

THE ROLE OF THE EUCHARIST IN THE MAKING OF AN ECCLESIOLOGY ACCORDING TO HAIMO OF AUXERRE'S COMMENTARY ON I Cor

ALFONSO HERNÁNDEZ
UNIVERSIDAD DE LA DEFENSA NACIONAL-
CONSEJO NACIONAL DE INVESTIGACIONES CIENTÍFICAS Y TÉCNICAS
ARGENTINA

Date of receipt: 17th of February, 2013

Final date of acceptance: 11th of February, 2015

ABSTRACT

Carolingian biblical exegesis presents itself as a synthesis of exegetical and theological patristic tradition in order to make it affordable to the Christians of that time. The result of that process are interpretations of biblical texts that can be considered new, though based on the texts of the Fathers. Among them it is possible to find images of the Church containing ideas about power or how to govern and to order society. This paper studies Haimo of Auxerre's commentary on I Cor 12, 12 et seq in order to establish the author's concept of 'body of Christ', in the context of the Eucharistic controversy of the ninth century. It also studies the ideological consequences of his exegesis.¹

KEYWORDS

Haimo of Auxerre, Carolingian Exegesis, Eucharist, Carolingian Ecclesiology, Carolingian Ideology.

CAPITALIA VERBA

Haimo Autissiodorensis, Exegesis Carolina, Eucharistia, Ecclesiologia Carolina, Ideologia Carolina.

1. Introduction

Several years ago Yves Congar stated that the study of early medieval ecclesiology presents a basic problem: there are no treatises *De ecclesia* in the Early Middle Ages². It means that there is no systematic theoretical reflection on the Church in that period, instead of this it is possible to find 'images of the Church'. The aim of this paper is to analyze the way Haimo of Auxerre defined one of them: the image of the Church as the Body of Christ. This concept has a direct scriptural origin, Paul uses it in I Cor 12, 12 et seq. and this occurrence ensured its success in the reflections on the nature of the Christian Church during the Middle Ages.

In this paper I will present a brief analysis of the relationship between Eucharist and ecclesiology based on the interpretation of Haimo's of Auxerre *Commentary on I Cor*. This commentary is a part of a broader exegetical work, the *Commentary on the Pauline Epistles* from the same author. The *Commentary On The Pauline Epistles* was read and copied throughout the Middle Ages (at least 180 manuscripts are preserved³, the oldest comes from the ninth century and the later one is a beautiful Renaissance ms. dated in 1569⁴). The *Commentary On The Pauline Epistles* was also the subject of several early printed editions during the XVIIth. century. The most accessible edition is that of *Patrologia Latina*, which reproduces the *editio princeps* Strasbourg 1519⁵. As usually happened to many Haimo's of Auxerre texts it was wrongly attributed to other author, to Haimo bishop of Halberstadt in the case of the *Commentary On The Pauline Epistles*⁶. This mistake took place during the Middle Ages and was corrected in 1917 by Riggenbach⁷.

We really do not know the reasons that motivated Haimo of Auxerre to write his *Commentary On The Pauline Epistles*. Neither have we too much biographical data about the author. Haimo was active in the monastery of Saint-Germain of Auxerre during the two decades of 840-860⁸. The news about his life are extremely scarce.

1. Used Abbreviations: BA, Biblioteca Ambrosiana; BL, British Library; BML Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana; BMO, Bibliothèque Municipale d'Orléans; BNF, Bibliothèque Nationale de France; WHABW, Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August Bibliothek.

2. Congar, Yves. *L'ecclésiologie du haut moyen age*. Paris: Cerf, 1968.

3. WHAB. Weissenburg, 46, f. 1-2; BL. Harley, 3102; BA. A, 138 sup., f. 4-133v; BMO. Ms. 81 (78), f. 211-317; 88 (85); BNF. Ms. lat. 2412; BNF. Ms. lat. 12303; BNF. Ms. lat. 13409.

4. BML, ms. XXIV.1, f. 1-257.

5. Hermanni, Sixtus. "In epistolam ad romanos". *Patrologiae. Cursus completus*. Paris: J.P. Migne: editorem, 1852: CXVII, cols. 364-938.

6. On the attribution of Haimo's texts, see Iogna-Prat, Dominique. "L'oeuvre d'Haymon d'Auxerre", *L'École Carolingienne d'Auxerre de Muretach à Remi 830-908*, Dominique Iogna-Prat, Colette Jeudy, Guy Lobrichon, eds. Paris: Beauchesne, 1991: 157-179.

7. Riggenbach, Eduward. *Historische Studien zum Hebräerbrief. I: die Ältesten lateinischen Kommentare zum Hebräerbrief. Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons 8*. Leipzig: Deichert, 1907.

8. On life and work of Haimo, Holtz, Louis. "L'école d'Auxerre", *L'École Carolingienne d'Auxerre...: 131-146*; Iogna-Prat, Dominique. "L'oeuvre d'Haymon d'Auxerre", *L'École Carolingienne d'Auxerre...: 157-179*. The most important work on Haimo was still in press when this work was done, it is Shimahara, Sumi. *Haymon d'Auxerre, exégète carolingien*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.



His date of birth is unknown, but John Contreni⁹ supposed it should have been in the early ninth century and —based on the studies of Johannes Heil—, it may have taken place in the Iberian Peninsula, although it is impossible to confirm this hypothesis¹⁰. Contreni also states that Haimo could have been a student of Teodulph of Orleans, in fact Heil found affinities between the two scholars¹¹. Henri Barré dated Haimo's death around 865-866¹², however J.J. Contreni supposed that he was the abbot of Sasceium (Cessy-les-Bois), near Saint-Germain d'Auxerre, between 865 and 875¹³.

Haimo's *Commentary on I Cor* has received little attention in modern scholarship. Jacques Le Goff used it in his *History of Purgatory* but retained the wrong attribution to Haimo of Halberstadt¹⁴. Edmond Ortigues studied it as a complementary source in his work on tri-functional order (work truly focused on Haimo's commentaries on the *Epistle to the Romans* and *on the Book of Revelations*)¹⁵. Pierre Boucaud point out the influence of Claudius of Turin in different aspects of Haimo's ideas¹⁶.

2. The theological context: ninth century Eucharistic controversy

The belief in transubstantiation is one of the dogmatic issues that makes a difference between the Catholic and many Reformed Churches from Trento to the present¹⁷. However this concept began to be used only since 1140¹⁸ and although it was recognized as a dogma in the fourth Lateran Council of 1215 and the Aristotelian —based doctrine of the transubstantiation was developed on the late thirteenth century, it coexisted with other interpretations, at least until the fifteenth

9. Contreni, John. "By Lions, Bishops are meant; by Wolves, Priests. "History, Exegesis, and the carolingian Church in Haimo of Auxerre's Commentary on Ezechiel". *Francia*, 29 (2002): 55-56.

10. Heil, Johannes. "Haimo's commentary on Paul. Sources, Methods and Theology", *Études d'exégèse carolingienne: autour d'Haymon d'Auxerre. Atelier de recherches Centre d'Études médiévales d'Auxerre 25-26 avril 2005*, Sumi Shimahara, ed. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007: 114-118.

11. Heil, Johannes. *Kompilation oder Konstruktion? Die Juden in den Pauluskommentaren des 9. Jahrhunderts, (Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden. Abt. A: Abhandlungen, 6)*. Hannover: Hansche, 1998: 275-334.

12. Barré, Henri. "Haymon", *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1969: VII, col. 92.

13. Contreni, John. *Haimo of Auxerre, Abbot of Sasceium. (Cessy-les-Bois) and a new Sermon of John v, 4-10. Revue Bénédictine*, 85 (1975): 317.

14. Le Goff, Jacques. *La naissance du Purgatoire*. Paris: Gallimard, 1981: 143-144.

15. Ortigues, Edmond. "Haymon d'Auxerre, théoricien des trois ordres", *L'École Carolingienne d'Auxerre...: 181-227* (reimpreso en Ortigues, Edmond. *La révélation et le droit*. Paris: Beauchesne, 2007: 77-130.

16. Boucaud, Pierre. "Claude de Turin (†ca. 828) et Haymon d'Auxerre (fl. 850): deux commentateurs de l'I Corinthiens", *Études d'exégèse carolingienne...: 187-236*.

17. According to Thierry Wanegffelen the definition of the nature of Eucharist was essential for Catholics and Protestants to build up their doctrines, Wanegffelen, Thierry. "La controverse entre Robert Céneau et Martin Bucer sur l'Eucharistie (septembre 1534-janvier 1535)". *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France*, 77 (1991): 341-349; see also: Burnett, Amy Nelson. "The social history of communion and the reformation of the eucharist". *Past and Present*, 211 (2011): 77-119.

18. Goering, Joseph. "The Invention of Transubstantiation". *Traditio*, 46 (1991): 147-170.



century¹⁹. The discussion about 'Eucharistic realism', ie the real presence —or not— of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine has antecedents in the Carolingian period. Moreover, during the Carolingian and post-Carolingian periods the Eucharist finished an evolution that began at least in the sixth century from its original nature of *mysterium*, in the ancient sense of the word, involving all the community and it finally became a salvific work and part of the monastic ascetical exercises useful as an instrument for salvation²⁰.

The most complete analysis of the Eucharistic controversy in the Carolingian period was written by Celia Chazelle. We follow her ideas in the next paragraphs²¹. It is possible to date the beginning of the ninth century's controversy about Eucharistic in 831-833, when Paschasius Radbertus wrote his treatise *De corpore et sanguine Domini*²². He later revised it (843-844) to present it to King Charles the Bald. However, the development of the dispute actually took place in later years from the middle of IXth century on. The corpus of texts in dispute includes the aforementioned Paschasius Radbertus' text, Ratramnus' *De corpore et sanguine Domini* (written between 830 and 840 and also dedicated to Charles the Bald)²³, Godescalcus of Orbais' two treatises²⁴, a *Florilegium* of Adrevaldo of Fleury drafted sometime after 840 and directed against a text (now lost) of Scotus Eriugena²⁵, a fragment of the *Expositiones in ierarchiam coelestem* of the hand of the same Eriugena (towards 862)²⁶, a letter from Rabanus of 853-856 which mentions a treatise on the issue drafted by

19. Macy, Gary. "The dogma of transubstantiation in the middle ages". *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 45 (1994): 11-31.

20. Vogel, Cyrille. "Une mutation culturelle inexplicée: le passage de l'Eucharistie communautaire à la messe privée". *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 54 (1980): 231-250.

21. Chazelle, Celia. "Exegesis in the Ninth-Century Eucharistic Controversy", *The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era*, Celia Chazelle, Burton van Namme Edwards, eds. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003: 167-187; Chazelle, Celia. "The Eucharist in Early Medieval Europe", *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages*, Ian Christopher Levy, Gary Macy, Kristen Van Ausdall, eds. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012: 205-250. See also, about the same question: Chazelle, Celia. *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and Art of Christ's Passion*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press, 2001; Otten, Willemien. "Between augustinian sign and carolingian reality: the presence of Ambrose and Augustine in the Eucharistic debate between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie". *Dutch Review of Church History*, 80 (2000): 137-156; For more general references to the discussion of the Eucharist in our period, see: Libera, Alain de. *La filosofia medievale*. Valencia: Universitat de València, 2006: 282; Onofrio, Giulio d'. *Storia della teologia nel Medioevo, II, Età Medievale*. Casale Monferrato: Piemme 2003, 83-94; Boureau, Alain. "Visions of God", *Early Medieval Christianities, c. 600-1100*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press, 2008: 503-504. *Cambridge History of the Christianity*. Thomas F.X. Noble, Julia M. H. Smith, eds. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press, 2014: III.

22. Pascasio Radbertus. *De corpore et sanguine Domini cum appendice epistola ad Fredugardum*, Paulus Beda, ed. Turnhout: Brepols, 1969: 1-131.

23. Ratramno. *De corpore et sanguine Domini: Texte original et notice bibliographique*, Jaan Nicholas Bakhuizen. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1974: 9-14.

24. *Oeuvres théologiques et grammaticales de Godescalco d'Orbais*, ed. Cyrille Lambot. Lovaina: "Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense". Bureaux, 1945: 324-335, 335-337.

25. Adrevaldi, "De corpore et sanguine Christi contra ineptias Joannis Scoti", *Patrologiae. Cursus completus*. Paris: J. P. Migne editorem, 1879: CXXIV, cols. 947-954.

26. Escoto, Juan. *Expositiones in ierarchiam coelestem*, ed. Jeanne Barbet. Turnhout: Brepols, 1975: 17, lines 584-594.



himself²⁷, other two lost texts of Radbertus (a commentary to Matthew's account of the Last Supper²⁸ and a letter to the monk Fredugardus²⁹) and finally fragments of a poem/treaty of Hincmarus of Reims called *The ferculum Salomonis*³⁰ written for Charles the Bald. Haimo was not involved in this controversy and a *De corpore et sanguine Domini* attributed to him in the *Patrologia Latina* (PL) is not actually his³¹.

A central idea of Celia Chazelle is that what was discussed in ninth-century Eucharistic controversy was not the reality of the Saviour's presence in the sacrament but 'what' body and blood of Christ it was. Another characteristic of this theological discussion was his exegetical nature, produced by the centrality of biblical exegesis in the Carolingian culture. A third element to consider is that this was a whole new discussion. While the two opposing positions used patristic sources, it is not possible to distinguish an 'Ambrosian' position against an 'Augustinian' one. Indeed, the problem is that there were no clear patristic developments on the subject and this was, according to Willemien Otten, the root cause of the dispute in Carolingian times and even later, during the Reformation³². Let us see briefly the Eucharist position of four of the Carolingian authors cited: Pascasius Radbertus, Godescalcus, Hincmarus and Ratramnus.

According to Pascasius Radbertus there is an identification of the Eucharistic body and blood of Christ with the historical ones, but this identification is 'figured' under the sensitive characteristics of bread and wine. Godescalcus, meanwhile, wrote against Pascasius' *De corpora* (a text he read but whose authorship he did not know)³³. Godescalcus based his statements on evangelical citations (Rom VI, 9 and I Peter III, 18), to assert that Christ's sacrifice on the cross was unique and therefore it could not be directly related to the one conducted daily at mass. Hincmarus, a declared enemy of Godescalcus, sided with the position of Pascasius Radbertus. Hincmarus shares with Radbertus the belief in the identity of the Eucharist with the body and blood of the historical Christ. The fourth participant in the Eucharistic controversy, from whom we have an important text is Ratramnus. In his *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, he states that the Saviour's presence in the Eucharist is real but only in a spiritual sense, so it is imperceptible to the senses. The communion wafer is a 'sign' of the true Christ. As we can see, Ratramnus accords in his position with Godescalcus, in the same way as Hincmarus does with Pascasius Radbertus.

27. Rabani Mauri, "Epistola 56", *Monumenta Germaniae historica. Epistolae Karolini aevi III. Epistolae V*, ed. Ernst Dümmler. Berlin: Weidmann, 1899: 509-514.

28. Radberto, Pascasius; Beda, Paulus, *Expositio in Matheo libri XII*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1984: 1288-1298.

29. Radberto, Pascasio; Beda, Paulus, *Epistola ad Fredugardum*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1984: 145-173.

30. Hincmaro, "Carmen 4", *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Poetae latini aevi Carolini III*, ed. Ludwig Traube. Berlin: Weidmann, 1896: 414-415.

31. Jullien, Marie Hélène. "Le *De corpore et sanguine Domini* attribué à Haymon", *Études d'Exégèse carolingienne...*: 23-57.

32. Otten, Willemien. "Between augustinian sign and carolingian reality...": 146.

33. Chazelle, Celia. "Exegesis in the Ninth-Century...": 167.



3. The relationship between Eucharist and Church body in Haimo's thought

In *I Cor* Paul deals with the Eucharist in verses I Cor 11: 17-34 and the Church as the Body of Christ in I Cor 12: 12-26. Haimo's exposition is systematic and explains the text carefully, stopping sometimes in whole verses, sometimes in specific words. The order of his exegesis follows the text of St. Paul, but sometimes he inserts fragments of other scriptural texts and performs the exegesis of them, though always in relation to the original Pauline text. The techniques used by Haimo are those of the monastic exegesis as described by Gilbert Dahan³⁴. This paper is restricted to Haimo's exegesis of some of the verses already mentioned.

The first thing I want to emphasize is that in this particular comment, Haimo seemed to favor the Eucharistic realism in Paschasius Radbertus' sense. He wrote in his commentary on I Cor 11, 24:

*ACCIPITE ET MANDUCATE: hoc est CORPUS MEUM QUOD PRO VOBIS TRADETUR. Sicut caro Christi quam assumpsit in utero virginali, verum corpus ejus est, et pro nostra salute occisum, ita panis quem Christus tradidit discipulis suis omnibusque praedestinatis ad vitam aeterna et quem quotidie consecrant sacerdotes in Ecclesia cum virtute divinitatis, quae illum replet panem verum corpus Christi est, nec sunt duo corpora illa caro quam assumpsit, et iste panis, sed unum verum corpus faciunt Christi: intantum ut dum ille frangitur et comeditur, Christus immoletur et comedatur, et tamen integer maneat et vivus.*³⁵

In his commentary on I Cor 11, 27 Haimo also condemns those who consider that the consecrated bread in the Eucharist is merely a food just like any other:

*Indigne dicit, id est ordine non observato, videlicet qui aliter mysterium illud celebrat vel sumit, quam traditum est a sanctis Patribus, vel qui nullam differentiam credit inter illud corpus Christi, et reliquos cibos.*³⁶

34. Dahan, Gilbert. *L'exégèse chrétienne de la Bible en Occident médiéval XIIe-XIVe siècle*. Paris: Cerf, 1999: 76-91.

35. Halberstatensis, Haymonis, " In I Cor", *Patrologiae. Cursus completus*. Paris: J. P. Migne editorem, 1852: CXVII, col. 572c: TAKE AND EAT, this is MY BODY DELIVERED FOR YOU. Just as the flesh of Christ, which he took in the virginal womb, is his true body and he was killed for our salvation, so the bread that Christ gave to his disciples and to all those predestined to eternal life and is daily consecrate by the priests in the Church with the strength of the Divinity. He who occupies that bread is the true body of Christ, so that when it is divided and eaten, Christ is slain and eaten, but remains intact and alive.

36. Halberstatensis, Haymonis, " In I Cor", *Patrologiae...* cols. 573d-574a: UNWORTHILY says (the Apostle), ie without observing the order, actually whoever celebrates or receives this mystery differently as it was transmitted by the Fathers, or who believes that there is no difference between the body of Christ and the remaining food...



This fragment suggests that Haimo was aware of the theological discussions about the Eucharist. Apparently he knew that there were people who considered that the Eucharistic bread was just bread. It may be a reference to the position of Ratramnus and Godescalcus. But it may also be an allusion to similar views present in his monastic community or in Haimo's ecclesiastical environment. In any case, the issue was important enough for the author to make him insist on its condemnation, as he does in his commentary on I Corinthians 11, 29:

*QUI ENIM MANDUCAT ET BIBIT INDIGNE, sicut supra diximus, JUDICIUM SIBI MANDUCAT ET BIBIT, id est ad damnationem suam illud sumit, NON DIJUDICANS CORPUS DOMINI, id est non discernens a reliquis cibus.*³⁷

The image of the Church as a body appears already in the Pauline text. Haimo insists on the unity of the body and follows the patristic idea that Christ is the head of that body in his exegesis on I Cor 12, 12:

*SICUT ENIM CORPUS UNUM EST, ET HABET MULTA MEMBRA, etc. Usque ITA ET CHRISTUS: subaudis, cum Ecclesia unum corpus est. His verbis docet non debere inflari quaelibet adversus alterum, quia etsi non magnum, tamen parvum est Ecclesiae membrum. Et sicut omnia membra, sive sint magna, sive parva, sive honesta, sive inhonesta, corpus humanum formant, ita homines diversi meriti unam Ecclesiam aedificant, et unum corpus Christi faciunt. Cum Christo enim qui est caput Ecclesiae, ipsa Ecclesia intelligitur, quae est corpus ejus.*³⁸

These statements are very traditional. In fact, the idea that the Church is the body of Christ appears in Tertullian³⁹. However, during the Carolingian period, there were reflections on the metonymy of the place of worship (the church building), the Church as the body of believers, and the Church as institution. The Carolingian period presented a series of transformations in the organization of the Church in relation to the place of worship, which would be essential in the future: Carolingian Church took God who was everywhere, without being in any special place and confined him into the church building, whose center was the altar. On that altar

37. Halberstatensis, Haymonis, "In I Cor", *Patrologiae...* col. 574d: actually one who eats and drinks unworthily, as we said above, eats and drinks his own judgment, ie he consumes it for his own damnation, when he does not perceive the body of the lord, ie he does not distinguish it from the remaining foods.

38. Halberstatensis, Haymonis, "In I Cor", *Patrologiae...* col. 578d: Actually as well as the body is only one and has many members, etc. Christ also is one body with the church. With these words he (Paul) teaches that no one should be prideful regarding the others, because even the small one is a member of the church. And as every member, whether great or small, honorable or shameful, forms the human body, also men of various merits constitute one church and conform the only body of Christ. So with Christ, who is the head of the church, the same church is his body.

39. Tertullianus, "Adversus Marcionem. Liber V", *Patrologiae. Cursus completus*. Paris: J. P. Migne editorem, 1844, II, line 18: *Sic ubi autem et ecclesiam corpus christi dicit esse —ut hic ait adimplere se reliqua pressurarum christi in carne pro corpore eius, quod est ecclesia—, non propterea et in totum mentionem corporis transferens a substantia carnis;* Tertullianus, *De monogamia. Patrologiae. Cursus completus*. Paris: J. P. Migne editorem, 1844. II, chap. 13, line 23: *Igitur si mortificari nos iubet legi per corpus christi, quod est ecclesia...*



took place the Eucharist sacrifice and, as we have seen, Eucharist produced one of the great theological controversies of the ninth century. In that altar many other social practices also happened (oaths, slaves freeing, donation or exchange of goods)⁴⁰. The ambiguity Church / church makes us wonder about the meaning of the concept 'body of Christ' not only in relation to that of 'Church' but also that of 'church', not just in Haimo, but also in other thinkers and Carolingian exegetes. But this issue is beyond the scope of this paper.

In the Commentary on I Cor it is possible to notice a number of interesting fragments containing Haimo's ideas of the Church. In first place, the commentary on I Cor 12: 4:

*ET DIVISIONES MINISTRATIONUM SUNT. Verbi gratia: ut in episcopis, presbyteris, diaconibus, caeterisque ordinibus, qui Spiritu sancto distribuyente Ecclesiae ministri constituuntur, non per propriam hominis deliberationem, sed per Spiritus sancti efficientiam; IDEM AUTEM DOMINUS, subaudis manet indivisus in omnibus.*⁴¹

Haimo points at two main issues. First, he underlines the structure of the ecclesiastical hierarchy according to their degrees but he expressly names the senior ministries: bishops, priests and deacons. Secondly, he notes that this kind of Church organization is the result of intervention of the Holy Spirit, not of human invention.

In his commentary on I Corinthians 12, 12 Haimo proposed that each component of the ecclesiastical body had a function, as we have already noted. Therefore, within the Church every Christian had a place and usefulness, regardless of his membership to the church hierarchy. As the author states later, the unifying condition of the Church is baptism:

*ETENIM IN UNO SPIRITU, subaudis, sancto, de quo scriptum est: 'Ipse vos baptizabit in Spiritu sancto et igne'; et: 'Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu sancto'. OMNES NOS IN UNUM CORPUS BAPTIZATI SUMUS, id est, ad hoc baptizati sumus ut essemus unum corpus cum capite nostro Christo, et omnes in uno Spiritu potati sumus.*⁴²

Haimo states in a very material way the strong union of the faithful. He says on I Cor 12, 14:

40. Iogna-Prat, Dominique. *La maison Dieu. Une histoire monumentale de l'Église au Moyen Âge*. Paris: Seuil, 2006: 107-314.

41. Halberstatensis, Haymonis, "In I Cor", *Patrologiae...* col. 577a: And there is a division of ministries, *verbi gratia*, bishops, priests, deacons and the remaining orders, which were instituted by the Holy Spirit. He provided them as ministers for the church, not because of men's decision, but because of the action of the Holy Spirit; but there is only one lord, it means that he remains undivided.

42. Halberstatensis, Haymonis, "In I Cor", *Patrologiae...* col. 578d-579a: *Also actually in one spirit, ie holy spirit, about whom it is written, 'he will baptize you in the holy spirit and in the fire' (Lk 3, 16); and 'except a man be born of water and of the spirit etc' (Jn 3, 5). All of us in one body were baptized, ie were baptized with the goal of being one body with Christ as our head and to be saturated with one spirit.*



*NAM ET CORPUS NON UNUM EST MEMBRUM, SED MULTA, quia unum membrum non facit corpus, sed multa simul nervis conglutinata: sic omnes credentes, sive sint sublimes vitae merito, sive parvi, unum corpus efficiunt, conglutinante eos virtute Spiritus sancti.*⁴³

It is interesting to note the use of the participle of *conglutino*. Firstly, Haimo uses it in its passive form when he shows that *multa (membra) simul nervis conglutinata (sunt)*. Secondly, it is used in its active form, pointing out that the binding agent is the strength of the Holy Spirit.

At this point of the paper, we must make a brief parenthesis. In other papers about Haimo of Auxerre, I argued that his vision of the matter, the flesh, the world and the body is extremely negative⁴⁴. This negative image is based on the monastic condition of our author and is directly related to the monastic *contemptus mundi*. This position is not a surprise coming from a Christian writer in general and a monastic one. However there is a problem: how could it be possible to reconciled an image of the Church as a body with the contempt of the flesh? The solution to this problem is the grace or the strength (*virtute*) of the Holy Spirit. The action of the Spirit is the theological instrument to overcome this contradiction and its ecclesiological implications. It is the third person of the Trinity who dignifies the *corpus ecclesiasticus* and rises above the matter so that it can become acceptable to his head Christ.

In the commentary on I Cor 12, 15 Haimo introduces for the first time in his text the idea that the laity is a constituent part of Church's body:

*Caput corporis sui, id est Ecclesiae, Christus est. Oculi hujus corporis, apostoli sunt intelligendi, de quibus dicitur: 'Pulchriores sunt oculi ejus vino', sed et praedicatores qui sibi aliisque spiritualia provident; aures sunt fideles auditores; nares, qui vim discretionis habent inter odores virtutum fetoresque vitiorum; os, qui divina eloquia aliis eructant, id est doctores; manus, qui operantur unde alii vivant; pedes, qui in negotiis saecularibus ad utilitatem caeterorum discurrunt.*⁴⁵

The reference to the laics thus appears in two ways. First, the *fideles* concept that includes them. According to Haimo the eyes of the Church body are the apostles but

43. Halberstatensis, Haymonis, "In I Cor", *Patrologiae...* col. 579a: Since the body is not one member but many, because one member does not make a body, but many bonded together simultaneously with nerves do it, so those who are sublimed through the merits of their lives, but also the small ones conform one only body, by the power of the Holy Spirit that brings them together.

44. Hernández, Alfonso. "Haimón de Auxerre y el profeta Oseas. Exégesis monástica y profecía en el período carolingio". *Temas Medievales*, 19 (2011): 109-111.

45. Halberstatensis, Haymonis, "In I Cor", *Patrologiae...* col. 579a-b: The head of his body, the Church, is Christ. We should understand that the eyes of this body are the apostles, about whom it is said: 'most beautiful are their eyes than the wine' (Gn 49, 12), but also the preachers who provide spiritual things to themselves and to others; the ears are the faithful auditors; the noses are those who have the ability to distinguish between the odors of the virtues and the stench of the vices; the mouth is that one who utter the divine speeches to others, ie doctors; the hands are those who produce what we all need to live; the feet are those running in secular business for the good of others.



also preachers. The function of preaching is traditionally occupied by the bishops but it can also refer to other levels of the Church hierarchy and even in the early days of the Carolingian Renaissance it could be performed by the lay rectors of the kingdom⁴⁶. The ears are the faithful, those who receive the Word. The clergy is the mouth that emits the divine speech. But then Haimo makes a direct reference to the role of the laity within the body of the Church, saying that those who work so that others may live with the fruit of that work are the hands of the ecclesiastical body—as well as feet are men who engage in the secular business—. Those who worked with their hands in Carolingian Europe in the mid-ninth century were undoubtedly peasants in first place and different kind of craftsmen in second place. It is more difficult to identify whom the author refers as *pedes, qui ad in negotiis saecularibus utilitatem caeterorum discurrunt*. It is tempting to think that he means the warrior aristocracy, since it is well known that Haimo of Auxerre is the oldest medieval author to propose the division of society in three functional orders⁴⁷. These *pedes*, are apparently the lay engaged in secular business. However, we know that the Carolingian clergy were also committed to the administration of the kingdom and that many churchmen were involved in secular business, although this were not—speaking theoretically at least—their function. But Haimo's claim is a theoretical statement and he assumes that secular business is the duty of the lower members of the Church, as our monk explains on I Cor 12, 22 following Saint Paul: *Sed multo magis quae videntur membra corporis infirmiora esse, sicut pedes sunt et manus, quae vilibus quibusque ministeriis deserviunt, necessaria sunt: quia pro toto corpore operantur...*⁴⁸

These lower members are almost certainly the laics. If so, it is possible that the *pedes* were the Carolingian warrior aristocracy, but they may also include secular people—whether warriors or not—dedicated to public service or trade. Although the latter seems more likely, the text retains some ambiguity. We must not forget that, before the Gregorian Reform, clergy and laity were much more integrated. Ultimately, the main problem for religious intellectuals, which were the majority—although there were a handful of lay ones⁴⁹—is to point a way of governance that allows the secular elite to get to heaven⁵⁰.

46. Lauwers, Michel. "Le glaive et la parole. Charlemagne, Alcuin et le modèle du *rex praedicator*: notes d'ecclésiologie carolingienne". *Annales de Bretagne et du pays de l'Ouest*, 111 (2004): 221-243.

47. Iogna-Prat, Dominique. "Le 'baptême' du schema des trois ordres fonctionnels: l'apport de l'école d'Auxerre dans la seconde moitié du IXe siècle". *Annales - Economies. Sociétés. Civilisations*, 31 (1986) : 101-126; Ortigues, Edmond. "L'Elaboration de la théorie des trois ordres chez Haymon d'Auxerre". *Francia*, 14 (1987): 17-43; Ortigues, Edmond. "Haymon d'Auxerre, théoricien des trois ordres", *L'École Carolingienne d'Auxerre...* : 181-227.

48. Haymonis Halberstatensis, "In I Cor", *Patrologiae...* col. 579d: Those members of the body considered the weakest, are like the feet and hands, which are devoted to the vile ministries, but they are necessities because they work for the whole body.

49. Wormald, Patrick; Nelson, Janet L., eds. *Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press, 2011.

50. The classic reference on this issue is Chélini, Jean. *L'aube du Moyen Âge. Naissance de la chrétienté occidentale. La vie religieuse des laïcs de l'Europe carolingienne (750-900)*. Paris: Picard, 1991 (2^o ed. 1997). Raffaele Savigni wrote a ver good synthesis on this problem, Savigni, Raffaele. *Giona di Orléans. Una ecclesiologia carolingia*. Bolonia: Pàtron, 1989; Savigni, Raffaele. "Les laïcs dans l'ecclésiologie carolingienne: normes statutaires



Haimon explicitly includes the warrior aristocracy within the church body in the commentary on I Cor 12, 28, when he explains the concept of *gubernationes* in this verse: *GUBERNATIONES, sicut in praelatis et regibus, episcopis aut ducibus...*⁵¹

I Cor 12, 28 presents the ecclesiastical degrees as St. Paul conceived them. The apostle only makes a list of ecclesiastical ranks: *primum apostolos, secundo prophetas, tertio doctores, deinde virtutes, exinde donationes curationum, opitulaciones, gubernationes, genera linguarum*. Haimo does an exegesis of these ranks. The explanation the Carolingian author gives of *gubernationes* is relevant to this work. Haimo identifies *gubernationes* with: *praelatis et regibus, episcopis et ducibus*. 'Prelate' in principle means 'bishop' but Haimo explicitly mentions the bishops alongside with the dukes and the prelates standing with the kings. Those dukes were lay aristocrats, so it is likely that, in this context, prelates are archbishops. Two groups conform the *Gubernationes*. The archbishops and kings on the top and bishops and dukes bellow them. The combination of ecclesiastical dignities with secular dignities shows many things. First, it expresses a reality of the Middle Ages and above all of the High Middle Ages. There is no clear distinction between a purely religious power and a purely secular power. As a matter of fact, Haimo accepts the religious condition of secular power but he also presents the secular nature of religious power. Second, although *gubernationes* —as Haimo presents them— can be grouped into two, the prelates are mentioned before the kings, which would give some prominence to the archbishops over monarchs. Although sovereigns appear above the bishops and they are grouped with the lay aristocracy —that is below the kings— at the highest level of power in the world there is a religious institution: the *praelati*⁵².

Another interesting point to note is that Haimo presents every form of *gubernationes* in plural, ie with no preeminence of any bishop or any particular king. This means, firstly, that the author disregards the aspirations of some Popes of the ninth century for Roman supremacy; secondly, perhaps aware of the Carolingian political reality after the Treaty of Verdun, which presents a fragmented political map between many kings with more or less the same power, though one of them holds the title of Emperor. In any case, the exercise of the government of the Church, or of the

et idéal de 'conversion' (à propos de Paulin d'Aquilée, Jonas d'Orléans, Dhuoda et Hincmar de Reims)", *Guerriers et moines. Conversion et sainteté aristocratique dans l'Occident médiéval (IXe-XIIe)*, Michel Lauwers, ed. Niza: Antibes 2002: 41-92. According to Rachel Stone the way to achieve this goal was the instruction of the laity according to the principles of the Carolingian Renaissance see Stone, Rachel. "The rise and fall of the lay moral elite in carolingian Francia", *La culture du Haut Moyen Âge. Une question d'élites?*, François Bougard, Régine Le Jan, Rosamond McKitterick, eds. Turnhout: Brepols, 2009: 363-375.

51. Halberstatensis, Haymonis, " In I Cor", *Patrologiae...* col. 580c: "governments, ie prelates and kings, bishops and dukes (*ducibus*)."

52. Sumi Shimahara studied on the basis of exegetical texts the way secular elite was relegated to a secondary place from middle ninth century on Shimahara, Sumi. "L'exégèse biblique et les élites: qui sont les recteurs de l'Église à l'époque carolingienne?", *La culture du Haut Moyen Âge. Une question d'élites?*, François Bougard, Régine Le Jan, Rosamond McKitterick, eds. Turnhout: Brepols, 2009: 201-217.



whole society is a collective one, as has been pointed out by other scholars studying Haimo's ideas⁵³.

4. Conclusion

In Haimo's thought the Pauline idea of the church as the body of Christ is also identified with the Eucharistic sacrifice. Christ had a real body, a historical body sacrificed on the Cross. But the Eucharist is also his real body. The Church as the body of Christ also rests on the Eucharistic realism. Christ has three real bodies: the historical, the sacramental and the ecclesiastical. In this sense there is in the haimonian exegesis a typical problem of Carolingian Eucharistic controversies: what is meant by 'real'? What 'real' means in itself? It is a difficult problem. But the Eucharist reality gives also 'reality' to that mystical body of Christ which is the Church. On this 'reality' Haimo builds his ecclesiology. In his ecclesiology there is a clergy with different dignities, a hierarchy. There is also the laity, also with a hierarchy that our author defined less clearly but it includes kings, dukes—warrior aristocracy—, manual workers and perhaps merchants and bureaucrats. The government of that body—which is the Church—is the duty of archbishops—*praelati*—, bishops, kings and dukes, ie a mixed collegial governance of both religious and secular authority, perhaps with a slight supremacy of the former over the second. Finally, Haimo did not establish primacies between religious and secular authorities.

This ecclesiology is as real as is real the presence of Christ in the Eucharistic sacramental bread, consecrated on the altar, inside a church or in a space controlled exclusively by the clergy. Therefore, if we want to have a full comprehension of Eucharist's place in ecclesiology, we also need understand the place of concepts such as church, temple and altar, both in Haimo's thought and in other intellectuals of the time as well.

53. According to Ortigues Haimo favors a collegial and an Episcopalian governance Church Ortigues, Edmond. "Haymon d'Auxerre, théoricien des trois ordres", *L'École Carolingienne d'Auxerre...*: 205-213.

