

JEFF RIDER

**THE GOD OF HISTORY : THE CONCEPT OF GOD IN THE
WORKS OF GALBERT OF BRUGES AND WALTER OF
THÉROUANNE (1127-1130)**

In his early twelfth-century *Vita Iohannis episcopi Teruanensis*, Walter of Thérouanne relates that John, in his youth, set off on a scholarly odyssey that took him to many schools and masters. Of these, Walter notes, John

duos (...), quos hic pro suae integritate vitae commemorandos iudicavimus, prae ceteris coluit. Unus fuit magnae religionis et scientiae magister Lambertus Traiectensis ; alter vero (...) dominus Ivo, qui post episcopus fuit Carnotensis, qui quantae religionis quantaeque scientiae temporibus suis culmen tenuerit, hodie quoque testantur et monasteria quae instituit et libri quos ordinavit¹.

Since I do not expect anyone ever to write a *Life of Jeff, Professor of Wesleyan*, I am forced to be my own biographer and to note that in my youth, I, too, attended many schools and had many masters, but one of those whom I respected above all others was Paul Tombeur, one of the most learned and zealous men of *his* day.

Professor Tombeur taught me many things but one of the most intriguing and most important was that the ability to access and search medieval texts via computer allows us to answer certain kinds of questions that it would otherwise be very difficult to answer, and to do so with a speed and degree of accuracy that was previously impossible. While the computers and programs we used almost thirty years ago are now altogether obsolete, it is a measure of Professor Tombeur's vision that many of the methods and kinds of studies he foresaw are still unexploited. We use computers to search texts, generate concordances,

¹ WALTER OF THÉROUANNE, *Vita Iohannis episcopi Teruanensis* 1, ed. O. HOLDER-EGGER, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 15.2, Hannover, 1888, p. 1140. 16/20. This citation appears in chapter 2 of the new edition of the *Vita* that I am preparing for the Corpus Christianorum.

and so on, but rarely do we allow computers to present texts to us in new ways, to make familiar texts strange, so that the texts, as Professor Tombeur used to put it, ask us questions rather than vice versa. This brief study will hardly do justice to the richness of Professor Tombeur's thought and instruction, but it will, I hope, serve as both a small indication of the kinds of things that he foresaw might be done and as a pitifully inadequate recognition of the immense intellectual debt I owe *magistro nostro*.

Charles the Good, count of Flanders, was surrounded by assassins and killed by a sword blow to the forehead while praying in an upper chapel of his castral church of Saint Donatian in Bruges on March 2, 1127². This assassination was one of the most stunning events of the early twelfth century – Galbert of Bruges tells us that *fama impiae mortis ejus* reached London within two days where it *perculit cives*³ – affecting the balance of power between England, France and the Empire and the commercial life of the most prosperous region of Europe.

² On Charles, see J. M. DE SMET, *Charles le Bon*, in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* 12, Paris, 1953, p. 483-86 ; J. B. ROSS in *Galbert of Bruges, The Murder of Charles the Good, Count of Flanders*, trans. J. B. ROSS, 1959 ; rev. ed., 1967 ; rpt. Toronto, 1982, p. 5-20 ; R. C. VAN CAENEGEM in *Galbert of Bruges, Le Meurtre de Charles le Bon*, trans. J. GENGOUX, Antwerp, 1978, p. 15-21 ; and the exhibition catalogue by the Karel-de-Goedecomité, *Karel de Goede, 1127-1977*, Bruges, 1977. The major narrative sources for his reign (and their English translations) are : GALBERT OF BRUGES, *De multro, traditione, et occisione gloriosi Karoli comitis Flandriarum*, ed. J. RIDER, Turnhout, 1994 (CCCM 131) ; GALBERT OF BRUGES, *The Murder of Charles the Good, Count of Flanders*, trans. J. B. ROSS, 1959 ; rev. ed., 1967 ; rpt. Toronto, 1982 ; WALTER OF THÉROUANNE, *Vita Karoli comitis*, ed. R. KÖPKE, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores* 12, Hannover, 1856, p. 537-61 (I am preparing a new edition and an English translation of this work) ; SUGER, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, ed. and French trans. H. WAQUET, Paris, 1929 ; SUGER, *The Deeds of Louis the Fat*, trans. R. CUSIMANO and J. MOORHEAD, Washington, DC, 1992 ; ORDERIC VITALIS, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans., M. CHIBNALL, 6 vols., Oxford, 1969-80 ; and HERMAN OF TOURNAI, *Liber de restauratione monasterii Sancti Martini Tornacensis*, ed. G. WAITZ, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores* 14, Hannover, 1883 ; HERMAN OF TOURNAI, *The Restoration of the Monastery of Saint Martin of Tournai*, trans. L. H. NELSON, Washington, DC, 1996.

³ *De multro* [12] 46/48 ; trans. p. 113.

Charles died without children and without an obvious successor. There were various pretenders, but the king of France, Louis VI, was ultimately successful in exercising his rights as overlord of the county of Flanders and chose William Clito, the son of Robert Curthose, the dispossessed duke of Normandy, and nephew of Henry I of England to be the new count. Louis's successful exercise of his rights cost him and the new count so much in promises and concessions to the Flemish nobility and bourgeoisie, however, that William's position was precarious from the start. Henry I's enmity towards the new count had a chilling effect on the important mercantile relations between the cities of Flanders and England in the months that followed his election, and this loss of revenues, coupled with a series of unpopular actions taken by William, led to rising discontent with the new count in urban centers like Lille, Bruges, Saint Omer and Ghent. By March 1128, William was no longer in control of the county. By the end of July, he lay dead from a wound suffered while besieging his principal rival, Thierry of Alsace, the son of Thierry II, duke of Upper Lorraine. The favorite of the bourgeoisie, Thierry quickly imposed himself as count, a position he held for forty years until his death in 1168.

These events are remarkably well-known to us thanks to the chronicle written by Galbert of Bruges in 1127-1128. Galbert was probably a cleric who worked principally in the fiscal administration of the castellany of Bruges. He was thus a marginal member of the count's *curia*, at least when the count was in Bruges, and it is reasonable to suppose that he was occasionally called on for various other, more punctual tasks like taking notes at juridical acts which served as the basis for the subsequent composition of charters, or helping the count with his correspondence. It is possible that he was also a marginal member of the *conventus* of Saint Donatian, perhaps principally for the sake of compensation. The fact that Galbert wrote a long text in Latin shows that he had been decently educated, but there is no reason to suppose that his studies extended beyond the trivium. He may have been educated at Saint Donatian itself or at a nearby center like Tournai, Arras, or Laon. By the time he wrote his chronicle, however, most of his recent education had probably come from his practical experi-

ence in the count's administration, conversation, and attendance at religious offices⁴.

Following a path laid out by Jan Dhondt, Father Huyghebaert, and Walter Mohr⁵, and based on what one might term a conventional reading of Galbert's chronicle, I have previously suggested that his "theory" of history, like everyone else's at the time, seems inspired distantly by Augustine's *City of God* and, more clearly although still vaguely, by Orosius's *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*⁶. Galbert, I proposed, shared the Augustinian/Orosian concept of a God who permeates history, ordaining all that happens. "The true protagonist" of Galbert's chronicle, I suggested, is "a God whose infinite mind and omnipotence determine the course and character of history, endowing it with an absolute inevitability and an enigmatic but infinite meaningfulness"⁷.

All the things he recorded, Galbert wrote in the Prologue to his chronicle, *sunt (...) Dei ordinatione congesta*⁸, and he believed this literally and profoundly. When Bruges was caught up in the war between Thierry of Alsace, whom the citizens of Bruges supported, and William Clito in the spring of 1128, for example, Galbert felt that the city's priests, carried away by the popular emotions surrounding the conflict, had begun to act as though they believed that they could *ita Deum incantare (...) ut, velit nolit Deus, Willelmus a comitatu ejiciatur*⁹. When Thierry was routed at the battle of Axpoele on June 21, 1128, Galbert writes, *nostri sacerdotes idiotae dicebant presbyterum ex Artrica et presbyterum ex Cnislara et Odfridum clericum per incantationes fu-*

⁴ On Galbert, see J. RIDER, *God's Scribe : The Historiographical Art of Galbert of Bruges*, Washington, DC, 2001, p. 16-28.

⁵ J. DHONDt, *Une mentalité du douzième siècle : Galbert de Bruges*, in *Revue du Nord*, 39 (1957), p. 101-109 ; N. HUYGHEBAERT, *Galbert de Bruges*, in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* 19, Paris, 1981, c. 737-39 ; W. MOHR, *Geschichtstheologische Aspekte im Werk Galberts von Brügge*, in R. LIEVENS, E. VAN MINGROOT and W. VERBEKE, eds., *Pascua Mediaevalia : Studies voor Prof. Dr. Jozef-Maria De Smet*, Leuven, 1983, p. 246-62.

⁶ J. RIDER, *God's Scribe*, p. 23.

⁷ J. RIDER, *God's Scribe*, p. 73 ; cf. p. 53-74, 131-133, 167, 178-183.

⁸ GALBERT, *De multro*, [Prol.] 38 ; trans. p. 80.

⁹ GALBERT, *De multro*, [113] 60/61 ; trans. p. 296.

gasse in bello consulem Theodericum et suos, cum Deus, Galbert reminds his audience, *omnia disponat et ordinet*¹⁰. Galbert's God works through human beings, but He also intervenes directly when need be. Towards the end of the first part of his work, for example, Galbert notes that when

nemo vero ausus fuit manum mittere contra Walterum [of Vladslo], quamvis traditionis [of Charles] conscius fuisse (...) [because] erat (...) par terrae illius alter a comite, factum est (...) Dei districto et horribili examine quod Walterus (...) in quadam militiae expeditione, ex proprio cursu suo ab equo praecipitatus, totius confractus langueret et postmodum in paucis diem obierit (...) Deus, cui vindicta relinquebatur, morte languida a fidelium aspectu exterminavit illum¹¹.

Galbert's truly profound belief in the providential structure of history was in fact, I argue, one of the principal reasons he wrote his chronicle in the form of a journal. He felt that the structure of history, the succession of events, was itself significant because it was created by God and should be recorded and reported by the historian as is, rather than interpreted or rewritten, in order to provide as accurate a representation of God's plan as possible. Galbert thought that the journal was the best form of historical record precisely because it respected the divinely ordained rhythm and order of time¹².

What I would like to do in the following pages is to test these ideas about Galbert's concept of God by means of a computer-assisted analysis of what he says about God in his chronicle. I have thus used the *Instrumenta lexicologica latina* prepared under Professor Tombeur's direction for the *De multro* to identify every use of certain keywords – *Deus* (*Deo*, *Dei*, *Deum*), *Christus* (*Christo* etc.), *Spiritus sanctus*, *Dominus*, and *divinus* – along with their immediate contexts (subject - verb - objects, etc.)¹³. I have then “lemmatized” these units (*templo*

¹⁰ GALBERT, *De multro*, [115] 1/15 ; trans. p 301.

¹¹ GALBERT, *De multro*, [89] 1/4, 27/31 ; trans. p. 262-63 ; cf. [14] 19/25 ; trans. p. 117-118 ; [75] 1/10 ; trans. p. 243 ; [91] 1/25 ; trans. p. 263-64. [121] 28/30 ; trans. p. 311.

¹² See J. RIDER, *God's Scribe*, p. 136-138, 139-140.

¹³ CETEDOC, *Instrumenta lexicologica latina*, fasc. 83 (CM 131), Series A - Formae, Galbertus Brugensis, *De multro, traditione et occisione gloriosi Karoli comitis Flandriarum*, Turnhout, 1995.

Christi, for example, becomes *templum Christi*) and organized them according to the case of the lemma or keyword and their vocabulary. This kind of analysis is based on the presumption that a person's conceptual field is closely interwoven with his or her linguistic practice, that the way one thinks about things is related directly to the way one talks and writes about them. An analysis of the way Galbert wrote about God should, therefore, tell us about the way he thought about Him. In his mind, there were things that God could and could not do, which is to say there were verbs of which He could and could not be the subject ; there were things that could and could not be done to Him, which is to say there were verbs of which He could and could not be the object ; and so on. The kind of analysis I have undertaken here asks not simply what words were associated with the word "God" in Galbert's mind, but how those words could – and could not – combine with the word "God" in his discourse. This kind of analysis could be carried out without the aid of computers, but a computer-assisted analysis has the advantages of being rapid and comprehensive. It permits one to do easily and accurately a kind of work that would otherwise take a long time and be highly liable to error. The data that is gathered still needs to be interpreted, of course, but the use of a computer to gather it improves the quality of the data and postpones the interpretive moment.

The social nature of language – the fact that we must use common words to express individual ideas – leaves any linguistically based analysis of a conceptual field open to the objection that the concepts it isolates are common concepts, concepts embedded in the author's linguistic tradition or community, rather than his or her unique ones. The peculiar language in which Galbert wrote further aggravates this problem since Latin was no one's maternal language in the twelfth century¹⁴, was learned differently from the way in which one learned other languages, had a unique status, was profoundly influenced by a relatively small group of discursive models – and by one model, the Bible, in particular – and was dominated by a single institution. One might thus suspect that the linguistic image of God that emerges from an analysis like that outlined above will reflect a traditional and institutional discourse rather than a personal concept.

¹⁴ In this connection, see the article by J. BATANY, *L'Amère maternité du français médiéval*, in *Langue Française*, 54 (May, 1982), p. 29-55.

In order to judge better the specificity of the concept of God that emerges from this analysis, therefore, I have undertaken a similar analysis of the two contemporary *vitae* by Walter, archdeacon of the see of Thérouanne : the *Vita Karoli comitis*, another account of the life of Count Charles the Good, and the *Vita Iohannis episcopi Teruanensis*, a life of John of Warneton, bishop of Thérouanne. These works were written at the same time as Galbert's chronicle (the *Vita Karoli* in 1127 and the *Vita Iohannis* in 1130), in almost the same place (Thérouanne is slightly more than fifty miles from Bruges)¹⁵, by an author who must have acquired his Latin in a setting similar to that in which Galbert acquired his. The *Vita Karoli* and Galbert's chronicle were, moreover, written on the same subject, while the *Vita Iohannis* and the chronicle share the similar inspiration of devotion to a former leader. Yet the two authors and three works were distinctly different. Galbert was a minor cleric in the count's service, a combination accountant and secretary. Walter spent his youth among the regular canons of Saint Martin of Ypres before being called to Bishop John's entourage and made an archdeacon in 1117 at a relatively early age, a task which brought him, too, into frequent contact with the count of Flanders. Walter's works suggest that he had been well educated, and he was, like his bishop, devoted to the reform movement¹⁶. Walter's

¹⁵ The geographic proximity of the two authors is in fact closer since the see of Thérouanne was divided into two archdeaconries, that of the Artois, to the west, and that of Flanders, to the east. Walter was evidently the archdeacon of Flanders, a territory consisting of the western part of Flanders proper (the deaconries of Diksmuide, Veurne, Bergues-St.-Winnoc, Bourbourg, Merck, Ypres, Poperinge, Cassel and Bailleul) (see H. VAN WERVEKE, *Het Bisdom Terwaan van den oorsprong tot het begin de veertiende eeuw*, Ghent, 1924, p. 63-64 and the map at the end of the volume [Recueil de travaux publiés par la Faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'Université de Gand 52]).

¹⁶ On Walter, see M. DUCHET, *Sur un point erroné de l'"Histoire littéraire de la France" par les Bénédictins*, in *Mémoires lus à la Sorbonne dans les séances extraordinaires du Comité Imperial des travaux historiques et des sociétés savantes (...)* *histoire, philologie et sciences morales*, 8 (1867/68), p. 199-211 ; N. HUYGHEBAERT, *Gautier de Thérouanne*, in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* 20, Paris, 1984, p. 115-16 ; and *The Narrative Sources from the Southern Low Countries, 600-1500*, University of Ghent, <<http://www.lib.rug.ac.be/n-exec.html>>, ID numbers G009 and G010. The edition of the charters of the bishops of Thérouanne

works are, moreover, hagiography, the first composed at the request of his bishop, the second in his memory at the request of his *familia*, whereas Galbert's chronicle is a *sui generis* response to a political and personal crisis, and is not addressed to any patron.

The results of the analyses of these three texts are limited, highly condensed, but exhaustive and unmediated images of Galbert's and Walter's discourses about God, which can be found in Tables 1 and 2, and are summarized in Table 3, below¹⁷. When one looks at these tables, one will perhaps first notice that the keywords occur more frequently in Galbert's work (197 times) than in Walter's (155 times), and that they likewise occur in more contexts (in connection with more verbs, more nouns, etc.) in Galbert's work (144 different contexts) than in Walter's (110 contexts). If one takes, for a more precise example, the

that is currently being prepared by Professor Benoît Tock will also help us fill in some pieces of Walter's biography. On the hagiographical context in which Walter composed his lives of Charles and John, see I. VAN 'T SPIJKER, *Gallia du Nord et de l'Ouest. Les Provinces ecclésiastiques de Tours, Rouen, Reims (950-1130)*, dans *Hagiographies*, ed. G. PHILIPPART, 2, Turnhout, 1996, p. 239-47, 263-79.

¹⁷ For Walter's two *vitae*, I have had to work with the electronic texts I have prepared in connection with my new editions of both works for the Corpus Christianorum. I have, however, provided references between parentheses to pages and lines on which the keywords are found in the published editions of the works in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. The parenthetical references for Galbert's text are to the chapters and lines of my edition of it.

I have left out instances of the keywords that occur in biblical citations and in quotations (even if I suspect they were written by author) since they are not attributable to the author's "voice", and he may actually have tried to express through them an attitude or idea not his own. I have likewise not taken into account the occurrence of the keywords in expressions like *anno Domini* or *dominica in Misericordia Domini* that are essentially dates. By limiting myself to the words *Deus*, *Christus*, *Spiritus sanctus*, *Dominus* and *divinus*, I have not identified every instance in which these authors write about God. I have not, for example, identified instances in which God is the antecedent of pronouns (*ille*) or possessive adjectives (*suus*). The resulting list is nonetheless long enough to enable us to form a distinct impression of each author's concept of God and the limitation is the same for both authors. I have also included various participial phrases (e.g., *Christo annuente*) in the nominative category (although I have represented them there as participles) since these are actions which God performs.

occurrences of keywords in the accusative case, one sees that they occur in the accusative 28 times in the *De multro*, but only 15 times in Walter's two *vitae*; and that the keywords are used in 25 different contexts (used with 25 different verbs etc.) by Galbert, but in only 12 different contexts by Walter. These absolute results are, however, deceptive insofar as the *De multro* contains 38,860 words whereas Walter's two works combined contain only about 19,172¹⁸. Proportionally, Galbert uses 5.2 of the keywords in 3.8 different contexts for every thousand words, whereas Walter uses 8.2 keywords in 5.8 different contexts per thousand words. In terms of density, then, God is significantly more "present" in Walter's work than in Galbert's.

The ways in which God is "present" in these two works are, moreover, quite different. The case in which the keywords appear most frequently in the works of both authors is the genitive, but they appear in the genitive far more frequently in Walter's works (97 of 155 occurrences, or 63% of the total occurrences) than in Galbert's (70, or 36%, of 197 occurrences). The next greatest discrepancy is found in the two authors' use of the keywords as the subjects of verbs, which represents only 9% (14 of 155) of the appearances of the keywords in Walter's work, but 28% (55 of 197) in Galbert's. The two authors' use of the keywords in the accusative, dative and ablative cases are closer to one another, although here, too, Galbert uses the keywords in these cases more often than Walter. God is thus overwhelmingly present in Walter's lives as a possessor – of things, people, qualities, faculties – whereas Galbert's God is far more actively engaged in the world, does more. Walter's God is more static but perhaps more internally complex, connected to the world in more ways, than Galbert's, who is simpler but intervenes more directly and frequently.

Other differences become apparent when one considers the specific make-up of the categories in the works of the two authors. In terms of frequency, their use of the keywords in the dative and ablative cases appears to be the closest since keywords in these cases represent

¹⁸ For Galbert, see *Instrumenta*, 10. The number of words in Walter's two Lives is based on a word count of my computerized versions of the texts (*Vita Karoli* c. 12,558 words; *Vita Iohannis* c. 6,614 words). A more exact count will have to wait for the publication of the Lives in the *Corpus Christianorum* within, I hope, the next two years.

19% of the occurrences of the keywords in Walter's works and 22% of their occurrences in the *De multro*. Just as God appears more frequently as the subject of a verb in Galbert's work, however, he likewise appears proportionately more often there as the agent of a passive verb (8) than he does in Walter's works (3). Galbert's God is also commended, offered or given more things (spirits, bodies, princes, sacrifices, etc.) and commended, offered or given things more often than Walter's God. The things offered Galbert's God – a body, a prince, spoils, vessels, revenge – are also more varied and concrete than the things offered to Walter's God – thanks, praise, confessions, oneself – which are more consistently "religious" or "cultish." It is also remarkable that Galbert refers four times to prayers or psalms addressed to God, whereas Walter's texts contain no such mention. Galbert likewise refers three times to offering or making vows or promises to God, whereas Walter's texts again contain no such mention.

The differences between the two authors' concepts of God as they are embodied in this category thus suggest that Walter's God is someone one wants to please (*acceptabilis Domino, approbatus Deo, deferre Deo, deuotus Deo, placitus Deo, exhibuere se pium Deo*), for whom one wants to do things (*astringere se Deo, dedicare operum suorum initita Domino, ducere heremiticam uitam Deo, militare Christo domino, tolerare pro Christo*), or to whom one wants to remain attentive (*vacare Deo*), whereas Galbert's God is more emotionally distant and requires more assiduous cultivation and a more complete obedience (*offerre, referre, perferre, reddere, relinquere, offerre se Deo sacrificium, prostratus Domino, se subicere Deo, servire Deo*). Only Walter's God can be petitioned and rewards (*postulare indulgentiam a Domino, expectare mercedem a Deo*). Galbert can imagine someone trying to – and wanting to – wrestle with God (*pugnare cum Deo*) ; Walter evidently cannot. Galbert's God seems more active and powerful, but also more capricious and proud : He inspires awe, requires obedience and needs to be placated. Walter's God is more passive, more indulgent, more giving : He is less active, but closer, friendlier, someone one wants to please out of affection and esteem rather than fear.

If we turn to the occurrences of keywords in the accusative case, the category in which Galbert's and Walter's use of the keywords is next most close (10% of the occurrences in Walter's work, 14% in Galbert's), we find a roughly similar picture. Walter's God is praised (*laudare Deum*), Galbert's is praised and blessed (*laudare, benedicere*

Deum). Galbert's God is proportionally more often prayed to, invoked, appealed to, suffered for than Walter's. Galbert's God is more capricious, more subject to influence (*incantare, placare, flectere, provocare, agere humiliter erga Deum*), more judicial and judgmental (*jurare, testari Deum, emendare quidquid apud Deum, meritum apud Deum*). Only Walter imagines turning to God or following Christ; only Walter, again, imagines earning a reward from God. Only Walter, curiously, speaks of a fear of God (or lack of it), although one senses that this fear is more a theological virtue, a sort of respect, than the very concrete fear of an active and vengeful God that one senses in Galbert's work. Only Galbert, again, can imagine anyone wanting to oppose God.

If we turn, finally, to occurrences of the keywords in the two categories in which the practices of the two authors are the least alike, a similar picture emerges, albeit with additional details. As I noted above, the use of the keywords in the genitive is the category in which the two authors differ the most and interesting tendencies appear already in what one might term their concrete visualizations of God. Both refer, as one might expect, to the body and blood of God, and both refer to the hand and name of God, but Walter's God also has a mother, a spirit, and undergoes suffering and execution, whereas Galbert's God has a sword: on the one hand, a human, suffering God; on the other, a vengeful, warrior God. Both Gods have their servants, their faithful, their people, but only Walter's God has priests, and only Galbert's has enemies. God's role as a landowner, an owner of real structures in the Flemish landscape, is more developed in Galbert's work than in Walter's. Already in these first few subcategories, then, there is a distinct difference between Walter's God, who is more sympathetic and proportionally far more involved in human relations (8 occurrences of *cultor, famulus, populus*, etc., versus 7 for Galbert), and Galbert's, who, like a feudal lord, owns specific buildings and lands, has enemies as well as servants, and a ready sword. It is perhaps significant, if one jumps a little ahead in the list, to find that Walter refers to the *opus Dei* while Galbert mentions the *pugna Dei*.

When one looks at the remaining subcategories of the genitive, one discovers that Walter's God is more internally complex than Galbert's, possessing glory, honor, an instinct, power, will, wisdom, prescience and counsel, whereas Galbert's has only authority, honor, majesty, power and what one might call cunning (*ars*): here, too, Galbert's God is more distant and lordly. Walter's God is likewise more emotionally

complex, and above all more kindly (*auxilium, bonitas, clementia, dignatio, fauor, gratia, misericordia, patientia, ira*), than Galbert's (*clementia, gratia, misericordia*), and he inspires a more complex response (*amor, confessio, seruitio, zelus, timor, contemptus*) than Galbert's (*amor, servitio*).

Both Gods ordain the course of history, both are judges, Walter's even more so than Galbert's, and both inflict punishment. Only Galbert's God, however, is a lawgiver, and the divine offices, curiously, are a more prominent part of Galbert's world than Walter's.

Walter, in sum, puts more emphasis on God's spiritual qualities and, especially, goodness, on His justice and judgment, on His relations with humans and the reactions He provokes in them (of which the dominant reaction is, again, and again curiously, *timor*). Galbert's God is simpler but more concretely, physically present in human life through his possessions and the daily services owed to him.

The most striking differences between the two authors' concepts of God appear in their use of the keywords in the nominative case or as the subject of verbs. Walter's God is relatively inactive and His few actions are almost all aimed at helping, inspiring, rewarding, glorifying, supporting humans. Only once does He do away with someone. Galbert's God is far more vigorous, far prouder, and, although He, too, can be helpful and supportive, He is a lawgiver and a judge who avenges and punishes, often severely, as often as He *deigns* to help and support. Both Walter and Galbert, as was noted above, refer to the *dispensatio, dispositio*, or *ordinatio*, and *iusticia* or *judicium Dei*, but only Galbert's God actively *dispensat, disponit* and *ordinat omnia*, only He *adjudicat* before our eyes. Only Galbert's God surveys all things and speaks.

Walter refers once to a vague *regnum Dei*, but Galbert's God is actively concerned about the well-being of the county of Flanders, which he rules and protects, and whose peace he maintains.

Only Galbert's God, finally, is the God of nature, bringing days to a close and renewing the seasons.

Galbert's and Walter's concepts of God thus overlap in many ways and to a large degree. They are rarely identical, however, even when they overlap, and they are ultimately, at least to my mind, far more different than I anticipated. Walter's God is by and large a sympathetic, kind, supportive, well-disposed, emotionally present but physically

distant father-like figure, a New Testament God who expects respect, and whom it is easy to respect, to whom one can turn and from whom one can expect help and rewards, a complex being who enjoys a wide range of relationships and who has a wide range of concerns, only part of which one perceives or understands. He is perhaps not unlike a benevolent, but spiritually-minded and naturally private bishop like John of Théroutanne.

Galbert's God is more physically present, more actively engaged in human lives, but more emotionally distant, harder and less sympathetic. And it is perhaps precisely because He is so directly involved in our lives that Galbert's God can provoke a kind of opposition that seems unimaginable to Walter. An Old Testament God, a proud law-giver, avenger, and judge, as well as a powerful protector to whom one owes regular service, Galbert's God emerges as a sort of feudal ruler – like Charles – resembling the wrathful Yahweh more than the gentle Christ.

Perhaps, in summary, one might note that while the word *God* is more present in Walter texts, God Himself is more present in Galbert's. Or it is perhaps fair to say that Galbert looks back to the harsher God of an earlier time, whereas Walter looks forward to the increasingly humanized God of the later twelfth century and the Marian cults¹⁹.

Given the similarities between Galbert and Walter – both Flemish clerics, who were born within twenty years of one another, lived their lives within fifty miles of one another, learned their Latin in similar ways, and wrote on the same or similar topics – the differences between

¹⁹ The cult of the Virgin was particularly strong in northern France in the twelfth century: "the earliest known collections of Mary legends originating in the West are those which gathered about the churches of France dedicated to the Virgin Mary" (E. F. WILSON, ed., *The "Stella Maris" of John of Garland*, Cambridge, MA, 1946, p. 3); the "Ave Maria" first became popular there in the twelfth century and was recommended by the Paris synod of 1198 (D. D. BERKVAM, *Enfance et maternité dans la littérature française des XIIe et XIIIe siècles*, Paris, 1981, p. 14, 137); and the cult of Monica, the mother of Saint Augustine, began after 1162 in northern France when "a regular canon of Arrouaise traveled to Italy and took some of Monica's bones home to northern France" (L. MILIS, *The Italian journey of Walter, prior of Arrouaise in 1161-1162*, in *Società, istituzioni, spiritualità. Studi in onore di Cinzio Violante*, Spoleto, 1994, p. 535-546).

their concepts of God are remarkable. They suggest that even among the relatively small group of truly literate clerics there was a wide range of ideas about God, and they beg explanation. Can they be explained by the – probable – ten to twenty years difference in age between Galbert and Walter ? Did the thinking in northern French and Flemish schools change so rapidly between c. 1085 and c. 1115 that the ambient concept of God there in, shall we say, 1090 was this different from the ambient concept there in 1110 ? Or are these differences due rather to the social milieus – the count's *curia*, the bishop's *familia* – in which the two men worked ? Or are they due simply to differences of character such as one might find between any two people even in the same milieu ? What would the result be if we conducted similar analyses of Galbert's and Walter's concepts of Count Charles ? or Galbert's concept of Count Charles and Walter's concept of Bishop John ? or the concepts of God that emerge from the count's and bishop's charters ? or those that emerge from other writers of roughly the same time and place ?

This is, as I said earlier, a poor tribute to the richness of Professor Tombeur's instruction, but it will, I hope, serve in a small way to suggest the provocativeness of that instruction and some of the ways the computer-aided analysis of medieval texts can help deepen our understanding of the literature and history of the period.

Wesleyan University
Middletown, CT USA

TABLE 1
GALBERT**Nominative**

Deus custos altarium et mensarum
altaris ([64], 40)

Deus miserator humanae conditionis
([57], 57)

Deus pauperum sustentator ([P], 48)

Deus propitius ([84], 8/9)

concedit Deus sibi dominum suum

Karolum videre et cum ipso manere et
cum illo perenniter beatificari ([64], 9)

concedit Deus ei consulatum ([121], 5)

confert Deus dona ecclesiae sancti
Donatiani ([78], 20)

confert Deus gra-
tiam, honorem, famam, divitias, vires, r
everentiam ([57], 43)

donat Deus martyrum palma comitem
([15], 21)

donans Deus ([4], 17)

praestat Deus eloquentiae bonum
([1], 33)

subvenit Deus ipsis dispensatio solita
([120], 18)

victores suos honestavit, regem et suos
sublimavit, super omnia majestatis suae
Deus nomen glorificavit, ecclesiamque
suam ab inquinatoribus in parte mun-
davit, et gloriosum illum martyrem
deflendum et circumfultum donavit
([63], 66)

dignatur Deus vota [s]uorum fidelium
suscipere ([64], 18)

dignatur Dominus suae praevisionis et
nostrae simul persecutionis ponere (...)
finem ([119], 2)

dignatur Deus reconciliari sibi eccle-
siam illam ([78], 21)

dignatur Deus suos revocare ([14], 1)

indulget Deus illi quod in domini sui
morte eget ([108], 30)

indulget Deus tanto peccatori quod
contra consulum pium delinquit
([46], 10)

non despicit Deus corripere fallaces
suos ([1], 33)

disponit et ordinat Deus omnia
([115], 14)

ordinans Deus ([P], 39/41), ([22] 39)

dispensat Deus utrumque ([70], 10)

dispensans Deus ([24], 24), ([7], 31)

profert Deus leges ([71], 34)

adjudicat Deus [aliquem] ([121], 23)

ascitur Deus iudex inter utrosque
([108], 44)

juvat Deus fidem juste agentis
([108], 45)

regit et protegit Deus comitatum
([66], 35)

restituit Deus gratiam pacis et status
terrae ([80], 10)
vult Deus pacem restituere patriae
([121], 1)

obstinat Deus corda eorum ([116], 47)
excecat Deus enim illos ([26], 25)
percutit Deus pravorum mentes
([79], 19)
terminat Deus correctionem ([70], 7)
corrigit Deus injuriam ([121], 30)
evaginavit Deus divinae ultionis
gladios ([26], 2)
exercet Deus vindictam ([14], 22)
incipit Deus vindictam ([27], 7)
vindicat Deus traditionem ([70], 28)
redigit Deus traditores in paucitatem
([75], 1)

Accusative

laudare Deum ([63], 64)
benedicere Deum ([22], 58), ([63], 64)

interpellare Deum ([17], 38), ([84], 8/9)
invocare Deum ([57], 57)
clamare Deum ([22], 58)
rogare Deum ([82], 9)
orare Deum ([81], 35)
exorare Deum ([84], 40)
expostulare Deum ([84], 7)

jurare Deum ut (...) ([18], 25)
testari Deum ([44], 25)

incantare Deum ([113], 60)
intellegere Deum incepisse vindictam
([26], 49)
placare Deum ([120], 17), ([121], 33)

persequitur Deus traditores ([79], 25)
insinuat Deus ipsis per flagella ([1], 33)
Deus turpitudinem et traditores mani-
festavit, damnavit, proscripsit, praecipit
avit ([57], 14)
exterminat Deus illum ([89], 29)
privat Deus [aliquem] a vita ([91], 17)

velit nolit Deus ([113], 61)
volens Deus ([11], 35), ([31], 13)

concludit Deus diem ([64], 43)
renovat Deus mundum ([76], 4)

speculatur Deus omnia ([1], 33)
ait Dominus ([71], 32)

flectere Deum ad injustitiam ([118], 28)
provocare Deum ad iram ([116], 50)

agere humiliter erga Deum ([108], 30)
votum humile apud Deum ([114], 23)
pati omnia propter Deum ([57], 34)
emendare quidquid apud Dominum
([4], 47)
egregia et honestissima mors erga
Deum ([19], 39)
meritum apud Deum ([6], 33)

nec differre pugnam et stragem propter
Deum ([108], 34/38)
superpositus contra Deum ([57], 35)

incertus praeter Deum ([37], 31)

Genitive

corpus et sanguis Christi ([16], 6),
([54], 26)

dextra Dei ([16], 48)

ensis Dei ([91], 11)

manus [Dei] ([57], 49)

nomen Christi/Domini ([84], 11),
([84], 38)

cultor Dei ([4], 35)

fideles et oves Christi ([1], 32)

hostes Dei ([26], 16)

populus Dei ([5], 6), ([27], 14)

servus Dei ([35], 17)

vernaculus Domini ([12], 36)

ecclesia/ae Dei ([P], 10), ([P], 49),

([P], 53), ([5], 15), ([6], 26),

([107], 22), ([114], 20)

sepulchrum Domini ([12], 35)

templum Dei/Christi ([57], 35),

([60], 19/20), ([63], 49)

causa Dei ([81], 35)

cultura divina ([64], 20)

donum Dei ([64], 42)

jussu divino ([7], 5)

lex/leges Dei ([4], 31), ([106], 28),

([121], 23)

officium divinum ([21], 7), ([25], 42),

([107], 28), ([114], 90), ([114], 92),

([116], 62)

pugna Dei ([57], 49)

scripta divina ([38], 33)

auctoritas Dei ([83], 10)

honor Dei ([6], 28)

majestas divina ([15], 18)

virtus Dei ([52], 12), ([115], 3)

clementia Dei ([7], 1)

gratia Dei ([57], 44), ([63], 57),

([76], 7)

misericordia Dei/divina ([22], 36),

([22], 54), ([108], 38)

ars Dei ([89], 25), ([89], 27)

dispensatio Dei/divina, ([22], 36),

([73], 13), ([75], 5), ([108], 38),

([120], 31)

ordinatio Dei/divina ([P], 38),

([25], 24), ([11], 3)

examen Dei ([89], 1)

justitia Dei ([6], 33), ([38], 47),

([104], 13)

ultio divina ([26], 1), ([81], 50)

amor Christi ([12], 32)

servitio Dei ([26], 7)

Dative, Ablative

concedi a Deo ([69], 57)
 dispensari a Deo ([13], 2), ([27], 23)
 disponi a Domino ([25], 23)
 mederi a Deo ([120], 16)
 mitti a Deo ([P], 42)
 praeferrere a Deo ([116], 52)
 praefigi a Deo ([120], 39)

communicare animae cuius commen-
 dationem Christo ([21], 1/3)
 obire in Christo ([3], 32)
 obdormire in Domino ([13], 19),
 ([3], 31)
 tradere spiritum suum Domino
 ([15], 25)
 vivere in comitatu superno cum Deo ac
 Domini ([23], 25)

commendare
 [aliquem]/corpus/principem Deo
 ([15], 30), ([24], 27), ([62], 5),
 ([78], 13)

offerre praedam Christo ([85], 27/28)
 offerre se Deo sacrificium ([15], 25)
 offerre vasa Deo ([61], 23)
 offerre vota Deo ([64], 2)
 offerre gratias Deo ([80], 7)
 referre gratias Deo ([120], 30),
 ([27], 11)

perferre oblationem Deo ([81], 6)
 reddere sua Deo ([66], 36)
 relinquere vindictam Deo ([75], 9)

profiteri confessionem Deo ([18], 38)

obsequium orationis debitum Deo
 ([66], 33)
 oratio Deo ([38], 49)

decantare psalmos Deo ([12], 20)
 psallere psalmos Deo ([3], 34)

promittere Deo ([108], 41)
 vovere Deo ut (...) ([114], 19)

reconciliari Deo ([38], 20)
 reconciliare ecclesiam Deo ([21], 33)

devotus Deo ([51], 8)
 prostratus Domino ([3], 35)
 se subicere Deo ([114], 69)
 servire Deo ([P], 51)

signa a Deo ([84], 43)

nec probabilis esse Deo ([64], 50)

pugnare cum Deo ([54], 20)

TABLE 2
WALTER**Nominative**

Christus testis (1150.5)	prouidens Deus (1149.45)
Deus protector (1146.3)	vestit Dominus corpus decore (1149.7)
	uult Deus fidelem suum glorificare (558.38)
annuens Christus (1141.10)	
concedit Deus animas omnes saluandas (1147.22)	operans Dominus signa et prodigia (539.48)
favens Christus (1143.7)	
inspirans Deus (557.17)	
ostendit Dominus miles ipsius emeritus quale donatium emeruit (1149.10)	fert Dominus [aliquem] de medio (1146.15)
prosperans Dominus (540.40), (1140.25)	

Accusative

laudare Deum (1141.13), (1143.14)	convertere ad Dominum (560.42)
	sequi Christum (1147.49)
inuocare Spiritum sanctum (1139.35), (1142.26)	nec metuere Deum (543.30)
orare ad Dominum (1145.2)	timere Deum (1139.42)
testari Deum (551.41)	emerere gratiam apud Deum (1146.20)
	deuotio in Christum (548.46)
irritare Deum (560. 40)	
placare Deum (560. 40)	in cuius manu post Deum constitit salus populi (539.37)

Genitive

corpus et sanguis Domini (550.34)
 genitrix Dei Maria (549.5), (1149.6)
 manus Domini (540.39), (552.27)
 nomen Domini (547.17)
 passio domini nostri Ihesu Christi
 (554.44)
 spiritus Dei (551.7)

cultor Dei (546.15), (1147.36)
 famulus Christi (1144.35)
 populus Dei (1145.42)
 sacerdos/sacerdotes Domini (1145.25),
 (1146.5)
 seruus Dei (1139.20)
 uir Domini (1140.44)

domus Dei (1142.24)
 ecclesia Dei (1142.27), (1145.24)
 regnum Dei (544.24)
 templum Domini (1144.1)

creatura Dei (545.28)
 famulatus Christi (1139.44)
 iniuria Dei (547.11)
 laus Domini (551.45)
 officium diuinum (1141.37)
 opus Dei (558.20)
 munus diuinum (1140.1)
 scriptura diuina (1140.11)

gloria Dei (558.31)
 honor Dei (1139.16)
 instinctus diuinus (1142.29)
 nutus diuinus (1149.31)
 ex parte Dei (1143.42)
 quoddam diuinum (1146.24)
 uis diuina (555.46)
 uoluntas Dei (556.10)

uirtus Dei/diuina (551.27), (552.26),
 (555.8), (555.41), (1146.8)

auxilium Dei/diuinum (543.13),
 (543.41)
 bonitas Dei/diuinum (552.13) (558.20)
 clementia Dei/diuina (551.15),
 (555.47), (557.10), (1147.20),
 (1148.44)
 dignatio diuina (558.27)
 fauor Dei (1149.48)
 gratia Dei/Christi/diuina (544.45),
 (545.28), (551.28), (551.40), (1143.11),
 (1143.30), (1150.33)
 ira Dei (560.39)
 misericordia/Dei/Domini/diuina
 (556.40), (560.44), (1149.1)
 patientia Dei (552.15)

sapientia diuina (1140.48)
 prescientia Dei (539.39)
 consilium diuinum (555.33)

dispensatio Dei (548.39)
 dispositio Dei/diuina (540.19),
 (541.13), (557.30)
 ordinatio Dei (1141.34)

arbitrium diuinum (542.8)
 districtio diuina (552.10), (555.22)
 examen Dei (556.22)
 iudicium Dei/diuinum (539.8),
 (539.35), (548.35), (555.11), (560.44)
 iusticia Dei/diuina (537.40), (552.13)

ultio diuina (538.4)

amor Dei/diuinus (1140.12), (1145.1)
 confessio Domini (540.14)

contemptus Dei (553.38)
 seruitio Christi domini (540.29)

timor Dei/diuinus (544.35), (552.24),
 (553.1), (557.7), (560.30), (1142.24)
 zelus Dei (1144.29)

Dative, Ablative

committi a Deo (546.15)
 remunerari a Deo (1139.14)
 reddi a Deo (1139.32)

dormire in Domino (1144.4)
 esse cum Christo (1146.7)

commendare [aliquem]/se Domino
 (549.7), (552.8)

agere gratias Deo (551.30), (1140.45),
 (1147.26), (1149.49)
 reddere laudes Domino (551.34)

facere confessionem Deo (554.28)

acceptabilis Domino (550.18)
 adoptare [aliquem] Christo (1139.47)

approbatus Deo (1141.28)
 astringere se Deo (1147.47)
 dedicare operum suorum initia Domino
 (548.44)
 deffere Deo (543.43)
 deuotus Deo (543.13)
 ducere heremiticam uitam Deo
 (1143.51)
 exhibuere se pium Deo (1143.26)
 militare Christo domino (540.17)
 obtemperare Deo (543.43)
 placitus Deo (538.6)
 tolerare pro Christo (1144.8)
 vacare Deo (1148.18)

postulare indulgentiam a Domino
 (554.29)
 expectare mercedem a Deo (1139.37)

TABLE 3

	Galbert			Walter			Difference
	#	%	Contexts	#	%	contexts	%
Nom.	55	28	50	14	9	13	-19
Acc.	28	14	25	15	10	12	-4
Gen.	70	36	37	97	63	60	+27
Dat./Abl.	44	22	32	29	19	25	-3
Total	197		144	155		110	