



UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI



<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Helda

From Author to Authority: Anselm's public reputation and the Council of Bari (1098)

Niskanen, Samu

Taylor and Francis Ltd.

2023

Niskanen, S 2023, 'From Author to Authority: Anselm's public reputation and the Council of Bari (1098)', *Journal of Medieval History*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03044181.2022.2153381>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/585228>

10.1080/03044181.2022.2153381

unspecified

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

From author to authority: Anselm's public reputation and the Council of Bari (1098)

Samu Niskanen

N.B. This is not the final edited text, for which see the *Journal of Medieval History*, 49 (2023), 1–22.

Department of Philosophy, History, Culture and Art Studies, University of Helsinki, Finland

samu.niskanen@helsinki.fi

ABSTRACT: Anselm of Canterbury (†1109) was already, during his own lifetime, considered an authoritative learned writer across Latin Christendom. This essay argues that it was his triumph at the Council of Bari in 1098, where he delivered a full-length speech on the Procession of the Holy Spirit and was cited by the pope as an authority, which elevated him to such an unusual status for a living author. The proposition is advanced by three arguments. Setting out the historical context, the first of these explores how Anselm came to be charged with a major conciliar assignment. The second explores events before and during the council, and assesses his achievement in terms of medieval literary theory. The final section demonstrates how his new renown provided him with readerships in regions where his works had not previously penetrated. The evidence derives from contemporary remarks and early manuscripts, many of which have gone unobserved in Anselmian scholarship.

Anselm of Canterbury (†1109), prior and then abbot of Bec in Normandy between 1063 and 1093 and subsequently archbishop of Canterbury, has been accepted as an eminent author ever since his own day.¹ What follows is an attempt to explain how he came to be respected, during his own lifetime, as an authoritative voice across Latin Christendom. The contention here is that a decisive factor in that triumph was his achievement at the Council of Bari in October 1098, where one of his works was cited by the pope and where he then delivered a plenary speech, the doctrinal context of which was the great controversy between Latin and Greek Christianity on the *filioque* addition to the Nicene Creed. Significantly, Eadmer, a member of Anselm's household, a participant in the council and subsequently Anselm's biographer, made a connexion between his master's international fame as an author and Bari.² Although only a brief aside, Eadmer's remark is significant; Anselm's later reputation has depended above all on his writings. Importantly, evidence for how he published is unusually rich, such as to enable a detailed exposition of his self-assertion and contemporary recognition as an author especially in domestic and proximate regions in France and England.³ Continuing

* I am indebted to Dr James Willoughby, Dr Jakub Kujawinski, the anonymous reviewers, the editor of this journal and the participants of the 2019 conference 'Anselm of Canterbury: Nature, Order and the Divine' at the University of Durham and of the Medieval Publishing Seminar at the University of Helsinki. Any remaining errors of judgement or fact are my own. This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 716538 (Medieval Publishing from c.1000 to 1500).

¹ The following abbreviations are used in this article: BAV: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana; BL: British Library; BM: Bibliothèque municipale / Médiathèque; BnF: Bibliothèque nationale de France; *Ep*: *Epistola(e)*; MGH: Monumenta Germaniae Historica; MS: manuscript; PL: Patrologia cursus completus. Series Latina. All translations are my own.

² Eadmer, *Historia nouorum in Anglia*, ed. Martin Rule. Rolls Series 81 (London: Longman, 1884), 106; see note 125 below. Eadmer wrote two books about Anselm. He began what became *Vita Sancti Anselmi*, a hagiographical biography, during Anselm's lifetime, even before the Council of Bari. The writing was halted on Anselm's order c.1100 and resumed after his death. Eadmer issued several redactions between c.1112 and c.1125, for which see *The Life of St Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. Richard W. Southern (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), viii–xii. Eadmer wrote *Historia nouorum*, a deliberation on Anselm's career as archbishop and Canterbury's prestige, after his death in several campaigns of execution; see ed. Rule, 217; Benjamin Pohl, 'The (Un)Making of a History Book: Revisiting the Earliest Manuscripts of Eadmer of Canterbury's *Historia nouorum in Anglia*', *The Library*, 7th ser. 20 (2019): 340–70 (362 and 368), and, for previous scholarship, 342–5. For Eadmer's authorial intentions, see John Gillingham, 'The Sins of a Historian: Eadmer of Canterbury, *Historia Nouorum in Anglia*, Books I–IV', *Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2019*, ed. S.D. Church, *Anglo-Norman Studies* 42 (Woodbridge: Boydell), 61–75, which redefines the discussion on Eadmer's (lack of) veracity.

³ Richard Sharpe, 'Anselm as Author: Publishing in the Late Eleventh Century', *Journal of Medieval Latin* 19 (2009): 1–87.

that discussion, this essay seeks to identify and explain central junctures in how he first came to be reputed as an authority in regions further from home. His is a rare case showing how this could happen to an eleventh-century writer in the course of his own lifetime. For years, he had been widely respected as an authority in Anglo-Norman learned circles, but the papal and conciliar endorsement, communicated in spectacular fashion, bestowed on him a lustre that made a difference.⁴ It will be argued that the Bari affair granted Anselm a new prominence, which gave him a relevance to the wider church and a platform by which to obtain faraway readerships for his writings.⁵

Anselm's triumph at the Council of Bari in 1098 will be illustrated here by way of three discussions. The first is an enquiry into how he came to be charged with delivering a conciliar address on trinitarian doctrine. Readerships for his treatises had hitherto been confined to England and France, and his relations with the papacy had reached a breaking point in 1095, so the matter needs some explanation. The focus is on his previous connexions to Pope Urban II, direct and indirect. The second discussion analyses the preparations for the council and Anselm's performance there. The objective is to assess in terms of medieval literary theory how his status as a theological author came to be so elevated at the council.⁶ Employing the medieval concept

⁴ For the recognition of his authority as a teacher before his preferment in 1093, see e.g. Anselm, *Ep* i.115, in *Letters of Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. S. Niskanen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 338–41.

⁵ For recent scholarship on authorial publishing in the Middle Ages, see Richard and Mary Rouse, 'Publishing Watriquet's *Dits*', *Viator* 32 (2001): 127–75; Paul Meyvaert, 'Medieval Notions of Publication: The "Unpublished" *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum* and the Council of Frankfurt (794)', *Journal of Medieval Latin* 12 (2002): 78–89; Gilbert Ouy, 'Le Célestin Jean Gerson: copiste et éditeur de son frère', in *La collaboration dans la production de l'écrit médiéval. Actes du XIIIe colloque du Comité international de paléographie latine (Weingarten, 22–25 septembre 2000)*, ed. Herrad Spilling (Paris: École des chartes, 2003), 281–313; Olivier Delsaux, 'La publication d'auteur en moyen français: enjeux d'une définition à partir du cas de Christine de Pizan. Une recherche en chantier', *Le moyen français* 63 (2008): 9–44; Sharpe, 'Anselm as author'; Daniel Hobbins, *Authorship and Publicity before Print: Jean Gerson and the Transformation of Late Medieval Learning* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009); Jaakko Tahkokallio, *The Anglo-Norman Historical Canon. Publishing and Manuscript Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019); Samu Niskanen, 'The emergence of a literary culture: authorial publication in Denmark in the long twelfth century', in *The Meaning of Media: Texts and Materiality in Medieval Scandinavia*, ed. Anna Catharina Horn, Karl G. Johansson (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 71–91.

⁶ It should be noted that the word 'theology' and its derivatives regained currency only in the twelfth century and later, and that Anselm and his contemporaries applied other terms and concepts to describe their activities in that line; G.E.M. Gasper, 'Theology at Le Bec', in *A Companion to the Abbey of Le Bec in the Central Middle Ages*

of *auctoritas*, the discussion argues that Anselm gained a new eminence through papal endorsement. The final section demonstrates that his triumph at Bari was a crucial factor in his emergence as an intellectual celebrity across Latin Christendom. The evidence, drawn mainly from references in his letters and manuscripts of his works, provides insights into how his fame was spreading—a significant moment in which was Urban’s council at St Peter’s in 1099—and how he obtained new readerships in France, Ireland, Germany, and Italy.

Invitation to deliver a conciliar speech

Anselm’s attendance at the Council of Bari was contingent upon his first exile from England in 1097–1100, which resulted from his profound disagreement with King William II about the extent of ecclesiastical loyalties to the crown. The divergence in their opinions had manifested itself in a series of conflicts that began almost immediately after Anselm’s nomination to the archbishopric in 1093. Anselm left England for Rome in November 1097 in order to consult Pope Urban II in person.⁷ Visiting major churches en route, such as Saint Bertin in Flanders and Cluny and Lyon, he and his companions travelled at a leisurely pace. They arrived at the papal curia towards the end of April 1098. Urban II gave Anselm a splendid reception,

(*11th–13th Centuries*), ed. Benjamin Pohl and Laura L. Gathagan (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 206–27 (207–8). For Anselm as a precursor to the theologians, see Sita Steckel, *Kulturen des Lehrens im Früh- und Hochmittelalter: Autorität, Wissenskonzepte und Netzwerke von Gelehrten* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2011), 975–86, 1004–5, 1181–2. The word ‘theology’ is, accordingly, used in the present essay only as a generic term to distinguish between learned inquiry into specific questions that would now be considered theological and into those pertinent to secular domains. For the latter, Anselm’s *Quomodo grammaticus* is a case in point. His prayers and meditations likewise fall outside the definition of theology applied here, with the exception of the *Proslogion*, a rationalistic inquiry into God’s essence but shaped as a prayer.

⁷ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, ed. Southern, 88–9 and 91–100 (II.17 and 20–4); *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 79–88. Modern commentators regard the exile either as self-imposed, resonating with the testimony of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, or as mandated by the king, following Eadmer. See Richard W. Southern, *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 274–8; Frank Barlow, *William Rufus* (London: Methuen, 1983), 374–6; Sally N. Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan: The Innocence of the Dove and the Wisdom of the Serpent* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press), 199–207, and *Archbishop Anselm 1093–1109: Bec Missionary, Canterbury Primate, Patriarch of Another World* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), 96–8; John Gillingham, *William II. The Red King* (London: Allen Lane, 2015), 34–8 and ‘Sins of a Historian’, 70–5.

according to Eadmer.⁸ The pope acclaimed him as extraordinarily learned in the liberal arts, profoundly pious, someone whom the pope should be consulting rather than the other way round. Such praise alluded by implication to Anselm's conciliar speech, then upcoming. Writing in retrospect, Eadmer may have recast Urban's tributes. However, conciliar speeches of great consequence 'would not have been made off the cuff', and it has been assumed that it was during conversations with the pope in Rome that Anselm received the commission to prepare to defend the Latin doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit at the Council of Bari.⁹ This would explain why Anselm was instructed to be accessible to the pope in the coming months.¹⁰

The delegation to Anselm of a central conciliar speech could hardly have been Urban's private resolution, taken without consultation. Before exploring this proposition it will be necessary briefly to chronicle their previous connexions. As abbot of Bec, in 1089 or 1090, Anselm had received a letter from Urban concerning the scandalous career of Fulk, bishop of Beauvais, who was a monk of Bec. The letter began by crediting Anselm with 'a prerogative in religion and learning'.¹¹ Urban already knew Anselm as a remarkable teacher, knowledge of which must have been acquired from papal servants involved in the Beauvais affair who were acquainted with Anselm; these were Brother John and Hugh of Die, to be introduced below. Anselm responded with a letter, which supported Bishop Fulk's endeavour to reform his diocese and requested a papal exemption from episcopal control over the abbey of Bec.¹² While the latter was not granted, it was a victory for the house that Urban chose to side with

⁸ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, ed. Southern, 93–106 (II.21–29); *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 88–96.

⁹ Sharpe, 'Anselm as Author', 50; Southern, *Portrait in a Landscape*, 279.

¹⁰ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, ed. Southern, 106 (II.29) and *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 96–7. These connect Urban's command to making arrangements to support Anselm against King William II. It will be argued shortly that Eadmer's testimonies to that effect are too biased to be trusted uncritically.

¹¹ 'Religionis ac scientiae tuae praerogatiuam [...]', Anselm, *Ep* i.109, ed. Niskanen, 320.

¹² Anselm, *Ep* i.110, ed. Niskanen, 324–9.

Fulk. An associate as a prelate in France would have been an asset for Bec, which had accumulated properties beyond the borders of the duchy of Normandy.¹³ The matter was complicated, however: Fulk was a corrupt bishop, suspected of simony and subsequently complicity in murder and treason. Anselm sent a second letter to Urban to propose that Fulk be discharged owing to his incompetence. The letter also sought to excuse the fact that Anselm had given his abbatial blessing to Fulk's episcopal preferment.¹⁴ If Urban responded, the letter does not survive. Nor did he release Fulk from office.

Anselm's next encounter with the papacy, following his preferment to the archbishopric of Canterbury in 1093, was a complex affair with dramatic exchanges on both sides. At that time King William II had not yet chosen whether to recognize Urban II or 'Clement III' as the lawful pope. A political drama ensued, which has captivated historians ever since.¹⁵ The king rejected Anselm's request for permission to visit Urban II in order to receive the pallium, a vestment the archbishop of Canterbury was entitled to wear. Urban's chief objective was to secure recognition by the English crown. The pallium became a bargaining chip in the process. In 1095 the vestment was brought to England by a papal legate, Cardinal-Archbishop Walter of Albano, and put into the king's hands. Anselm was not invited to, or even informed of, negotiations between the king and the papal legate.¹⁶ Royal hostility had made the archbishop of Canterbury a liability to the papal cause. Anselm responded in kind. When Cardinal Walter subsequently proposed a collaboration for the reform of the English Church, Anselm refused even to meet him, citing various excuses.¹⁷ Walter in turn sent a severe

¹³ Constant J. Mews, 'St Anselm, Roscelin and the See of Beauvais', in *Anselm: Aosta, Bec and Canterbury: Papers in Commemoration of the Nine-Hundredth Anniversary of Anselm's Enthronement as Archbishop, 25 September 1093*, ed. David E. Luscombe and Gillian R. Evans (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 106–19 (107–9, 111–12).

¹⁴ Anselm, *Ep* i.111, ed. Niskanen, 329–31.

¹⁵ For modern commentary, see note 7 above.

¹⁶ Eadmer, *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 68–73.

¹⁷ Anselm, *Ep* 191, in *Sancti Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, ed. F.S. Schmitt. 6 vols. (Seckau, Rome, Edinburgh: Nelson, 1938–61), 4: 77–8.

reprimand. The letter does not survive but its main articles were referred to in Anselm's reply. Walter had asserted that Anselm's excuses were invalid; that he had been offered no help in England; that Anselm had isolated himself from his bishops; that Anselm had been consecrated by schismatics and had become one himself; that Anselm still refused to meet with him; and that Anselm obstructed the brethren of Christ Church so as to make use of their possessions. Walter may well have been genuinely offended by Anselm's reluctance to acknowledge him, but his outburst was probably in part a performative affect to intimidate Anselm into collaboration. Anselm's frustration with Urban and his circle is evident, however. In stark contrast with his habitual epistolary discretion, he openly expressed annoyance: 'I certainly did not endorse the cause of the Lord Pope Urban for nothing (as the kingdom of England is my witness), so that I should see how I have deserved this from him or his servants'.¹⁸

A reconciliation was arranged before Walter left England, as is implied by the politeness of Anselm's next letter to him. The letter requests that the cardinal carry and commend a *munusculum* ('a little gift') to Urban II. The gift is referred to also in a letter Anselm addressed to the pope, which Walter is likely to have carried.¹⁹ In epistolary contexts, the word 'munusculum' was commonly used as a metonym for a writing submitted together with a letter.²⁰ Eleventh-century instances include Franco of Liège, Bertha of Vilich, Otloh of St

¹⁸ 'Nempe non sic accepi teste regno Angliae nomen domini Urbani papae in vanum, ut hoc me ab illo vel a fidelibus eius meruisse cognoscam'; Anselm, *Ep* 192, ed. Schmitt, 4: 81. For a brief but insightful reconsideration of Walter's legation, and especially Eadmer's account of it, see Gillingham, 'Sins of a Historian', 73–4.

¹⁹ Anselm, *Ep* 193 and 194, ed. Schmitt, 4: 83 and 84.

²⁰ Alberto Casadei, "'Canticam... offero'" e altri problemi esegetici', in *Nuove inchieste sull'epistola a cangrande. Atti della giornata di studi Pisa 18 dicembre 2018*, ed. Alberto Casadei (Pisa: Pisa University Press, 2020), 129–52 (136–7). The connexion, with the emphasis that it was only a possibility, was made in Walter Fröhlich, *Letters of Anselm*, 3 vols. (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1990–4), 2: 124 note 8. The comment does not betray awareness of the above-mentioned philological aspect.

Emmeram, and Petrus Damiani.²¹ The best candidate for Anselm's *munusculum* is, I argue, *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, a treatise intimately related to his controversy with Roscelin of Compiègne (to be discussed below), which he is known to have addressed to Urban II some years before the Council of Bari.²² Anselm's references to his 'little gift' are admittedly oblique, such that the proposed identification cannot be conclusive. Even so, the sum of semantic, physical, and chronological coincidence with *De incarnatione* and its despatch to the pope is notable. As for the physical coincidence, a hint that the *munusculum* could have been *De incarnatione* is that as it is described in the said two letters, the gift was of no great proportion or length ('quantitas'). *De incarnatione* is a short piece. For instance, in the near contemporary manuscript, Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 1. 37 (fols. 38r–45r), it occupies a little less than a quire.

The chronological aspect needs a brief discussion. To construe Anselm's little gift as *De incarnatione* is to propose that he published it in 1095.²³ He had written a draft already in the early 1090s, when he was still abbot of Bec, but soon put it aside. These details can be inferred from a letter in which he requested his brethren send the sketch to him in England,

²¹ Franco of Liège, *De quadratura circuli*, ed. J.-P. Migne. PL 143, new edn. (Paris: Apud Garnier fratres, editores et J.-P. Migne successores, 1882), col. 1375; Bertha of Vilich, *Vita Adelheidis abbatissae Vilicensis et Sanctae Mariae Coloniensis*, ed. O. Holder-Egger. MGH Scriptores 15 (Hanover: Hahn, 1888), 755; Otloh of Sankt Emmeram, *De admonitione clericorum et laicorum*, ed. J.-P. Migne. PL 146, new edn. (Paris: Apud Garnier fratres, editores et J.-P. Migne successores, 1884), col. 246; Adam of Bremen, *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum*, ed. B. Schmeidler. MGH Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi 2 (Hanover, 1917), 281; *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. K. Reindel. MGH Briefe der deutschen Keiserzeit 4, 4 vols. (Munich, 1983–93), 3: 507 (*Ep* 40).

²² Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, ed. Southern, 72–3 (II.10), implying that the despatch took place years, rather than months, before the council.

²³ Previous suggestions were made by Constant J. Mews, 'St Anselm and Roscelin: Some New Texts and their Implications. I. The *De incarnatione Verbi* and the *Disputatio inter christianum et gentilem*', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 58 (1991): 55–98 (58) suggesting that completion took place 'soon after' Anselm's appointment as archbishop; Sharpe, 'Anselm as author', 22, 36–40, 42, 86, puts forward the time-frame of 1093–4; Southern, *Portrait in a Landscape*, xxvii and 180 suggests, respectively, the year 1094 and a point of time within two years of Anselm's election as archbishop; Giles E. M. Gasper, *Anselm of Canterbury and his Theological Inheritance* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 38, proposes that the treatise was sent to the pope c.1095.

which he was visiting at the turn of 1092.²⁴ As such, the project was resumed some months or weeks before his preferment to the office of archbishop in March 1093. A copy of this draft or, less likely, a subsequent one, designating him as abbot and addressed ‘to all masters and fathers and brothers observant of catholic and apostolic faith’, is preserved in a partial autograph manuscript of William of Malmesbury, now Lambeth Palace, MS 224.²⁵ Passages from yet another draft, which lies between William’s text and the final version, survive in Hereford Cathedral, MS P. I. 1.²⁶ This text was likewise written, or at least begun, before Anselm’s preferment to Canterbury and was shaped as a circular rather than an address to a specific party.²⁷ A further sketch, towards chapters 10–11 of *De incarnatione*, survives in three manuscripts.²⁸ Finally, two authorial recensions of a complete text, which designates Anselm as archbishop and is addressed to Urban II, are known.²⁹ The differences between the earlier drafts and the final version are remarkable, albeit they mainly concern expression rather than argument. As for the first draft, it extends to less than half the length of the final recension; much of the text was rewritten; much was suppressed and much added; propositions were repositioned.³⁰ This number of recensions testifies either to a period of

²⁴ Anselm, *Ep* i.128, ed. Niskanen, 376–7.

²⁵ Anselm, *Epistolae de incarnatione verbi prior recensio*, ed. Schmitt, 1: 281: ‘Dominis et patribus et fratribus omnibus catholicae et apostolicae fidei cultoribus’.

²⁶ For the discovery of this manuscript, see R.W. Southern, ‘St. Anselm and His English Pupils’, *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 1 (1941): 3–34 (31–4). Schmitt, who had published an edition of the draft preserved by William of Malmesbury in 1938, reports variant readings from the Hereford manuscript in the apparatus to his edition of the final version of *De incarnatione*. Inclined to categorize textual variation as resulting from authorial emendation, Schmitt proposed that the Hereford manuscript conveys material also from two subsequent recensions; ‘Cinq recensions de l’*Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* de S. Anselme de Cantorbéry’, *Revue Bénédictine* 51 (1939): 275–87 (279–82). These texts probably belong to the same recension, however; Mews, ‘Anselm and Roscelin, I’, 59–60.

²⁷ Anselm, *De incarnatione*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 3, apparatus criticus; Southern, ‘Anselm and His Pupils’, 32.

²⁸ Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 269; London, BL, Royal 5 E. XIV; Cambridge, University Library, Dd. 1. 21. The text, *Cur Deus magis*, was identified by and edited by Mews, ‘Anselm and Roscelin, I’, 82–5; for the nature of variance between this draft and the final recension, see a table at pp. 61–2.

²⁹ The earlier recension is known from two manuscripts, BAV, Reg. lat. 452 and Paris, BnF, lat. 2479. For an instance in which this text is obviously intermediate between the first recension and the final version, see Schmitt, ‘Cinq recensions’, 284, especially the clause ‘sicut illi aliud – aliud esse filium’. Cf. Sharpe, ‘Anselm as Author’, 41 note 106.

³⁰ For the nature of rephrasing, see a table in Southern, ‘Anselm and His Pupils’, 33 and the apparatus of Schmitt’s edition, 2: 3–20. As for suppressions, additions, and reordering, the latter records more than twenty cases, excluding those of only one or two words.

concentrated effort or a prolonged authorial process, disrupted several times.³¹ While it cannot be determined with certainty which of those two solutions holds true, it should be kept in mind that having been made abbot of Bec, Anselm did not compose a theological treatise for at least five years, a silence he ascribed to his official obligations.³² A recently installed archbishop would likewise have had pressing and time-consuming duties, impeding other undertakings.

It may be added that the letter to Urban II mentioning the *munusculum* intercedes for Bishop Fulk of Beauvais. Anselm had previously requested, as mentioned, that the pope release Fulk from office on account of the man's ineptitude.³³ If my reading of the word *munusculum* is correct, Anselm positions himself in the letter first as a mediator on behalf of someone he had formerly denounced, and then as a defender of orthodoxy. Should the former role have been taken as a lapse, the latter would have made amends for it.

By Eadmer's account, the submission of *De incarnatione* to the pope opened up an avenue to Bari for Anselm. In his *Vita Anselmi*, a biography with hagiographical purpose, Eadmer remarks briefly that the pope was so impressed with *De incarnatione* that he later cited it before the council.³⁴ Written with hindsight, that short observation embodies Eadmer's authorial intention of celebrating Anselm and his career. To rely on the *Vita Anselmi*'s here offering a statement of fact, one would need independent corroboration. Neither Anselm's massive letter collection nor his works' earliest manuscripts suggest dissemination or an impact for his works on the continent other than in France at this stage. There is also evidence

³¹ For a detailed discussion of the composition of *De incarnatione*, see Mews, 'Anselm and Roscelin, I', 63–8.

³² Sharpe, 'Anselm as Author', 20–22, 86; he may have written his only secular treatise, *Quomodo grammaticus*, of no great length, during that period; Anselm, *Ep* i.88, ed. Niskanen, 258–9.

³³ Anselm, *Ep* 193, ed. Schmitt, 4: 83.

³⁴ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, ed. Southern, 72–3 (II.10).

that in 1098 Anselm personally presented the pope with another copy of *De incarnatione*, the implication being that the one carried by Walter had been lost.³⁵ What is more, upon accounting in the curia for his legatine mission to England, Cardinal Walter hardly enthused over Anselm, with whom he had clashed. Recommendations by other associates would have been a prerequisite for the papal decision to entrust Anselm with a major conciliar role in 1098. To see how this might have happened, one must chart the network of admirers who enjoyed recognition at the curia.

In the course of his unhurried journey from England to Rome in 1097–8, Anselm held prolonged meetings with the two most powerful papal associates north of the Alps, both of whom communicated frequently with Urban and his curia. The first was Abbot Hugh of Cluny (†1109). Anselm spent the Christmas of 1097 at Cluny as his guest.³⁶ Their conversations resulted in a friendship, which Hugh celebrated in a letter in 1101 × 1103.³⁷ Apparently in 1099 or 1100, he invited Anselm to deliver a sermon in Cluny, a token of remarkable esteem.³⁸ Endowed with its famous liberty of being under the pope's sole jurisdiction, Cluny was a reservoir of papal reformers. The prime manifestation of that bond was Urban II.³⁹ The pope was a monk of Cluny, who had served as its grand prior, in which capacity he had been Abbot Hugh's closest aide. Even as pope, Urban regarded Hugh as his master, to whom he was 'son and disciple'.⁴⁰ Hugh's admiration for a person would have

³⁵ Samu Niskanen 'Anselm's so-called *Commendatio operis ad Vrbanum papam II*: its affiliation, transmission and a new critical edition', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 17 (2022), 341–66 (356–8).

³⁶ Eadmer, *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 90.

³⁷ Anselm, *Ep* 259, ed. Schmitt, 4: 172–3; Gilo, *Vita S. Hugonis*, in A. L'Huillier, *Vie de St. Hugues, abbé de Cluny* (Solesmes: Imprimerie Saint-Pierre, 1888), 574–618 (588–9).

³⁸ Southern, *Portrait in a Landscape*, 385–6. For a transcript by Eadmer, see in *Memorials of St. Anselm*, ed. R.W. Southern and F.S. Schmitt. *Auctores Britannici medii aevi* 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1969), 273–91.

³⁹ H.E.J. Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), 58–61 and 174–87.

⁴⁰ Urban II, *Ep* 2, ed. J.-P. Migne. PL 151, new edn. (Paris: Apud Garnier fratres, editores et J.-P. Migne successores, 1881), col. 285: '[...] filii et alumni tui [...]']

counted as a strong recommendation within Urban's circle. The period of almost four months between Anselm's visit to Cluny and his arrival at the Roman curia in April 1098 is likely to have seen several interactions between these two institutions. Urban's correspondence, much of which is lost, refers to dealings with Cluny at about that time. His letters of 1097 include two addressed to Abbot Hugh. Confirming the abbey's privileges, they concerned affairs that had required sending Cluniac delegations to the papal curia.⁴¹ Only seven of Hugh's own letters survive, from what must once have been a considerable body. Extant letters attest to active collaboration with the papal curia. In a letter of 1097 to Urban, Hugh remarked that due to 'various impediments' some of those seeking papal advice 'come [to him], as it were to your servants, to be counselled and assisted in their needs'.⁴² Anselm was a case in point.

Anselm's next stop was Lyon, which he reached around 1 January 1098, leaving for Rome only in mid-March. His host was Archbishop Hugh of Lyon, who had supported him at a critical time some fifteen years earlier. Towards the end of the 1070s, Anselm had written his first two scholarly treatises, the *Monologion* and *Proslogion*. By his own admission, he circulated them only anonymously until Hugh ordered in 1083 × 1085 that he sign them.⁴³ The reason for Anselm's hesitation was that some readers disapproved of his use of the rationalistic method to discuss mysteries of faith, as will be discussed below. Hugh's command, given in his capacity as papal legate, implicitly certified that Anselm's approach to theological inquiry was valid.⁴⁴ At the turn of the 1080s, Hugh would have been informed of

⁴¹ Urban II, *Ep* 214 and 220, ed. Migne. PL 151, cols. 485–8 and 493–4 respectively. There were also other Cluniac missions to the pope in 1097, as shown by a letter from Urban to Archbishop Hugh of Lyon; Urban II, *Ep* 216 (with reference to an intercession by Abbot Hugh), ed. Migne. PL 151, cols. 488–9.

⁴² Hugh of Cluny, *Ep* 4, ed. J.-P. Migne. PL 159, new edn. (Paris: Apud Garnier fratres, editores et J.-P. Migne successores, 1903), col. 929: 'Multi, o domine Pater, justis ac necessariis causis existentibus, cupiunt dignam vestram adire praesentiam, sed impediuntur variis difficultatibus obsistentibus. Unde et aliqui eorum saltem ad nos veniunt, quasi ad domesticos vestros, si quomodo eis consulatur vel subveniatur illorum necessitatibus.'

⁴³ Anselm, *Ep* i.88 and 94, ed. Niskanen, 256–9 and 272–5.

⁴⁴ Anselm, *Proslogion*, Prooemium, ed. Schmitt, 1: 94. The date-frame derives from Hugh's designations as archbishop and papal legate. For the wider context of Hugh's legatine injunction, see Samu Niskanen, *Publication and the Papacy in Late Antique and Medieval Europe* (Cambridge University Press, 2021), 61–8.

Anselm's debate with Roscelin and advised the pope about it. Hugh's admiration for Anselm is also evident in an eyewitness account that, when the men were together, he insisted on calling Anselm 'his master' ('dominum suum').⁴⁵ While Hugh's legation under Urban II was not as active a tenure as the one he had held under Gregory VII, he was by no means an isolated figure. In the years leading up to the Council of Bari, he is attested as in the company of, or in communication with, Urban, often several times per year.⁴⁶ Many, perhaps most, of his exchanges with the pope and the curia are not mentioned explicitly, or at all, in the documentary record. A case in point is a letter Anselm sent to the pope from Lyon before his departure to Rome. The letter was carried to Rome by a group of messengers, of which at least one and probably all were provided by Hugh.⁴⁷ The one charged to present the letter to the pope was also to communicate messages to him by word of mouth, a normal practice.⁴⁸

Anselm had a very important contact in Italy: Abbot John of Telese. Not a man who has often featured in modern scholarship, he needs a brief introduction.⁴⁹ An Italian by birth, John began his career in papal administration as a clerk at an unknown date. He relocated to Beauvais, where he was made a canon of Saint-Quentin. Having felt the monastic calling, he entered the abbey of Bec apparently sometime in the early 1080s, when Anselm was its abbot.⁵⁰ John became one of his most trusted assistants, as is witnessed by their joint efforts to solve the predicament of Bishop Fulk of Beauvais's scandalous career, mentioned above. The

⁴⁵ Alexander of Canterbury, *Liber de dictis beati Anselmi XLII*, in *Memorials of St. Anselm*, ed. Southern and Schmitt, 240.

⁴⁶ K.R. Rennie, *Law and Practice in the Age of Reform: The Legatine Work of Hugh of Die (1073–1106)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 42–52 and 214–15.

⁴⁷ Hugh would have provided a courier for a letter to the pope by a high-ranking guest far from home, such as Anselm. Careful reading of Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, ed. Southern, 103 (II.27) corroborates that assumption; Anselm's letter was carried by more than one courier ('nunciatorum'). His retinue at Lyon consisted only of two companions, Eadmer and Baldwin. Eadmer's short remark implies that he did not carry the letter.

⁴⁸ Anselm, *Ep* 206, ed. Schmitt, 4: 99: '[...] per praesentium latorem cognoscetis.'

⁴⁹ For further details, see Mews, 'Anselm and the See of Beauvais', 107–10.

⁵⁰ The time-frame is suggested by John's position in Bec's profession list, the sequence of which is chronological; BAV, Reg. lat. 499, fol. 8v.

affair re-established John's contact with the papacy, with the result that in 1089 or 1090 Urban II ordered him to present himself at Rome within a year.⁵¹ John's action in the 1090s goes virtually unrecorded, but he certainly made an impression at the curia. Urban II had appointed him abbot of Holy Saviour at Telesse by 1098. He was promoted to the office of cardinal-bishop of Tusculum by 1100. Subsequently, he served as a legate under Paschal II in France and England.⁵²

That John had been educated by Anselm was an acknowledged fact in papal circles, although the evidence, a letter from Paschal II to Anselm datable to 1101, is *post festum* in relation to the Council of Bari.⁵³ John was at any rate responsible for two prerequisites for Anselm's triumph at the council. His *De incarnatione*, which the pope cited before the assembly, was ultimately the fruit of John's request. Shortly before his return to Rome, c.1090, John, then at Beauvais, informed Anselm by letter of a new trinitarian proposition by Roscelin of Compiègne, the above-mentioned secular master. He asked Anselm to expound, which he did in a response.⁵⁴ Roscelin's teaching became the object of controversy and condemnation, private and conciliar.⁵⁵ This was a menace to Anselm because Roscelin had claimed that their views were essentially in agreement. To make the situation more complex, the debate had political implications, in that the cause against Roscelin was connected, through John, to local support for Bishop Fulk of Beauvais.⁵⁶ To clear his name, Anselm prepared a statement for a clerical assembly in Soissons that he adhered to Catholic orthodoxy as defined in the major

⁵¹ Anselm, *Ep* i.109, ed. Niskanen, 322–3.

⁵² R. Hüls, *Kardinäle, Klerus und Kirchen Roms 1049–1130* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1977), 141.

⁵³ Anselm, *Ep* 213, ed. Schmitt, 4: 111.

⁵⁴ Anselm, *Ep* i.112 and 143, ed. Niskanen, 332–3 and 406–9 respectively.

⁵⁵ For the Roscelin controversy, see Constant J. Mews, 'Nominalism and Theology before Abaelard: New Light on Roscelin of Compiègne', *Vivarium* 30 (1992), 4–34; 'Anselm and Roscelin, I'; 'The Trinitarian Doctrine of Roscelin of Compiègne and its Influence: Twelfth-century Nominalism and Theology Re-considered', in *Mélanges offerts à Jean Jolivet*, ed. A. de Libera, A. Elamrani-Jamal, and A. Gallonier (Paris: Vrin, 1997), 346–64; 'St Anselm and Roscelin: Some New Texts and their Implications. II. A Vocalist Essay on the Trinity and Intellectual Debate c.1080–1120', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 65 (1998): 39–90.

⁵⁶ Mews, 'Anselm and the See Beauvais', esp. 116–19.

creeds.⁵⁷ He also decided to compose a treatise on the subject. The work in question is *De incarnatione*, which he completed after at least two interruptions and sent to the pope either in 1095, as was proposed above, or a year or two before.

John's second contribution was of a more practical nature. In his capacity as abbot of Telese, he offered to host Anselm in the mountain village of Sclavia in the months before the Council of Bari. The invitation offered sanctuary from the Italian summer, more pleasant in the montane Sclavia than in a scorching Rome. Having instructed Anselm to stay close by him, Pope Urban gladly approved of this plan as he was about to pay visits to adjacent regions.⁵⁸ In the summer of 1098, the papal entourage travelled from town to town, to Salerno, Capua, Aversa, and Benevento.⁵⁹ Sclavia and, about thirty kilometres to the east, Telese stood conveniently close to the intersections of the region's three main roads, Via Appia, Via Popilia, and Via Traiana. Judging by Urban's itinerary and his request that Anselm remain accessible, John's offer was perhaps a deliberate arrangement to enable consultations in preparation for the council.

The council: preparations and performance

In June 1098 Anselm had a prolonged reunion with the pope at the siege of Capua, some twenty kilometres from Sclavia. They lodged in neighbouring tents and conversed on a regular basis. After the siege ended, Anselm accompanied the pope to Aversa. It was there, in Eadmer's narrative, that the pope presented Anselm with a formal injunction to present himself at the Council of Bari; the wrongs that King William II had inflicted on Anselm

⁵⁷ Anselm, *Ep* i.118, ed. Niskanen, 346–51.

⁵⁸ Eadmer, *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 96–7; *Vita Anselmi*, ed. Southern, 106 (II.29).

⁵⁹ Georg Gresser, *Die Synoden und Konzilien in der Zeit des Reformpapsttums in Deutschland und Italien von Leo IX. bis Calixt II., 1049–1123* (Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 2006), 322.

provided the reason for the invitation.⁶⁰ That may have to be taken with a grain of salt. One of Eadmer's main objectives was to prove that Anselm's first exile, a source of much misery in England, was not self-imposed but mandated by the king. To make that point, Eadmer exaggerated Pope Urban's actions and utterances against King William II, as has recently been argued and will be restated below.⁶¹ Some of Eadmer's contemporaries were not convinced by his insistence that it was not Anselm's own decision to leave England, and we too should read him here with caution.⁶²

Having paid a brief visit to the abbey of St Lawrence (San Lorenzo ad Septimum), Anselm returned to Sclavia. In late September he rejoined Urban II's retinue in an unknown place to travel to Bari.⁶³ It may be safely assumed that on both occasions the matter of the council was on the agenda of their discussions. For instance, the citation of *De incarnatione* at the council would have required prior consultation. The work is not entirely devoted to the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, which was the bone of contention at Bari. It attends to the subject twice, in a single sentence and then, more broadly and importantly, in its concluding discussion from chapters XIII to XVI.⁶⁴ This section explicates trinitarian relationships as procession, using a topographical analogy as the starting point. The River Nile embraces a source, a river, and a lake. Hence the river exists from the spring, and the lake exists from them both.⁶⁵ In like manner, the Son proceeds from the Father and the Holy Spirit proceeds

⁶⁰ Eadmer, *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 99–104, and *Vita Anselmi*, ed. Southern, 110–12 (II.33–34).

⁶¹ Gillingham, 'Sins of a Historian', 70–5.

⁶² For a contemporary reader who did not believe that Anselm was forced into exile, see William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors, R.M. Thomson, and M. Winterbottom, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998–9), 560 (315).

⁶³ Eadmer, *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 104, and *Vita Anselmi*, ed. Southern, 112 (II.34).

⁶⁴ The said sentence is Anselm, *De incarnatione*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 11: 'Nam nomen spiritus sancti non est alienum a patre et filio, quia uterque est et spiritus et sanctus.'

⁶⁵ Anselm, *De incarnatione*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 31–5.

from the Father and the Son, while all three are one.⁶⁶ A copy of *De incarnatione* would have been needed, and Anselm had one on his desk at Sclavia. His *Cur Deus homo*, completed there, references and rephrases a section in *De incarnatione*.⁶⁷ The parallelisms are too precise to have been worked out from memory. What is more, the so-called *Commendatio operis ad Vrbanum papam II*, a short prefatory note attached to a presentation manuscript to the pope, suggests that Anselm gifted him a copy of *De incarnatione* in person in 1098.⁶⁸

The Council of Bari convened on 1 or 3 October and was in session for a week.⁶⁹ The bulk of the delegates came from southern Italy and represented Latin and Greek Christianity.

According to medieval estimates, delegates of episcopal rank approached 185 in number. The council's acts do not survive, but anecdotes from a variety of sources betray an agenda concerned with the Crusade, lay investiture, and the churches of southern Italy.⁷⁰ A main objective was the integration of the Greek Churches in southern Italy into the Roman obedience. Part of that scheme was an argument about the Procession of the Holy Spirit, which Anselm was assigned to deliver.⁷¹ Urban opened discussion on the subject possibly on

⁶⁶ The analogy owes to Augustine, *De fide et symbolo* viii.17, ed. I. Zycha, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 41 (Vienna: Tempsky, 1900), 18–19. The Nile topography, derived from Pliny's *Naturalis historia* (V.10) perhaps via an intermediary, was Anselm's addition and made the analogy more concrete and elegant.

⁶⁷ Anselm, *De incarnatione* (VI–XI) and *Cur Deus homo* (II.9), ed. Schmitt, 2: 20–30 and 105–6 respectively. It is of importance that the chapter in question comes from the final third of *Cur Deus homo*. That is, it is not one of the 'first sections' ('*primas partes*') written in England, which were being circulated without Anselm's permission; *Praefatio*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 42.

⁶⁸ Anselm, *Commendatio operis*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 41. *Commendatio* identifies its mother texts only as '*subditum opusculum*', and its manuscripts associate it either with *De incarnatione* or, as in ed. Schmitt, 2: 39–41, *Cur Deus homo*. See my 'Anselm's so-called *Commendatio operis*', 354–6, proposing that *Commendatio* must preface *De incarnatione*.

⁶⁹ See R. Somerville, *Pope Urban II's Council of Piacenza* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 125–7 and Gresser, *Die Synoden*, 321–7, both with references to sources and scholarship. For identifiable participants, see Gasper, *Theological Inheritance*, 179–80.

⁷⁰ For papal interests in the region, see G.A. Loud, *The Latin Church in Norman Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 181–219.

⁷¹ The main source for Anselm's attendance at the Council is Eadmer, on whom subsequent medieval comments rely, for which see William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. Michael Winterbottom and R.M. Thomson. 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), I: 154–7 (I.53); Orderic Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. Marjorie Chibnall. 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969–80), V: 206–7; *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, ed. R.R. Darlington and P. McGurck. 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995–), III: 88–9; John of Salisbury, *Liber de Vita Sancti Anselmi*, ed. Inos Biffi (Milan: Jaca Books, 1990), 82–3 (X). As for detailed commentary on the theological aspect, see esp. Gasper, *Theological Inheritance*, 174–97 and Nicola Bux, 'Sant'Anselmo al

the first day of sessions. Provoked by the papal comment, an unnamed Greek bishop responded to contest it. Urban retorted citing several proofs from various sources, ‘among them materials from *De incarnatione*’, according to Eadmer’s *Historia nouorum*.⁷² His *Vita Anselmi* articulates the same comment in different words, adding that Urban held *De incarnatione* as ‘of such authority that he drew from there the basis of his own argument’.⁷³ Eadmer identified neither the other works cited by the pope nor what was adduced from *De incarnatione*. The former were picked, no doubt, from the pool of patristic theology, as was customary. The citation from *De incarnatione* is likely to have been drawn from its Chapters XIII to XVI, as mentioned above. A further corroboration for that conjecture is that *De processione Spiritus sancti*, in which Anselm elaborated upon his Bari speech, relies on *De incarnatione* only for the said analogy between the River Nile (not mentioned by name in the former) and the Trinity, and then in a single sentence.⁷⁴

To properly appreciate the significance of Urban’s citation from *De incarnatione*, one can conceptualize the affair with reference to the medieval notion of *auctoritas*. Literary *auctoritates* were texts considered formative in their respective fields. To quote a leading theorist of medieval scholarly literature, authors responsible for such writings were ‘to be respected and believed’.⁷⁵ In the domain of faith, *auctoritates* were adduced as conclusive evidence or substantiation on which a premise might be built. Such a definition was general.

concilio di Bari’, in *Anselmo d’Aosta figura europea. Atti del convegno di studia, Aosta 1° e 2 Marzo*, ed. Inos Biffi and Constante Marbelli (Milan: Jaca Books, 1989), 103–8.

⁷² Eadmer, *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 104–6; *Vita Anselmi*, ed. Southern, 112–13 (II.34). The quotation is from *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 105: ‘Huic errori cum multis argumentis tum plurimis rationibus papa contraire nisus, inter alia quiddam de epistola sibi olim ab Anselmo de incarnatione Verbi edita et directa exempli gratia intulit [...]’. See also Anselm, *De processione Spiritus sancti*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 186.

⁷³ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, ed. Southern, 73 (II.10): ‘[...] in tanta auctoritate habuit [...] inde robur suae disputationis assumeret [...]’

⁷⁴ Anselm, *De processione*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 203–5 and 178 (IX and I respectively).

⁷⁵ A. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, 2nd edn. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), 10.

A case in point is Anselm's later claim, quoted below, that the Greek delegation at Bari was unable to justify their case.

[...] they say that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of the Father in one way and the spirit of Son in another way, something they can prove neither by an authority nor by reason nor from things that are certain.⁷⁶

The recognition of a text as an *auctoritas* was considered the preserve of posterity. In order to command obedience, a writing had to stand the test of time.⁷⁷ Anselm was a contemporary. Furthermore, to be cited by the pope in a council meant that the writing in question bore *auctoritas* as representing Catholic orthodoxy. *De incarnatione* had been quoted in a doctrinal context of paramount importance. Anselm was presented as an authority in the field of trinitarian dogma. His citation implied that, together with the Fathers, he guaranteed that the Roman doctrine of the Procession of Holy Spirit was orthodox. Urban II's quoting from *De incarnatione* amounted to a quite remarkable display of admiration.

The elevation of Anselm's status was emphasized by ostentatious theatrics. Silencing animated debate after his own response to the Greeks, the pope called Anselm to stand and come to sit closer to him. Chairs in proximity to the pope's were then rearranged—a performance to display promotion to a new rank in the conciliar hierarchy.⁷⁸ Urban introduced Anselm to the astonished assembly and announced that he would deliver a full-scale response to the Greeks. Exhausted from the day's business, delegates preferred to hear the address the

⁷⁶ *De processione*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 210: '[...] quod ipsi dicunt spiritum sanctum aliter esse spiritum patris, aliter filii, quod nec auctoritate nec ratione nec ex iis quae certa sunt possunt ostendere.'

⁷⁷ Minnis, *Medieval Authorship*, 10–12.

⁷⁸ Seating arrangements, which indicated the relative rank of delegates in assemblies, were of great importance, and occasionally caused physical conflicts, even bloodbaths, as in Goslar in 1063, for which see T. Heikkilä, *Das Kloster Fulda und der Goslarer Rangstreit* (Helsinki: Academia scientiarum Fennica, 1998), 116–20.

next day. It was to be a major deliberation, such that the morning session had to be rescheduled to start earlier. Anselm's speech does not survive. His 'arguments, reasons, and authorities of holy scripture' were not reported by Eadmer either, who remarked that *De processione Spiritus sancti*, a later composition, would serve those interested.⁷⁹ How closely that treatise may echo the sermon cannot be measured.⁸⁰

Anselm remained the focus of attention after the sermon. The next topic on the agenda was his disagreement with King William II. It should be noted that the witness of Eadmer, the main source for the proceedings, cannot be confidently trusted on the subject of why Anselm left England for exile. Eadmer's efforts to prove that the departure was a necessity born of royal harassment manifest themselves in silences and dishonest testimonies in his *Vita Anselmi* and *Historia nouorum*.⁸¹ Eadmer almost certainly overstated animosities vented against the king at Bari, as is suggested by his claim that Urban II would have excommunicated William had Anselm not intervened.⁸² For Urban to have done so would not have complied with due process.⁸³ Furthermore, excommunication would have constituted a drastic reversal of his English policy. In 1096, Jarento, abbot of Dijon, had entered England as a papal legate. To evade attempts to reform the church, William had sent an envoy in advance to the curia with the handsome gift of ten marks of pure gold.⁸⁴ The manoeuvre obtained for the king a suspension of papal revision of his policies. While Anselm's assignment at Bari no doubt granted him some leverage in the curia, it cannot be ascertained how far Urban

⁷⁹ Eadmer, *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 105–6: 'Sed quibus hoc argumentis, quibus rationibus, quibusve divinae scripturae auctoritatibus et exemplis egerit [...]'.
⁸⁰ For the context of his thinking pertinent to the sermon, see Gasper, *Theological Inheritance*, 183–93.

⁸¹ Gillingham, 'Sins of a Historian', 70–5.
⁸² Eadmer, *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 106–7.

⁸³ Southern, *Portrait in a Landscape*, 279 n. 3, who took it as a possibility that 'either Anselm or his biographer misunderstood what the pope was about to do'.

⁸⁴ Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, ed. G.H. Pertz. MGH Scriptores 8 (Hanover: Hahn, 1848), 474–5. Anselm and Eadmer are silent about Jarento's legation. See Gillingham, 'Sins of a Historian', 73–4; Barlow, *Rufus*, 364–5.

espoused the cause against the English king, upon whom he never passed formal sentence.

Anselm's new papal alliance yielded other benefits, however.

The council brought a sort of closure to his previous quandaries about employing the rationalistic method in his enquiries. In 1077, or slightly before, he submitted his first learned treatise, the *Monologion*, to Archbishop Lanfranc for inspection before publication. The response was that the work should be furnished 'with divine authorities'. Stressing that he proposed no novelty in it, Anselm politely rejected Lanfranc's advice.⁸⁵ The absence of *auctoritates* kept on baffling other readers, as is implied in the prologue to the *Monologion* and recorded in Anselm's letter to Abbot Rainald, perhaps Rainald of Saint-Cyprien in Poitiers.⁸⁶ The pre-publication reception of his next treatise, the *Proslogion*, was even worse. A clandestine party among his own brethren at Bec sabotaged his drafts twice.⁸⁷ The assault must have been incited by Anselm's pursuit of rationalistic inquiry into God, because the *Proslogion* bears no other aspect to provoke such a radical reaction.⁸⁸ In the aftermath of such predicaments, Anselm was reluctant to disseminate the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* openly before receiving Hugh of Lyon's commendation, as mentioned above. Anselm's teaching met with a new imputation towards the end of the 1080s. Roscelin of Compiègne asserted that his own trinitarian proposition accorded with Anselm's views.⁸⁹ Anselm wrote *De incarnatione* to distance himself from that claim. While that was the crux, the appositeness of dialectical reasoning in the domain of faith was a side issue. Anselm felt the need to include a detailed discussion of the preconditions to be filled by those who wished to explore faith from reason.

⁸⁵ Anselm, *Ep* i.68, ed. Niskanen, 198–201.

⁸⁶ Anselm, *Monologion*, Prologus, ed. Schmitt, 1: 8 and *Ep* i.74, ed. Niskanen, 214–17.

⁸⁷ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, ed. Southern, 30–1 (I.19).

⁸⁸ Giles E. M. Gasper, 'Envy, Jealousy, and the Boundaries of Orthodoxy: Anselm of Canterbury and the Genesis of the *Proslogion*', *Viator* 41 (2010): 45–68, (46–47 and 61–8); and my 'Anselm's Predicament: the *Proslogion* and Anti-intellectual Rhetoric in the Aftermath of the Berengarian Controversy', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 82 (2021, forthcoming).

⁸⁹ For the context, see Southern, *Portrait in a Landscape*, 174–80.

Emphasizing the spiritual qualities associated with the religious life, he asserted that men such as his unnamed enemy, Roscelin, lacked the virtues necessary for such an undertaking.⁹⁰ The implication was that rationalistic inquiry into faith was solely a monastic preserve.

Anselm was, indeed, seeking papal endorsement for his whole intellectual project. The evidence comes from the aforementioned short prefatory note *Commendatio operis ad Vrbanum papam II*, written in 1098 in Sclavia.⁹¹ Beside its dedicatory function, *Commendatio* reads as an apologia for rationalistic theology. It proposes the resumption of the patristic endeavour to expound Christian faith from reason, arguing that the rational basis of truth is immense and therefore far from exhausted, and that in the Bible God encourages such inquiry. Significantly, *Commendatio*'s justification of the rationalistic approach embraced the full corpus of Anselm's previous and coming treatises, rather than only the specific title that he presented to the pope. The passage in question runs as follows.

Encouraged by such a consideration, even though I am a man of very little learning, I try to stand up every now and then to perceive the rationale behind those things that we believe, insofar as the divine mercy deigns to admit me; and should I discover something that I had not seen before, I am keen to refer it to others so that I may learn on account of others' judgement what I should maintain.⁹²

⁹⁰ Anselm, *De incarnatione*, ed. Schmitt, 2:6–10.

⁹¹ Apparent verbal parallels between *Commendatio* and *Cur Deus homo*, I.1, an introductory discussion, hint that they were composed at about the same time; see the apparatus of Schmitt's edition, 2: 39–40; Niskanen, 'Anselm's so-called *Commendatio operis*', 343–4 and 356–7.

⁹² Anselm, *Commendatio operis ad Vrbanum papam II*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 40: 'Hac igitur ego consideratione, licet sim homo paruae nimis scientiae, confortatus, ad eorum quae credimus rationem intuendam, quantum superna gratia michi dare dignatur, aliquando conor assurgere; et cum aliquid quod prius non uidebam repperio, id aliis libenter aperio, quatinus quid secure tenere debeam, alieno discam iudicio'.

The *Commendatio* was plainly a device purposed to secure papal endorsement for Anselm's theological approach. While emphasizing that faith overrides human intellect, invariably placing the premium on the former, he regularly proceeded from reason with minimal or no citation of authorities. That he sought Urban's commendation for his method seems somewhat surprising; he ought to have been impervious to the potential criticism of readers after his elevation to the archbishopric. Perhaps the unwelcome association with Roscelin, a heretic who exploited dialectical tools, had awoken memories of past criticisms by Lanfranc and others. Be that as it may, Anselm succeeded brilliantly. *De incarnatione*, which Urban II cited at Bari, explicates trinitarian relationships by means of a discursive method. If considered from that perspective, the Council of Bari sealed Anselm's victory over detractors of the rationalistic inquiry into faith.

New prominence

The word of Anselm's triumph spread fast and wide. Of importance in that respect was that his status as a defender of Latin orthodoxy against the Greeks was reaffirmed at a council convened by Urban at St Peter's in the Vatican in April 1099. Although resting on circumstantial evidence, the case for that is strong. The proceedings of the council are known only imperfectly, and Eadmer is once again a chief source. Silent on the Greek schism, he accounted for conciliar pronouncements against lay investiture and clerical homage to lay rulers, and an urgent plea by a delegate in support of Anselm against King William II. As for the latter, abruptly halting his recitation of the conciliar canons, Bishop Rangerius of Lucca enjoined the pope to help Anselm as best he could.⁹³ The incident implies that Anselm had already been the focus of some attention during the previous proceedings at St Peter's. Significantly, a contemporary register of *gesta*, or

⁹³ Eadmer, *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 112–14, and *Vita Anselmi*, ed. Southern, 115 (II.38).

deeds, related to the church of Arras at the time of Pope Urban II briefly reports the council. The author understood that ‘the error and heresies of the Greeks’ was the main issue for which it was convened.⁹⁴ Whether or not Anselm gave a talk on the subject cannot be known, but it can be safely assumed that his contribution at Bari was cited at least in informal conversations. As such the 1099 council was an important moment in the consolidation of his reputation as an expert in Christian doctrine in service of the Latin cause. By Eadmer’s account, the delegates came from Italy and France. According to a contemporary estimate, by Bernold of Constance, those who were bishops or abbots numbered 150. As such, the council at St Peter’s was a key moment in how Anselm was endorsed by the wider church, or, at that stage, the circles who espoused Urban II rather than ‘Clement III’, antipope. The Arras source informs us that several bishops from the province of Reims attended, Bishop Lambert of Arras among them.⁹⁵ That latter anecdote is of consequence here. Anselm and Lambert became friends who corresponded with each other.⁹⁶ A copy of two of his treatises relevant to the Greek schism was consigned from Canterbury to Arras, as will be discussed below. The volume is physical evidence that the Greek schism was central to a long-distance rapport created at St Peter’s in 1099.

The earliest recorded explicit reaction to Anselm’s triumph at Bari is a letter from Bishop Malchus, or Máel Ísu Ua hAinmire, of Waterford in Ireland. Addressed to an exiled Anselm, the letter dates to between late 1098 and late Autumn 1100, the respective termini by which news of the proceedings of Bari and Anselm’s return to England would have reached Ireland at the earliest. Malchus requested that Anselm send him ‘and all Irish priests that book on the

⁹⁴ *Gesta quibus Atrebatensium ciuitas sub Vrbanò Romane et apostolicae sedis episcopo, Cameracensium excusso subiectionis iugo, in antiquam reformatur dignitatem*, ed. Lotte Kéry, *Die Errichtung des Bistums Arras, 1093/1094*, Beihefte der Francia, 33 (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1994), 188–9: ‘pro errore et haeresibus Grecorum diuersarum regionum et prouintiarum primates, archiepiscopos, et episcopos ad celebrandum concilium studuit conuocare’.

⁹⁵ For the sources and identified participants, see Gresser, *Die Synoden*, 328–9.

⁹⁶ Anselm, *Ep* 437–9 (ed. Schmitt, 5: 385–7); see also *Ep* 285 (ed. Schmitt, 4: 204).

Holy Trinity’, which ‘the apostolic authority [that is, the pope] had commended, as [he] had recently heard’.⁹⁷ The book was *De incarnatione*. It is of interest here that Malchus did not possess a copy already. Given his entreaty that copies be presented to ‘all Irish priests’ (that is, bishops), Bishop Samuel Ua hAingliu of Dublin is unlikely to have had one either. Anselm had consecrated Samuel and Malchus in 1096, the former at Winchester on 20 April and the latter at Canterbury on 26 December. He had kept both by him for a period of instruction, which, at least in Malchus’s case, had involved a theological side. According to his letter, he had heard Anselm preach on the subject of the Incarnation during the meal of St Martin’s Day, 11 November 1096.⁹⁸ Anselm had not considered it essential at that point to supply the bishop-elect with his written treatment of the subject.

In 1101 × 1102, Bishop Hildebert of Le Mans, a poet, sent a letter to Anselm to request that he turn his speech against the Greeks delivered at Bari into a concise treatise.⁹⁹ Anselm had apparently already completed that task. He despatched *De processione Spiritus sancti*, which elaborates on that address, to Hildebert.¹⁰⁰ As the latter responded with praise, Anselm consigned more of his works to him.¹⁰¹ These are likely to have included *Cur Deus homo*, since Hildebert composed a short poem under the same title.¹⁰² In his letter to Anselm, Hildebert mentioned that he had been informed by ‘the Apulians’ of Anselm’s achievement at Bari. That reference points towards Hildebert’s tour across Apulia in 1101 to collect funds for

⁹⁷ Anselm, *Ep* 207, ed. Schmitt, 4: 101–2: ‘Multum ego uos rogo, ut mittatis mihi et omnibus Hiberniensibus clericis librum a uobis compositum de sancta trinitate et commendatum apotolica auctoritate, sicut nuper audiui.’

⁹⁸ Eadmer, *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 73–4 and 77; Anselm, *Ep* 207, ed. Schmitt, 4: 102. For the year, see Sharpe, ‘Anselm as Author’, 45, n. 113.

⁹⁹ Anselm, *Ep* 239, ed. Schmitt, 4: 147.

¹⁰⁰ For its making, see Sharpe, ‘Anselm as Author’, 50–1.

¹⁰¹ Anselm, *Ep* 240 and 241, ed. Schmitt, 4: 148–50.

¹⁰² Hildebert, *Carmina minora*, ed. A.B. Scott (Leipzig: Teubner, 1969), 32.

his building project at Le Mans.¹⁰³ Anselm's performance at Bari evidently enjoyed a sustained local reputation in southern Italy.

The next known pertinent entreaty came from Bishop Walram of Naumburg (†1111). He requested that Anselm provide him with advice about how to argue with the Greeks on the subjects of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, and marital regulations on degrees of consanguinity.¹⁰⁴ An exchange ensued, which now consists of two short treatises, *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati* and *Epistola de sacramentis ecclesiae*, and Walram's response to the former. Relevant to this essay's argument, the termini of composition must be discussed briefly since previous opinions somewhat disagree.¹⁰⁵ The internal evidence of *De sacrificio* provides for an unusually tight time-frame. Anselm inquired whether or not Walram sided with 'the successor of Julius Caesar, Nero, and Julian the Apostate against the successor and vicar of Peter the Apostle'.¹⁰⁶ Walram replied that he had denounced his allegiance to the emperor.¹⁰⁷ He is known to have done so together with several other bishops in 1105.¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, the emperor Anselm had in mind must have been the excommunicate Henry IV, rather than his son Henry V. Having obtained a papal release from his oath of loyalty to his father at the turn of 1104, Henry V became the head of the opposition against him. Walram was a member of that party.¹⁰⁹ Deposed in December 1105, Henry IV died in August 1106. Anselm would have heard of the demise of

¹⁰³ F.W. Bautz, 'Hilbert von Lavardin, Erzbischof und Schriftsteller', *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* 2 (Hamm: Bautz, 1990), cols. 843–4.

¹⁰⁴ Anselm, *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 223 and 231 (proem, I, and VII).

¹⁰⁵ F.S. Schmitt, "Zur Chronologie der Werke des Hl. Anselm von Canterbury," *Revue Bénédictine* 44 (1932): 322–50 (348–9); Sharpe, 'Anselm as Author', 52–3; Fröhlich, *Letters of Anselm*, II: 187–8.

¹⁰⁶ Anselm, *De sacrificio*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 223 (proem): '[...] successori Iulii Caesaris et Neronis et Iuliani Apostatae contra successorem et uicarium Petri apostoli [...]']

¹⁰⁷ Walram, *Epistola ad Anselmum*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 237–8 (V).

¹⁰⁸ G. Zeilinger, 'Walram, Bischof von Naumburg', *Biographisch Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* 22 (Nordhausen: Verlag Traugott Bautz, 2003), cols. 1500–2.

¹⁰⁹ Walram, *Epistola ad Anselmum*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 237 (V) clearly refers to Henry IV, supporting the proposed identification.

the disgraced emperor within weeks. So Anselm's *De sacrificio* must have been written 1105 × Autumn 1106. Walram's first letter, now lost, to which that treatise was a response, can therefore be dated to 1104 × Summer 1106.

De sacrificio was intended to equip Bishop Walram with a defence against the Greeks. Its proem reports that Anselm added a copy of *De processione*, an elaboration of the Bari speech, to the same despatch. His wording implies that he believed Walram to be unfamiliar with *De processione*.¹¹⁰ Given the absence of Anselm's previous connexion with ecclesiastics in Germany, his assumption was probably right.¹¹¹ Within Walram's circles, Anselm's fame as an expert in disputation against the Greeks rested not on his writings, but on hearsay about the Council of Bari years after the event.

Fascinatingly, five manuscripts witness to Anselm's publishing of *De processione* and *De sacrificio* as a pair. Four of them have previously been discussed in that context, while the testimony of one manuscript, cited in Anselmian textual scholarship already in 1940, has gone unobserved.¹¹² For the sake of convenience, all five must be surveyed here, so that their cumulative testimony may be appreciated. The 'new' manuscript is BAV, Ross. 343, a composite volume consisting of three booklets.¹¹³ A table of contents on fol. 1r implies that they were joined together by the fourteenth century. The third booklet, folios 149–180, only includes *De processione* and *De sacrificio*. As such, the booklet represents the texts' primary circulation as a pair, a previously unrecognized aspect. The script suggests an early twelfth-

¹¹⁰ Anselm, *De sacrificio*, ed. Schmitt, 2: 223 (proem): 'Quoniam autem ad defensionem ueritatis, quam contra Graecos qui ad uos uenerunt quaeritis, secundum posse nulli deesse debemus, opusculum uobis misi, quod De spiritus sancti processione contra illos edidi.'

¹¹¹ Walram is his only known German correspondent.

¹¹² Sharpe, 'Anselm as Author', 54 and 83–4; ed. Schmitt, 2: 2.

¹¹³ Cf. Sharpe, 'Anselm as Author', 45–6, note 114.

century origin in central Italy.¹¹⁴ The aforementioned manuscript Arras, BM, 484 is a small booklet, which does not contain other works. As betrayed by the so-called ‘Christ-Church style’ of its hand, it comes from the cathedral priory in Canterbury and dates from the first quarter of the twelfth century. An *ex libris* on fol. 1r shows that it had reached Arras by the mid-twelfth century.¹¹⁵ It has been argued that the manuscript was presented to Bishop Lambert of Arras (†1115), who was Anselm’s correspondent.¹¹⁶ Lambert’s attendance at Urban II’s council at St Peter’s in 1099, as mentioned above, would support that argument. Paris, BnF, lat. 5305 is a composite volume. The section relevant here, folios 49–110, dates roughly from the mid-twelfth century.¹¹⁷ It originally contained the two treatises under discussion. Not very long after, *De nuptiis Christi et ecclesiae* by Fulcoius of Beauvais, a lengthy poem, was appended. The provenance and perhaps the origin is Fécamp, a Norman abbey with a wide connexion.¹¹⁸ London, BL, Royal 5 E. v fols. 50–73, is a booklet bound in yet another composite volume. It has been dated to the first quarter of the twelfth century. The origin is an unknown house in France, perhaps in Normandy. The last survivor is Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 244. Its witness to the authorial pairing of *De processione* and *De sacrificio* (fols. 47r–64r) is, however, distorted by the inclusion, without codicological breaks, of two other treatises by Anselm and works by the near-contemporary authors Peter Damian, Marbod of Rennes, and Honorius Augustodunensis.¹¹⁹ While the script is roughly datable to

¹¹⁴ S. Maddalo, *Catalogo dei codici miniati della Biblioteca Vaticana*, i: *I manoscritti Rossiani*, i. *Ross. 2–413* (Vatican: BAV, 2014), 628.

¹¹⁵ Richard Gameson, ‘The Earliest Books of Arras Cathedral’, *Scriptorium* 61 (2007): 233–85, (247–8, 251, and 271).

¹¹⁶ The proposition is Schmitt’s but its errors were amended by Gameson, ‘Earliest books’, 248 as to the *ex libris* inscription and then by Sharpe, ‘Anselm as Author’, 55–6 as to transmission.

¹¹⁷ My dating differs from Sharpe, ‘Anselm as Author’, 54 (s. XIIⁱⁿ) and Tommaso Gramigni and Stefano Zamponi, ‘Le iscrizioni della Croce di Rosano’, in *La Croce dipinta dell’abbazia di Rosano: Visibile e invisibile Studio e restauro per la comprensione*, ed. Marco Ciatti, Cecilia Frosinini, and Roberto Bellucci (Florence: Edifir, 2007), 71–88 (84) (probably the late 12th century).

¹¹⁸ F. Dolbeau, ‘Anciens possesseurs des manuscrits hagiographiques latins conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris’, *Revue d’histoire des textes* 9 (1979): 183–238 (200–1).

¹¹⁹ The Hunter manuscript carries *Cur Deus homo* and *De incarnatione*, which are followed by the two treatises under discussion and then by works of the said authors.

the second quarter of the twelfth century, it is too standardized to allow for the identification of the region of origin with confidence. The earlier, tentative suggestion that the manuscript is Italian is almost certainly mistaken; the general aspect of hand and the style of abbreviations point towards transalpine Europe, probably France.¹²⁰ Finally, the historical record betrays two lost copies of the pairing *De processione* and *De sacrificio*, the one Anselm despatched to Walram and another one he sent to Hugh of Lyon. The latter was incorporated in an Anselmian anthology which Hugh left to his cathedral and is itemized in a Lyon necrology.¹²¹

The tradition of *De processione* and *De sacrificio* remains an unsolved text-critical question.¹²² Furthermore, their most recent edition accounts for the textual evidence in an unsystematic manner. To assess how wide a dissemination the five above-mentioned manuscripts testify to, I have critically assessed a sample of the textual evidence. The method involved selection of significant variant readings from the apparatus of the edition to collate with the manuscripts BAV, Ross. 343 and Paris, BnF, lat. 5305.¹²³ The main results were that

¹²⁰ I thank Giovanna Murano, Outi Merisalo, and Jakub Kujawinski for this assessment. Cf. J. Young and P.H. Aitken, *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Hunterian Museum in the University of Glasgow* (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1908), 196–7, who tentatively propose Italian origin apparently on the basis of early-modern provenance.

¹²¹ ‘Librum [or Libros] Anselmi cantuariensis archiepiscopi de ueritate, de libertate, de casu diaboli, de incarnatione Verbi, Cur Deus homo, de conceptu uirginali et de originali peccato, de processione Spiritus Sancti, epistolam de azimo et fermentati’, in M.-C. Guigue, *Obituarium lugdunensis ecclesiae. Nécrologie des personnages illustres et des bienfaiteurs de l’Église métropolitaine de Lyon du IXe au XVe siècle*, (Lyon: Scherring, 1867), 130. The alternative reading in the square brackets is Sharpe’s conjecture; ‘Anselm as Author’, 63 n. 173. He speculates that Hugh probably received booklets, which were perhaps ‘bound, or copied, into a single volume’. The grounds are that in the mid-1080s Anselm promised to send his future writings to Hugh and that his treatises as published by him travelled as booklets. Contrary to Sharpe, ‘Anselm as Author’, 53 and 84, I exclude from the discussed pool of manuscripts Chartres, BM, 194, destroyed in an air raid in 1944. It included *De ueritate, De libertate arbitrii, De casu diaboli, De incarnatione, Cur Deus homo, Meditatio (iii) de redemptione humana, De conceptu uirginali, De processione, De sacrificio, De sacramentis*; H. Omont, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France* 11: Chartres (Paris: Plon, 1890), 100–1. The impression is one of a chronologically arranged collection.

¹²² For *De processione*, see *Sancti Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, ed. F.S. Schmitt, new edn. 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Friedrich Frommann Verlag, 1984), Prolegomena, 67* and for *De sacrificio*, his article ‘Drei Rezensionen der *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati*’, *ibid.*, 90–9*, adapted from his ‘Eine dreifache Gestalt der *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati*’, *Revue Bénédictine*, 47 (1935): 216–25. For criticism, see Sharpe, ‘Anselm as Author’, 54–6.

¹²³ Schmitt reported those two manuscripts in a piecemeal fashion. For *De processione*, the variants were ‘oppositio obsistit’, ‘ut om. and spiritus sancti’, ‘sicuti’, ‘postquam’, ‘utroque’, ‘simul om.’ ‘enim om.’, ‘unum uidere’, ‘sunt om.’, in ed. Schmitt, 2: 181, 184, 185, 187, 189, 192, 194, 207, and 216 respectively. For *De*

the manuscripts are independent of each other and that they witness three to five previous copies, now lost. The French transmission as represented by London, BL, Royal 5 E. v and Paris, BnF, lat. 5305 embraced certainly one and probably two lost exemplars on which the survivors drew. Glasgow, Hunter 244 has been shown elsewhere to descend ultimately from the same defective exemplar on which Arras 484 relied at Christ Church, but it did so probably via a lost intermediary on the continent.¹²⁴ BAV, Ross. 343 sprang from a lost copy available in central Italy. It should be emphasized that the figure of three to five lost copies represents a minimum. Losses, by the usual attrition of neglect, fire, and wear and tear, are likely to have been more numerous. The copy Anselm sent to Walram of Naumburg, now lost, is a case in point. Despatched to Germany, it cannot have fathered any of the five extant manuscripts. Archbishop Hugh's copy might, at least in theory, have served as a source for one of the two French survivors. To conclude, the evidence testifies to a widely spread continental transmission, contemporary and near-contemporary. It was centred on France, with attested copies in Normandy, Arras, and Lyon, and it reached southern Germany and central Italy.

Such dissemination chimes with Eadmer's remark that Anselm had *De processione* circulated 'around the world where the notoriety of the [Greek] error had spread'.¹²⁵ Bishop Walram, by his own testimony, had confronted the Greeks. Presumably the same thing applied to Archbishop Hugh of Lyon, a papal legate commanding a major church situated ideally for transalpine travel. At Arras, the Greek schism was considered the main issue of Urban's 1099 council at St Peter's, where Anselm befriended Bishop Lambert;¹²⁶ the bishop is likely to have

sacrificio, they were 'qui ad uos uenerunt om.', 'sine peccati fermento and paganis potius', 'illorum', 'seruari and seruari ut dixi', in ed. Schmitt, 2: 223, 227, 231, and 232 respectively.

¹²⁴ Sharpe, 'Anselm as Author', 55–6.

¹²⁵ Eadmer, *Historia nouorum*, ed. Rule, 106: '[...] idque per multa terrarum loca ubi eiusdem erroris fama peruenit ab amicis suis rogatus direxit.'

¹²⁶ See note 95 above

been the recipient of the copy of *De processione* and *De sacrificio* that is now Arras BM, MS 484. BAV, Ross. 343 presupposes a despatch of the same two treatises as a pair to a party in central Italy, where a variety of contacts with southern Italy ensured engagement with Greek Christianity. The completion of *De sacrificio* in 1105 × 1106 gave Anselm a new impulse to circulate *De processione*. Bound together, the two treatises were well matched, attending to two central issues in the East-West Schism, the *filioque* addition and the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist. Inspired by the composition of *De sacrificio*, the old archbishop resumed his role as a champion of the Latin cause against the Greeks, a mandate conferred on him by Urban II for the Council of Bari.

Signals of how that papal association consolidated and boosted Anselm's authorial recognition can also be detected in manuscripts of his other works. It has recently been charted how his treatises, most notably the *Monologion* and *Proslogion*, found readerships in England, Normandy, and elsewhere in France even before his transfer to Canterbury in 1093.¹²⁷ Attention paid to his treatises' penetration into continental regions beyond France has been more piecemeal.¹²⁸ Italy is of chief significance to this essay's argument, Germany somewhat the less.¹²⁹ His treatises' Italian manuscripts from the first half of the twelfth century, excluding the above-mentioned third booklet of BAV, Ross. 343, will be surveyed below. In addition to the transmission of *De processione* and *De sacrificio* as a pair, there is another case of authorial circulation.

¹²⁷ Sharpe, 'Anselm as Author', 34–5, 43–4, and *passim*.

¹²⁸ His prayers' first transmission to Italy, contingent on his making the acquaintance of Matilda of Canossa during his second exile, has been chronicled elsewhere and is not of immediate relevance here. See Sharpe, 'Anselm as Author', 56–8, with comment on the earliest German transmission and detailed discussion on previous scholarship in footnotes.

¹²⁹ His works' transmission to other regions took place only later and is not discussed here.

In a letter to Prior Ernulf of Christ Church at about the year's turn from 1104 to 1105, Anselm instructed that *Cur Deus homo* and *De conceptu uirginali et de originali peccato*, composed at Lyon in 1099 or 1100, be sent to Pope Paschal II 'in uno uolumine'.¹³⁰ That commissioned volume is lost. Two manuscripts have hitherto been known to carry the said pairing, and a third will be introduced here.¹³¹ Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Vittorio Emanuele, 159 (Farf. 11) is an Italian manuscript. It was written in Farfa Abbey sometime during the first decades of the twelfth century. It consists of two originally separate parts. The first, folios 1–62, carries only these two treatises, *Cur Deus homo* and *De conceptu uirginali*. A booklet bound into Cambridge, Jesus College, QG 16, folios 86–118, contains the same pairing. The manuscript dates from the first quarter of the twelfth century and comes probably from Durham. The pairing is also found in Munich, clm 14509, previously unobserved in Anselmian scholarship. The volume comes from St Emmeram and has been dated to the latter half of the twelfth century. It comprises two distinct booklets. The first, folios 1–73, includes *Cur Deus homo*, *De conceptu uirginali*, and Gilbert Crispin's *Disputatio Iudei et Christiani*, which he dedicated to Anselm. The presence of Gilbert's treatise takes the manuscript's testimony a step away from authorial publication towards scribal dissemination. At the same time it serves as a clue to transmission. Gilbert was not an author whose works would have been available in Rome, where Anselm had sent a volume of *Cur Deus homo* and *De conceptu uirginali*.¹³² Rather, the contents of the St Emmeram booklet bespeak an English taste. One is tempted to speculate that the manuscript was perhaps connected to Honorius Augustodunensis (†1154), Anselm's pupil, whose writings frequently draw upon his master's work. Having left England sometime after Anselm's death, he joined the abbey of St James at Regensburg, almost adjacent to St Emmeram, towards the end of his life. Honorius is

¹³⁰ Anselm, *Ep* 349, ed. Schmitt, 4: 289.

¹³¹ Sharpe, 'Anselm as Author', 49.

¹³² For a manuscript census, see *The Works of Gilbert Crispin*, ed. A.S. Abulafia and G.R. Evans (London, 1986), xi–xx.

considered a primary channel by which Anselm's works gained circulation in Germany.¹³³

The Jesus manuscript and, probably, the Munich manuscript represent the authorial publication of *Cur Deus homo* and *De conceptu uirginali* as a pair in England. The Farfa copy, produced about fifty kilometres from Rome, is likely to descend from the book sent to Paschal II.

Our remaining four Italian witnesses embody scribal dissemination, transmission designed by copyists rather than the author. The second unit of the above-mentioned Vatican manuscript Ross. 343 (fols. 83–148) is a booklet of central Italian origin and datable to the mid-twelfth century.¹³⁴ It conveys a selection of Anselm's treatises and prayers and a record of his sermon at Cluny, which are interspersed with each other.¹³⁵ No verifiable rationale behind the selection and arrangement can be discerned. The impression is one of active engagement with various sources in order to bring together as many of Anselm's works as possible. Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, VII D. 11 is likewise from central Italy and also datable roughly to the mid-twelfth century.¹³⁶ The manuscript embraces *Cur Deus homo*, *De ueritate*, *De libertate arbitrii*, *De casu diaboli*, *De incarnatione*, *Meditatio (iii) de redemptione humana*, *De conceptu uirginali*, *De sacrificio*, and *Quomodo grammaticus*. The selection is reminiscent of what is found in the first booklet of Exeter Cathedral Library, MS 3520, a composite volume.¹³⁷ Although some of the texts in the Exeter manuscript are omitted in the Naples

¹³³ V.I.J. Flint, *Honorius Augustodunensis of Regensburg*, *Authors of the Middle Ages* 6 (Aldershot, 1995), 2.

¹³⁴ Maddalo, *Manoscritti Rossiani*, 628.

¹³⁵ *Monologion*, *De processione*, Eadmer's *De beatitudine perennis uitae* (that is, Anselm's sermon at Cluny), *Oratio (ii) ad Christum*, *Meditatio (iii) de redemptione humana*, *Oratio (v) ad sanctam Mariam*, *Oratio (vii) ad sanctam Mariam*, *Oratio (viii) ad sanctum Iohannem Baptistam*, *Proslogion*, *Oratio (i) ad Deum*, and *De libertate arbitrii*.

¹³⁶ I thank Dr Jakub Kujawinski for the dating. Cf. ed. Schmitt, 2: 38: 's. XII. ineuntis'; Cesare Cenci, *Manoscritti francescani della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli*, 2 vols. (Florence: Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1971), 1: 30: 'sec. XII o XIII'.

¹³⁷ Exeter Cathedral Library MS 3520, pp. 1–232: *De ueritate*, *De libertate arbitrii*, *De casu diaboli*, *De incarnatione*, *Cur Deus homo*, *Meditatio (iii) de redemptione humana*, *De conceptu uirginali*, *De sacrificio*, *Quomodo grammaticus*, *Oratio (xvii) episcopi uel abbatis*, *Oratio (xv) ad sanctum Benedictum*.

book and the arrangement of works is somewhat different, the resemblance suggests some distant connexion in transmission. Datable to the beginning of the twelfth century and coming from Normandy, the Exeter manuscript embodies early continental dissemination.¹³⁸ The odds are that the copyist of the Naples volume or a lost intermediary selected works from an earlier anthology made in France and rearranged them.

Another variety of scribal dissemination, and one more relevant to the essay's argument, is encountered in two central Italian books from the first half of the twelfth century. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Calci 10, comes from the Carthusian house in Calci, about ten kilometres from Pisa. It is a theological anthology with three titles by Augustine, four by Ambrose, and Anselm's *Proslogion*.¹³⁹ Pistoia, Archivio Capitolare, C.91 is a theological digest from the Tuscan cathedral of Pistoia, whose chapter was formed of canons regular with connexions to papal circles. Written in several contemporaneous hands, the volume was a communal exercise. It excerpts Ambrose, Cyprian, Origen, Augustine, and John Chrysostom, as well as *Enarrationes in Euangelium Matthaei* of Anselm of Laon (†1117), the greatest biblical scholar of his day, and the *Monologion*.¹⁴⁰ As opposed to the patristic authors, the two Anselms were not identified by name, hinting that their status was considered somewhat inferior, as one would perhaps expect for a twelfth-century context.

Our earliest Italian manuscripts of Anselm's treatises suggest that the alliance with the papacy forged in the months prior to the Council of Bari was a crucial factor in Anselm's recognition.

¹³⁸ Richard Gameson, *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (c.1066–1130)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy), 88.

¹³⁹ Augustine, *Dialogus quaestionum LXV*; Anselm, *Proslogion* (with the proem); Augustine, *Dialogus de natura uel quantitate animae; De fide et symbolo*; Ambrose, *De rebus gestis in ecclesia Mediolanensi, De fuga saeculi, De mysteriis, De sacramentis*; Giovanna Murano, *I manoscritti del fondo Certosa di Calci nella Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana di Firenze* (Florence: Edizioni Regione Toscana, 1996), 66.

¹⁴⁰ Fols. 135r–139r; Giovanna Murano, Giancarlo Savino and Stefano Zamponi, *I manoscritti medievali della provincia di Pistoia* (Florence: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 1998), 37–8.

First, they all come from central Italy, a region where papal influence was at its strongest. Secondly, when they represent transmission as designed by Anselm, they carry works either from his first exile or subsequent years, that is, the pairings *Cur Deus homo* and *De conceptu*, and *De processione* and *De sacrificio*. The latter pairing reflects his role as an opponent of the Greeks, his assignment at Bari. Within a generation or so, Anselm's works, including earlier treatises and prayers, became the object of scribal dissemination in central Italy. Copyists made new compilations. The evidence is too fragmentary to reveal key junctures of that process, but two more or less simultaneous trends are evident: anthologies were made dedicated exclusively to Anselm, alongside the circulation of his treatises in compendia of various writers. The latter presented him as an equal, or nearly so, of patristic *auctoritates*. Anselm had come to be recognized as an authority for the Latin Church.