh, *Charity*, p. 159.

¹⁷⁸ Hugh, *Days*, p. 86.

admired Abelard's philosophy before his later petulance towards it had developed.¹⁷⁹ Whether or not this is the case, Abelard's work coloured William's either as a result of influence or of rebellion, and his opinions must be taken into consideration.

Thanks in part to William's denouncement of Abelard, not all of Abelard's works survived to the end of his lifetime. However, plenty of his work did escape burning, and these are useful in comparing his work to William's. Abelard's earliest works consist largely of commentaries on logic and are therefore useless for these purposes.¹⁸⁰ Similarly, though tantalizing, his letter exchange with Heloise and his autobiography, *The History of My Misfortunes*, are of little use in this context. One of Abelard's most famous works, known interchangeably as *Ethics*, or *Scito te Ipsum* is crucial in comparison. From the very first line, Abelard rigorously considers the concepts of good and evil, and the degree to which man has moral control over himself. This is a point on which William and Abelard clash frequently, however the core thesis: know thyself, is of central importance to both men's interpretation of how humanity should function. Also of use are Abelard's *Collationes*, and *Christian Theology*. *Collationes* consists of a fictional dialogue between a Christian, a Jew, and a Philosopher in which they debate the merits of each of their belief systems across a number of fronts, including the potential for salvation. *Christian Theology*, despite its ambitious title, is a short treatise, the use of which lies in its discussion of the dichotomy between fear and love. Finally, Abelard wrote an exegesis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, which, seeing as it was also one of the few books on which William also commented, is a propitious point of comparison particularly on the point of adoption and the varying roles of Christ and the Holy Spirit in causing individual salvation.

Abelard wrote very little about the Will of God, and never defined the Holy Spirit in relevant terms. He did, however, write a great deal on the will of man, and, while his thoughts on this topic range from standard to radical he consistently defines good

¹⁷⁹ See the biography section of this chapter for evidence of the friendship. Several historians have speculated on this topic including: Matthew R. McWhorther in 'William of St. Thierry and the reasoning of Faith' *Irish Theological Quarterly* 76(1) (Maynooth: Saint Patrick's College, 2011) p. 79, and Zerbi in 'Dispute,' p. 183.

¹⁸⁰ For more on these treaties see: John Marenbon, *The Philosophy of Peter Abelard* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) pp. 42-43 and Clanchy, *Abelard*.

will as being synonymous to justice¹⁸¹ William and Abelard outline similar objectives for the advancement of human will, however their interpretations of the process are different. Love, on the other hand, seems to be a unifying factor between Abelard and William. It was not a topic that played a major role in their schism, and it holds an equally vital place in the theological metaphysics of both men. Abelard avoids applying the identity of love to the Holy Spirit, however the implicit connections are more present and less cryptic in the case of love than they are with will. On the occasions that he does relate love and the Spirit, however, it is in the context of a Trinitarian division that William strongly opposed. There is the strongest dissonance between William and Abelard on the topic of unity. Although Abelard briefly considers some of the topics that William associates with spiritual unification, as a concept it seems entirely outside of Abelard's sphere of interest.

Conclusions

William was certainly familiar with, and influenced by, more patristic and early medieval thinkers than Augustine and Origen alone. Similarly, the twelfth century provided no shortage of theologians and thinkers with whom William may have had familiarity and to whom a comparison could be fruitful. However, for the purposes of this investigation, these six thinkers: Origen, Augustine, Anselm, Bernard, Hugh, and Abelard, are the most appropriate with relation to their explorations of the Holy Spirit and the three topics that William associates with Him. By comparing William's writing on the Holy Spirit as He relates will, love, and unity with the considerations of these six thinkers on the same topic, William's originality can be made clear.

¹⁸¹ Abelard, *Collationes*, ch. 120 p. 136: 'bona uoluntas, quo iustitia dicitur.' Translation from same volume, p. 137. This definition would have been acceptable for most of the theologians of the time. To have a good will is to will what God wills, and God's Will is always just. It is impossible for God to act unjustly, just as it is impossible for a man to will something that opposes God's Will and still have a will that is considered good. Therefore, the two terms can be considered complimentary.

Chapter 3: Will

Free will, William stresses, is one of the main capabilities that define mankind as distinct from and superior to the remainder of the created order. In the progression towards salvation, the first aspect of the soul to be affected by the grace of the Spirit is the human will.¹ As with the remainder of the themes to be discussed, the way in which this concept relates to the Spirit is twofold. First, Will is one of the names by which the Spirit is identified. The Spirit *is* God's Will; He is, therefore, also able to impact and guide the weaker manifestation of will that is the free will of humankind. William writes in his *Golden Epistle* that,

The Holy Spirit is good will. And it is not without great hesitation that anyone is to be excluded from any vocation, to whatever heights it aspires, whose good will bears witness to the indwelling and the attraction of the Holy Spirit.²

The Spirit both is Will and is an agent of will. William goes on to demonstrate that the improvement and enlightenment of human will that is made possible through the investment of the Holy Spirit is fundamental to the bestowal of salvation.

William, although drawing on his contemporaries and on his patristic influences, is more explicit than other traditional medieval theologians in his illustration of the Holy Spirit's impact on both human and divine will. It takes considerable analysis and comparative consideration to draw out the pneumatological import of will in twelfth century theological writing. William, however, draws unambiguous soteriological connections between the Spirit and will. He explicitly identifies the Holy Spirit as being God's will: a claim that is not found to such a categorical extent in the writing of any of his peers.

¹ See vocabulary section in the introduction for clarification of terms.

² *Epistula*, ch. 142 p. 258: 'Spiritus enim sanctus bona uoluntas est. Nec enim sine gradi scrupulo mentis, a quacumque professionis altitudine arcendus est, cui testis inhabitantis et trahentis Spiritus sancti bona uoluntas est.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 142, p. 57-58.

William does not spend a great deal of time considering the biblical foundation for his claims regarding the Holy Spirit's identity as will. While he occasionally recalls John 3:8 to demonstrate that, just as the wind blows wherever it so chooses, so too the Holy Spirit can engage whatever He wills, the implications that William draws from this are imaginative and various. Although it is ultimately the preordained choice of God whether or not a soul is saved, this choice relies on the worthiness of the individual. Forgiveness, and eventual salvation, will not be granted to those disposed toward evil. The alterations that the Holy Spirit makes to individual will facilitate will's transformation toward good. Analysis of William's writing across his texts makes evident the conclusion that he considers the Holy Spirit's guidance to will to be directly essential to the salvation of man.

In historiographical terms, William's distinct exploration of the will is largely overlooked. To the extent that William's treatment of will is examined, it is usually in the context of short articles, or tangential observations.³ E. Rozanne Elder, acknowledges William's fascination with will, arguing that the main purpose of William's *Golden Epistle*, is to propose that the liberation of will results in the liberation of reason.⁴ Elder makes an important point here: will's redemption of reason is a significant aspect of its spiritual importance, however she does not acknowledge the spiritual extent of will's consequence. In addition to liberating reason, liberated will leads to virtuous behaviour and heightened spiritual experience. While Elder concedes the intellectual aspect of will's importance for William, she does not acknowledge its full value within his spiritual reality. David Bell and Carmen A. Cvetkovic, both of whom wrote theses on the influence of Augustine on William's thought, come closer to the point. Cvetkovic highlights William's bold articulations of the Holy Spirit as Will and illustrates how this deviates from Augustine's more hesitant portrayal of that relationship.⁵ Cvetkovic indicates this

³ See for example: Robert Thomas, 'William of Saint-Thierry: Our Life in the Trinity,' *Monastic Studies* vol. 3, (1965), pp. 139-164. in which Thomas astutely observes that, according to William, will of the human mind represents the Holy Spirit in the *imago dei*, (pp. 143, 149, 162.) Also, Bernard McGinn's *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism*, vol. II: The Growth of Mysticism (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1994), in which he demonstrates William's understanding of the relationship between an individual's will and his similarity to God (p. 232.)

⁴ E Rozanne Elder, 'William of St. Thierry: Rational and Affective Spirituality,' in *The Spirituality of Western Christendom* ed. E. Rozanne Elder (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Studies, 1976) p. 101.

⁵ Carmen Angela Cvetkovic, *Seeking the Face of God: The Reception of Augustine in the Mystical Thought of Bernard of Clairvaux and William of St. Thierry* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), p. 143.

critical aspect of William's theology, but her purpose is to analyze William's use of Augustine rather than his departure from it, so she does not extensively consider William's theology of will on its own grounds. Similarly, Bell considers the relationship between will and grace in William's ideology, but his considerations are intrinsically linked to Augustine.⁶

In order to establish the degree to which William's development of this topic is distinct, it is important to consider how and to what extent he drew upon his sources in order to formulate his theory. It will be argued that William's representation of the Holy Spirit acting as Will and impacting will is essential to William's own understanding of the process of human salvation. While other theologians considered the implications of will for salvation, this discussion is largely limited to very specific concerns. William considers the Holy Spirit to actually embody Will of God, and William alone presents an explanation of how will relates to salvation.

In order to explore William's views of will's relationship with pneumatology and soteriology, the concept must be approached from a range of areas. First, will's role in the image of God should briefly be established. It must be sufficiently demonstrated that William did indeed consider Will to be a part of the Holy Spirit. Thereafter, the manner in which Spirit-Will affects the inferior will of man must be considered. With both of these fundamental aspects of the argument established, aspects of the self that pertain to will can be discussed. First, the will shall be considered as it relates to sin. This is the topic on which William's contemporaries contribute the most to his thought. Second, because of William's general emphasis on rational faith, the influence of rational intellect on the will shall be examined. The final section of this chapter will consider the relationship between will and mystical spirituality. Here, William's most original contribution to the topic of will can be found as it relates to the salvation of the individual.

⁶ Bell, David N., *The Image and Likeness: The Augustinian Spirituality of William of St. Thierry*, (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1984), pp. 103-131.

Likeness and Image of Will

The notion that human will has a role in salvation through the Holy Spirit hinges on a theme intrinsic to William's soteriology: the *imago dei*. William writes in *Nature* that immediately upon investing man with his soul, God places within it,

The power of memory so that he might always remember the powerfulness and goodness of the Creator. Immediately and without delay, memory of itself begets reason, then both memory and reason from themselves bring forth the will. Memory possesses and contains that to which it must strive. Reason—that it must strive; the will strives.⁷

William makes an immediate and clear connection of each of these aspects of the mind with the persons of the Trinity who are meant to govern them: 'God, therefore, the Father claims the memory for himself, the Son the reason, and the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from both, claims the will proceeding from both.'⁸ The mind is the seat of God's image in man. The contents of the mind, therefore, must reflect both the diversity and the oneness of that Triune God. The mind may be one, but it consists of, and is governed by, these chief aspects which each represent the workings of a person within the Trinity. Although William consistently describes the human mind as triune, with each aspect representing a part of the Holy Trinity, the aspects that make up that three are not always the same. In this passage, William articulates a strong example of the will as a representative of the Holy Spirit. This demonstrates the fact that William considers will to be one of the aspects of the image that God planted in man so that man might become like Him.

⁷ *Natura*, ch. 3, p. 180: extended Latin for context: 'Etenim cum *in faciem noui hominis spiraculum uitae*, spiritualem uim, id est intellectualem, quod sonat spiratio et spiriculum; et uitalem, id est animalem, quod sonat nomen uitae, infudit, et infundendo creauit; in eius quasi quadam arce uim memorialem collocauit, ut Creatoris semper potentiam et bonitatem memoraret. Statimque, et sine aliquo morae intersitio memoria de se genuit rationem, et memoria et ratio de se protulerunt uoluntatem. Memoria quipped habet et continet quo tendendum sit; ratio quod tendendum sit; ratio quod tendendum sit; uoluntas tendit.' English translation from: *Nature*, 3 p. 54.

⁸ *Natura*, ch. 3 p. 180: 'Ut ergo Deo inhaereret creata in homine rationalis anima, memoriam sibi uindicauit Pater, rationem Filius, uoluntatem ab utraque/procedentem ab utroque procedens Spiritus sanctus.' English translation from: *Nature*, 3 p. 55.

Holy Spirit is Will

William is clear in defining the Holy Spirit as the Will of the triune God. In *Meditations*, for example, he states ‘the Father and the Son have not two wills, but one, which is the Holy Spirit. Through the Holy Spirit, therefore, the Triune God reveals himself to any friend of God on whom he would bestow especial honour.’⁹ More succinctly, in *Romans*, William writes, ‘The Holy Spirit is the will of the Father and the Son.’¹⁰ Will is a function that is shared by the Father and Son, therefore it must naturally fall into the realm of all those things that proceed from both of them: the realm of the Holy Spirit. All acts of the will of God are enacted through the Holy Spirit. As a result, William’s purpose in according so much of his theory of salvation to the agency of the Holy Spirit-Will is evident: for man to be saved it must be God’s Will that they are saved. This is an unusual formulation.¹¹

William is never so audacious as to identify an identity of the Spirit without at least significant implication on the part of some pre-existing authority. That said, in the case of Will, William moved beyond those authorities in his line of reasoning. With

⁹ *Meditatiuae*, ch. III:6 p. 70: ‘Voluntas autem non alia est Patris, alia Filii, sed una et eadem, quae est Spiritus sanctus. Ergo per Spiritum sanctum alicui amico Dei quem nimis honorare uoluerit reuelat semetipsam Trinitas Deus.’ English translation from *Meditations*, 3:6 p. 105. See also: *Nature*, 3 p. 54.

¹⁰ *Romanos*, ch. XI, 36 p. 161: ‘Voluntas Patris et Filii Spiritus sanctus est.’ English translation from: *Romans*, 11:33-36 p. 223.

¹¹ While William is unusual in the extent to which he discussed the will of God as an attribute of the Holy Spirit, it is worth a quick consideration of how some of those contemporaries on which this thesis focuses described the Will of God. The description of the Will of God laid out by Hugh of St. Victor implies a binary in God’s desire. Hugh describes the unique and eternal desire of God as being distinct from, but involved with the signs of God’s will as acted out within the historical framework. The acts of his will are, therefore, to be considered as part of the Spirit’s impact on man, however the being of his desire must be examined here. God’s good desire, which is, of course, all of his desire, is eternal, consistent, and one. Hugh writes, ‘the will of God (*voluntas*), which refers to his good pleasure (*beneplicitum*), is one and simple because whatever he wills once he wills always; and what he does not will once he does not will ever, because his wishing (*velle*) never becomes not-willing and vice versa.’ (Hugh, *Sentences*, p. 149.) Although Hugh does not make any connection between this Will and the Holy Spirit, this is the Will that William would describe as being one of His attributes or identities. This Will is a consistent and eternal desire for those things which are just and good, and therefore, which are the things that bring pleasure to the benevolent creator. It is one of the very things by which divinity is defined. Along with Hugh, Peter Abelard is also bold enough to make claims regarding the Will of God. Towards the end of Peter’s controversial *Theology*, he intimates the dissonance between the notion of an all-powerful God and the conviction that sinful men act against some of His desires. He does not, however, seem to regard this as an insurmountable problem. God wills to reward good acts. If an individual does not act well, they are simply not rewarded in the manner in which God would like to reward those who behave piously. (Peter Abelard, *Theology*, p. 92.) If God wills something to the extent that it must be done, then this is an act both of necessity and of goodness. These desires are invariably acquiesced. (Abelard, *Theology*, p. 94.) Given that one of William’s most virulent complaints about Abelard related to his division of persons of the trinity, it is worth noting that Abelard at no point attributes the will to the Holy Spirit, and in fact, he regards it as one of the unifying essences which makes up the one substance of God. (Abelard, *Theology*, p. 70.)

the other two major identities of the Holy Spirit that William discusses, Love and Unity, the aspects that set William apart concern his program of spiritual ascent. While there is an existing tradition describing the Will of God in pneumatological terms, this tradition is narrow and can be traced almost exclusively to reiteration of Augustine. By the twelfth century, those few writers that do mention Will as an attribute of the Spirit are acknowledging Augustine more than they are expanding on a theological tradition. William, on the other hand, engages in a detailed and rich discussion of the Holy Spirit's identity as Will, and what it means both within the divine One, and for its effect on man.

Augustine is the most evident influence on William with regards to an association between the Holy Spirit and God's Will.¹² In his *De Trinitate*, Augustine makes several explicit connections between the Spirit and Will. He writes, 'if any person of the trinity is to be distinctively called the will of God, this name like charity fits the Holy Spirit more than the others.'¹³ Later, Augustine reiterates, 'As far as the Holy Spirit is concerned, the only thing I pointed to in this puzzle as seeming to be like him is our will.'¹⁴ These quotations, while they admittedly demonstrate a perceived connection between the Will and the Spirit, are low commitment in their scope. Both of these direct claims about the Spirit as Will come from the same book of *De Trinitate*, and are found toward the end of the manuscript. It was clearly not a concept that Augustine found particularly worthy of emphasis. Furthermore, neither of these quotations make the statement, as William does, that the Holy Spirit *is* the Will of God. Augustine, rather, emphasises that He is *like* the will, and that this can

¹² Another Patristic author who mentioned a willful identity to the Holy Spirit is St. Basil. In his treatise explaining and defending the Holy Spirit, Basil touches on the concept of will only briefly. Basil's treatise serves as a representative for many similar texts at the time, and it is likely that many of Basil's ideas would have been transmitted via other patristic authors with which William would have been readily familiar. Despite the fact that very little of this text addresses actual description of the workings and identity of the Spirit, Basil lists 'willing Spirit' as one of the proper names by which a believer might address the Holy Spirit. (Basil, *the Holy Spirit*, p. 42.) In describing the nature of the Spirit's independent yet unified role in the Trinity, Basil writes, 'the Lord serves in various capacities, but the Holy Spirit is also present of His own will, dispensing gifts to everyone according to each man's worth.' (Basil, *Spirit*, p. 61.) As Will, the Spirit chooses which individuals deserve visitation, grace, and the liberation of their own will. The concept that this benevolence is the responsibility of the Spirit within the Trinity to bestow is one that resonated with William. Whether or not he had access to this text the parallel is striking.

¹³ Augustine, *Trinitate*, ch. IV:20, lin, 36: 'sed uoluntas dei si et proprie dicenda est aliqua in trinitate persona, magis hoc nomen spiritui sancto competit.' English translation from: *Trinity*, XV:38 p. 430.

¹⁴ Augustine, *Trinitate*, ch, IV:21, lin, 22: 'de spiritu autem sancto nihil in hoc aenigmate quod et simile uideretur ostendi nisi uoluntatem nostram,' English translation from: *Trinity*, XV:41 p. 432.

only be claimed in so far as any person of the Trinity ought to be seen as representing it. Augustine depicts the relationship between the Spirit and the Will as metaphorical, whereas for William it is actual. William's discussion of the Spirit as Will sets him apart fundamentally from his most significant influences. William's characterization of the Holy Spirit as *embodying* rather than merely representing God's Will is striking. He is also decisive, in comparison to his less presumptuous contemporaries, in defining and exploring that Will

Although he is not as consistently pneumatological with regards to will as William, St. Bernard also makes some sporadic but specific connections between the Will and the Spirit. In *Sermon Eight* of his series on the Song of Songs, for example, he writes that without knowledge of the Spirit, no believer can claim to have knowledge of the Father nor the Son because, 'No man has a complete knowledge of another until he finds out whether his will be good or evil.'¹⁵ This draws a strong correlation between the Will and the Spirit, but Bernard falls short of applying the title of Will to the Spirit. These references are worth acknowledging, however they lack the prevalence or emphasis to constitute a significant aspect of Bernard's thinking, whereas for William pneumatological identities are at the forefront.

William is consistent in his identification of Will as one of the roles of the Holy Spirit across his monastic career. That said, one of his lengthiest descriptions of this role can be found in his late work, *The Mirror of Faith*, and this reflects both the line of argument that is coherent across he writing, and how that argument is manifested when it is mature. He writes,

The will of God...is God, for it is the Holy Spirit, who is the substantial will of God. This is the Will of God whereby God makes all that he wills, about whom it is written: Everything that the Lord willed he did. The same Holy Spirit, then, makes himself known to the person into whom he pours himself. The very Will of God makes himself known to the person in whom it is

¹⁵ Bernard, *Sermones Cantica*, sermo: 8:4 p. 38: 'sed uni Pater et Filius perfecte agnoscitur, utriusque bonitas, quae Spiritus Sanctus est, quomodo ignoratur? Neque enim integre homo homini innotescit, quamdiu latet utrumnam bonae an malae sit voluntatis.' English translation from: *Song I*, p 47.

accomplished...only the person who does this [will] can be a partaker of His sweetness and only willing what God wills.¹⁶

Primarily, this passage serves to demonstrate categorically that the Holy Spirit is Will. This Will is divine both because it is a faculty of God which reflects the desire of God, and because it *is* God, because it is a part of the Spirit. This passage also establishes the importance of the Will to humanity. Not only is God's Will important simply as an attribute of Himself, but it is also a model for how man's will should be oriented. The Holy Spirit in William's description is both an inspiration to will and Will itself.

When the Holy Spirit affects man's will this is in itself an act of Will. The Spirit as Will is willing to rescue the individual's human will from its soiled state and restore it to something more akin to Himself. William highlights and expands upon John 3:8: 'The Spirit breaths where he wills and you hear his voice...it is the Spirit who gives life; the flesh, however, does not profit anyone. For the one and the same Spirit does all this as he wills.'¹⁷ What William is describing in this passage is a saving act. The Spirit salvages the tainted human form from its flesh and restores its spirit. This is done under the identity of Will because the Spirit is enacting the Will of God by choosing to liberate the individual. He does so entirely as a result of His own motivation. He chooses, He desires, and resultantly, He saves. The individual salvation of a man is, in William's understanding, intrinsically intertwined with the Spirit's identity as the Will of God.

¹⁶ *Speculum*, ch. 61 p. 128: Latin quotation in full: 'occultum enim voluntatis Dei, et altissimum est, et omnium sacramentorum sacramentum, quod notum facit secundum bonum placitum suum, quibus vult et sicut vult; quod sicut divinum est, sic modo quodam divino revelat ei qui donate ipso dingu est. Quin potius non divinum, sed Deus est; quia ipse est Spiritus Sanctus qui substantialis Dei voluntas est. Haec enim est voluntats Dei qua facit Omnia quae vult Deus; de quo scriptum est: *Omnia quaecumque voluit Dominus fecit*. Ipse ergo Spiritus Sanctus ei cui se infundit, ipsa Dei voluntas ei in quo fit innotescit; nec innotescit alibi quam ubi est. Nam et si a claritate luminis et veritatis eius abscondere se non potest oculus humanae rationis, non tamen nisi qui eam facit, et in quo fit, volendo scilicet quod vult Deus, particeps potest esse eius suavitatis.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 19 p. 48.

¹⁷ *Speculum*, ch. 60 p. 126: 'Spiritus ubi vult spirat, et vocem eius audis, et nescis unde veniat aut quo vadat. Sic est omnis, qui natus est ex spiritu.' translation from: *Mirror*, 19 p. 46.

Human Will and Divine Will in Man

According to William's understanding, the will is the first of a progression of ways in which the Spirit chooses to impact the soul of man. Within his identity as Will, the Holy Spirit enters man's will, and while still maintaining man's freedom of choice, He imparts onto man an awareness and an openness to those things that God wills. As William writes in *Nature*, 'When grace anticipates and contemplates, [the will] begins to cleave by its good assent to the Holy Spirit who is the Love and the Will of the Father and Son.'¹⁸ In the spiritual transformation of the believer, this appropriation of the human will is one of the first steps in the transition towards similitude to God. Although free will is still present and intact, the influence of the Holy Spirit works to enact improvements within that freedom.

William is careful not to stratify excessively the Oneness of the Trinity, and to that end he is very careful in his description of why it is the Holy Spirit whose relationship to man's will is so essential. William writes that the believer does not come naturally to belief in Son, but rather that he comes because the Father draws man to Himself. This is accomplished in the believer 'by creating in him and inspiring in him a free will whereby he may freely choose that which he chooses; this is so that what he chooses rightly may be of his own will.'¹⁹ On first reading, this quotation seems to imply that it is God the Father, and not the Holy Spirit, that serves as the guiding force for will. If the text itself is considered plainly, however, the only thing that is actually asserted here is that the Father bestowed free will at creation so that man would have the *ability* to choose to be faithful to the Son. If God had simply created man with an inherent faithfulness that choice would not be his own, and would therefore have very little spiritual value.²⁰ Repeatedly, William emphasizes

¹⁸ *Natura*, ch. 4 p. 180: 'Quae cum, praeueniente et cooperante gratia ipsi Spiritui sancto, qui Patris et Filii amor est uoluntas, bono sui assensu incipit inhaerere, uehementer incipit uelle quod Deus uult, et quod uolendum memoria suggerit et ratio, et uehementer uolendo amor efficitur.' English translation from: *Nature*, 4 p. 56.

¹⁹ *Speculum*, ch. 17 p. 80: 'Utique creando in eo, et inspirando ei liberam uoluntatem, qua libere uult id quod uult; hoc est ut uoluntatis eius sit quod bene uult.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 5 p. 17.

²⁰ Although, as was seen in the section on free will and grace in the introduction, William considered the *implications* of free will as it relates to the influence of God, the reasoning behind God's choice to make man's will free is not something that William considered to any extent. William is not in the habit of questioning God's logic, however, Hugh of St. Victor considered the logic behind God's choice to bestow free will on humanity. As a result of the consistency of God's wilful desire: the first guise of divine Will, this aspect does not pertain to symbols and signs that have taken place historically and scripturally to help enlighten man as to God's will. Therefore, the second portion of God's will is the representations and manifestations of his desires in the existing order. Hugh lists

that the virtues that are inborn have very little leverage on God's evaluation of the individual; it is the extraordinary and voluntary virtues that the creator values in the economy of salvation. By giving the gift of will, God allowed for the risk of further sin, but he also implanted the ability for goodness by self-motivation. The Father *gives* the will here, but it is the role of the spirit to *guide* it.

Several lines after his discussion of the Father, William writes that,

Spiritual birth and spiritual increase is a matter of will. In this the will is the child of grace. Grace begets this child, grace nurses, grace nourishes and carries this child along and leads the child all the way to perfection.²¹

So, although the creation of will is the work of the Father, and the destination of will, in the sense of the previous quotation, is the Son, it remains the work of the Spirit to actually tend to the will along this path. The grace of the Spirit is what guides the believer to perfection. In *Nature*, William writes more concisely, will becomes 'filled with good when it is helped by grace.'²² Human goodness is rooted in grace: the gift of the Holy Spirit. Its ability is natural, but its propensity is from the Spirit. The Spirit's impact on will, therefore, is crucial in leading the individual towards that holy aspiration. Although will's origin in the soul comes from the father at man's creation, after inception it remains the jurisdiction of the Holy Spirit.

these as the following: 'operation, permission, precept, and prohibition.' (Hugh, *Sentences*, p. 153.) Hugh explains that the first two, operation and permission, constitute the primary expressions of God's will, because they imply action and allowance. It is through these expressions of God's desires that man's free will is allowed to interact with God's. When God permits an action, he expresses to man that it is something that His will condones; it then is left to the will of the believer to consummate that permissive will with actions of his own. (Hugh, *Sentences*, p. 153.) The second two signs, precept and prohibition, are more subtle. They require the analysis of a rational mind and are, therefore, reserved for individuals that are willing to apply their reason to deciphering God's intentions. (Hugh, *Sentences*, p. 153.) The four-fold second meaning of Hugh's two-fold divine will is reliant on interaction within the created order. Whereas the first form of will was autonomous within God, this second will is created and expressed through its influence on the mundane. The first form of will that Hugh described lines up reasonably well with William's description of the Holy Spirit as God's will, as was seen in the previous section. This second description of divine Will that Hugh provides can similarly be related to William's understanding of how the Holy Spirit working within human will. While these concepts of deific Will do align, however, for William it is explicitly the realm of the Holy Spirit. Hugh makes no such claims and his dissection of will is entirely devoid of pneumatological rumination.

²¹ *Speculum*, ch. 21 p. 84: 'Spiritualis vero nativitas et incrementa spiritualia voluntatis sunt. Voluntas vero, in hoc, filia gratiae est. Gratia eam generat; gratia lactat; gratia nutrit ac provehit, et ad perfectum esque perducit.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 7 p. 20.

²² *Natura*, ch. 4, p. 180: 'bono replendus, cum adiuuatur a gratia; malo, cum sibi dismissus, deficit in semetipso.' English translation from: *Nature*, 4 p. 56.

William explains that the Spirit reveals goodness and truth within the faculty of will and, once an individual has been shown by the Spirit what it is that God wills, his soul will choose to will the same thing, because what God wills is the epitome good.²³ In his *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, William offers up a prayer for this intervention of the will:

O God, you who are charity, Holy Spirit, Love of the Father and the Son, and substantial Will, dwell within us and set us in order that your will may be done in us. May your will become our will, that being ready to do the will of the Lord our God, we may find his law and his order in the midst of our heart.²⁴

William establishes that it is not within the independent ability of man to know what God wills. However, when the Holy Spirit chooses to infiltrate the soul in the guise of Will, this allows man to begin his spiritual journey towards salvation, by willing what God wills, man takes the first step to become like Him.

As with the Spirit's identity as Will, Augustine is the most well written of William's sources on the topic of the Holy Spirit's impact on man's will. It has been established that William's understanding of the human will relies on his belief that the will is one of the representatives of the Holy Spirit in the image of God held within the created mind. William draws his understanding that the image is made up of micro-trinities within the human mind largely from Augustine. Trinitarian explanations of the *imago Dei* are a frequently recycled theme in Augustine's writing, and indeed, he changes which aspects of the mind constitute that trinity even within the same texts. In many cases, however, he defines these three as memory, reason, and will.²⁵

²³ In theory, the freedom of man's will means that he retains the *ability* to reject God's Will, however, no man who has reached this spiritual level actually would. The man that reaches the height of being revealed God's Will would absolutely make the choice of following it. Although the ability exists the possibility does not. See the introductory section on grace and free will for more on this topic.

²⁴ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. XXVI, 127 p. 90: 'O caritas Deus, sancta Spiritus, amor Patris ac Filii, et substantialis uoluntas, habita in nobis, et ordina nos, ut fiat uoluntas tua in nobis. Voluntas tua fiat uoluntas nostra ut facturi uoluntatem domini Dei nostri, legem ordinemque eius inueniamus in medio cordis nostri.' English translation from: *Exposition Song*, 131 p.104.

²⁵ Augustine, *Trinity*, IV:30, XII:25, XIII:26, X:17-18, XIV:8, XIV:10. In his *Confessions*, Augustine describes a similar image of the Trinity: to be, know, and will, these are the three indivisible aspects within the mind, which is of a single essence. (Augustine, *Confessions*, p. 275.) Augustine himself my

According to this designation, the will of man mirrors the role of the Spirit: man's will is made in the Spirit's image. The trinity of the mind that William later imitated in his own texts finds its origins in this Augustinian division. It is in these human triune divisions that Augustine makes the most explicit statements of the relationship between will and salvation.²⁶

The most direct and explicit of Augustine's assertions that the Holy Spirit guides human will is found, aptly, in his *Admonition of Grace*. Here, Augustine writes that, although the road towards God is difficult to traverse, God's chosen ones are able to continue because, 'their will is so roused by the Holy Spirit that they are able to persevere, because they will to do so; and they will to do so because God effects this will.'²⁷ This text is somewhat obscure, but it provides an incontrovertible statement on Augustine's part of the direct impact of the Holy Spirit on the will of man, and furthermore of that impact on man's ability to seek God.²⁸ William develops these Augustinian tropes further, and is perspicuous in his claim that the Spirit elevates man's will.

Although William clearly derived significant inspiration from Augustine in attributing the Will to the Holy Spirit, outside of his text on *Grace* even Augustine is hesitant to definitively apply that appellation. Whereas Augustine and William's contemporaries seem more comfortable working in metaphor, William's writing is

be drawing on older authority: the first reference to the mind being made up of memory, intelligence, and will is from Cicero. (Ayres, 'Eatin,' p. 54.)

²⁶ For example: Augustine, *Trinity*, IV:30, X:17, X:18, XIV:8.

²⁷ St. Augustine of Hippo, *De corruptione et gratia*, Patrologia Latina, 44, 915-946, p. 939: 'tantum quipped spiritu sancto accenditur uoluntas eorum, ut ideo possint, quia sic uolunt; ideo sic uelint, quia dues operatur ut uelint.' English translation from: 'Admonition of Grace,' in *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation Volume 2* trans. John Courtney Murray ed. Joseph Defarrari (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1966), p. 291.

²⁸ Ambrose of Milan was, perhaps, more effusive on this topic than his student, Augustine. Despite being Augustine's inspiration, the student frequently overshadows the master in this case. In the text in which he comes closest to writing a commentary on the Song of Songs, *Isaac or the Soul*, Ambrose writes that conformity in will is one of the ways in which the bride can become closer to unification with her bridegroom. Although Ambrose does not make the connection between the will and the Spirit, this emphasis on will as a catalyst for unity is relevant to the discussion. William's ultimate goal is unifying with the deity, and this process is intrinsically pneumatological for him, so Ambrose's employment of will in this context would have been of interest to him. Although Ambrose's unity is Christologically based, it is still an interesting comparison and could certainly have been a source for William in his consideration of will, especially given William's wide spread familiarity with Song of Songs texts. (St. Ambrose of Milan, 'Isaac, or the Soul,' in *Seven Exegetical Works* trans. Michael P. McHugh (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1972), p. 42.)

absolute. This is, perhaps, the result of his quest to intimately *know* God. He writes of metaphorical trinities,

This sort of understanding makes neither division on conjunction in the Trinity. but, when and how and as far as the Holy Spirit wills, it controls the believing mind, so that something of what you are may be seen by those who in their prayer and contemplation have got past all that you are not, although they do not see you as you are.²⁹

William does not reject metaphorical divisions of the trinity as a teaching tool. In order to understand the divine, however, William does not see these devices as sufficient. To know God, to the extent that it is possible while still in carnal form, man must seek Him spiritually. Awareness of the divine comes, therefore, not from metaphorical teachings, but from ardently willing and seeking so to do.

Despite his depiction of human will before the intervention of the Spirit as being tainted, William does express limited trust in the power of human will, and this may have been a result of his penchant for Origen. Origen's descriptions of human will tend to focus on its ability to help man enact rational judgement, rather than its lascivious applications. Origen generally reflects on will as a tool with which humanity can enact self-improvement. That said, even Origen, albeit briefly, admits that in order to appropriately orient human will, some divine influence is necessary. Origen, with seeming reluctance, agrees with Paul's sentiment in Philippians that, in Origen's words;

The will of man is not by itself sufficient to the accomplishment of salvation...unless this good will of ours and our ready purpose and whatever industry we may possess is both helped and strengthened by the divine assistance.³⁰

²⁹ *Meditativae*, ch. 24 pp. 74-76: 'Haec in Trinitate sancta nil diuidit, nil compingit, sed sensum fidelem sic quando et quantum et quomodo uult Spiritus sanctus perstringit, ut orantes te uel contemplantes supergressi nunnunquam omne quod tu non es, per hoc ipsum quod tu non es, uideant aliquatenus te qui es.' English translation from: *Meditation*, 3:11, p. 108.

³⁰ Origen, *Principiis*, full Latin quotation ch. III:19 p. 232: 'Ita ergo et apostolus dixisse intellegendus est: quoniam non sufficit ad perficiendam salutem sola voluntas humana, nec idoneus est mortalis cursus ad consequenda caelestia et ad capiendam 'palmam supernae uocationis dei in Christo Iesu',

Origen upholds the general tradition that it is God who must give aid to human will, however, he admits far less assistance than William later would. Whereas William makes it clear that it is only through the enlightenment of the Spirit that human will can be elevated, Origen only concedes to some ambiguous assistance. More significantly still, Origen does not specify the Holy Spirit under any name or grace as the Person or process through which this help is delivered. William, while sharing both the centrality of human will and the belief in the provision of divine aid to will, departs quite starkly from Origen's judicious requirement of the deity.

Ultimately, the most important reason that God could choose to grant free will to His creation is so that the creation could endeavour to become worthy of salvation. William emphasises that the ascent to God, which is the ascent to salvation, must be initiated through a transformation of will. He writes that, within the soul, each man possesses an internal staircase by which he may ascend toward God. This staircase is built on the power of man's own will, and fortified by the support of the Will of God. In his Twelfth Meditation, William lists these steps as the climb: 'first, a great will is needed, then an enlightened will, and thirdly, a will upon which love has laid its hand.'³¹ William goes on to emphasise that man's will possesses a natural resilience through its creation, but that through the Gift of the Spirit, will can be enlightened and elevated so that it can form a foundation from which to strive toward a higher form of self.³² Man's created will acts the foundation and man's Spiritually elevated will forms the echelons of a stronghold from which worthiness of salvation can be sought.

nisi haec ipsa bona voluntas nostra promptum que propositum et quaecumque illa in nobis potest esse industria, divino vel iuuetur vel muniatur auxilio.' English translation from: *Principles*, p. 256. It is worth noting that, although this quotation comes from Rufinus's Latin and is, therefore, the phrasing with which William would have been familiar, the Greek text commits even less to the involvement of God.

³¹ *Meditatiuae*, ch 16 p. 200: 'Primum necessaria uidetur uoluntas magna, deinde illuminate, deinde affecta.' English translation from: *Meditations*, 10 p. 173. It shall be demonstrated that both Love and Will are identities of the Holy Spirit.

³² Although he is not one of the major influences to be considered in this thesis, Boethius is worth mentioning on this issue. Boethius in *The Consolation of Philosophy*, implies that free will is one of the manners in which man is able to take personal responsibility for his own redemption. He argues that without the faculty of will, man would not possess self-control, which would cause God to be culpable for man's sins. Such a proposal is, of course, unthinkable. By giving man will, God gave him the power to determine his own worthiness. (Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy*, trans. P. G. Walsh (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), pp. 102-103). Boethius does not implicate the Holy Spirit in this understanding of will, does imply a direct connection between the improvement of will that the salvation of the individual.

William expands his notion of the helplessness of man without the Spirit when he discusses spiritual preordination. He writes that preordination dictates the individuals to whom the Holy Spirit bestows grace, and that for those lucky chosen, grace acts as a constant arbiter of goodness. These individuals will ultimately triumph in their own inner struggle against ill will, because in receiving the gift from the Spirit, they were given the strength and the penchant to struggle against their poorer judgement and to persevere on the path to willing God. Although these people may turn away from the good path from time to time, grace always calls them back. This is particularly pertinent to will, because, William says, ‘Grace accomplishes good in us so we may will; it cooperates with us when we do will; and without it we can neither will nor accomplish any good.’³³ Both good desires, and good actions rely on the grace of the Spirit in order for them to be made possible. Once again, William is making a clear and direct assertion that goodness in man, the thing by which he brings himself closer to salvation, is reliant on grace for its potentiality. This goodness is dependent upon the desire to do good, and that desire must be both incepted and built up by the Spirit’s attentive support.

As with all developments in William’s theology of salvation, human will has to go through a hierarchy of stages before it becomes an asset in the pursuit of salvation. Some of these stages William illustrates instructionally, so that the believer can improve his own self-worth and help himself climb towards worthiness in the eyes of God. The pivotal step in the salvation of the will is, however, the liberation granted by the Holy Spirit. William writes of the rational man whose will has been improved,

His good will is transformed into good intelligence, and the desire with which he has even tending Godward is replaced by understanding and love; for now

³³ *Romanos*, praefatio, p. 3-4 full quotation: ‘Gratia enim priusquam essemus, cum nichil essemus, nos praedestinavit; auersos uocavit; conuersos iustificavit; iustificatos si ingrati non fuerimus, glorificabit. Ipsa bonum operatur in nobis uelimus, cooperatur cum uolumus, sine qua nil boni uel uelle uel perficere ualemus. Sicut enim ex nullis subsistentibus a Deo creati sumus, ut aliquid simus in eius creature, sic a gratia ex nullis meritis *creati sumus in operibus bonis.*’ English translation from: *Romans*, pref. p. 16.

he sees, now he has fruition of God. The Holy Spirit helps this man's infirmity.³⁴

The process is clearly a multifaceted one: in part it is intellectual, in part spiritual, but the most essential part is Gifted by the Divine. William stands firmly outside of the tradition with regards to his specific understanding of the liberation of will. His explanation relies on hard work on the part of the individual, but relies more importantly on momentous and relentless participation from the Holy Spirit. This distinct combination of qualities that William so clearly demands and articulates proves his theology on the topic wholly original. It is nonetheless simple: the Spirit *is* Will, and the Spirit saves will.

Will and Sin

William sees ill will, the will that leads towards sinful behaviour, as a part of man's punishment for the fall. However, it is a punishment that can be overcome with the help of the Spirit. William writes that man's soul was created with a natural ability to discern good, but that tainted will often leads man's judgement to be clouded or overruled.³⁵ William writes that the soul,

Lost its freedom to will and to act. For as a punishment for sin and as evidence of the natural dignity it lost, the power of choice was left to it, although captive, as a sign. This is even before the conversion and liberation of the will it can never wholly lose by any perversion of the will.³⁶

The only way to liberate man from his own sinful desires, therefore, is through interaction with the Holy Spirit that leads man to reorient his will back toward those things which he naturally perceives as good.

³⁴ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. III, 16 p. 26: 'uoluntas bona transeat in mentem bonam, desiderium tendentis in intellectum uidentis uel amorem fruentis. Cumque adiuuante Spiritu sancto infirmitatem hominis,' English translation from: *Song*, 19 p.14

³⁵ *Epistle*, 199 p. 79.

³⁶ *Epistula*, ch. 200, pp. 270-271: 'positum est ei in signum arbitrium, sed captiuum; quod etiam ante conuersionem et liberationem uoluntatis numquam perdere potest ex toto ulla auersione ipsius uoluntatis.' English translation from: William, *Epistle*, 200 p. 80.

William continues in *The Epistle* from describing will's post-lapsarian state, to draw an explicit correlation between the redemption of human will and the Holy Spirit. He writes that man's will is finally 'set free...when the charity of God is poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit who is given to us.'³⁷ Once this has happened, human judgement, the good judgement that was natural to man's creation, is finally unfettered by the tainted carnal will, and it takes over as the navigator of the man's will and choice: 'then it becomes it's own master, that is, it makes free use of itself; it becomes spirit and a good spirit.'³⁸ It is distinctly the person of the Spirit that liberates man's will. While man may have the natural gift of good judgement, he is unable to exercise it until the Spirit has allowed him to do so. All rejection of sin in man is a result of the gift of the Spirit.

Out of the five primary characteristics of will that this chapter identifies as central to William's pneumatology of salvation, will's relationship to sin is the theme that received the most attention from his contemporaries and influences. This section of this chapter, therefore, contains the most significant contribution from other theologians that might have influenced William. Despite the myriad of voices in agreement with William on the topic of will, sin, and grace, his theology remains distinct from the others with regards to both his compromising attitude toward individual human will, and his overriding reliance on the Holy Spirit.

Will and sin are naturally intertwined as topics. While man's will provides his ability to choose good behaviour, the freedom of that will renders him equally capable of ill will and sinful action. As a result of humanity's post-lapsarian pollution, an individual's will is more likely to engender impious, gluttonous impulses. If that will is cleansed, however, it can be reoriented toward good things, which it naturally desired before the fall. William attests that clean will can help an individual to make upright choices that bring him closer to behaviour that is worthy of salvation and that this cleanse takes place as a result of the Holy Spirit. Sin tempts the already tainted will, but Spiritually strengthened will leads away from sin. Will's freedom is,

³⁷ *Epistula*, ch. 201 p. 271: 'liberatur uero uoluntas quando efficitur caritas, cum caritas Dei diffunditur in cordibus nostris per Spiritum sanctum datur nobis.' This is a reference to Romans 5:5. English translation from: *Epistle*, 201 p. 80.

³⁸ *Epistula*, ch. 201 p. 271: 'hoc est seipso libere utens, efficitur et fit animus et bonus animus.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 201 p. 80.

therefore, inherently intertwined with its sinfulness. Nonetheless, historically theological definitions of freedom are not consistent.

As established in the section on vocabulary, Anselm of Canterbury had a very carefully defined understanding of 'freedom' within the context of will. William and Anselm's differing understandings of what it means for a will to be free probably influenced the two thinkers' interpretations of the origin of sin.³⁹ For William, human will has been sinful since the fall, the will is imperfect, easily swayed, and inclined toward sinfulness. Although Anselm is clear that once the will has abandoned its freedom of rectitude it can only be returned by grace, he does not specify the fall as the origin of that sin. He instead focuses his attention on adducing the maintained presence of freedom of will even in its sinful state. Although sin may not be an action of the free part of will, and sin may remove will's goodness, nothing can take away the will's inherent inborn potential for goodness, which is its freedom. In Anselm's own words,

Just as, even when the sun is absent, we have in us the sight whereby we see it when it is present, so too when the rectitude of will is lacking to us, we still have in us the aptitude to understand and will whereby we can preserve it for its own sake when we have it.⁴⁰

Anselm establishes that the ability for good is preserved even when good behaviour is not. William's understanding of sin is reconcilable with Anselm's to this point. Both men concede a potential good that is within the will, and both men look to an outside source to inspire the use of that goodness. However, William alone emphasises the Holy Spirit as that source.

It is evident that William drew on Anselm in determining the nature of will, however, it is equally evident that he deviates significantly from his source. William's commentary on *Romans*, for example, shows strong evidence for

³⁹ By way of reminder: Anselm argues that only good will is free because God's will is good, but will that is free to sin leads to the slavery of hell.

⁴⁰ Anselm, *Arbitrii*, ch. 14, p. 224: 'Sicut enim, etiam quando sol abest, habemus in nobis visum quo illum videmus cum adest: sic etiam, quando rectitudo voluntatis nobis deest, habemus tamen in nobis aptitudinem intelligendi et volendi, qua eam possumus servare propter se cum eam habemus.' English translation from: *Choice*, p. 210.

Anselm's influence, then deviates from Anselmian conclusions. William writes of man's will, 'This will, which is free in evil things because it delights in them, is therefore not free in good things because it is not freed.'⁴¹ This seems to follow Anselm's line of argument that human will should not be considered free will while it is free to sin. However, unlike Anselm, rather than focussing on the imprisonment of will that leads to entrapment and damnation, William writes that the will is not free in that its capacity for good is limited. Human will is free, he explains, in that it is free to follow its sinful desires, as those are the things that come naturally to it. While William seems to be taking some influence from Anselm in that he rejects the definition of human will as 'free,' his argument as to what its limitations are differs.

A more critical divergence from Anselm's understanding of sinful will can be found several lines later in the same section of William's *Romans* commentary. Whereas Anselm emphasises the propensity for good will that exists within the sin-bound will of man, William's focus is on the process by which that will is made good. He accentuates will not as a faculty that is inherently not-free, but rather as one that has not been freed. The ability to will good must be unlocked in man by an external and divine emancipator. For William, this must naturally be the Holy Spirit. He writes that the will is made free only through the sanctification of Charity: 'we have it through the Holy Spirit who is given to us.'⁴² Although Anselm may implicitly present divine revelation as the source of man's will's eventual liberation, he makes no claims or implications about the person of the Spirit being the agent of this freedom. While William probably derived Anselmian influence for his foundational depiction of fettered human will, this affirmation of the Spirit's essential role as saviour of will is entirely his own. This provides greater evidence for the pattern in William's work in which he develops accepted themes from the greater tradition, and then inserts pneumatological solutions.

Man's inherent freedom to choose between his good will and his sinful desire defines the experience of human will as it is before visitation of the Spirit. Even after the will has been transformed and improved, so long as a man remains alive, the lecherous

⁴¹ *Romanos*, ch. VI, 21-22 p. 89: 'Sed haec uoluntas quae libera est in malis, quia delectatur malis, ideo libera in bonis non est, quia liberate non est.' English translation from: *Romans*, 6:21-22 p. 125.

⁴² *Romanos*, ch. VI, 21-22 p. 89: 'habemus per Spiritum sanctum, qui datus est nobis.' English translation from: *Romans*, 6:21-22 p. 125.

desires of his carnal entrapments cause his will to be applied sinfully. As William confesses through the character of the *Song of Songs*' bride: 'my will is ever the same, but until my good will becomes equivalent to a good soul, my desire is incessant.'⁴³ To turn away from sinful desires, and to realize holy desires is a goal of monastic life. Through this process salvation is made attainable, as it is a process that relies heavily on the transformation of will as caused by revelation of the Will.

This struggle with desire that William describes is one with which his contemporary, Peter Abelard, was readily familiar.⁴⁴ Whereas William has a very stern approach to the morality of one's will, Abelard's morality of will is situational. Abelard begins the prologue of *Scito te ipsum* with the statement, 'In the study of morals we deal with the defects or qualities of the mind which dispose us to bad or good actions.'⁴⁵ Abelard is establishing will as cause of ethical and unethical behaviour. Will and morality are entangled in Abelard's understanding of ethics and this fits well with William's thinking. William seeks consistently to encourage good will, and the desire of godly things. His emphasis on the will as a prerequisite for salvation relies on the assumption that the will implied is morally correct, and is seeking to turn away from carnal desires.

Abelard's understanding of the goodness of will relies on an apparent moral relativity.⁴⁶ He writes in *Collationes*, 'actions are not judged to be good or evil except according to the root of intention.'⁴⁷ In Abelard's view, the culpability of the sinner relies entirely on the intention of his will rather than the action. He explains that the same behaviour may be undertaken by a good, an evil, or a neutral man

⁴³ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. XI, 57 p. 48: 'Eiusdem enim semper sum uoluntatis; sed donec bona uoluntas bona mens fiat, semper desidero.' English translation from: *Song*, 60 p. 48.

⁴⁴ His famous struggles with Heloise and sexuality as outlined in his autobiographical *Historia Calamitatum* are evidence of this.

⁴⁵ Abelard, *Scito*, ch. 1:1 p. 1: 'Mores dicimus animi uicia uel uirtutes, quae nos ad bona uel mala opera pronos efficiunt.' English translation from: *Ethics*, p. 15.

⁴⁶ He insists that it is impossible for a weak human to exist without desire of some kind. It is for this reason that scripture instructs man to work against his sinful desires rather than to eradicate them. (See *Ethics*, pp. 23-25) It is by resisting carnal urges that man is able to remain exempt from sin, despite having desired to sin. Similarly, there are some rare examples of an individual sinning accidentally and through no fault of his or her own, such as cases in which the enactor of the sin has been deceived or physically overpowered. Through these examples, Abelard demonstrates the manner in which the justness of a will can differ from the actual sinfulness of he who wills.

⁴⁷ Abelard, *Collationes* ch. 205, p. 206: 'Non enim actiones bone uel male nisi secundum intentionis radicem iudicantur, sed omnes ex se indifferentes sunt.' English from same volume, p. 207.

depending on the circumstances, requirements, and intentions at the time. Therefore, he concludes, specific actions must not have intrinsic moral values.

The value and integrity of an act must, in Abelard's ethical understanding, be variable to its circumstances. This sort of lenience and lack of consistency was problematic to William. That being said, the advocacy of good intent was something the two men shared. William insisted that to seek God was the most important goal. Penance and prayer were a part of this journey, but, to William, the acts associated with piety were of no importance if the intention was not purely devotional. William criticized monks who sought glory through the outward signs of humility while secretly taking pride in their suffering.⁴⁸ To that end, William and Abelard do share a heightened esteem for intention within their analyses of will and wilful action, but Abelard is more freely forgiving in cases in which William would be reticent.

In *Collationes*, Abelard makes the claim that even if a man's will matches God's exactly that will still has the potential to be proven immoral. Goodness, writes Abelard, hinges completely on intent. In order to emphasize the way in which the morality of desire can be circumstantial, Abelard employs the unique example of Judas. While God willed for Christ to be betrayed so that he could be given the opportunity to make his sacrifice, his purpose in this desire was the redemption of the human race. Judas, like God, willed to betray Christ, but his will to do so was inspired by silver, not love. While the unalterable goodness of God's will remains intact, the same desire can be made immoral if the intent is corrupt.⁴⁹ William is never so controversial as to call into question the morality of God's will. While William does prioritize intent in judging the goodness of desire, he does so with caution and never reaches to the same theoretical extremes as Abelard does in considering situations in which God's will might be matched but immoral. Abelard's

⁴⁸ See for example: *Mirror*, 8 p. 21.

⁴⁹ See: Abelard, *Collationes*, ch. 215, pp. 212-214: 'quia scilicet faciunt quod Deus uult fieri, aut ideo bonam habent uoluntatem, quia uolunt id quod Deus? Not uitique! Etsi enim faciunt uel facere uelint quod Deus uult fieri, non ideo tamen id faciunt uel facere uolunt quia credunt Deum uelle id fieri, nec eadem intentio est in eodem facto illorum que Dei, et quamquam id uolunt quod Deus, eademque illorum et Dei uoluntas in eo dici posit quod idem uolunt, mala tamen eorum uoluntas est et bona Dei, cum id scilicet diuersis de causis uelint fieri.' English from same volume. It should be noted that the translator points out some variations in manuscript, however this form of the quotation seems the most accurate.

radical relativism and his complete omission of the Holy Spirit couple to make his understanding of will distant from William's, despite some shared concerns.

The moral relativism that Abelard espouses and William flirts with is shared with Hugh of St. Victor. Like William, Hugh of St. Victor views situational forgiveness or sinlessness as possible, to a very limited degree, through grace.⁵⁰ Hugh implies that it is the *actions* of the believer that grace guides, while the will itself is already endowed with good intentions:

Since the counsel of man is weak and ineffective without divine aid, arouse yourself to prayer and ask and help of him without whom you can accomplish no good thing, so that by his grace, which, going before you has enlightened you, he may guide your feet, as you follow, onto the road of peace; and so that he may bring that which as yet is in your will alone, to concrete effect in good performance.⁵¹

There is a distinct discrepancy between good will and good acts. In Hugh's understanding, rather than needing his will adjusted, the endeavouring soul needs grace's support to help bend his actions to match his will. Monastic expressions of the struggle between conscience and behaviour are common, conscience is often seen as the seat of the divine in man. Hugh seems to meld this conception of conscience with the notion of will, and therefore works from the premise of will's goodness. Whereas for William, grace adjusts will, for Hugh, grace helps will to accomplish what it intended from the start.

⁵⁰ When using evidence from the *Didascalicon*, it is worth remembering that it was written as a teaching tool for scholastically inclined monks. That being said, its line of arguing, as is natural to the context in which the author lived, is religiously derived. Perhaps Hugh describes the will as seeking goodness and the divine because his audience is drawn from people who have joined the monastic order and dedicated themselves to learning, and therefore have an established desire for God. This does not, however, detract from the fact that this view is a considerable diversion from William's, especially because William would have described his audience similarly. Their disparity in monastic orders does not override the fact that they were both writing for the learned and religious elite.

⁵¹ Hugh, *Didascalicon*, ch. 5 p. 110: 'rursus, quoniam consilium hominis sine diuino auxilio infirmum est et inefficax, ad orationem erigere, et eius adiutorium pete, sine quo nullum potes facere bonum, ut uidelicet ipsius gratia, que preueniendo te illuminauit, subsequendo etiam pedes tuos dirigat in uiam pacis, et quod in sola adhuc uoluntate est ad effectum perducatur bone operationis. deinde restat tibi, ut ad bonum opus accingaris, ut quod orando petis operando accipere merearis.' English translation from: *Didascalicon*, p. 132.

William's position on the matter of will and grace differs significantly from Hugh's. In *Romans*, William writes, 'you willed but, perhaps, could not carry out your will; he will take not of you as though you did what you willed.'⁵² This implies two important points. The notion that will possess greater integrity than behaviour demonstrates that William acknowledges that a person is capable of good will even if that person is acting poorly. In William's theological order, however, it must be implied that this will has already been freed by the Holy Spirit from its carnal tendencies if it is turning itself toward higher intent. In this sense, God, as judge, is more willing to forgive sinful behaviour in the case of an individual with a less sinful will. Intention, therefore, trumps action in both William's and Hugh's understanding of Holy judgement. In order for this not to contradict the rest of William's teaching, however, this still relies on an initial cleansing from the Holy Spirit in order for that will to have turned to good initially. For Hugh no such prerequisite is stated.

Whereas Peter Abelard's rationalization of the morality of will is considerably fluid and tied to the circumstances in which he is debating, and Hugh of St. Victor's involved a level of circumstantial judgement, Bernard of Clairvaux presents a ridged opposite extreme. In his treatise on *Free Choice*, Bernard consents that not all acts can be judged, however, he rejects the idea that any sinful act of will could be considered less sinful. Bernard emphasises that so long as an individual is possessed of his reason and his will, he has freedom. Therefore, if a sin is committed by that individual, they are culpable for that sin because in all cases sin is an act of conscious will: man 'does not sin unless he wills.'⁵³ Whereas this is closer to William's interpretation of will, he is somewhat softer than Bernard in that he believes that man's will has positive potential. William's view of human will lies somewhere between the two extremes that Abelard and Bernard espoused.

For Bernard, every sin is an act of will: the will is human and, therefore, soiled and misguided. Human will naturally leads man away from things that are good. Bernard maintains that, 'No one does not will what he wills, or wills what he does not will—

⁵² *Romanos*, ch. II, 5 p. 29: 'Voluisti, nec forsitan potuisti; sic te adnotabit, quasi feceris quod uoluisti; et de te quoque dicitur: VNICVIQUE SECVNDVM OPERA EIUS.' English translation from: *Romans*, 2:5 p. 47.

⁵³ Bernard, *Arbitrio*, par. 4 p. 169: 'non peccat nisi velit,' English translation from: *Free Choice*, p. 59.

so it is impossible for it [the will] to be deprived of its freedom.’⁵⁴ Bernard demands personal responsibility and dismisses both the conditional absolution of Abelard and the gradient of sin that William seems to propose. Until it has been rescued by divine intervention, Bernard grants human will no merit and holds it fully responsible for the impulse and decision to sin. While this view comes considerably closer to William’s than Abelard’s claims regarding responsibility of will in the case of sin, William does not abandon the human will as entirely despicable as Bernard does.

For all of the negativity that theologians of strict ideologies such as St. Bernard associate with human will and its propensity for sin, there is another school of thought which sees the relationship between will and sin in a very different light. From the very first pages of his study of the *First Principles* of Christian life, Origen emphasises the connection between will and sin. However, rather than portraying will as the faculty by which we are tempted into sin, as William would, Origen depicts will as a tool that was given to the created order so as to help it fight sin. Origen writes,

Every rational soul is possessed of free will and choice, and also that it is engaged in a struggle against the devil and his angels and the opposing powers; for these strive to weigh the soul down with sins, whereas we, if we lead a wise and upright life, endeavour to free ourselves from such a burden.⁵⁵

Origen’s description of will’s relationship with sin seems to be something that William both draws upon and ultimately rejects.

William describes will’s initial state was one that entreats sin, however he also commends will’s strength as something which can be employed for good once the it has been made good. In *De Principiis*, Origen emphasises that human will can be used as a shield against sin. William was probably inspired to some degree by this concept. Although William sees carnal desire as entrapping many men in sin, he also

⁵⁴ Bernard, *Arbitrio*, par. 5 p. 169: ‘nemo quippe aut non vult quod vult, aut vult quod non vult -, etiam impossibile est sua privari libertate,’ English translation from: *Free Choice*, p. 59.

⁵⁵ Origen, *Principiis*, ch. I: pref. p. 12: ‘omnem animam rationabilem esse liberi arbitrii et voluntatis; esse quoque ei certamen adversum diabolum et angelos eius contrarias que virtutes, ex eo quod illi peccatis eam onerare contendunt, nos vero si recte consulte que vivamus, ab huiusmodi labe exuere nos conemur.’ English translation from: *Principles*, pp. 4-5.

sees good desire: desire for salvation and desire for God, as an instrument with which man can arm himself against sinful impulses. Will can be used defensively against sin rather than as a source of temptation drawing man into sin. That said, the prior enlightenment of the Holy Spirit is essential in William's understanding of this fortified will. Without the Spirit's influence and guidance, man's will can only turn toward sin. It is only because the will has been invested with the Spirit that it has either the strength, or even the positive inclination to turn against sin and orient man towards deliverance. William here seems to draw on Origen's depiction of the power of will as a tool against temptation, but only as a description of will after the required intercession of the Holy Spirit.

Despite a shared regard for will's strength, William's interpretation of will is set soundly apart from Origenian tradition. Origen does not cite the Holy Spirit as a source of strength in man's will. Moreover, he goes so far as to emphasise will's autonomy in the internal battle against sin. Origen continues from his affirmation of will's power against the devil to write, 'if we are possessed of free will, some spiritual powers may very likely be able to urge us on to sin and others to assist us to salvation.'⁵⁶ Here, he does concede that evil desires are also associated with will, however, he also suggests that human will can, unaided by the deity, elevate the believer toward salvation. This is a trend in William's reception of Origen: William will often draw on Origen's foundational interpretations within a given topic, however Origen will imply a dangerously Pelagian sovereignty of the individual, where William diverts all personal success to the involvement of the Holy Spirit. William's respect for will in the face of sin is powerful enough to suggest a lineage from Origen's *De Principiis*. Similarly, the importance of a justly-oriented will in the ascent towards salvation is shared by both men. However, Origen's audacious suggestion that man could independently fortify his own will against sin, and moreover that this will could be an independent step toward salvation is entirely irreconcilable with William. The excerpts of William's work in which he draws on Origen's foundation are saturated with involvement of the Holy Spirit: an addition which is entirely William's own.

⁵⁶ Origen, *Principiis*, ch. I: pref. p. 12: 'enim nostri arbitrii sumus, inugnare nos fortasse possint aliquae virtutes ad peccatum et aliae iuvare ad salutem,' English translation from: *Principles*, p. 5.

William retains Origenist designations of strength to will, however, in his theology positive use of that strength relies entirely on the excision of vulgarity from the will. In his commentary on *Romans*, William expresses the redemption of will through the allegory of Jewish law. He explains that, although tradition dictates circumcision, true circumcision is not physical. The amputation that has spiritual relevance is not corporeal but rather, ‘circumcision of the heart, that is a will free from all concupiscence.’⁵⁷ Physical development is of little interest to God, but to remove the lasciviousness from the heart itself is pleasing to Him. This is done through the power of the will, which must be strengthened and turned away from carnal weakness. William reminds his reader that this process is not done through the letter, but through the spirit. This reminder is ubiquitous in William’s theology, however it is striking here. He is emphasizing the importance of submission to the Spirit for the improvement of the soul. Man must remove the poison from his will in order to improve, and this removal can only be achieved through the intervention of the Spirit, rather than through a personal intellectual endeavour toward change.

Will, whether it is oriented towards evil or good, is an extraordinarily powerful force within the human mind. William suggests that it is because will is such a dominant aspect of the self that sin occurs, because will is able to convince the mind to commit behaviours it objectively knows to be sinful. He intuits that man’s physical senses leave an impression on the will to the extent that the will is capable of continued perception of those things. As a result of the will’s significant power, that imprinted sensory perception leads to the desire of them in their absence: ‘with such intensity that the will itself is made love or cupidity or lust.’⁵⁸ Although this strength is what causes will to be a potential contributor to salvation, will’s associations with lust and cupidity suppress its potential for goodness. It is the process of reorienting will that eventually fortifies man’s will with the stronger ability and desire to leave behind those carnal imprints, and this process is a part of the Spirit’s interaction with humanity.

⁵⁷ *Romanos*, ch. II, 25 p. 38: ‘pura ab omni concupiscentia uoluntas.’ English translation from: *Romans*, 2:25 p. 60.

⁵⁸ *Speculum*, ch. 100 p. 170: ‘ut uoluntas ipsa efficiatur amor, uel cupiditas, uel libido.’ English translation from: *Mirror*, 29 p. 72.

It has been demonstrated that William implies a reliance of good will on the intercession of the Holy Spirit's grace. This is a concept that William reiterates in *The Mirror*, and here he adds another important element to will. William writes, 'Faith is an element of free will, but will freed by grace,' and that men 'are incapable of freely choosing or of perfecting any fruit of justice unless, freed from sin by liberating grace.'⁵⁹ By writing this, William inserts faith into the existing relationship between will and grace, and, therefore, implies not only interdependence between faith and will, but also dependence of faith on the Spirit. If a man's will is understood to direct his actions and beliefs, then it makes sense that faith would be a part of a wilful choice to hold belief. Post-lapsarian will, however, is bent toward sinful behaviour. Grace: the agent by which the Spirit works, is the thing which liberates the will from sin and sets it free to have faith. Faith, therefore, depends on an individual's possession will that is unfettered by sin, and attaining that will depends on the movement of the Spirit.

Will and Rational Intellect

Although will functions independently as a faculty of the human mind, William is adamant that will has significant ties to intellectual reason and rationality. While the Holy Spirit is the superior guide for human will, man's own reason serves to augment that guidance. In demonstrating this, William reveals some debt to his sources. His trust in human reason is well seated in the greater theological tradition, although it does set him apart, to some degree, from his fellow Cistercians. The manner in which William describes will's employment of reason proves ultimately unique, however, as a result of his conviction that, while reason assists will, both are augmented by the Holy Spirit. William's examination of will's dependence on reason provides further evidence for an overall theology of salvation that, while steeped in tradition, is personal to William.

⁵⁹ *Speculum*, ch. 13, p. 76: Latin quotation given in full 'Est autem fides res liberi arbitrii, sed liberati a gratia. Nequaquam enim liberum potest esse arbitrium hominis *venudati sub peccato*, nisi liberante eo, de quo dicitur: *si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc vere liberi eritis*. Ad peccatum tantum per se liberum est: qua libertate peccant omnes quicumque delectatione vel amore peccati peccant. Sed hac libertate *servi facti sunt peccati, liberi iustitiae*, ad nullum fructum iustitiae liberum habentes vel *velle* vel *perficere*, nisi liberante gratia, *liberati a peccato, servi facti fuerint iustitiae*.' This references John and Romans. English translation from: *Mirror*, 5 p.13.

William habitually reflects positively on the advantages that reason provides to humanity. He explains that, whereas other sentient creations are moved only by their inborn nature and by the power of their creator, humanity is armed with one extra tool. Man's rationality helps him seek higher ways of living, and helps to instruct his will to desire goodness. William writes in *Romans*, that,

Rational man, however, is left to the choice of his own will and the judgement of the reason he has received with the result that, if by prevenient grace he wills to go where he is led by the power of reason, he is held fast there by love and is formed by a growth of piety, by the beauty of justice and by everlasting happiness and by the fullness of God's justice, to the fullness of his everlasting happiness.⁶⁰

Will is essentially independent as a human faculty, and that characteristic is critical in defining its importance. The Holy Spirit guides and advises the will, however individual decisions are left to the believer to make for himself. Within the human mind, will takes its seat in reason, and reason is able to inform will's decisions. However, no matter how rational and strong-minded an individual may be, reason alone is not enough to turn the will good. Without the interference of the aforementioned 'prevenient grace,' the will would be so distracted by its carnal entrapments that it would not be receptive to reason's urgings. As a result of defining will and its place in the mind in this way, William maintains will's autonomy, while still stressing its reliance on God through the Spirit.

With regard to his belief that reason acts as an interior guide for the will, William's views are concordant with those of Anselm of Canterbury. When goodness in the will is lacking, or distracted by sin, Anselm instructs that the power that man has to rectify himself is his reason. The ability to take rational approach to decision making is one of the ways in which man was given the power to improve his own will. As has been demonstrated, William adopts this belief that reason has the power to assist

⁶⁰ *Romanos*, ch. I, 20-21 p. 23: 'Rationalis autem homo dimittitur arbitrio propriae uoluntatis et iudicio acceptae rationalis, ut si praeueniente gratia uoluerit, quo rationis uirtute perducitur, ibi inhaereat amoris affectu, et profectu pietatis conformetur, et pulchritudine iustitiae as plentitudinem perennis beatitudinis suae.' English translation from: *Romans*, 1:20-21 p. 39.

confused will, however, Anselm, in this context, seems to offer reason as a stand-alone guide, which William clearly depicts as insufficient.

In his discussion of free choice, Anselm writes that reason is the way in which man is able to recognize and select goodness, so that ‘freedom of choice consists of both of these:’ reason and will.⁶¹ Strong reason can lead a confused or misguided believer towards stronger decision-making and greater rectitude in their will. Anselm is more audacious in relating will to reason. He writes that, ‘even if uprightness-of-will is absent, rational nature still has without diminution what belongs to it essentially.’⁶² Reason, according to Anselm, is a consistent presence in the mind, and can act as a beacon to will, which has deviated from the path to righteousness. Although it is possible that William drew on Anselm in developing his understanding of interdependence of reason and will, William has less faith in the human mind to rectify itself. William expands from Anselmian tradition in that he internalizes Anselm’s depiction of reasoned development of the will but then expands those stages of development to extend to a climax that is reliant on the Holy Spirit.

William differs from Anselm with regards to the Spirit’s involvement in reason, however they share a fundamental faith in reason as an affirmative guide for will. This is perhaps related to Origen’s earlier correlation of reason and will. Origen is regularly a proponent of human reason as a means for man to guide himself towards the divine. Origen often flirts dangerously with Pelagianism in the degree to which he attributes sovereignty to human reason in the pursuit of salvation. William is significantly less extreme than Origen in this regard, however, there are some distinct similarities. Origen writes,

Reason in man includes the faculty of distinguishing between good and evil, and when man has done this he possesses also the power of choosing that

⁶¹ Anselm, *Arbitrii*, ch. 4 p. 214: extended Latin provided for context ‘Si igitur absente re quae videri possit, in tenebris positi et clausos sive ligatos oculos habentes, quantum ad nos pertinet, videndi quamlibet visibilem rem potestatem habemus: quid prohibet nos habere potestatem servandi rectitudinem voluntatis propter ipsam rectitudinem, etiam ipsa absente rectitudine, quamdiu et ratio in nobis est qua eam valemus cognoscere, et voluntas qua illam tenere possumus? Ex his enim constat praefata libertas arbitrii.’ English translation from: *Choice*, p. 199.

⁶² Anselm, *Arbitrii*, ch. 3 p. 212: ‘Etiam si absit rectitude voluntatis, non tamen rationalis natura minus habet quod suum est.’ English translation from: *Choice*, p. 197.

which he has approved of, he is rightly deemed worthy of praise when he chooses what is good and of blame when he follows what is base and evil.⁶³

Where as William shares, to a lesser degree, Origen's commendation of human reason as a significant guide to will, he is less trustful in human reason than Origen. William cautions of the many clouds to reason's judgement, whereas Origen seems to believe that reason maintains its ability to differentiate between good and evil.

In the third book of his *De Principiis*, Origen writes that when a man is faced with a decision, reason dissects and presents that man with his options, making obvious the moral hierarchy within those options. He implies that once a man's reason has informed his will of its choices, the laudable man will simply select the good option. William denies man this ability without having first been awakened by the Spirit. Whereas William almost certainly derived some inspiration from Origen in the extent of his reliance on reason as an important aspect of wilful faith, he departed from Origen's understanding radically when it came to the degree of man's self determination. Reference to the Holy Spirit, and indeed, to the whole of divinity is entirely lacking in the explanation that Origen provides of how reason can impact man's will. For William, on the other hand, the Holy Spirit is central to the decision making process. Reason informs the will in both men's explanations, but in William's this is only possible because of the ignition of the Holy Spirit, whereas Origen describes the will of man as autonomous.⁶⁴

Despite these varying degrees of trust, and the fact that William repeatedly adds a pneumatological element to the rational processes seen in previous authorities, William's trust of reason allies him with the schools of thought of theologians such as Anselm and Origen, however it also sets him apart from some of his closer contemporaries. Of these the most prominent is Bernard of Clairvaux. Whereas William describes the interaction between will and reason as symbiotic, Bernard is a

⁶³ Origen, *Principiis*, ch. III:1 p. 197: 'rationis huius, quae est in homine, habet in se vim dinoscendi boni vel mali, id que cum discreverit, inest ei facultas etiam eligendi quod probaverit, in eligendo quidem quod bonum est laudabilis, in sequendo vero quod turpe vel malum est iure culpabilis iudicetur.' English translation from: *Principles*, p. 199.

⁶⁴ As was seen in the section on the Spirit's impact on man's will, Origen *does* believe that human will is not strong enough for salvation without some help from God, however this emphasizes more the general need for God in the quest for salvation than his necessity for good will.

great deal more sceptical. Bernard ordains that, while most men fail on their journey to salvation, all sane men desire to be saved. He expresses concern that reason acts as a barrier to that desire, because with reason the mind can examine the laboriousness of the path to salvation, and can use that awareness to inspire a spiritual lethargy that overwhelms good will. Reason shows will that, while the road to righteousness may have a more desirable destination, there are other ways of living that are far easier and more desirable in the present. Reason's role in Bernard's understanding is to turn choice against good will, so that sinful but easy behaviour takes the place of the more difficult self-improvement that would have led to salvation.⁶⁵ This understanding sets Bernard firmly at odds with William in their estimation of reason's purpose.

It is evident that with regard to his understanding of reason, William is well situated within the general intellectual milieu of his time. He is also distinct from his contemporaries in that he occupies a seeming middle ground between two major views. Anselm represents a position that accepted reason as a positive attribute in the mind of man: a gift of his creation. Bernard, on the other hand, views human faculties as dangerous, tainted, and untrustworthy. Reason in Bernard's eyes has no value until after God has informed its path. While William rejects the notion that reason alone has enough power to elevate man's will, he also recognizes independent value in reason. He relies on the Holy Spirit to purify the will, but he trusts that reason itself is pure and can be implemented as a tool to help the will along with the ultimate support of the Spirit.

While Spiritual reason has an important role in his soteriology, William regards reason in a structurally academic sense with some suspicion. He expresses repeatedly that, although *scientia* deserves a role within the monastic realm, that role was limited. Knowledge, like reason, should be used as a tool, which can help the thinker to come closer to *sapientia*, which is a higher form of knowing. Despite viewing reason as an aid by which the will might be improved, William maintains that in order to achieve a righteously oriented will, one must remember that 'this is not accomplished by the letter which teaches and threatens, but by the spirit which helps

⁶⁵ St. Bernard of Clairvaux, 'On Conversion, A Sermon to Clerics,' in *Sermons on Conversion*, trans. Marie-Bernard Saïd (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1981), p. 44.

and heals.’⁶⁶ Although will may be aided in part by reason, only the Spirit can truly free the will from its carnal appetite and appropriate that desire towards the divine. Despite the often-nurturing relationship between reason and will, it is important that reason takes on a supporting and not leading role.

Having considered the roles of reason and knowledge as forms of general guidance to the will of the endeavouring believer, the higher forms of wisdom and intellect merit consideration. It has been demonstrated that William presented reason as a practical guide towards laudable decision-making, but there is a far more important spiritual aspect to intellect that must also be addressed with regards to will. If the will is what allows man to desire salvation, then it must also be the impetus that engenders his desire to know God. The wish for holy knowledge and the desire to engage in contemplative acts that teach man to know and recognize his creator are also an aspect of will’s engagement with reason.

Hugh of St. Victor is the most outspoken of William’s contemporaries in regard to interpreting intellectual pursuits in a spiritual light. Hugh considered the accumulation of knowledge to be among the most important aspects of monastic life. While Hugh advocates a rational approach to intellectual studies, he is very specific about the manner in which will and reason should interact spiritually: the two should unite to form the desire to know God. Hugh establishes that the will to know true good is natural in man, however, it is not realized in everyone. He writes that,

Although every rational soul naturally desires this, yet it is often deceived in discerning how it ought to desire the truth. Indeed, to desire the truth incorrectly is to desire it with curiosity or cupidity or iniquity.⁶⁷

These false agencies of desire cloud the greater capability of good will. The will that is satisfied with these baser, more mundane approaches leads not only to weaker knowledge, but even further away from God. The superior approach with which one

⁶⁶ *Romanos*, ch. II, 25 p. 38: ‘non fit littera docente et minante sed spiritu adiuuante et sanante.’ English translation from: *Romanos*, 2:26-27 p. 60. This is very similar to one of William’s favourite scriptural references: 1st Corinthians 3:16: *Littera ex enim occidi spiritus autem vivificat.*

⁶⁷ Hugh, *Sententiae*, prol. p. 913: ‘cum omnis anima rationalis naturaliter hoc appetat, fallitur tamen multotiens in discernendo qualiter uerum debeat appetere. Verum enim non bene appetere, est appetere uerum curiositate uel cupiditate uel iniquitat.’ English translation from: *Sentences*, p. 113.

might come to know true good, for Hugh, is to seek to know the self, and to know the creator.⁶⁸

Like William, Hugh sees self-knowledge and reflection on the *imago dei* as a way in which one can come closer to knowledge of the Creator, however there is an important difference in their understandings of Spiritual ascent. Whereas Hugh's ultimate goal is perfect knowledge of the Deity, William's is unity with Him. Hugh explains that curiosity leads to frivolity, however, intimate seeking leads to true knowledge. Seeking knowledge of the self allows the believer to seek the ability to make himself better. The will for self-knowledge can lead to a higher discipline and, therefore, a heightened worthiness in God. The will for knowledge of God leads to more perfect respect and worship for God's almighty divinity, this brings the believer both to a stronger understanding of his purpose and a superior awareness of God's will, which in turn can help the believer to follow that will. For both William and Hugh, it is through seeking and willing this knowledge that the individual comes closer to perfection, and therefore, more worthy of salvation. For Hugh, knowledge of God transforms into wisdom, which is the attribute of the man that is the most credible. While William agrees with this understanding, he draws it further: wisdom of God makes man more worthy of salvation in that it allows man to adhere more firmly to the Almighty. Wisdom, for Hugh, is the goal, but for William it is merely a tool that allows man to make his will fit more perfectly to God's Will, who is the Holy Spirit.

For William, the Holy Spirit's impact on man's will is logical because it is inherent in the structure of the soul itself. Through the will, the Spirit helps man to achieve an elevated level of thinking and understanding. He explains in the *Golden Epistle* that

Will impels the memory to bring forth matter, it impels the intellect to give shape to what is brought forth. It applies the intellect to the memory so that the

⁶⁸ Hugh, *Sentences*, p. 113, in Hugh's own words: 'To know oneself is to know what sort of person one is so that one may correct oneself is to know what sort of person one is so that one may correct oneself and know what sort of person one is so that one may correct oneself and what sort of person one ought to be so that one may desire this. To know the creator is to believe that God exists, that he is supreme, to attribute every good to him, and to subject oneself utterly to his command. And whoever achieves these two, namely to know oneself and his God, that person is perfect.'

concept may be formed from it. To the intellect it applies the power of thought so that the concept may spring from it.⁶⁹

From this process, William explains, the Holy Spirit helps man to avoid ‘senseless thought,’ because the will pushes the other attributes of the mind to contemplate more significant and more correct concepts.⁷⁰ In other words: ‘a dutiful will engenders thoughts which are rich in the fruits of the Spirit and bring enjoyment of God.’⁷¹ It is worth noting that the *Epistle* comes very close to the end of William’s career. This demonstrates how consistently integral a relationship between intellectual understanding and the Holy Spirit’s impact on will is in William’s writing. The Spirit is the arbiter of good thinking within the still independent mind of the believer, and He is assisted in His work by that rational mind.

Both in the quotidian decisions that an individual must make as a matter of survival, and in the deeper, spiritual endeavours of the soul, William champions reason as an important source of reassurance for the human will. That said, the Holy Spirit is consistently the ultimate authority and guide to humanity. William reconciles the guidance of human reason and of the Holy Spirit by demonstrating a way in which they can both support and compliment each other. This solution, while it draws upon, and is compatible with, some of the views of some of his contemporaries and sources is original to him. The Spirit liberates man’s will, and together with reason it leads man to seek further knowledge. This both serves to reinforce the existing reason, and to build a greater spiritual foundation from which to reach toward the divine.

⁶⁹ *Epistula*, ch. 242 p. 278: ‘Voluntas cogit memoriam, ut proferat materiam; cogit intellectum ad formandum quod profertur, adhibens intellectum memoriae, ut inde formetur, intellectui uero aciem cogitantis, ut inde cogitetur. Quae quia in unum cogit uoluntas et facili quodam nutu concopulat, a cogendo cogitatio nomen accepisse uidetur.’ English translation from: *Epistle*, 242 p. 89.

⁷⁰ *Epistula*, ch. p. 90. Conversely, several lines down in ch. 252 p. 280 William also writes that: ‘Sic ergo uoluntas neglecta facit cogitationes otiosas et indignas Deo, corrupta, peruersas, quae separant a Deo; recta, necessariae ad usum uitae huius.’ English translation from: *Epistle*, 252 p. 93: ‘a will that is neglected gives rise to thoughts that are idle and unworthy of God; a will that is corrupted yields thoughts that are perverse and alienated from God; a rightly ordered will leads to thoughts that are necessary for living of this life.’

⁷¹ *Epistula*, ch. 252 p. 280: ‘pia efficacis ad fructus Spiritus et as fruendum Deo.’ English translation from: *Epistle*, 252 p. 93.

Will and Mystical Spirituality

Out of the three attributes of the Holy Spirit that are prevalent in William's theology, Will is, at face value, the least easily applied to mysticism. Love and Unity are naturally entangled with Mysticism by the way in which they are expressed between deity and creation. That being said, the Holy Spirit lends Himself naturally to the mystical experience because, in William's estimation, it is He with whom the worshipers are invested when they experience moments of divine enlightenment. Will, therefore, as an identity of the Spirit, naturally affects mystical spirituality as William experiences it. It is within this subcategory of the pneumatological impact of will that William's true originality is most visible. Whereas with regard to sin and intellect William's creativity was revealed through his interpretation and expansion of established theological tropes, within the mystical experience of will William expresses himself more freely.

In order to explore the relationship that William envisions between will and mystical spirituality, it is important to establish the connection that he perceives between will and faith. Faith in God is the first experience that man shares with his Creator, and it is the basis for all further spiritual experience. In *Natura*, William writes that before the Spirit has descended into the will of an individual, thus readying it to make the faithful choice, that individual's amenability to God is the result of fear rather than goodness. William attests that prior to a soul's inspiration from grace, the believer will be guided only by the 'spirit of fear—in which up till that point it was, like a child afraid of punishment.'⁷² Salvation is not granted to those who choose to worship God only out of trepidation. Although fear can be a positive first step, it should characterise the origins but not the infrastructure of one's relationship with the divine. If that person whose will has been touched by grace responds to the Spirit's prompt, and abandons 'this road to hell,' then they will proceed out of fear and towards piety.⁷³ It is the pious individual who is worthy of salvation, not the fearful one. The transformation of will that is enacted within the believer by the Holy Spirit allows this fear to be overcome, and replaced by pious faithfulness.

⁷² *Natura*, ch. 5 p. 181: 'Spiritu timoris, quo hactenus ut puer timebat poenam.' English translation from: *Nature*, 5 p. 57.

⁷³ *Nature*, 5 p. 57.

It is worth considering whether this limited praise for fear, so uncharacteristic of William's writing, was inspired by St. Bernard, for whom fear plays a major theme. Bernard consistently emphasises fear as a catalyst for human improvement: fear drives man to behave more laudably.⁷⁴ In his *Grace and Free Choice*, Bernard writes that

Between these two: the divine Spirit and the fleshly appetite, what is called in man free choice, or, in other words, human will, occupies as it were a middle position. Able to go in either direction, it is, as it were, on the sloping side of a fairly steep mountain.⁷⁵

As a result of the will's versatility with encouraging both good and bad behaviour it is natural that will must be mitigated by fear. However, the good will must also be encouraged if it is to reach the echelons of its potential. This, for both men, is the work of the Spirit through grace. William emphasises, however, that fear is not an aspect of faith associated with the Spirit. Like reason, fear is a weak human faculty that is able to act as a modifier to the will, but the superior guide is the Holy Spirit, who works not through fear, but through love.

The faith that William describes, one that is ignited by fear, but raised toward piety by the Holy Spirit, is only possible because of will. For an individual to be considered worthy of salvation, they must first choose to have faith. God, therefore, increases the chances of his specifically chosen individuals electing faithfulness. William writes that 'Faith is an element of free will, but of a will freed by grace.'⁷⁶ The very core of belief, therefore, is founded in the faculties of will and grace—both are essential to the faithfulness of man, and both are reliant on the bestowal of the Holy Spirit. Natural free will is entrapped by its own sinfulness, however, through grace, the Spirit frees it from those entrapments. Then, because will is also under the

⁷⁴ See for example: Bernard, *Song I*, p. 36.

⁷⁵ Bernard, *Arbitrio*, ch. 41 p. 195: 'Inter quem utique divinum Spiritum et carnis appetitum, tenet medium quemdam locum id quod dicitur in homine liberum arbitrium, id est humana voluntas, et tamquam in devexo montis latere admodum ardui inter utrumque pendens.' English translation from: *Free Choice*, p. 98-99. It should be remembered that this work was dedicated to William so he would have been readily familiar with its contents.

⁷⁶ *Speculum*, ch. 13 p. 76: 'Est autem fides res liberi arbitrii, sed liberati a gratia.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 5 p. 13.

jurisdiction of the Holy Spirit the will becomes increasingly inclined towards faithfulness.

It is important to be unambiguous here: faith is not the exclusive domain of the Spirit. Faith belongs to the whole of the Godhead. However, the Spirit is the Gift of that Godhead, and the bringer of His gifts, therefore the Spirit is a harbinger and enkindler of faith. As William explains, ‘We do not have a right faith about faith, however, if we do not faithfully understand, about all, whose gift it is.’⁷⁷ That gift is God’s entirely, but it is manifested and delivered with the grace of the Spirit as He impacts the will and choice of man.

William establishes through his exposition of will that in order to be faithful, it is necessary to understand that faith as a gift. Similarly, faith can only come naturally to those who are willing to be faithful, and because such a positive desire requires a cleansed will, faith is a gift that comes through the Gift. The claim here is not that faith itself is the Holy Spirit. Nonetheless, based on its reliance on will and grace, visitation from the Spirit is compulsory in order for faithfulness to be realized. Without a personal commitment to faith, there can be no salvation, and without the Spirit’s requisite alteration of will there can be no faith. These broad assertions about the nature of faith that William establishes set him apart from the majority of his peers. The extended discussion of the origin of faith independent of an admonition simply to have faith is, in itself, peculiar, and William’s supposition of the unique requirement of the Spirit is original to his thought.

Man’s will is entangled with mysticism in that his desire for God is what leads him to seek the mystical experience. Even this incipient desire as it exists previous to mystical communion with the deity is the result of the encouragement of the Holy Spirit. William writes that the nascent soul learns how to pray, and therefore to express good desire, only through the Spirit. Previous to its first experience of God the soul lacks the familiarity to know what to pray for. The Spirit must guide the soul:

⁷⁷ *Speculum*, ch. 13 p. 76: ‘De fide autem non rectam fidem habemus, si non intelligimys fideliter ante omnia cuius donum sit.’ English translation from: *Mirror*, 5 p. 13.

It is the Spirit which desires and asks on his behalf, and the Spirit makes him experience what as yet he does not know, and the Spirit makes him ask and desire that which he does not know through his senses.⁷⁸

Before man is even aware of his own spiritual potential, and before he is capable of seeking out mystical experiences as a result of his own aspiration, the Spirit touches man, and guides him toward greater Spiritual awareness through his own will. The very human desire for his own creator is a result not of his created nature, but of the Spirit teaching his will. William establishes a conclusive and primordial link between the Holy Spirit and good will in the spirituality of man.

In his introduction to the Golden Epistle, William instructs his brethren-readers as to how to pursue that ‘loftiest of professions,’ monasticism that pursues enlightenment.⁷⁹ He intuits that, while the strict rules of scripture are intended to retain order in the church, monks on the other hand, are not intended to concern themselves,

Feebly with the ordinary commandments nor to give your attention only to what God lays down as of obligation; you must seek his desires, fulfil in yourselves what is God’s will, good thing, the desirable thing, the perfect thing.⁸⁰

This description of monastic behaviour exemplifies the manner in which the faculty of will can be mystically attributed. The believer is instructed to open his inner self to the divine. William has suggested that it is possible for the will of God to be drawn within the seeker. In this quotation he suggests that perfection can be realized within the self. This is accomplished through the discovery and execution of God’s Will. For these suggestions to remain theologically consistent with the body of his

⁷⁸ *Romanos*, ch. VIII, 26 p. 123: ‘Spiritus enim est, qui pro eo desiderat et postulat, et quamvis nescientem interim, sentientem tamen facit, et postulantem, et desiderantem idipsum, quod sentiendo nescit.’ English translation from: *Romanos*, 8:26 p. 173.

⁷⁹ *Epistula*, ch. 15 p. 231: ‘Altissima est enim professio uestra.’ English translation from: *Epistle*, 15 p. 14.

⁸⁰ *Epistula*, ch. 15 p. 231: ‘Non est uestrum languere circa communia praecepta, neque hoc solum attendere quid praecipiat Deus, sed quid uelit, *probantes quae sit uoluntas Dei bona et beneplacens, et perfecta.*’ He is referencing Romans 12:2 English translation from: *Epistle*, 15 p. 14.

work, William must be suggesting that it is possible for the Holy Spirit, as God's will, to enter the openly-yearning soul of an individual and make God's desires manifest therein.

William's apparent scepticism regarding dogmatic dicta, as exemplified in his introduction to *The Epistle*, is a consistent theme in his writing. William often approaches Christian rule with the attitude that, while it provides a good source of instruction to the incipient Christian, those who have devoted themselves wholly to the divine should seek answers within their own spiritual experience rather than in the pages of a sacred text. In this passage of *The Epistle*, William applies this approach to Will, and the result is the successful intersection of mystical experience with the Holy Spirit and pneumatological influence on the will as the Will. The Spirit, rather than preordained instructions, should guide the believer to superior desires.

William makes a bold choice in proposing mystical supplementation of doctrinal maxims. Whereas most of William's contemporaries look to scripture and patristic writing as the ultimate authority to the endeavouring monk, William makes the dissident choice of trusting the individual monk to successfully contact and interpret the deity within his own soul.⁸¹ Ideally, this contact will reveal to the believer aspects of God's Will that are visible only through mystical interaction, not through canonical study. Through experiencing this revelation, that believer could then attempt to adopt those desires as his own, thus drawing himself closer in similarity to God. This process relies heavily on the support of the Spirit, however it also relies on the uprightness of the individual to construe and enact divine Will. This trust in humanity coupled with the heavy dependence on the Holy Spirit's presence make this concept radical, and characteristic to William.

Obviously, to seek communication and interaction with the divine requires a conscious willing choice on the part of the individual, however this interaction is more concretely an act of will on the part of the deity. Whether or not an individual

⁸¹ This is not to say that William is the only theologian to consider individual salvation. As was discussed in chapter two, the twelfth century has been associated with emphasis on the individual historiographically. William, however, provides a very intimate and detailed investigation of individual salvation and privileges the individual in his writing.

has entreated this contact, any interface with the divine is a result of His choice, and is therefore both caused and enacted by the Holy Spirit: ‘through the Holy Spirit, therefore, the Triune God reveals himself to any friend of God on whom he would bestow especial honor.’⁸² Man alone does not have the ability to beckon God to himself, interaction is a result of God’s will to reveal Himself to that man. The Holy Spirit as Will, therefore, is the cause and the actuator of mystical experience.

For William, the desire on the part of God to interact with and save his individual creations is a central characteristic of the benevolent divine. God’s inherent praiseworthiness is highlighted by his compassion towards his creations. William is in the company of several of his contemporaries in that they all concur that, through grace, the weaker will of man is saved, however other descriptions of this process are significantly more vague than William’s. Anselm writes that grace helps man to engage his ability to sin less regularly.⁸³ Nevertheless, where, for William, this is the crux of spiritual achievement within the will, Anselm discusses it relatively little, and this divine intervention is discussed only in very limited passages. Although Bernard’s focus in discussing God’s choice to liberate will is in establishing its inherent goodness as given by the Father and redeemed by the Son, Bernard writes that the definition of will’s purpose to be ‘saved,’ an act which is accomplished by grace.⁸⁴ Here, Bernard acknowledges the involvement of the Holy Spirit, however only in so far as he concedes the involvement of grace: he never names the Spirit, nor diverges from his focus on the redemption of the Son. Finally, Hugh of St. Victor, while neglecting to reference the key feature in the previous two descriptions, grace, does write that the Will of God teaches man’s will, ‘the desire to know true good.’⁸⁵ True good is the nature and the desire of the Almighty, and, therefore, desire to know true good implies the will to know God. Unlike William, Hugh makes no effort to connect this desire to the Holy Spirit. Hugh describes the pursuit of revelation as a pursuit of knowledge; William reveals it as the pursuit of divinity.

⁸² *Meditatiuae*, ch. III, 8 p. 70: ‘Ergo per Spiritum sanctum alicui amico Dei quem nimis honorare uoluerit reuelat semetipsam Trinitas Deus.’ English translation from: *Meditations*, 6 p. 105.

⁸³ For example: Anselm, *Arbitrii*, ch. 3, p. 210: ‘Licet peccato se subdidissent, libertatem tamen arbitrii naturalem in se interimere nequiverunt; sed facere potuerunt, ut iam non sine alia gratia quam erat illa quam prius habuerant, illa libertate uti non valeant.’

⁸⁴ Bernard, *Arbitrio*, ch. 1:3 p. 116: “<<Quid igitur agit>>, ais, <<liberum arbitrium?>> Breviter respondeo: Salvatur.” Self translated.

⁸⁵ Hugh of St. Victor, *verbo*, ch. 3 p. 68: ‘linea: 124: Primum enim disceruntur uoluptates id est utrum bono uel malo dediderio affectus sit animus.’ English from: *Sentences*, p. 113.

While all three of these authors describe the process by which the will is saved in terms that have parallels to William's understanding, their accounts lack William's conviction and the centrality of his Spiritual understanding.

William is consistent in establishing the Holy Spirit as being the *cause* of mystical interaction and the *actuality* of that interaction. Although these interactions are usually the domain of other Spiritual identities, in the *Speculum Fidei* William describes the important role that the Will plays in manufacturing this experience: 'His face, revealing itself to the senses of the person who loves, is His will. His face is the recognition of his truth.'⁸⁶ William intuits that not only is the choice to reveal Himself to man an act of divine Will, and therefore the Holy Spirit, the actual revelation is *of* Will. Seeing the face God is seeing His Will: The Holy Spirit.

At the heart of William's theology is his desire to guide his readers toward the achievement of a higher spiritual experience. In William's theological anthropology all attributes of the human soul can be oriented as tools through which to seek the divine. William demonstrates that good will is one such attribute, and that through the divine experience as achieved through the will, the believer can grow closer to worthiness of salvation. In espousing this belief, William occasionally comes close to the views of some of his contemporaries. On the whole, his pneumatological thought, as well as the centrality of will in his spiritual thought, are areas on which he dwelt to a much greater extent.

Conclusions and Relation to Greater Thesis

William is very clear in establishing the spiritual importance of will both for quotidian tasks and in terms of the longer ascent towards worthiness of salvation. The connections that William draws between will and the Spirit, as well as between will and salvation range from nuanced to explicit and they are significant elements in his thought. It is evident that a positively inclined human will is compulsory for salvation. Will gives a believer the opportunity to turn himself toward the divine and to reorient his desires from the lasciviousness associated with post-lapsarian longing, to a purified and pious longing for God. William, however, is adamant that man is

⁸⁶ *Speculum*, ch. 121 p. 190: 'Vultus eius sensui amantis innotescens voluntas eius est; facies eius, cognition veritatis eius.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 32 p. 85.

not capable of this purification of will unassisted. Without the guidance and redeeming grace of the Holy Spirit, man could not improve himself, nor would he truly seek to do so. Without reappropriation of will, which is only accomplished through the grace of the Spirit, man cannot be saved. This belief is of central importance in establishing William's metaphysics. This theory, while well grounded in authority, reaches beyond the established teaching. Comparison with the sources shows this conviction to be distinct to William.

Free will is one of the most important signifiers of human identity. It distinguishes humanity from the remainder of the creation, and within humanity it is one of the most important faculties with which good people are distinguished from bad. Man's distinct will, in many ways, is a part of what defines him as an individual, because it establishes his inner desires and dictates his actions. William is consistent in that all of the aspects of the soul that he identifies with the Holy Spirit are faculties that are chief in establishing individual identity. William's theological emphasis on the Holy Spirit and on individual, rather than holistic spiritual improvement are inextricably linked.

As well as being a catalyst of salvation itself, the liberated will is also a gateway to the liberation of other aspects of the self. With the aid and guidance of the Paraclete Spirit, the heightened will turns itself towards the higher spiritual qualities of love and unity, which the next chapters will explore. According to William, the just will eventually evolves into the state of love. He explains in his treatise *On the Nature*, that, just as the quality of a man changes as he grows older and matures, so too the faculty of will is only the burgeoning stage for what later becomes love.⁸⁷ He explains that 'By ardent willing it becomes love. For love is nothing other than the will ardently [fixed] on something good.'⁸⁸ Later, in *Mirror*, William expands on this process in greater detail, and he suggests to his reader that once his will is on the road to improvement he ought to

⁸⁷ *Nature*, 3 p. 53.

⁸⁸ *Natura*, ch.4 p. 180: 'Nichil enim est aliud amor quam uehemens in bono uoluntas.' English translation from: *Nature*, 4 p. 56.

Begin to love; that is: do it so you may choose to and you will begin to believe. You will believe as much as you shall want to, that is, as much as you shall love. For the will is the beginning of love. Love then is a vehement will. And love in the person who believes will furnish the faculty for believing.⁸⁹

This is an example of how William's pneumatology can be implemented by one of his spiritual sons. Although a large part of William's understanding of salvation rests on the Holy Spirit's choice to give an individual his gifts through grace, understanding the way in which that grace works can nonetheless be instructional to the endeavouring soul. By opening up the will to the gift of the Spirit, and inviting His will to affect theirs, struggling monks are being proactive. While the act of salvation is ultimately God's and no monk will be saved without His making it so, William is instructing his readers on one of the few ways in which they can seek increase their own chances of salvation. Seeking to will what God wills is the first step towards coming to love God according to William's structure of spiritual development.

Along with being a nascent form of love, will also allows for the development of the final identity of the Holy Spirit through which salvation is achieved: Unity. By seeking out the Spirit-Will and by striving in the Spirit to match one's will to His, the believer is taking steps to increase in similarity to God. Free will is one of the seats of the *imago dei*, because only God and man possess free will. Therefore, by bending his will to God's, man becomes more God-like. William writes,

Now to will what God wills is already to be like God, to be able to will only what God wills is already to be what God is; for him to will and to be are the same thing. Therefore it is well said that we shall see him fully as he is when we are like him, that is when we are what he is.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ *Speculum*, ch. 19 p. 82: 'Incipe diligere, hoc est age ut veils; et incipies credere; et tantum credes quantum voles, hoc est quantum diliges. Voluntas enim initium amoris est. Amor siquidem vehemens voluntas. Et amor crediti suggerit facultatem credendi.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 6 p. 18.

⁹⁰ *Epistula*, ch. 258 p. 281: 'Velle autem quod vult Deus, hoc iam Deo similem esse est; non posse velle nisi quod vult Deus, hoc est iam esse quod Deus est, cui velle et esse idipsum est. Vnde bene dicitur, quia tunc uidebimus eum plene sicuti est, cum similes ei erimus, hoc est erimus quod ipse est.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 258 p. 94.

In writing this, William is making a powerful claim. Will becomes one avenue by which man achieves unity to God. If man wills what God Wills, then man participates in the Will of God, and because the Will is the Holy Spirit, by participating in the Will, man is participating in the Holy Spirit, thus elevating himself to a kind of Godliness. Although will is only one of several ways in which man can conform to the Spirit, it is nonetheless an intensely powerful bond to salvation in Oneness.

As with every theological triad, these three identities of the Holy Spirit: Will, Love, and Unity, are inextricable from each other. They are connected in that they rely on one another for achievement, and they are bound by their cause, which is grace. Each one of these aspects is present in the human mind, but their improvement and realization as a means of salvation is contingent on the investment and imbueing of the grace of the Spirit. Will, in William's conviction, is the first step by which the Holy Spirit advances the believer up in the hierarchy toward salvation, however, it can in no way be separated from the steps that are to come.

There is a surfeit of references in William's writing to the place and importance of will both within humanity and within the deity. It is clear that for him, will is a capacity that is indispensable in the maintenance of man's inimitability within the created order. Most importantly, however, good will is essential in order for a soul to achieve salvation. This good will is achieved only through the intercession of the Holy Spirit in man's soul. Although William does not address the apparent disconnect between freedom and reliance on the Spirit, it is clear that he does not see the two as mutually exclusive. For William, part of man's goodness is his willingness to submit to that influence. The Holy Spirit's impact on will is a means through which man is enabled. The Spirit helps man to save himself.

William is not alone in his conception of the Spirit and will. There are a range of sources, both patristic and contemporary that express similar beliefs. The definition of the Holy Spirit as being similar to Will that Augustine espoused ensured the popularity of the idea in the medieval era. That being said, William is interesting in the extent to which he considers this subject. Other authors have often discussed will with no reference to the Spirit, and excluded Will as even a tropological denotation

for Him. For William the two are indivisible. The understanding of good will as a catalyst for salvation is not uncommon. While other theologians of the time understood good choices and good preference as a means through which man could become closer to God and could prove himself more worthy of being saved, William was certainly the most discursive and explicit of these. William's insistence on will as central both to the relationship between the Holy Spirit and man, and to the man's journey towards salvation, prove the originality of this topic in his thought. Without good will there can be no salvation, and without the Holy Spirit no man would have good will.

Chapter 4: Love

Love, for William of St. Thierry, is the most pervasive definition and dominion of the Holy Spirit. In the monastic sphere, the art of learning to love God should, in William's eyes, be the ambition of every monk. Novices must commit themselves to its persistent pursuit, because, as William confesses, although he assiduously desires to love God, such a powerful love is beyond the realm of carnal man to achieve without assistance.¹ William intuits that although love for God is naturally hidden within the soul of all men, it remains a neglected and inactive ability until the Holy Spirit intercedes to allow it to come forward.² Love forms part of the broader theme in William's theology in which the requirements for salvation which can be incrementally worked on by an individual, but which ultimately require the intercession of the Holy Spirit.³ William proclaims: 'to love you belongs to grace; and feeling love is a manifestation of grace.'⁴ Without the graceful intercession of the Holy Spirit, love for God and resultant salvation cannot be achieved. An exposition of his thinking on the spiritual development of love will reveal an innovative way of approaching the topic of humanity's ability to love, historical impressions of love, and the relationship between love and religion in the context of Christian theology.

William's beliefs are situated within the theological tradition established by authoritative texts of the patristic era. He draws upon Augustinian tradition and authority in presenting his view of spiritual progress. There are also strong scriptural veins for some of William's applications of pneumatological love: Romans 5:5, for example, explains that the Holy Spirit pours love into man, and Galatians 5:22 lists love first amongst the fruits of the Spirit. However, William develops a neoteric

¹ *Mirror*, 4, p. 11.

² *Meditations*, 12:17-18, p. 177.

³ A novice, for example, can increase his understanding of God by surrounding himself by those who have already reached for the love of God, so as to increase his own awareness of and aptitude for love according to *Meditations*, 12:16, p. 177.

⁴ *Meditatiuae*, ch. XII, 29 p. 210: 'amare te gratiae est; affectus gratiae manifestation est.' English translation from: *Meditations*, 12:17, p. 177.

approach in his emphasis on the Holy Spirit as the vehicle of love, and his conviction that Spiritual-love is a constituent of salvation. While an acceptance of the Holy Spirit as representing love within the Godhead is traditional within William's intellectual inheritance, explorations of the manner in which His Love acts, and His relationship to man's spiritual journey are rare. William privileges pneumatological functions and emphasises the Holy Spirit more heavily than the Father or the Son in his analysis of the source of love, and the requirements of salvation.

In the historiographical terms, William's treatment of love has been widely regarded as imitative and unoriginal. David Bell argued that William's theology of love should be seen holistically as an analysis of Augustine. Bell's thesis is particularly relevant in this chapter as it draws important lines of transmission from Augustine to William with regards to the Holy Spirit's participatory love.⁵ Similarly, and with the same conclusion, Carmen Cvetkovic argues that William's account of how individuals can increase in likeness through love is strictly a paraphrase of Augustinian.⁶ Out of the recent scholarship that has sought to revive William's legacy, Bell provides the most complete analysis of the Holy Spirit's role in love, however, because Bell's purpose in this examination is to reveal William as an Augustinian thinker rather than reveal his significant deviations, he does not recognise William's independent development supererogatory to reiterating the Augustinian ethos. In his brief review of William in his four volume investigation of Western mysticism, Bernard McGinn accurately depicts William's heavy emphasis on love, as well as his depiction of the mutually beneficial, symbiotic relationship between reasoned and loving approaches to God.⁷ Unfortunately, McGinn does not have the space to fully excavate the details of William's thinking on this topic. Overall, while in some cases modern scholarship has succeeded in emphasising how important love is to William's theology, it has failed to recognize how significant that theology was.

⁵ See for example: David Bell, *The Image and Likeness: The Augustinian Spirituality of William of St. Thierry*, (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1984), p. 139.

⁶ Carmen Angela Cvetkovic, *Seeking the Face of God: The Reception of Augustine in the Mystical Thought of Bernard of Clairvaux and William of St. Thierry* (Turnhout: Brepols: 2012), p. 155.

⁷ McGinn, Bernard, *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism*, vol. II: The Growth of Mysticism (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1994), pp. 233-235.

This chapter will approach the theological concept of love as it pertains to personal salvation from several angles. First, as with each chapter, love will be described with regards to its seat in the *imago dei*. A critical examination of the five major premises on which love is presented across William's works will follow. In order to understand William's theology of love, it is of primary importance to demonstrate that Love is indeed an identity of the Holy Spirit. Having accepted this role for the Spirit, the manner in which He engages with the carnal form of love must be analysed. Love elevates man out of his sinful nature, therefore, the concept of punishment and retribution should be examined through the lens of love, as well as the iniquitousness that love combats. Rational faith is an important aspect of William's theology of self-improvement, therefore love must next be considered for its impact on intellect. Finally, given William's historiographical identification as a mystical theologian, it is also worthwhile to consider what role love plays in the mystical experience of God, and the degree to which this is an experience with the Spirit as an agent of the Godhead, rather than with the Godhead Himself.

These five love-related concepts will be considered both for their importance to William, and for their comparative use by the established contemporary and authoritative thinkers. Conclusions can thereby be drawn as to how the Holy Spirit as Love engenders salvation. Additionally, the extent to which the theme of love relates to the greater concept of pneumatologically-inspired salvation as it is reflected in William's work can be considered. This will demonstrate a unique quality in William's understanding of the process by which one attains eternal life, and the importance of Love in that process.

Love is Likeness

In the preface to his *Exposition on the Song of Songs*, William explains why the theme of love is so important to his concept of man's relationship to God. This preface is largely an account of what makes the Song of Songs extraordinary, and why a love song is an appropriate medium with which to approach concepts of spiritual unity. His explanation relies on his understanding of the *imago dei*. William writes that of man's faculties the only one that exists for the sole purpose of serving

God is love.⁸ God loves himself and God loves man. By sharing in this love both for his creator and for his neighbour, man is partaking in behaviour that mimics God. By loving, man makes the image of God within him stronger, and increases in likeness to Him.

The Holy Spirit-Love is the arbiter and cause of man's ability to love, and his ability to become more similar to God. William writes:

The love of God, or the Love that is God, the Holy Spirit, infusing himself into man's love and spirit, attracts him to itself; then God loves himself in man and makes him, his spirit and his love, one with himself. For as the body has no means of living apart from its spirit, so a man's affections, which are called love, have no means of living that is to say of loving God, but the Holy Spirit.⁹

This complex expression of the relationship between love and Love perfectly describes why the image is best communicated through love and why love so essential to salvation. The Holy Spirit both *is* love, and is essential to man's love. The image of God in man is, therefore, that image of love, which was implanted at creation, and that potential becomes actual Love through the divine investment of the Holy Spirit.

Not every seeming act of love that man commits is part of God's image. Only what William defines as enlightened love constitutes similarity to God. In his schema those whose love has been impacted by the influence of the Holy Spirit learn to 'live by the Spirit of life' and experience God.¹⁰ Love is the power of the soul which is most engaged with experience. Whereas Will had the power to pull man toward God, and Unity will make man one with God, Love is the turning point in this process. Willing what God wills gives man a certain similarity to God, but love *is* man's

⁸ *Expositio Cantica*, Ch. 1, 1 p. 19: 'libera a seruitute corruptionis id quod tibi soli deseruire debet in bobis, amorem nostrum.' English translation from: *Song*, 1, p. 3-4.

⁹ *Epistula*, ch 170 pp. 263-264: 'Amor enim Dei, uel amor Deus, Spiritus sanctus, amor hominis et spiritui se infundens, afficit eum sibi; et amans semetipsum de homine Deus, unum secum efficit et spiritum eius et amorem eius. Sicut enim non habet corpus unde uiuat nisi de spiritu suo, sic affectus hominis qui amor dicitur non uiuit, hoc est non amat Deum, nisi de Spiritu sancto.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 170, p. 67.

¹⁰ *Expositio Cantica*, Ch. 1, 1 p. 19: 'uiuit de spiritu uitae.' English translation from: *Song*, 1, p. 4.

likeness to God. Love contains the image, and love is the key to engaging in divine experience.

The Holy Spirit is Love

As with Will, so Love is a proper name for the Holy Spirit as well as a human faculty that He can affect. This understanding of the Spirit's identity is hardly unique to William: it is common in medieval theology.¹¹ That said, in defining the Holy Spirit as Love William was taking a pneumatological stance, rather than reiterating a universal trope. William draws on tradition as he formulates his understanding of the Spirit, and develops his own explanations. To examine both allows for a more thorough understanding of both what the Holy Spirit's role as Love entails, as well as the theological and salvatory implications of William's adoption of this definition of the Spirit.

Although William is certainly not alone in defining the Spirit as Love, this definition sets him in opposition to one of his major influences: Origen. Origen applies metaphorical triads infrequently in explaining the Godhead than later patristic thinkers; William uses them with obvious regularity. However, the discrepancy between William and Origen on the subject of the Holy Spirit's identity as Love goes farther than omission. Where Origen does discuss love's identity within the Trinity, and concludes that 'Christ is called Charity,'¹² William repeatedly and explicitly describes the Trinity in terms that contradict this claim. While Jesus may love man, and act charitably toward him, that Love and Charity that He uses *is* the Holy Spirit. William's description of charity departs entirely from Origen as far as its role within the Trinity, despite Origen's apparent influence on William elsewhere.

William investigates the Trinity through multiple metaphorical triads that provide microcosmic clarifications and descriptors that act as hallmarks for the greater

¹¹ Augustine popularized the definition of the Holy Spirit as love, however this definition is also used, along with William and many of the six thinkers to which he will be compared, by Peter Lombard, Richard of St. Victor, Bonaventure, to name only a few of many. It is also scripturally evidenced, particularly in Romans and Galatians.

¹² Origen, *Canticum*, prolog p. 69: 'filius 'caritas' est.' English translation (which differs slightly from the Latin, but retains its meaning) from: Origen, *Song*, p.32.

divinity to which they point.¹³ As was the case with Will, William demonstrates that it is possible for the Holy Spirit to *be* Love by describing a microcosm of the Trinity within the human experience: ‘in the likeness of the Most Holy Trinity, therefore, faith begets hope, and charity proceeds from both.’¹⁴ The Holy Spirit, ‘who is the love,’¹⁵ is himself a gift given to the created order as a sign of salvation, which He can cause to be made manifest. This Spirit-Love ‘is something divine, the pledge and the betrothal gift of the Spirit, by means of which you, God, rejoice and feed your poor servant in this life.’¹⁶ The Love of God the Father for His Son and the Son for His Father *is* the Holy Spirit who proceeds from both of them. However, this same Love, and thus the same Spirit, is the Love of God for man. When the Spirit has imbued man’s soul with love, He also conceives man’s love for God.

One of the most frequent micro-trinities that William espouses as an ‘image’¹⁷ of the Trinity is that of Faith, Hope, and Charity. In this context, William demonstrates a subtle favouritism for the Spirit by emphasizing charity as the highest within that ranking. He points out that ‘even devils believe,’¹⁸ which means that faith can be housed in bad souls as well as good ones, and continues that in the world after this one, all three faculties will give way and unite to charity.¹⁹ He writes that it is charity which draws the struggling soul through faith and hope, and that ‘there often is or appears to be among these three only one single face of charity.’²⁰ William clearly does not believe that the Trinity gives way in heaven and is ruled only by the Spirit,

¹³ This follows in the Pauline tradition, however William likely developed the habit as a result of his extensive familiarity with Augustine.

¹⁴ *Speculum*, ch. 1, 9 p. 68: ‘Ad similitudinem ergo summae Trinitatis, sicut fides spem gignit, sic caritas ab utroque, hoc est a fide et spe, procedit.’ English translation from: *Mirror*, 3, p. 9. As was discussed in the vocabulary section, Charity is a form of love.

¹⁵ *Contemplando*, ch 14 p. 163: ‘Spiritus sanctus, amor Patris ad Filium.’ English translation from: *Contemplating*, 11, p. 54.

¹⁶ *Meditatiuae*, ch. XII, 22 p. 204: ‘Diuinum quiddam est et arrha uel pignus spiritus, quo in hac uita pauperem tuum, Deus, laetificas et pascis.’ English translation from: *Meditations*, 12:13, p. 174.

¹⁷ *Mirror*, p. 8 ch. 2.

¹⁸ *Speculum* ch. 1, 8 p. 68: ‘Sic enim et daemones credunt.’ English translation from: *Mirror*, 3, p. 8. This discussion is out of character for William, as devils are not a topic of discussion in his other works. He is referencing James 2:19, in which devils are used as an example of why fearing and believing in God is not a sufficient emotional reaction to Him. William reiterates the message from the scripture, writing that, although they fear and dislike God, devils still believe he exists. The Human relationship with God must, therefore, expand past belief to include love or else humans are no better than devils.

¹⁹ *Mirror*, 4, p. 9.

²⁰ *Speculum* ch. 1, 10 p. 70: ‘nonnisi una sit seu appareat facies caritatis.’ English translation from: *Mirror*, 4, p. 10. This is also representative of how love transforms into unity: the Holy Spirit is both, and unifies partially with the power of love.

yet makes the direct claim that charity, which he explicitly states as being the Spirit, takes on that role. It is the loving comfort of the Spirit that shelters and encourages the aspiring soul through times of trial. There is an obvious causal relationship between the Spirit-Love and human salvation, and the Spirit, rather than the Father or Son, is the most readily present guide in that journey as well as the face of acceptance at the end. This passage is revealing in that it demonstrates clearly that, while man has the image of the Trinity within himself in many forms, and all aspects of the divine have a role in guiding man, it is the role of the Spirit as charity, a form of love, to bring man into the next life.

As always, William is drawing significantly on Augustine in formulating the trinities with which he explains the Trinity. Augustine defines the Trinity in a myriad of ways²¹ as seen above in the chapter on Will, but the most prevalent is the unity between varying semantic conceptualizations of existence, intellect, and love.²² In his analysis of the Trinity, Augustine expounds no fewer than nine microcosms and metaphors for the triune God in which the Holy Spirit is represented by love.²³ In comparison to the variation of definition that Augustine applies to the other Persons of the Trinity, such consistency is noteworthy.²⁴

Two predominant love-based models emerge in Augustine's theology. The first is a union between a Father who is represented by a sort of base for existing: sometimes

²¹ In addition to the major three examined in this thesis, Augustine sees the Father as the framework of the mind itself, the son as the understanding of that mind, and the Holy Spirit as the love of the mind (*Trinity*, IX:8, XIV:11, XIV:13-14). Alternatively, he describes the father as image, the son as likeness, and the Holy Spirit as equality (*Trinity*, IX:16), describes the trinity as a family of a man, a woman, and a child, (*Trinity*, XII:5, XII:8-9), and describes the Godhead as being like three rings forged from one piece of gold, (*Trinity*, IX:7). He divides theology into civil, natural, and fabulous (*City of God*, p. 190.) Augustine also references trinities of memory, perception, and desire, (*City of God*, p. 370) Creation, Wisdom-Power, and Unity (St. Augustine of Hippo, *On Genesis: Two Books on Genesis Against the Manichees, and On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis: An Unfinished Book*, trans. Roland J. Teske (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1991), p. 145), and three causes of existence, ('St. Augustine of Hippo, *Eighty-Three Different Questions*, trans. David L. Mosher (Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1977), p. 46).

²² See for example: *City of God*, 'God alone could be the author of nature, the bestower of intelligence, and the kindler of love by which life becomes good and blessed,' p. 369.

²³ Augustine, *Trinity*, pp. 257 (VIII: 14), 274 (IX: 4), 372 (XIV: 4), 379-384 (XIV: 11-13), 402, (XV: 4).

²⁴ Augustine defines true love clearly, and such a working definition can prove invaluable for understanding Augustine's writing on the topic. Given Augustine's wide ambit of influence, this definition should be taken as a significantly authoritative. In the *Trinitate*, Augustine writes, 'true love then is that we should live justly by cleaving to the truth, and so for the love of men by which we wish them to live justly we should despise all mortal things.' (Augustine, *Trinity*, VIII:10 p. 253.)

life itself, sometimes the actual form of the mind, sometimes memory; a Son who is represented intellectually, by knowledge, reason, or understanding; and a Spirit who is invariably love.²⁵ This is a metaphorical trinity that is reiterated and paraphrased frequently following Augustine's career. The purpose for this Trinity is to demonstrate how three faculties can have independent affects and movements while still participating in a unified, singular whole. The soul is one, but within it, it contains, for example, the mind, knowledge, and love.²⁶ The existence of these three does not diminish the oneness of the soul. William reiterates Augustine's method in developing his own discussion of the Trinity, but he expands the application this metaphor to include a greater number of categories for the Father and Son, while holding fast to consistent titles for the Holy Spirit. This greater coherence within one person is indicative of a stronger sense of definition for the Spirit's Person as well as an inheritance from Augustine.

The other major Trinitarian model that is referenced by Augustine is that between 'the lover, what is being loved, and love.'²⁷ To a certain extent this changes the Holy Spirit's relationship with love. Whereas in Augustine's previous trinities, the Spirit dominated the role of love, and the other persons were unrelated to it, in this trinity, each member is defined by His relationship to love. To an extent this highlights the importance of the Spirit Who represents the very faculty through which the other Two work. While the Father is defined by being the subject, and the Son the object, the Spirit is the action itself.²⁸ Consequently, the Holy Spirit's definition as Love is reinforced significantly by passages that reference this Trinitarian representation. William clearly accepted this model for the Trinity, but he expanded on it significantly.

As divine Love, the Holy Spirit expresses love both outwardly, to the creation and inwardly, to His Whole. Fundamentally, the Spirit is the way in which God loves himself. William writes, 'Love-worthy Lord, you love yourself in yourself when the Holy Spirit, who is the Love of the Father for the Son and of the Son for the Father,

²⁵ See for example: Augustine, *Trinity*, IX:4, IX:6-8, IX:15, IX:18, XIV:11, XIV:13-14, XV:39, XV:10, XV:42-43.

²⁶ Augustine, *Trinity*, p. 276. IX:8.

²⁷ Augustine, *Trinitate*, lib. VIII ch. 10: 'amans et quod amatur et amor.' English translation from: *Trinity*, VIII:14 p. 257.

²⁸ Augustine, *Trinity*, XV:10 p. 402.

proceeds from the Father and the Son.’²⁹ Love of God for Himself is a defining role for the Holy Spirit, and it is in that role that the Spirit is able to operate in man’s love. Similarly, that Love itself allows God to love man and desire that his creation be saved. Love as a characteristic of the Spirit is, as a result, essential to salvation because without this role, God would not care to look after carnal man, nor would he give the option of forgiveness.

Whereas Augustine was assertive in his categorization of the Spirit as love, he writes very little about the nature of that love itself. Closer to William’s own time, however, there is significant investigation of Spiritual love.³⁰ Anselm of Canterbury, for example, in *The Monologion*, provides a lengthy and revealing analysis of the Trinity, and it is here that the most concrete illustration of his understanding of the Holy Spirit as Love can be found.³¹ Having discussed the nature of the Godhead and the Father’s relationship to the Son at great length, Anselm introduces the concept of a love that is shared by these two. Anselm establishes that the Father represents the memory of the Godhead, and the Son His understanding.³² As a result of this remembering and understanding, explains Anselm, the two form a love for each other, and because this love is shared it is as strong as each of the two faculties on their own.³³ However, it is illogical to think that something of equal strength to God could conceivably be anything but God Himself, and so that Love must naturally be part of God.³⁴ This love is the Trinitarian identity of the Holy Spirit.³⁵ Anselm takes inspiration from the micro-trinities established by Augustine, and later utilized by

²⁹ *Contemplando*, ch. 14 p. 163: ‘Amas ergo te, o amabilis Domine, in teipso, cum a Patre procedit et Filio Spiritus sanctus, amor Patris ad Filium, et Filii ad Patrem.’ English translation from: *Contemplating*, 11, p. 54.

³⁰ Spiritual in the sense of the Holy Spirit rather than the spirit of man.

³¹ That Anselm analyses this love should not be taken to mean that he does not also define the Spirit as love outright. He provides a direct assertion of the Holy Spirit as love in the *Proslogion*. While exalting God the Father for his Supreme Goodness, Anselm writes, ‘The one Love common to you and Your Son, viz., the Holy Spirit who proceeds from You both, is [also] this [same supreme good]. For this Love is not unequal to you or to Your Son; for You love Yourself and Your Son, and He loves Himself and You.’ (Anselm, *Proslogion*, ch. 23 p. 117: ‘Hoc ipsum est amor unus et communis tibi et filio tuo, id est sanctus spiritus ab utroque procedens. Nam idem amor non est impar tibi aut filio tuo; quia tantum amas te et illum, et ille te et seipsum, quantus es tu et ille; nec est aliud a te et ab illo quod dispar non est tibi et illi; nec de summa simplicitate potest procedere aliud quam quod est de quo procedit.’ English from, p. 108.) Anselm is clearly defining the Holy Spirit as the Love of the Godhead, as he represents the love of the Father and Son for each other.

³² Anselm, *Monologion*, ch. 48.

³³ Anselm, *Monologion*, ch. 49-50.

³⁴ Anselm, *Monologion*, ch. 51-54.

³⁵ Anselm, *Monologion*, ch. 62.

William to describe the Holy Spirit. Anselm develops them not only into identities, but also into causes for each other's identities. William accepts that the Holy Spirit is Love as a fact of faith, but from Anselm he receives a logical analysis as to why it is a fact.

Just as Anselm probably helped build the foundation of William's understanding of the identity of the Holy Spirit, William, in turn, probably inspired St. Bernard in his sparing pneumatological investigations. William's early influence on Bernard is evidenced by Bernard's rhetorically reluctant *Apologia*, which he only wrote because of William's continued insistence,³⁶ and William's strongest influence on Bernard was evidently on the topic of the Song of Songs: a topic saturated in love. Although Bernard's sermon series on the topic has garnered far more attention than William's writing, he only started his investigation on the topic after his shared convalescence with William. William, on the other hand, had already compiled several collections of patristic commentaries on the topic, and seems to have ignited Bernard's interest in making his commentary. Whereas William is often perceived as the less inventive of the two, Bernard's *Sermons on the Song of Songs* show a strictly traditional approach to the topic of Spiritual-Love. The small deviations and creative investigations into the nature of pneumatological Love that Bernard does make seem to have been informed and influenced by William.

In his work on the Song of Songs, Bernard transparently depicts the Bridegroom as Christ, but that does not entirely preclude the Holy Spirit a role in the matrimony. The kiss that the Bride boldly demands of her spouse is a topic on which Bernard repeatedly ruminates, and it is clearly an important aspect of the spiritual education that he wishes to draw out of the scripture. In one of his many analyses of this kiss, Bernard correlates the groom bestowing this kiss with Jesus breathing the Holy Spirit into his disciples. He writes that 'that favor, given to the newly-chosen Church, was indeed a kiss.' He continues that, like the kiss of the mouth, which the bride craves, that exchange of breath was far more than a somatic conferral, 'but rather the invisible Spirit.'³⁷ It is for this reason that the kiss is so valued by the zealous bride.

³⁶ Bernard, *Apologia*, p. 33.

³⁷ Bernard, *Sermones Cantica*, sermo: 8:2 p. 37: full Latin quotation: 'INSUFFLAVIT, inquit, EIS, haud dubium quin Iesus Apostolis, id est primitivae Ecclesiae, ET DIXIT: ACCIPITE SPIRITUM

By receiving the kiss, she receives not just her groom-Christ, but in fact the entirety of God, for the gift of the Holy Spirit proceeds from both Son and Father and therefore is representative of all divinity. In this way, Bernard does assert the Holy Spirit as an aspect of the love exchanged between the bride and Bridegroom.

In addition to His participation in the kiss, the Holy Spirit is also the catalyst for loving Christ. Bernard explicates that, ‘there is no love of Christ at all without the Holy Spirit.’³⁸ Even physical love of Christ is associated with such a goodness that it naturally transforms into Spiritual love. The implication here is that the aptitude for loving Christ in any capacity must come from God’s Love. This is not a point that Bernard emphasises to any degree and, despite His mention here, Bernard is reticent or perhaps uninterested in attributing love of Christ to the Spirit. Nonetheless, in this and other cases, the Spirit is invoked as a representative of love, however exiguously. Ultimately, however, it is still Christ on whom Bernard focuses, rather than the Love itself. William’s concerns tend more toward the conceptual, while Bernard’s are grounded in the person of Christ.

Bernard does provide a limited number of specific affirmations of the Holy Spirit’s identity as love, however he equally envisions the Son in that role. Whereas for William the Holy Spirit is the teacher and administrator of love to mankind, Bernard instructs: ‘Christian, learn from Christ how you ought to love Christ. Learn a love that is tender, wise, strong; love with tenderness, not with passion wisdom, not foolishness, and strength.’³⁹ The instruction here is more than just to follow Christ as a role model. There is a defined implication that Christ as the way is the way of love. It is His instruction that teaches love, and through His Love that man learns to love. This effectively removes the Spirit of two of His customary roles: teacher and Love. This is not to say that Bernard actually appropriated these roles from the Spirit, however, it highlights the general lack of pneumatological interest demonstrated in

SANCTUM. Osculum profecto fuit. Quid? Corporeus ille flatus? Non, sed invisibilis Spiritus.’ English translation from: *Song I*, p. 46. It should be noted that this is the same Sermon in which Bernard establishes the Holy Spirit as love, which reveals his pneumatology to be circumscribed.

³⁸ Bernard, *Sermones Cantica*, sermo: 20:7 p. 119: ‘Nam alias quidem nequaquam sine Spiritu Sancto vel in carne diligitur Christus, etsi non in illa plenitudine.’ English translation from: *Song I*, p. 153.

³⁹ Bernard, *Sermones Cantica*, sermo: 20:4 p. 116: ‘Disce, christiane, a Christo, quemadmodum diligas Christum Disce amare dulciter, amare prudenter, amare fortiter: dulciter, ne illecti, prudenter, ne decepti, fortiter, ne oppressi ab amore Domini avertamur.’ English translation from: *Song I*, 149.

Bernard's writing. Such an absence proves inadequate in the face of William's theology.

Whereas Bernard was the most outspoken of William's contemporaries on the topic of the place of love in the Godhead, it is nonetheless important to establish that the two other thinkers did share the popular understanding that the Spirit represented love in the Trinity. Hugh, like the other authors examined here, repeatedly establishes Love as an identity and faculty of the Holy Spirit. In his Trinitarian treatise, *On the Three Days*, for example, he repeatedly refers to the Spirit as 'Love,' 'the love of the Father,' 'the love of the Son,' or 'the love of the Father and the Son.'⁴⁰ In this text, the Spirit's role as Love is defined clearly as the final advancement of the Trinity. William would certainly have agreed with this placement, as well as His defined identity. Interestingly, however, Hugh only defines the Spirit by His relationship with the Father and the Son. Trinitarian relationships and identities are obviously inextricable, but Hugh seems particularly unwilling to define the Spirit individually, an omission that is not applied to the Father or the Son.

Of William's contemporaries Abelard addressed the Holy Spirit as Love the least frequently. Abelard defines the Holy Spirit within the Trinity as Goodness, 'benignitas.'⁴¹ Although William took issue with the nature of this division, this role as Goodness relates to a similar role in love that William condoned. In *Christian Theology*, Abelard writes that, because the Holy Spirit is the Goodness of God, He is naturally drawn toward good things. If the Spirit loves something, it must possess a good nature, because the Spirit would not otherwise be positively inclined towards it. Love on the part of the Spirit is, according to Abelard, an expression of goodness.⁴² William emphatically opposed Abelard's attribution of the Goodness of God to the Spirit's person. His opposition was, however, largely methodological. This understanding of the purpose of the Spirit's love, as well as the conviction that such love is intrinsic to the Holy Spirit's existence, are congenial to William's broader views.

⁴⁰ Hugh, *Diebus*, p. 52: 'amorem,' English translation from: *Days*, p. 85, Hugh, *Diebus*, p. 56: 'amor Patris et Filii.' English translation from: *Days*, p. 87.

⁴¹ He starts aligning this phrase with the Spirit in Abelard, *Theologia* lib. 1 lin. 3, and continues for the rest of the text. Occasionally, he also refers to summa bonitate as well.

⁴² Abelard, *Theology*, p. 47.

Under the title of goodness, Abelard makes claims that the Spirit controls and feeds love. Abelard, like Bernard and to an extent William, sees fear and love as the two pillars that are foundational in an individual's relationship with God. Fear is conjured by sapience and power, 'but love belongs to goodness.'⁴³ This is an application of the Trinity that, while not overtly stated, has a clear meaning. Abelard boldly assigns power and wisdom, the two faculties with which he has repeatedly defined the Father and the Son, to propagating fear. The Spirit, under the title of Goodness, generates love. While love may not be an explicit identity of the Spirit it certainly lies within His sphere of dominion according to Abelard's understanding.

William is in good company when it comes to this definition of the Holy Spirit. That said, he spends more time and attention discussing the significance of the Spirit's identity as Love than any of the other thinkers listed. For William, this identity is a pillar of faith, both because it is an important aspect of the Godhead, and because it represents an important aspect of man's relationship to God. While William is not alone in this belief, the degree to which he emphasises it, and to which Spiritual-Love permeates his understanding of the Godhead is further in his writing than is found in the writing of his contemporaries.

That the Spirit is Love is, at this point, well established. It remains to locate and analyse the significance of that identity within the context of William's theology. In his *Enigma of Faith*, William writes that, love, as a divine identity, must be granted to man in order for him to have the capacity to experience it.⁴⁴ Therefore, the Spirit visits man and invests him with the power of love with which he both loves God and his neighbour. Humanity's own goodness, as species, relies on this love, both for God and for each other. Without it, man would be detestable. At the time of man's creation, however, God had already decided that He would love the species, and that He would save some members of it to join Him in His house. Therefore, God 'poured out his love in our hearts through the Holy Spirit.'⁴⁵ In so doing, God

⁴³ Abelard, *Theologia*, ch. I:6 lin. 83: 'Benignitas autem eius ad amorem pertinent.' Self translated.

⁴⁴ *Enigma*, 90 p. 116.

⁴⁵ *Aenigma*, par. 100, p. 190: 'sui caritatem suam per Spiritum sanctum diffudit in cordibus nostris,' English translation from: *Enigma*, p. 116. The translator chose to translate caritas as love in this case,

allowed for the Holy Spirit both to save man and to liberate man to save himself. By loving his neighbour, man acts well and improves himself, by loving God, man is enlightened and is more adhered with his Creator, making him more worthy of salvation. The gift of the Holy Spirit-Love is the gift of salvation from the whole Trinity, through the Spirit to man.

The Holy Spirit acts as a sort of nurse for the weak and insufficient love of man. It is the Spirit who daily tends to man's incapability and strengthens his zeal. The Spirit cares both for man's love and the object of his love, as William informs that, 'over the impoverished and needy love of those poor in spirit and over what they love anxiously hovers the Holy Spirit, the Love of God.'⁴⁶ The Spirit not only strengthens and reinforces the meagre love of man, but it also cares for the objects of his love while he is too weak to do so. As this love is turned toward God it strengthens, and the Spirit supports and enforces it toward higher expressions of this love. The manner in which the Spirit provides this support, and its significance will be the topic of the next section.

Human Love and Divine Love in Man

William asserts that there is a precedent love *of* God, and the subsequent development of love *for* God throughout his writing career. The development from one to the other is imperative to his understanding of amorous interaction between the humane and the divine.⁴⁷ In *On Contemplating God*, he writes,

We could not with justice have been saved, had we not loved you, nor could we have loved you, save by your gift. You willed, therefore, that we should love

which, though not textually accurate retains conceptual coherence. William is likely referencing Romans 5:5.

⁴⁶ *Speculum*, ch. 108 p. 178: 'Etenim pauperum spiritu amori indigo et egeno, et ad id quod amant anxio, superfertur Spiritus Sanctus, amor Dei.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 32 p. 78.

⁴⁷ In the *Nature*, 16-20 (pp. 73-77) William articulates what he perceives to be the five senses of human love. With the exception of the final sense, these are largely stages of mundane love, and are therefore largely irrelevant to this argument. He writes that each of the five physical senses acts as a symbol of a sense of love: love for parents is similar to touch, fraternal love within the church is akin to taste, love of all mankind is smell, love of enemies, hearing, and divine love is vision. This chapter addresses love as it interacts with the Spirit, and therefore only the fifth stage of love applies. The Love of the Holy Spirit, exists outside of, and superior to, these weak forms. The Holy Spirit eventually cleanses and reorients all carnal love according to *Song*, p. 19, so the first four senses do not affect salvation. For consideration of these five senses see: G. Webb, 'William of Saint-Thierry: The Five Senses of Love,' *New Blackfriars* 46 (1965), pp. 464-468.

you. So, Lord, as the Apostle of your love tells us, and as we ourselves have said before, you ‘first loved us’; and you love all your lovers first.⁴⁸

William explicitly states the most crucial functions of love and both applies them chronologically, which illustrates emotional development, and emphasises their requirement for salvation. There are several important things to grasp from this quotation in order to understand William’s view of love. First, William indicates the injustice and impossibility of salvation without the act of loving God, reiterating love as a salvatory function. He then establishes that man is incapable of loving God without God’s help: specifically His ‘gift,’ which is the Holy Spirit.

In William’s understanding, it is God’s will that man be saved.⁴⁹ The only way for such an outcome to be just would be for man to act in a way that merits God’s forgiveness. The man who loves God demonstrates to God through this act of loving, that despite his sins, he is still possessed of a nucleus of goodness. As a result, God desires that man love Him, because love makes the soul worthy of salvation despite individual acts of unworthiness. God is benevolent and bestows the ability to love in man. The Spirit tends to this nascent ability so that it blossoms and man comes to love God, Who already loved man.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ *Contemplando* ch. 13 p.162: ‘Voluisti ergo ut amaremus te, qui nec iuste poteramus saluari nisi amaremus te; nec amare te poteramus, nisi procederet a te. Ergo, Domine, sicut Apostolus amoris tui dicit, et nos iam diximus, prior dilexisti nos, et prior diligis omnes dilectores tuos’ English translation from: *Contemplating*, 10, p. 53. He alludes to John 4:10 here.

⁴⁹ William establishes that God loves his creation repeatedly across his works. He also establishes that everything that God does is just. To love something that is unworthy of love would be injustice. Therefore, God must have implanted in man some reason to be worthy of love. William writes to God that He must, ‘Vehemently wish that you may love us in yourself through the Holy Spirit, your love, and you wish to love yourself through us and in us.’ (William, *Romanos* lib. 3, V, 5-11 p. 64: ‘Vis enim hoc, et uehementer uis ut per Spiritum tuum, amorem tuum, ames nos in te, et ames te de nobis et in nobis.’ English translation from: *Romans*, p. 95) The gift of the Spirit is not only an act of generosity on the part of the deity: by giving man the gift and investment of the Spirit, God makes man loveable so that He can justly love him, as He desires.

⁵⁰ William remains within the boundaries of tradition. Even Ambrose, whose discussion of love is limited, introduces the concept of love to his theology so as to illustrate its source, and its propensity to serve. All love, according to Ambrose is ‘a gift from God,’ (St. Ambrose of Milan, *De Officiis*, ed. and trans. Ivor J. Davidson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), book 1, paragraph 127: ‘Vitam amamus tamquam Dei munus, patriam parentesque diligimus, deinde aequales quibus sociari cupimus.’ English from same volume: p. 191.) whether it is mundane in nature or not. It follows, as he later argues, that the best way to devote oneself to God is to exercise that gift: ‘if we want to commend ourselves to God, let us possess love for one another, let us be of one mind, and let us strive to show humility.’ (Ambrose, *Officiis*, book 2, paragraph 134: ‘Si volumus commendare nos Deo, caritatem habeamus, unanimes simus humilitatem sequamur.’ English from: p. 343.) This loving behaviour reinforces godliness and demonstrates appropriate gratitude for the benevolent gift that love

In establishing his belief that the Spirit actively elevates love, William expands on Augustinian foundations. The previous section demonstrated Augustine's penchant for metaphorical triads of human faculties as a means of describing the Trinity. The faculties that he utilizes are intended to demonstrate the distinct but symbiotic relationship that the Three can maintain within the One. In addition to doing that, however, Augustine also uses these trinities to show how the Trinity relates to the human soul. This is illustrated in the following passage: 'when the mind knows and loves itself, its word is joined to it with love. and since it loves knowledge and knows love, the word is in the love and the love in the word and both in the lover and the utterer.'⁵¹ All three interact with one another and support and strengthen each other. In addition, the three-faced identity of the soul allows the individual to have different effects within the world while still having a singular identity, just as the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit do within God. The consistency of love's place as the third role within these trinities illustrates love as the responsibility of the Spirit.

There is a clear connection between the Spirit and Love in Augustine's theology, and William absorbed his suggestion that within the *imago dei*, love represents the Spirit. That said, what Augustine's theology lacks is an explicit expression of how the Spirit actually acts within that image. Augustine is clear that the Spirit is *represented* by human love, but he does not claim, as William later does, that the Spirit actively interacts with that human love. Augustine writes, for example, that anyone who possesses a sound mind is able to perceive things because the mind is in the image of the trinity: man is 'recalled by memory, beheld by intelligence, embraced by love—has thereby found the image of that supreme trinity.'⁵² What Augustine is emphasizing here is that the mind's faculties bear *similarity* to the Trinity. This is in broad contrast to William who writes, 'That precious substance by which we love

is. William would affirm a similar understanding of the place and importance of loving God with regards to the formation of the human conscience.

⁵¹ Augustine, *Trinitate*, lib. IX ch. 10: 'Cum itaque se mens nouit et amat, iungitur ei amore uerbum eius. et quoniam amat notitiam et nouit amorem, et uerbum in amore est et amor in uerbo et utrumque in amante atque dicente.' English translation from: *Trinity*, IX:15, p. 282.

⁵² Augustine, *Trinitate*, lib. XV ch. 20: 'reminiscitur per memoriam, intuetur per intellegentiam, amplectitur per dilectionem, profecto reperit, illius summae trinitatis imaginem.' English translation from: *Trinity*, XV:39, p. 431.

you is not in us from ourselves, but from your Holy Spirit whom you gave us.’⁵³ William is clear that the Holy Spirit as Love is active and resides within the lesser love of man. There is no motion in Augustine’s theology: love exists and is utilized symbolically for the Spirit. For William, love exists and is augmented, enhanced, and liberated by consistent interaction with the Spirit.

Earlier than Augustine, Origen is more prescriptive in outlining the way in which he perceives process of reordering one’s love as being accomplished. Origen does not discuss love with much frequency, nor does he connect it directly to the Spirit, however, he is resolute in his affirmation of salvation relying on love, as William also was. Origen writes, ‘It is charity alone that possesses immortality. And what is immortality, except the life eternal which God promises to give to those who believe in Him.’⁵⁴ The eternal salvation sought by all Christians is, therefore, the property of charity. Within enlightened love man can be saved. William’s application of the Holy Spirit to the shared connection between love and eternal life proves his thinking independent from Origen’s. As a result of the fact that post-lapsarian man exists carnally, he is incapable of independently determining which objects are worthy of his love. It is the work of God, therefore, to help man’s charity become properly oriented so that it loves things that are worthy and detests those that are not. For William, this is a process that is facilitated by the Holy Spirit, but Origen looks to the Bride’s call for her love to be set in order as proof that this is done by Christ.⁵⁵ Once again, while the two men’s approaches are conceptually similar, Origen’s writing is saturated with Christology, and William’s is not.

William clearly uses these patristic sources in moderation, and the parallels between his understanding of human love and that of his contemporaries are equally existent, and equally limited. Just as with defining the Holy Spirit as Love, William seems to draw some of his foundational thinking in the topic of the purpose of human love from Anselm of Canterbury. Anselm writes in the *Proslogion* that the very reason

⁵³ William, *Romanos* lib. 3, V, 5-11 p. 64: ‘Non enim est nobis a nobis tam pretiosa haec substantia qua te diligimus, sed a Spiritu sancto tuo, quem das nobis.’ English translation from: *Romans*, p. 95

⁵⁴ Origen, *Canticum*, prol. p. 90: ‘Ipsa est enim sola, quae habet immortalitatem, siquidem ‘Deus est caritas’, qui solus habet immortalitatem lucem habitans inaccessibilem. Quid autem aliud immortalitas nisi ‘vita aeterna’ est, quam daturum se promittit Deus credentibus in ipsum ‘solum verum Deum, et, quem misit, Iesum Christum’ filium eius?’ English translation from: Origen, *Song*, p. 33.

⁵⁵ Origen, *Song*, p. 187-193. He is referencing Song 2:4.

that God made man in his own image was so that he would be granted the benefit of being able to ‘remember, contemplate, and love you,’⁵⁶ thus candidly asserting love as being an important aspect of worship, as well as being one of the causes for man’s superior creation. This demonstrates a value for love that William shares, as well as a belief that love is a creative gift. William develops this infrastructure of love and expands on Anselm’s claims to affirm man’s patent inability to love well without the active help of God.

In the *Monologion*, Anselm is more explicit on the topic of love. He asserts that the very creation of rational man was for one purpose: ‘to love above all [other] goods the Supreme Being, inasmuch as it is the Supreme Good.’⁵⁷ This is a powerful statement of the importance of love: it is not only essential to human-divine relationships, it is the very cause of human existence. Anselm then launches into a lengthy analysis of how and why this love should be accomplished. Despite the nuance of this discourse, his conclusion is clear: if humans are fulfilling their purpose, which is to love God, then there is no reason for their life to be ceased. If humans are living in defiance of their nature, then they will be extinguished eternally. Although all men may die in their mundane form, ‘the human soul is such that if it keeps that end for which it exists, it will at some time live happily—truly free from death itself and every other form of distress.’⁵⁸ The key to salvation is concentrated to a very simple ethos here: love God and He will save you. Although there is obviously a great deal more required to live a good Christian life, love is both the pinnacle and the foundation of that life. Through love, the Christian soul is saved.

⁵⁶ Anselm, *Proslogion*, ch. 1 p. 100: ‘Fateor, domine, et gratias ego, quia creasti in me hanc imaginem tuam, ut tui memor te cogitem, te amem.’ English translation from: ‘Proslogion,’ p. 93 This is probably intended as a representation of the Trinity. Such a division represents very common categories given to the persons of the Trinity and although it is not directly stated, the implication is only thinly masked. Proslogion is significantly devoid of in-depth Trinitarian divisions to the degree that this trinity sufficiently implied without having to provide a detailed analysis.

⁵⁷ Anselm, *Monologion*, ch. 68 p. 78: ‘Hinc itaque satis patenter videtur omne rationale ad hoc existere, ut sicut ratione discretionis aliquid magis vel minus bonum sive non bonum iudicat, ita magis vel minus id amet aut respuat.’ English translation from, ‘Monologion,’ p. 78.

⁵⁸ Anselm, *Monologion*, ch. 69 p. 80: ‘Liquet igitur humanam animam huiusmodi esse, ut si servet id ad quod est, aliquando vere secreta ab ipsa morte et omni alia molestia beate vivat.’ English translation from, ‘Monologion,’ p. 79.

There is clearly agreement between Anselm and William with regards to the direct relationship between loving God and salvation. However, once again, William accepts Anselm's foundations and adds to them his own stipulations. Anselm concludes that it is the gift of reason that leads man to love God: because man is able to remember and understand how good God is, his natural inclination is to love Him.⁵⁹ For William, although man's reason assists in teaching man *why* he should love God, it does not give him the inherent ability to do so. That ability comes only from the Holy Spirit Whom Anselm does not specify. For both men reason leads man to want to love God, but William has stricter stipulations for the divine nature of that love before it makes a man worthy of salvation. A similar discrepancy can be seen between William's view of man's love and that of Hugh of St. Victor. It is possible that both William and Hugh grounded their theories of how to love the divine in these Anselmian origins. Whereas William adds an explicit and entrenched pneumatology to this foundation, Hugh reflects more deeply on the role of reason.⁶⁰

Within the charitable act of loving God, Hugh of St. Victor sees divisions. He writes that God can be loved in three ways: 'love runs from God, when it receives from God himself and the wherewithal to love him. It runs with God when it opposes his will in nothing. It runs unto God when it desires to rest in God himself.'⁶¹ Although William does not explicitly state these three loves as separate from each other, each one is something that he expresses in the context of the Holy Spirit. According to Hugh's quotation, the good man receives the ability to love from God, he learns to will the same things as God, and he eventually applies his own love to a desire to be with God. In William's explanation the Spirit opens man up to loving, He guides man's will to align with God's, and he transforms man's love from inadequate into all encompassing. Hugh agrees with William in terms of some of the most important uses of love, however Hugh has abstained from mentioning the Holy Spirit, Who is central to William's application of those terms.

⁵⁹ Anselm, *Monologion*, ch. 68.

⁶⁰ This will be considered in even greater detail in the section on that subject later in this chapter.

⁶¹ Hugh, *Substantia*, ch. 4 p. 90: 'Amor namque per desiderium et de Deo et cum Deo ordinate currere potest. De Deo currit quando de ipso accipit unde eum diligit. Cum Deo currit, quando eius uoluntati in nullo contradicit. In Deum currit quando in ipso requiescere appetit.' English translation from: *Substance*, p. 146.

Hugh discusses the Trinity by analogizing it to three days. He employs this metaphor in order to demonstrate how each person of the Trinity might have a separate developmental effect on the believer. With each day, the soul is impacted upon by a new force of the Triune God. The effect of the previous day is never removed, but simply built upon by the new maturation. These days should be understood, according to Hugh, as stages of enlightenment. With each stage, or day, God shines greater light on the recipient and makes clearer his spiritual purpose. Hugh emphasizes that the final day does not ‘expel’ the previous days.⁶² Although the stages must happen in a progressive order, they are maintained simultaneously, and upon the advent of the third day, they culminate in the brightness and enlightenment that the oneness of the Trinity induces.⁶³

As Hugh describes these days a clear parallel to William’s writing emerges, as well as a correlating emphasis on the Spirit. Hugh writes,

The first day is fear; the second day is truth; the third day is love. The first day has power as its sun. The second day has wisdom as its sun. The third day has kindness as its sun. Power pertains to the Father, wisdom to the Son kindness to the Holy Spirit.⁶⁴

The vocabulary here differs from that of William, but the persons are categorically the same. Fear and power are the qualities that the Father built into human nature so that man might turn to God. They are incipient reasons to follow Him, but they are necessary in order for the believer to begin his spiritual journey. The feeling of fear will continue to drive the believer even after he has taken on later stages, because even as he comes to better know God, he must still remember God’s power. Truth and Wisdom are both faculties frequently associated with the Son because of His historical manifestation. As the word, the Son educated and enlightened the people. Finally, love and kindness represent an intimate connection with the almighty. The

⁶² Hugh, *Days*, p. 93.

⁶³ Hugh, *Days*, p. 94.

⁶⁴ Hugh, *Diebus*, p. 63-63: ‘Primus dies est timor, secundus est ueritas, tercius dies est caritas. Primus dies solem suum habet potentiam; secundus dies solem suum habet sapientiam; tercius dies solem suum habet benignitatem. Potentia ad Patrem, sapientia ad Filium, benignitas pertinet ad Spiritum sanctum.’ English translation from: *Days*, p. 91

Holy Spirit, in Hugh's vision, represents the final and most advanced stage in a believer's relationship with God.

To a significant extent, Hugh implies that he sees love, kindness, and, therefore, the Holy Spirit as the highest level of interaction with the creator. However, this division strongly emphasizes the Spirit as the bearer of the final, most important, and most mature state of the human soul. Hugh may have shared, in this sense, William's pneumatological leanings. That said, Hugh's pneumatology requires a great deal of intellectual archaeology, where as William's is explicit and pervasive. In that respect, though there is a degree of agreement between the two men's theologies, William's is still the more inherently Spirit-based.

Hugh of St. Victor also considered the degree to which man is capable of Godly love. In Hugh's metaphysics, God's greatest mundane creation, man stands at the highest level of carnality and reaches toward the divine. It is cogent, therefore, to claim that man's love is applied in both directions. When man loves God, according to Hugh, he does so with charity. This is the same faculty with which God loves man. Hugh's claim implies that man has the power to love on a Godly level. William makes a similar claim when he writes that man loves charitably when his love is heightened and enlightened, but he strongly insists on the Holy Spirit as the cause of this elevation. Such a deific involvement is absent from Hugh; he simply applies the power of God to man.

Whereas Hugh and Anselm seem to perceive love for God as something towards which humans must strive, Bernard believes firmly that any love for God exhibited by man is exclusively the result of a divine gift. William's perception seems to lie somewhere between these views, in that he establishes both the need for man to seek to love God and the requirement of the Holy Spirit's bestowal of Love. However, Bernard diverges even more significantly from William in that he holds varying persons of the Trinity responsible for love. Bernard writes, 'The love of God gives birth to the love of the soul for God, and his surpassing affection fills the soul with

affection.⁶⁵ Bernard shares William's insistence that loving God is too difficult for man to accomplish singularly, however, Bernard does not identify the Holy Spirit as the source of this love.

Although he never commits to a relationship between Love and the Spirit, Bernard is explicit with regards to Christ's involvement in the human capacity for love. This focus on the Son's relationship to love is resultant of Bernard's conviction that loving the Son is what provides Christians with their superiority to other monotheistic faiths. Bernard concedes that devotees of other religions may feel love for God simply because he is the highest power, and therefore loveable in that capacity.⁶⁶ However, Bernard insists that other faiths are only capable of half the love of Christians, for they have fewer reasons to love God. Heathens, writes Bernard, do not know of the suffering, sacrifice, and humility of God the Son, nor the love that the Father expressed in sending Him.⁶⁷ Loving God to the extent that a monk should is, therefore, a uniquely Christian experience, and it was bestowed on Christians as consequence of the historical person of Jesus Christ. Accordingly, Bernard sees love as a Christologically oriented power, which is a stark deviation from William's understanding.

As William expresses it, love exists within man because God placed it there at creation, but it is awakened when it is called by the Spirit. On this point, William deviates from his theological influences. As a result of God's own love for his creation He decided to make it possible for man to become worthy of salvation despite man's many sins. The insertion of the potential for love is, therefore, an act of the Godhead, but the eventual actuality of loving is an act of the Spirit. All of salvation, therefore, hinges on the Love of the Spirit. In William's own words, 'When the spirit of man deserves to be drawn to him, spirit in Spirit, love in Love, then human love becomes in a certain manner divine; from then on, when man loves

⁶⁵ Bernard, *Sermones Cantica*, sermo: 69:7 p. 206: 'Ergo ex propriis quae sunt penes Deum agnoscit, ned dubitat se amari, quae amat tta est: amor Dei amorem animas parit, et illis praecurrens intentio animam facit, sollicitudo que sollicitam.' English translation from: *Song IV*, p. 34.

⁶⁶ Bernard, *On Loving God*, ed. and trans by Watkin Williams (Cambridge: The University Press, 1926) p. 23, see also p. 15.

⁶⁷ Bernard, *Loving*, p. 24.

God, man is at work, but it is God who works.⁶⁸ Man alone is incapable of the righteous love that is necessary in order for love to be applied to so supreme an entity as the Lord. Although the *ability* to love lies within man, it is far outside his ability to comprehend the depths of love required for such a unique Good without the investment of the Spirit. William writes, ‘our love for him is the Holy Spirit, whom he gives us.’⁶⁹ Loving God is a divine feat. Man is only is man capable of achieving that divine behaviour through the grace of the Holy Spirit.

William’s most succinct expression of how the Holy Spirit affects man’s love comes toward the end of his commentary on the Song of Songs. Here, William makes it clear that acts of love by man are only given force and significance with the assistance of the Spirit. He writes, ‘By the love of the Spirit, the leaps of human efforts do, indeed, soar from the depths to the heights.’ He continues, however, that it is the Father who gives these efforts the ‘force to attain their effect.’⁷⁰ The Father imbues man with the ability to engage in powerful acts. If these acts are good, they make the possibility of an individual’s worthiness for salvation more likely. Nevertheless, the Father does not provide the moral direction for these acts, only their force. It is the Spirit who, in his perfect love, takes the power that the Father made inherent in man, and turns it toward loving Goodness. Without the Father, man has no force, but without the endowment of Love, man has no righteousness.

The achievement of the act of loving comes with significant rewards. In William’s understanding, the experience of loving God has two fundamental spiritual benefits for the believer, both of which are made possible by the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. The process of loving God is inherently rewarding, regardless of God’s responsiveness to that love. Love strengthens and fortifies the conscience of the lover. Loving God is so good and so natural that the conscience itself rejoices in

⁶⁸ *Expositio Cantica*, p. 73: ‘Cui cum meretur affici spiritus hominis, spiritus Spiritui, amor amori, amor humanus diuinus quodammodo efficitur; et iam in amando Deum homoquidem est in opere, sed Deus est qui operatur.’ English translation from: *Song*, 100, p. 81.

⁶⁹ *Romanos*, ch. 5, 11 p. 66: ‘Amor noster ad ipsum Spiritus sanctus, quem dat nobis.’ English translation from: *Romanos*, 5:7-11, p. 98.

⁷⁰ *Expositio Cantica*, Ch. XXXI, 146 p. 103: ‘Et de imis quidem in alta per amorem Spiritus se uibrant humanorum conatuuum saltuss, sed desursum a Patre luminum uirtutem effectus sui accipiunt.’ English translation from: *Song*, 150, p. 123.

doing so without needing response. This is the first reward bequeathed to the loving soul.⁷¹

The joyful response of the conscience is enough to encourage a monk to seek to love God. However, with the realization of this enlightened love comes the most important of all rewards: love leads to eternal life.⁷² Salvation relies on the reaction of love on the part of the believer. Personal joy motivates love, but it is ultimately rewarded through salvation. The reward for love is, therefore, twofold: it exists in consolations to the living soul, but is consummated by the paramount reward after death. Each man participates in his own salvation to the extent that he seeks the Spirit's participation in himself, and accepts the burden of loving that comes with the Spirit's gift of the ability to love. To love, therefore, is a Spiritually endowed effort, but one that leads to love-eternal.

Love and Retribution

Once man's natural potential for love has been liberated by the Holy Spirit's Love, it becomes the strongest source of goodness within man. Whereas other human characteristics are easily broken, love remains strong despite confrontation with temptation. It is for this reason that it is such a capable harbinger of salvation. When a challenge to the love of an enlightened worshiper occurs, 'it says: you know that I love you...and once someone believes all matters of faith with an intrepid heart unto righteousness, let him confess with his mouth unto salvation.'⁷³ William establishes a firm correlation between the individual whose love is strong and the salvation of that individual, partially because when love is enlightened by the Spirit and turned toward God, it is more difficult to tempt or corrupt that love.⁷⁴ It provides a shield for

⁷¹ *Epistle*, 167, p. 66.

⁷² *Epistle*, 167, p. 66.

⁷³ *Speculum* ch. 33 p. 96: 'Tu scis, inquit, quia amo te...et cum cuncta quae fidei sunt intrepido corde credat ad iustitiam, ore autem confiteatur ad salute.' English translation from: *Mirror*, p. 29. William draws on John 21:15 and Romans 10:10 here.

⁷⁴ William may be appropriating the concept of fortified love from John Chrysostom. John writes that love should be cultivated in the human soul not only because of its own inherent goodness, but also because it is so powerfully good that it actually blocks negative emotions from growing. (John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians*, ed. Philip Schaff, Oxford translation, (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956) p. 195). He emphasizes this ability by writing that the devil himself tries to rob humans of love so as to, 'cut off the way of correction, and may retain him in the error and thee in enmity, and thus block up his way to salvation.' (Chrysostom, *Corinthians*, p. 199).. This understanding of love as both a powerful

the carnal self so that the soul may be refined and redirected. In this sense not only is the soul more worthy of salvation, it is also less likely to take actions that will tarnish that worthiness.

In addition to having the strength to prevent sin, according to William, love is so powerful that its involvement can cause sin to be more or less egregious. William writes that sins that are committed against loving charity are more abhorrent and more punishable than others. Conversely, so long as the sinner maintains love even despite sin, he is not beyond rescue. A sin may be committed against a different force of good with less stringent repercussions. In order to demonstrate this, William invokes the example of Peter, who lied with his mouth rather than his heart, and therefore sinned not against love, but against truth.⁷⁵ His was, therefore, a lesser sin. Alternatively, a sinner might sin because his charity was inactive, only to have it reactivated, thus triggering regret and confession. This circumstance is exemplified by David. At the time of David's sin, his inner charity was rendered temporarily incapacitated by the venom of temptation. As David recovered from this impairment, his love recognized his mistake and he repented and was forgiven immediately.⁷⁶ Therefore, if the sinner's charity itself is not corrupted, the sin has less significance and is more easily overcome. If charity is either unaffected or in some way not culpable because of lack of participation, then the sin is less grave.

Augustine seems to lie behind key aspects of William's understanding of sin. In *The Spirit and the Letter*, Augustine writes that fortunate believers who receive the gift of the Spirit are able to supersede the law and go unpunished for a sin that they have committed:

There, delighted by the sweetness and righteous through the gift of the Spirit, they may escape from punishment that the letter threatens...by faith they

deterrent and a spiritual guide can be found reiterated in William's work. However, John describes love as something that a person ought to cultivate within himself.

⁷⁵ *Nature*, 14, p. 71. William is, of course, referring to the story of Peter denying Christ three times before the cock's crow, as recorded in John 18:13-27.

⁷⁶ *Nature*, 14, p. 71. This refers to David's affair with Bathsheba from 2 Samuel 11-12.

believe that only God's grace can help their weakness to fulfil what the law of the works commands.⁷⁷

Interestingly, this is one of the rare times in which William focuses less on the action of the Spirit than one of his predecessors. Where as William describes lack of culpability as being a result of one's love being inhibited or compromised, Augustine explicitly inserts the action of the Spirit and the guidance of grace to faith as being the cause of their forgiveness.

In *The Spirit and the Letter*, in an uncharacteristic passage, Augustine also writes, 'the law of God, then, is love...when love itself is poured out in the hearts of those who believe, it is the law of faith and the Spirit who gives life to their lovers.'⁷⁸ In fact, in the twelfth chapter of his *Confessions*, Augustine explicitly says that humanity should *not* work outside of the rules of scripture: man should devote himself to loving God and man should not believe he can live outside of the law.⁷⁹ It is possible that the change in Augustine's attitude toward scriptural law is a result of the purpose for which this text was written. If Augustine enforces the rules too rigidly then he concedes that the man who follows the rules perfectly *is*, to a degree, self-saving, as the Pelagians heretically believed was possible. Focussing on the Spirit's ability to alleviate sin allows Augustine to encourage the rules, while emphasising that salvation is not within the scope of human power. Whatever his purposes, this softer, more Spiritually inclined Augustine clearly appealed to William. Augustine's argument in *The Spirit and the Letter* is one of the rare places in which the Holy Spirit is explicitly present rather than inserted by William later.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ Augustine, *De spiritu et littera*, ed. C.F. Vrba and J. Zycha, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 60 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1913), ch. 10:16 p. 169: 'confugiant per fidem ad iustificantem gratiam et per donum spiritus suavitate iustitiae dilectati poenam litterae minantis euadant...ed lege fidei, qua credit nullo modo posse suae infirmitati ad implenda ea, quae lex factorum iuberet, nisi diuina gratia subueniri.' English from: 'The Spirit and the Letter,' from *Answer to the Pelagians*, trans. Roland J Teske, ed. John E Rotelle (Hyde Park: New City Press, 1997), p. 160. This is one of Augustine's anti-Pelagian texts.

⁷⁸ Augustine, *Littera*, ch. 17:29 p. 183: 'lex ergo dei est caritas. Sed ad hanc prudentiam carnis terrendam cum in tabulis scribuntur opera caritatis, lex est fidei et spiritus uiuificans dilectorem.' English translation from: 'Letter,' p. 169. It is worth noting that Augustine is using Caritas rather than amor, here, a slight difference from William.

⁷⁹ Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. Maria Boulding (San Francisco: Ignatious Press, 2012), XII: 25 p. 396.

⁸⁰ Anne Hunt argues that, 'For William, the Holy Spirit is not love as such (as in Augustine's thinking), but the reciprocity of love. Moreover, the Holy Spirit is love *and knowledge*' in *The Trinity: Insights from the Mystics* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2010), p. 21.

In both Augustine and William there is a strong sense that they are developing on Second Corinthians, 3:6: ‘Not the letter, but the Spirit [non littera, sed Spiritu]’.⁸¹ William draws inspiration scripturally and patristically, and sets himself apart for his conviction that, while the rules are set with a purpose, the Spirit supersedes all rules, and can override sin with His supreme Love.

Theologically, William tends to explore the affirmative aspects of faith rather than lingering on damnation. His considerations of sin are brief and infrequent. The fact that he chooses to consider the degrees to which an act is sinful in the face of love demonstrates the strength of his conviction in love’s power to save. It is possible that one of his reasons for believing that sins against love are more heinous is that by sinning against love, one sins directly against the Holy Spirit.⁸² According to Matthew 12:30, there is only one unforgivable sin for the Christian: the eternal sin against the Holy Spirit. Despite the severity of unforgivable sin, there is no scriptural description of what this sin actually entails. Perhaps as a result of this ambiguity, there is very little medieval consideration of the eternal sin. In many ways, by suggesting that sinning against love some how has greater force, and is less forgivable than all other sins, William has posited his own innovative answer to what the eternal sin is. This reinforces the importance of the act of loving, and therefore the centrality of the Spirit Himself in William’s theology of salvation. It once again sets him apart from his contemporaries in that he was willing to consider eternal sin and set love as a greater barrier to damnation.

⁸¹ The remainder of this line: The letter kills but the Spirit gives life, is a favourite of William’s, and is clearly a strong theme here.

⁸² William’s writing on this topic probably influenced the later similar explorations of Peter Lombard. Peter approaches the sin of the Holy Spirit, and his analysis follows closely to William’s. Penance can be made for blaspheming against Christ, and even the Father, however the sin of the Holy Spirit is an irrevocable sentence for damnation. There is an intrinsic problem with this sin, however, and that is that there is not any specific outline of what constitutes it anywhere in scripture. Peter concludes that the acceptable answer is that the sin of the Spirit ‘is the sin of despair or obstinacy.’ (Peter, *Sentences II*, p. 211.) While obstinacy is problematic, despair seems a harsh sin to punish unforgivably. Peter speculates, therefore, that the form of despair that is worthy of such punishment is despair from salvation. The believer who loses hope of forgiveness is, in so doing, implying that the power and weight of their sin is too great to be overturned by God. They are, in short, deciding that they are more evil than God is good. Such obstinacy in the face of forgiveness is the only thing God finds unforgivable, largely because he who has given up hope for salvation will never dedicate himself to God. The connections between salvation, love, and the Holy Spirit, are present in Peter’s work in similar ways to that of William.

Love and Intellect

William is fond of drawing a connection between love and wisdom or knowledge. It is therefore worth considering how intellect, reason, wisdom, and knowledge overlap with Spirituality, and the degree to which they inform love and contribute to the journey to salvation. William frequently returns to the watch-phrase ‘amor ipse intellectus est’: Love itself is a kind of knowledge.⁸³ William is distinctive in his use of this phrase in that he includes the Holy Spirit into the established relationship between love and intellect. William writes in his commentary *On The Song*,

First knowledge was a gift from divine Wisdom, and that first love a gratuitous infusion from the Holy Spirit. From the Bride to the Bridegroom, knowledge and love are all the same; for here love itself is understanding.⁸⁴

In order to form a more complete love for God, man should strive to know Him. The Spirit infuses the soul with the ability and powers of knowledgeable love so that it can come closer to an understanding of the deity.

Interestingly, William’s belief that love can be augmented by knowledge is not limited to humanity. God, in His omnipotence, knows man intimately. He is able to see into man’s conscience, which is where He finds man’s love and worthiness. William expresses to God that, ‘Your knowledge bears witness in my conscience that I love you alone.’⁸⁵ It is worth noting that rather than describing God’s omniscient awareness as *sapientia*, as might be expected, William uses the term *scientia*, which refers to a more worldly awareness, generally perceived as secondary to wisdom. God Himself in his mightiness still approaches man with a rational, critical eye. He

⁸³ For textual evidence see: *Epistle*, 173 p. 264, *Song*, 10, l. 73, and William, *Disputatio aduersus Petrum Abaelardum*, in *Opera omnia V. Opuscula asuersus Petrum Abaelardum et de fide*, ed. Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 89A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), ch. 2, p. 20. Pyong-Gwan Pak in his PhD Dissertation from Boston College described this quotation as William’s ‘fundamental stance’ and ‘his maxim.’ (Pyong-Gwan Pak, *The Vernacular, Mystical Theology of Jan Van Ruusbroec: Exploring Sources Contexts and Theological Practices*, Boston College, (2008), p. 128) While the quotation was one that William favoured, this seems like an over-simplification of William’s body of work.

⁸⁴ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. X, 54 p. 47: ‘Cognitio uero sponsae ad sponsum et amor idem est, quoniam in hac re amor ipse intellectus est.’ English translation from: *Song*, 57, p. 46.

⁸⁵ *Expositio Cantica*, ch XXIX, 139 p. 98 Latin expanded to whole line: ‘Gratias tibi, quoniam per primitias Spiritus tui amores mei antiqui odibiles, qui alieni a te alienabant me a te, iam non sunt, cum teste scientia tua in conscientia mea, unum unice te amem, semper certe libero iudicio rationis, et quando liber et compos sui esse potest animus meus, integro affect mentis.’ English translation from: *Song*, 144, p. 114.

seeks to know the emotional state of man so that, with that knowledge, he can be made aware of man's love, his conscience, and, therefore, the degree to which he merits salvation.

William explores this interrelation between love and intellect across his monastic career. He writes that,

Love of God itself is knowledge of him; unless he is loved, he is not known, and unless he is known, he is not loved. He is known only insofar as he is loved and he is loved only insofar as he is known.⁸⁶

Knowledge of God, therefore, is an attribute of loving him. By seeking an understanding and awareness of God the believer comes closer to being able to achieve the love that he seeks. There are many works in which William explicitly connects the bestowal of enlightened and knowledgeable love to the Spirit, but in this quotation he overtly states its requirement in a proper relationship between creation and Creator.

The notion of love drawing some of its inspiration from knowledge is somewhat post-patristic. However, by the twelfth century it is fairly commonplace. Hugh of St. Victor, for example, clearly shares William's momentous treatment of theological love. In *On the Praise of Charity*, Hugh writes that charity not only cures the soul's inadequacies, and provides the soul with merit, but it even provides a source of illumination to the mind and makes it possible for the soul to perceive God.⁸⁷ In Hugh's theology, while the cupidity with which man loves mundane things does not cause spiritual reinforcement, the higher amorous power, which is charity, has almost limitless powers for instruction. In the final sentence in this quotation, Hugh attests that charity itself precipitates knowledge of God. Like William, Hugh sees love as bringing man all the closer to knowing and seeing his Creator. Hugh does not, however, specify the Spirit as being a part of that process.

⁸⁶ *Expositio Cantica*, ch XV, 71 p. 59: 'Amor quippe Dei ipse intellectus eius est; qui non nisi amatus intelligitur, nec nisi intellectus amatur, et utique tantum intelligitur quantum amatur, tantum que amatur quantum intelligitur.' English translation from: *Song*, 76, p. 64. See also p. 74 for reiteration.

⁸⁷ Hugh, *Charity*, p. 166.

Divine knowledge is not the only form of intellect that William depicts as spiritually beneficial. Love and reason are intertwined in his theology to a degree that sets him apart even from some of his scholastically inclined counterparts. Despite the fact that William clearly regarded Peter Abelard's use of reason as excessive, the two share some core concepts with regard to interrelation between love and intellect. In his *Collationes*, Abelard briefly approaches the relationship between knowledge and love that is so essential in William's understanding. *Collationes* take the form of a dialogue, however, and he therefore assigns the approach of reason to the character of the Philosopher, and that of love to the protagonist, the Christian. The result is that, although they are sometimes in agreement, the two approaches never reach the level of symbiosis that they do in William's writing.

In Abelard's dialogue, the Philosopher first defends knowledge of God in man as a vehicle through which man can increase his love for God. Philosophus argues, 'the more we know God, the more we love him, and with the reward we receive our love for God increases correspondingly.'⁸⁸ This argument should be familiar from William's writing, which would probably have incensed William given that it is attributed the Philosopher. The Christian in Abelard's dialogue, while not discrediting knowledge as a useful tool, objects to the application of love as a reward. The Christian argues that love that is conceived in reaction to a prerequisite benefit is not true love, but rather a compulsory reflex. Therefore, if knowledge of God is seen as a reward on earth, the respondent love for him will be of lesser value because it is not voluntary but rather hinged on consequence. Love that comes as a response to prior stimuli, far from being love of the provider of that stimulation, is in fact love of one's self, because the lover is only experiencing that love because he has been positively impacted. The Christian argues, therefore, that the ultimate reward from God should come in salvation. Until that time, man should love what he knows of God, rather than assuming that seeking knowledge of him will incur some reward.⁸⁹

⁸⁸ Abelard, *Collationes*, ch. 151 p. 160: 'quo amplius Deum cognoscimus magis eum diligamus, et cum ipsa retributione pariter nostra dilectio crescat in Deo, ut semper meliores efficiamur, profecto in infinitum ita nostre beatitudinis extenditur augmentum, ut numquam sit perfectum quod semper recipit incrementum.' English translation from same volume, p. 161.

⁸⁹ Abelard, *Collationes*, pp. 161-163.

Abelard's depiction of this debate probably contributed to William's alienation from, and anger towards, his work. There is an important difference between the understandings of the two men with regards to the reward of knowledge. Whereas Abelard is arguing that knowledge is the expected reward to which the lover strives, William instead suggests that knowledge is a tool that might be utilized to strengthen one's love. Love is the gift from the Spirit, knowledge, while still being a gift, is the means by which one might love more ardently.

To an extent, Abelard's Christian conforms to William's understanding of knowledge and love as gifts, but with an inverse order of bestowal. What upsets the Christian about the Philosopher's argument is the notion that God would grant the gift of love to an individual as a reward for seeking out knowledge. In the Christian's eyes, the acquisition of knowledge, while valuable, does not merit such a benevolent accolade. Love is a supreme faculty, and, as William and Abelard both concluded, the power to love God is divine and salvatory. An individual does not deserve this power simply for seeking knowledge of God. As Abelard describes it, if a man endeavours through piety and humility to teach himself to love God, and therefore behaves in a way that earns him spiritual merit, this act is worthy of reward. To the amatory seeker, God provides the fitting reward of knowledge. In Abelard's understanding, therefore, the Christian, rather than using knowledge to teach oneself love, should give himself up to love in the hopes of being rewarded with the bestowal of knowledge.⁹⁰

This argument is incompatible with William's. Abelard seems to view love as a struggle, while knowledge has the potential to be granted as a gift. William, on the other hand, could never accept the idea that knowledge could be granted as a reward for love, because such a reward naturally implies that love can be obtained by man through his own achievement, rather than through the generosity of the Spirit. William's intense belief that the Holy Spirit alone can bestow the liberation of human love once again sets him apart. In his early text *On the Sacrement*, William writes, 'just as the spirit is to the flesh, so charity is to knowledge.'⁹¹ Knowledge, for

⁹⁰ Abelard, *Collationes*, ch. 154 p. 164.

⁹¹ William, *De sacramento altaris*, ed. Stanley Ceglar and Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 88 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), ch. 14, p. 90: 'Accedat spiritus ad carnem, sicut caritas ad scientiam.' Self translated.

William is laudable, but the capacity for it is mundane, whereas love is spiritual. While both William and Abelard describe love as the greater quality than knowledge, for Abelard, the smaller reward comes as a result of greater struggle, whereas for William that great struggle, the struggle to love, is impossible for man to accomplish without the Spirit: it must be given.

William's extended explorations of the fusion between love and intellect also encompass concepts of reason and rationality. William writes that *caritas*, the most accomplished form of love, develops from the combination of *amor* and *ratio*.⁹² These are the 'two eyes' with which enlightened love seeks to see 'the light that is God.'⁹³ Both eyes are equally necessary in the approach to the deity because without the grounding power of reason, love becomes too ethereal, but without the uplifting joy of love, reason lacks the ability to approach the heights of reality that are divine. The two forces work together symbiotically to create a more powerful, more sophisticated form of love.

To an extent, William sees reason as an early stage of love, which is why the addition of the second eye transforms it so dramatically. However, William is adamant that when the two combine, the wisdom and knowledge that are born from such an enlightened reason constitutes a new form of love in itself. Reason informs love and love guides reason.⁹⁴ By experiencing love in God, man comes better to know his own Creator and Saviour: 'by loving he may understand and by understanding he may love. For in this way the spirit faithful to God deserves the Holy Spirit. Grace merits grace, faith merits understanding.'⁹⁵ Conforming to the love of God is, therefore, an act both of love and of reason. The two foster each other, and both faculties are strengthened through their mutual experiences.

⁹² It should be remembered that *amor* is not itself naturally lower. It as a term applies to general love including unenlightened love and *caritas*.

⁹³ *Natura*, ch. 21 p. 193: 'lumen quod Deus est.' English translation from: *Nature*, 21, p. 77.

⁹⁴ *Epistle*, 196, p. 78.

⁹⁵ *Speculum*, p. 90: 'et diligendo intelligatur et intelligendo diligatur. Sic enim creditus cum Deo Spiritus meretur Spiritum sanctum, gratia gratiam, fides intellectum et affectum pietatis et intellectionem amoris, in captivitatem redigentem omnem intellectum in obsequium Christi, ut secundum quod scriptum est: Nisi credideritis non intelligetis, qui credit amando intelligere mereatur quod credit.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 9, p. 23.

Over the course of William's discussion of the interrelation of reason and love, he contends that reason seeks its answers in what is not. The rational approach to things requires provable, comprehensible answers. With God, these are difficult to obtain, and resultantly reason knows God only through his absence of definability.⁹⁶ While this definition is in the negative, it is nonetheless informative: 'Reason, therefore, seems to advance through what God is not toward what God is.'⁹⁷ Reason provides the seeker with a reverse understanding of God. It is based on absence, but it is nonetheless revealing to demonstrate what God is not.

Love, conversely, knows God in the positive sense. Love is not based on fact, but on Spiritually endowed experience. Love does not need to define its subject in order to love it. William explains that the result of this capacity of love is that love 'advances more by its shortcomings and apprehends more by its ignorance...love, putting aside what God is not, rejoices to lose itself in what he is.'⁹⁸ Although the soul seeking God cannot define God's presence, it can nonetheless rejoice in it, and this is done through love. Through this rejoicing and loving, the seeker brings himself closer to God's Love through the invigoration of his own. His understanding of God is augmented through this charitable sharing and through his own ecstasy in the experience of the divine. In this way, Love is able to provide the lover with a more thorough understanding of its subject, despite the fact that the experience of love is divorced from empiricism.

The result of approaching God with these two powers, reason and love, is that the believer is provided with a more comprehensive understanding of the deity. The negative comprehension of absence provided by reason overlaps with the positive experience of love to provide a fuller image. In this way, the seeker is able to interpret information regarding both what He is and what He is not. As William writes, 'Reason has the greater sobriety, love the greater happiness.'⁹⁹ Reason brings

⁹⁶ *Natura*, 21, p. 77.

⁹⁷ *Natura*, ch. 21 p. 193: 'Ratio ergo per id quod non est, in id quod est uidetur proficere.' English translation from: *Natura*, 21, p. 78.

⁹⁸ *Natura*, ch. 21 p. 193: 'Amor autem suo defectu plus proficit, sua ignorantia plus apprehendit...amor postponens quod non est, in eo quod est gaudet deficere.' English translation from: *Natura*, 21, p. 78.

⁹⁹ *Natura*, ch. 21 p. 193: 'Ratio maiorem habet sobrietatem, amor beatitudinem.' English translation from: *Natura*, 21, p. 78.

a sense of gravity to the spiritual experience while love brings uplifting joy. The combination of these two approaches brings a higher understanding through which the seeker can approach Him with the resultant more perfect loving charity.

The topic of love's reliance on, and interaction with, intellectual concepts is one of the places in which William demonstrates the most original thinking. Many of his conclusions can scarcely be found in authoritative influences, yet it is a topic on which he spends a great deal of time. To the extent that he is remembered in modern historiography, William is often associated with his formulation of the phrase *ratio fide*.¹⁰⁰ This section illustrates that, while rational faith is an attribute of William's use of intellect, rational love, and indeed a rational relationship with God's Love is the cornerstone of that faith.

William demonstrates a creative and carefully reasoned theology with regards to knowledge, and it can in no way be separated from his theology of love. William was repulsed by what he saw as the exclusive use of logic, such as in the case of Peter Abelard who uses logic as the solitary support for his argument without other evidence for his theological claims. Contrastingly, William champions logic as a valuable contribution to a theological argument if it is accompanied and augmented by other Spiritual sources. The use of this elite level of reasoning was a goal that William saw as being achievable only through the Love and the consistent assistance of the Holy Spirit.

Love and Mystical Spirituality

William perceives personal experience with the Holy Spirit as an important means through which the developing soul receives enlightenment. As a result of his consistent devotion to experience, it is relevant to consider William's theology of

¹⁰⁰ For some prominent examples of this see: David Tracy, 'Trinitarian Theology and Spirituality: Retrieving William of St. Thierry for Contemporary Theology Towards a Trinitarian Theology Centered on Love,' in *Rethinking Trinitarian Theology: Disputed Questions and Contemporary Issues in Trinitarian Theology*, eds. Robert J. Woźniak and Giulio Maspero (London: T and T Clark, 2012), particularly pp. 390-407, and Elder, E Rozanne, 'William of St. Thierry: Rational and Affective Spirituality,' in *The Spirituality of Western Christendom*, ed. E. Rozanne Elder (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Studies, 1976), pp. 85-105.

love in light of his mysticism.¹⁰¹ Love naturally lends itself to mystical interaction, because it is such an important basis for an individual's relationship with his Creator. William extols a harmony between love and contemplation with regards to approaching God. He writes that love, once it has been enlightened, becomes a tool for contemplation. Through enlightened love, the believer, 'speaks inwardly with God.'¹⁰² This interior contemplation is made more communicative with the power of love, but it is necessary for this love to have already been improved by the intercession of the Holy Spirit.

William emphasizes the correlation between the act of contemplating and that of loving to the point of contending that they are the same act. William attests that pondering goodness is the same process as loving it, because ruminating on goodness leads to adoration of that goodness. The same principle must naturally apply to the highest good, which is God. Therefore, William suggests that, 'to ponder him and to love him are the same.'¹⁰³ This conclusion is particularly revealing considering that William's theology is based on a strictly personal, contemplative mysticism that leads to momentary interactions with God that bring the believer closer to an eventual intimacy with the Creator. If the act of contemplation, which is the gateway to interaction with the deity, is also an act of enlightened love, that fact solidifies the requirement of love in the pursuit of salvation.

William is consistently set apart from his contemporaries because of his use of pneumatology, and mysticism reveals this most blatantly because it is the Holy Spirit with whom man interacts in moments of ecstatic experience. In William's view, the goal of any morally guided man is to increase his likeness to his Creator. William intuits that the ability to do this relies on loving contemplation, which leads both to personal interaction with God, and to a greater ability to make one's self like God as a result of the superior awareness derived from that interaction. Love and contemplation cannot be separated, nor can loving contemplation from salvation. Mysticism allows man to contemplate God through the medium of his own soul. By looking inwardly, man is able to see the likeness of God that exists within him. By

¹⁰¹ See introduction for clarification of term.

¹⁰² *Speculum*, ch. 117 p. 186: 'qui intus Deo loquitur.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 32 p. 83.

¹⁰³ *Speculum*, ch. 113 p. 182: 'quod cogitare et amare idipsum est.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 32 p. 81.

appealing outwardly to God, man is able to increase his own similarity through the attendance of the Holy Spirit.

William's affirmation of the contemplative life as a means through which to increase similitude was probably enforced by his reading of Augustine.¹⁰⁴ Whether or not Augustine is accepted as an active mystic himself, he addressed, undeniably, topics of contemplation and adherence to God. Descriptions that could be assessed as mystical are scattered throughout Augustine's works and many of them are directly related to the concept of love. In his *Confessions*, for example, Augustine describes what should be interpreted as a mystical experience in which he has a vision of light. This light exists above all else, but not in a trivial physical sense: it is above everything in that it is superior to everything. He writes of this light, 'anyone who knows the truth knows it, and whoever knows it knows eternity. Love knows it.'¹⁰⁵ Here, in a moment of mystical contact with God, Augustine espouses both that love is a way of knowing Him, and that knowing him, through experiences such as this, implies eternal life. Although descriptions such as this one are not common from Augustine, this is one example from which William could have developed.

Nevertheless, although William may have derived some inspiration from Augustine in his own iteration of this argument, his approach is different. Augustine is inspired by God to experience disgust with himself. He writes that God leads him to look inwardly and recognize, 'how despicable I was, how misshapen and begrimed, filthy and festering.'¹⁰⁶ Where William also expresses such self-loathing in his *Meditations*, his approach to contemplation-induced revelation and self-improvement is a positive one. Rather than focusing on man's natural moral poverty, William appeals to man's ability to improve. The spiritual growth resultant from divine experience that Augustine describes is one that is predicated on an experience of shame and remorse. William, contrastingly, focuses on love's ability to lift humanity

¹⁰⁴ Cuthbert Butler, *Christian Mysticism: The Teaching of Ss. Augustine, Gregory, and Bernard on Contemplation and the Contemplative Life* (London: Constable and Company, 1926), p. 24, refers to Augustine as the 'Prince of Mystics'. See also discussion in Mark A. McIntosh, *Mystical Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), pp. 12-13.

¹⁰⁵ Augustine, *Confessionum libri tredecim*, ed. L. Verheijen, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 27 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1981), book: VII ch. 10: 'qui nouit ueritatem, nouit eam, et qui nouit eam, nouit aeternitatem. Caritas nouit eam.' English translation from: *Confessions*, p. 179.

¹⁰⁶ Augustine, *Confessionum*, book: VIII ch. 7: 'ut uiderem, quam turpis essem, quam distortus et sordidus, maculosus et ulcerosus.' English translation from: *Confessions*, p. 212.

out of its natural abjection toward not only salvation in the after life, but even a state of improvement during life. He writes, 'In loving you, God, the conscience which loves finds great reward.'¹⁰⁷

William has most in common on the topic of mysticism with Bernard of Clairvaux. Like William, Bernard devotes a great deal of effort to describing and chronicling the spiritual journey of the believer. The two monks share the conviction that it is love that defines a mature approach to God. Bernard celebrates this advancement with the proclamation, 'How great the power of love: what great confidence and freedom of spirit! What is more manifest than that fear is driven out by perfect love!'¹⁰⁸ This power of love is what reinforces the worshiper with the strength and the boldness to continually approach God. For both William and Bernard, the sheer experience of love is both the temptation and reward of the endeavouring soul.

In Bernard's interpretation, the two pillars of belief in God are fear and love. In the previous chapter, Bernard's examination of reason and will made clear the importance of fear. Reason teaches to fear punishment, which drives man's will to seek higher approaches. Love is that higher approach. Bernard writes that as the soul develops, its love grows stronger, 'until finally he comes to a state where perfect love entirely casts out fear.'¹⁰⁹ Although he is a clear proponent of fear as a source of inspiration to the burgeoning believer, Bernard claims that this fear must be balanced out and tempered by love, and that eventually, in the relationship between a just believer and his deity, the superior power of love will eclipse the weaker fear.

The journey from fear into perfect love is documented in its greatest detail in Bernard's *On Loving God*. In this text, Bernard outlines a series of steps that the soul experiences as its love is heightened. The steps progress, as might be expected, from the state of loving out of fear to that of loving perfectly. In the first stage, the

¹⁰⁷ *Epistula*, ch. 167 p. 263: 'Nam et in diligendo te, Deus, retribution magna est diligenti conscientiae ipsa dilectio tua.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 167 p. 66.

¹⁰⁸ Bernard, *Sermones Cantica*, sermo: 7:3 p. 32: 'O quanta vis amoris! Quanta in spiritu fiducia libertatis! Quid manifestius quam quod perfecta caritas foras mittit timorem?' English translation from: *Song I*, p. 40.

¹⁰⁹ Bernard, *Sermones Cantica*, sermo: 51:9 p. 89: 'Ceterum si paulatim per incrementum gratiae coeperit deficere timor et proficere spes, cum demum ad hoc ventum fuerit ut perfecta caritas ex toto foras mittat timorem, nonne eiusmodi anima singulariter in spe constituta videbitur, ac perinde etiam in pace in idipsum dormire iam et requiescere?' English translation from: *Song III*, p. 47.

believer loves only himself, he then realizes that he is not alone in the universe and so begins to love God selfishly, for protection both from God and from His other creations. Having discovered God in this second stage of love, curiosity leads man to learn more about God and the more he learns, the greater his love becomes. In this stage he, 'loves God, not merely as his benefactor but as God.'¹¹⁰ Bernard speculates that this stage may be as far as many men are capable of going while alive.

If a believer possesses the resolve to continue to the fourth stage, and the perfection with which it is associated, then his love for God transcends the self. Rather than loving God for man's sake, or even loving God for Himself, in this stage man loves everything in existence, including his own soul, for the sake of God.¹¹¹ This journey reflects some of the similarities between William and Bernard: both see the development of love for God as a multi-step process through which every soul must journey in order to self-improve. For both men, part of this process is an adherence to God through meditative rumination on Him until recognition of his goodness is reached. There are, however, some significant differences. Most essentially, Bernard describes this process as something through which man develops, whereas for William, the only way in which man is able to overcome weaker love is through the intercession of the Holy Spirit. Not only does Bernard's outline lack the implications of a divine intervention, but the text is pneumatologically barren.

Contemplation is the process by which the ardent willing of the previous chapter transforms into love. As zealous focus and contemplation on the deity transforms good will into love, so too the Holy Spirit lends importance and weight to those contemplations, elevating both love and thought. William describes this process as a part of his vision of the progression toward superior monastic living:

When the object of thought is God and the things which relate to God and the will reaches the stage at which it becomes love, the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of

¹¹⁰ Bernard, *Loving*, p. 61. For greater detail on each of these stages see: step one, ch. VIII, p. 42, step two and three, ch. IX, p. 45-46, step four: ch. X, p. 47, Perfect Love, ch. XI, p. 50.

¹¹¹ Bernard, *Loving*, p. 62.

life, at once infuses himself by way of love and gives life to everything lending his assistance in prayer, in meditation or in study to man's weakness.¹¹²

Contemplation is revealed as an essential asset to love so that it is possible for love to be strengthened by the Holy Spirit. Conversely, however, that spiritual strengthening that is initiated by loving contemplation also draws the Spirit to assist in future contemplative acts. He gives strength to the reflections of those who contemplate lovingly. The ability to reach higher levels of proximity to God relies both on the love and on the thought of the lover. Mysticism is integral to William's vision of salvatory love, because love strengthens experience, and experience encourages love.

Conclusions and Relations to the Greater Thesis

William strongly emphasises God as the source for love. Whereas man seeks to, and often succeeds in, loving God, this love is preceded by divine Love for man. Just as God implanted the potential for good will in man at his creation, but individuals are aided by grace and choose whether or not to enact it, so too, God implants in man the potential for the perfect love of God, but individuals may or may not realize that potential. From the time of man's genesis, God loved his creation, but each believer must learn individually to love God over the course of his own lifetime. Once again, like will, this process is accomplished through the uplifting grace of the Holy Spirit.

The human soul increases in likeness to God by loving Him. It requires divine power acting in man for man to love God, therefore, by utilizing that power, man is behaving in a way that reflects spiritual similarity. William writes of the loving Bride, man's soul, that God

Calls her 'beautiful,' for once again he has conformed her to his image and likeness according to man's original state. He commands her...not merely to love but to love passionately.¹¹³

¹¹² *Epistula*, ch. 249 p. 279: 'Cum uero de eis quae de Deo uel ad Deum sunt cogitatur, et uoluntas eo proficit ut amor fiat, continuo per uiam amoris infundit se Spiritus sanctus, spiritus uitae, et Omnia uiuificat, adiuuans seu in oratione seu in meditatione seu in tractatu infirmitatem / cogitantis.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 249 p. 92.

¹¹³ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. XXXIV, 157 p. 110: 'Formosam suam denominat, quam secundum atiquae conditionis dignitatem imagini et similitudini suae reformat. Iubet eam non solum surgere et

Love is the Holy Spirit. Therefore, through the act of loving, the soul conforms to the Spirit. The human soul becomes more beautiful and more lovable by becoming more like God, which is made possible by the love of the Spirit. This recalls the juxtaposition of image and likeness: the ability to love was implanted in man at his creation; although it gives him a kernel of similarity to the divine it does not make him worthy of praise. Through the act of loving man achieves likeness. This act is made possible by the image, it is undertaken by each individual, and it is urged and elevated by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit allows man to realize likeness and likeness allows man to be saved.

Similitude is necessary for salvation because similitude is the reason for which mankind is loved. In his contemplation of God's nature, William writes, 'You, therefore, love us insofar as you make us lovers of yourself, and we love you insofar as we receive your Spirit, who is your Love.'¹¹⁴ God only loves man in that He loves His own image within man. Therefore, both love for God and Love of God are because of the human participation in the Spirit. The reason human love needs to be elevated by the Spirit is twofold. The first is so as to increase likeness. The second is that without participation of the Spirit man is unable to love God and God will therefore not love man. Human love alone is not strong enough to merit God's affections. In order for Him to love an individual enough to save him, therefore, that individual must have the power of divine Love inside himself so that God can love that reflection of Himself. The order in which love strengthens is as follows: God loves man as His creation, but is disappointed in his failures. Man strives to love God. The Holy Spirit guides man's love and helps it build strength. Finally, the Spirit enters man's love both elevating it and acting on its behalf. Man's love is finally strong enough to love God's Love because it now *is* God's Love. Man's Love is worthy of being saved.

uenire, sed et properare; hoc est non solum amare, sed et uehementer amare.' English translation from: *Song*, 160 pp. 131-132.

¹¹⁴ *Contemplando*, ch. 15 p. 163: 'Amas itaque nos in quantum nos efficis tui amatores; et nos amamus te in quantum a te Spiritum tuum accipimus, qui est amor tuus.' English translation from: *Contemplating*, 11 p. 55.

William combines and connects all of the faculties that he perceives as being essential to the Holy Spirit and to salvation. As Will was connected to the stronger attribute of Love, so too Love leads toward Unity. His explanations of this transition are numerous, however they can be exemplified by the following passage, and it is consequently worth quoting at length:

Whenever a soul receives by God's gift, a certain grace for its own profit, it receives also, with that gift, understanding of the Giver; that man may not be ungrateful to God, but his turning may be toward the Giver. When humble love turns toward God more ardently, it is conformed to him toward whom it turns; because as it turns it is given by him toward whom it turns; because as it turns it is given by him an aptitude for such conformity. And since man is made in the likeness of his Maker, he becomes attracted to God; that is, he becomes one spirit with God, beautiful in his Beauty, good in his Goodness; and this takes place in proportion to the strength of his faith, the light of his understanding and the measure of his love. He is then in God by grace, what God is by nature.¹¹⁵

Love opens the human soul to the potential for union with God. Man starts with a mere humble love, one that is weak and only worthy of his carnal nature. Once the Spirit has awakened in man the desire to fix his love to God, and has strengthened man's ability and resolve toward loving God, this love develops an awareness and understanding of God. Loving God is itself a form of imitating Him since it is a Godly act. The act of imitation brings the believer closer in their simulation to a reality of similitude. The highest form of similitude is a likeness so strong that the differences cease to exist and man is able to cleave to God and dissolve into His Oneness through the realization of unity. It is a requirement of the process of unification, therefore, to love and love passionately.

¹¹⁵ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. XIX, 90 p. 69: '*Quaecumque enim anima ad utilitatem suam, aliquam donante Deo accipit gratiam, cum dono ipso, donates etiam accipit intelligentiam, ut non sit homo Deo ingratus, sed ad donantem semper sit conuersio eius. Cui cum ardentius intendit humilis amor, ipsi cui intendit conformatur; quia interndendo in hoc ipsum ab ipso efficitur. Cumque efficitur ad similitudinem facientis, fit homo Deo affectus; hoc est cum Deo unus spiritus, pulcher in pulchro, bonus in bono; idque suo modo secundum uirtutem fidei, et lumen intellectus, et mensuram amoris, existens in Deo per gratiam, quod ille est per naturam.*' English translation from: *Song*, 94 p. 76

William writes that without the love of God a man is spiritually dead. Just as the human soul is what differentiates body from corpse, so too the soul needs love of God in order to provide it with productive sensual and spiritual experiences.¹¹⁶ As a consequence of loving God, ‘the person is made one spirit with God to whom he is attracted.’¹¹⁷ Man’s love for God drives him towards the Love of God, which is the Spirit. Through ardent loving, the two loves are able to combine, thus uniting the spirit of man with the Spirit of God through their mutual love. Unity with God and blissful salvation are the work of the Holy Spirit in man acting through Love.

William envisions many interpretations and manifestations of the Trinity within the human mind. Within these the strongest seat of the Spirit is love. As William writes,

In those things which pertain to God, the sense of the mind is love. Through this love it senses whatever it senses of God, according to the spirit of life. And, the spirit of life is the Holy Spirit; by him anyone loves who loves what truly ought to be loved.¹¹⁸

This is a powerful statement of the vitality of the Spirit in man’s relationship with the divine. The Spirit allows man to sense God and to come to know him, both through the instrument of loving Him. This increased sensibility, awareness, and love all drive man towards a higher goal. Through them, man experiences the divine with increased aptitude and similarity, and through them, man comes closer to worthiness of salvation. The Spirit teaches man to love, and accordantly, the Spirit allows man to be saved.

¹¹⁶ *Mirror*, 29 p. 72.

¹¹⁷ *Speculum*, ch. 99 p. 170: ‘*unus spiritus efficitur homo cum Deo, cui afficitur.*’ English translation from: *Mirror*, 29 p. 72.

¹¹⁸ *Speculum*, ch. 97 p. 168: ‘*In eis vero quae sunt ad Deum, sensus mentis amor est; ipso sentit quicquid de Deo secundum Spiritum vitae sentit. Spiritus autem vitae, Spiritus Sanctus est, de quo amat quicumque amat quod vere amandum est.*’ English translation from: *Mirror*, 27 p. 71.

Chapter 5: Unity

The final quality of the Holy Spirit that William depicts as essential to salvation is unity. There are several ways in which unity relates to the Holy Spirit, and through the Holy Spirit to salvation. Unity is once again a formal name for the Spirit, and an aspect of His identity within the Trinity. Man participates in the Unity of the Spirit through three main avenues. The first is through the spirit of adoption: the Spirit leads man to become worthy of participation in the divine family by imitating Christ and adopting God as his true Father. The second form of unity takes place through the Spirit of matrimony as it is described in the Song of Songs. In this form of unity the individual soul is united with the groom, Christ, through the Holy Spirit. The third and highest level of unity is participation in the Holy Spirit Himself. The Spirit allows man to partake in His own divinity, which unites man to God. William outlines how all of these forms of union are possible because of the Spirit, who gives extraordinary power to the human soul if He is invested properly. William suggests that, while studying God has value in establishing awareness of Him, spiritual connection is vastly more valuable. In his instructional text, the *Golden Epistle*, he writes ‘It is for others to serve God, it is for you to cling to him; it is for others to believe in God, know him, love him and revere him; it is for you to taste him, understand him, be acquainted with him, enjoy him.’¹ Unity in this form requires diligent work from the individual as well as the bestowal of grace from the Spirit and William’s descriptions of it border on deification. For William union with God is the central aspect of pneumatological salvation.

Unity must be approached in a different manner to the way in which will and love were considered. Whereas William identified will and love as pre-existing emotional faculties that needed to be reoriented, unity, by contrast, is a goal towards which man must strive. The development of good will is the inaugural step in a spiritual

¹ *Epistula*, ch. 16 p. 231: ‘Aliorum est enim Deo seruire, uestrum est adhaerere. / Aliorum est Deum credere, scire, amare, et reuereri; uestrum est sapere, intelligere, cognoscere, frui.’ English translation from: *Epistle*, 16 p. 14.

progression. Love is the force by which progress is made. Unity, however, is the pinnacle of that progression. In this sense, although Unity is a part of the process of spiritual elevation, it is superior to that process: it is the outcome.

There are significant aspects of William's understanding of Unity that have been developed from the greater theological tradition of which he is a part. The belief that the Holy Spirit represents the Oneness of the Trinity, for example, is dogmatic. The concept of the spiritual adoption originates in Romans 8:15, and is a Pauline definition of the Christian experience. Although other theologians have explored this metaphor since St. Paul, William's provides a significantly more detailed explanation of the process and experience of adoption.² Similarly, matrimonial union as a theological tradition generally recalls the Song of Songs, and exegetical considerations of that book explore this form of union.³ That said, William deviates appreciably in the extent to which he believes that deific unity will be manifested. William takes the authority given to him by II Corinthians 3:6: *littera enim occidit Spiritus autem vivificat*, to reject the rules established both scripturally and traditionally. His belief that an individual can be subsumed into the Spirit's Unity is a result of the rejection of those rules, and it is a conclusion that he reaches without the use of authoritative evidence.

Historiographical consideration for William's theological understanding of Unity is patchy. Dechanét fails entirely to recognize the importance of Unity to William's theology, although he does note that William sees the Holy Spirit's grace as the thing which allows for better imitation of Christ, which is an aspect of unity.⁴ Bell, too, seems to ignore the concept, and Cvetkovic points out the scriptural context for William's understanding of unity but does not analyse its significance.⁵ Elder describes a hierarchy of mental faculties that starts with Will and progresses to Love,

² Origen and Abelard are of relevance to the current discussion.

³ See for example: Origen, St. Ambrose, St. Bede, Gregory the Great, Gregory of Narek (an Armenian monk with whom William would not have been familiar) St. Bernard, Gilbert of Hoyland, and John of Ford.

⁴ J. M. Déchanet, *Aux Sources de la Spiritualité de Guillaume de Saint-Thierry* (Bruges: Éditions Charles Beyaert, 1940), p. 15.

⁵ David Bell, *The Image and Likeness: The Augustinian Spirituality of William of St. Thierry* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1984). Carmen Angela Cvetkovic, *Seeking the Face of God: The Reception of Augustine in the Mystical Thought of Bernard of Clairvaux and William of St. Thierry* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), p. 213.

however, she incorrectly suggests that Wisdom is its final state.⁶ More informative considerations can be found in some of the more specific literature focused on William's thought.⁷ For example, in his 1965 study, Robert Thomas unfolds William's description of the Oneness of the trinity and the Spirit's role as that Unity, however, he comes to some unsubstantiated conclusions regarding roles of the other persons of the Trinity.⁸ Delesalle notes how distinctive William's description of unity is, but unfortunately the length of the article is insufficient to fully explore the intricacies of the topic.⁹ Although these articles contribute to the general understanding of William's articulation of unity, a complete consideration of the topic is still lacking.

For William, Unity's place in the human mind is different from Will and Love. Unity is a state of being. For this reason, the subjects that were intertwined with the affecti are not applicable here. The earlier sections of this chapter are familiar: unity's role with regards to likeness will still need to be established within the framework of William's metaphysics. In addition, although far more briefly than in the previous two chapters, that the Holy Spirit *is* Unity, and that he affects man's ability to unify will be made evident, in three sections, each focused on a type of unification that William perceives. First, the Spirit of adoption will be presented as an option through which man can be united to God in a familial sense. While this is not unity in the sense that the individual soul is made fully one with the divine, it does allow for complete acceptance of God as the authority by which man lives. Next, the unity of matrimony will be considered. This describes the process by which the human soul

⁶ E Rozanne Elder, 'William of St. Thierry: Rational and Affective Spirituality,' in *The Spirituality of Western Christendom*, ed. E. Rozanne Elder (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Studies, 1976), p. 89.

⁷ Brief mentions of William's concept of unity are also made in Bernard McGinn's *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism*, vol. II: The Growth of Mysticism (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1994), p. 232, Odo Brook's article, 'The Speculative Development of the Trinitarian Theology of William of St. Thierry in the <<Anigma fidei,>>' in *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 28, (1961), pp. 193-211, David Tracy's article Tracy, David, 'Trinitarian Theology and Spirituality: Retrieving William of St. Thierry for Contemporary Theology Towards a Trinitarian Theology Centered on Love' in *Rethinking Trinitarian Theology: Disputed Questions and Contemporary Issues in Trinitarian Theology*, eds. Robert J. Woźniak and Giulio Maspero (London: T and T Clark, 2012), p. 405, and Michael Tomasic's article 'Neoplatonism and the Mysticism of William of St.Thierry,' in *An Introduction to the Medieval Mystics of Europe*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Albany: State University of New York, 1984), p. 69.

⁸ Thomas, Robert, 'William of Saint-Thierry: Our Life in the Trinity.' *Monastic Studies* vol. 3, (1965), pp. 139-164.

⁹ Delesalle, Jacques, "'On Being 'One Single Spirit' with God in the Works of William of Saint-Thierry,'" trans. Brian kerns, *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, v. 33.1, (1998), pp. 19-29

weds itself in spirit to Christ, through this union the two become one and the human spirit is exchanged for Spirit. The final and most distinct version of unity is active participation in the Holy Spirit. In this stage, the individual forsakes his individuality as he becomes entirely enveloped by the Holy Spirit, through Whom he participates in the divine.

Unity through Likeness

William repeatedly makes references relating the three qualities of Will, Love, and Unity to each other and to the concept of spiritual improvement through the increase in likeness to God. In the *Golden Epistle*, William describes these three as a form of combined likeness to God. William suggests that, through achieving higher, more pure forms of these faculties, man achieves a likeness that is ‘so close in its resemblance that it is styled not merely a likeness but a unity of spirit.’¹⁰ It is well established that, while man possesses a permanent similarity to God that is His image in man, there is a fluctuating likeness, which man builds as he increases his similitude to God. The faculties of will and love, both of which are the domain of the Spirit, are those things which have the power to increase this likeness, but the increase of likeness is what defines the realization of unity.

As was examined in the chapter on will, William explains that a kind of unity with God is developed out of man’s possession of good will. As the Spirit guides man, his will increases in similitude to God’s will, and man’s own will slips into likeness. He no longer wills differently than God, not because he is unable to, but because he does not desire to do so. This is itself a type of unity: it is the achievement of perfect likeness within the dimensions of will.¹¹

Next, the Spirit brings about the same unity within love. He teaches man to love even as God loves. As William explicates, the Spirit acts as the love of Father and Son, and in so doing also is their Unity. Therefore, when the Spirit enlightens the love of man and calls upon him to partake in charity, He invigorates the charity of God in man. The Holy Spirit, ‘becomes for man in regard to God in the manner appropriate

¹⁰ *Epistula*, ch. 262 p. 282: ‘in tantum proprie propria, ut non iam similitudo, sed unitas spiritus nominetur.’ English translation from: *Epistle*, 270 p. 95.

¹¹ *Epistle*, 261-263 p. 95.

to him what he is for the Son in regard to the Father or for the Father in regard to the Son through unity of substance.¹² The Spirit acts as a mediator between Godhead and man. As a result He imbues man with the same types of power that he provides within the Trinity. Although these do not have the same force that they do within the Godhead, the Spirit's impact on man's ability to love elevates him beyond something that is merely human. The result is a unity between man and God because the Spirit draws man to God by increasing his similarity in charity. Through the elevation and purification of love, man's love is made alike to God's. The Spirit creates a unity between man and God by improving these two faculties of will and love. This unity is both a hallmark of a man that is to be saved, and represents that salvation itself.

Salvation *is* this unity, and unity *is* the Holy Spirit. The Unity of God is the role of the Spirit within the Godhead, but unity of man with God is achieved through creating perfect likeness, and William believes that,

As in the Father and the Son, that which is vision is also unity; so in God and man that which is vision will be the likeness that is to come. The Holy Spirit, the unity of the Father and the Son, is himself the love and likeness of God and man.¹³

This is a clear articulation on William's part of the Holy Spirit's defining role in salvation: he is salvation. If salvation is likeness and the Holy Spirit causes that likeness, then the act of union between man and the Spirit is the saving act. Christ may allow for redemption, but the Spirit enacts salvation. He does this both by investing the human spirit with potential, and by giving him the vision of God that allows man to see what He truly is, and therefore become like him.

¹² *Epistula*, ch. 263 p. 282: 'hoc idem fit homini suo modo ad Deum, quod consubstantiali unitate Filio est ad Patrem uel Patri ad Filium.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 263 p. 96.

¹³ *Aenigma*, par. 6: 'Vbi etiam sicut in Patre et Filio, quae uisio, ipsa unitas est, sic in Deo et homine, quae uisio, ipsa et similitudo futura est. Spiritus sanctus unitas Patris et Filii, ipse etiam caritas et similitudo Dei et hominis.' English translation from: *Enigma*, 5 p. 39.

Holy Spirit is Unity

Whereas in the case of Love and Will, William provided evidence and metaphors for his belief that they were identities of the Holy Spirit, he evidently does not see explanation as necessary for the Spirit's role as Unity. William writes:

It is called unity of spirit not only because the Holy Spirit brings it about or inclines a man's spirit to it, but because it is the Holy Spirit himself, the God who is Charity. He who is the love of the Father and Son, their Unity, Sweetness, Good, Kiss, Embrace and whatever else they can have in common in that supreme unity of truth and truth of unity¹⁴

The very Unity and Oneness of the Father and the Son defines the Holy Spirit, independent of the need for allegorical appellations. William writes in the *Mirror of Faith* that

The recognition which is mutual to the Father and Son is the very unity of both, which is the Holy Spirit. The recognition by which they recognize one another is nothing other than the substance by which they are.¹⁵

So even within the Godhead, it is the Spirit who unites the persons, because the Spirit is made up of the very unity that links the Father and the Son to each other.

The Holy Spirit is easily defined as unity, because whatever is shared within the Trinity is the seat of the Spirit; as William writes, 'the Holy Spirit, naturally and consubstantially, is mutual charity, unity, likeness, recognition, and whatever else is common to both.'¹⁶ By calling the Holy Spirit Unity, William defines the Spirit as all

¹⁴ *Epistula*, ch. 263 p. 282: 'Dicitur autem haec unitas spiritus, non tantum quia efficit eam, uel afficit ei spiritum hominis Spiritus sanctus, sed quia ipsa ipse est Spiritus sanctus, Deus caritas; cum qui est amor Patris et Filii, et unitas et suauitas, et bonum et osculum, et amplexus et quicquid commune potest esse amborum, in summa illa unitate ueritatis et in ueritate unitatis, hoc idem fit homini suo modo ad Deum, quod consubstantiali unitate Filio est ad Patrem uel Patri ad Fillium.' *Epistle*, 263 p. 95-6.

¹⁵ *Speculum*, ch. 106 p. 176: 'Ea uero cognitio quae mutual est Patris et Filii, ipsa est unitas amborum, qui est Spiritus Sanctus; nec aliud eis est cognition qua se mutuo cognoscunt, et substantia qua sunt id quod sunt.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 31 p. 75.

¹⁶ *Speculum*, ch. 107 p. 176: 'Ibi enim mutua caritas, unitas, similitudo, cognitio, et quicquid commune est ambobus, naturaliter et consubstantialiter Spiritus Sanctus.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 31 p. 77.

those things that make the Trinity One, and that very Oneness itself.¹⁷ This is a simple concept, however, as will be demonstrated, it is one that William emphasizes to a far greater degree than any of his predecessors

William often distills his convictions in various identities for the persons of the Trinity from Augustinian texts. However, Augustine is far less committed to the Holy Spirit's identity as Unity than William. Augustine writes in *De Trinitate*, 'the Holy Spirit too takes his place in the same unity and quality of substance.'¹⁸ While this quotation affirms the Spirit's Unity within the Godhead, it asserts only His participation in the existing Unity that makes the Three One, not an explicit identity as *being* that Oneness.¹⁹ Furthermore, this confirmation of the Spirit comes four full books after Augustine's scriptural analysis of the Unity, in which he emphasises the unity of the Father and Son. Although the intention may be to imply subtly that the Spirit is that Oneness, the Spirit is entirely absent from explicit mention in the discussion.²⁰ The lack of direct confirmation of the Holy Spirit's identity as the Unity of the Godhead here is significant, both because *De Trinitate* is Augustine's lengthiest and most detailed exploration of the identities of the individual and united persons of the Trinity, and because it is a treatise from which William derived a great deal of evidence. Augustine's comparative silence on the topic of pneumatological Unity is indication of William having developed the opinion external to Augustinian influence.

Despite the fact that Augustine does not identify Unity as an identity of the Holy Spirit in his most important piece of work on the topic, he does suggest this role in other treatises. In his unfinished *Literal Commentary on Genesis*, for example, he writes,

¹⁷ Despite his commitment to depicting the Holy Spirit as both the unity of the godhead and the unity of God with man, William does not explore ecumenism. Although this form of unity is not as commonly considered in pneumatological terms, Cyprian, with whom William was probably familiar, writes that the Holy Spirit holds the many seats of the church together and causes unity of faith (Cyprian of Cathage, *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate*, ed. M. Bévenot, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1972), ch. 4, 9). William chose to overlook this form of unity.

¹⁸ Augustine, *Trinitate*, ch. VI, 5: 'uapropter etiam spiritus sanctus in eadem unitate substantiae et aequalitate consistit.' English translation from: *Trinity*, VI:7 p. 210.

¹⁹ Augustine had already confirmed that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one in his First Book of *Trinitate*, ch. I:7.

²⁰ Augustine, *Trinitate*, II:3 p. 98.

God the father almighty made and established all of creation through his only-begotten Son, that is, through the Wisdom and Power consubstantial and coeternal to himself, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, who is also consubstantial and coeternal.²¹

While this quotation is closer to William's understanding of Spiritual Unity it still makes no explicit identification of Unity as the Holy Spirit. Although William may have taken some inspiration from Augustine in associating the Spirit with Unity, once again he takes allusions from Augustinian text and asserts concrete pneumatological identities.

Where Augustine's references to the Spirit as Unity are scarce, references in the other five thinkers to whom William is being compared are even rarer. In neither of his explorations of the identity of the Holy Spirit in the *De Principiis*, does Origen identify Unity as an identity of the Holy Spirit. Although he does establish that the Spirit can help man to seek unity with God, he is a cultivator of that unity, not its embodiment.²² The four contemporaries, Anselm, Bernard, Hugh, and Abelard, repeatedly claim that the Holy Spirit is a part of God's Unity, but never its actuality. Moreover, it is likely that references of this nature are meant more to emphasise the Holy Spirit's equality within the Trinity, rather than to identify a specific role for Him within God.²³

²¹ Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber*, ed. J. Zycha, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 28,1 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1894), ch. 1, p. 459: 'deum omnipotentem patrem uniuersam creaturam fecisse atque constituisse per filium suum unigenitum, id est sapientiam et uirtutem suam consubstantialem sibi et coaeternam, in unitate spiritus sancti et ipsius consubstantialis et coaeterni.' English translation from: *On Genesis: Two Books on Genesis Against the Manichees, and On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis: An Unfinished Book*, trans. Roland J. Teske (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1991), pp. 145.

²² Origen, *Principiis*, ch. I:3.

²³ This may be a defense of the Latin church: emphasizing the Holy Spirit as being equal to the Father and Son implicitly reiterates his procession from both persons, rather than from only the Father as the Eastern church believed. It is worth remembering that William and his contemporaries were writing in the aftermath of the great Schism. A major fracture between the Western and Eastern churches was caused by the filioque controversy. The question arose from ambiguous language in the Nicene Creed describing the procession of the Holy Spirit. Augustine, in describing the procession, attests that it takes place from the Father, *filioque*, 'and from the son.' This led to early skepticism of Augustine on the part of Greek theologians, who attested that the Spirit proceeds only from the Father (Henry Chadwick, *The Making of a Rift in the Church, From Apostolic times until the Council of Florence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 28). This phrase continued to cause a significant wedge between the two segments of the Church. As early as the Seventh Century, Spanish communities were including 'filioque' in the Creed, it was then fully adopted by the Carolingians, and, by the start of the Eleventh Century, by Rome (Giles E. M. Gasper, *Anselm of Canterbury and*

William's most explicit, and perhaps most clear, assertion of the Spirit's role in Unity comes from his discussion of the concept in his *Golden Epistle*. Here, while anatomizing the ways in which the Spirit causes unity, he writes, 'It is called unity of spirit not only because the Holy Spirit brings about or inclines a man's spirit to it, but because it is the Holy Spirit himself, the God who is Charity'²⁴ Here is an unambiguous assessment of the Spirit's relationship with Unity. He causes unity in man, and He Himself is Unity in God. It is the Spirit who unites man to God, but this is natural to Him because it is the Spirit who unites God within Himself. The Trinity's Oneness is an affect of the Spirit, who bonds together the Father and Son as he proceeds from them. This is William's definition, and his alone.

Holy Spirit in Man's Unity

Having established the Spirit's identity as Unity in the Godhead, it is also necessary to explore what it means for him to be a herald of unity in man in order to demonstrate how the Spirit causes individual salvation. In the same section of the *Golden Epistle* in which William gave the clear assertion of the Spirit's identify as Unity, he writes that because of the Unifying Spirit's impact on man,

The soul in its happiness finds itself standing midway in the Embrace and the Kiss of Father and Son. In a manner which exceeds description and thought, the man of God is found worthy to become not God but what God is, that is to say man becomes through grace what God is by nature.²⁵

This is a powerful and controversial claim, but it is the very substance and core of William's theology. Through the liberation of the Spirit, man enters in to the divine whole. William is clear that this does not make man become God in actuality, but it

his Theological Inheritance (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), p. 184). At the end of the Eleventh Century, Anselm of Canterbury himself attended the Council of Bari to uphold the Latin interpretation of Spiritual procession. His treatise on the Spirit's procession, written only five years later, was in many ways an account of the debate that took place at that council (Gasper, *Inheritance*, 183). The debate about the procession of the Holy Spirit remains a controversy between West and East, and it was still fiercely contended at the time in which William was writing.

²⁴ *Epistula*, ch. 263 p. 282: 'Dicitur autem haec unitas spiritus, non tantum quia efficit eam, uel afficit ei spiritum hominis Spiritus sanctus, sed quia ipsa ipse est Spiritus sanctus, Deus caritas.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 263 p. 95-96.

²⁵ *Epistula*, ch. 263 p. 282: 'Cum in osculo et amplexu Patris et Filii mediam quoquammodo se inuenit beata conscientia; cum modo ineffabili et incogitabili, fieri meretur homo Dei, non Deus, sed tamen quod Deus est: homo ex gratia quod Deus est ex natura.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 263 p. 96.

makes him become something so similar that they are undivided. Through the gift of unity as bestowed by the Holy Spirit, man is restored to the position for which he was created at the centre of the divine embrace: the place from which he fell with the sin of Adam.

This extreme level of participation in the Holy Spirit is a concept that appears unique to William. It bears some Origenist hallmarks, however, there are fundamental differences. Origen writes that every living person engages in a degree of participation in the Holy Spirit.²⁶ For William, only those who are chosen by God to be saved are granted this gift. Similarly, although Origen does describe the Holy Spirit as being an important participant in man's connection with his Creator, he describes the actual unification as being of the whole of the Godhead: 'when they have been rendered capable of receiving God, then God will be to them "all in all."²⁷ This transformation, for Origen, is physical, whereas William describes it in post-physical terms.

The manner in which the Spirit enlightens man's faculties and grants him his inborn freedoms has been demonstrated through the case of will and love to this point. As man's intellectual and emotional faculties are made more free, their goodness becomes more akin to godliness.²⁸ William explains that the Holy Spirit guides the soul and fosters its better qualities, so that, 'when this soul is free to be free in God, to cleave to God, she is made like to God through the piety of devotion and the unity of will.'²⁹ The increasing freedoms that have been granted to the soul are a result of its Spiritually guided development, and they lead it consistently closer to God. If chosen, and man is successful in following the Spirit's guidance, he will reach a

²⁶ Origen, *Principles*, p. 42.

²⁷ Origen, *Principiis*, ch. III:6 p. 290: 'cum capaces dei fuerint effecti, sit eis deus omnia in omnibus.' English translation from: *Principles*, p. 332.

²⁸ Although it is unlikely that he was familiar with William's work, it is interesting that John of Salisbury would later come to a similar conclusion. He writes in his *Metalogicon*, that 'Grace reveals hidden divine truths by means of those things which have been made, and by that unity which belongs to love, communicates what it has made manifest, thus uniting man to God' (John of Salisbury, *The Metalogicon*, trans. Daniel D. McGarry (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1971), p. 232) This is a bold statement, and one that is unexpected from a man with whom mystical theology is not associated. For John, philosophy and reason lead to wisdom, and through a combination of adherence to reason and elevation from the Grace of the Spirit, man is united to the divine. This is strikingly similar to William and shows a potential transmission of his thought if not his actual writing.

²⁹ *Natura*, ch. 23 p. 195: 'Et cum animae illi uacat Deo uacare, Deo inhaerere, Deo efficitur similis per deuotionis pietatem, et uoluntatis unitatem.' English translation from: *Nature*, 23 p. 80.

pinnacle of freedom at which point he is free even in the same way that God is. This freedom is a form of unity with the Lord that is caused entirely by the guidance of the Spirit.

In order to save William from threats of heresy, it is important to underline that, while making bold claims of spiritual adherence, William is not claiming that man can actually become the same as God. He writes that through transformations of will and love, man,

Will be unexpectedly and entirely transformed, not into the nature of divinity certainly, but into a kind of blessedness beyond the human form yet short of the divine, in the joy of illuminating grace and the sense of an enlightened conscience.³⁰

This is a strong depiction of Spiritual unity. While the unity of man with the Spirit does not make a God out of man, it does elevate him so that he is able to participate in those holy things which identify God—His blessedness, enlightenment, joy, and grace. God remains in existence entirely independent of man, but man ceases to exist outside of his new identity in God.

The Holy Spirit both facilitates the qualities in man that guide him toward unity with God and sustains that unity itself. To the man who has adopted God in his heart, it is the Spirit who testifies that that man is a son.³¹ The Spirit remains in man so as to help him maintain this spiritual dignity. He reminds man of his heightened standing so as to reinforce the continuation of this good behaviour and, ‘If love and the delight of justice move you to keep the commandments of God, that is the testimony of the Spirit of God dwelling in you.’³² A part of unity is, therefore, the manifestation of the Spirit within the self. This indwelling helps to facilitate good behaviour in man both carnally and spiritually. The Spirit inhabits man so as to help him live properly

³⁰ *Speculum*, ch. 101 p. 170: ‘tota repente transmutetur, non quidem in naturam divinitatis, sed tamen in quondam supra humanam, citra divinam formam beatitudinis; in gaudium illuminatis gratiae, et sensum illuminatae conscientiae.’ English translation from: *Mirror*, 30 p. 72-73.

³¹ William bases this concept off Romans, 8:16.

³² *Romanos*, ch. VIII, 16 p. 115: ‘Si dilectio et delectatio iustitiae te agit ad obseruationem mandatorum Dei, hoc est testimonium habitantis in te Spiritus Dei.’ English translation from: *Romanos*, VIII:16 p. 163.

during his time on earth, but with the purpose of helping him enter into the next world.

Indwelling is an important part of William's perception of how man can be saved, but it is a subject that is largely glossed over by the majority of his influences. Although Augustine does reference the Holy Spirit as helping man lean towards Salvation in his commentary on Psalms, the Spirit does this by cleansing the soul, not actively engaging in it.³³ Furthermore, Augustine more zealously describes the Son as interceding between man and the Godhead, describing him as a 'mediator between God and men,' who 'intercedes for us.'³⁴ William deviates from Augustine when developing the most fundamental part of his theology: the way in which man is saved. Whereas for Augustine it is the Son who mediates with men, William's beliefs require that man engage intimately with the Holy Spirit.

It is evident that this spiritual union of man to God is made reality not because of the nature of his creation, but because of the work of the Holy Spirit to inspire man and to improve him. William explains that the Son was naturally a part of Trinitarian Unity, but that it was the grace of the Spirit that that imbued his carnal form with that Unity. That the Spirit implanted the Son into His virgin mother is generally accepted. However, William expands this, continuing of this same grace and Spirit: 'to the rest of men he is given in measure, as God has divided to everyone the measure of faith.'³⁵ As members of the church, all Christians are members of the body of Christ. Just as the Holy Spirit made the physical body of Jesus a part of the Holy Unity that is the Trinity, so too the Spirit makes every saveable member of that church a part of that Unity through the investment of that same grace. Individual Christians are obviously not unified to the degree that Jesus was, however, to those that are worthy of salvation, the Spirit's grace allows them to participate in divinity in a muted version of the same participation as Christ. The first way in which they do that is to adopt the same Father as Him.

³³ St. Augustine, *On the Psalms*, trans. Scholasitica Hebgin and Felicitas Corrigan v. I: psalms 1-29 (Westminster: The Newman Press, 1960) pp. 45-46.

³⁴ Augustine, *Trinitate*, ch. IV:8 lin. 1: 'dem ipse mediator dei et hominum.' 'interpellans pro nobis.' English translation from: *Trinity*, IV:12 p. 165.

³⁵ *Romanos*, ch. XII, 3 p.168: 'Caeteris autem ad mensuram datur unicuique, sicut partitur Deus mensuram fidei.' English translation from: *Romans*, XII, 3 p. 233.

Adoption

As Unity, the Holy Spirit inspires man to participate in divinity by adopting God the Father as his parent, thus making him a brother to, and in many ways alike to, Christ. William makes it clear in a number of passages that this adoption is possible only through the Holy Spirit: ‘we are sons by a gift, indeed, who is the Holy Spirit,’³⁶ and again, ‘the Holy Spirit bears witness to their conscience that they are the sons of God.’³⁷ By allowing individuals to partake in this relationship with God, the Spirit saves man from participating in the soiled earthly world, and reorients him towards higher things; ‘it is in the Holy Spirit too, who creates and sets in order the unity that makes us one among ourselves and in you. He makes us who were by nature sons of wrath, to be Sons of God by grace.’³⁸ By inspiring man to adopt God as his Father, the Spirit saves man from a life of base carnality. This change in familial course is not in itself salvation, but it does redirect the believer towards the proper path.

The process of adoption, while focussed on the parenthood of the Father and the imitation of the Son, is actuated by the Spirit. Although He may not be adoption’s aim, He facilitates the process and both readies man to be opened up towards adoption, and extends the grace of God to accept man into the family. William writes that, ‘having received the Spirit of the sons of God, we ourselves are made the sons of God, both understanding and experiencing that we have God as a Father.’³⁹ The Spirit gives Himself to man so that, by the virtue of the unity of the Godhead, man is elevated spiritually to a point of familiarity with God. This elevation is an act of grace both caused and received by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit elevates man to familial status and then accepts man into the family as a spiritual son: ‘the Holy Spirit is made present to bear witness to the sons of grace that they are the sons of

³⁶ *Meditatiuae*, ch. VI, 12, p. 114: ‘Dono utique qui est Spiritus sanctus.’ English translation from: *Meditations*, VI:12 p. 129.

³⁷ *Speculum*, ch. 14 p. 78: ‘et testimonium reddit Spiritus sanctus conscientiae eorum, quod sint filii Dei.’ English translation from: *Mirror*, 6 p. 14. He cites Romans 8.16 here.

³⁸ *Meditatiuae*, ch. VI, 12 p. 114: ‘Vnitatis uero qua in nobis uel in te unum sumus, auctor et ordinator est idem Spiritus sanctus, filios Dei faciens nos per gratiam, qui filii irae eramus per naturam.’ English translation from: *Meditations*, VI:12 p. 128.

³⁹ *Speculum*, ch. 27 p. 92: ‘Accepto enim Spiritu Filii Dei, efficimur et ipsi filii Dei; et intelligentes, et sentientes nos Patrem habere Deum.’ English translation from: *Mirror*, 10 p. 25.

God.⁴⁰ This process, therefore, involves both man's elevation through imitation of the Son, and God's benevolence in accepting that man as a son.

William provides an exegetical example of the development of a familial relationship with God in his many explorations of Romans 8:15.⁴¹ He writes in the *Mirror*, for example, that through the Holy Spirit, man achieves a unity that is 'so true that the spirit of man which before had scarcely been able to say in the Holy Spirit: Jesus is Lord, now, amid the sons by adoption, cries out: *Abba*, Father!'⁴² William seems to interpret this jubilant cry, which is to be made by the adoptive son, as a declaration of liberation. Through adopting God as his Father, William explains in his exegesis of the passage, man ceases to serve God as a slave, and instead serves him as a son: an individual committed to his master not by the bondage of fear, but through the unity of family.⁴³ Despite the fact that the vocabulary here is paternal, William is quite clear that the adoptive transformation is facilitated and enforced by the Holy Spirit.⁴⁴ Although the act of adopting is focused on the Father as its object, it is facilitated by the guidance of the Holy Spirit who allows man to emancipate himself from fear, and binds him to God familiarly.

The proclamation of God as *Abba*, from Romans 8:15 inspired a number of considerations of divine adoption, including within some of the early texts that would have been most influential on William, such as those of Origen. Although Origen mentions the possibility of spiritual adoption in *De Principiis*,⁴⁵ it is in his commentary on the Song of Songs that he diverges from the primary text of that exegesis to consider the Romans quotation. He writes that the human soul, as the bride of Christ, should devote herself both to the study of herself, and of those 'sacred pursuits' of theology and scripture. This newfound knowledge entices the

⁴⁰ William, *Speculum*, ch. 21 p. 84: 'praesto fit Spiritus ad testimonium perhibendum filiis gratiae.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 7 p. 20.

⁴¹ For example: See for example: *Nature* p. 82, *Song*, p. 32, *Enigma*, p. 103, *Contemplating* twice on p. 55, and *Mirror* pp. 18, 24, and 73, and *Romans*, V, 8 p.163, where the passage is explicated. By extension William should also love Gal 4:6 which is almost identical, however he rarely references its phrasing.

⁴² *Speculum*, ch. 100 pp. 170-172: 'in tantum ut spiritus hominis qui Paulo ante vix in Spiritu Sancto poterat dicere: Dominus Ihesus, iam inter filios adoptionis confidenter clamet: Abba Pater!' English translation from: *Mirror*, 30 p. 73.

⁴³ *Romans*, V, 8 p.163.

⁴⁴ For example: *Romans*, p. 196.

⁴⁵ Origen, *Principles*, p. 25.

soul to seek the paternity of the divine so that she may call out ‘*Abba*, Father,’ inaugurating her familial, rather than bridal, relationship with the divine.⁴⁶ Origen’s interpretation of this passage adheres to a more wilful than unifying understanding of adoption. The individual entreats the Father to accept him as a child through the Spirit by his own actions. According to Origen, therefore, man can seek adoption, not merely by opening himself up to familial unity and hoping that the Spirit will choose him, but rather through aggressive pursuit of knowledge leading to an eventual revelation of family. William’s portrayal of adoption is far more passive than the pursuit depicted by Origen.

Despite going out of his way to consider this passage in his commentary on the Song, Origen skims over 8:15 in his actual examination of Romans. Nonetheless, during his consideration of the surrounding scripture, Origen makes some points that do relate to William’s interpretation of adoption. Origen explains that there are many types of spirit, and that all men were born in the spirit of slavery. After Christ’s sacrifice, however, the Son offered his own Spirit to mankind, the Holy Spirit, in the form of the Spirit of adoption. In so doing, Christ invited man to share in his role as son, and in his holy inheritance. This includes both immortal life and, ‘participation in his authority.’⁴⁷ This inherited participation that Origen describes is the major theme of William’s interpretation of adoption. That said, there are some important differences between the two descriptions. First, Origen describes adoption as being a gift of the Son, whereas for William it is an imitation of the Son granted by the Spirit. More conspicuously, whereas for William the inheritance associated with adoption is a central theme, Origen glosses over it in the wider point he is making. William’s interpretation is significantly more detailed and, as always, more pneumatological.

Although Origen was influential on William, he was far more instrumental in inspiring Peter Abelard. Like William and Origen, Abelard wrote a lengthy commentary on St. Paul’s Epistle. Origen had a heavy influence on Abelard’s

⁴⁶ Origen, *Canticum*, p. 139.

⁴⁷ Origen, *In Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos explanationum libri*, [Latin, trans. Rufinus] in *Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes: Kritische Ausgabe der Übersetzung Rufins*, 3 vols., ed. C. P. Hammond Bammel (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1990-1998), ch. 7.1 p. 559: ‘sed etiam in consortium potestatis adducit.’ English translation from: *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans Books 6-10*, trans. Thomas P. Scheck (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2002), p. 65.

commentary, and there are points at which Abelard has simply lifted lengthy passages from Origen's exegesis without analysing them. Like William, however, Abelard gives significant attention to Romans 8:15. Abelard begins his discussion of adoption by asking if God could have other sons than his Begotten One, and answers himself that, indeed, God has a plethora of sons, but these are all made his sons through the spirit of adoption.⁴⁸ Abelard's interpretation of adoption becomes confused, however. He begins his explanation sounding almost identical to William and championing the Spirit as the cause of man's adoptive state. Quite quickly, however, Abelard transitions into a discussion of the son-hood of martyrs, and by the end of this brief passage he has proclaimed that it is Christ who causes the adoption through intercession.⁴⁹ There are some striking similarities between Abelard and William as he initially enters his discussion of adoption, but he quickly reverts from his burgeoning pneumatology to a fully Christological explanation. This is yet another example both of a case in which William's thoughts are surprisingly similar to Abelard's given their feud, and also of a case in which William's explanation of a process deviates from his contemporaries because of an overarching centrality of the Holy Spirit.

It is possible that Abelard's explanation of adoption turned immediately Christological because some of his thought bordered on Adoptionist heresy. Abelard explored the duality between the human and the divine aspects of Christ to a dangerous degree, and was condemned for doing so. In addition, although William does portray adoption as a manner of Christological imitation, Abelard takes this belief to its heretical extreme. He writes that, just as Christ, as God's son, engendered salvation through his sacrifice, so too God's adopted sons are 'killed as martyrs for man's salvation.'⁵⁰ This has two implications which William would have

⁴⁸ Abelard, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, trans. Stephan R. Cartwright (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2011), p. 272.

⁴⁹ Abelard, *Romans*, p. 282.

⁵⁰ Peter Abelard, *Commentaria in Epistulam Pauli ad Romanos*, ed. E. M. Buyaert, CCCM, 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996), ch. 3:8 lin. 524: 'martyres pro salute hominum sunt occisi.' English translation from: Abelard, *Romans*, trans. Cartwright, p. 281. Abelard writes that, through their own suffering martyrs are paying their debt of suffering back to Jesus. (Abelard, *Romans*, p. 274.) William would obviously reject this view for two reasons. Firstly, Abelard's statement makes heretical implications about man's equality to Jesus. Secondly, William repeatedly implies that he considers martyrdom to be something that unclean souls run to as an escape from doing the intensive spiritual labour usually required for a soul to be cleansed. He therefore considers martyrdom an overrated, easier escape. See for example: *Mirror*, 7 p. 21, 11 p. 31, and *Enigma*, 9 p. 11.

rejected: the first is that an adopted son's sacrifice in some way has the same power as Christ's, and the second is that man can be saved through his own actions rather than through the grace of the Holy Spirit. Both of these allegations would be considered heretical. Finally, Abelard writes that these men enact their adoption and resultant similarity to Christ through love. For William, although adoption rests on a foundation of love, it is an act of unity. Abelard's interpretation of adoption, although it has some shallow similarities to William's, is both heretical, in its implications for human ability, and excessively docile, in that it does not reach for the adoptive extreme of unity. Both Abelard and Origen expressed adoption in terms that William shares, but with Origen citing will and Abelard love as adoption's cause, both men fall short of William's salvatory vision.

Whereas the two commentaries on Romans, Origen's and Abelard's, provided striking differences to William, Bernard, who wrote no such commentary, shares William's interest in the spiritual process of adopting God as one's personal Father, and on this topic the two men are almost identical. Like William, Bernard likens this process to *imitatio Christi*. This is unsurprising given Bernard's Christological leanings. Bernard also expresses adoption in terms of the Spirit. In his Eighth Sermon on the Song of Songs, Bernard announces that there must be some among his brethren who have already reached this adoptive level. These are those monks, 'who at certain times perceive deep within their hearts the Spirit of the Son exclaiming: "Abba, Father."' ⁵¹ Although Bernard is commenting on a slightly different line of scripture, the spirit of the text, and the words with which the Father is invoked, remains the same for both men. Bernard explains that those men who have experienced this spiritual awakening have received an acknowledgement of adoption on the part of God the Father. The Father, explains Bernard, sends his kiss to his spiritual sons, and this kiss is his Love: the Holy Spirit. Christ taught the masses about the kiss, but the kiss is bestowed by the Spirit.

In describing adoption, William emphasises that, although the journey reaching towards the Spiritual adoption of the Lord is strenuous, such paternity comes with a

⁵¹ Bernard, *Sermones Cantica*, sermo: 8:9 p. 41, 'Quae in vobis anima sensit aliquando in secreto conscientiae suae Spiritum Filii clamantem: ABBA, PATER?' English translation from: *Song I*, 8:9 p. 52. He is referring to Gal 4:6.

rich inheritance. When the soul has been made ready for entry into the holy family, ‘Stand with me, God says to you, and I will adopt you as a son; all that is mine is yours; you will be my kingdom, and I will be your good.’⁵² By becoming a son to God, man makes himself worthy of God’s earthly heritage. He naturally inherits those earthly things that God made for him at creation. However, more importantly, this new familial union means that man stands to inherit the greater possessions of God as well. By standing as the Good of man, God sets a new example through which He can guide his adopted son through the earthly kingdom toward the eternal one.

All men, as creations of God, have the theoretical ability to adopt Him as their Father. Like charity and good will, the propensity for a familial understanding of God is natural to creation, however, it needs to be awakened by grace in order to be realized. William asserts that, rather than those who are highly regarded in the world, it is, ‘those simple men who are God’s sons.’⁵³ In this extended passage, William criticizes men who consider themselves wise in the carnal world for their focus on the present. William intuits that, because their understanding, their love, and their interests lie within the sinful and unimportant realm of the world, they will never truly learn to love God as their Father, but only as their master. The earthly-oriented and vain are ‘enslaved to their senses.’⁵⁴ They become bogged down with their surroundings, rather than reaching forward for what is to come. These are the slaves, rather than the sons, of God.

Despite this condemnation of carnal men, there is a demographic to which spiritual adoption is a possibility. Humble, simple men can seek to open themselves up to

⁵² *Romanos*, ch. V, 3 p. 63: ‘Sta mecum, dicit tibi Deus, et adopto te in filium; omnia mea tua sunt; tu eris regnum meum, et ego bonum tuum.’ English translation from: *Romans*, p. 94.

⁵³ *Epistula*, ch. 59 p. 240: ‘cum eis qui sunt *simplices filii Dei*.’ English translation from: *Epistle*, p. 32. William seems to be alluding to the concept of the ‘Fool for God’s sake,’ in which the believer openly chooses to reject logic and reason and instead is guided by his abundance of blind love. This idea originates scripturally in First Corinthians 4:10, and is a favorite of William’s (see for example his introduction to *Epistula* and *Aenigma*.) Patristic sources for this concept include John Chrysostom, (in his commentary on Corinthians) St. Basil (who taught it by demonstration) and the desert fathers. It is generally a concept associated with Greek theology rather than that of the Latin Church (For secondary evidence see Andrew Louth, *The Greek East and the Latin West* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2007, p. 277). It was later adopted as a model for the Franciscans. John Saward examines the concept of the Fool in his article in ‘The Fool for Christ’s Sake,’ in *One Yet Two*, ed. Basil Pennington (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976).

⁵⁴ *Epistula*, ch. 60 p. 240: ‘seruos sensuum suorum.’ English translation from: *Epistle*, 60 p. 32.

familiarity with God. These are those men who, in the words of 1 Timothy 4:8 as William quotes it,

Reap the fruits of the spirit, which are charity, joy, peace, patience, kindness, forbearance, generosity, gentleness, faith, temperateness, chastity, continence and piety which promises well both for this life and for the next.⁵⁵

In referencing this quotation, William makes two significant points. First, he describes those qualities that should be prevalent in a spiritual son of God, and to this end William provides a clear list of those faculties which man should seek to propagate within himself as he strives toward adoption. More importantly, there is a clear statement of the Spirit's involvement as the herald of those fruits, and in the promises of goodness in the next life. It can be inferred from this passage that those men who follow the Spirit's guidance and assume these qualities will resultantly adopt God as their Father and, therefore, become closer to worthiness of salvation. This is an obvious correlation between the Spirit, adoptive unity, and being saved.

There is, it should not be forgotten, one example of a supremely humble man for whom God was Father. While comparing created sons to the Begotten One requires some care, it is worthwhile, because adoption can be interpreted as an imitation of Christ, and because, as the only man for whom God was automatically Father, he serves as an important example.⁵⁶ When considering concept of adoption in this light, it is useful to consult Anselm of Canterbury's discussion of the divine and carnal forms, which he considers at length in his *Cur Deus homo*. Such analysis is necessary in order to ascertain why and how God became man in the historical person of Christ. Anselm does not in any sense extend this possibility to other men, nor does he depict this spiritual imbue into carnal form as an act that will be repeated. However, he does discuss the process through which God entered into man, and that discourse is worth some scrutiny, since it is his only assertion of the possibility of God Fathering a man. This examination should in no way be taken to

⁵⁵ *Epistula*, ch. 60 p. 240: '*fructus Spiritus, qui sunt caritas, gaudium, pax, patientia, benignitas, longanimitas, bonitas, mansuetudo, fides, modestia, castitas, continentia, et pietas promissionem habens uitae quae nunc est et future.*' English translation from: *Epistle*, 60 pp. 32-33.

⁵⁶ See the introduction for an explanation of how this relates to, and is distinct from, adoptionist heresy.

imply that either William or Anselm considered the divinity of Christ to be one that could be duplicated in an enlightened man. Christ is universally regarded as the unique, incomparable union between divine and carnal. However, the manner in which the divine entered the carnal can provide some awareness of the nature of divinity in man.

Anselm's description of God as man strictly affirms that, while God humbled Himself by taking on the role of a man, He did not in any way remove or tarnish his divinity. Anselm writes that in describing the incarnate Word,

We do not signify any abasement of the divine substance; rather we declare the personal unity of the divine nature and the human nature. Therefore, we do not understand any abasement of the divine substance to have occurred in the incarnation of God; instead, we believe that the human nature was exalted.⁵⁷

While this description is oriented entirely toward the person of Christ, it can reflect some truths about the inferior infusion of the divine in man that is described by William. When an individual has been enlightened and made free by the Spirit, he is, to a degree, impregnated with some of the Goodness and divinity of the Spirit. Although they do not experience the realization of this divinity in life, they are made ready for its fulfilment in salvation after death.⁵⁸

The important lesson that William draws from Anselm is the maintenance of the Spirit's exaltation. God is in no way tainted or strained when he extends the gift of salvation to man. By guiding man through his struggle, the Spirit improves man, and yet remains unchanged in Himself. Man's potential to unite with God has no impact on God's own unity or wholeness. William clearly asserts the same values that Anselm lauds in Christ as qualities that the individual should develop in seeking adoption: modesty and simplicity. Nevertheless, the heredity of Christ is different from the adoptive parentage that William encourages in man, and the potential for

⁵⁷ Anselm, *Cur Deus*, ch. 1:8 p. 59: 'Sic enim nullam divinae substantiae significamus humilitatem, sed unam dei et hominis monstramus esse personam. Non ergo in incarnatione dei ulla eius humilitas intelligatur facta, sed natura hominis creditor exaltata.' English translation from: 'Cur Deus,' p. 309.

⁵⁸ There is a parallel between this experience and that of the Virgin Mary. The virgin was impregnated with divinity and then gave birth to Christ, the enlightened individual is impregnated with divinity and is reborn to participate in the divine after death.

that second relationship is something that Anselm completely ignores. Anselm's theology is consumed with the person of Christ, and the way in which his sacrifice made salvation possible. William accepts the grounds of Anselm's theology, however, rather than being interested in the redemptive action of Christ, he is concerned with the way in which individual sinners are able to be saved. Anselm's focus is, therefore, concerned with the theoretical salvation of the whole of humanity, while William is concerned with individual man.

Despite the difference in focus between William and Anselm, both agreed that Jesus provided a model of the ideal man. Imitating Christ naturally improves the lifestyle of the believer. Adoption is imitation's highest form, and it therefore comes with the greatest rewards. The act of becoming a spiritual son gives the believer the resolve to seek holy things of his own volition, as William writes,

Through the grace inbreathed into us by the Spirit of your adoption, we have confidence that all that the Father has is ours also. So, through the grace of adoption, we invoke you now under the same name as your only Son invokes you by right of nature.⁵⁹

Although the Spirit is always a teacher and guide to the human soul, by participating in the familial union with God, man becomes less in need of this persistent guidance. The Spirit leads the soul's will and love, and He gives man greater awareness of his Creator, and because the Spirit has led man to familial participation, man becomes more capable: 'Once illuminating grace has come we are no longer under a tutor, for wherever the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty.'⁶⁰ William explains that this liberty is the parenthood of God. Once again, although the Spirit is the guide for the soul, there is an important emphasis on freedom. It is the individual's choice to listen to the prompts of the Spirit, and ultimately it is his choice to enter into the form of union that is the assumption of the role of son. This metamorphosis would not, however, be possible without the grace of the Spirit. When man accepts God as his

⁵⁹ *Contemplando*, ch. 14 p. 163: 'iam per inspiratam nobis gratiam, per Spiritum adoptionis / tuae, omnia quae Patris sunt, nostra esse confidentes, ipso te nomine inuocemus per adoptionis gratiam, quo Filius tuus unicus per naturam.' English translation from: *Contemplating*, 11 p. 55.

⁶⁰ *Speculum*, ch. 27 p. 92: 'Cum enim venerit illuminans gratia, iam non sumus sub paedagogo, quia ubi fuerit Spiritus Domini, ibi libertas.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 10 p. 25.

true Father it is because ‘the conscience of the one who cries out testifies that he is the Son of God,’⁶¹ and that cry ‘is made to God in the Holy Spirit.’⁶² Joining with the divine in a familial sense means forsaking the earthly father for the Father, and the earthly brother for Christ, however to emancipate oneself carnally, and to adopt spiritually is to choose the Holy Spirit.

Matrimony

Another form of spiritual union through which the human soul cleaves itself to God is that of matrimony. The Song of Songs has long been accepted as a metaphor for man’s soul devoting itself to God, most prevalently by Origen, who provided the earliest mystical interpretation, and St. Bernard, who dedicated eighty-six sermons to the topic. William is no exception in his interpretation.⁶³ However, despite the Bridegroom continually representing Christ allegorically, William manages to include a pneumatological aspect to his interpretation. William writes that Christ wedded the church, ‘in order that God might become man, and man might become God.’⁶⁴ This sounds like an assertion of Christ as the catalyst for unity. When the process for achieving that unity is addressed, however, William is quick to emphasise the role of the Spirit. He explains that in wedding the soul, he, ‘pours forth within her the grace of his love, drawing her spirit to himself and infusing into her his spirit, that both may be one spirit.’⁶⁵ Despite the fact that it is Christ who is acting, it is the Spirit that makes the actions possible. God the Son is wedded with the soul, but the soul is made one with her Bridegroom because of grace and love: both identities of the Holy Spirit. This union is realized when man’s spirit is infused with the Spirit of God. The transformation of the two into one is a result of the imbuelement of the Holy Spirit and His acceptance of the human spirit into Himself. Matrimony with Christ is, therefore, a Spiritual endeavour.

⁶¹ *Aenigma*, par. 83 p. 181: ‘et conscientia sua testimonium perhibet clamanti quod sit filius Dei.’ English translation from: *Enigma*, 73 p. 103.

⁶² *Aenigma*, par. 83 p. 181: ‘in Spiritu sancto clamatur Deo.’ English translation from: *Enigma*, 73 p. 103.

⁶³ According to Chavasse, Hippolytus was the first Christian to comment on the *Song* (Claude Chavasse, *The Bride of Christ* (London: Faber and Faber, 1939), p. 23). However the metaphor quickly expanded by authors with whom William was more familiar including Origen and St. Ambrose, and later Gregory the Great and St. Bede.

⁶⁴ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. IV, 27 p. 33: ‘ut Deus homo, homo Deus fieret.’ English translation from: *Song*, 30 p. 26.

⁶⁵ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. IV, 27 p. 33: ‘gratiam ei sui amoris infundit, spiritum eius sibi adtrahens et suum infundens ei, ut inuicem unus spiritus sint.’ English translation from: *Song*, 30 p. 26.

Origen is an important source for William's focus on marriage as a form of union. However, while William may have turned to Origen in observing the existence of a matrimonial quality to unity, William's interpretation of the marriage described in the Song of Songs departs from Origen's on several fronts. While William consistently interprets the marriage as taking place between the individual human soul and Christ, Origen describes the marriage as being between the Christ and the Church. For Origen, instead of an individual being united to God, the whole of human Christianity is united to Him. This is an example of William absorbing an explanation of a salvatory process that applies to the Christian population holistically and reinterpreting it to make it apply individually. Whereas Origen was interested in explaining how the Church could be saved, William's interest is in individual man.

There are several other ways in which William's interpretation of matrimony relies on, yet departs from the Origanist description of the Song of Songs. Origen writes that the result of the marriage between the Church and the Son is that the Church becomes impregnated with 'the seed of the Word of God,' thus, through the sacraments, giving birth to mundane sons of God anew.⁶⁶ Origen is describing a matrimonial union between the mundane and the divine, however, to the extent that it pertains to the individual Christians existing within the Church, it is a union of paternity not of marriage. Although this familial connection is described in the terms of a birth-right, it is still more akin to the unity of adoption as described by William than it is to William's interpretation of marriage. The Church as a collective whole is given the ability to elevate her members to the role of spiritual children of God, but the spiritual union is with that whole, its individual parts are merely the product of that union.

The final major departure that William makes from Origen's influence with regards to his interpretation of marriage is the most obvious one: Origen's view of marriage does not involve a significant role for the Holy Spirit. William's matrimonial narrative agrees with Origen's in that they both perceive the role of the Bridegroom being taken by Christ. To that extent, William accepts Origen's Christology. Origen, however, does not provide a description of the way in which a marriage between the

⁶⁶ Origen, *Canticum*, prol. p. 74: 'ex semine quidem Verbi Dei.' English translation from: Origen, *Song*, p. 38.

mundane and the divine is able to take place. For William, this the most important facet of marriage: the Holy Spirit as mechanism of unification. Despite Origen's importance as a commentator on the Song of Songs, there are three major ways in which William departs from Origen to create his own theology of marriage: William sees marriage as individual whereas Origen describes it as holistic. William sees humanity as partaking in the marriage whereas Origen sees man as the product of the marriage. William interprets as pneumatological a union, which Origen construes in strictly Christological terms.

Although William does explore the importance of Christ in spiritual union, his exploration of matrimonial metaphor has more to do with the accomplishment and results of such a union. William, in contrast to Origen, is captivated by the question of how the lowly human soul is made capable of wedding such a supreme groom. His answers are consistently pneumatological. William writes that as lovers, the created and Uncreated spirits unite and that this union

Is nothing else than the unity of the Father and the Son of God, their Kiss, their Embrace, their Love, their Goodness and whatever in that supremely simple Unity is common to both. All this is the Holy Spirit—God, Charity, at once Giver and Gift.⁶⁷

This is a revelation of the Spirit's importance to deific union. The Holy Spirit enacts matrimonial unity because he is the Unity, and all those things from which it is made. The result of the soul wedding itself to God is that that soul is able to receive the dowry, which is the gift of the Holy Spirit.

William emphasises the eschatological aspect of marriage: despite the rich promises of this dowry, they are gifts that must be looked forward to, rather than enjoyed in this life. Just as adoption takes place in this world and inheritance in the next, a monk must promise himself to his Groom in this world, but he cannot enjoy the fullness of that union until he leaves it. While still alive, 'the wall of this mortal life holds back

⁶⁷ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. XX, 91 p. 70: 'non est alia quam unitas Patris et Filii Dei, ipsum eorum osculum, ipse amplexus, ipse amor, ipsa bonitas, et quicquid in unitate illa simplicissima commune est amborum; quod totum est Spiritus sanctus, Deus caritas, idem donans, idem et donum.' English translation from: *Song*, 95 p. 78.

Bridegroom and Bride from the full kiss of mutual union.’⁶⁸ The union that is marriage to Christ through the Spirit is a reward for just action in this life. The individual promises himself to his Groom, but the Spirit only actualizes their union after death. This deific matrimony is, therefore, inextricable from salvation.

The union represented in the Song is not always traditionally depicted as taking place post-mortem. Many theologians, including, most famously, St. Bernard, consider the marriage to be a mystical experience that takes place throughout a monk’s life. Bernard explains that it is natural as a beloved creation of God that man is meant to be ‘one spirit with God.’⁶⁹ He also reminds his audience that by abiding in charity, a worshiper is abiding in God.⁷⁰ Both of these points are also emphasised by William, however there is a difference in style that reveals a critical difference in their theological interpretations: Bernard presents unity with God metaphorically, for William union with God is concrete. According to Bernard, man enters into a metaphorical unity with God because by acting charitably he is acting like God who is charity.⁷¹ Bernard is advocating an imitation of God’s Love rather than a transformation into God’s Love. The distinction is subtle, but demonstrates once again William’s commitment to a theology in which man is consumed by the Spirit, rather than simply attempting to improve himself under His influence.⁷²

Perhaps the clearest example of Bernard’s championship of Christ rather than of the Holy Spirit comes in his Forty-Sixth Sermon on the Song of Songs. Here, Bernard provides a lengthy description of the Holy Spirit’s role in love, and the importance of

⁶⁸ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. XXXIII, 151 p. 106: ‘a pleno osculo mutuae coniunctionis, a pleno amplexu mutuae fructuionis, sponsum et sponsam solus diuidat paries huius mortalitatis.’ English translation from: *Song*, 154 pp. 126-127.

⁶⁹ Bernard, *Sermones Cantica*, sermo: 71:6: ‘unus cum Deo spiritus sum.’ English from: *Song IV*, p. 53.

⁷⁰ Bernard, *Song IV*, p. 53.

⁷¹ It is also worth examining Bernard’s discussion of *unum* as opposed to *unus* as interpretations of unity. *Unum*, he explains, refers to the higher quality of Oneness that describes the Godhead itself, whereas *unus* refers to conformity of charity and will. This can potentially be seen as a division between Divine Oneness and a secondary, human oneness. *Song IV*, p. 55. William does not make room for such a divide.

⁷² It is not until this passage of his Seventy-First Sermon that Bernard is so explicit and progressive with regards to the topic of unity. This sermon would have been delivered towards the end of a lengthy intellectual friendship with William. It is evident, therefore, that integrating Spiritual charity into the marriage that Bernard depicts as being exclusively between man and Christ is not St. Bernard’s theological priority. William very likely inspired the sudden interest that Bernard demonstrates in this excerpt, however despite Bernard’s partial imitation, William remains exceptional in his degree of emphasis on the Spirit.

that love. He concludes it, however, by stating that when building one's spiritual house, it is best to utilize wood from a variety of trees. 'Joy in the Holy Spirit,' is but one of the many trees in the Bridegroom's garden, which He grows for the use of His many brides.⁷³ This statement makes evident Bernard's Christological partiality. The Holy Spirit, he readily acknowledges, teaches an essential asset to the endeavouring soul, but it is just one of many, and it is one that is encompassed in the greater provisions tended by the Son. This is almost the direct opposite of the responsibilities of the Trinity as set out by William.

In one of his earlier Song of Songs Sermons, Bernard sets out to list all of the positive abilities associated with the human condition: strength, unenlightened love, justice, wisdom, and many others. These, explains Bernard, can be bestowed on man because, 'Christ is truly all these things.'⁷⁴ Christ is the gift and Christ is the redemption, because Christ *is* all of the qualities in man that make him worthy of being saved. The theological favouritism of Christ that Bernard is implying here is ubiquitous in the twelfth century: all four of the established contemporaries espouse a similarly Christocentric Christianity. While the Spirit, in Bernard's theology, is fundamental in that he teaches man to love Christ, Christ is those things by which man is loved. Bernard's theology of salvation, therefore, even when it reveals some pneumatological arteries, is a theology of Christ, which remains a stark difference to William.

The magnitude and centrality of unity through marriage for the development of the soul is the same for both William and Bernard, but their divergent objectives reveal substantial dissonance. Bernard writes, 'devotion to the humanity of Christ is a gift, a great gift of the Spirit.'⁷⁵ In Bernard's understanding, the Spirit bestows man with a gift: the ability to love Christ. The Spirit is the courier, but Christ is the goal. The roles of redeemer and saviour are, therefore, reversed from William's understanding of the relationship. William describes the sacrifice of the Son as having liberated man of the natural burden of the fall. This enables man to be saved, but does not

⁷³ Bernard, *Sermones Cantica*, sermo: 46:9 p. 61: 'gaudium in Spiritu Sancto.' English translation from: *Song II*, ch. 46:9 p. 247.

⁷⁴ Bernard, *Sermones Cantica*, sermo: 20:8 p. 120: 'haec omnia nempe Christus.' English translation from: *Song I*, 20:8 p. 154.

⁷⁵ Bernard, *Sermones Cantica*, sermo: 20:8 p. 120: 'Licet vero donum et magnum donum Spiritus sit istiusmodi erga carnem Christi devotio.' English translation from: *Song I*, p. 154.

necessarily mean he *will* be saved. Bernard sees the Spirit merely as the giver of the gift of loving Christ, which is the actual object to be desired. For William, Christ's great gift is that He enables man to partake in the Spirit who brings the actual bestowal of salvation.

The majority of William's fellow commentators on the Song of Songs were most intensely concerned with demonstrating the adoration that the monastic bride should show for her Husband-Christ. Marrying Christ, in these commentaries, is purely an expression of loving Him. In William's commentaries, he focuses more intensely on the moments in which the bride is alone, and feels abandoned. For William the purpose of marriage is the resulting oneness. The lonely bride is spiritually empty, but she is the perfect vessel for the Holy Spirit's gifts. In his Eighth Meditation, William describes how the Spirit aids the longing soul, He tells her: "Open your mouth wide and I will fill it," and she tastes and sees your sweetness...she is made that which she eats: the bone of your bone and flesh of your flesh.'⁷⁶ William is explicit that it is the Spirit who fills the mouth of the thirsty soul with his benevolent grace. While the Son is the object of the bridal soul's affection, the Spirit *is* that affection, and he facilitates, causes, and *is* the oneness that is the purpose of marriage.

Participation

The final form of unification, participation in the Holy Spirit, is both the most complex and the most distinctively William's own of the types of unity addressed in his theology. In order to achieve this union perfectly, man must go through a series of guided stages. Unification in this form comes from an extended knowledge of God: through knowing God thoroughly, man can transform into something so alike to Him that he becomes consumed into the greater Whole. The first step in this process is, therefore, to contemplate God. As a result of the man's zealous contemplation, the Holy Spirit eventually opens man's eyes, so that he can now see the Creator. Extensive vision of God *face to face* allows man to come to recognize Him. During this time, 'the Lord and his servant often talk together as a man does

⁷⁶ *Metitativae*, ch. 8:5 p. 140, Latin extended to full quotation: 'Dilata os tuum et ego implebo illud, et illa gustans et uidens suauitatem tuam sacramento magno et incomprehensibili, hoc efficitur quod manducat, os ex ossibus tuis, et caro de carne tua.' the line that William attributes to God is Psalms 80:11. English translation from: *Meditations*, 8:5 p. 142.

with his friend...the bride is in the company of the bridegroom, and heavenly is united to the earthly, the divine to the human.⁷⁷ This intercourse, which is achieved through the Holy Spirit, allows man to truly *know* the Divine, and in so doing, become divine himself. The Holy Spirit, through this process, allows man to become similar to what He is, and subsumes man into himself, so that man and Spirit are one. This is the purpose of Unity: it is William's definition of salvation.

William emphasises the place of contemplation in the process of unifying with God. Through the act of contemplation, man begins to gain the ability to see aspects of God. While it is clear that these visions are murky, they are nonetheless essential for the achievement of awareness of the divine. The partial vision granted to man while he is alive is intended as an instructional foreshadowing of what is to come. William writes of the face of God: 'no one can live and see in the world.'⁷⁸ Spiritual sight is, therefore, twofold. There is the vision of God that is granted to the righteous man while he is alive, as a guide for how to increase one's similitude, and there is the higher vision that is experienced by the saved after their death. Part of unity is this experience of perfect sight, and such glorious vision is only granted to those who have been awarded salvation.

The first revelation of God's face is given to man only dimly. William exercises a number of metaphors for the shadowy, illusive manner in which God can be seen by living man. He repeatedly anatomises First Corinthians 13:12, in which the vision of God's face is described as dim, and in a reflective mirror rather than in present reality.⁷⁹ This metaphor obviously resonated with William, and it became the increasing focus of his personal theology over time. He writes that this form of vision, while imperfect, provides the best rubric through which man can judge himself: 'for the limits of human imperfection are never better realized than in the

⁷⁷ *Epistula*, ch. 35 p. 235: 'Dominus et seruus eius saepe colloquuntur, sicut uir ad amicum suum; in qua crebro fidelis anima Verbo Dei coniungitur, sponsa sponso sociatur, terrenis caelestia, humanis diuina uniuntur.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 35 p. 22.

⁷⁸ *Epistula*, ch. 297 p. 289: 'Haec est enim *facies Dei*, quam nemo potest uidere et uiuere mundo.' This references Ex 33:20. English translation from: *Epistle*, 297, p. 105.

⁷⁹ See for example: the *Aenigma*, pp. 36 twice, 39 twice, 40, 50, 52 twice, 69, and 107, *Speculum*, pp. 10, 33, 34, 55, 75, 78, 80 (as well as 13:13 on 3, 5, and 46) *Expositio Cantica*, pp. 17, 28 twice, 29, 46, 106, 120, 142, and 163, *Epistula*, pp. 43, 49, 97, and 100, *Meditatiuae*, pp. 107, 137, and 154, and *Romanos*, pp. 122, 164, and 171.

light of God's countenance, in the mirror which is the vision of God.⁸⁰ God reveals himself spiritually to some chosen men to provide them with an example to which to aspire. Through striving towards this example, man increases his similarity and resultantly his worthiness. There is a sort of unity in this revelation and increased likeness that transforms into the greater unity that is the actual vision of God achieved in the afterlife by those who are saved.

The face-to-face vision that William seeks is indivisible from his concept of unity. A part of the transformation that is required of man in order for him to unify with God is the embodiment of likeness with God. However, man cannot realize that likeness without knowing what it is that he is seeking to become. Therefore:

To the extent that we will see him, we will be like him. And it is there where we see him that we shall be like him, that is, in our soul. And even now to the degree that we do not see him, we are unlike him.⁸¹

It is for this reason that a face-to-face meeting with God is so desirable to the man that seeks union. Man cannot conform to God without the knowledge that sight provides.

William's desire to seek God's face has strong Augustinian roots. While Augustine is not as prescriptive as William would later be in advocating contemplation, he clearly had an affinity for the notion of deific sight. In his *Trinitate*, Augustine references First Corinthians 12:13, the same verse which William later uses to entreat face-to-face interaction, no less than twenty-six times. In his homily on Psalm Fifteen, Augustine writes that seeing God face to face liberates man from sin because, 'when they see thee face to face, their joy will exclude every other desire'⁸² Augustine does not extol the advantages of face-to-face sight in connection with

⁸⁰ *Epistula*, ch. 271 p. 284: 'Nusquam enim melius se deprehendi modus humanae imperfectionis, quam in lumine uultus Dei, in speculo diuinae uisionis.' English translation from: *Epistle*, 271 p. 97.

⁸¹ *Aenigma*, par. 5 p. 131: 'In tantum ergo eum uidebimus, in quantum similes ei erimus, et inde eum uidebimus unde similes ei erimus, mente scilicet: quia et nunc in tantum non uidemus, in quantum dissimiles ab eo sumus.' English translation from: *Enigma*, 4 p. 38.

⁸² Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, ed. E. Dekkers and J. Fraipont, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 38; 39; 40 (Turnhout: Brepolis, 1956), ps. 15 par. 10 'adimplebis eos laetitiam, ut non ultra quaerant aliquid, cum facie ad faciem te uiderint.' English translation from: *On the Psalms*, ch. 15:10 p. 162.

deific unification, however. While William may have been partially inspired by Augustine in establishing the importance of the line of scripture, his development on the theme was independent.

William's position may also have been inspired, to a more limited degree, by Origen who also emphasizes the importance of seeking God's face. In *De principiis*, Origen outlines the stages of rationality leading toward greater and greater ways of thinking. He writes that ultimately, the perfected mind will advance to 'perfect knowledge, no longer hindered by its former carnal senses, but developing in intellectual power, ever approaching the pure and gazing "face to face"'⁸³ As has been demonstrated, William believed in a strong correlation between reason and faith, so this excerpt would probably have resonated with him. However, the apex of Origen's described trajectory is perfect knowledge alone. This conclusion is echoed more closely in Hugh than in William. Perfect knowledge is the penultimate outcome for William; he seeks it as a prerequisite for unification. Origen stops short of what is, to William, the definitive aspiration: unity with God.

William expands on this notion of sight-inspired likeness in his later *Mirror of Faith*. In this treatise, William compares two kinds of recognition: one which God has for himself, or which the members of Godhead have for each other, and the other through which man is able to recognize God, and which allows man to achieve a likeness to God. William insists that man's transformation into this likeness is made possible only through the work of grace, once again manifesting oneness through the vocabulary of the Spirit. He quotes the Apostle John to say, 'we will be like to him because we will see him as he is. There, to be like to God will be either to see or to recognize him. One will see or recognize him, will see or recognize to the extent that he will be like Him.'⁸⁴ If salvation is realized through transformation of man's likeness to God, and likeness can only be accomplished through recognition of God, then this recognition must be taught by the divine teacher: the Spirit. Man is only capable of the wisdom of recognition as a result of the grace invested in him by the

⁸³ Origen, *Principiis*, ch. II:11 p. 191: 'perfectam scientiam mens iam perfecta perducitur, nequaquam iam ultra istis carnalibus sensibus impedita, sed intellectualibus incrementis aucta, semper ad purum et, ut ita dixerim, 'facie ad faciem'' English translation from *Principles* II, XI p. 192.

⁸⁴ *Speculum*, ch. 107 p. 178: 'Similem enim ibi esse Deo, videre Deum sive cognoscere erit; quem in tantum videbit sive cognoscet qui cognoscet vel videbit, in quantum similis ei erit.' English translation from: *Mirror*, 32 p. 77.

Spirit. In more simple terms, God is Truth. In order to learn Truth one must both be taught and be made able to learn. The Holy Spirit is the teacher of truth, the infrastructure that allows the student to be aware of the Truth that he is learning, and that very Truth itself.

In many ways, William's description of participatory union sounds similar to Origen's descriptions of the advancement of man. Although Origen emphasises that the spiritual improvement of man is the result of the Father, he writes that man becomes more holy and pure because participation in the Holy Spirit removes man's 'stains of pollution and ignorance.'⁸⁵ William explicitly echoes this conceptual cleansing. However, Origen prefaces this description with an affirmation of his belief that existence comes from Father, rational nature from Son, and holiness from Spirit. He emphasises that it is through these gifts from each of the persons of the Trinity that an individual is able to 'become capable of receiving Christ afresh in his character of the righteousness of God.'⁸⁶ This is the key divergence from Origen in William's interpretations of participation in the Spirit. Whereas for William the pinnacle of the soul's ascent to purity is the act of participation in the Spirit, for Origen this participation is the final step in a process that leads to the reception of Christ: his actual goal. Although both men describe the process in similar terms, and William probably borrowed some aspects of this concept from Origen, even within the context of this inherently pneumatological concept; Origen's goals tend toward the Christological.

Origen's description of this participation inspired other theologians of the greater twelfth century. Anselm of Canterbury is among these, and his interpretation falls far

⁸⁵ Origen writes in full that 'When a man, by being sanctified through participation in the Holy Spirit, is made purer and holier, he becomes more worthy to receive the grace of wisdom and knowledge, in order that all stains of pollution and ignorance may be purged and removed and that he may make so great an advance in holiness and purity that the life which he received from God shall be such as is worthy of God, who gave it to be pure and perfect, and that that which exists shall be as worthy as he who caused it to exist.' Origen, *Principiis*, ch. I:3 p. 61 'per hoc quod participatione spiritus sancti sanctificatus est quis, purior ac sincerior effectus, dignius recipit sapientiae ac scientiae gratiam, ut depulsis omnibus expurgatis que pollutionis atque ignorantiae maculis, tantum profectum sinceritatis ac puritatis accipiat, ut hoc quod accepit a deo ut esset tale sit, quale deo dignum est [eo], qui ut esset pure utique praestitit ac perfecte; ut tam dignum sit id quod est, quam est ille qui id esse fecit.' English translation from: *Principles*, p. 49.

⁸⁶ Origen, *Principiis*, ch. I:3 p. 61: 'rursum Christi secundum hoc, quod 'iustitia' dei est,' English translation from: *Principles*, p. 49. Referencing 1 Cor 1:30.

closer to the original than Williams does.⁸⁷ Like Origen, Anselm's comparison is Christologically based. Whereas William sees the template for imitation of God as being the shadowy image granted through spiritual sight, Anselm suggests examining the reflection of God that was the Word. Man is capable of faithful hope because he is a superior creation of God. However, the exuberance associated with this realization should not incite pride, because man must also realize his insufficiency when compared with God.

The living man is said to be the true man; but the likeness, or image, of a true man is said to be in a portrait [of this man]. By comparison, the Word is understood to be true Existence, for the being of the Word exists so supremely that, in a way, it alone exists; but a kind of likeness of this Supreme Being is understood to be in those things which, in a way, by comparison with it, do not exist—even though they have been made something through it and in accordance with it.⁸⁸

This quotation highlights man's metaphysical singularity. When he compares himself with the created order, man reigns supreme; when he compares himself with his creator, man is reminded of his significant imperfection. The reflection of God, for Anselm, serves as a cause for humility. Humility, in turn, is essential to salvation.

William's views correspond with Anselm's with regards to the value and importance of comparing oneself with God. Man was made in God's image, therefore a comparison to the origin of that image is natural, and it proves two key benefits. First, man is given a preview of the perfection of the divine that serves as inspiration in striving toward salvation. Second, man is given a form with which to compare himself for improvement. For Anselm, the value of this juxtaposition with God is to emphasise one's weakness, so as to inspire ardency in worship and passion for Christ. William, however, sees that as only one of the results. Once man has

⁸⁷ See Gasper, *Inheretance*, pp. 13-32 for evidence that Anselm had access to these texts.

⁸⁸ Anselm, *Monologion*, 31: 'Verum forsitan nihil huius remanebit ambiguitatis, si quemadmodum in vivo homine veritas hominis esse dicitur, in picto vero similitudo sive imago illius veritatis: sic existendi veritas intelligatur in verbo cuius essentia sic summe est, ut quodam modo illa sola sit, in iis vero quae in eius comparatione quodam modo non sunt, et tamen per illud et secundum illud facta sunt aliquid, imitation aliqua summae illius essentiae perpendatur.' English translation from: 'Monologion,' p. 47.

scrutinized the image of God, he is more open to inspiration from the Spirit to strive towards self-improvement. According to Anselm, this realization leads to fuller joy: for William it leads to elevation.

William explains that the results of this elevation are tremendous. It is through these dim visions that man is granted, and through his continued struggle to increase in likeness, with the help of grace that man is finally made ready for the final stage of unity: participation. In this stage, man's vision, as outlined in Second Corinthians, finally reaches its full potential: the image man sees is no longer a dim reflection but, 'beholding the glory of the Lord with open face, [he] is transformed into the same image from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord.'⁸⁹ The Spirit allows the face of God to be seen so that man is able to imitate it, and he then assists the believer in embodying this transformation. Man is united to God because through the Holy Spirit, his image becomes reality. Man's weak and lesser faculties unite to their respective superior faculties so that, through imitation they become alike. This is a process set in motion by the Spirit, and realized through conjunction with Him.

The vision provided by the Spirit results in the unity and the salvation of man. In *Meditations*, William provides perhaps his strongest articulation of this concept:

Whereas the birth of the Son from the Father belongs to the eternal divine nature, our birth as sons of God is an adoption of grace. The former birth is not something that happens, nor does it effect a unity; it is itself a oneness in the Holy Spirit. The latter birth, however, has no existence of itself, but comes to being through the Holy Spirit, in so far as it is stamped with the likeness of God. This unity of course transcends the limits of human nature, but falls short of the unity that belongs to the being of God. The Holy Spirit is also called the seed of this birth... moreover the likeness of God will be conferred on us by the sight of God, when we not only see that he exists, but see him as he is; that is the likeness that will make us like him.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. I, 1 p. 19: 'reuelata facie, speculans gloriam tuam, in eandem imaginem transformatur, a claritate in claritatem, sicut a domini Spiritu.' This is a favorite quotation of Williams, and he uses it in *Speculum* as well. English translation from: *Song*, 1 p. 4.

⁹⁰ *Metitatuiae*, ch. 6 p. 116 'Natiuitas vero Filii de Patre, aeternitatis natura est; natiuitas in nobis, gratiae adoptio est. Illa nec fit, nec facit unitatem, sed ipsa in Spiritu sancto unitas est; ista non est, sed

Although William is very clear that man does not *become* God, he is making the bold claim that through the Holy Spirit the human soul can become *like* God. In life, a human being has no hope of spiritually seeing anything more than a cloudy representation of what God means, however, in the salvation of union brought about by the Holy Spirit, man has the power to see God as he truly is. As William describes it, man seeks spiritual perfection and ‘progress in it is to look upon God’s glory with face uncovered; its perfection is to be transformed into the same likeness, borrowing glory from glory, enabled by the Spirit of the Lord.’⁹¹ This supreme and holy awareness finally allows man not just to hope to make himself more similar, but actually to make himself alike to the divine.

While William’s influences do consider the notion of indwelling of the Spirit, or at least an awareness-based increase in similitude resultant from mystical vision, no one draws the implications of these spiritual developments out to their conclusion. For William, the implied consequence of this supreme similitude is Spiritual transformation. As man comes closer to being like God, and has his faculties elevated by the Spirit to the point of personal holiness, man’s spirit is subsumed into the Holy Spirit. Rather than mystical indwelling of the Spirit in man, man becomes a participant in the Spirit. William writes that, once the Spirit has liberated man’s love, he proceeds to partake in ‘all the affections of the soul.’⁹² This turns man so alike to the Spirit that, ‘when he does that, we love you, or you love yourself in us, we affectively and you effectively, making us one in you, thorough your own unity, through your Holy Spirit whom you have given us.’⁹³ The Love of the Holy Spirit teaches man how to love and be loveable, this allows the Unity of the Spirit to accept

fit per Spiritum sanctum, in quantum similitudine Dei insignitur, equidem ultra modum naturae, sed citra essentiam diuinae. Nam et semn huius natiuitatis Spiritus sanctus dicitur, de quo dicit idem apostolus: Omnis qui natus est ex Deo non peccat, quoniam semen ipsius in eo manet, et ideo non potest peccare. Similitudinem autem ipsam Dei conferet nobis uisio eius, qua Deum uidebimus, non quod est, sed sicut est, et ipsas est similitude qua similes ei erimus esse Deo. Haec unitas, haec similitude ipsum est caelum, quo Deus in nobis habitat, et nos in Deo.’ English translation: *Meditations*, 6:8 p. 129.

⁹¹ *Epistula*, ch. 45 p. 237: ‘profectus eius, reuelata facie speculari gloriam Dei; perfectio uero, transformari in eandem imaginem a claritate in claritatem, sicut a Domini spiritu.’ This references II Cor. 3:18. English translation from: *Epistle*, 45 p. 27.

⁹² *Contemplando*, ch. 17 p. 165: ‘animae nostrae omnes affectiones.’ English translation from: *Contemplating*, ch. 11 p. 58.

⁹³ *Contemplando*, ch. 17 p. 165: ‘in se conuertens et sanctificans, amamus te uel amas tu te in nobis, nos affectu, tu effectu. Vnam nos in te efficiens per unitatem tuam, id est ipsum Spiritum sanctum tuum, quem dedisti nobis.’ English translation from: *Contemplating*, ch. 11 p. 58.

the individual soul into Himself thus incorporating that self into the greater Spiritual Whole.

The realization of fullest unity that William describes might easily be conceived as deism, and, although no contemporary ever made any such accusation, for that reason it is important to be clear in considering his meaning and the implications of his theology.⁹⁴ William is very clear in making two distinctions both of which distance his theory from heresy, but equally distance him from the theological assertions of his contemporaries. First, William asserts that man is not uniting with the whole of the Godhead, but only with the Person of the Spirit. Second, William is clear that this unity is accomplished through the mechanism of grace and the vehicle of the individual will and love. In this way, William's process of salvation is very simple: the Spirit liberates the affections, and the newly improved affections are able to unify with in the Spirit. Salvation is that Unity.

William summarises the way in which the Holy Spirit causes participatory unity in the *Mirror*. He writes,

The Holy Spirit himself communicates to man this word 'Spirit', and to the end that, according to the Apostle 'the man of God may be made one spirit with God,' both by the grace of the name and by the effect of its power. It is not one person only but many persons who have one heart and one soul in Him, as a result of the sharing in this supreme charity at the source of which is the unity of the Trinity.⁹⁵

The process through which unity is achieved with God is one that must be undertaken on an individual basis, but it applies to the whole of salvation-worthy humanity. Each distinct soul must have first his will and then his love liberated, and

⁹⁴ Jacques Delesalle, points out that that this was considered a possibility by earlier biographers in 'On Being' p. 21, and it has been suggested as proof of his Greek influence (See for example: *One Yet Two*).

⁹⁵ *Speculum*, ch. 110 p. 180: 'Spiritus communicat homini ipse Spiritus Sanctus, ut secundum Apostolum sit homo Dei cum Deo *unus spiritus*, et gratia nominis et effectu virtutis; non unus tantum homo, sed multi homines *cor unum* habentes in ipso et *animam unam*, ex derivatione summae illius caritatis, in cuius fonte est quod unitas Trinitatis.' This references 1 Cor. 6:17 English translation from: *Mirror*, 32 p. 79.

through this process each distinct soul is elevated to the point at which he is able to partake in the Unity of the Holy Spirit.

William's explanation of salvation is original. The centrality of unity, the conviction in a participatory approach to the divine, and the unwavering reliance on the Holy Spirit as agent and source of salvation are all distinct to William's theology. In explaining salvation, William describes a balanced relationship between hard spiritual work on the part of the believer and benevolence on the part of the Spirit. When an individual has reached the right level of self-improvement and Spiritual participation, the Spirit, 'unites him to Himself so that the spirit of the person who believes, having trusted in God, may be made one with Him.'⁹⁶ The Spirit chooses those monks whom He wishes to emotionally liberate, and the Spirit invites man to partake in divinity, but each man must personally pursue worthiness of selection and, once will and love have been fortified, must apply good will and passionate love to increase their worthiness. Once the soul's faculties have increased to utmost similarity to the Holy Spirit, then Spirit incorporates that soul into Himself so that spirit and Spirit become One. This is what makes William's view of salvation unique: it champions the Holy Spirit as savior and it expects each individual to actively engage in his own salvation.

Conclusions

The mutual Oneness of the Father and the Son, which is the Holy Spirit, is often described in terms of a loving embrace. The theological truths to which William's body of thought attest reflect that, although man has fallen from favour, it is possible for him to be lifted by the Holy Spirit, and permitted to enter through Him into this collective embrace. In William's own words, 'The embrace extends to man, but it surpasses man. For this embrace is the Holy Spirit.'⁹⁷ The unity of man with God is not the same Oneness and Sameness experienced by the persons of the Trinity, but it is nonetheless a likeness and cohesion that is entirely unearthly, and is something that the Holy Spirit enkindles in men.

⁹⁶ *Speculum*, ch. 109 p. 180: 'et unit eum sibi, ut *creditus cum Deo, unus cum eo fiat Spiritus* hominis credentis.' This references 1 Cor. 6:17. English translation from: *Mirror*, ch. 32 p. 79.

⁹⁷ *Expositio Cantica*, ch. XXVII, 128 p. 91: 'Amplexus iste circa hominem agitur, sed supra hominem est. Amplexus etenim hic Spiritus sanctus est.' English translation from: *Song*, 132 p. 106.

In many ways, the Unity of the Spirit unites even the previous two concepts of love and will. Union with God must necessarily involve adapting all parts of God that are within man to His respective parts. Therefore,

“unity of spirit” with God for a man who has his heart raised on high is the term of will’s progress toward God. No longer does it merely desire what God desires, not only does it love him, but it is perfect in its love, so that it can will only what God wills.⁹⁸

In unity, it is no longer an effort for man to conform his will and love to God’s because by joining into the divine man’s will and love become the same as those of God.

Unity affects and is built up to by these other works of the Spirit in man. As Paraclete, it is the prerogative of the Spirit to teach man how to take his own will and love and apply them to God. The Spirit enhances man’s will and teaches man to recognize what is good and what is sinful and transforms man’s will into good will. As that will is strengthened and fortified it eventually becomes so good that it transforms into love. Once again, the Spirit enters into this love, He turns it away from its carnal applications and instead educates and enhances it. As a result of these transformations brought on by the Holy Spirit, the soul is ‘unexpectedly and entirely transformed, not into the nature of divinity certainly, but into a kind of blessedness beyond the human form.’⁹⁹ Through this magnificent transformation, William writes, man ceases to ‘recognize God as a man recognizes his friend,’ but, rather, comes to ‘recognize Him as He recognizes himself.’¹⁰⁰ Through the grace of the Holy Spirit,

⁹⁸ *Epistula*, ch. 257 p. 281: ‘Vnitas uero spiritus cum Deo, homini sursum cor habenti proficientis in Deum uoluntatis est perfectio, cum iam non solummodo uult quod Deus uult, sed sic est non tantum affectus, sed in affectu perfectus, ut non possit uelle nisi quod Deus uult.’ English translation from: *Epistle*, 257 p. 94.

⁹⁹ *Speculum*, par. 101 p. 119: ‘tota repente transmutetur, non quidem in naturam diuinitatis, sed tamen in quamdam supra humanam.’ English translation from: *Mirror*, 30 p. 72. He goes on in this same section of the treatise, on page 76 ‘Those therefore to whom the Father and the Son reveal [themselves] recognize them as the Father and the Son recognize Themselves, because they have within themselves Their mutual knowing because they have within themselves the unity of both, and their will or love: all that the Holy Spirit is.’ This chapter is invaluable in understanding the relationship between knowing and becoming between God and man.

¹⁰⁰ *Speculum*, par. 105 p. 121: ‘Aliud quippe est cognoscere Deum sicut cognoscit uir amicum suum; aliud cognoscere eum sicut ipse cognoscit semetipsum.’ English translation from: *Mirror*, 31 p. 75. This should recall the discussion of the attributes of twelfth century anthropology from the second

therefore, man is trained to harness will and love in order to achieve unity. He learns the reality of the divine, and is thereby transformed into something that is beyond carnal conscription. Salvation is achieved only because the Holy Spirit chooses to bestow the ability to strive for salvation on the soul.

To an extent, unity's inclusion of the other key themes is natural to its function. If the Spirit-Unity represents the Oneness of God, then it is natural that that Unity should be inclusive of the other identities associated with God. Similarly, in His benevolence, it should be considered natural that God chooses to unite himself to his creations so as to elevate them to a higher level. William accordingly offers this supplication,

May your holiness and hallowing make us holy, may your unity unite us and, through what is indeed a sort of blood relationship, may we be united to God who is love through the name of love. We shall be made one with him through the power of this name.¹⁰¹

As a result of man's role as a child of the deity, and because that deity is all loving, man's natural inheritance is salvation. As William foresees it, this salvation does not take place within man. Salvation is otherworldly and all-powerful. In order to participate in it, therefore, man must rise out of his carnal form and into a higher one; through the Holy Spirit, he must participate in the Oneness of God.

chapter. William establishes, as was a hallmark of 'humanist' thought, a friendly, interpersonal relationship of the divine. William, however, pushes this further than most of his contemporaries taking the relationship from merely friendly to participatory.

¹⁰¹ *Contemplando*, ch. 17 p. 166: 'Sanctificet nos sanctitas et sanctitas et sanctificatio tua, uniat nos unitas tua. Et Deo qui est caritas uelut cognate quadam affinitate per caritatis nomen sociemur; per uirtutem nominis uniamur.' English translation from: *Contemplating*, 11 p. 59.

Conclusion

William of St. Thierry was a critical theological and intellectual thinker, who developed a distinctive pneumatological soteriology. William's pneumatology provides insight into the contextual view of the anthropology of the individual, both spiritually and intellectually. His body of thought has significance both for its independent value as an intriguing, comprehensive Trinitarian theory, and because of its implications for the wider intellectual culture in which he was writing. This examination of his theology reveals the extent to which William's work deserves recognition and investigation historiographically and theologically.

What William Accomplished

Although William's corpus spans a considerable range of topics, he continually and persistently revisits the theme of salvation through the Holy Spirit. In pursuing that theme, William accomplished some considerable theological feats: he provided fresh epistemology in which to discuss the Holy Spirit and an articulation of the mystery of salvation. Both the Holy Spirit and the state of salvation are indescribable in human terms. What William did, therefore, was define how human language is applicable and explore the extent of human understanding. In so doing, he developed an understanding of the mystery of salvation that is tailored to the individual, but is broadly applicable, and he developed a soteriology that is human-positive.

William takes great care to describe and parse the many names by which the Holy Spirit can be identified, and their significance. Ultimately, William consistently invokes the three identities that have formed the basis of the current discussion: he calls the Spirit, 'your spirit who is called the Love, and the Unity, and the Will of the Father and the Son.'¹ William is among the first theologians to consider not simply *that* the Holy Spirit is, but rather *who* He is. In defining how theology can talk about

¹ William, *Contemplando*, ch. 14 p. 162: 'Spiritus sanctus tuus, qui amor dicitur Patris et Filii, et unitas, et uoluntas,' English translation from *Contemplating*, 11 p. 54.

the Spirit, William also articulated, in a connected and integrated manner, a facet that is perhaps more important: man's relationship with Him.

The three pneumatological appellations that Williams developed: Will, Love, and Unity, have emotional counterparts in the human soul. By naming the Holy Spirit in this way, William provided a natural avenue for the cultivation of a personal relationship with the Holy Spirit. William gave to the Spirit anthropological characteristics, which allows for both Spiritual intervention in man, and humane effort towards the Spirit.² The result is a conception of salvation that is both deeply individualistic, and potentially applicable to the whole of humankind. Whereas God the Father gave the created order its life and its image, and God the Son acted to redeem it, God the Spirit helps specific weak souls to seek their own salvation to the best of their abilities, while also ultimately manifesting them with the grace necessary for it to be achieved.

It is, William tells his readers, the grace of the Spirit that gives prayers weight, but the person praying must still commit to saying those prayers zealously and frequently.³ The Spirit helps man to help himself, and this is no easy journey; it 'is a task that is not completed in a moment, nor a single day: it demands a long time and much hard work, much sweat; it depends on God's mercy and grace and on man's will and alacrity.'⁴ By providing a method through which man can work with the Spirit towards his own improvement, William provided an alternative to Pelagianism

² In establishing a vocabulary with which to address pneumatological topics, William participates in a balancing act expressed by Augustine in his *De doctrina christiana*. Augustine writes that the task of reading scripture should be undertaken for two reasons: to glean what should be understood from scripture, and to figure out how to demonstrate that understanding to others. (Augustine, *Teaching Christianity*, trans. Edmond Hill (Hyde Park: New City Press, 1996) 1:1 p. 106.) William's development of this new pneumatological vocabulary both helps him to understand the Holy Spirit, and helps him to articulate his own understanding of the Holy Spirit to his audience. To further the comparison, William's use of a collection of terms as representative for a more complex concept highlights Augustine's argument regarding the difference between things and signs. Whereas things can be both concrete and symbolic, words are always symbolic because they always point to a greater truth. (Augustine, *Teaching*, 1:2, pp. 106-107.) The three faculties that William uses to identify the Holy Spirit are signs that he uses to highlight an ultimately inexpressible divine reality. Although the words that he uses are insufficient, they are necessary signs without which he would be unable to communicate his theological understanding.

³ *Contemplating*, 11 p. 55.

⁴ *Epistula*, par. 94, p. 274: 'opus non in uno fit momento conuersionis, non est unius diei, sed multi temporis est, multi laboris, multi sudoris, secundum gratiam Dei miserentis et studium hominis uolentis et currentis.' English from: *Epistle*, 94 p. 43.

that denied man's ability to be saved without the Will of God, but still gave individuals agency towards their salvation.

In providing an explanation of salvation that is both personal and pneumatological, William advanced an understanding of soteriology that had previously been postulated by Anselm of Canterbury. In *Cur Deus homo*, Anselm firmly establishes that no human, even if God were to recreate a sinless one, is capable of atoning for his or her own sins.⁵ This is because humans lack a strong enough currency with which to repay the debt of sin to God. It is necessary, therefore, that the being which atones for human sin be divine, because only the deity is powerful enough to pay the deity. In essence, the answer that Anselm provides is that God became the God-man, and in so doing Christ atoned for the Fall.⁶ William accepts and adopts Anselm's argument on this point. However, Anselm's explanation is only satisfactory when applied to the question of how holistic salvation was made possible and the issue of original, Adamic sin: the question of how each individual is able to atone for the sins of his specific life remains.

Worthiness of salvation relies on human *affecti* to achieve heights of Goodness that are super-human. The acts of willing as well as God wills, and truly loving God with the strength of love that He deserves are beyond man's powers to achieve. The Holy Spirit, therefore, infiltrates the human soul and lifts its ability; He unifies man to Himself so that that man is made more worthy than he is capable of making himself. Man lacks the currency to repay God for his sins, but the Spirit is able to elevate man to the level that his love and will are worth more, and he is finally able to repay his debts. Just as Anselm explained how the purgation of sin that lead to redemption required an act of the Word who is Christ, so William demonstrates that the achievement of Goodness that leads to salvation requires the act of Will-Love-Unity who is the Holy Spirit.

⁵ Anselm, *Cur Deus*, ch. I:5,

⁶ For literature focused on this aspect of Anselm's soteriology see: Giles E. M. Gasper, 'Anselm of Canterbury,' *Christian Theologies of Salvation*, ed. Justin Holcomb (New York: New York University Press, forthcoming) and David Brown, 'Anselm on Atonement,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Anselm*, eds. Brian Davies and Brian Leftow (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 279-303.

Consideration of the economy of salvation up until this point had accounted only for the theory of redemption. The Trinitarian focus in twelfth-century speculative theology was always Christ, because Christ makes salvation possible. William, instead, considered what makes salvation *happen*. His answer to that quandary required a far more intimate approach, which could only be provided by the Holy Spirit. William posited a genuine, reasoned, and consistent solution to the questions of both the causes of salvation, and the role of the Holy Spirit in the Christian experience.

William's Legacy

It is difficult to make explicit claims about William's influence on broader theology, however it is worth taking a moment to speculate. William's *Golden Epistle*, by far his most popular work, condensed his theology of salvation into a brief didactic form, and in this form monks across Europe had access to his view of spiritual elevation.⁷ The personalized, mystical form of spirituality that grew in popularity from the twelfth century onward was very much realized in William's writing. From the twelfth century, pneumatology blossomed, and it is hard to believe that this was not at least accelerated by William's writing on the topic.

Concrete evidence of William's influence can be seen most immediately on his closest friends. Of these the most important was St. Bernard.⁸ It is apparent that significant aspects of Bernard's character were built on William's guidance. Bernard's pneumatological interests, limited though they were, were certainly the result of his friendship with William. In addition, it is increasingly evident that more fundamental aspects of his intellectual identity: his interest in the Song of Songs, his definition of God's love, even the extent of his familiarity with the Church Fathers, with whom his authority is so associated, were all William's doing.⁹ Through his influence on Bernard, William exercised accidental influence across a greater population.

⁷ See chapter 2 for more on transmission of the *Epistle*.

⁸ Bernard was among the most influential individuals of the medieval era. See chapter 2 for qualification of this claim: Bernard was a highly public figure as demonstrated through his success in preaching the second crusade, and he was also a charismatic and distinguished monk, as seen by the massive increase in Cistercian monasteries partially resulting from his popularization of the order.

⁹ Louis j. Lekai postulates that William significantly increased Bernard's familiarity even with Augustine, in *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality*, (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1977), p. 229.

William's pneumatological focus came at the start of a general increase in consideration of the Holy Spirit, which had become more commonplace by the end of the medieval era. One of the ways in which the larger universities taught pneumatology was through required commentaries on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*.¹⁰ Peter Lombard (1100-1160) had compiled the *Sentences* in order to create a massive heuristic collection of, and commentary on, established authoritative theology. The result provided the later medieval era with a comprehensive encyclopaedia of theology. Early in Lombard's career he spent a period of time in the care of Bernard of Clairvaux, through whom he may have been exposed to William.¹¹ Textual evidence indicates that William influenced Lombard's writing, particularly within the realm of pneumatology.¹² Like William, Lombard writes that human faculties must be elevated out of their post-lapsarian form, and that this is accomplished through grace.¹³ Lombard demonstrates this through a defence of will as being both autonomous and reliant on grace's guidance.¹⁴ Further, and more similar to William, Lombard demonstrates the elevation of grace through a discussion of pneumatological love in which he describes the Holy Spirit as both being God's Love, and acting through man's love, a concept that is distinct in William's

¹⁰ Elizabeth A. Dreyer, *Holy Power Holy Presence: Rediscovering Medieval Metaphors for the Holy Spirit* (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2007), p. 14. Book I, distinctions X-XV deal most specifically with pneumatology. See: Peter Lombard, *The Sentences Book I: The Mystery of the Trinity*, trans. by Giulio Silano (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2010) pp. 58-84. For more on the transmission and reception of the *Sentences*, see Marcia Colish, *Medieval Foundations of the Western Intellectual Tradition, 400-1400* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997, pp. 282-287, as well as Colish's two volume biography of Lombard, *Peter Lombard* (New York: Brill, 1993).

¹¹ Bernard, *Letters*, trans. Bruno Scott James (London: Burns Oats, 1955), 442, p. 508. In this letter, addressed to Abbot Gilduin of St. Victor, Bernard states that Bishop of Lucca asked Bernard to care for Lombard, which Bernard did while Lombard was at Reims. Bernard, in turn, writes Gilduin to request that he care for Lombard as he transitions to study in Paris.

¹² Like William, Lombard writes that human affecti are the means by which a man's goodness is increased, however human faculties were all oriented toward evil by the fall. Lombard referenced, and has been compared with, the same characters that relate to William. Although the *Sentences* draw primarily from Augustine, they are fundamentally a work of systematic theology, a genre, as Rosemann points out, essentially invented by Origen (Philipp Rosemann, *Peter Lombard* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 16). Rosemann also indicates theological similarities between Lombard and St. Anselm, (p. 23) Hugh of St. Victor, with whom he studied, and Peter Abelard (p. 27). In her text book, Colish provides a lengthy comparison between Lombard and Hugh, (*Foundations*, p. 278-286) and in her biography of Lombard she spends a small section expousing William as a contemporary writer and potential source for Lombard. (Colish, *Lombard*, pp. 188-190).

¹³ Peter *Sentences II*, Distinction XXV:7 p. 121 Peter restates this point several times (See for example the remainder of Distinction XXV, and Distinction XXVI:1, 2, p. 123).

¹⁴ For comparative evidence see Lombard's description of will and choice, particularly as espoused in the first book of the *Sentences*, Distinction III:2-7 pp. 22, 23, and Distinction VII:4, p. 40, which match William's closely. This is the more relevant because of will's relationship to pneumatology. Like William, Lombard 'preserves and enhances human free will,' in his interpretation (Colish, *Foundations*, p. 283).

soteriology.¹⁵ Lombard's *Sentences* not only demonstrate the increased intellectual emphasis on the Holy Spirit following William, they exhibit appropriation of an argument that is central in his writing.

What William provided through his pneumatology, along with a clear outline of salvation, was a means for strengthening faith. Along with its intellectual applications as seen in the *Sentences*, William's message of Spiritual love resonated with many mystics. Although the twelfth century was, perhaps, the greatest age for monastic forms of mystical theology, this development within the cloister had a tremendous effect on the outside world. Following William's era of theology, less privileged sectors of society began to engage in religious experience through an increase in vernacular preaching, adoption of the *vita apostolica*, and mysticism.¹⁶ Most notably, the thirteenth century witnessed a great increase in women partaking in theology, particularly through the vocation of mystic.¹⁷ Although William cannot be attributed credit for the development of female and lay spirituality that was to come, his emphasis on personal interaction as superior to scriptural or authoritative education makes him a champion of personal mystical piety. This focus opens some doors for lay piety. As McGinn puts it the monks of the twelfth century paved the way for the new mysticism, which came after by 'their emphasis on the authentication of their teaching through visionary experience.' William's focus on vision of, and interaction with, the Spirit makes Christianity more accessible, and his belief in man's ability to become alike to God lends legitimacy to the *vita apostolica*.

¹⁵ See for example, *Sentences*, Distinction 17:6. Rosemann, who elucidates Lombard's discussion of pneumatological love, (Rosemann, *Lombard*, pp. 85-89) acknowledges William's development of this concept (Rosemann, *Lombard*, p. 89). Although Colish interprets Lombard slightly differently, and writes that, in Lombard's theology the Holy Spirit only *affects* human charity, rather than embodies it, Rosemann successfully refutes this claim. (Rosemann, *Lombard*, pp. 88-89).

¹⁶ For more on these movements see: Bernard McGinn's third volume of *Presence, The Flowering of Mysticism* (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1998), particularly pp. 3-35. See also, Clifford Backman, *Worlds of Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) 291-403, or Colish's *Foundations*.

¹⁷ Bernard McGinn writes that, 'the great age of women's theology begins in 1200,' in *Presence* vol. III, p. 15. Most relevant to William is the rise of the Beguin order, a lay order originating in Lotharingia, which gave rise to a number of contentious but influential female mystics, and which McGinn notes bears some similarities to the Cistercian Order in its goals and foundation (*Presence* vol. III, p. 32). For more on women's lay mysticism see Barbara Newman's *From Virile Woman to WomanChrist: Studies in Medieval Religion and Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995) or the introductory chapters of her *Sister of Wisdom: St. Hildegard's Theology of the Feminine* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

Although his theology was exclusive, its personal, individualistic nature anticipates more public forms of worship.

Repeatedly, William states that the Spirit helps him in times of weakness.¹⁸ What the Holy Spirit gives is fortitude, which allows the forsaken soul to toil despite the magnitude of the task of seeking God, and the weakness of the human form. This concept gained him popularity among mystics in the centuries to follow and, despite much of his audience receiving his teaching in Bernard's name, William had a very direct influence on the French and Flemish mystics of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Hadewijch, (d. 1248) a Beguine from Antwerp, directly quotes William's *Nature* at length and reiterates his proclamation of reason and love as mutual modes of seeking God.¹⁹ A little later, in France, the mystic Marguerite Porete (d. 1310) demonstrated potential familiarity with William's *Epistle* in her *The Mirror of Simple Souls*.²⁰ In the fourteenth century, the Blessed John of Ruusbroec (d. 1381) internalized and interpreted William's understanding of Spiritual indwelling,

¹⁸ *Song*, p. 144, *Mirror*, p. 68, *Epistle*, p. 93. He writes at great length of the Bride's experience of loneliness and isolation, however he is steadfast in saying that, because of the pledge of the Spirit, she is able to have hope for his return. See for example, *Song* 135: "The Bride was sitting all by herself, awaiting the Bridegroom's return; she possessed the Spirit as the pledge that he would come back speedily; she prayed, wept and longed for him to return."

¹⁹ This was first noticed by Jozef Van Mierlo, in 'Hadewijch en Willem van St.-Thierry,' *Ons Geetelijk Erf*, 3 (1929), pp. 45-59, and was expanded upon by Paul Verdeyen in 'William of Saint Thierry's Influence on the Flemish Mystics,' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry*, trans. Jerry Carfantan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987) in which Verdeyen provides a convincing side by side comparison of the excerpt from *Nature* with Hadewijch's 18th letter on pp. 242-243. Verdeyen had already presented this idea ten years earlier in his native Dutch in 'De Invloed van Willem van Saint-Thierry op Hadewijch en Ruusbroec,' *Ons Geetelijk Erf*, 51 (1977), pp. 3-19. It is also worth consulting Rob Faesen on this point, specifically 'The Radical Humanism of Christian Mystics: William of Saint-Thierry, Hadewijch and Ruusbroec versus Abaelard and Ockham,' in *Seeing the Seeker: Explorations in the Discipline of Spirituality: A Festschrift for Kees Waaijman on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Hein Blommestijn (Leuven: Peeters, 2008), pp. 263-278. For the letter which in which Hadewijch directly draws from William's *Nature*, see *Hadewijch, The Complete Works*, trans. Columba Hart (New York: Paulist Press, 1980), p. 179.

²⁰ This argument has primarily been made by Luisa Muraro in her article 'Marguerite Porete, lectrice de l'*Epistula Aurea*,' in *Signy l'Abbaye, site Cistercien enfoui, site de Mémoire, et Guillaume de Saint-Thierry*, ed. Nicole Boucher (Signy l'Abbaye: Association des Amis de l'abbaye de Signy, 1998) pp. 555-563, and has been supported by John Arblaster in 'The Pious Jackal and the Pseudo-Woman: Doctrines of Deification in Late Medieval France,' in *Mysticism in the French Tradition: Eruptions from France*, eds. Louis Nelstrop and Bradley B. Onishi, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2015), pp. 121-148, and Rachael Matthews in her thesis *The Mystical Utterance and the Metaphorical Mode in the Writings of Marguerite d'Oingt and Marguerite Porete*, Durham University (2015) pp. 33, 98. For the primary source see Marguerite Porete, *The Mirror of Simple Souls*, trans. Ellen Babinsky (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1993).

specifically in his *The Sparkling Stone*.²¹ These three well-known mystics' familiarity with William provide serious evidence of William's wider-ranging influence on the development of pneumatologically based mystical spirituality following his own era.

Along with the explicit reiteration of William's themes found amongst the mystics, after the twelfth century, popular views of salvation have resonance with William's description. The Greek concept of *Theosis*: the act of partaking in Spiritual divinity, first explicitly appeared in the West in the late thirteenth century in the mystical writings of Meister Eckhart (d. 1328).²² Although Eckhart popularized the word, it was a concept that had already been developed and disseminated by William. It is possible Eckhart was influenced by William's explanation of salvation, which would have been readily available to him.²³

The 'democratization' of Christianity that followed the twelfth century, through which lay people participated more actively in their own faith, resulted in the popularity of lay preachers and mystics, however, they were, in many ways,

²¹ These connections have been noted by Verdeyen in both of his articles, as well as by Faesen, in 'Radical,' and Arblaster in 'Jackal.' Oliver Davies notes a connection between William and Ruusbroec in *Meister Eckhart: Mystical Theologian* (London: SPCK, 1991) pp. 221-222. For Ruusbroec's actual text see *The Sparkling Stone*, trans. C. A. Wynschenk (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1916) Verdeyen makes the argument that William's influence can specifically be noted in cap. 3.

²² Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *The Holy Spirit: A Guide to Christian Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012), p. 38. Eckhart's form of mysticism was far less emotional than William's and he avoided the romantic language that William so frequently indulged in, favouring instead a more cerebral approach to the divine (See: Colish, *Foundations*, pp. 239-241). Nonetheless, Eckhart calls for a unification within the mystical experience between contemplation and action, and this echoes William. For a detailed investigation of Eckhart's theology of spiritual union see: Davies, *Meister Eckhart*, pp. 99-160. Davies addresses William's potential influence on p. 143. Eckhart is known for using rational intellectual arguments to encourage unity with God through grace. This argument has obvious connections to William's theology. (See: Frank Tobin, *Meister Eckhart: Thought and Language* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986) p. 19) For relevant primary sources see: Meister Eckhart, *The Complete Mystical Works of Meister Eckhart*, ed. and trans., Maurice O'C. Walshe (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2009).

²³ Saskia Murk-Jansen makes a case for Eckhart's unlikely familiarity with Hadewijch. If she proves correct, that provides a direct lineage for excerpts of William's work. It is also a strong articulation of why influences on Eckhart should not be dismissed for merely linguistic or geographic reasons: Saskia Murk-Jansen, 'Hadewijch and Eckhart: Amor Intellegere Est,' in *Meister Eckhart and the Beguine Mystics: Hadewijch of Brabant, Mechthild of Magdeburg, and Marguerite Porete* ed. Bernard McGinn (New York: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1994) pp. 17-30. Eckhart was certainly directly influenced by Marguerite Porete's *Mirror for Simple Souls*, providing another potential connection to William, McGinn, 'Meister Eckhart and the Beguines in the Context of Vernacular Theology,' in *Meister Eckhart and the Beguine Mystics: Hadewijch of Brabant, Mechthild of Magdeburg, and Marguerite Porete* ed. Bernard McGinn (New York: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1994) p. 2.

following in William's footsteps.²⁴ The individualized, personal, mystical relationship with the divine that became so popular amongst the increasing populations of mystics had already been expressed to a significant extent in the form of William's soteriology. As a result of the detachment of his name, William's influence is difficult to establish, however by tracing his thought, that influence becomes increasingly evident in multiple intellectual and theological milieus. Evidence from Trinitarian theology in the schools, rational faith in the mystics, and participatory salvation theology, demonstrates that William's legacy and influence is more significant than the scholarly tradition has previously allowed.

Predating William, the majority of soteriological theology focuses on the Person of Christ. Shortly after William, however, there were an increasing number of theologians that hinged their notions of salvation on the Holy Spirit.²⁵ William should be regarded, at the very least, as the figure at the charge of an encompassing and pervasive pneumatological trend. His theological contribution can be witnessed in the scope of this trend, in the flourishing of individuality and personalized anthropology, and in a soteriology and understanding of the economy of salvation that is still referenced today.

What Significance William's Legacy Has

In twentieth-century historiography, the concept of 'twelfth century humanism,' and the 'discovery of the individual,' has been debated.²⁶ Although the reality of a twelfth century renaissance has been largely refuted, there was a pronounced exploration of

²⁴ The term is borrowed here from McGinn, 'Eckhart,' p. 10, but has extensive roots historiographically.

²⁵ This expands past the medieval era. Immediately following William this trend can be seen in many of the thinkers discussed in this thesis including of St. Victor, Rupert of Deutz, Peter Lombard, Hedawijch of Antwerp, and St. Francis of Assisi. As has been seen, the Holy Spirit became increasingly distributed through the theological fabric. After the reformation many sects increasingly turned to the Holy Spirit for guidance. William's emphasis on Spiritual guidance as superior to authority is shared by many protestant groups. Modern theology reflects a massive increase in the importance of the Holy Spirit within the writings of theologians such as Urs Von Balthasar and Eduard Schweizer emphasising His place in the Christian experience.

²⁶ Most explicitly by Colin Morris, in *The Discovery of the Individual 1050-1200* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), and Richard Southern in his essay collection on Medieval Humanism,' in *Medieval Humanism and other Studies* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970), and his book *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe*, vol. I: Foundations (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1995). See also Haskins's *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (New York: Meridian Books, 1955) and M-D. Chenu, *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century* (London: University of Toronto Press, 1997).

anthropology in the twelfth century, and the concept cannot be entirely dismissed. While this is not a humanist study, and William is not concerned with the concept of humanity, he is deeply concerned with the experience of each individual human. This can, in many ways, be seen as a very modern way of conceiving at faith. William focused on the Holy Spirit because, while Jesus saved mankind, the Spirit saves individual man. This leads to an experience of faith that is personal, individual, and inspiring: it means that you as an individual matter. William departed from the fraternal, universal faith that was seen in coenobitic monasteries, and developed a theology centered on the monk himself. This has significant implications both for theology, and for intellectual history.

In defining the core identities of the Holy Spirit, as experienced from the human perspective, William identified what he considered to be the most important features of the self. His detailed considerations of will, love, and unity, although they are presented exclusively in a theological context, give the modern reader an intimate view of a twelfth-century anthropological understanding. They also contribute to the development of pneumatology as a theological study.

The twelfth century witnessed the expansion of several intellectual trends that are relevant to this study: specifically the increase in anthropology that has historiographically been deemed as ‘humanism,’ the recently documented use of theological writings for didactic purposes, and development of a personal pedagogy. The most relevant quality of humanism is the way in which humanist thought impacts man’s perception of his relationship with God. Southern writes that one of the defining characteristics of what he perceived as twelfth century humanism was that it made God appear less as a distant monocrat and more as a close, semi-anthropomorphised friend.²⁷ Although William does express distance from the whole of the Godhead, the Holy Spirit, as Paraclete and Comforter, is always close to William. In William’s description of man’s relationship with God, the Spirit stands with the individual soul on a constant basis and guides, protects, and empowers him. Richard Southern accredits Saint Bernard with the invention of ‘spiritual

²⁷ Southern, ‘Humanism,’ p. 37. He writes that this, in turn, made the universe itself seem ‘friendly, familiar, intelligible.’

humanism,²⁸ continuing that after Bernard developed this mode of thinking it was adopted and disseminated by the universities and became a significant facet of scholasticism.²⁹ It seems far more likely that this mode of thinking, which emphasised an individualized relationship with the divine, and the importance of learning in that relationship, was developed first by William, and then later assumed by the younger Bernard.

This study also contributes to the continued dismantling of the perceived dichotomy between scholastic and monastic theology in the twelfth century. The persistent and incorrect view that all writing in the high medieval era necessarily belonged to one of these denominations has been significantly dissolved, and examination of William's writing contributes to that ongoing endeavor. William, while advocating a rejection of authority in favor of Spiritual guidance, demonstrates how intellect and reason can augment the monastic mystical experience. William treats reason as an aid and guide to love. By emphasizing that the two guides to humane love are the Holy Spirit and the individual's own reason, William elevates the importance of reason theologically. Although obviously the Holy Spirit is the more powerful and authoritative of these two guides, the very fact that reason sits within the same category as Him demonstrates how significant William perceives reason to be.³⁰ William, with his similarities to his contemporaries, and ultimate digression from all of them, demonstrates that the intellectual climate in the twelfth century was, and continued to be, far more nuanced than a battle between intellect and spirit. Just as each of those four contemporaries act as synecdoches for an intellectual fashion or faction, William can be viewed as reflective of the greater intellectual reality. As a well educated, intellectually active monk who also advocated the rejection of authority and the embodiment of the fool so as to spiritually flourish, William represents the combination of love and intellect.

Another historiographically emphasized dichotomy that this study of William helps to lay to rest is that between the twelfth century individual and the twelfth century

²⁸ Southern, 'Humanism,' p. 34.

²⁹ Southern, 'Humanism,' p. 37.

³⁰ For evidence of this see William's discussion of the 'two eyes' of charity in *Nature*, p. 77 as well as the discussion of concurrence in chapter one, which demonstrates how intellect is depicted as a tool through which God can guide man.

community. Whereas Morris suggested a significant loss of communal allegiance in the face of individuality, Bynum demonstrates that the relationship between individual and community was far more fluid.³¹ Bynum argues that, while there was a marked increase in concern for the individual, that concern was demonstrated through the individual's role within the community, not by his independence from it. The twelfth century marked, in many ways, a 'discovery of consciously chosen community.'³² William is demonstrative with regards to this argument; he strived throughout his career both to find and to create the perfect community.³³ William is archetypical, therefore, of how the twelfth-century individual could manifest individuality while elevating his community. Bynum writes that the twelfth century concern for the self was borne out of a greater concern for the group.³⁴ William is above all else a spiritual teacher, and he teaches not because of a particular concern for himself, but because of his concern for each of the individuals within the community. He demonstrates the dual commitment to understanding the self, developing a personal relationship with God, and individual ascent to salvation, while still maintaining a commitment to enriching and participating in one's chosen community.

Despite his desire to teach his own community, William has been accused of acting in opposition to intellectual progress because of his aggression against specific individuals in the scholastic movement, most famously Abelard, but also Rupert of Deutz, and William of Conches. If these attacks are viewed in light of recent consideration of twelfth century pedagogy, however, a different understanding of these actions emerges. The whole of William's corpus is focused on leading individuals to the guidance of the Spirit so that they can be saved. His didactic texts teach reason and rationality as aids to spiritual learning and elevation. The threat that William perceived in Abelard, and certainly in Rupert and William, was not so much a threat to the whole of the church as it was a threat to the intellectual and spiritual

³¹ Morris, *Individual*, for example, p. 13, Caroline Walker Bynum, 'Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?' in *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), p. 84.

³² Bynum, 'Individual?' p. 108.

³³ When the Benedictines failed him, William sought reform. When reform proved dissatisfactory, William absconded to the Cistercians. Even within Signy, William continued to strive for the perfect community both by investigating the ideals he perceived in the Carthusians, and by improving the one of which he was a part through the expansion of libraries and his own spiritual teaching.

³⁴ Bynum, 'Individual?' p. 85.

development of the individual. All of these men were teachers: they were teachers that were teaching incorrectly. That was why William felt the need to attack them, and why he dedicated his own writing to righting their misconceptions. Intellectual learning is a part of Spiritual Learning, and, not wanting individuals to be led astray, William lashed out against the misguided and set about attempting to save individuals himself through the dissemination and instrumentation of rational faith. In so doing, William was reorienting his students from the poor pedagogy of the teachers he disliked, and towards the highest teacher, the Holy Spirit.

Although William encourages a mystical approach to Spiritual learning, his writing reflects a clear and advanced pedagogical approach. William developed his own teaching philosophy, and he encouraged the individuals within his care to develop at their own rate. From intellectual education, he drew emotional development. This is reflected in his soteriology: William teaches that each individual must increase in similitude and unification to the divine. The process by which this is done is through an increase in the quality of faculties, which are decreasingly cerebral and concrete: from will, to love, to unity the process becomes less tangible and less quantifiable as it becomes more important. By studying William's writing, more can be comprehended about how twelfth century monastic culture understood learning, because William instructed his students to use mundane learning to form a ladder from which spiritual learning can be reached.

Although Christ saved humanity by one historical act, the salvation of the Spirit is enacted through the individual, and in many ways rests on actions taken by that individual. Although the Spirit picks, and guides individuals, they must also ultimately make the choice to save themselves. William's soteriology is characterised by his uniquely pervasive pneumatology, and by his radical implications for the agency of humanity in its own salvation. Articulation of that soteriology is vital to understanding both historical and current rational faith. William thoroughly deserves consideration as a major twelfth-century theologian and a major theologian of pneumatology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

WILLIAM'S WORKS

William of St. Thierry, *Aenigma fidei*, in *Opera omnia V. Opuscula asversus Petrum Abaelardum et de fide*, ed. Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 89A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 129-191.

William of St. Thierry, *De Contemplando Deo: La Contemplation de Dieu: L'oraison de Dom Guillaume*, ed. and trans., Jacques Hourlier. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1959).

William of St. Thierry, *Disputatio aduersus Petrum Abaelardum*, in *Opera omnia V. Opuscula asversus Petrum Abaelardum et de fide*, ed. Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 89A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007) pp. 13-59.

William of St. Thierry, *Epistula de erroribus Guillelmi de Conchis*, ed. Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 89A (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 61-71.

William of St. Thierry, 'Epistula ad fratres de Monte Dei,' in *Opera omnia III. Opera didactica et spiritualia: De Sacramento Altaris; De natura corporis et animae; De contemplando Deo; De Natura et dignitate amoris; Epistula ad fratres de Monte Dei*, eds. Stanly Ceglar and Paul Verdeyen (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003).

William of St. Thierry, 'Excerpta de libris beati Ambrosii super Cantica Canticorum,' in *Opera Omnia II, Expositio super Cantica canticorum; Brevis Commentatio; Excerpta de libris beati Ambrosii super Cantica canticorum; Excerpta ex libris beati Gregorii super Cantica canticorum*, eds. Stanly Ceglar and Paul Verdeyen. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997)

William of St. Thierry, 'Excerpta de libris beati Gregorii super Cantica Canticorum,' in *Opera Omnia II, Expositio super Cantica canticorum; Brevis Commentatio; Excerpta de libris beati Ambrosii super Cantica canticorum; Excerpta ex libris beati Gregorii super Cantica canticorum*, eds. Stanly Ceglar and Paul Verdeyen. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997).

William of St. Thierry, 'Expositio super Cantica canticorum,' in *Opera Omnia II, Expositio super Cantica canticorum; Brevis Commentatio; Excerpta de libris beati Ambrosii super Cantica canticorum; Excerpta ex libris beati Gregorii super Cantica canticorum*, eds. Stanly Ceglar and Paul Verdeyen. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997).

William of St. Thierry, *Meditativae orationes: Oraisons méditatives*, ed. and trans., Jacques Hourlier (Paris Éditions du Cerf, 1986).

William of St. Thierry, *De Natura corporis et animae*, ed. Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 88 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), pp. 177-212.

William of St. Thierry, 'De Natura et dignitate amoris,' in *Opera omnia, III. Opera didactica et spiritualia: De Sacramento Altaris; De natura corporis et animae; De contemplando Deo; De Natura et dignitate amoris; Epistula ad fratres de Monte Dei*, eds. Stanly Ceglar and Paul Verdeyen (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003).

William of St. Thierry, *Opera Omnia I: Expositio super Epistulam ad Romanos*, ed. Paul Verdeyen. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1989).

William of St. Thierry, *Oratio ('Domine Iesu')*, ed. Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 88 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), pp. 169-171.

William of St. Thierry, *Oratio uel Meditatio ('Seduxisti me')*, ed. Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 88 (Turnhout, Brepols, 2003), pp. 171-173.

William of St. Thierry, *De sacramento altaris*, ed. Stanley Ceglar and Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 88 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), pp. 47-91.

William of St. Thierry, *Speculum fidei: Le Miroir de la Foi*, ed. and trans., Jean Déchanet (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1982).

William of St. Thierry, *Vita prima sancti Bernardi Claraevallis abbatis*, ed. Paul Verdeyen, CCCM, 89B (Turnhout, Brepols, 2011), pp. 31-85.

WILLIAM'S WORKS IN TRANSLATION:

William of St. Thierry, 'On Contemplating God,' in *On Contemplating God, Prayer, and Meditations*, trans. Penelope Lawson (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1970), pp. 36-66.

William of St. Thierry, *The Enigma of Faith*, trans. John D. Anderson (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1973).

William of St. Thierry, *The Golden Epistle: A Letter to the Brethren at Mont Dieu*, trans. Theodore Berkeley (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1971).

William of St. Thierry, *Exposition on the Epistle to the Romans*, ed. John D. Anderson trans. John Baptist Hasbrouck (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1980).

William of St. Thierry, *Exposition on the Song of Songs*, trans. Mother Columba Hart (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1968).

William of St. Thierry, 'Meditations,' in *On Contemplating God, Prayer, and Meditations*, trans. Penelope Lawson (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1970), pp. 89-190.

William of St. Thierry, *The Mirror of Faith*, trans. Thomas X. Davis (Kalamazoo:

Cistercian Publications, 1979).

William of St. Thierry, 'On the Nature of the Body and the Soul,' in *Three Treatises on Man: A Cistercian Anthropology*, ed. Bernard McGinn, trans. Benjamin Clark (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1977), pp. 101-152.

William of St. Thierry, *The Nature and the Dignity of Love*, trans. Thomas X. Davis (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1981).

PRIMARY SOURCES IN LATIN:

St. Ambrose of Milan, *De Officiis*, ed. Ivor J. Davidson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

St. Anselm of Canterbury, *De Concordia praescientiae et praedestinationis et gratiae dei cum libero arbitrio*, in *Opera omnia S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi*, ed. F.S. Schmitt, 6 vols. [vol. 1 printed at Seckau 1938; vol 2. at Rome 1940, all reset for the Nelson edn] (Edinburgh 1946–1961), reprinted with new editorial material as *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, 2 vols (Stuttgart-Bad-Cannstatt 1968-1984) henceforth: *Opra omnia*, Schmitt, volume], vol. II, pp. 245-288.

St. Anselm of Canterbury, *Cur Deus homo*, in *Opera Omnia*, Schmitt, vol. II, pp. 39-133.

St. Anselm of Canterbury, *De libertate arbitrii*, *Opera Omnia*, Schmitt, vol. I, pp. 205-226.

St. Anselm of Canterbury, *Monologion*, *Opera Omnia*, Schmitt, vol. I, pp. 5-122.

St. Anselm of Canterbury, *De processione spiritus sancti*, *Opera Omnia*, Schmitt, vol. II, pp. 177-219.

St. Anselm of Canterbury, *Proslogion*, *Opera Omnia*, ed. Schmitt, vol. I, pp. 93-122.

St. Augustine of Hippo, *De Ciuitate Dei*, eds. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, 47; 48 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955).

St. Augustine of Hippo, *Confessionum libri tredecim*, ed. L. Verheijen, *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, 27 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1981).

St. Augustine of Hippo, *Contra Iulianum*, *Patrologia Latina*, 44, 641-874.

St. Augustine of Hippo, *De corruptione et gratia*, *Patrologia Latina*, 44, 915-946.

St. Augustine of Hippo, *De diuersis quaestionibus octoginta tribus*, ed. A. Mutzenbecher, *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, 44A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1975), pp. 11-249.

- St. Augustine of Hippo, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, ed. E. Dekkers and J. Fraipont, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 38; 39; 40 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1956).
- St. Augustine of Hippo, *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber*, ed. J. Zycha, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 28,1 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1894), pp. 459-503.
- St. Augustine of Hippo, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim*, ed. J. Zycha, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 28,1 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1894), pp. 3-435.
- St. Augustine of Hippo, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, Patrologia Latina, 34, 173-220.
- St. Augustine of Hippo, *De spiritu et littera*, ed. C.F. Vrba and J. Zycha, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 60 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1913), pp. 155-229.
- St. Augustine of Hippo, *De Trinitate*, ed. W.J. Mountain, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 50, 50A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1968).
- St. Benedict of Nursia, *Regula*, ed. A. de Vogüé, Sources Chrétiennes, 181, pp. 412-490 and 182, 508-674 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1972).
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Apologia ad Guillelmum abbatem*, in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, 8 vols., eds. J. Leclercq and H. M. Rochais, vol. 3, (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1963) pp. 81-108.
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistulae*, in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, 8 vols., ed. J. Leclercq and H. M. Rochais, vol. 7-8, (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1974-1977).
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Liber de diligendo Deo*, in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, 8 vols., ed. J. Leclercq and H. M. Rochais, vol. 3 (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1963), pp. 119-154.
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Liber de gratia et de libero arbitrio*, in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, 8 vols., ed. J. Leclercq and H.M. Rochais, vol. 3 (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1963), pp. 165-203.
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum*, in *Sancti Bernardi opera*, 8 vols., ed. J. Leclercq, C. H. Talbot, and H.M. Rochais, vol. 1-2 (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957-1958).
- Cyprian of Cathage, *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate*, ed. M. Bévenot, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1972), pp. 249-268.
- Hugh of St. Victor, *Didascalicon de studio legendi*, ed. C. H. Buttmer (Washington D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1939), pp. 1-133.

- Hugh of St. Victor, *Sententiae de Divinitate*, in A. M. Piazzoni, 'Ugo di San Vittore 'auctor' delle *Sententiae de diuinitate*,' *Studi Medievali*, 23 (1982), pp. 861-955, at 912-955.
- Hugh of St. Victor, *De substantia dilectionis*, in *Six opuscles spirituels*, ed. R. Baron Sources Chrétiennes, 155 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1969), pp. 82-92.
- Hugh of St. Victor, *De Tribus Diebus*, ed. D. Poirel, CCCM, 177 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002).
- Hugh of St. Victor, *De verbo dei*, ed. R. Baron Souces Chrétiennes, 155 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1969), pp. 60-80.
- Origen of Alexandria, *Commentarium in Canticum Canticorum*, [Latin, trans. Rufinus] in *Origenes Werke* vol. 8, ed. W.A. Baehrens, Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, 33 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1925), p. 61-241.
- Origen of Alexandria, *In Epistulam Pauli ad Romanos explantionum libri*, [Latin, trans. Rufinus] in *Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes: Kritische Ausgabe der Übersetzung Rufins*, 3 vols., ed. C. P. Hammond Bammel (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1990-1998).
- Origen of Alexandria, *De principiis (Periarchon)*, ed. P. Koetschau, Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, 22 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913), pp. 7-364.
- Peter Abelard, *Collationes*, ed. John Marenbon and Giovanni Orlandi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- Peter Abelard, *Commentaria in Epistulam Pauli ad Romanos*, ed. E. M. Buyaert, CCCM, 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996), pp. 41-340.
- Peter Abelard, *Historia Calamitatum*, ed. J. Monfrin (Vrin: Bibliothèque des textes philosophiques, 1962), pp. 63-109.
- Peter Abelard, *Scito te ipsum*, ed. R. M. Ilgner, CCCM, 190 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001).
- Peter Abelard, *Sic et non*, eds. B. Boyer and R. McKeon (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1977).
- Peter Abelard, *Theologia christiana*, ed. E.M. Buytaert, CCCM, 12 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), pp. 71-372.
- Rufinus, *Praefationes in libros Origenis Periarchon*, ed. P. Koetschau, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 20 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1968).
- Abbot Sugar of Denis, 'Liber de rebus in administratione sua gestis,' in *On the Abbey Church of St. Denis and Its Art and Treasures*, ed. Erwin Panofsky (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946), ch. XXXIII.

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, ed. Marietti Textus Leonitus (1961), Book III.

Various, 'Prima capituli provincialis ordinis S. Benedicti Remis A. D. 1131 Habiti,' ed. Stanley Ceglar, published in 'William of Saint Thierry and His Leading Role at the First Chapters of the Benedictine Abbots (Reims 1131, Soissons, 1132),' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry*, (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), pp. 51-63.

Various, 'Les Lettres de Guillaume de Saint-Thierry,' ed. Jean Leclercq, *Revue Bénédictine* (1969), pp. 375-391.

Various Abbots in Reims, 'acte d'association spirituelle et temporelle entre plusieurs abbayes de la province de Reims' in *Obituaires français au moyen âge*, ed. Auguste Molinier (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1890).

PRIMARY SOURCES IN TRANSLATION:

Alcuin of York, 'Against the Adoptionist Heresy of Felix,' in *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe: Documents in Translation*, ed. Edward Peters (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980), pp. 50-56.

St. Ambrose of Milan, 'The Holy Spirit,' in *Theological and Dogmatic Works*, trans. Roy J. Deferrari (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1987), pp. 35-217.

St. Ambrose of Milan, 'Isaac, or the Soul,' in *Seven Exegetical Works*, trans. Michael P. McHugh (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1972).

St. Ambrose of Milan, *Hexameron, Paradise, and Cain and Abel*, trans. John J. Savage (New York: Fathers of the Church Inc. 1961).

St. Ambrose of Milan, *De Officiis*, ed. and trans. Ivor J. Davidson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Anonymous, 'The Vita Antiqua of William of St. Thierry,' trans. David N. Bell *Cistercian Studies* 11, (1976), pp. 247-255.

St. Anselm of Canterbury, 'Cur Deus Homo,' in *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), pp. 295-389.

St. Anselm of Canterbury, 'Freedom of Choice,' in *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), pp. 191-213.

- St. Anselm of Canterbury, 'The Harmony of the Foreknowledge, the Predestination, and the Grace of God with Free Choice,' in *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), pp. 515-530.
- St. Anselm of Canterbury, 'Letters on the Sacraments,' in *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), pp. 531-574.
- St. Anselm of Canterbury, 'Monologion,' in *The Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Jasper Hopkins (Minneapolis: Arthur J Banning Press, 2000), pp. 1-89.
- St. Anselm of Canterbury, 'The Procession of the Holy Spirit,' in *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), pp. 466-514.
- St. Anselm of Canterbury, 'Proslogion,' in *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), pp. 88-112.
- Anselm of Laon (suspected), *The Glossa Ordinaria on the Song of Songs*, trans. Mary Dove (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2004).
- St. Augustine of Hippo, 'Admonition of Grace,' in *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, vol. II, ed. Joseph Defarrari, trans. John Courtney Murray (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1966).
- St. Augustine of Hippo, *Against Julian*, trans. Matthew A. Schumacher (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1957).
- St. Augustine of Hippo, *Concerning the City of God Against the Pagans*, trans. Marcus Dods, (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2009).
- St. Augustine of Hippo, *The Confessions*, ed. David Vincent Meconi, trans. Maria Boulding (San Francisco: Ignatious Press, 2012).
- St. Augustine of Hippo, *Eighty-Three Different Questions*, trans. David L. Mosher (Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1977).
- St. Augustine of Hippo, *On Genesis: Two Books on Genesis Against the Manichees, and On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis: An Unfinished Book*, trans. Roland J. Teske (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1991).
- St. Augustine of Hippo, 'The Spirit and the Letter,' from *Answer to the Pelagians*,

- ed. John E Rotelle, trans. Roland J Teske (Hyde Park: New City Press, 1997).
- St. Augustine of Hippo, *Teaching Christianity, De Doctrina Christaina*, ed. John E. Rotelle, trans. Edmund Hill (Hyde Park: New City Press, 1996).
- St. Augustine of Hippo, *On the Trinity*, trans. Edmund Hill (Hyde Park: New York City Press, 2012).
- St. Augustine, *On the Psalms*, vol. I: psalms 1-29 trans. Scholasitica Hebgin and Felicitas Corrigan (Westminster: The Newman Press, 1960).
- St. Basil the Great, *Exegetic Homilies*, trans. Sister Agnes Clare Way (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963).
- St. Basil the Great, *On the Holy Spirit*, trans. David Anderson (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988).
- The Venerable Bede, *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. and trans., Judith McClure and Roger Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).
- The Venerable Bede, *On Genesis*, trans. Calvin B. Kendall (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008).
- St. Benedict of Nursia, *Benedict's Rule: A Translation and Commentary*, ed., trans., and commentary Terrance Kardong (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996).
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Cistercians and Clunais: St. Bernard's Apologia to Abbot William*, trans. Michael Casey (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1970).
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, 'On Conversion, A Sermon to Clerics,' in *Sermons on Conversion*, trans. Marie-Bernard Saïd (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1981).
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Grace and Free Choice*, trans. Daniel O'Donovan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1988).
- Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letters*, trans. Bruno Scott James (London: Burns Oats, 1955).
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Loving God*, ed. and trans., Watkin Williams (Cambridge: The University Press, 1926). Edition used with extensive amendment. Latin referenced primarily.
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs I*, trans. Kilian Walsh (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1971).
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs II*, trans. Kilian Walsh (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1983).
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs III*, trans. Kilian Walsh and Irene M.

- Edmonds (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1979).
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs IV*, trans. Irene M. Edmonds (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1980).
- St. Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Steps of Humility and Pride*, trans. M. Ambrose Conway (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1973).
- Anicius Manlius Severinus Boëthius, *The Consolation of Philosophy*, trans. P. G. Walsh (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).
- Anicius Manlius Severinus Boëthius, *On the Holy Trinity*, trans. Erik C. Kenyon (2004).
- Cyril of Jerusalem, 'Catechetical Oration 16,' in *The Holy Spirit: Classic and Contemporary Readings*, ed. Eugene F. Rogers Jr. (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2009), pp. 131-135.
- Gilbert of Hoyland, *Sermons on the Song of Song I*, trans. Lawrence C. Braceland (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1978).
- Gilbert of Hoyland, *Sermons on the Song of Song II*, trans. Lawrence C. Braceland (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1978).
- Gilbert of Hoyland, *Sermons on the Song of Song III*, trans. Lawrence C. Braceland (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1978).
- Gregory Nazianzen, 'The Fifth Theological Oration (Oration 31) On the Holy Spirit,' in *On God and Christ: The Five Theological Orations and Two Letters to Cledonius*, trans. Lionel Wickham (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002), pp. 117-149.
- Gregory of Nyssa, 'On the Holy Spirit against Macedonius,' in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church V. VL Greg of Nyssa Dogmatic Treatises etc.*, eds. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), pp. 315-326.
- Gregory of Nyssa, 'On the Holy Trinity, and of the Godhead of the Holy Spirit to Eustathius,' in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church V. VL Gregory of Nyssa Dogmatic Treatises etc.*, eds. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, trans. H. A. Wilson (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), pp. 326-330.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, trans. Casimir McCambley (Brookline: Hellenic College Press, 1987).
- Gregory of Nyssa, 'On the Making of Man,' in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church V. VL Gregory of Nyssa Dogmatic Treatises etc.*, eds. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, trans. H. A.

- Wilson (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), pp. 387-428.
- Hadewijch of Antwerp, *The Complete Works*, trans. Columba Hart (New York: Paulist Press, 1980).
- St. Hilary of Poitiers, *The Trinity*, trans. Stephen McKenna (New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc. 1954).
- Hugh of St. Victor, *Didascalicon*, trans. Jerome Taylor (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968).
- Hugh of St. Victor, 'On the Praise of Charity,' in *On Love: A Selection of Works of Hugh, Adam, Achard, Richard, and Godfrey of St. Victor*, ed. Hugh Feiss, trans. Franklin T. Harkins (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), pp. 159-169.
- Hugh of St. Victor, 'On the Substance of Love,' in *Love: A Selection of Works from Hugh, Adam, Achard, Richard and Godfrey of St. Victor*, ed. Hugh Feiss, trans. Vanessa Butterfield (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), pp. 143-149.
- Hugh of St. Victor, 'On the Three Days,' in *Trinity and Creation: Victorine Texts in Translation, Exegesis, Theology and Spirituality from the Abbey of St. Victor*, eds. Boyd Taylor Coolman and Dale M. Coulter, trans. Christopher P Evens (Hyde Park: New City Press, 2011), pp. 61-103.
- Hugh of St. Victor, 'Sentences on Divinity,' in *Trinity and Creation: Victorine Texts in Translation, Exegesis, Theology and Spirituality from the Abbey of St. Victor*, eds. Boyd Taylor Coolman and Dale M. Coulter, trans. Christopher P. Evens (Hyde Park: New York City Press, 2011), pp. 103-179.
- St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians*, ed. Philip Schaff, Oxford translation (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956).
- John of Ford, *On the Song of Songs*, VI vols., trans. Wendy Mary Beckett (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1997-1984).
- John of Salisbury, *The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury: A Twelfth-Century Defence of the Verbal and Logical Arts of the Trivium*, trans. Daniel D. McGarry (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1971).
- The Blessed John Ruusbroec, *The Sparkling Stone*, trans. C. A. Wynschenk (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1916).
- Marguerite Porete, *The Mirror of Simple Souls*, trans. Ellen Babinsky (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1993).
- Meister Eckhart, *The Complete Mystical Works of Meister Eckhart*, ed. and trans., Maurice O'C. Walshe (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2009).

- Origen of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans Books 6-10*, trans. Thomas P. Scheck (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2002).
- Origen of Alexandria, *On First Principles*, trans. G. W. Butterworth (Notre Dame: Christian Classics, 2013).
- Origen of Alexandria, *The Song of Songs Commentary and Homilies*, trans. R. P. Lawson (Mahwah: The Newman Press, 1957).
- Peter Abelard, *Christian Theology*, ed. and trans. J. Ramsay McCallum (Oxford: Basil Blackwell & Mott Ltd., 1948).
- Peter Abelard, *Collationes*, ed. and trans., John Marenbon and Giovanni Orlandi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- Peter Abelard, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, trans. Stephan R. Cartwright (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2011).
- Peter Abelard, *Ethics*, trans. J. Ramsay McCallum (Merrick: Richwood Publishing Co., 1976).
- Peter Lombard, *The Sentences Book I: The Mystery of the Trinity*, trans. Giulio Silano (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2010).
- Peter Lombard, *The Sentences Book II: On Creation*, trans. Giulio Silano (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2012).
- Peter Lombard, *The Sentences Book III: On the Incarnation of the Word*, trans. Giulio Silano (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2010).
- Peter Lombard, *The Sentences Book IV: On the Doctrine of Signs*, trans. Giulio Silano (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2010).
- Rufinus, 'Preface of Rufinus,' in *On the First Principles*, trans. G. W. Butterworth (Notre Dame: Christian Classics, 2013), pp. lxxvii-lxxx.
- Rupert of Deutz, 'The Spirit Hovers over Baptism,' in *The Holy Spirit: Classic and Contemporary Readings*, ed. Eugene F. Rogers Jr. (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2009) pp. 177-179.
- Tertullian, *Homily on Baptism*, ed. and trans. Ernest Evans (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1964).
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles Book II: Creation*, trans. James F. Anderson (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975).
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles, Book III: Providence*, trans. Vernon J. Bourke, Part I (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975).

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles, Book III: Providence*, trans. Vernon J. Bourke, Part II (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975).

Abbot Sugar of Denis, *On the Abbey Church of St. Denis and Its Art and Treasures*, ed. and trans., Erwin Panofsky (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946).

William of St. Thierry and Others, *St. Bernard of Clairvaux: the Story of His Life as Recorded in the Vita prima Bernardi by Certain of his Contemporaries, William of St. Thierry, Arnold of Bonnevaux, Geoffrey and Philip of Clairvaux, and Odo of Deuil*, ed. and trans., Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker (Westminster: Newman Press, 1960).

SECONDARY SOURCES

Anderson, John D., 'Introduction,' in *Exposition on the Epistle to the Romans*, (Kalamazoo, Cistercian Studies, 1980), pp. 3-9.

Anderson, John D., 'The Use of Greek Sources by William of St. Thierry Especially in the Enigma Fidei,' in *One Yet Two: Monastic Tradition East and West*, ed. Basil Pennington (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976).

Anderson, John D., 'Introduction,' in *The Enigma of Faith*, (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1972), pp. 1-32.

Arblaster, John, 'The Pious Jackal and the Pseudo-Woman: Doctrines of Deification in Late Medieval France,' in *Mysticism in the French Tradition: Eruptions from France*, ed. Louis Nelstrop and Bradley B. Onishi (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2015), pp. 121-148.

Ayres, Lewis, 'It's for eatin'-it's for lookin' through': memoria, intelligentia, voluntas-and the argument of Augustine's De Trinitate IX-X,' in *The Mystery of the Holy Trinity in the Fathers of the Church The Proceedings of the Fourth Patristic Conference, Maynooth 1999*, ed. D. Vincent Twomey and Lewis Ayres (Portland: Four Courts Press, 2007), pp. 37 to 65.

Backman, Clifford, *The Worlds of Medieval Europe*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Barth, Karl, *Church Dogmatics*, Volume I (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1936).

Bartlett, Anne Clark, ed. *Vox Mystica: Essays on Medieval Mysticism in Honor of Professor Valerie M. Lagorio*, (Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1995).

Bell, David N., *The Image and Likeness: The Augustinian Spirituality of William of St. Thierry*, (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1984).

Bell, David N., 'Introduction,' in *The Nature and Dignity of Love*, (Kalamazoo:

Cistercian Studies, 1981), pp. 5-44.

Bell, David N., *The Libraries of the Cistercians, Gilbertines and Premonstratensians*. ed. by David N. Bell, 12 Volumes, (London: The British Library, 1992).

Bell, David N., 'The Vita Antiqua of William of St. Thierry,' *Cistercian Studies* 11, (1976), pp. 246-247.

Berlière, Ursmer, *Documents inédits per servir a l'histoire ecclésiastique de la Belgique*, (University of Toronto: The Internet Archive, 2011), Reference URL: https://archive.org/stream/documentsindit00berl/documentsindit00berl_djvu.txt

Berschin, W., 'Greek Elements in Medieval Latin Manuscripts,' in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Michael W. Herren and Shirley Ann Brown (London: Boydell and Brewer, 1988), pp. 85-104.

Biller, Peter and Dobson, Barrie, eds. *The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy, and Religious Life: Essays in Honour of Gordon Leff* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer Limited, 1999).

Bouhot, Jean-Paul and Genest, Jean Francois, eds. *La Bibliothèque de L'abbaye de Clairvaux* (Paris: CNRS Editions, 1997).

Boynton, Susan, 'Training for the Liturgy as a Form of Monastic Education,' in *Medieval Monastic Education*, ed. by George Ferzoco and Carolun Muessig, (London: Leceister University Press, 2000), pp. 7-20.

Bredero, Adriaan H., *Étudies sur la Vita prima de saint Bernard*, (Rome, 1960).

Bredero, Adriaan H., 'William of Saint Thierry at the Crossroads of the Monastic Currents of His Time,' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry*, trans. Jerry Carfantan, (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), pp. 113-137.

Brooke, Odo, 'The Speculative Development of the Trinitarian Theology of William of St. Thierry in the <<Anigma fidei,>>' in *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 28, (1961), pp. 193-211.

Brooke, Odo, 'The Trinitarian Aspect of the Ascent of the Soul to God in the Theology of William of St. Thierry,' in *Studies in Monastic Theology* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1980).

- Brown, David, 'Anselm on Atonement,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Anselm*, eds. Brian Davies and Brian Leftow (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 279-303.
- Brown, Stephen F. and Flores, Juan Carlos, eds. *Historical Dictionary of Medieval Philosophy and Theology*, (Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2007).
- Bruschi, Caterina and Biller, Peter, eds. *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy*, (York: York Medieval Press, 2003).
- Bryan, Jennifer, *Looking Inward Devotional Reading and the Private Self in Late Medieval England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).
- Burgess, Stanley M., ed. *Christian Peoples of the Spirit: A Documentary History of Pentecostal Spirituality from the Early Church to the Present* (New York: New York University Press, 2011).
- Burgess, Stanley M., *The Holy Spirit: Medieval Roman Catholic and Reformation Traditions* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc, 1997).
- Burke, Trevor J., *Adopted into God's Family: Exploring A Pauline Metaphor* (Downers Grove: IntraVarsity Press, 2006).
- Butler, Cuthbert, *Christian Mysticism: The Teaching of Ss. Augustine, Gregory, and Bernard on Contemplation and the Contemplative Life*, Second Edition (London: Constable and Company, 1926).
- Bynum, Caroline Walker, 'Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?' in *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982). pp. 82-110.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).
- Bynum, Caroline Walker, *The Resurrection of the Body: In Western Christianity, 200-1336* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995).
- A Carthusian, *The Way of Silent Love: Carthusian Novice Conferences*, trans. an Anglican Solitary (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1993).
- A Carthusian, *The Wound of Love: A Carthusian Miscellany* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1994).
- A Carthusian, *The Call of Silent Love: Carthusian Novice Conferences*, trans. an Anglican Solitary (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1995).
- A Carthusian, *Interior Prayer: Carthusian Novice Conferences*, trans. Sister Maureen Scrine (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1996).
- A Carthusian, *Carthusian Spirituality: The Writings of Hugh of Balma and Guigo de*

Ponte, trans. Dennis D. Martin (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1997).

A Carthusian, *The Freedom of Obedience: Carthusian Novice Conferences*, trans. An Anglican Solitary (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1998).

Caspers, C. M. A., 'The Lord's Supper and Holy Communion,' in *Religious Identity and the Invention of Tradition: Papers Read at a NOSTER Conference in Soesterberg January 4-6, 1999*, ed. Jan Willem van Henten and Anton Houtepen (Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2001).

Ceglar, Stanley, 'William of Saint Thierry and His Leading Role at the First Chapters of the Benedictine Abbots (Reims 1131, Soissons, 1132),' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry*, trans. Jerry Carfantan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), pp. 34-112.

Chadwick, Henry, *East and West the Making of a Rift in the Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Châtillon, Jean, 'William of St. Thierry, Monasticism, and the Schools: Rupert of Deutz, Abelard, and William of Conches,' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry*, trans. Jerry Carfantan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), pp. 153-180.

Chadwick, Henry, *The Making of a Rift in the Church, From Apostolic times until the Council of Florence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Chavasse, Claude, *The Bride of Christ* (London: Faber and Faber, 1939).

Chaurand, Jacques, 'William of Saint Thierry's Aspirations to the Simple Life: A Study in Vocabulary,' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry*, trans. Jerry Carfantan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987). pp. 138-152.

Chenu, M-D., *Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century* (London: University of Toronto Press, 1997).

Clanchy, Michael T., *Abelard: A Medieval Life* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997).

Clanchy, Michael T., 'Documenting the Self: Abelard and the Individual in History,' *Historical Research*, 76, 193, (2003), pp. 293-309.

Clavier, Mark, "'Oro, Deus, cognoscam te, amem te, ut gaudeam de te" Rhetorical Theology and the Influence of Anselm on Richard of St. Victor,' in *Saint Anselm of Canterbury and His Legacy*, eds. Giles E. M. Gasper and Ian Logan (Durham: Institute of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2012), pp. 133-155.

Colish, Marcia L., *Medieval Foundations of the Western Intellectual Tradition, 400-1400* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).

- Colish, Marcia L., *Peter Lombard*, Two Volumes (New York: Brill, 1993).
- Cvetkovic, Carmen Angela, *Seeking the Face of God: The Reception of Augustine in the Mystical Thought of Bernard of Clairvaux and William of St. Thierry* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012).
- Davies, Oliver, *Meister Eckhart: Mystical Theologian* (London: SPCK, 1991).
- Davis, Robert, *The Force of Union: Affect and Ascent in the Theology of Bonaventure* (Harvard University, 2012).
- Davy, M. M., 'Les trois étapes de la vie spirituelle d'après Guillaume de Saint-Thierry,' *Recherches de science religieuse* 23, (1933), pp. 569-588.
- Davy, M. M., 'L'amour de Dieu d'après Guillaume de Saint-Thierry,' *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 18, (1938), pp. 319-346.
- Davy, M. M., 'La Connaissance de Dieu d'après Guillaume de Saint-Thierry,' *Recherches de science religieuse* 28, (1938), pp. 430-456.
- Davy, M. M., *Théologie et mystique chez Guillaume de Saint-Thierry* (Paris: Vrin, 1954).
- Déchanet, Jean Marie, *Aux Sources de la Spiritualité de Guillaume de Saint-Thierry* (Bruges: Éditions Charles Beyaert, 1940).
- Déchanet, Jean Marie, *William of St. Thierry: The Man and his Work*, trans. Richard Strachan (Spencer: Cistercian Publications, 1972).
- Déchanet, Jean Marie, 'Introduction,' in *The Golden Epistle: A Letter to the Brethren at Mont Dieu* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1971), pp. ix-xxxiii.
- Déchanet, Jean Marie, 'Introduction,' in *On Contemplating God, Prayer, and Meditations* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1970), pp. 181-185.
- Déchanet, Jean Marie, 'Introduction,' in *Exposition on the Song of Songs* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1968), pp. vii-xlvi.
- Déchanet, Jean Marie, 'Un recueil singulier d'opuscules de Guillaume de Saint Thierry: Charville 114,' *Scriptorium* 6 (1952), pp. 196-202.
- Delesalle, Jacques, "'On Being 'One Single Spirit' with God in the Works of William of Saint-Thierry,' trans. Brian kerns, *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, v. 33.1, (1998), pp. 19-29.
- de Lubac, Henri, *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*, vol. 1, trans. Mark Sebanc, (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1998 [1959]).

- de Lubec, Henri, *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*, vol. 2, trans. E. M. Macierowski, (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000 [1959]).
- Dictionnaire de Spiritualité: Ascétique et Mystique Doctrine et Historie: Fascicules XXXIX-XL* Bariel-Dodet des Marais Beauchesne, (Paris: 1965).
- Diehl, Jay, 'The Grace of Learning: Visions, Education and Rupert of Deutz's view of Twelfth-Century Intellectual Culture,' *Journal of Medieval History*, 39:1, (2013), pp. 20-47.
- Diehl, Jay, 'Masters and Schools at St.-Laurent: Rupert of Deutz and the Scholastic Culture of a Liègeois Monastery,' in *Medieval Liege at the Crossroads of Europe: Monastic Society and Culture, 1000-1300*, ed. Steven Vanderputter, Tjamke Snijders, and Jay Diehl (Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming).
- Dionisottii, A. C., 'Greek Grammars and Dictionaries in Carolingian Europe,' in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Michael W. Herren and Shirley Ann Brown (London: Boydell and Brewer, 1988), pp. 1-56.
- Dreyer, Elizabeth A., *Holy Power Holy Presence: Rediscovering Medieval Metaphors for the Holy Spirit* (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2007).
- Dreyer, Elizabeth, "'Affectus" in St. Bonaventure's Theology,' *Franciscan Studies*, vol. 42, (1982), pp. 5-20.
- Dunthorne, Judith, 'Anselm and Hugh of St. Victor on Freedom and the Will,' in *Saint Anselm of Canterbury and His Legacy*, eds. Giles E. M. Gasper and Ian Logan, (Durham: Institute of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2012), pp. 114-133.
- Elder, E. Rozanne, 'Bernard and William of St. Thierry,' in *A Companion to Bernard of Clairvaux*, ed. Patrick McGuire (Danvers: Brill Publishing, 2011).
- Elder, E. Rozanne, 'The Christology of William of Saint Thierry,' *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 50, (1991), pp. 79-112.
- Elder, E. Rozanne, 'Introduction,' in *The Mirror of Faith* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Studies, 1979), pp. xi-xxxi.
- Elder, E. Rozanne, 'William of Saint Thierry and the Greek Fathers: Evidence from Christology,' in *One Yet Two: Monastic Tradition in the East and West*, ed. Basil Pennington (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), pp. 258-266.
- Elder, E. Rozanne, 'William of St. Thierry: Rational and Affective Spirituality,' in *The Spirituality of Western Christendom*, ed. E. Rozanne Elder (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Studies, 1976), pp. 85-105.

- Faesen, Rob, 'The Radical Humanism of Christian Mystics: William of Saint-Thierry, Hadewijch and Ruusbroec versus Abaelard and Ockham,' in *Seeing the Seeker: Explorations in the Discipline of Spirituality: A Festschrift for Kees Waaijman on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Hein Blommestijn (Leuven: Peeters, 2008), pp. 263-278.
- Freibergs, Gunar and Dales Richard C., eds. *Aspectus et Affectus: Essays and Editions in Grosseteste and Medieval Intellectual Life in Honor of Richard C. Dales* (New York: AMS Press Incorporated, 1993).
- Gasper, Giles E. M., 'Anselm of Canterbury,' *Christian Theologies of Salvation*, ed. Justin Holcomb (New York: New York University Press, forthcoming).
- Gasper, Giles E. M., *Anselm of Canterbury and his Theological Inheritance* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004).
- Gasper, Giles E. M. and Logan, Ian, eds. *Saint Anselm of Canterbury and His Legacy* (Durham: Institute of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2012).
- Gilson, Etienne, 'Notes on William of Saint-Thierry,' Appendix V, in *The Mystical Theology of Saint Bernard* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1940), pp. 198-214.
- Hammond, C. P., 'Notes on the Manuscripts and Editions of Origen's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans in the Latin Translation by Rufinus' in *The Journal of Theological Studies* XVI, (1965), pp. 338-357.
- Harriet, Francisco Bastitta, 'Human Communication and Difference in Gregory of Nyssa: From Trinitarian Theology to the Philosophy of Human Person and Free Decision' in *Gregory of Nyssa: The Minor Treatises on Trinitarian Theology and Apollinarism*, ed. Volker Henning Drecoll and Margitta Berghaus (Leiden: Brill, 2011).
- Haskins, Charles Homer, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (New York: Meridian Books, 1955).
- Heron, Alasdair I. C., *The Holy Spirit: The Holy Spirit in the Bible, the History of Christian Thought, and Recent Theology* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1983).
- Hollywood, Amy M. and Beckman, Patricia Z., *The Cambridge Companion to Christian Mysticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- Hourlier, Jacques. 'Introduction,' in *On Contemplating God, Prayer, and Meditations*. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Studies, 1970. Pages 3-35.
- Hunt, Anne, *The Trinity: Insights from the Mystics* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2010).

- Hunter, Ian, Laursen, John Christian and Nederman, Cary J., eds. *Heresy in Transition: Transforming Ideas of Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Hants: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2005).
- Iverson, Gunilla, 'From *Jubilus* to Learned Exegesis: New Liturgical Poetry in the Twelfth-Century Nevers' in *Sapientia et Eloquentia: Meaning and Function in Liturgical Poetry, Music, Drama and Biblical Commentary in the Middle Ages*, ed. Gunilla Iverson and Nicolas Bell (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), pp. 203-258.
- Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti, *The Holy Spirit: A Guide to Christian Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012).
- Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti, ed. *Holy Spirit and Salvation: The Sources of Christian Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010).
- Keech, Dominic, *The Anti-Pelagian Christology of Augustine of Hippo, 396-430* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Knowles, David, 'Bernard of Clairvaux: 1090-1153,' in *The Historian and Character and Other Essays Collected and Presented to Him by his Friends, Pupils, and Colleagues on the Occasion of his retirement as Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963).
- Knowles, David, 'Cistercians and Cluniacs: The Controversy Between St. Bernard and Peter the Venerable,' in *The Historian and Character and Other Essays Collected and Presented to Him by his Friends, Pupils, and Colleagues on the Occasion of his retirement as Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), pp. 50-75.
- Knowles, David, 'The Humanism of the Twelfth Century,' in *The Historian and Character and Other Essays Collected and Presented to Him by his Friends, Pupils, and Colleagues on the Occasion of his retirement as Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), pp. 16-30.
- Kretzmann, Norman, *The Metaphysics of Creation: Aquinas's Natural Theology in Summa contra gentiles II* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).
- Lambert, Malcolm, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2002).
- Lawrence, C. H., *Medieval Monasticism Forms of Religious Life in Western Europe in the Middle Ages* (New York: Longman, 1996).
- Lawson, R. P., 'Introduction,' in *Origen on the Song of Songs Commentary and Homilies* (Mahwah: The Newman Press, 1957), pp. 3-20.

- Leclercq, Jean, 'Origene au XIIIe siecle,' in *Irenikon* 24, (1951), pp. 425-439.
- Leclercq, Jean, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, trans. Catherine Mirahi, (New York: Fordham University Press, 1961, reprint 2009).
- Leclercq, Jean, 'Towards a Spiritual Portrait of William of Saint Thierry,' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry*, trans. Jerry Carfantan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), pp. 204-224.
- Leff, Gordon, 'St. Augustine's Concept of Man,' in *Essays in Honor of Edward B King*, ed. Robert G Benson and Eric W. Naylor (Sewanee: The University of South Sewanee, 1991).
- Lekai, Louis J., *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality* (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1977).
- Levy, Ian, 'Bruno the Carthusian: Theology and Reform in His Commentary on the Pauline Epistles,' *Analecta Cartusiana* 300, (2013), pp. 5-61.
- Little, Katherine C., *Confession and Resistance: Defining the Self in Late Medieval England* (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006).
- Louth, Andrew, *The Greek East and the Latin West* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2007).
- MacDonald, Alasdair A., ed. *Christian Humanism: Essays in Honour of Arjo Vanderjagt*. Zweder RWM von Martels and Jan R. Veenstra (Leiden: Brill, 2009).
- Marenbon, John, *The Philosophy of Peter Abelard* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Marmion, Declain and Nieuwenhove, Rik Van, *An Introduction to The Trinity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- Matthews, Rachel, *The Mystical Utterance and the Metaphorical Mode in the Writings of Marguerite d'Oingt and Marguerite Porete*, Durham University (2015)
- McGinn, Bernard, 'Meister Eckhart and the Beguines in the Context of Vernacular Theology,' in *Meister Eckhart and the Beguine Mystics: Hadewijch of Brabant, Mechthild of Magdeburg, and Marguerite Porete*, ed. Bernard McGinn (New York: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1994), pp. 1-14.
- McGinn, Bernard, *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism*, vol. I: The Foundations of Mysticism (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1994).
- McGinn, Bernard, *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism*,

- vol. II: The Growth of Mysticism (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1994).
- McGinn, Bernard, *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism*, vol. III: The Flowering of Mysticism (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1994).
- McGinn, Bernard, ed. *The Essential Writings of Christian Mysticism* (New York: Random House Ltd., 2006).
- McGrade, Arthur Stephen, 'The Medieval Idea of Heresy: What are We to Make of It?' in *The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy, and Religious Life: Essays in Honour of Gordon Leff*, ed. Peter Biller and Barrie Dobson (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer Ltd., 1999), pp. 111-139
- McIntosh, Mark A., *Mystical Theology: The Integrity of Spirituality and Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Limited, 1998).
- McWhorter, Matthew R., 'William of St. Thierry and the reasoning of Faith' *Irish Theological Quarterly* 76, 1, (2011), pp. 79-92.
- Merton, Thomas, *Charter, Customs, and Constitutions of the Cistercians*, ed. Patrick F. O'Connell (Kalamazoo, Cistercian Publications, 2015).
- Mews, Constant J., 'The Council of Sens (1141): Abelard, Bernard, and the Fear of Social Upheaval' *Speculum*, vol. 77, 2, (2002), pp. 342-382.
- Mews, Constant J., 'Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter Abelard and Heloise on the Definition of Love,' *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia*, vol. 60, 3, (2014), pp. 633-660.
- Mills, Ludo, 'William of St. Thierry, His Birth, His Formation and His First Monastic Experiences,' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry*, trans. Jerry Carfantan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), pp. 9-33.
- Molinier, Auguste, *Obituaires français au moyen âge* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1890).
- Moore, R. I., *The War on Heresy: Faith and Power in Medieval Europe* (London: Profile Books, 1996).
- Morgan, Ben, *On Becoming God: Late Medieval Mysticism and the Modern Western Self* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013).
- Morris, Colin, *The Discovery of the Individual 1050-1200* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972).
- Muraro, Luisa, 'Marguerite Porete, lectrice de l'*Epistula Aurea*,' in *Signy l'Abbaye, site Cistercien enfoui, site de Mémoire, et Guillaume de Saint-Thierry*, ed. Nicole Boucher (Signy l'Abbaye: Association des Amis de l'abbaye de Signy, 1998), pp. 555-563.

- Murk-Jansen, Saskia, 'Hadewijch and Eckhart: Amor Intellegere Est,' in *Meister Eckhart and the Beguine Mystics: Hadewijch of Brabant, Mechthild of Magdeburg, and Marguerite Porete*, ed. Bernard McGinn (New York: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1994), pp. 17-30.
- Murray, Albert Victor, *Abelard and St. Bernard: A Study in Twelfth Century 'Modernism'* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967).
- Neal, Derek G., *The Masculine Self in Late Medieval England* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2008).
- Newman, Barbara, 'Charles Williams and the Companions of the Coinherence,' *Spiritus*, 9, 1 (2009), pp. 1-26
- Newman, Barbara, *God and the Goddesses: Vision, Poetry, and Belief in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2003).
- Newman, Barbara *Saint Hildegard of Bingen: Symphonia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988).
- Newman, Barbara, *Sister of Wisdom: St. Hildegard's Theology of the Feminine* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).
- Newman, Barbara, *From Virile Woman to WomanChrist: Studies in Medieval Religion and Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995).
- Newman, Martha G., *The Boundaries of Charity: Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098-1180* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996).
- Otten, Willemein, 'Religion as *Exercitatio Mentis*: A Case for Theology as a Humanist Discipline,' in *Christian Humanism: Essays in Honour of Arjo Vanderjagt*, eds. Alasdair A. MacDonald, Zweder von Martels, and Jan R. Veenstra (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 58-73.
- Papaioannau, Stratis, 'Byzantine Mirrors: Self-Reflection in Medieval Greek Writing,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 64, (2010), pp. 81-101.
- Pak, Pyong-Gwan, *The Vernacular, Mystical Theology of Jan Van Ruusbroec: Exploring Sources Contexts and Theological Practices*, Boston College, (2008).
- Peters, Edward, *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe: Documents Translation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980).
- Peters, Ted, *GOD as Trinity: Relationality and Temporality in Divine Life* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993).

- Petersen, Nihls Holget, 'Biblical reception, representational ritual, and the question of "liturgical drama"' in *Sapientia et Eloquentia: Meaning and Function in Liturgical Poetry, Music, Drama and Biblical Commentary in the Middle Ages*, eds. Gunilla Iverson and Nicolas Bell (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), pp. 163-202.
- Petry, Ray C., ed. *Late Medieval Mysticism* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957).
- Poirel, Dominique, 'Scholastic Reasons, Monastic Meditations and Victorine Conciliations: The Question of the Unity and Plurality of God in the Twelfth Century' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, eds. Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 168-181.
- Pourrat, Pierre, *La Spiritualité Chrétienne*, vol. II: *Le Moyen Age* (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1924).
- Prestige, George Leonard, *God in Patristic Thought*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1952).
- Pranger, Burcht, 'Sic et non: Patristic Authority between Refusal and Acceptance: Anselm of Canterbury, Peter Abaelrd and Bernard of Clairvaux,' in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, Volume 1, ed. Irena Backus (New York: Brill, 1997).
- Reilly, Diane J., 'Education, Liturgy and Practice in Early Cîteaux,' in *Understanding Monastic Practices of Oral Communication*, ed. Steven Vanderputten (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), pp. 85-114.
- Renardy, C., 'Les écoles liégeoises du IXe au XII siècle: grands lignes de leur évolution' *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, lvii, (1979), pp. 309-328.
- Robertson, Duncan, 'The Experience of Reading Bernard of Clairvaux "Sermons on the Song of Songs,' *Religion and Literature* 19, 1, (1987), pp. 1-20.
- Rogers, Eugene F. Jr., ed. *The Holy Spirit: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2009).
- Rosemann, Philipp W., *Peter Lombard* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- Rubenstein, Jay, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York: Routledge, 2002).
- Runciman, Steven, *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XIth and XIIth Centuries* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2005).
- Ryan, Patrick, 'The Witness of William of St. Thierry to the Spirit and Aims of the Early Cistercians' in *The Cistercian Spirit: A Symposium in Memory of Thomas Merton*, ed. M. Basil Pennington (Washington: Cistercian Publications Consortium Press, 1973), pp. 261-264.

- Saward, John, 'The Fool for Christ's Sake' in *One Yet Two: Monastic Tradition East and West*, ed. Basil Pennington (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), pp. 46-80.
- Scott, Bruno, 'Introduction,' in *The Letters of St. Bernard* (London: Burns Oats, 1953).
- Scheck, Thomas P., *Origen and the History of Justification: The Legacy of Origen's Commentary on Roman* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008).
- Schweizer, Eduard, *The Holy Spirit*, trans. Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980).
- Smith, Lesley, *The Glossa Ordinaria: The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary* (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2009).
- Squire, Aelred, 'The Cistercians and the Eastern Fathers,' in *One Yet Two: Monastic Tradition in the East and West*, ed. Basil Pennington (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976).
- Stiegman, Emero, 'Bernard of Clairvaux, William of St. Thierry, The Victorines,' in *The Medieval Theologians*, ed. G. R. Evans (Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), pp. 129-155.
- Strayer, Joseph R. and Jordan, William C., *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* (New York: Scribner, 1989).
- Sommerfeldt, John, 'Bernard of Clairvaux,' in *The Spirituality of Western Christendom*, ed. Rozanne Elder (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976).
- Southern, Richard W., 'Medieval Humanism,' in *Medieval Humanism and other Studies* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970).
- Southern, Richard W., *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe*, vol. I: Foundations (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1995).
- Sweeney, Eileen, 'Abelard's *Historia Calamitatum* and Letters: Self as Search and Struggle,' *Poetics Today* 28, (2008), pp. 303-336.
- Taylor, Claire, *Heresy in Medieval France: Dualism in Aquitaine and the Agenais, 1000-1249* (London: The Royal Historical Society, 2005).
- Taylor, Henry Osborn, *The Medieval Mind: A History of the Development of Thought and Emotion*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949)
- Tissier, Bernard, *In opera beati Guillelmi praefatio*, *Patrologia Latina*, 180, 202-210 republished from the original *Bibliotheca cisterciensium*, 4.

- Thomas, Robert, 'William of Saint-Thierry: Our Life in the Trinity.' *Monastic Studies* vol. 3, (1965), pp. 139-164.
- Tobin, Frank, *Meister Eckhart: Thought and Language* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986).
- Tomasic, Thomas Michael, 'Neoplatonism and the Mysticism of William of St. Thierry,' in *An Introduction to the Medieval Mystics of Europe*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Albany: State University of New York, 1984), pp. 53-75
- Tracy, David, 'Trinitarian Theology and Spirituality: Retrieving William of St. Thierry for Contemporary Theology Towards a Trinitarian Theology Centered on Love' in *Rethinking Trinitarian Theology: Disputed Questions and Contemporary Issues in Trinitarian Theology*, eds. Robert J. Woźniak and Giulio Maspero (London: T and T Clark, 2012), pp. 390-412
- Vacandard, E., 'L'histoire de saint Bernard, critique des sources,' in *Revue des questions historiques* XLII, (1888), pp. 337-389.
- Van Mierlo, Jozef, 'Hadewijch en Willem van St.-Thierry,' *Ons Geetelijk Erf* 3, (1929), pp. 45-59.
- Vaughn, Sally, 'Anselm of Bec: the Pattern of his Teaching,' in *Teaching and Learning in Northern Europe*, eds. Sally N. Vaughn and Jay Rubenstein (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), pp. 99-127.
- Verdeyen, Paul, 'William of Saint Thierry's Influence on the Flemish Mystics,' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry*, trans. Jerry Carfantan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), pp. 240-253.
- Verdeyen, Paul, 'De Invloed van Willem van Saint-Thierry op Hadewijch en Ruusbroec,' *Ons Geetelijk Erf* 51, (1977), pp. 3-19.
- Wagner, M. M., *Rufinus the Translator: A Study of his Theory and his Practice as Illustrated in his Version of the Apologetica of St. Gregory Nazianzen* (Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1945).
- Walsh, Gerald Groveland, *Medieval Humanism* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1942).
- Ward, Benedicta, 'Desert Myth: Reflections on the Desert Ideal in Early Cistercian Monasticism,' in *One Yet Two: Monastic Tradition East and West*, ed. Basil Pennington (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976).
- Webb, G., 'William of Saint-Thierry: The Five Senses of Love,' *New Blackfriars* 46, (1965), pp. 464-468.
- Williams, Watkin, 'Introduction,' in *Concerning Grace and Free Will* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1920).

Wilmart, André, 'Les écrits spirituels des deux Guigues,' *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*, 5 (1924) pp. 59-79.

Wilmart, André, *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du Moyen âge latin*, Etudes d'histoire littéraire (Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1932).

Zerbi, Piero, 'William of Saint Thierry and His Dispute with Abelard,' in *William, Abbot of St. Thierry: A Colloquium at the Abbey of St. Thierry*, trans. Jerry Carfantan (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), pp. 181-203.