Volume XI Number 2

Autumn 1988

KING'S Theological Review

THE MYSTICAL MEANING OF SCRIPTURE: MEDIEVAL AND MODERN PRESUPPOSITIONS

GRACE M. JANTZEN

In 1506 Wynkyn de Worde, one of the foremost printers in England, published a book entitled *The Pilgrimage of Perfection*, in which he expresses great concern for the readers of Scripture of his time that they "lene all togyder to the litteral sense of scripture, and not to ye spiritual or mistical sense". Four and a half centuries later, theologians and Biblical scholars find it difficult to understand such motivation, let alone to share it. Mysticism in much modern thinking stands for subjective psychological states characterized by terms like ecstasy, union and ineffability.[1] In many book shops it is categorized with magic and the occult. In so far as the "mystical sense" of Scripture is remembered, it is thought of, often, as a web of pious fantasy spun by medieval authors who found free association more congenial than historical accuracy, and from which we have been mercifully delivered by modern critical scholarship. Wynkyn de Worde's fears that readers of the Bible will "lene all togyder to the litteral sense of scripture" have been fulfilled in a far greater measure than even he could have foreseen.

I do not wish to undervalue in any way the enormous gains in our understanding of the Bible made possible by modern historical and critical study, or the fruitfulness of recent approaches of narrative interpretation. Nevertheless, I suggest that the virtual disappearance of study of the mystical sense of scripture is both a symptom and a cause of our increasing intellectual and spiritual poverty. In this paper I wish to outline what was intended by the "mystical meaning of scripture" and thereby indicate some shifts in hermeneutical principles from medieval to modern times, particularly in relation to the spiritual life. These shifts are closely related to the drastic change from medieval to modern presuppositions of what mysticism is, and this will be a subtheme in what I have to say.

From patristic times through the Middle Ages and until the Reformation, the mystical meaning of Scripture was considered to be of primary importance. There were, of course, changes of nuance and emphasis during those centuries, and their view of Scripture and its exegesis was of course not monolithic.[2] For the purposes of this paper, however, I shall for the most part draw attention not to the differences, but to the similarity and continuity of presuppositions and hermeneutical principles, considering in turn their understanding of the purpose of Scripture, the goal which the interpretation of Scripture was intended to achieve, and the methods by which it was held that this goal could be accomplished.

1. The Purpose of Scripture

According to medieval students of the Bible, and consistent with their patristic sources, the purpose of Scripture could be understood only with reference to Christ. Christ is the Logos, the Word of God who brings the good news of the love of God to us, and thus restores us to God by his Incarnation. This message of Christ we receive through the tradition, which goes back to the apostles who had direct contact with Jesus, and it is confirmed by the Holy Spirit in his transforming action in our lives and communities. It is also recorded in the Gospels.

From this it follows that the Incarnation, understood with reference to our salvation, is the fundamental hermeneutical principle. Medieval students of the Scripture do not start with Biblical exegesis and work towards a theology; they start with the work of Christ for us and in us, and use this as the key to understanding Scripture. Biblical interpretation is therefore seen to be fundamentally related to worship, the worship of God with our whole minds as we seek to penetrate the biblical books, and with our whole selves as we are transformed into the image of Christ by means of that study.

Because Jesus the Incarnate Word has shown us that God's intention to us is an intention of love and reconciliation, and because Jesus drew on the Hebrew Scriptures in his teaching to make God's ways known to us, it follows that we have in Jesus both the principle and the example of how those Scriptures should be interpreted. Christ used the Scriptures to show "the things concerning himself", the way in which they found their fulfilment in him and his work of reconciliation. Accordingly the Scriptures are for us also the Word of God in a secondary sense; they point to Christ who is the Word of God in the primary sense. Hence it was held that everything in Scripture (indeed, every *word*, sometimes) pointed to him, and to our restoration to God through him. Boniface, in his *Ars Grammatica*, expressed it succinctly: To understand something *is* to see it in relation to Christ.[3]

This method of interpreting the Bible in terms of its relationship to Christ goes back at least to Origen, who in turn drew on the practices of allegorizing already prevalent with Philo the Jew, and Origen's mentor, Clement of Alexandria, and who exercised an influence on the Latin West through the translation of Rufinus. Origen discusses exegesis in some detail in his book *On First Principles*. Just, as in his view, a human being consists of body, soul and spirit, so also the Scripture has three corresponding levels of meaning: the literal, the moral, and the mystical or spiritual.[4] Origen considers the mystical meaning to be real and important; indeed, he takes it to be the most important of all the three senses, though often it is hidden in an obscure passage, or is something which would be a "stumbling block" if taken literally.[5] On the whole, the mystical meaning of Scripture is the one that shows its significance in relation to Christ. Thus, for example, Origen cites St Paul's discussion of the ancient Israelites' drinking of the water from the rock which Moses struck for them, an account which St Paul concludes with the statement, "And that rock was Christ". This procedure, by which the apostle finds the deepest meaning of the ancient Scripture fulfilled in Christ, is taken as normative.

The threefold sense of Scripture is often reduced by patristic writers, including Origen himself, to a twofold distinction between the literal and the mystical. The "mystical", again, is intended as an objective meaning, not a subjective fantasy, let alone a mere state of mind. The contrast between literal and mystical is in no way a contrast between objective and subjective, but rather the

contrast between the old covenant and the new, the letter and the spirit, the promise and the fulfilment. It is for this reason that the mystical meaning in patristic exegesis centres on Christ, who is the fulfilment of all the promises and the bringer of the new covenant.

In Origen this fulfilment was seen, sometimes, more in terms of the Christ-Logos than in terms of the historical Jesus; and it was partly for this reason that the Church took exception to his writings.[6] With the Cappadocian Fathers, however, influenced as they were by the strongly incarnational Christology of Irenaeus, the mystical meaning of Scripture is the meaning which interprets the passage in question in relation to the Incarnation and its redemptive significance. A famous example is Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Moses*. Gregory first recounts for his Hellenized readers the events of Moses as given in Jewish scriptures, and then proceeds to explain their spiritual or mystical meaning; the light of the burning bush becomes Christ the Radiance of the world; the manna is the Word, Christ, who comes down from heaven and is born of a virgin; even the rod that changed to a snake before Pharaoh is "a figure of the mystery of the Lord's incarnation" which frees those who are bound under the tyranny of the evil one.[7] Thus, the movement from the literal to the mystical sense is not a movement away from historical reality but rather a movement to a deeper understanding of its objective significance, as found in Christ.[8]

A delightful example in Western patristic writing of drawing out the mystical meaning of a passage of Scripture is found in Augustine's exposition of Psalm 89.6[9], which reads, in the version Augustine was commenting upon, "For who is he among the clouds who shall be compared unto thee, Lord?" Augustine was indignant at the very thought that this should be taken in no more than its straightforward sense:

> Does it appear to you, brethren, a high ground of praise, that the clouds cannot be compared to their Creator? If it is taken in its literal, not in its mystical meaning, is it not so: what? are the stars that are above the clouds to be compared with the Lord? what? can the sun, moon, angels, heavens, be even compared with the Lord?

He then proceeds to elucidate the mystical meaning, in which the clouds are compared, first to the flesh in general, as that which veils the brightness of the spirit (the sun); and then to the flesh of Jesus Christ in the Incarnation, which veiled the heavenly brightness of his divinity from human eyes.[10]

This idea of the mystical meaning of Scripture as the essence of its significance for us was developed and refined throughout the medieval period, with the "mystical" itself being subdivided into further categories. Thus, for example, Bonaventure in his *Breviloquium* explains that

> the depth of scripture consists in a multiplicity of mystical interpretations. Besides the literal sense, some passages have to be interpreted in three different manners, namely allegorically, morally, and tropologically. There is *allegory*, when one fact points to another, by reference to which one should believe. There is *tropology* or *morality*, when facts make us understand rules of conduct. There is *anagogy* or elevation of the mind towards the eternal felicity of the saints.[11]

Different thinkers subdivided the concept in different ways; but common to the writers of the late medieval hermeneutical tradition and on into the Reformation we find still the Christological focus which had been to the fore in patristic writings. Martin Luther took this up in his early *Dictata super Psalterium* of 1513-15. He distinguished between two meanings of the Old Testament, the literal-historical, and the literal-prophetic meaning, by which he means its significance to Jesus Christ and the Church. On this basis Luther maintained that Christ is the *sensus principalis* of Scripture, the one in whom it all hangs together. This Christological hermeneutical principle ties together all the senses of Scripture: the literal, and the various mystical senses – allegorical, tropological, and anagogical – in the central focus on Christ.[12]

Now, taking the Incarnation as the fundamental hermeneutical principle is relatively plausible in terms of the four Gospels, and these were indeed taken as the key to understanding all Scripture. But it is far from obvious in the case of other books of the canon: how could it be said that the accounts of the kings of Israel and Judah, or the cynicism of Ecclesiastes, or the meticulous details about clean and unclean beasts in Leviticus all really refer to Christ? Yet here again it was held that the Incarnation gives the clue. Just as Christ was really the divine Son of God though he became truly man for our sakes, so also all Scripture was genuinely the Word of God pointing to Christ for our redemption, though it was given in human forms. Just as the human flesh both revealed and concealed the divine Son, so the words of Scripture both reveal and conceal its full meaning. The eyes of the disciples had to be opened before they could recognize Jesus as the Son of God; just so must we be spiritually enlightened to discern Christ in all of Scripture. It was the task of the leaders of the faith to show the depth of meaning of Scripture: hence the examples of Gregory of Nyssa and Augustine already quoted, and the medieval practice of "glossing" the Scripture – that is, copying interpretative comments of the fathers either in the margins or interlinearly.[13]

Implicit in this is a further major hermeneutical principle, namely that of the unity of the Scriptures. Because of the Incarnation, the Bible can be known to be unlike any other book. It is the revelation of God's salvific intentions to humankind, the way in which the message of his love can penetrate our hearts. Accordingly, no Scripture is to be taken in isolation, but each part is to be compared to every other part, with the Gospels taking pride of place, because they are the primary testimony to Christ. Medieval authors were on the whole not oblivious of the fact that the books of the Bible were composed by a wide variety of authors writing in very diverse circumstances; and to a certain extent this was recognized to be important. But far more important than the question of what the original author "really meant" by any given passage was what the Holy Spirit, the primary Author, "meant". To the extent that they did concern themselves with the author's intentions they might follow the Alexandrians and say that although the

human writer was aware only of the historical meaning, the Holy Spirit used this to convey a mystical meaning as well, though this was not part of the author's intention. Or, less likely, they would follow the Antiochenes and say that the author was indeed aware of the mystical meaning which was divinely revealed to him, but that he deliberately veiled it in the historical meaning, just as Christ deliberately took flesh in the Incarnation.[14] But the more fundamental issue was not the human author's intentions, but the intention of God the Spirit, and this could be discussed only from the point of view of the Incarnation. In so far as the books of the Bible are Scripture, therefore, they are the unified Word of God pointing spiritually to the primary Word of God who is Christ.

The physical body of Christ was real and important, and so also is the literal or historical sense of Scripture. This is not to be ignored, and certainly not to be violated. Indeed, it is taken as the foundation upon which understanding of Scripture rests, without which there could be no revelation, just as there could be no Incarnation without a real human body of Christ. Some medieval exegetes like Andrew of St Victor made more of this foundation than others did,[15] but they all agreed that it was indispensible. But they agreed, also, that veiled by this historical sense is the inner mystical sense, and it is this which must be discerned. Should anyone get stuck on the historical sense to the exclusion of the mystical sense, that would be equivalent to recognizing the humanity of Christ only, and not his divinity, thereby missing the central point of the Incarnation.

The ever present danger of stressing these mystical meaning(s) of scripture was that exegesis could degenerate into sheer fantasy, with interpreters reading whatever they liked into the text and then dignifying their speculations with the term "mystical". Modern thinkers tend, partly for that reason, to dismiss the idea of a mystical meaning of Scripture; and it cannot be denied that in the Middle Ages there were times when fantasy went wild. It is also true, however, that medieval theologians had a different view than do modern thinkers of the role of the imagination in exegesis; we shall soon explore this further. Yet it should not be thought that medieval theologians were unaware of the danger of undisciplined fantasy; and we have already seen some of the ways in which their hermeneutical principles were intended to prevent it. In the first place, they held that while the spiritual sense is the essence, the literal sense is the foundation on which it is built, and any particular mystical interpretation must be established by the literal sense of the scriptures as a whole. Secondly, interpretation is not a private matter, but takes its place within the church and is subject to the corporate exegesis of the church. Because of this, it is subject above all to the transforming work of Christ in the lives of believers, and must be grounded in the Incarnation and the salvation through the love of God expressed therein.[16]

2. The Goal of Scripture Study

Since the purpose of Scripture is to lead women and men to Christ, and thus restore them to God and God's love for humankind, it follows that the aim of exegesis is to further this restoration. Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana* has been called the Magna Carta of medieval Biblical interpretation.[17] In it he said,

> Whoever... thinks that he understands the divine Scriptures or any part of them so that it does not build the double love of God and of our neighbour does not understand it at all.[18]

For the medieval exegetical tradition, this statement was normative. If Christ is at the centre of hermeneutics, then the goal of all Biblical study must be the building of love, *caritas*, which he restores. The mystical meaning of Scripture, therefore, has a moral dimension, not necessarily in the sense of implying rules or principles, but in the sense that it has an application to the reader's own relationship to Christ and the church. Bede, for instance, says that reading the Scriptures is receiving the bread of God by which "the Lord designates the secret meanings by which the world was to be nourished unto perpetual salvation".[19]

Since God's intention to humankind is revealed in Christ to be our salvation, and since all Scripture points to Christ, it follows that the aim of studying Scripture is our conversion, restoring us to the divine image that has been fractured by sin. It is not primarily the acquisition of information that is important, not even information about God, let alone about the historical authors and their circumstances. This is rather a means to an end, and that end is transformation into the love of God. Thus, the mystical meaning of Scripture is not something that we can learn while leaving everything else as it is. It is rather that which soaks us in the love of God. To use terms dear to the heart of Bernard of Clairvaux, it is the encounter with the love of Christ in the word of Scripture that transforms our hearts of stone into hearts of flesh, restoring us to dignity and freedom individually and collectively as we receive the grace of God. And for all his emphasis on the importance of Scripture, Bonaventure says at the end of *The Soul's Journey into God*

> But if you wish to know how these things come about,
> ask grace not instruction,
> desire not understanding,
> the groaning of prayer not diligent reading,
> the Spouse not the teacher,
> God not man,
> darkness not clarity,
> not light but fire
> that totally inflames and carries us into God...[20]

The study of Scripture is to take us beyond itself, to the heart of God; and though Scripture is indispensible as a means, it is not an end. Beyond the clarity of understanding is the darkness of God, the mystery that is not a problem to be solved but the living flame of love ignited in our lives by the encounter with that love in Christ through the words of the Bible.

Because of this (among other reasons), medieval exegetes had a rather different understanding of the role of imagination than is found in, say, modern Biblical critics. As Augustine had said,

> Whoever finds a lesson there useful to the building of charity, even though he has not said what the author may be shown to have intended in that place, has not been deceived, nor is he lying in any way.[21]

Imaginative meditation is to be encouraged, not cramped by the literal or historical sense, because it is by imaginative entry into the mystical sense of Scripture that we encounter and receive the love and grace of God in a way that allows that grace to penetrate our lives rather than be merely theoretical. Some particularly beautiful examples of this are to be found in the prayers of Anselm. Here, for instance, is the beginning of his "Prayer to St Mary Magdalene":

St Mary Magdalene,
you came with springing tears
to the spring of mercy, Christ;
from him your burning thirst was abundantly refreshed;
through him your sins were forgiven;
by him your bitter sorrow was consoled.
My dearest lady,
well you know by your own life
how a sinful soul can be reconciled with its creator,
what counsel a soul in misery needs,
what medicine will restore the sick to health...[22]

And it is this restoration that is the object of Anselm's meditation and prayer. Subsequent scholarship might object that Anselm is illegitimately running together various Marys of Scripture and tradition, and combining them with the woman at the well of the fourth Gospel; but in comparison with the depth of his meditation, such an objection, though accurate, is shallow.

That is not to say that anything goes. As already seen, the boundaries of meditation are set by the Incarnation, and thus more generally by consistency with the Gospels and the broad literal sense of Scripture which, like the flesh of Christ, must be transcended but never denied or violated. But within these boundaries the moral transformation enabled by imaginative engagement with the mystical meaning of the text is out of comparison more important than accuracy to the precise historical or literal meaning. "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

3. The Methods of Scripture Study

Implicit in what I have said about the goal of Biblical study are principles about how it should be undertaken. Since its aim was transformation into the love of God, it was obviously not a disinterested or objective stance, but one of prayer, contrition and worship. This is not to say that intellectual acumen was not brought to bear. On the contrary, medieval Biblical scholarship is characterized by great stretching of the mind, creative and disciplined thinking intended to "bring every thought into the captivity of Christ" and to love God with all one's mind. Augustine had instructed that Biblical scholars should make use of all the intellectual resources available in philosophy, grammar, rhetoric, and indeed all the liberal arts[23]. In medieval schools this was taken literally: students were admitted to formal Biblical study only after having completed the *quadrivium* and the *trivium*, the Seven Liberal Arts which included the study of logic and the classics, and might well take four or more years of solid study.[24] Indicative also of the sheer labour that was expended is the hand-copying of the Bible and its massive glosses, and the love that went into the intricate detail of manuscript illumination.

Nevertheless all this intellectual and manual labour was a product and expression of the context of prayer. In *De Doctrina Christiana*[25] Augustine had set forth seven steps for the understanding of Scripture. They begin with the fear of God and recognition of God's will which bring about moral purity and integrity, proceed through meekness and intellectual purgation, and culminate in the experience of the mercy of God which illuminates and leads to wisdom. The progression, and in particular the relationship between asceticism, integrity, and insight deserves a study in itself: for the present let me simply re-emphasize that a moral and intellectual will-to-integrity is recognized as necessarily inseparable from insight into Scripture, if by insight is meant not the acquisition of data merely, but the encounter with the love of God in Christ.

According to Benedict, his monastery was to be "a school for God's service"[26], a school where the monks would learn to receive and to give divine *caritas*. Inevitably, therefore, the study of Scripture according to the principles I have sketched was an indispensible part of Christian formation in the monastery, and the practices of the monastery were inseparable from the developing quest for the mystical meaning of Scripture. Two aspects of monastic life which both expressed and gave shape to this quest were the *lectio divina* and the liturgy.

The *lectio divina*, the private or public reading of Scripture, was given a large place in developing monasticism. Even when this reading was done privately, it was often done semi-audibly, forming the words of Scripture with the lips and tongue; and it was done ruminatively, chewing over the sense and sound of each word and passage, and thus inscribing it upon the memory. The monks tried to learn the Scriptures "by heart", committing them to memory and being so immersed in them that thought and life flowed out of them.[27] Thus, we find in Bernard of Clairvaux, one example among many others, that his writings are a catena of Scriptural phrases and allusions. He thinks his thoughts in Biblical language, and though they are formed by that language they are still his, and highly original. Choosing a passage at random, we find in the second Sermon on the Song of Songs the following:

> How shall I, mere dust and ashes, presume that God takes an interest in me? He is entirely taken up with loving his Father, he has no need of me or of what I possess... If it be really true, as you prophets have said, that God has determined to show mercy, to reveal himself in a more favourable light, let him establish a covenant of peace, an everlasting covenant with me by the kiss of his mouth. If he will not revoke his given word, let him empty himself, let him humble himself, let him bend to me and kiss me with the kiss of his mouth.[28]

In these few lines are at least eight quotations from the Vulgate;[29] woven together to express Bernard's own intentions. The rich layers of nuance and allusion made possible by this immersion in Scripture is the outward manifestation of the inner encounter with Christ in prayerful attentiveness to the Word.

As such, it could be said to be sacramental, and a reflection also of the liturgy. The mystical meaning of

Scripture, the encounter with Christ through the sacred page, is importantly parallel to the encounter with him in the Eucharist, his mystical body and blood. It is no accident that both are called "mystical": in each case the reference is to the divine reality given in and through the physical. In neither case is the physical dispensible; in both cases it must be understood as more than it appears. The celebration of the Eucharist, the receiving of Christ through the elements of bread and wine, is the communal enactment and context of the reception of Christ which also takes place in Scripture.

From this it is apparent that the grasp of the mystical meaning of Scripture, like the reception of the mystical body and blood of Christ, is not a matter of purely private consolation. It is communal, both in the sense that it is in the context of a worshipping community that it is received, shared and tested, and also in the sense that the development of *caritas* which is its goal cannot but have social and political consequences. It is no accident that the monasteries, devoted to learning the mystical meaning of Scripture, were also often oases of social justice, and addressed themselves to the problems of poverty, illness, and ignorance and to political and ecclesiastical structures that reinforced these social ills. The measure of the encounter with the *caritas* of Christ in Scripture is the measure of the transformation of life, individually and communally, into his likeness.

We cannot go back behind the legacy of the Reformation and the Enlightenment, and its impact upon Biblical scholarship. Nor should we want to. It would be foolish indeed to reject the gains of historical and literary insight into Scripture, or to refuse to take seriously its criticisms of medieval hermeneutical procedure. But I suggest that if in the process we "lene all togyder to the litteral sense of scripture, and not to ye spiritual or mistical sense", as Wynken de Worde feared, and if we lose thereby the transformation of our lives and societies by failing to encounter in Scripture the love and justice of Christ, the divine Word, then our loss is incomparably greater than our gain.

FOOTNOTES

I wish to thank Janet Morley for insights derived from our discussions of this paper.

1. This is in large part a legacy of William James *The Varieties of Religious Experience* Gifford Lectures of 1901-2 and still regularly reprinted and regarded as normative for much subsequent thinking about mysticism. For a penetrating account of the inadequacy of James' position see Nicholas Lash *Easter in Ordinary: Reflections on Human Experience and the Knowledge of God*, (London, SCM, 1988).
2. A standard discussion of medieval interpretation of Scripture is Henri de Lubac *Exégèse Médiévale: Les quatre sens de l'Ecriture*, 2 Vols. (Paris, 1959-). See also Beryl Smalley *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3rd edition (Oxford, Blackwells, 1983).
3. Cf. Jean Leclercq's discussion of Boniface in his *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study in Monastic Culture*, (London, SPCK, 1978) pp. 47-50.
4. Origen *On First Principles*, IV.9.
5. Ibid. IV.2.9.
6. Cf. K. J. Torjesen *Hermeneutical Procedure and Theological Method in Origen's Exegesis*, Patristische Texte und Studien (Berlin and New York, de Gruyeter, 1986). For an example in Origen where fulfilment of the mystical meeting goes beyond the historical Jesus, see Homily XXVII in Numbers, where the 42 stopping places of the Israelites in the wilderness are interpreted first in terms of the 42 ancestors of the incarnate Christ, but then also in terms of the steps toward perfection which the pilgrim soul should pursue. Rowan Greer, ed., *Origen*, Classics of Western Spirituality (London, SPCK, and New York, Paulist Press, 1979) pp. 245-269. I am grateful to Christoph Schwöbel for his helpful comments on this point.
7. Gregory of Nyssa *The Life of Moses* trans. Abraham Malherbe and Everett Ferguson, Classics of Western Spirituality (London, SPCK, and New York, Paulist Press, 1978); the references are II.26, 27, 139-40.
8. Cf. Andrew Louth *Discerning the Mystery: An Essay on the Nature of Theology*, (Oxford, Clarendon, 1983) ch. V.
9. In the Vulgate, Psalm 88.
10. Augustine *Expositions on the Book of Psalms* Philip Schaff, ed., Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church Vol. VIII (Wm B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1888, reprinted 1983).
11. Bonaventure *Breviloquium* Prologue 4.1. *The Works of Bonaventure* 5 vols. trans. José de Vinck (Patterson, New Jersey, St. Anthony Guild Press, 1960-1970).
12. Alistair McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1985) p. 80; cf p. 122. McGrath notes that Luther later shifted to an increased emphasis on the tropological, though this if anything reinforced the emphasis on Christ.
13. Cf. G. R. Evans, *The Logic and Language of the Bible Vol. I The Earlier Middle Ages; Vol. II The Road to Reformation* (Cambridge, 1984-5).
14. Smalley, op. cit., pp. 6-20.
15. Ibid., ch. IV.
16. Cf. Aquinas, *In I Sent*, Prologue q.1 a.5 and a.7; Jean Gerson, *De Sensu literali sacrae scripturae*.
17. By Sandra Schneiders in "Scripture and Spirituality" in Bernard McGinn et al., eds., *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century* (New York, Crossroad, and London, RKP, 1987) p. 14.
18. Augustine *On Christian Doctrine* Bk. I. XXXVI trans D. W. Robertson Jr. The Library of Liberal Arts (New York, Bobbs-Merrill, 1958).
19. Quoted by Benedicta Ward in *Fairacres Chronicle*, Vol. 21 no. 1, Spring 1988, p. 15.
20. Bonaventure, *The Soul's Journey into God*, VII.6 trans. Ewert Cousins Classics of Western Spirituality (New York, Paulist Press, and London, SPCK, 1978).
21. *On Christian Doctrine*, Bk I.XXXVI.
22. *The Prayers and Meditations of St Anselm*, trans. Benedicta Ward, (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, Penguin, 1973) p. 201.
23. *On Christian Doctrine*, Bk. II.XL; BK. IV.III, IV, XI, etc.
24. Cf. William Boyd, *The History of Western Education*, Eleventh edition revised by Edmund J. King (London, Adam and Charles Black, 1975) Ch. V.
25. Bk. II.VII.
26. Prologue *The Rule of St Benedict*, trans. Anthony C. Meisel and M. L. del Mastro (New York, Image Books, Doubleday, 1975).
27. Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, pp. 88-96.
28. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs*, Vol. I Serm. 2.6, trans Kilian Walsh, OCSO (Cistercian Publications, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1977).
29. They are Sir. 10.9; Ps. 15.2; Ps. 76.8; Sir. 45.30; Is. 61.8; Ps. 888.35; Phil. 2.7; Song 1.1. (Psalms are numbered as in the Vulgate.)