

Anselm as Author: Publishing in the Late Eleventh Century

by Richard Sharpe

In the summer of 1098, while Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, was in exile, staying at the mountain village of Selavia in southern Italy, “insigne uolumen edidit quod Cur Deus homo intitulauit” (“he put out a remarkable book, which he entitled *Cur Deus homo*”).¹ So Eadmer tells us, and it is tempting here, as in some other contexts, to say that Anselm published the treatise. This is one of the ordinary uses of the verb *ēdere* at all periods.² To the biographer it was in some sense an event: at a certain time and place Anselm finished the work and made it public. Intention lay with the author. The difficult question is how Anselm did it. We know from his preface that

* This paper presents an expanded version of the J.R. O'Donnell Memorial Lecture, delivered in St. Michael's College, University of Toronto, on 26 October 2007. It is offered as a foretaste of a book, *Editio. Authorial Publishing in the Twelfth Century*, intended as a companion to *Titulus. Identifying Medieval Latin Texts* (Turnhout, 2003). I must express particular gratitude to Michael Herren for the invitation to deliver the lecture. I am grateful to Christopher Brooke, David d'Avray, Michael Gullick, Samu Niskanen, and Teresa Webber, who have given me the benefit of their advice on drafts of the paper; and to Karsten Friis-Jensen, Marco Palma, and Jay Rubenstein, who at my request have examined manuscripts in Copenhagen, Rome, and Paris. Thanks also to Lesley Smith and the anonymous peer-reviewer for their perceptive comments at a late stage.

¹Eadmer, *Vita et conuersatio Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi*, 2.30, ed. R. W. Southern (Edinburgh, 1962; Oxford, 1972), p. 107. Selavia, known as Schiavi di Formicola until 1862, has been known since then as Liberi; it lies in the province of Caserta, about 20 km north from Capua. Anselm was there at the invitation of John, a Roman clerk, who had become a monk at Bec, and who was in 1098 abbot of Telese in the province of Benevento (see n. 88). Liberi lies west of Telese at a distance of some 30 km by road.

²The verb *ēdere* (“to bring forth”) is commonly used where the object is a spoken utterance or a written work. In the latter case, context must determine whether one translates as “to write” (i.e. to bring forth from one's mind on to the page) or “to publish” (i.e. to give out to the public what has been written). Compare passages cited in nn. 3, 34, 40, 57, 84, 120, 141, 165, 166; that referred to in n. 91 serves as a caution, since here “parte quadam edita” obviously refers to incomplete writing. Reflexes in modern usage, such as French *édition* or Italian *edizione* “publication,” reflect the dominance of the sense “to publish.”

the book had some history before this point. He had begun the work at least a year earlier, when he was living in England, and he mentions that incomplete copies, surreptitiously obtained, had been circulating in the meantime.³ We have an author, far from home but not without some household staff; a book with a title given to it by its writer; and we have a willing audience scattered about England, France, and Italy. What did he do that constituted the *editio* of his book?

With Anselm and his books we have sufficient evidence to discuss that question. When the question is put more generally, How did a writer around the year 1100 publish a new book? The picture is more complex and answers far from certain. Not all books were published in the same way, and not all made an immediate impact; some enjoyed only a limited circulation, others hardly any at all. When we come to read a text nine hundred years later, it is far from easy to be sure we understand how widely available it was at the time of its first appearance. Yet, unless we make the effort to discover the manner and extent of its circulation, we run the risk of treating a medieval text as if it reached us in a time-capsule with no historical context. It is dangerous to think that, because we know when and where a book was written, we may assume its availability or its audience. It is equally

³“... propter quosdam qui, antequam perfectum et exquisitum esset, primas partes eius me nesciente sibi transcribebant, festinantius quam mihi opportunum est, ac ideo breuius quam uellem sum coactus ut potui consummare. Nam plura quae tacui inseruissem et addidissem, si in quiete et congruo spatio illud michi edere licuisset. In magna enim tribulatione quam unde et cur passus sim nouit Deus, illud in Anglia rogatus incepti, et in Capuana prouincia peregrinus perfecti” (“on account of some people who were making copies for themselves, without my knowledge, of the first parts of the work before it was complete or polished, I have been forced to make an end of it, as far as I could, more quickly than is convenient to me and more concisely than I wished. I said nothing on several topics, which I should have included and added, if I had been able to produce (*edere*) it in quiet and with enough time. At a time of great trouble – God knows whence and why I suffered it – I began the work in England at another’s request and finished it as an exile in the province of Capua”); Anselm, *Cur Deus homo*, preface; ed. Franciscus Salesius Schmitt, *Sancti Anselmi opera omnia*, 6 vols (Seckau, Rome, Edinburgh, 1938–1961]; reprinted with Prolegomena, Addenda, and Corrigenda, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1968), 2:42. The edition was much disrupted by war and was rescued by H. P. Morrison of Thomas Nelson and Sons, Edinburgh. The first volume had to be reprinted, and the stock of the second and third was transferred from Rome to Edinburgh, with the result that many copies show Edinburgh 1946 as their date of publication. Distribution before that date was very restricted.

dangerous to imagine, when we know that certain writers were at work around the same time, that there was a contemporary readership aware of their various writings. This caveat applies to most books in the middle ages, but it applies especially to new books.

We have an evidential problem: that our usual evidence for the history of a text – surviving manuscript copies, entries in medieval booklists reflecting lost copies, citations in medieval writers – rarely takes us back to the point of publication. There are of course some autograph copies surviving, even for some early medieval texts, but such autograph copies too often testify to the unpublished preservation of the text. Rarer, and perhaps harder to identify, is an example of the first stage in a successful work's journey from the writer to his readers.

One of the rare cases is the treatise by Cardinal Lotharius de Segnis, the future pope Innocent III, *De miseria conditionis humanae*, and the key evidence is codicological. This work, written in the winter of 1194–1195, enjoyed instant success and lasting popularity. It added credibility in theology to the ambitious cardinal's reputation as a lawyer and administrator, widening the support for his candidacy for pope.⁴ We can be sure that he made every possible effort to place copies in the right hands. Nearly seven hundred manuscript copies have been listed, ranging from his own time to the fifteenth century – many surely remain unlisted and uncounted – and the work was printed more than fifty times between 1473 and 1645.⁵ The work is not long, and in the great majority of library copies it occupied only a few folios among other texts to form a volume. Obviously when first circulated by the writer, it travelled alone, and out of all these witnesses there are two that take us close to the beginning. Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana, MS F. 26, part 2, is a booklet of twenty-three leaves (now fols.

⁴ W. Wili, "Innocenz III und sein Werk über das Elend des menschlichen Daseins," in *Humanismus, Mystik, und Kunst in der Welt des Mittelalters*, ed. J. Koch (Leiden, 1953), pp. 125–36, argued that in Book I of this work the cardinal wrote as a brilliant stylist but in Books II and III decisively changed his approach, avoiding style and brilliance, and concentrating on philological and juristic reading of his scriptural authorities. One cannot help wondering whether this too was a tactical change.

⁵ The fullest list is provided by Robert E. Lewis, *Lotario dei Segni. De miseria conditionis humanae*, Chaucer Library (Athens, GA, 1978), pp. 236–53. This does not include copies attested by medieval booklists. Lewis, 68, noted that 86 copies appeared in medieval English book-lists without any control on double-counting. From those English booklists surveyed to date in the Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 1–13 (1990–2008), I count 85 copies, of which only ten survive. That ratio provides a crude multiplier based only on copies recorded from institutions.

66–87, 96), 210 × 135 mm., written in Rome between March 1195 when the work was finished and January 1198 when the author became pope.⁶ It contains only the one work, though with a few sentences at the end extracted from Bernard of Clairvaux, *De consideratione*.⁷ A second early copy is smaller in format, 170 × 120 mm (written area only 125 × 85–95 mm), thirty-three leaves; this is now Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. lat. 71, part 1, of similar date, and including the same extract from Bernard at the end.⁸ Both copies identify the writer as cardinal deacon of SS. Sergius and Bacchus, and it is unimaginable that a copyist writing in Rome around this time would not have added the words, usual even in the early copies, “qui postea Innocentius papa III,” if it was made after his election. Here we have, not copies originally put into circulation by Cardinal Lotharius, but at least copies very close to that stage. This important fact was first recognized by Michele Maccarrone, who suggested that they both derived from a copy of the archetype or from the archetype itself.⁹ The codicological point is more certain than the textual, for textually these two witnesses differ in significant ways, suggesting that they may be already at more than one remove from the textual archetype. Although neither is an authorial original, none the less they still represent the primary phase of transmission, when the work circulated on its own. This would be less apparent if the work were large enough that it usually filled a whole volume. How long such primary copies would have continued to circulate, we do not know, but already by the beginning of the thirteenth century Innocent III’s work was finding its home among other works in larger library books. It was, for example, widely received in England within a few years of Innocent’s election to the papacy.¹⁰ Very many works were, like this one, not

⁶ Described by Lewis, p. 61. Erratic errors suggest that the copy (or its exemplar) was hastily made.

⁷ The passage in question is a brief account of the deviousness of the Romans from *De consideratione* 4.5, PL 182:774CD; J. Leclercq and H. M. Rochais, *Sancti Bernardi opera*, 8 vols (Rome, 1957–1977), 3:452.2–12).

⁸ Described by André Wilmart, *Codices Reginenses latini* (Rome, 1937–1945), 1:156–57. The quiring is irregular, 1¹⁰, 2², 3⁸, 4⁸ (plus a single leaf after 8), 5², 6², with the number of ruled lines varying between 21 and 24 per page. Wilmart dated the copy to the beginning of the thirteenth century; it has no known provenance.

⁹ Michele Maccarrone, *Lotarii Cardinalis de miseria humanae conditionis* (Lugano, 1955), p. xxxi: “Uterque indubie dimanauit a quodam libro manu scripto qui aut fuit exemplar archetypi aut archetypum ipsum” (“Each of them undoubtedly derived from a manuscript book that was either a copy of the archetype or the archetype itself”).

¹⁰ Lewis records two copies with the dating saec. XII/XIII, both English. London, British Library, MS Add. 57533 (saec. XII/XIII, not before AD 1198, ?Leicester abbey), contains two

long enough to form a whole volume bound in boards, but copies such as these, from the initial stage of circulation, are rare.

In this essay I shall seek to show how codicological evidence of this sort can reveal more than has hitherto been appreciated about the circulation of Anselm's writings in his lifetime. In focusing attention on authorial publishing, I should define my categories. Publication requires some deliberate action and intention to make public, and in that sense it is distinct from dissemination. *Cur Deus homo*, we are told, though it may be no more than a cliché, began to circulate unfinished and unauthorized, because eager readers had the means to make copies. Literary convention, at any rate, asks us to believe that. By authorial action with this work, as with others, Anselm sought to assert control over the text as well as to signal its public availability and, we may presume, to promote its circulation. If a work was well received, simple dissemination might quickly take over, but reception is distinct from publication. Anselm composed short finished works which lend themselves to publication at a definite time more than, for example, an extended commentary on a text read in the schools year after year. Even among writers of such well-defined and publishable works, methods of giving out a work might vary: the example of Anselm serves as one type out of several. How far different methods may have influenced a work's success will not be considered here, nor will it be appropriate to judge success by long-term reception. Peter Abelard was an instantly popular teacher and writer, but within a single generation his works went uncopied and his name was most familiar from Bernard's condemnation of his teachings. It is chance that has preserved some revealing early copies of works by Anselm, and it is in part the fact that his works are short, like that of Innocent III, that allows the physical evidence to tell a distinctive story. In what follows I shall

works of Aelred of Rievaulx, miracles of the Virgin, two Marian sermons of Fulbert of Chartres, Innocent's *De miseria* (fols. 65v–80r), and Geoffrey of Burton's *Vita S. Modwennae uirginis* (described by R. J. Bartlett, *Geoffrey of Burton. Life and Miracles of St. Modwenna* (Oxford, 2002), pp. xxxvii–xxxviii). London, Lambeth Palace, MS 366, fols. 1–82 (saec. XII/XIII, not before AD 1198), brings together Innocent III's *De officio missae* and *De miseria* (fols. 62v–80v). Out of ten further copies listed as beginning of or early thirteenth century, five are from England. One is a booklet of just twelve leaves, BL MS Royal 8 D. XX (saec. XIII^{1/4}, Spalding priory); in another, Cambridge, Pembroke College, MS 225 (saec. XIII¹, Reading abbey), the text occupies only fols. 24r–29r. In Cambridge, St. John's College, MS 111, fols. 67r–105v (saec. XIIIin), the preface begins, "Incipit prologus d(omini) Lotharii diaconi cardinalis SS. Sergii et Bachi anno iiiij^o d(omini) Celestini pape III indictione xij^a," suggesting that the exemplar was very early indeed, before Cardinal Lotharius was elected pope.

survey against a time-line Anselm's progress from teacher to author, focusing on the evidence for the writing and publication of each of his works as it happened. After drawing together some conclusions from this contemporary evidence, I shall discuss how his reputation and his works were promoted together in the twenty years after his death. The accidents of subsequent reception and the choices made by his editors have influenced our perception of the author and his oeuvre. It is time to put away hindsight and to recapture how the writer's career unfolded. If Anselm had dated his works, this would have been less complex, but he did not, and there is no easy short cut.

This essay opened with Eadmer's saying that Anselm published his treatise *Cur Deus homo* from Sclavia in 1098, and there are several reasons why Anselm makes a good case-study of authorial publication.¹¹ First, he wrote during a particularly interesting period in the late eleventh century, when the number of new writers successfully putting work into circulation was rising – and the upward curve would lead into the golden age of medieval Latin literature. Second, and more particularly, his prefaces and his letters frequently refer to the circumstances in which he wrote or distributed his various books, and his biographer Eadmer provides a further commentary. Such sources are not only unusually abundant but also exceptionally informative: Anselm writes explicitly about his literary activity to a far greater extent than most writers of his time and involves himself directly in their dissemination. It is telling that he begins to do this at a particular point in his writing career. Third, a combination of manuscript evidence and analysis of the textual history of his works illuminates what can be inferred from Anselm's statements. It is an advantage that his works are short, because perforce they all began their circulation as booklets, and some significant early examples survive that witness to this. It is also clear that works, once completed, were not continually revised, but we are fortunate also to have some very early sketches relating to some of the treatises. The

¹¹ For the development of Anselm as a thinker and author, R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer. A Study of monastic life and thought 1059–c. 1130* (Cambridge, 1963), remains the foundation, now rewritten as *Saint Anselm. A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge, 1990). Very relevant to my approach is the article by C. E. Viola, "Un écrivain pèlerin: Saint Anselme de Cantorbéry 1033–1109: essai d'un Sitz im Leben de son oeuvre," in *Figures de l'écrivain au moyen âge*, ed. D. Buschinger, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik 510 (1991), pp. 347–79.

investigation of the manuscripts for the most part dates back to the 1920s and '30s, when Dom André Wilmart (1876–1941), Dom F. S. Schmitt (1894–1972), and to a lesser extent R. W. Southern (1912–2001) sought out new textual evidence. Schmitt's edition has long remained standard, but its use of manuscript evidence leaves a great deal to be desired.¹²

¹² Fortunately the manuscripts have delivered largely sound texts, so that the failings of the edition have not hampered reading the author's words. We make do with Schmitt's work (see n. 3), which has served as the basis of translations into English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish. Some basic bibliographical work in preparation for his edition and some interpretative ideas were published as a series of articles in *Revue Bénédictine* and elsewhere, but there is no survey of the manuscript evidence, no explanation of his choice of manuscripts, no attempt to understand their relationships, and no clear orientation concerning the transmission of each work. The manuscripts used by Schmitt cannot be assumed to include all the available copies even of a very early date, and his choices in reporting from later copies are beyond guessing (see, for example, n. 144). To someone attempting to use his apparatus, the assignment of the same letter to different manuscripts, and even the assignment of different letters to the same manuscript, can be very disorientating. Nor can the accuracy of his reporting be trusted. Schmitt mentioned in the prologue to his first volume that he intended to set out his "Ratio editionis" in the sixth volume, when the whole work was complete (Schmitt, 1:vii), but when the time came for that to appear, more than twenty years later, there was, as he put it, no space ("Prolegomena," 1*). Articles were collected with some new material as "Prolegomena seu Ratio editionis," when the whole edition was reprinted in two thick volumes of reduced format in 1968. These articles are: "Zur Chronologie der Werke des hl. Anselm von Canterbury," *Revue Bénédictine* [hereafter *RB*] 44 (1932), 322–50; "Eine dreifache Gestalt der *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati* des hl. Anselm von Canterbury," *RB* 47 (1935), 216–25; "Eine frühe Rezension des Werkes *de Concordia* des hl. Anselm von Canterbury," *RB* 48 (1936), 41–70; "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der handschriftlichen Sammlungen der Briefe des hl. Anselm von Canterbury," *RB* 48 (1936), 300–17; "Ein weiterer Textzeuge für die I. Rezension von *de Concordia* des hl. Anselm," *RB* 48 (1936), 318–20; "Les corrections de S. Anselme à son *Monologion*," *RB* 50 (1938), 194–205; "Cinq recensions de l'*Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* de S. Anselme de Cantorbéry," *RB* 51 (1939), 275–87; "Zur neuen Ausgabe der Gebete und Betrachtungen des hl. Anselm von Canterbury," in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, Studi e testi 121, 122 (Rome 1946), 2:158–78; "Die Chronologie der Briefe des hl. Anselm von Canterbury," *RB* 64 (1954), 176–207; "Die echten und unechten Stücke der Korrespondenz des hl. Anselm von Canterbury," *RB* 65 (1955), 218–27; "Geschichte und Beurteilung der früheren Anselmausgaben," *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens* 65 (1954), 90–115; "Die unter Anselm veranstaltete Ausgabe seiner Werke und Briefe: die Codices Bodley 271 und Lambeth 59," *Scriptorium* 9 (1955), 64–75. Also relevant are his earlier editions of four works, from very limited manuscript evidence, in the series *Florilegium patristicum* 18 (1929) [*Cur Deus homo*], 20 (1929) [*Monologion*], 28 (1931) [*Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*], and 29 (1931) [*Proslogion*]; an edition of Anselmian sketches, *Ein neues unvollendete Werk des hl. Anselm von Canterbury*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters 33/3 (1936), was largely superseded by F. S. Schmitt and R. W. Southern, *Memorials of St. Anselm* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 295–360. Schmitt's first article, "Zur Überlieferung der Korrespondenz Anselms

It goes without saying that Anselm's education had equipped him to express himself lucidly and even elegantly in Latin prose. The writing of letters was a literary skill. Some of Anselm's have little or no datable context, others are rooted in a historical moment, but inevitably the letters have been crucial to dating. Anselm's letter to his former prior, now Archbishop Lanfranc, assuring him of his continuing love, has long been placed first in the ordering of letters. It was written, presumably, in the summer of 1070, soon after Lanfranc left Normandy for England. Schmitt took it for granted that it was also first in date, so the letters that follow have been dated to the early 1070s, often for no better reason than their sequential place in the collections.¹³ The impression is thereby given that Anselm's

von Canterbury," *RB* 43 (1931), 224–38 (not reprinted), was intended to claim the right to edit the letters against Dom André Wilmart, who had published a series of important papers on Anselm over preceding years, most recently "La tradition des lettres de S. Anselme. Lettres inédites de S. Anselme et de ses correspondants," *RB* 43 (1931), 38–54. In the same year both also brought out editions of the newly discovered first recension of *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* (see n. 105 below). An agreement was reached that Wilmart would edit the prayers and meditations (Schmitt, 1:vii) "ut in hac editione imprimerentur" (Schmitt, 3:vii). Wilmart died on 21 April 1941 (the anniversary of Anselm's own death), and two years later they were published out of chronological sequence in the third volume in 1943. In the preface here Schmitt again invokes the "Ratio editionis," still unexplained, to justify the statement that Wilmart's edition, though complete, had had to be revised for publication – "tum in aliis rebus, tum in ordine, inscriptionibus, (rarius) in textu recensito" – to such an extent that Schmitt had taken over responsibility for the final text (Schmitt, 3:vii; see below, n. 155). There had been no opportunity for them to confer ("neque nobis cum eo de hac re conferendi opportunitas fuisset"). Schmitt moved to the Collegium S. Anselmi on the Aventine in 1940, but in June of the same year Wilmart returned to Paris from the Vatican. Southern too had contemplated an edition of the letters, which he abandoned in deference to Schmitt in the course of 1933–1934; his most notable manuscript discovery was made in Hereford (see n. 108).

¹³ Anselm, *Ep.* 1 (Schmitt, 3:97–98). It is placed first in **N** and in **LPEVC**. It was printed in first place from **V** in the Victorine edition by Jean Picard (1612); his sequence was retained and supplemented by Dom Gabriel Gerberon (1675), whose arrangement continues to underlie Schmitt's. Schmitt's notes on date and sequence are usually very concise and often merely relative to other letters; a better overview is provided by his article, "Die Chronologie der Briefe des hl. Anselm von Canterbury," *RB* 64 (1954), 176–207, which has the merit of using the numbers of old and new editions and also of showing the sequence in **L** for letters between 1093 and 1109. The English translation by Walter Fröhlich, *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, 3 vols. (Kalamazoo, MI, 1990–1994), will often give just a bald date. In the Italian edition, *Anselmo d'Aosta. Lettere*, 3 vols. (Milan, 1988–1993), Costante Marabelli's notes are fuller and less liable to give a misleading appearance of chronological certainty. There is very little evidence for dating these letters, and their presentation in the edition no longer reflects any manuscript arrangement. Schmitt pretends to a chronological sequence, but the overview in his article shows the impossibility of accepting any

writing of letters was stimulated more by Lanfranc's removal from Caen to Canterbury than by his own appointment as prior in 1063, when Lanfranc left Bec to become abbot of Caen. That need not be so. The prominent placing of the letter to Lanfranc to serve as a frontispiece has tended to obscure the possibility that Anselm was already writing monastic letters between 1063 and 1070. To illustrate how Anselm provided monastic

arrangement as that on grounds of reason rather than trust. While it can be accepted that the main manuscript collections were, very broadly speaking, chronologically arranged (Southern, *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, p. 470), with a clear division provided by his consecration as archbishop, this does not get one near to dating most of the letters, especially those from before 1093. As Wilmart observed of the early letters in Gerberon's edition, "la succession des pièces n'a aucune portée chronologique" ("Les propres corrections de S. Anselme dans sa grande prière à la Vierge Marie," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 2 (1930), 189–204, at p. 192n). Although showing only the manuscript sequence in L, Schmitt does not adhere to it as his guiding principle. Fröhlich holds as a premise, "Since the collections of letters grew larger over the years and the chronological sequence of the letters was continually being corrected, ..." (*Letters of Saint Anselm*, 1:26), a point not tested against the manuscripts; in principle he accepts L as the final perfect sequence, but in practice he substitutes Schmitt for L, ignoring Schmitt's departures from the sequence of L. Fixed points are few, because the internal evidence for secure dates is scanty. Editorial notes, or the lack of them, reflect the difficulty; M. D. Knowles, in reviews, *English Historical Review* 64 (1949), 363–64, and especially *ibid.*, 67 (1952), 110–11, and 68 (1953), 304, was shocked by Schmitt's indifference to such historical evidence as might have been used. Even where external evidence is available, caution must be exercised. For example with Anselm's reference to waiting on King William I to secure a charter of confirmation for Bec (*Ep.* 118), Schmitt placed it among nine letters all assigned to Anselm's period as abbot, "1079–1093" (*RB* 64 [1954], 186), though in relative terms he thought it was after "1082–1093" (*Epp.* 109, 112) and before "1088" (*Ep.* 123), which leads him to abandon the sequence in V and Gerberon. Anselm visited England twice in this period. He came when first abbot (Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, 1.29–31 (Southern, pp. 48–57, with the date 1079); *Epp.* 98, 99, written from England, have been dated by Schmitt from the letter-sequence to 1081; Fröhlich follows Eadmer, 1079/80, though elsewhere he dates the visit to 1080/81, *Letters of Saint Anselm*, 1. 281n). A second visit, not mentioned by Eadmer, is attested in the letters: *Ep.* 116 announces to the monks of Bec that he landed in England "at the third hour"; on his first visit he told them he had landed "at the ninth hour" (*Ep.* 98). This second visit has been dated to 1086 from a reading of the letters and of undated charters, none of them attested by Anselm in England; H. E. Salter, "Two deeds from the abbey of Bec," *EHR* 40 (1925), 74–76; M. Chibnall, "The relations of Saint Anselm with the English dependencies of the abbey of Bec, 1079–1093," *Spicilegium Beccense* 1 (1959), 521–30, at p. 522. Fröhlich accepted this reasoning and dated *Epp.* 116–21 to 1086; from *Ep.* 118 the dates of that visit have been narrowed to "mid-Lent until just after Pentecost." When the charters are considered apart from the letters, however, there is a possibility that they may be better associated with the earlier visit; D. R. Bates, *The Acta of William I (1066–1087)* (Oxford, 1998), 560–61. There is no fixed point here.

guidance through his letters, Eadmer quotes part of one. It is one of two letters addressed to Lanzo, a novice at Cluny, whom Anselm may have known from his early years in Burgundy.¹⁴ Solely on the basis of sequence it has been assumed to date from the early 1070s. Yet in 1077 Lanzo had the responsibility of leading the first Cluniac priory in England, suggesting that he was by then more than four or five years out of his novitiate.¹⁵ A revised dating to before 1070, therefore, deserves consideration. Some thirty years later Anselm would recommend to another novice, Warner, at Canterbury, that he should study the letter to Lanzo – which of the two is not certain. These early letters were available there for study.¹⁶ The same two letters were also available elsewhere, as we shall see, and Anselm may have begun to circulate such letters while he was still at Bec.¹⁷

Anselm was also teaching on a regular basis while he was prior. He found it tedious to teach grammar to the schoolboys, but in one of several letters to a former pupil, Brother Maurice, now at Canterbury, he encourages him to attend conscientiously the lectures of Brother Ernulf.¹⁸ In the same period it appears that Anselm would deliver monastic lectures, even in abbeys far away from Bec, to help young monks grow in their vocation:

¹⁴ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, 1.20 (Southern, pp. 32–34), quotes part of Anselm, *Ep.* 37 (Schmitt, 3:144–48), to Brother Lanzo, novice monk at Cluny. This letter was dated by Southern to ca. 1072–1073.

¹⁵ William of Malmesbury noted in the margin of his copy of *Ep.* 2 (London, Lambeth Palace, MS 224, fol.129r), addressed to Odo and Lanzo, “Lanzoni postea priori de Leues.” Lanzo was the first prior of Lewes, the first Cluniac house in England. Annal sources show that he came to England in 1077 and died in 1107 (David Knowles and others, *The Heads of Religious Houses: England and Wales* (Cambridge, 1972–2008), 1:119). A remarkable story of his holy death is told by William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, 5.442–43, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson, and Michael Winterbottom (Oxford, 1998–1999), 1:788–95. An early twelfth-century copy of *Ep.* 37, written in Normandy but now BL MS Harley 203 fols. 29–52 (see n. 70), has *Ep.* 37 with the anachronistic rubric, “Epistola Anselmi archiepiscopi ad Lanzonem priorem,” showing that the recipient’s identity was known.

¹⁶ Anselm, *Ep.* 335 (Schmitt, 5:271–72), perhaps written during the second exile, urged Warner to ask to read his letter to Lanzo. This might more likely refer to *Ep.* 37, quoted by Eadmer (and was so taken by Southern), or possibly to *Ep.* 2 (Schmitt, 3:98–101), jointly addressed to Odo and Lanzo, which was in part summarized in two other early letters (*Epp.* 35, 51), evidence of its usefulness. In either case, it is an indication that the letter was available for study at Canterbury more than thirty years after it was written.

¹⁷ The two letters to Lanzo were copied together at the end of a work of Augustine in a manuscript made at Gloucester abbey, now Hereford Cathedral, MS P. I. 3 (saec. XIIin), fols. 93v–100v (see n. 73 below). Both are also found in three small groups of letters, of which the earliest was certainly in circulation before Anselm became archbishop (see nn. 68, 70 below).

¹⁸ Anselm, *Ep.* 64 (Schmitt, 3:180–81). On Brother Ernulf, see n. 69 below.

Guibert, a novice in the abbey at Fly, famously recalled how much he was influenced by the teaching of Prior Anselm during his frequent visits.¹⁹ During the time when Anselm was abbot, from 1078, “clerks and laymen” came to Bec “ad consilium probatissimi sophistae” (“for the advice of the renowned philosopher”), according to Orderic, and his teaching attracted students.²⁰ Monastic teaching, at a variety of levels, lies in the background to all Anselm’s works. It is not known when he began to write. His first works, on any plausible dating, are not theological treatises but short spiritual exercises and monastic letters.

The first works to be given written circulation, so far as we can tell, were some of Anselm’s prayers and meditations. His first sharing any of these has been dated from his letters as arranged by Dom Schmitt, and the insecurity of his sequence bedevils the dating. Southern gives priority to a letter which has been dated to 1071, when Anselm was thirty-eight and had been prior of Bec for eight years.²¹ With this letter, he sent a selection of psalms, as requested, to a royal lady named Adeliza, to which he added “orationes septem, quarum prima non tantum oratio quantum meditatio dicenda” (“seven prayers, of which the first should rather be called a meditation than a prayer”); the prayers can be identified only in part, the first being his *Meditatio de timore mortis*.²² The lady has been identified with some confidence as Adeliza, daughter of William the Conqueror, who “commended herself to God.”²³ Since Adeliza was hardly fifteen in 1071,

¹⁹ Guibert of Nogent (ca. 1060–ca. 1125), *Monodiae*, 1.17, ed. E. R. Labande (Paris, 1981), pp. 138–41. On the uncertainty of Guibert’s dates, see J. C. Rubenstein, *Guibert de Nogent. Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York, NY, 2002), p. 17, p. 222, n. 2.

²⁰ Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, Book 4, ed. M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1968–1980), 2:294–97).

²¹ Anselm, *Ep.* 10 (Schmitt, 3:113–14), a letter found only in the Canterbury collections; Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, pp. 36–37, 42; idem, *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, pp. 91–93. The dating to 1071 rests on its place in sequence in the Canterbury manuscripts (Schmitt, “Zur Chronologie der Werke,” *RB* 44 (1932), 338–39). Wilmart had previously proposed a later date, ca. 1090, guessing that the prayers sent to Adeliza included that to St. Nicholas (see n. 31).

²² Besides the *Meditatio* (Schmitt, 3:76–79), the letter identifies only prayers to St. Stephen (*Oratio* 13; Schmitt, 3:50–54) and St. Mary Magdalen (*Oratio* 16; *ibid.*, 64–67). Southern thinks it probable that the others were *Orationes* 8–11 (Schmitt, 3:26–45), Wilmart and Schmitt had other ideas, but there is no way of knowing.

²³ Orderic Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 5.11 (ed. Chibnall, 3:114): “Adelidis pulcherrima uirgo iam nubilis deuote Deo se commendauit et sub tutela Rogerii de

and nothing in the letter refers to her youth, a later date might be thought more plausible. “In the following year,” if we go along with Southern’s dating, he sent to Gundulf, a monk of Bec who accompanied Lanfranc, first to Caen in 1063, then in 1070 to Canterbury, three new prayers to the Virgin Mary, a theme on which he had been asked to write by one of the monks; the letter says that the three prayers were written as successive attempts to achieve a satisfying result.²⁴ Wilmart was not influenced by the sequence of the letters, and he thought the sending of three prayers to Gundulf probably marked the beginning of Anselm’s sharing of such works, which he preferred to date soon after Gundulf left Bec for Caen in 1063.²⁵ For him the seven prayers sent to Adeliza might have included these three, whereas for Southern the three sent to Gundulf were “new prayers,” augmenting the set. Two other letters, one of them certainly from the 1070s, refer to the *Orationes siue Meditationes*. One, to his kinsman Folceraldus, a monk in France, mentions only the difficulty of sending a copy of the *Orationes* because of the dangers on the roads around Reims.²⁶ The other, datably addressed to Anselm by Durandus, abbot of La Chaise-Dieu in the Auvergne from 1073 to 1077, praises the *Meditatio de timore mortis* and other writings with it, asks for copies of any further writings, and initiates fraternity

Bellomonte sancto fine quieuit.” The question of Adeliza’s age obviously connects with the dating of Anselm’s letter (see n. 13 above). She is thought to be King William’s eldest daughter, born ca. 1057. Southern takes her for a girl living under the guardianship of Roger de Beaumont near Bec, but Orderic makes that association with reference only to her death. Elisabeth van Houts interprets him as meaning that she was a nun at Saint-Léger-des-Préaux near Pont-Audemer (*ODNB* [2004], s.n. Adeliza). This convent was under Roger’s patronage; V. Gazeau, “Le domaine continental de l’abbaye de Saint-Léger de Préaux au XIe siècle,” in *Aspects de la société et de l’économie dans la Normandie médiévale (Xe–XIIIe siècles)*, Cahiers des Annales de Normandie 22 (Caen, 1988), pp. 165–83.

²⁴ Anselm, *Ep.* 28 (Schmitt, 3:135–36). The prayers are *Orationes* 5, 6, and 7 (Schmitt, 3:13–25), and in two twelfth-century copies the letter to Gundulf was copied to introduce them. The date 1072 is advanced, without reasons, by Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, p. 36. In the edition, Schmitt, 3:135, more cautiously dates it before 1077, when Gundulf was nominated bishop of Rochester; in his later article, “Gebete und Betrachtungen,” *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, 2:170, he pitched for “etwa 1074.”

²⁵ He is not dogmatic on the point: “Pour mon compte, j’aimerais donc assez inscrire cette trilogie [*Or.* 5–7] entre 1063 et 1070, peu après le départ du cher Gondulf pour Caen. En tout cas, devrait-on la placer force avant 1077;” Wilmart, “Les propres corrections,” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* (1930), 189–204, at pp. 191–92; see also n. 13.

²⁶ Anselm, *Ep.* 55 (Schmitt, 3:169–70, there dated 1070 × 1078, i.e. after *Ep.* 1 and before Anselm became abbot). The letter mentions “*Orationes quas tibi, cum mecum esses, scribi feceram*” (“The prayers which I caused to be written for you, when you were with me”).

between their houses and an exchange of books as pledges.²⁷ Durandus had heard about Anselm from two young men from Bayeux, but the letter does not make it clear whether they were carrying this book. It should be emphasised that the sequence of these letters is uncertain and their dates of writing mostly guesswork.

The letters, moreover, indicate only when Anselm began to circulate his prayers and meditations, and there is no certainty as to whether the three sent to Gundulf and the seven sent to Adeliza were yet conceived as part of a single sequence. Composition may have begun before 1070, perhaps long before; that is only the date of *Ep.* 1 to Lanfranc and not a fixed constraint. Indeed Southern made the suggestion that one of the meditations, *Deploratio uirginitatis male amissae per fornicationem* (“Regret over virginity ill lost through fornication”) may have been Anselm’s earliest work by some years; his reasons are in part psychological and in part stylistic, but the inference, though not secure, is persuasive.²⁸

There is strong evidence that the full set of nineteen prayers and three meditations was not completed until around 1100 or even later; the prologue which introduces the collection appears to date from 1104, and it was only at this time that Anselm put the collection into its final order.²⁹ Most of the manuscript evidence dates from after that, but there are some revealing early copies. One of these, from the abbey of Saint-Arnoul at Metz, not earlier than 1084, has a sequence of twelve prayers and meditations, seemingly in no particular order and without indication of their writer.³⁰ Here, the prayer

²⁷ Durandus, *Epp. Anselmi* 70 (Schmitt, 3:190–91), securely datable to 1073 × 1077, while Durandus was abbot; Fröhlich, without justification, expresses this as ca. 1075/1076. Anselm’s reply (*Ep.* 71) says nothing about books.

²⁸ Anselm, *Deploratio uirginitatis male amissae per fornicationem* (*Medit.* 2; Schmitt, 3:80–83); Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, pp. 45–46; idem, *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, p. 105. Southern also proposed a very early date for *Quomodo grammaticus*, 1060 × 1063, which I find less convincing (see n. 58 below).

²⁹ The dating to the early part of 1104 was proposed by A. Wilmart, “Le recueil de prières adressé par Saint Anselme à la comtesse Mathilde,” *RB* 41 (1929), 35–45. It depends on the movements of Anselm and his agent Alexander. On the arrangement of the collection adopted at the time of the letter to Countess Matilda, see n. 155.

³⁰ Metz, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 245 (Saint-Arnoul, Metz), was picked out as one of the most important early witnesses by A. Wilmart, *Méditations et prières de Saint Anselme* (Paris, 1923), pp. xlv–xlv; he emphasises that the copy was made, while Anselm was alive, “par un moine auquel on n’a révélé son identité.” He there dated it ca. 1100, working from photographs, but after seeing the manuscript itself he revised this to the end of the eleventh century (“Les propres corrections,” *RTAM* 2 [1930], 198). Schmitt in the third volume (1943) of his edition said that this manuscript contains *Orationes* 6, 2, 15, 7–9, and 11 as a group, but

to St. Nicholas (*Or.* 14) appears separately. It has been thought that this prayer could be dated from the spread of the cult in the west, but inference from the manuscript context has also played a part in dating.³¹ It was included among the main sequence of prayers in another very early copy, in which the last meditation, *Meditatio redemptionis humanae*, evidently written in 1099 or 1100, has been added along with the prayer to the Cross

with *Oratio* 14 (perhaps not finished until 1092) elsewhere in the volume. In his article of 1946 the account of the contents of this manuscript is different, mentioning in numerical order *Orationes* 2, 5–11, 15, 18, and 19, which he takes to represent “eine frühe Rezension” (“Gebete und Betrachtungen,” *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, 2:161–62). He had a third attempt in the 1968 corrigenda to his edition: *Orationes* 6, 2, 15, 18, 19, *Meditatio* 1, *Orationes* 5, 7–9, 11. The book itself escaped the destruction of many Metz manuscripts in 1944, and it turns out that Schmitt was inaccurate in all three accounts. The basic manuscript, fols. 9–98, comprises works of Jean de Fécamp or from his circle and was copied in the second half of the eleventh century. The added fols. 1–8 contain an account of Saint-Arnoul and Anselm’s *Oratio* 14 (this at fols. 5v–7v); at the end of the book are documents from Saint-Arnoul and the sequence of prayers, *Orationes* 6, 2, 15, 18, 19, *Meditatio* 1, *Orationes* 5, 7, 16, 8, 9, and 11 (fols. 103r–119r). Two dates are provided in the manuscript: a letter of Jean de Fécamp (fols. 8v–11r) is dated 1064, one of the added Metz documents (fol. 102v) is dated 1084 (C. Samaran and R. Marichal, *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date 5 Est de la France*, ed. M.-C. Garand and others [Paris, 1965], 578). This last must be the *terminus a quo* for the copying of the prayers and meditations. Perhaps the different placing of *Oratio* 14 is evidence that the main text of the book had been copied before that prayer was available, but availability at Metz does not equate with existence at Bec. It is also impossible to see why, for example, the Marian *Orationes* 5, 6, and 7, which originated as a group, are here separated; or why 10 is missing from the group 8–11. It is not clear what weight can be placed on this arrangement as an early recension but the copy is early and the text of *Or.* 7 is of the earliest type (Wilmart, “Les propres corrections,” *RTAM* 2 [1930], 198).

³¹ The prayer to St. Nicholas was thought by Wilmart to date from after the translation of St. Nicholas to Bari in 1087 and perhaps after a relic of the saint reached Bec around 1090; Southern followed him (*Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, 36n). Schmitt, “Zur Chronologie der Werke,” *RB* 44 (1932), 338–39, held that an earlier date was allowable, because the cult of St. Nicholas was already known in Normandy ca. 1030 and because the prayer was included in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson A. 392, which he consistently dated “circa a. 1085” (see n. 79 below). Anselm requested a copy of the prayer, together with another work, still in progress, from Bec when he was in England late in 1092 (*Ep.* 147). Cottier observes the distinction between “feci” and “facere inchoavi” in that letter, inferring that the prayer was by this date finished rather than in progress; he would allow it to be earlier than 1087; J.-F. Cottier, *Anima mea: Prières privées et textes de dévotion du moyen âge latin. Autour des prières ou méditations attribuées à saint Anselme de Cantorbéry (XIe–XIIe siècle)* (Turnhout, 2001), pp. lxxxi–lxxxii.

(*Or.* 4).³² The two prayers that were composed last (*Or.* 1 and 3) may date from no earlier than the prologue.³³ How widely the first prayers and meditations circulated cannot be assessed without more evidence from before 1100. Eadmer mentions them at an early stage in the *Life*, as the prayers “*quas ipse iuxta desiderium et petitionem amicorum suorum scriptas edidit*” (“which at the desire and request of his friends he published in written form”).³⁴ The four letters already referred to show that circulation had begun by the 1070s. Anselm would at intervals return to the same genre and compose additional prayers, and at various stages in so doing – as Wilmart was able to show – he made some small additions to the text of one prayer, the long prayer to the Virgin Mary (*Or.* 7).³⁵ When first circulated, these were meant to be read as anonymous spiritual writings, but some readers at least knew who was the writer, and as he came to be seen and to accept himself as an author, he would eventually acknowledge them in an added preface. These *Orationes siue Meditationes* remained distinct in their early textual history from the theological treatises for which Anselm is now most widely known.

In 1077 or thereabouts Anselm wrote the work that was to become known as the *Monologion*, sending a copy without title to Lanfranc for his approval.³⁶

³² On the additions to the prayers and meditations in Bodl. MS Rawlinson A. 392, see below nn. 79, 82. The last meditation is dated by Eadmer to the period when Anselm was staying at Lyon in 1099–1100 (*Vita Anselmi*, 2.44 [Southern, p. 122]).

³³ It is certain that the prayers numbered *Or.* 1 and 3 by Schmitt are late, because they have not found a place in the sequence even in the Canterbury collected works (see n. 155 below).

³⁴ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, 1.8 (Southern, p. 14). Anselm himself, in his covering letter to Countess Matilda, in 1104, refers to the prayers as “*orationes quas diuersis fratribus secundum singulorum petitionem edidi*” (“prayers which I produced for different brethren in accordance with their several requests”) (Schmitt, 3:4).

³⁵ Wilmart, “*Les propres corrections*,” *RTAM* 2 (1930), 192–97. See below, n. 155.

³⁶ Anselm, *Ep.* 72 (Schmitt, 3:193–94). The letter and book were brought by Brother Robert, along with three other letters (*Epp.* 73–75), to Prior Henry of Canterbury, Brother Maurice, and Brother Lanfranc. Schmitt dated the *Monologion* to the latter half of 1076 (“*Zur Chronologie der Werke*,” *RB* 44 (1932), 342); Southern preferred 1077 (*Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, p. 50). The dating depends on the assumption that the letter-collection followed by Picard and Gerberon was arranged in date-order; three letters concerning *Monologion* (*Epp.* 72, 74, and 77) all preceded *Ep.* 78, dated some time after Gundulf was promoted to bishop (consecrated 19 March 1077) and *Ep.* 80, following Paul of Caen’s appointment as abbot of St. Albans (28 June or 4 July 1077).

The letter asks the archbishop, if he approves the work, to give the copy to Brother Maurice, who may be returning to Bec shortly. If he does not approve, he should destroy the copy and notify Anselm, who would then destroy the other copy which he had retained in Bec. A separate letter to Maurice, sent at the same time, asks specifically that any corrections should be marked in the copy and returned with Maurice, or by other means if Maurice was delayed, so that Anselm could revise the work.³⁷ Lanfranc did not entirely approve the work but made criticisms, to which Anselm responded by letter but not by revising the draft.³⁸ None the less the earliest copies of the work carry a dedicatory letter to Lanfranc.³⁹ Although the philosophical leap forward contained in this work was surely recognized by the writer, it was conceived and initially presented as the writing down of an address “de meditanda diuinitatis essentia,” as the prologue makes clear, for the benefit of the monks of Bec. It was another meditation. “Nescio tamen quo pacto sic praeter spem euenit, ut non solum praedicti fratres, sed et plures alii scripturam ipsam quisque sibi eam transcribendo in longum memoriae commendare satagerent” (“I know not how it turned out that, contrary to my expectation, not only the brethren mentioned but also many others made an effort to commend the treatise to posterity by each making a copy for himself”).⁴⁰ Publication in writing has already taken place

³⁷ Anselm, *Ep.* 74 (Schmitt, 3. 195–96). There is an interesting variant reading: the primary text of the letter uses the present tense (*mitto* **V** and mentioned as alternative in **E**), but the later edited text has a perfect tense (*misi* **LPE**), implying that the book had been sent at an earlier date.

³⁸ Anselm, *Ep.* 77 (Schmitt, 3:199–200). Lanfranc’s letter was not copied into either the collection of his own letters nor Anselm’s and is lost. It seems that he had recommended the adding of scriptural authorities, and Anselm claims to have acted on this advice and to have anticipated it (“hoc et post ... uestram admonitionem et ante feci, quantum potui”), but that “quantum potui” disguises the fact that no substantive change was made. It is possible that the preface, with its general reference to scripture and the writings of St. Augustine, was meant to meet this criticism.

³⁹ Anselm, *Monologion, Epistola ad Lanfrancum archiepiscopum* (Schmitt, 1:5–6), from the two earliest witnesses (from Sées and Troarn, below, pp. 23, 30–33), William of Malmesbury’s copy (Lambeth 224, fol. 1r), and two later copies. The early witness from Salisbury also has this letter. The Canterbury collected works does not include this letter with *Monologion*.

⁴⁰ Anselm, *Monologion*, prologue (Schmitt, 1:7–8). A similar formulation is used in the dedication of the work to Lanfranc which accompanies the text in several copies: “De quo opusculo hoc praeter spem euenit, ut non solum illi quibus instantibus editum est, sed et plures alii illud uelint non solum legere sed etiam transcribere” (“with this little work it happened, contrary to my expectation, that not only those at whose urging it was published but many others also wanted both to read it and to copy it”) (Schmitt, 1:6).

informally, it seems, and at the end of this prologue Anselm indicates that copying is expected but he requests, “si quis hoc opusculum uoluerit transcribere” (“if anyone wants to make a copy of this little work”), that the prologue should be copied with the work.⁴¹ This is Anselm’s first preface and his first claim to authorial ownership of a work. Another letter reveals Anselm’s caution in the early stages of distributing this work. He reluctantly sends a copy, still untitled, to Abbot Rainaldus, who has repeatedly asked for it over a long period, but asks him to show it only to those *rationabilibus et quietis* (“capable of reason and contemplation”), who will read the work as it should be read.⁴²

Anselm’s second major work, what was to become known as the *Proslogion*, was probably written soon afterwards during his last year as prior. The dating depends on Eadmer, who tells how the drafting of the work was inspired by God. The first of two drafts on wax tablets was mysteriously lost, the second suffered unexplained damage, and it was with difficulty that it was copied on to parchment.⁴³ There is no immediate evidence in the letters that allows us to see this work start out on its journey into the world. It was perhaps held back by the same diffidence that had accompanied the first writing of the *Monologion*, and by the time they have their titles and are given to the world the two works are referred to together by Anselm himself.

How Anselm overcame his hesitation over publishing the *Monologion* and the *Proslogion* is shown by two revealing letters written to Hugh, archbishop of Lyon from 1082/3 to 1106. What is not so certain is their dating, and one must be careful to avoid the elision of “not before 1082” into 1082. In the first, Anselm responds to a request for something he had written, “de scriptis nostris mitto quod iussistis” (“I send you what you asked for from my writings”), noting also that he has added the style of abbot to the heading. He refers also to work on other questions, “de quibus me uelle scribere dixi et reuerentia uestra me monuit” (“about which I said I wanted to write and your reverence advised me”), bemoaning how many

⁴¹ The implied assumption that, even in the case of new works, prefatory letters and prologues might readily be left out in copying is not without interest.

⁴² Anselm, *Ep.* 83 (Schmitt, 3:207–8), dated by Schmitt to after *Epp.* 72, 74, and 77, and after the publication of *Monologion*; Fröhlich expresses this as ca. 1078. Anselm again defensively asserts that he has followed St. Augustine. Rainald has been identified tentatively with the abbot of Saint-Cyprien, Poitiers, from 1073 until 1100, the addressee of Lanfranc, *Ep.* 46 (ed. V.H. Clover and M.T. Gibson [Oxford, 1979], pp. 142–51), concerning Berengar’s misinterpretation of the thinking of Hilary of Poitiers as to Christ’s being at once God and man.

⁴³ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, 1.19 (Southern, pp. 29–31).

things prevented him from getting down to composition.⁴⁴ This presumably alludes to the questions that would be treated in the three dialogues, for even *De ueritate* was not yet written. The second letter to Hugh, assumed to have been sent soon after this one, reveals that the works sent were the *Monologion* and the *Proslogion*, but it allows us to see the steps by which they acquired these titles.⁴⁵

Precor igitur ut si libellos, quos sanctitati uestrae iussus misi, recuperare poteritis, illud quod in ipsis titulis positum est, scilicet de ratione fidei, uelut superabundans recidentes, illum quem Monoloquium nominaui, Monologion uocetis, et alterum non Alloquium sed Proslogion tituletis; et secundum titulorum correctionem finem praefatiunculae minoris libelli, quae de eis titulis loquitur, emendetis.

I beg therefore that, if you can recover the little books that I sent to your holiness as I was commanded, you should shorten what is placed in the headings by removing the superfluous words “on the reason of Faith”; the one that I called *Monoloquium* you should call *Monologion* and the other that I called *Alloquium* you should call *Proslogion*; and in line with the correction in the titles, you should correct the end of the preface to the shorter book where these titles are mentioned.

It appears that Anselm, since his exchange with Lanfranc around 1077, has given titles to the two works. The *libelli* sent to Lyon contained the titles *Monoloquium de ratione fidei* and *Alloquium de ratione fidei*. These are now to be shortened to one-word titles using the Greek-derived *-logion* rather than the Latin *-loquium*. The reference here to the preface of the *Proslogion* is especially significant. This preface begins by referring to the *Monologion* in the form of words that had been its original title, “opusculum quoddam uelut exemplum meditandi de ratione fidei.” At the end of the preface Anselm explains how he had circulated the two works anonymously under provisional titles.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Anselm, *Ep.* 100 (Schmitt, 3:231–32). Schmitt dates this letter “not before 1082” (but in building on it he uses 1082, below p. 23 and n. 60); Fröhlich, following the sequence of letters, goes for “ca. 1083/84.” Archbishop Hugh was elected in 1082 (Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronica*, s.a.; MGH *Scriptores* 8:460); from a statement as to the length of his tenure it has been calculated that he was installed in February 1083. (*Gallia Christiana* [Paris 1715–1865], 4.98; Abbé Rony, “La politique française de Grégoire VII. Conflit entre le pape et son légat,” *Revue des questions historiques* 109 (1928), 5–34, at p. 32. He was instructed to accept the archbishopric by Pope Gregory VII by letter (Reg. 9.18), dated 24 October [1082] (JL 5220 under 1081); the next letter in the register (9.19) addresses him as archbishop (JL 5246 under 1083); H. E. J. Cowdrey, *The Register of Pope Gregory VII* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 418–19.

⁴⁵ Anselm, *Ep.* 109 (Schmitt, 3:241–42). Schmitt dates this letter simply “after *Ep.* 100”; Fröhlich expresses this as “ca. 1085.”

⁴⁶ Anselm, *Proslogion*, Prooemium (Schmitt, 1:93–94). Hugh had been appointed legate by Gregory VII in 1077, when he was still bishop of Die in the province of Vienne.

Et quoniam nec istud nec illud cuius supra memini dignum libri nomine aut cui auctoris praeponeretur nomen iudicabam, nec tamen eadem sine aliquo titulo, quo aliquem in cuius manus uenirent quodam modo ad se legendum inuitarent, dimittenda putabam: unicuique suum dedi titulum, ut prius *Exemplum meditandi de ratione fidei*, et sequens *Fides quaerens intellectum* diceretur. Sed cum iam pluribus cum his titulis utrumque transcriptum esset, coegerunt me plures et maxime reuerendus archiepiscopus Lugdunensis, Hugo nomine, fungens in Gallia legatione apostolica, qui mihi hoc ex apostolica praecepit auctoritate, ut nomen meum illis praescriberem. Quod ut aptius fieret, illud quidem *Monologion*, id est soliloquium, istud uero *Proslogion*, id est alloquium, nominaui.

Since I did not think either this work or that one which I mentioned above deserved to be called a book or to have its author's name at the top, yet thought they should not be circulated without some heading to invite anyone into whose hands they might come to read them, I gave them each a heading, so the first is called *Exemplum meditandi de ratione fidei*, and the other *Fides quaerens intellectum*. But when both had already been copied under these headings by many people, many of them forced me – I name only the most reverend Archbishop Hugh of Lyon, the papal legate in France, who by apostolic authority commanded me – to put my name at the top. So that this might be more fittingly done, I gave them titles, *Monologion*, that is an internal conversation, and *Proslogion*, that is a conversation addressed to someone.

The title *Proslogion* is then used in a letter that offers a foretaste of the work itself to a recluse at Caen.⁴⁷ More worthy of note than the change of title is surely the disclosure that it was Hugh who made him sign the two books. This must have preceded the first of the two letters just quoted, since there Anselm mentions sheepishly that he has also described himself as abbot, “non ... ut personam monstrarem honoratiorem, sed ut nominis excluderem aequiuocationem” (“not in order to appear as a person of high status but more to avoid confusion with another of the same name”).⁴⁸ The evidence of the manuscripts does not bear out this last point, for no copy of either work has yet been traced in which the author has the simple style of abbot.

Anselm had become abbot of Bec in 1078. By then he had drafted both the *Monologion* and the *Proslogion*, but he was for some years reluctant to circulate them. At the time of this correspondence with Archbishop Hugh, he

⁴⁷ Anselm, *Ep.* 112 (Schmitt, 3:244–46). This letter, datable only from the reference to *Proslogion*, is addressed to Hugh *inclusus*, identifiable with “Hugonem inclusum Cadumensem” mentioned in *Ep.* 45 (Schmitt, 3:158–59).

⁴⁸ One may well ask what other Anselm had been seen as a source of confusion. The most plausible answer is the secular Master Anselm, known as Anselm of Laon, who was teaching in Paris from the 1070s and later at Laon from ca. 1090 to his death in 1117.

was not only giving his attention to the form in which these two works were to be published but was also aspiring to write on other questions.

Yet Eadmer's discussion of Anselm's books divides them between those written when Anselm was prior, down to 1078 and those written after he became archbishop in 1093.⁴⁹ He simply does not refer to literary work while Anselm was abbot. He thereby gives the impression that four other works were all written as prior before he became abbot. These are the treatise on a logical question, *Quomodo grammaticus sit substantia et qualitas* ("whether *grammaticus* may be both substance and quality"), and the three interrelated dialogues, *De ueritate*, *De libertate arbitrii*, and *De casu diaboli*. Indeed, he deals with them before discussing the writing of the *Monologion*.⁵⁰ The evidence of the texts contradicts Eadmer, for in *De ueritate* Anselm puts an explicit quotation from the *Monologion* into the mouth of his interlocutor. Use of the title *Monologion* is in itself evidence that *De ueritate* was not composed until 1083 at the earliest, perhaps as late as 1085.⁵¹ And a long letter to Brother Maurice, written by Anselm as abbot, not as prior, shows him still at the start of work on *De casu diaboli*; he sent Maurice the first section of text as drafted, still untitled and far from its full form. The sketch appended to this letter would form § 11 in the finished *De*

⁴⁹ Schmitt, "Zur Chronologie der Werke," *RB* 44 (1932), 322–23, 325, begins with a summary of Eadmer's apparent division of the works into two periods and sets out to test it. Eadmer, "utpote adolescens qui tunc eram" ("youth though I was at that time"), first met Anselm in England in 1079 (Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, 1.29 [Southern, p. 50]), and would not meet him again until Anselm returned to England in 1092.

⁵⁰ "his temporibus scripsit tres tractatus scilicet de Veritate, de Libertate arbitrii, et de Casu diaboli ... Scripsit et quartum quem titulauit de Grammatico... . Fecit quoque libellum unum quem Monologion appellauit" ("at this period he wrote three treatises, On truth, On the freedom of the will, and On the fall of the devil... . He also wrote a fourth treatise On the grammarian, as he called it... . He also composed another small book, which he called *Monologion*") (Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, 1.19 [Southern, p. 28]). Working this into Anselm's obituary, under the year 1109, Robert de Torigny replaced "his temporibus" with "dum adhuc prior esset in Beccensi cenobio" ("while he was still prior at the abbey of Bec"), and this passed into wider currency; it was Schmitt, "Zur Chronologie der Werke," *RB* 44 (1932), 327n, citing PL 160:429D, who first recognized that this change was made by Robert de Torigny. Robert was a monk of Bec until his election as abbot of Mont-Saint-Michel in 1154. L. Delisle, *Chronique de Robert de Torigni, abbé du Mont-Saint-Michel* (Rouen, 1872–1873), 1:135–36, had noted that the passage came to Robert from a contemporary Bec chronicle via William of Jumièges, but he was in error; the passage that appears in editions of William of Jumièges, 6.9 (PL 149:843C; ed. E. M. C. van Houts (Oxford, 1992–1995), 2:74–77) is part of a long addition concerning Bec (ibid., 60–77) made by Robert de Torigny himself, while the passage in the Bec chronicle (PL 150:650B) is not the source but a still later derivative.

⁵¹ Anselm, *De ueritate*, ch. 1 (Schmitt, 1:176).

casu diaboli, but the manner in which the letter introduces it suggests that this was the first part of the work to have been drafted.⁵² The absence of *De casu diaboli* from the earliest manuscript witness for *De ueritate* and *De libertate arbitrii* may well indicate that it was the latest of the three dialogues.⁵³ The three dialogues belong together; their collective preface, added by Anselm himself, explains their order and refers to their being written *diuersis temporibus* (“at various times”), but there is nothing to suggest that they were not all written within a few years of one another in the 1080s.⁵⁴ It is not possible to know how soon Anselm considered them finished and ready for distribution, but the preface alludes to those who had copied them without authority before they were finished.⁵⁵ This is in some measure borne out by the text in the earliest manuscript containing only *De ueritate* and *De libertate arbitrii*. The teacher’s writings were quickly in demand; as with a secular master, his pupils wanted books to study before they are ready for publication.⁵⁶

⁵² Anselm, *Ep.* 97 (Schmitt, 3:224–28). Schmitt’s text from **LPEV** has the draft, and in the manuscripts it is marked off with an initial and a line. There is a different – earlier? – version of *Ep.* 97 in another family of copies **NFMD**, but these are not accompanied by the draft. William of Malmesbury included a copy in his collection of Anselm’s works (Lambeth Palace, MS 224, fol. 86r–v). It appears also to have had some independent circulation. For example, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 22291 (saec. XII), fols. 105r–106r, “quomodo cum malum nihil esse dicitur nomen eius aliquid significet”; the late-thirteenth-century Franciscan compilers of *Registrum Anglie* recorded a copy of “Tractatus Si malum nichil est” at Brinkburn priory in Northumberland (*Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum ueterum*, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, R. H. Rouse, and M. A. Rouse (London, 1991), p. 165 (R33.10, where union-reference “165” signifies Brinkburn).

⁵³ See below, pp. 30–33, on Bodl. MS Rawlinson A. 392, whose copies of *De ueritate* and *De libertate arbitrii* may represent the state of the text before final revision (see n. 83).

⁵⁴ This preface (“Tres tractatus pertinentes ad studium sacrae scripturae quondam feci diuersis temporibus,” Schmitt, 1:173) was printed from four manuscripts dated by Schmitt to the beginning of the twelfth century, including the collected works in Bodl. MS Bodley 271, and from a fifth, a later volume of collected works from the middle of the century. None of them can date from before Anselm’s death, so they provide no evidence for when he added the preface to the group of three treatises. The preface is found in a good many other manuscripts, including a number used by Schmitt elsewhere in his edition; why he limited himself here is not apparent.

⁵⁵ “Licet itaque a quibusdam festinantibus alio sint ordine transcripti, antequam perfecti essent: sic tamen eos ut hic posui uolo ordinari” (“Although they have been transcribed in a different sequence by some impatient individuals, before they were finished, none the less I want them to be kept in the order in which I have placed them”) (Anselm, *De ueritate*, preface; Schmitt, 1:174).

⁵⁶ Compare, for example, Peter Abelard, *Historia calamitatum*, lines 219–21, ed. J. Monfrin (Paris 1959, ³1967), p.69, on his students’ seeking to copy lecture-notes; Abelard,

The date of writing of *Quomodo grammaticus* is far less clear. It is, however, referred to in the preface to the three dialogues, which accounts for Eadmer's mentioning it in connexion with them.⁵⁷ Although there called a fourth treatise, it is not clear that it was contemporary with them. Southern characterizes it as an introduction to logic, focused on a school text, Aristotle's *Categoriae*, inferring that as such it may have been written at a different time. He would place the composition of *Quomodo grammaticus* much earlier than the three dialogues. Describing it as "Anselm's only commentary on an ancient text, his only work on a secular subject, the work in which he was nearest to Lanfranc, and the only one in which he draws extensively on Aristotle," he favours the years between 1060 and 1063, "when Anselm was Lanfranc's assistant in the external school at Bec."⁵⁸ He thought that Anselm then gave up publishing until he began to circulate the early prayers and meditations after 1071. If one follows Wilmart and dates the first prayers to the 1060s, the gap is not so long. Even so, I incline rather to think that *Quomodo grammaticus* was written after Anselm had found his voice. It is a discussion of paronyms, answering a question out of Priscian as much as out of Aristotle's *Categoriae*. It is relevant to the nominalism affecting theology more than to basic teaching in logic, and it is better dated to around 1080 or a little later, contemporary with the other dialogues.^{58a}

The references in *De ueritate* to the *Monologion*, in the preface to the three dialogues to *Quomodo grammaticus*, probably in the late 1080s, and then to both *Monologion* and *Proslogion* when he published his *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, despatched to the pope in 1093 or 1094, show that

unlike Anselm, was not concerned to control the exact form in which his work was read; D. E. Luscombe, *The School of Peter Abelard* (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 95–96.

⁵⁷ "Tres tractatus pertinentes ad studium sacrae scripturae ...; quartum enim, quem simili modo edidi, ... cuius initium est de grammatico: quoniam ad diuersum ab his tribus studium pertinet, istis nolo connumerare" ("three treatises relating to the study of the Bible ...; a fourth, which I have likewise produced, whose opening words are *De grammatico* ...; I do not wish to number it with them because it relates to a different area of study") (Anselm, *Praefatio in tres tractatus* [Schmitt, 1:173]). Eadmer, following this passage, says that he titled the fourth work *De grammatico* (see n. 50), though Anselm's own longer and less perspicuous title is found in the principal copies used to establish the text.

⁵⁸ Southern, *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, p. 65. Schmitt simply retains the association with the three dialogues and dates *Quomodo grammaticus* to ca. 1080–1085, and he associates this with its presence in Bodl. MS Rawlinson A. 392, which he dates to ca. 1085 ("Zur Chronologie der Werke," *RB* 44 [1932], 334–35, 350).

^{58a} C. J. Mews, "Nominalism and Theology before Abaelard: Roscelin of Compiègne," *Vivarium* 30 (1992), 4–33.

during his time as abbot Anselm assumed that works he had already published were available to readers of his newer books.⁵⁹ He was now known as an author, and some early copies survive to show in what form his works were known to contemporary readers.

At this point we may turn to those manuscripts that most nearly represent the primary circulation of Anselm's early works. For convenience of reference a list of these is given as an appendix to this paper.

One copy of the *Monologion* still survives with the title *Exemplum meditando de ratione fidei*, now Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 13413 fols. 1–57, a narrow booklet of six quires, 31 lines per page; on fol. 3v, in a later medieval hand, is the ownership mark, “Liber sancti Martini Sagien(sis),” the Benedictine abbey of Saint-Martin, Sées, in south-west Normandy. Schmitt dated the manuscript to the late eleventh century and drew a strong inference from the combination of title and date: “De quoi il résulte, comme de la rare fidélité du texte, que ce ms. sans aucun doute est non seulement en copie ultérieure mais en original l'un des exemplaires qui furent copiés avant qu'Anselme n'eût changé le titre.”⁶⁰ Schmitt dated this manuscript to 1077 × 1082; the year 1082 is a tendentious guess, combining a strong presumption as to the early date of the letters to Archbishop Hugh and the supposition that a copy with the early *titulus* could not have been made any later.

⁵⁹ Anselm, *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, ch. 6 (Schmitt, 2:20): “Si quis legere dignabitur duo parua opuscula mea, *Monologion* scilicet et *Proslogion*, ...” (“If anyone will deign to read my two little works, *Monologion* and *Proslogion* ...”).

⁶⁰ Schmitt, “Les corrections de S. Anselme à son *Monologion*,” *RB* 50 (1938), 197. Since Schmitt's dating the manuscript to “a. 1077–1082” (Schmitt, 1:3) was arrived at from the title, it would be truer to say that he deduced the character of the manuscript from the title alone. He provides a plate in his edition, facing vol. 1, p. 14. The hand is certainly early, but experts in palaeography are unlikely to agree on a dating more precise than ca. 1080–1120. The *Monologion* occupies fols. 1r–55v (fols. 56 and 57 are blank). It is not apparent from Schmitt's description that he realised that it was a booklet; he says, “les caractères jusqu'au feuillet 79 sont très anciens et remontent jusqu'au XIe siècle,” but there is no change of hand at fol. 79, which is more than twenty leaves into the second of five booklets, fols. 58–122, also early, containing only Gregory the Great on the Song of Songs (fols. 59r–119r). In presenting a list of the eight most important Anselm manuscripts, Schmitt makes this the first; F. S. Schmitt, “Intorno all' *Opera omnia* di S. Anselmo d'Aosta,” *Sophia. Fonti e studi di storia della filosofia* 27 (1959), 220–31, at p. 224.

The original title intended for the *Proslogion*, that eloquent phrase *Fides quaerens intellectum*, is found in several manuscripts, which Schmitt regarded as representing a first recension, presumed to be earlier than the correspondence with Hugh. Of these he placed most weight on BAV MS Vat. lat. 532, fols. 81–226, a copy of Cassian’s *Conlationes*, written, he says, in the distinctive early twelfth-century Christ Church script, which ends (fols. 219v–226v) with a copy of the text with this early title and lacking preface, chapter headings or division into chapters, whose want Schmitt regarded as diagnostic of an early witness.⁶¹ The manuscript need not be earlier than the 1120s, but one may well wonder for what purpose this copy was made, presumably from a primary booklet datable no later than the early 1080s, at a time when Christ Church had assembled the collected works into two volumes. It is, however, quite obviously not a primary copy, nor does Schmitt’s group of related manuscripts represent a distinct recension at all.⁶² He allowed the early form of the title to distort his understanding.

⁶¹ To judge from the first volume of the catalogue of *Vaticani latini* (1902), the first book of the *Conlationes* (fols. 1–80) was written separately from and later than the second and third books (fols. 81–219), and this copy of *Proslogion* was added at the end; a later booklet (fols. 227–238, saec. XV) provides a table to the *Conlationes*. Only Schmitt has reported the Christ Church hand here. The catalogue offers a later date of saec. XII/XIII. The manuscript was owned in the fifteenth century by Cardinal Domingo Ram y Lanaja (d. 1445), archbishop of Taragona. It is possible that the early form of the title has led Schmitt into speculative dating and attribution.

⁶² His apparatus shows almost no deviation from the main early twelfth-century witnesses to the text of the *Proslogion*. It is filled rather with variants (in two tiers) from the seven (or eight, the much later BAV MS Chigi A. VI. 184 being somewhat erratic in its appearance) manuscripts representing this supposed early recension (see below, n. 110). This gives the semblance of significant revision, but in fact all these variants represent corruption within a family grouping and have no bearing on the text of a putative early recension. The one arguable reading (ch. 23, Schmitt, 1:117 lines 11–12) amounts to no more than the choice between “sanctus spiritus” and “spiritus sanctus.” A fairly early member of this family is BL MS Harley 203, fols. 29–52 (saec. XII^{1/4}), fols. 40r–47r, more likely Norman than English in origin, to judge from the initial on fol. 40r. This booklet contains *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, followed by “Fides querens intellectum” with a gloss added apparently by the rubricator, “i. Prosologion,” and five letters (on which see n. 72). Schmitt misdated this copy to saec. XIIex, apparently overlooking the break between this early booklet and the later booklet now bound with it, fols. 53–100 (saec. XIIex); this has five works of Anselm from different periods of his career in an order that suggests mixed sources, *De conceptu uirginali et originali peccato* (fols. 53r–60r), *De libertate arbitrii* (fols. 60r–65r), *De casu diaboli* (fols. 65r–75r), *Cur Deus homo* (fols. 75r–94r), and *De ueritate* (fols. 94r–98v).

What may in reality be the earliest extant manuscript of the *Proslogion* was not used by Schmitt in his edition, though he knew of its existence.⁶³ It is a booklet of only twenty-eight leaves, now Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B. 1. 37, fols. 46–73. The hand that copied *Proslogion*, *Cur Deus magis*, and the letters has been recognized as that of a copyist working at Salisbury between 1086 or a little later and the end of the century.⁶⁴ This copy does not have the early title but the final title. After a plain “Explicit,” the text is followed as usual by a *repetitio*, “Ergo domine qui das.” The remainder of the booklet comprises another essay by Anselm, *Cur Deus magis*, a sketch with very limited circulation, followed by a group of early letters. It was some time later when other hands at Salisbury added six letters sent by Anselm as archbishop, after 1093, addressed to Osmund (d. 1099), bishop of Salisbury, or to nuns of his diocese. These were evidently copied from the original letters, which had been retained at Salisbury, a fact of some importance as an aspect of the transmission of Anselm’s letters.⁶⁵ It is tempting, indeed, to imagine that Osmund had tucked the original letters into this booklet as keepsakes of the great man. Since the principal texts here were copied by a Salisbury scribe, this cannot be a booklet actually sent by Anselm. It was most likely copied from one or perhaps two primary booklets, depending on whether or not one thinks the *Proslogion* might have been already associated with the other texts here.

⁶³ It was the source of hitherto unknown letters published in Schmitt’s very first article, “Zur Überlieferung der Korrespondenz Anselms von Canterbury. Neue Briefe,” *RB* 43 (1931), 224–38; it was cited also in the notes on the rubric at the head of *Cur Deus homo* (Schmitt, 2:42).

⁶⁴ R. Sharpe and T. Webber, “Four early booklets of Anselm’s works from Salisbury,” *Scriptorium* 63 (2009). The copyist is identified as Webber’s Scribe ii, who wrote much of Exon Domesday and whose work she has recognized in twenty other manuscripts; Teresa Webber, *Scribes and Scholars at Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1075–c. 1125* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 12–13, with the manuscript-descriptions, pp. 143–57. On the date, see below, p. 42. He wrote several stints, working alongside other scribes.

⁶⁵ These letters were first published by Schmitt, “Zur Überlieferung der Korrespondenz,” *RB* 43 (1931), 224–38, and five of them were included in his edition (*Epp.* 177, 190, 183, 195, 184). *Ep.* 183 is known also from a group of fourteen letters identified by Wilmart in several manuscripts; the others are found only here. The sixth letter was rejected as inauthentic in F. S. Schmitt, “Die echten und unechten Stücke der Korrespondenz des hl. Anselm von Canterbury,” *RB* 65 (1955), 218–27, at pp. 220, 226, where he proposed to attribute it to Lanfranc. The route of transmission appears secure. It is worth noting, however, that *Ep.* 185, to Matilda, abbess of Wilton, is linked with *Ep.* 183 in wording and context, and one might also have expected that here; it survives through the main letter-collections.

Two of these provide the closest clue to dating. The group of early letters is preceded by one addressed to Fulk, a monk of Bec, who was bishop of Beauvais from 1089 until his death in 1095. Between the end of the *Proslogion* and the start of this letter is the sketch beginning *Cur Deus magis*. This and the letter to Fulk both belong to the period of Anselm's concern with the erroneous teaching of Roscelin – of which more in the next section of this paper. On a cautious dating, both belong to the period 1090 × 1093; less cautiously the indicators point to 1092 × 1093. This is the most probable date for the exemplar of this booklet. One might even speculate that it was sent by Anselm himself to Bishop Osmund after they had met, either at the king's Christmas court in 1092 or when the bishops were summoned to the sick and penitent king at Gloucester at the beginning of Lent 1093.⁶⁶ Recent contact between Anselm and Osmund, Osmund's retaining letters received from Anselm over the next few years, and their copying into the Salisbury booklet, are three considerations that make a circumstantial case for inferring that Osmund had received the exemplar at Anselm's behest. The local writing of the copy suggests that it was made at once and the exemplar returned or handed on.

This group of early letters is not without its own interest. There is one other copy of exactly this group, including the letter to Bishop Fulk, found along with another copy of *Cur Deus magis* in a thirteenth-century manuscript, now BL MS Royal 5 E. XIV.⁶⁷ The second copy – at however many removes – has the texts slotted among other works of Anselm whose precise coming together cannot be recovered. Behind it, however, there was presumably a booklet like the Salisbury one that combined the letter to Fulk from 1090 × 1093 and the roughly contemporary sketch *Cur Deus magis*

⁶⁶ Eadmer, *Historia nouorum in Anglia*, pp. 32–43, ed. M. Rule, RS 81 (1884), 27–37, is the primary witness, and from him, William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, 1.48, ed. M. Winterbottom (Oxford, 2007), p. 118. Anselm visited England in connexion with the foundation of Chester abbey (1092). He attended the king's Christmas court, when there were discussions involving the king, the bishops, and other *primores*, about the filling of the vacant archbishopric. There is no evidence for the venue of this Christmas court, but Westminster is not unlikely. A short while later, King William was taken seriously ill, the bishops were summoned to attend him at Gloucester, and Anselm too was called to what was thought to be the king's death-bed, where William nominated Anselm to the see on 6 March 1093. No source mentions Osmund's presence on either occasion, but that is no objection.

⁶⁷ C. J. Mews, "St Anselm and Roscelin: some new texts and their implications 1 The *De incarnatione Verbi* and the *Disputatio inter christianum et gentilem*," *AHDLM* 58 (1991), 55–97, at pp. 69–70.

with fourteen letters of significantly earlier date.⁶⁸ The two manuscripts of this early group are closely related, as Schmitt realised, with the same textual contamination in two of the letters.⁶⁹ It is a moot point whether the descent of two such copies adds weight to the possibility that circulation was authorized by Anselm and was, perhaps, not a one-off for Bishop Osmund.

While the date of copying makes this booklet from Salisbury the earliest direct evidence we have that a group of letters was already in circulation, other textual evidence shows that it is only part of a more complex picture. If we exclude the letter to Fulk as added for its topical interest, the booklet contains only letters from Anselm's time as prior, mostly though not entirely concerned with monastic life. These could have been circulating for as much

⁶⁸ The letters found as a group in Trinity College, B. 1. 37 and Royal 5 E. xiv are: *Epp.* 136 to Bishop Fulk, 1 to Archbishop Lanfranc (1070), 3 to Br Robert, 11 to Abbot Gerbert, 13 to Br Ralph, 4 to Br Gundulf (not later than 1077), 5 to Br Henry, 6 to Br Hugh, 38 to Br Ernulf, 8 to Br Herluin, 45 to Frodelina, 61 to Br Fulk, (ca. 1078), 41 to Br Gundulf (not after 1077), 37 to Lanzo and 2 to Odo and Lanzo (both probably earlier than 1070).

⁶⁹ Schmitt, "Zur Überlieferung der Korrespondenz," *RB* 43 (1931), 225, noted that *Ep.* 41 in both Trinity College, MS B. 1. 37, and BL MS Royal 5 E. xiv continues with an extraneous passage beginning *Vinculum coniugale*; Mews, "St. Anselm and Roscelin," pp. 69–70, independently found another copy of this passage following *Cur Deus magis* in Paris, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal, MS 269 (saec. XII²), fol. 108v; the text is given by Schmitt, 225, and by Mews, pp. 72–73. This last copy has apparently preserved the text distinctly but both copies of the early letter collection have it running continuously from the end of the *Ep.* 41; it was presumably added without proper distinction, perhaps even in a margin, in their archetype. The passage is made up of five sentences excerpted from the work *De incestis coniugiis*, composed by Brother Ernulf, schoolmaster at Canterbury: *Vinculum coniugale – incestus in sua uita.*] PL 163:1473A; *Dicit aliquis eum peccauit cum uxore.*] PL 163:1465AB; *Quod ille peccauit – sed tamen iusta.*] PL 163:1465B; *Ideo fortassis uoluit – in eterna uita.*] PL 163. 1465B; *Preterea etsi de coniugis – et una caro.*] PL 163:1465C. This is evidence of a close textual connexion. Ernulf's work has been datable only to before the death of Bishop Walkelin of Winchester (3 January 1098), to whom it is addressed. P. J. Cramer, "Ernulf of Rochester and Anglo-Norman canon-law," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 40 (1989), 483–510, at p. 494n.), notes that the meeting of Ernulf and Bishop Walkelin at Canterbury (PL 163:1457B) might have taken place in October 1097 (Eadmer, *Historia nouorum in Anglia*, p. 93 [Rule, 81]), which has given rise to a loose dating "ca. 1098" (Mews, p. 72). Rather, we have evidence here for an earlier dating. Ernulf, monk of the abbey of Saint-Lucien, Beauvais, came to Canterbury from Bec in 1070 or soon after (William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, 1.72 [Winterbottom, p. 220]); Anselm once refers to him as Dom Ernulf of Beauvais (*Ep.* 74). Walkelin would have been in Canterbury often enough and may have met Ernulf before the latter become prior (ca. 1096); and Ernulf's mention of the coming of *regii exsecutores* is not particular to any year, though it would be particularly appropriate to the vacancy between 1089 and 1093, when the revenues of the see were collected on the king's behalf.

as fifteen years already. There are also twelfth-century copies of a second, later, group of letters, discovered by Wilmart, which can be seen circulating more widely. There is a considerable degree of overlap between the two groups, for, though differently arranged, only four letters were dropped and four others added. The latest addition has been dated to 1104.⁷⁰ The earlier group, first recognized by Schmitt, may have been in circulation from as early as 1078 when Anselm was still prior, texts, as it were, to support Anselm's monastic lectures.⁷¹ The inclusion of the letter to Fulk with the early group but not with the later group may support the inference that it was added temporarily, and for its topicality, during Anselm's period of concern with Roscelin's teaching. Related to these two groups are smaller batches drawing on the same letters. BL MS Harley 203, fols. 29–52, is another Anselm booklet from the early twelfth century. Its contents are *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* (fols. 29r–40r), *Proslogion* (fols. 40r–47v), the latter copied from an early exemplar since it retains the title *Fides quaerens intellectum*, and a batch of five letters (fols. 47v–52v), two of them shared with both larger groups, one shared only with the later and more widely attested group, and two letters with a different circulation. The same batch of

⁷⁰ Wilmart, "La tradition des lettres," *RB* 43 (1931), 42. At the beginning *Ep.* 136 to Fulk has gone, and the other omitted letters are 11, 6, 38, and 61. The later group begins with *Ep.* 65 to Abbot William, identified by William of Malmesbury as the abbot of Fécamp, which Schmitt noted did not well suit his chronology based on the sequence in V (Schmitt, 3:181n.), though its placing in N might point to a date in 1078; this is also the most likely year in which William, after less than twelve months as a monk of Caen, was chosen to follow Abbot John at Fécamp. The following ten letters also found in the earlier group, 2, 37, 4, 5, 41, 45, 8, 13, 1, 3; then three additional letters, 183 to Abbess Eulalia of Shaftesbury (ca. 1094), 208 to Archdeacon Hugh, sending greetings to the abbesses of Shaftesbury, Winchester, and Wilton (1099), and 337 to Abbess Eulalia again (?1104). It should be noted that these last three have a more limited transmission than the others, for they are not found in the main collections, and it seems possible that the later group was created at or, perhaps more probably, for Shaftesbury. If so, the local selection did not inhibit dissemination. This collection is found in manuscripts from England, France, and Italy: BL MS Cotton Claudius E. 1 (saec. XII^{ex}, Tewkesbury), fols. 44v–48v, and two later English witnesses; a group of copies from French Cistercian houses, Brussels, Bibliothèque royale, MS 2004–2010 (saec. XII^{2/4}, France), Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 513 pt 1 (saec. XII^{med}, Clairvaux), Paris, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal, MS 984 (saec. XII^{2/3}, Fontenay) and BNF MS lat. 4878 (saec. XII^{2/3}, ?Preuilly); and from Italy, BAV MS Ottob. lat. 173 (saec. XIII), and Bodl. MS Canon. Pat. Lat. 204 (saec. XIV, Montello, OCarth).

⁷¹ Schmitt, "Zur Überlieferung der Korrespondenz," *RB* 43 (1931), 224; see above, pp. 25–26. Orderic Vitalis would later report that Anselm's pupils kept copies of his letters (see below, p. 66 and n. 176), but hindsight may be at work there.

five letters is found in later copies.⁷² Finally, another witness contains the two letters common to all three groups, *Epp.* 2 and 37, preceded, as in the late group by *Ep.* 65. These three letters were copied to fill the space at the end of a booklet containing two works of Augustine, made at Gloucester, now Hereford Cathedral, MS P. I. 3, fols. 93v–100v. It is datable from the texts on the end-leaves to around the time of Anselm's death.⁷³ Taking the three together, this might represent the beginning of a copy of Wilmart's group, limited perhaps by the space left in the booklet, or it might suggest that these three had a shared currency before that group was put together. The two letters common to all four branches, *Epp.* 2 and 37, are those to the novice Lanzo, future prior of Lewes, to which Anselm directed another troubled novice and which Eadmer quoted to illustrate Anselm's monastic guidance by means of letter. While there is obvious evidence that a shared parent text of *Ep.* 2 in these groups is independent of the main collections, Samu Niskanen's more detailed investigations suggest that the groups themselves are not closely interconnected.⁷⁴ Neither Wilmart's group of fourteen letters nor that in Harley 203 of five letters can go back as early as

⁷² This group of five comprises *Epp.* 37, 2, 183, 160 to Fulk, bishop of Beauvais (1093), and 161 to Geoffrey, bishop of Paris (1093). This booklet is the second, and oldest, of three booklets now forming MS Harley 203 (see n. 62). The same group is found in BAV MS Vat. lat. 310 (saec. XIII²), fols. 114r–116v; Oxford, Merton College, MS 10 (saec. XIV), fols. 40r–41v; and BAV MS Vat. lat. 10611 (saec. XIV), fols. 208r–210r.

⁷³ Hereford Cathedral, MS P. I. 3 (saec. XI/XII), comprises a booklet of three quires containing Augustine's *De agone christiano* by a recognizable Gloucester copyist with added genealogical notes and poems (fols. 1–20) bound at an early date with a booklet of ten quires containing two further works of Augustine, *De uera religione* and *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, and Anselm's *Epp.* 65, 2, and 37 (fols. 21–100); fol. 101r is an end-leaf with three more letters of Anselm, *Epp.* 471, 472, and 401, which could not have been copied before 1109. At the front of the book are two more end-leaves, on which the copyist who wrote the additional letters wrote notes datable after 1111 (fol. i^r) and after 1119 (fol. ii^r), while another hand has written a note datable after 1124 (fol. i^v). Michael Gullick draws my attention to the fact that the end-leaves are integral to the medieval sewing. It is tempting to infer that the book was made and bound close to 1110.

⁷⁴ In all three groups and in the Hereford copy, *Ep.* 2 continues with an extraneous passage, "In ipsa quippe sua origine – curam ablatam" (printed by Schmitt, "Zur Überlieferung der Korrespondenz," *RB* 43 (1931), 225, from the Salisbury booklet and BL MS Harley 203); identified by Samu Niskanen as coming from the end of Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Iob*, 35.14. 43–44 (ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 143, 143A, 143B [1979–1985], 1805.46–63). The extract is not found in the copies of *Ep.* 2 in the main collections, so it belongs only with the early circulation and proves that the different groups were not put together independently. It is a real question whether the extraneous passage at the end of *Ep.* 41 (see n. 69) in two of these groups can have originated in the same context.

the Salisbury group, but the possibility exists that *Epp.* 2 and 37 had been circulating as a pair since a very early date.⁷⁵

This one booklet copied at Salisbury extends our understanding of Anselm the author towards the end of his monastic career at Bec. It is bound with three other booklets, containing *Monologion*, *Cur Deus homo*, and in the last in date of writing *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* combined with *Ep.* 65 to Abbot William, identified by William of Malmesbury as abbot of Fécamp (which would find a place in the second group of early letters). The writing of these booklets is in no case later than the early twelfth century, but there is no means of tying them down as precisely in date and place as that containing *Proslogion* and the first group of early letters. It is not even possible to be sure that the four booklets were brought together before the beginning of the thirteenth century. It seems more likely, however, that we have an early collection of booklets remaining together than that someone after 1200 located and brought together four such booklets of diverse origin.

Anselm's works would have been known to his contemporaries mostly in small booklets of this type, usually containing only one work or perhaps two or three. When he referred to the *libelli* sent to Archbishop Hugh at Lyon, he may have meant two works each in separate booklets or two works in one small booklet of several quires. It is impossible to tell. Beyond that primary stage, however, we can see texts coming together in small groups. An early example is Arras, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 455 (cat. 1021), from the abbey of Saint-Vaast, dated by Schmitt to the end of the eleventh century, largely on the basis that it has only very early works. It contains *Monologion*, *Proslogion*, and *Orationes siue Meditationes*. As such it can hardly have been "an original," if that means a copy sent out by the author when he first "gave out" (*edidit*) a new book. It may reflect a stage of copying soon after the primary circulation.⁷⁶

A surviving manuscript from Normandy takes the process one stage further. The manuscript, now Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson A. 392, comes from Saint-Martin de Troarn, a Benedictine abbey closely linked with Bec.⁷⁷ It contains all the early works except *De casu diaboli*, and

⁷⁵ It is worth noticing, in connexion with the extract from Gregory's *Moralia* associated with *Ep.* 2 in these groups, that Anselm took a particular interest in that work around the time of writing *Epp.* 23, 25–26.

⁷⁶ For a manuscript with similar contents at Christ Church, Canterbury, now lost, see n. 198.

⁷⁷ There is an ownership mark at the end of the book, fol. 100r, "Iste liber scriptus est ad honorem sancti Martini Troarni. Qui eum furatus fuerit anathema sit" ("This book was copied in honour of St. Martin at Troarn. If anyone steals it, may God punish him"). A note at the

Schmitt regarded it as an important witness. The handwriting belongs to the end of the eleventh or the early twelfth century, and Schmitt in the edition usually gives it the date “circa a. 1085.”⁷⁸ The year is again a guess; the reasoning behind it in part depends on the dating of the texts in the manuscript, but the dating of the manuscript appears also to have influenced the dating of some works. So Schmitt dates *De ueritate* and *De libertate arbitrii* to 1080–1085 but *De casu diaboli* to 1085–1090; the third dialogue is wanting from this manuscript and so must be later, but there is no literary historical evidence to divide them at 1085. This dating of the manuscript also influenced his dating *Quomodo grammaticus* to before 1085. This line of reasoning also influenced Schmitt’s dating of *Oratio* 14, which the manuscript includes; Wilmart had dated it to 1090 × 1092, but Schmitt thought it had to be earlier. And the final *Meditatio*, not composed until 1099 or 1100, is found here, but Schmitt is inconsistent about noticing that.⁷⁹ He says that the copies in this volume exhibit features that he classified as early, such as the lack of chapter-headings; *tituli* are rare, and nowhere do they refer to Anselm as archbishop; and its texts are particularly good, persuading Schmitt that they were probably copied from what he called “an original.”⁸⁰ Since the works must originally have been put into circulation

front records that in June 1705 “les religieux de Troarn” gave the book to Nicolas-Joseph Foucault (1643–1721), later marquis de Magny; manuscripts and printed books from his library were sold in London in 1721, and others are now in English collections. The manuscript was first identified as an important early witness by Wilmart, *Méditations et prières de Saint Anselme*, pp. xlv–xlvi. Anselm was one of twelve Norman abbots who witnessed an important charter of Roger de Montgomery for Troarn in the time of Abbot Durandus (d. 1088) (Bates, *Acta of William I* [see n. 13], 844–45, no. 281). Two letters from Anselm to Ernulf, abbot of Troarn from 1088 to 1112, are found in Anselm’s letter-collections, one written soon after Ernulf’s election (*Ep.* 123), the other towards the end of Anselm’s life (*Ep.* 425).

⁷⁸ Schmitt provides a plate from fol. 13r in his edition, facing vol. i, p. 36. A fair judgement of the date of writing would be ca. 1080 × ca. 1120.

⁷⁹ Bodl. MS Rawlinson A. 392 contains the prayer to St. Nicholas (*Or.* 14) (fols. 60v–62v), for which Schmitt, therefore, allowed an earlier date than Wilmart or Southern (see n. 31 above). On his dating of *Quomodo grammaticus*, see n. 58. In listing the distribution of prayers and meditations in the manuscripts collated, he says (vol. 3, p. 2) that this manuscript contains *Or.* 2, 5–7, 9, 11–13, 14–17, 10, 18–19, and *Medit.* 1–3, but at the start of the text (vol. 3, p. 5) he mentions this as one of three manuscripts without the third meditation. In his 1968 *Corrigenda*, he again itemized the contents, but there he omitted to mention at all *Or.* 4 and *Medit.* 3, which are both present as additions (see n. 82 below).

⁸⁰ “Der ungewöhnlich gute, von Fehlern fast völlig freie Text legt es nahe, daß die Hs. direkte auf ein Original zurückgeht,” in “Zur Chronologie der Werke,” *RB* 44 (1932), 334. Schmitt’s edition segregates the readings of this manuscript (T) as representing “prior

singly, there could not have been just one physical original lying behind these copies. The manuscript is more complex than one can learn from what Schmitt says about it, but his judgement of its early date and importance is correct.

It is not a unitary volume, though in its binding it has been trimmed to appear uniform. Four booklets have been bound together. (1) The first two works, *Monologion* and *Proslogion* constitute one booklet of six quires (fols. 1–47); the four used for *Monologion* were ruled for 36 lines per page, and this continues for the first leaf of *Proslogion*, where the fourth quire ends (fol. 31v); the two quires for *Proslogion* and its adjuncts were ruled for 31 lines, perhaps on the basis of calculating the length to fit the quires. Signatures are visible on fols. 7v (I), 15v (II), 23v (III), and 39v (the tips of V). Both works have their *capitula* and chapter-numbers throughout. Early features are the inclusion of the letter to Lanfranc (fol. 1v) and the simple identification of the author in the *tituli*, “Incipit Monologion liber Anselmi,” “Incipit Proslogion liber Anselmi,” as in the Salisbury booklet. The outer leaves of the booklet are blank, a sign that this was intended as a booklet; it is not a mere accident that quiring and text form a unit within a book. (2) The prayers and meditations follow in a distinct booklet of similar format (fols. 48–77), also with blank outer leaves; it is the work of two hands, whose stint ends at fol. 73v with *Deploratio uirginitatis amissae*; there is no title for the collection, but each text has its own rubric.⁸¹ The text of the third prayer to the Virgin (*Or.* 7) agrees with the earliest state of the text.⁸² Two texts were added subsequently by different hands, *Oratio ad sanctam crucem* (*Or.* 4; fols. 73v–74r, in a distinctly higher register of script), and *Meditatio redemptionis humanae* (*Medit.* 3; fols. 74v–77r). This last was not composed until 1099–1100; its featuring as an early addition argues for the

recensio” in the case of the *Monologion* (though here it is not regarded as highly as the Sées copy, BNF MS lat. 13413), *Quomodo grammaticus* (inconsistently, along with Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, MS A. 259 (cat. 486) (saec. XII², Rouen, Saint-Ouen), fols. 205r–209r), *De ueritate*, and *De libertate arbitrii*; its text of the *Proslogion* is not accorded this distinction. For the only significant variants, see n. 83 below.

⁸¹ The order of prayers, using Schmitt’s numbering, is *Or.* 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 10, 18, 19; *Medit.* 1–2; and then the added items, *Or.* 4, *Medit.* 3. Schmitt’s edition mistakenly reports it as lacking *Or.* 8, but this omission is corrected in the addenda and corrigenda (1968), but he there fails to mention the added items.

⁸² Wilmart, “Les propres corrections,” *RTAM* 2 (1930), 192–97. The other copies representing this state of the text are the very early witness, Metz 245 (see above, n. 30), and two later manuscripts, BNF MS lat. 2881 (s. XII, ?Bec), and MS lat. 2882 (saec. XII², Mortemer), which presumably have an early shared ancestor.

early date of the copy in which it has been added. The same observation may apply to the prayer. (3) Next, *Quomodo grammaticus*, here without any title, fills a single quire (fols. 78r–86v); the hand is very like that of the first booklet, but the written page is slightly shorter with 33 lines per page. (4) The two dialogues *De ueritate* and *De libertate arbitrii* form a fourth booklet (fols. 87r–100v), with no titles or other rubrics and with not even an initial to mark the transition from one work to the next (fol. 94r). Readings reported by Schmitt may indicate that they were copied before either had received final revision; the most striking is in the opening of the second dialogue, still untitled, where the first sentence in T differs from that in other copies.⁸³ This, combined with the want of *De casu diaboli*, may bear out Anselm's complaint in the preface to the three dialogues about premature copying. This booklet, or its immediate exemplar, may indeed date from the late 1080s. The four booklets present a range of Norman bookhands, all appearing to date from the late eleventh or perhaps early twelfth century: someone with a better eye than mine and with more experience of Norman script in this period may judge how far these booklets may be all quite so early.

The four booklets all have the same line-length (115 mm), but the number of lines per page varies and the height of the written area varies a little too, but there would have been no difficulty in bringing them together in a single binding. They were surely already bound together when the Troarn inscription was added on the last leaf, which would hardly refer only to the final quire as “iste liber.” The outer leaves of the booklets have not been exposed to much wear and tear, so it is likely that they were kept together, perhaps initially in a parchment wrapper, from an early date. This now appears as the earliest surviving attempt to gather the early works. Might we infer that the bringing together of such booklets as a single-author collection is a sign of the writer's growing status as *auctor*? Readers are expected to want whatever he has written rather than a particular work. There is nothing here that demands a date after Anselm became archbishop. While it does not contain all he had written before then, it none the less amounts to something in the nature of volume one.

Two of the earliest copies of the finished *Proslogion*, those just mentioned from Saint-Vaast and Troarn, contain as a sequel a short text headed “Quid ad haec respondeat quidam pro insipiente” (“what someone may say in answer to this on behalf of the fool”). Eadmer informs us that an

⁸³ Other significant variants appear in *De ueritate*, cc. 6 and 8 (Schmitt, 1:183, 188) and in *De libertate arbitrii*, cc. 1, 5 (Schmitt, 1:207, 214–16).

unnamed friend sent a copy of this anonymous piece (*scriptum*) to Anselm, who:⁸⁴

repraehensori suo gratias agens, suam ad hoc responsionem edidit, eamque libello sibi directo subscriptam, sub uno ei qui miserat amico remisit, hoc ab eo et ab aliis qui libellum illum habere dignantur petitum iri desiderans, quatinus in fine ipsius suae argumentationis repraehensio, et repraehensioni sua responsio subscribantur.

expressing his thanks to his critic, produced (*edidit*) his reply to the criticism; he had this reply written at the end of the little book (*libello*) which had been sent to him and returned it as one (*sub uno*) to the friend from whom it had come, desiring him and others who might deign to have that little book (*libellum*) to write out at the end of it the criticism of his argument and his own reply to the criticism.

Anselm in this way sought to give the work of his critic circulation by implanting it in the transmission of his own little book. Anselm addressed the critic anonymously – “Dicis quidem quicumque es ...” – and his identity emerges only from the closing rubrics of two early-twelfth-century copies: a manuscript from Jumièges in Normandy, now Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, MS A. 366 (cat. 539) (saec. XIIin), which contains eight works by Anselm, closes Anselm’s response with the words “Explicit responsio Anselmi ad Gaunilonem Maioris Monasterii monachum”; while the copy from Marchiennes, now Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 354 (saec. XIIin), containing five works of Anselm, ends “Explicit responsio editoris ad Gaunilonem monachum Maioris Monasterii.”⁸⁵ Gaunilo, the obscure monk

⁸⁴ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, 1.19 (Southern, p. 31). He provides no sense of how much time elapsed between final publication and the exchange with Gaunilo, and he is frustratingly opaque in his use of *libellus*: are we to infer that “libello sibi directo” is a copy of Gaunilo’s *scriptum* or of *Proslogion* with Gaunilo’s comment added? Later in the sentence, “libellum illum” is his own *Proslogion*.

⁸⁵ I have not seen either manuscript. In view of the date assigned to them by Schmitt, they may turn out to be made up from booklets rather than uniform volumes, though neither is particularly small in format. The sequence of works in Rouen, A. 366 suggests that, if it is not separate booklets, it was copied from three or four booklets, not arranged in due order: the three dialogues (fols. 1r–40v, with the archiepiscopal style in the heading), with or without *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* (fol. 41r–58v); *Monologion* and *Proslogion* (fols. 59r–110v, again with archiepiscopal style); and *De conceptu uirginali* with *De processione Spiritus Sancti* (fols. 111r–147v). The opening initial of *Monologion* is the work of Hugo Pictor; it depicts Anselm as archbishop flanked by two monks, one of whom receives the book (illustrated in O. Pächt, “The illustrations of St. Anselm’s Prayers and Meditations,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 19 (1956), 68–83 (Pl. 16c), who dates the work to “about 1100”); Gameson saw an erased halo, a sign that Anselm was alive, and dated it to 1093 × 1109; R. G. Gameson, “Hugo Pictor, enlumineur normand,” *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 44 (2001), 121–39, at p. 136). The last two works in the Jumièges book could not have been copied before 1099/1100. The Douai manuscript begins with *Cur Deus homo* (fols.

of Marmoutier, thus achieved fame of a kind. This short critique *pro insipiente* “on behalf of the fool” is a token of the philosophical intelligence of some of Anselm’s unknown readers in the monasteries of France. The date of the exchange can be inferred only from the fact that it is not found in those manuscripts, like BAV MS Vat. lat. 532, which Schmitt regarded as descending from an exemplar earlier than the adoption of the title *Proslogion*. Nor is it found in the Salisbury manuscript, but it is found in all other early witnesses to the finished *Proslogion* as reported by Schmitt. We may add Marmoutier, near Tours, therefore, to the places where this text was known at an early date. The dating of the Salisbury booklet to the very early 1090s may mean that the exchange with Gaunilo happened later than is usually thought, perhaps as late as 1092, though presumably not after Anselm became archbishop of Canterbury.

The period between 1090 and 1093 is an important one for our purposes. During this period we have for the first time manuscript evidence for Anselm’s working his way towards a statement of his views on the Trinity. The historical evidence, however, is tantalizing.

In 1089 Fulk, a monk of Bec, was elected bishop of Beauvais in the Île-de-France. His election was attended by much dispute; Pope Urban II had annulled the election but by 13 May [?1090] he had cleared Fulk and accepted him as bishop, as we learn from Urban’s letter to Fulk’s archbishop.⁸⁶ This letter appears, perhaps surprisingly, to be a little later than the pope’s letter to Anselm on the same subject, which is preserved without any dating clause among Anselm’s letters but with a misleading date elsewhere.⁸⁷ In this letter Urban refers to the case of John, a Roman clerk

1r–(38)); next is the preface to the three dialogues and *De ueritate*, but the catalogue says nothing of the others and the space (fols. 38–(48)) is insufficient for them unless quires are missing; *Monologion* and *Proslogion* with the exchange with Gaunilo follow; at fol. 98 *De incarnatione Verbi* is reported under the title *De fide trinitatis ad Vrbanum papam*; two more works are not by Anselm, an anonymous *De templo et de pentecoste* and Guibert of Nogent’s *De bucella Iudae data*.

⁸⁶Urban II to Archbishop Rainald of Reims (PL 151:388; dated at the Lateran, 13 May, and entered by Jaffé–Loewenfeld 5522 as 13 May [1094]); D. Lohrmann, *Papsturkunden in Frankreich 7 Nördliche Île-de-France und Vermandois* (Göttingen, 1976), p. 23. The intervening years 1091, 1092, and 1093 are all excluded because the pope was not in Rome in May (but see next note).

⁸⁷Urban II, *Epp. Anselmi* 125 (Schmitt, 3:265–66); the papal dating clause is omitted from the Anselmian collection. As Schmitt notes, the text in Gerberon’s edition has a dating

who had become a monk at Bec; at the time of writing John was in Rome, perhaps putting Anselm's case on behalf of Fulk; he sends John back to Normandy, asking that he return to Italy "ante exactum a praesenti quadragesima annum" ("before a year is over from the present Lent").⁸⁸ This indicates that the letter to Anselm was written before Easter; if the year is 1090, Easter fell on 21 April. Some time later, perhaps from Beauvais, Brother John wrote to Anselm, requesting that he should not delay writing a refutation of Roscelin's position on the Trinity.⁸⁹ Anselm wrote a letter against the views of Roscelin, who had claimed the agreement of both Lanfranc and Anselm. At some point, however, Anselm learnt that Roscelin's teaching was to be considered at a council called by Archbishop Rainald of Reims, as we learn from the letter Anselm wrote to Fulk, now bishop of Beauvais: "dictum mihi est concilium a uenerabili Remensi archiepiscopo Rainaldo colligendum esse in proximo" ("I have been told that a council will shortly be brought together by the venerable Archbishop Rainald of Reims"). He asks Fulk to represent his views at this council and

clause, "Data Capuae kal. August.>"; in this form it was reprinted by Migne among Urban II's letters (PL 151:305), and from there it was listed as Jaffé–Loewenfeld 5406 (1 August 1089). Schmitt sets aside this date on the grounds that internal evidence shows that the letter was written during Lent. Gerberon's source for the dating-clause may have been a manuscript from Bec, now BNF MS lat. 14146 (saec. XII), fol. 164v, to judge from a note in Lohrmann, *Papsturkunden in Frankreich*, 7:246–47 (no. 13), who follows Jaffé–Loewenfeld and accepts this date despite the internal contradiction. M. Horn, "Zur Geschichte des Bischofs Fulco von Beauvais (1089–1095)," *Francia* 16 (1989), 176–84, was not misled by the dating-clause (pp. 178–79), favouring Lent 1090; for Jaffé–Loewenfeld 5522, however, he prefers May 1091, rejecting the place-date at the Lateran as an erroneous substitution in copying. C. J. Mews, in a wider study of the historical context, suggested Lent 1089 ("St Anselm, Roscelin, and the see of Beauvais," in *Anselm: Aosta, Bec, and Canterbury*, ed. D. E. Luscombe and G. R. Evans (Sheffield, 1996), pp. 106–19, at 107). Fulk's predecessor Bishop Ursio is usually said to have died on 18 April 1089 (*Gallia Christiana*, 9:711), in the third week *after* Easter, but Mews notes that the year is not directly attested and that he might have died on that date in 1088; Horn, 176n, accepted the received date for Ursio's death and Fulk's election.

⁸⁸ The letter is an important source for the early career of John, who by 1098 was abbot of Telesse and Anselm's host at Sclavia (see n. 1 above). By 1100 he had been promoted to cardinal-bishop of Tusculum, perhaps more likely by Pope Urban II before his death in 1099 than by the new pope Paschal II. Cardinal John served as legate in France and England in 1101, wrote to Anselm in 1102 (*Epp. Anselmi* 284), was written to by Anselm during his second exile (*Ep.* 339), and died in 1119.

⁸⁹ John, *Epp. Anselmi* 128 (Schmitt, 3:270–71), together with the reply, Anselm, *Ep.* 129 (Schmitt, 3:271–72). Dated by Schmitt to ca. 1090 on the grounds that Lanfranc (d. 28 May 1089) is referred to as dead. John's letter, written at least a year before Anselm's move to Canterbury (1093), is one of a small number of early letters that have survived only through the archive at Canterbury.

make clear that he did not endorse the position of Roscelin.⁹⁰ The dating of this letter has been the subject of some circular reasoning. Schmitt dates it only after the letters to Pope Urban, allowing a date-range 1090 × 1093. The wording of this letter is echoed in Anselm's treatise against Roscelin, *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*: when word of Roscelin's heresy reached him, he says, "incepti contra hunc errorem quamdam epistolam, quam parte quadam edita perficere contempsi, credens non ea opus esse, quoniam et ille contra quem fiebat in concilio a venerabili archiepiscopo Remensi Rainaldo collecto errorem suum abiurauerat" ("to refute this error I began a letter, though when it was partly drafted (*edita*) I decided it was not worth completing, believing there to be no need for it, because the person against whom it was directed abjured his own error in a council brought together by the venerable Archbishop Rainald of Reims").⁹¹ Southern explains the context in these terms: "Anselm had briefly replied to Roscelin when he was first challenged on this subject in about 1090. He had then embarked on a more detailed reply, but he abandoned it when Roscelin recanted at the Council of Soissons."⁹² This council at Soissons is usually dated to the year 1092, though where this begins I do not know.⁹³ It is mentioned in a letter of Ivo, bishop of Chartres, to Roscelin, written after Roscelin had reverted to

⁹⁰ Anselm, *Ep.* 136 (Schmitt, 3:279–81). Schmitt's dating is merely "after *Epp.* 128, 129"; Fröhlich proposes ca. 1091/92; Marabelli, 1. 398, more cautiously, says 1090 × 1093. It must, however, be earlier than *Ep.* 147 (winter 1092).

⁹¹ Anselm, *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, ch. 1 (Schmitt, 2:4).

⁹² Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, p. 80; in the revised text, *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, p. 177, this has become, "Anselm wrote first to the bishop of Beauvais in 1089, simply affirming his assent to the statements of the Creeds, and asserting that it was the duty of all Christians to believe these statements, whether they understood them or not [citing *Ep.* 136]. He also started to write a longer explanation, but having heard that Roscelin had dropped his allegations, he put his unfinished reply aside, no doubt with some relief." Anselm's engagement with the ideas of Roscelin is discussed by Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, pp. 78–81; idem, *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, pp. 175–80. For Roscelin and his views, see C. J. Mews, "Nominalism and theology before Abaelard: Roscelin of Compiègne," *Vivarium* 30 (1992), 4–33.

⁹³ For example, "when Roscelin recanted at the Council of Soissons in 1092" (Jasper Hopkins, *A Companion to the Study of St. Anselm* [Minneapolis, MN, 1972], p. 100); "Roscelin's doctrine was condemned at a council held by the bishop of Beauvais at Soissons in 1092" (R. W. Southern, *ODNB* [2004], s.n. Anselm). *Gallia Christiana*, 9:712, refers the council to 1093 (citing Anselm). The learned Google leads me to an essay by H.C.C., "On the conceptualism of Abélard," *Gentleman's Magazine* 178 (1845), 249–58, at p. 250n.: "Roscelin was silenced by the Council of Soissons in 1092 or 1093." The author gives his address as Doctors' Commons, enabling me to identify him as Henry Charles Coote (1815–1885); G. D. Squibb, *Doctors' Commons* (Oxford, 1977), 195n; *DNB*.

his old arguments. And Roscelin himself, in a much later letter to Abelard, admits that he had recanted his views “in the presence of the church of Soissons and Reims.” Yet these letters provide no precise evidence as to the date of the council.⁹⁴ While Fröhlich dates Anselm’s letter from that of the council, Mews with stronger reason dates the calling of the council from Anselm’s letter.⁹⁵ It can hardly have been long after the council before Roscelin reverted to his former heretical views.

The closure of this period is less insecure. From September 1092, Anselm was in England, at first on monastic business at Chester; later waiting to speak to the King and staying meanwhile, as Southern has shown, with Gilbert Crispin, a monk of Bec – son, indeed, of the abbey’s patron William Crispin – but since ca. 1085 abbot of Westminster.⁹⁶ Their conversations at this time may have occasioned Gilbert’s first book.⁹⁷ Anselm wrote a letter to Prior Baudri and the monks at Bec, which one of Gilbert’s monks delivered. In it he asked Baudri to send him “orationem ad sanctum Nicolaum quam feci, et epistolam quam contra dicta Roscelini facere inchoavi, et si quas de aliis nostris epistolis habet dominus Mauritius quas non misit” (“the prayer that I made to St. Nicholas and the letter that I had begun against the teachings of Roscelin, and any other of our letters that he

⁹⁴ “Scio te post concilium Suessionense ... pristinam sententiam tuam clandestinis disputationibus studiosissime defendisse et eandem quam abiuraueras et alias non minus insanas persuadere uoluisse” (Ivo of Chartres, *Ep.* 7 (PL 161:17B; ed. J. Leclercq [Paris, 1949], p. 22); “haec tria omnibus modis refello et testimonio Suessoniensis et Remensis ecclesiae falsa esse pronuntio” (Roscelin, *Epistola ad Abelardum*, PL 178:357–72, at 360A; ed. J. Reiners, *Der Nominalismus in der Frühscholastik. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Universalienfrage im Mittelalter*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters 8/5 [1910], 62–80, at pp. 64–65). Roscelin’s letter is known only from Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 4643 (saec. XII^{ex}–XIII¹), fols. 93v–99r.

⁹⁵ Fröhlich, *Letters of Saint Anselm*, 1:303, 316; Mews, “St Anselm, Roscelin, and the See of Beauvais,” p. 110, says that “the council of Soissons was called some time between 1090 and 1092,” a date inferred from Anselm’s letter, and that it had taken place by May 1092, when Roscelin was at Bayeux and on his way to England.

⁹⁶ R. W. Southern, “St Anselm and Gilbert Crispin, abbot of Westminster,” *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 3 (1954), 78–115, at pp. 86–92. The abbot of Bec witnessed a writ of King William II for Abbot Gilbert (*Regesta* 436), presumably at this time.

⁹⁷ Gilbert Crispin, *Disputatio iudaei et Christiani*, ed. A. S. Abulafia and G. R. Evans, *The Works of Gilbert Crispin* (London, 1986), pp. 8–53. The work is dedicated to Anselm, and four of the manuscripts containing the earliest form of the text dedicate it to him in the words “reuerendo patri et domino Anselmo abbati”; later forms of the text use his archiepiscopal title. The earlier form suggests a date no later than 1093, therefore, for the first circulation of the work; but Anselm’s influence on the text reflects ideas more current in 1092/93 than earlier.

may have that Dom Maurice has not already sent”).⁹⁸ Brother Maurice’s role in keeping or copying the abbot’s letters is not certain, but Anselm, it appears, is now going through them himself.⁹⁹ More importantly for our immediate purpose he intends to revise his letter against the views of Roscelin. Another letter may suggest that some mishap had befallen the draft at Bec, where two trusted brethren had been careless with Anselm’s quires; the nature of the mishap is unclear, and it is not even certain that the letter refers to this draft.¹⁰⁰ Anselm, at any rate, received his draft and the task resumed. Let us return to his own words in the final revision:¹⁰¹

Partem tamen illam quam feceram, quidam fratres me nesciente transcripserant atque aliis legendam tradiderunt. Quod idcirco dico ut si in alicuius manus pars illa uenerit, quamquam nihil ibi falsum sit, tamen tanquam imperfecta et non exquisita relinquitur

⁹⁸ Anselm, *Ep.* 147 (Schmitt, 3:293–94). See n. 29 above.

⁹⁹ The evidence regarding Maurice’s role is two letters. In *Ep.* 104 (assigned a date ca. 1085), Anselm refers to “epistolas nostras, quas dominus Mauritius nobis mittere debuit, adhuc expectamus” (“we are still waiting to receive our letters, which Dom Maurice ought to have sent to us”). Schmitt took this to refer to Anselm’s own letters addressed to Maurice during his sojourn at Canterbury some years earlier (“Zur Entstehungsgeschichte,” *RB* 48 (1936), 308). He draws the inference that the absence of these eight letters (*Epp.* 42, 43, 47, 60, 64, 69, 74, 79) from the early collection N, BL MS Cotton Nero A. VII (saec. XI/XII), fols. 41–112, indicates that Maurice had not returned them even as late as 1092, when *Ep.* 147, quoted above, was sent. This led him to think that the collection in N was put together without them around this date. Southern, *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, pp. 397–99, 461–62, picks up this point but notes that the letters were eventually returned, and he allows that N “was compiled while Anselm was still engaged in his ultimately successful attempt to recover his letters from Maurice” (p. 399). On the premise that N was not used by William of Malmesbury and that it was therefore unofficial – both questionable inferences – Southern supposed that N was an unauthorized copy of the materials collected in 1092/93. A different interpretation of these two letters is possible, since this linear join across seven years fails to allow for the possibility that Maurice had a wider role in keeping or copying Anselm’s letters, not merely letters addressed to himself, something allowed (p. 461) but not applied by Southern.

¹⁰⁰ “si tamen incautum est quod de quaternionibus nostris fecistis” (“if it is a careless thing that you have done with my quires”) (Anselm, *Ep.* 146 [Schmitt, 3:292–93], addressed to Brother John (see n. 88 above) and Brother Boso, Anselm’s foil in *Cur Deus homo*). Presumed to refer to the draft solely on the grounds that the two letters are juxtaposed in V, whose order is followed by Picard, Gerberon, and Schmitt.

¹⁰¹ Anselm, *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, ch. 1 (Schmitt, 2:4–5). Strictly speaking, the passage conflicts with our understanding of *Ep.* 147, for here Anselm says that he heard about Roscelin’s reversion only after his nomination as archbishop, yet he asked for the draft while still waiting for the king’s agreement on other business and before his nomination. Roscelin’s reversion also provoked a letter from Bishop Ivo of Chartres (see n. 94), which can only be dated from context.

et quod ibi incepti diligentius inceptum et perfectum requiratur. Postquam enim in Anglia ad episcopatum nescio qua dei dispositone captus et retentus sum, audiui praefatae nouitatis auctorem in sua perseuerantem sententia dicere se non ob aliud abiurasse quod dicebat nisi quia a populo interfici timebat.

The part that I had written was transcribed without my knowledge by certain brethren who gave it to others to read. On this matter I say this. If that part has come into anyone's hands, although it contains nothing false, none the less, since it is unfinished and unrevised, let it be set aside. Instead the carefully begun and finished version of what I had started there should be sought out. For after I was caught and retained by some divine dispensation to be a bishop in England, I heard that the author of the foresaid novelty, continuing in his old opinion, had said that he would not have recanted what he said if he had not been afraid that he would be killed by the people.

Anselm has therefore resumed work on the subject, and the result is *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, addressed in this its final form to Pope Urban II by Anselm, who now styles himself “iubente siue permittente deo Cantuarie metropolis uocatus episcopus” (“by divine command or consent called bishop of the metropolitan see of Canterbury”). It is clear, therefore, that between his asking for his draft in the winter of 1092/93 and his sending this text to the pope, he has become archbishop, to which office he was nominated by King William on 6 March 1093 and consecrated at Canterbury on Sunday, 4 December 1093. Anselm's work on the text in this period is reflected in Gilbert Crispin's early awareness of its argument.¹⁰² It is not possible to be sure when the work was finished; it appears to have been still fresh more than four years later, when Bishop Malchus of Waterford wrote seeking a copy.¹⁰³ Pope Urban was to cite the finished work in Anselm's presence at the Council of Bari in October 1098.¹⁰⁴

By a remarkable chance, the draft that Anselm had begun but not finished survives. William of Malmesbury found it, and he included a copy in his own arrangement of Anselm's letters. Here it was discovered by both Wilmart and Schmitt, and in 1931 both published the text as a first draft of Anselm's *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*.¹⁰⁵ William's source is not known.

¹⁰² Gilbert Crispin, *Disputatio cum gentili*, §§ 99–107 (Abulafia and Evans, *Works of Gilbert Crispin*, pp. 84–87), shows by several parallels his familiarity with *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*. Gilbert's work is thought to date from 1093 or soon after.

¹⁰³ Malchus, *Epp. Anselmi*, 207 (Schmitt, 4:101–2); see below, p. 44 and n. 111.

¹⁰⁴ Eadmer, *Historia nouorum in Anglia*, p. 119 (Rule, p. 105); *Vita Anselmi*, 2.10 (Southern, pp. 72–73).

¹⁰⁵ London, Lambeth Palace, MS 224 pt 1 (copied by William of Malmesbury, probably in the 1120s), fols. 121v–124v, where it is the last of three letters (following *Epp.* 102, 101) for which his source is not known. The text was the subject of one of two clashes between Wilmart and Schmitt in the same year (see also n. 12 above). It was printed, along with the

The piece has no title in William's copy; rather it is presented simply as a letter openly addressed, "Dominis et patribus et fratribus omnibus catholicae et apostolicae fidei cultoribus qui hanc legere dignantur epistolam" ("to all lords, fathers, brothers, followers of the catholic and apostolic faith, who deign to read this letter"). When it was written must be inferred from the difficult chronology of ca. 1090–1092. It was revised to form chs. 1–6 of the finished version. The finished text of *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, the first work that Anselm published as archbishop, has a far wider circulation. Eadmer mentions that Anselm despatched it to the pope.¹⁰⁶ As in the joint preface to *De ueritate, De libertate arbitrii*, and *De casu diaboli*, so here Anselm complains that the monks had been circulating unauthorized copies before the text was complete. The survival of that initial draft is due to William's being able to find and copy the text. It has usually been surmised that he must have found it in the archive at Canterbury: in line with Anselm's express wish that the unfinished and unrevised text be set aside, it was neither allowed to circulate alongside the revised text nor incorporated in the Canterbury letter-collection.

letter of Brother John (now *Epp. Anselmi* 128), by A. Wilmart, "Le premier ouvrage de Saint Anselme contre le trithéisme de Roscelin," *RTAM* 3 (1931), 20–36 (John's letter at p. 21, from BNF MS lat. 2478; Anselm's letter at pp. 25–36); and again, along with John's letter and Anselm's two replies by F. S. Schmitt, "S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi Epistola de incarnatione Verbi; accedit prior eiusdem opusculi recensio nunc primum edita," *Florilegium patristicum* 28 (1931), 27–36 (where it is followed by John's letter, from London, Lambeth Palace, MS 59, p. 37, and *Epp.* 129, 136, pp. 38–39). This first recension was printed again in the collected works, Schmitt, 1:281–90, where he makes no reference to Wilmart's edition.

¹⁰⁶ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, 2.10 (Southern, pp. 72–73), mentions that it was sent to the pope, "quod opus, epistolari stilo conscriptum, uenerabili sancte Romane ecclesie summo pontifici Urbano dicauit, destinauit" ("this work, written in the form of a letter, he dedicated and sent to the venerable Pope Urban, supreme pontiff of the holy Roman church"). Schmitt sought to identify in two copies the particular form of the text that was sent to Pope Urban ("J'incline à admettre que les mss. **VP** représentent la recension de l'exemplaire de l'*Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* envoyé à Urbain II" (F. S. Schmitt, "Cinq recensions de l'*Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* de S. Anselme de Cantorbéry," *RB* 51 (1939), 275–87, at p. 283). He thought that BAV MS Reg. lat. 452 (cited as **V**) was made at a very early date ("il date d'environ 1100"). In the edition, he dates the copy saec. XIIⁱⁿ, though to judge from his plate this is probably too early; Wilmart dated it saec. XII², which is understandable but too late; Teresa Webber hesitantly suggests saec. XII¹. Anselm's work (fols. 131r–141r) is merely part of a uniform codex of some 200 leaves, six different works, and absolutely not a primary copy. While **VP** agree on quite a number of insignificant errors, that does not amount to a recension.

What is more remarkable is that other passages survive that represent intermediate sketches of parts of the finished work. How did such passages come to survive? If from partial unauthorized copies, one must wonder why anyone retained and recopied them after the work was completed.

Lying between the first draft (ca. 1090–1092) and the final text (1093 × 1098, but presumably 1093), intermediate passages were discovered by Richard Southern in a manuscript made at Gloucester abbey, now Hereford Cathedral, MS P. I. 1 (saec. XII^{med}–saec. XII²), fols. 154v–155v.¹⁰⁷ He dated them to January–March 1093, when Anselm was at Westminster before he was called to Gloucester by the king and nominated to the vacant see of Canterbury.¹⁰⁸ Schmitt and Southern both allowed that the survival of these passages must have resulted from unauthorized copying, but Schmitt's attempt to discern passages from three layers of revision within these sketches is surely untenable.

A further passage, *Cur Deus magis*, is another sketch towards *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*; it would be revised to form chs. 10–11. This sketch was first recognized by Constant Mews, surviving in three copies of the late twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries.¹⁰⁹ The Salisbury booklet, discussed above, contains a much earlier copy. That appears more likely to have been copied from something permitted to circulate by Anselm than the result of copying without his knowledge. The inclusion of *Cur Deus magis*

¹⁰⁷ The manuscript context is suggestive. The volume is an assemblage of booklets, of which fols. 135–162 is the last. After a copy of *Cur Deus homo* (fols. 135r–154v), there are two Anselmian sketches, which might have been copied with it in a primary booklet made at Canterbury. The first is the sketch for part of *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, which is followed (fols. 155v–156v) by a text beginning “Ad insinuandum interioris hominis custodiam,” known from four other copies, and printed by Southern and Schmitt, *Memorials*, pp. 354–60. There is no direct route to Anselm's archive at Canterbury, and one must wonder where, when, and why a sketch superseded already in 1094 should be copied with a work not finished until 1098.

¹⁰⁸ Schmitt, “Cinq recensions,” *RB* 51 (1939), 275–87 (who credits Southern with the discovery at Hereford); Southern, “St Anselm and his English pupils,” *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 1 (1941) 3–34, at pp. 32–34. This find came too late to be used in Schmitt's presentation of the first recension in volume 1 (1938), but it is reported alongside the final text in volume 2 (1940).

¹⁰⁹ C. J. Mews, “St Anselm and Roscelin: some new texts and their implications 1 The *De incarnatione Verbi* and the *Disputatio inter christianum et gentilem*,” *AHDLMA* 58 (1991), 55–97, at pp. 57–68, text at pp. 82–85. The second part of this study followed some years afterwards, “A vocalist essay on the Trinity and intellectual debate c. 1080–1120,” *AHDLMA* 65 (1998), 39–90.

in that context confirms the probable date of the booklet's exemplar and authenticates the sketch as something Anselm allowed to be copied.

The unfinished draft of the opening section and the sketch towards chs. 10–11 both have a discernible transmission from Anselm himself; so does the first sketch towards *De casu diaboli* attached to *Ep. 97* to Brother Maurice. The passages in Hereford demand explanation, but unauthorized copying of such short disconnected passages during the process of composition does not make much sense. Anselm stayed at Gloucester abbey at the beginning of Lent 1093. Could he have left behind a few scraps of parchment with these jottings, saved by the monks and later copied? These texts do take us into Anselm's study and allow us to see him at work. To write of recensions, however, is surely to mislead: *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* is not an example of a complete text, revised and worked over, but rather an incomplete draft, sketches of evolving ideas for eventual inclusion, and a finished version. Indeed, contrary to the trend of Schmitt's thinking, nowhere among Anselm's writings is there clear-cut evidence that Anselm revised any work to a significant degree after it was finished and published.¹¹⁰

At the time of his promotion to archbishop of Canterbury, Anselm was actively working on *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, which he sent to Pope Urban II. His circumstances were now very different from when he first diffidently offered the *Monologion* to Lanfranc's judgement. By 1093 he

¹¹⁰ Schmitt not infrequently describes a particular copy, or several copies, as representing an early recension, and he sometimes reserves a separate apparatus for selected readings. This supposes a view of Anselm's method of writing that is not borne out by the textual evidence. So, his categorization of Metz, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 245 as preserving an early recension of the *Orationes siue Meditationes* is less than secure (above, n. 30); the witnesses to the *Proslogion* clustered around BAV MS Vat. lat. 532 as "priors recensiones" (Schmitt, 1:93, 95, 97) present no variant that could conceivably be authorial revision, so they are *priores* only in having preserved an earlier title for the work (above, n. 62); Bodl. MS Rawlinson A. 392, which is seen as attesting an early recension of *Monologion*, *Quomodo grammaticus*, *De ueritate*, and *De libertate arbitrii*, offers only a handful of significant variants, but these might actually indicate for the last two works that the copy was made before the text had received its final touches (above, n. 83); the putative early recension of *De processione Spiritus Sancti* in Glasgow, University Library, MS Hunter 244, as compared with Arras, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 484 (cat. 805), is a gross misreading of the textual evidence (below, p. 55 and n. 149); in his argument for an early recension of *De concordia* he appears to have misconstrued some surviving sketches from late in Anselm's life as evidence

was an established author, whose books were known in monasteries scattered over much of France. His role in the controversy with Roscelin and his episcopal advancement might have increased the demand for copies of his writings. Malchus, bishop of Waterford, whom Anselm had consecrated at Canterbury on Sunday, 27 December 1096, wrote to express sorrow at Anselm's leaving England for exile and to request that the archbishop send him, and all the Irish bishops, a copy of "illum librum a uobis compositum de sancta trinitate et commendatum apostolica auctoritate, sicut nuper audiui" ("that book on the Holy Trinity composed by you and recommended, as I lately heard, by the authority of the pope").¹¹¹ Malchus goes on to ask Anselm "ut componeretis dictamine illum sermonem incarnationis domini nostri Iesu Christi, quem uos narrastis nobis in festiuitate beati Martini ad prandium" ("that you should compose in formal words the sermon on the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ that you delivered to us during the meal on St. Martin's day"). Schmitt takes this sermon to refer to the half-written treatise *Cur Deus homo*, and infers that Anselm may have spoken at Saint-Omer – for which we should understand the abbey of Saint-Bertin – in the first days of his first exile, on St. Martin's day, 11 November 1097, though there is no other evidence for Bishop Malchus's presence on that occasion or

of a long and involved history, linking *De concordia* to two of the earlier dialogues (below, n. 157). The discovery of Anselm's unfinished draft of *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* in 1931 appears to have triggered interest in the possibility of finding other authorial drafts, a point made by J. Rivière: "Du moment que ces quelques pages inachevées avaient pu mériter l'attention d'un copiste, comment trouver peu vraisemblable que d'autres aient cru devoir faire un sort au brouillon du *Cur Deus homo*?" ("Un premier jet du *Cur Deus homo*?", *Revue des sciences religieuses* 14 [1934], 329–69, at p. 330). In fact, the writer there under review, Eugene Druwé, had already published his identification of a supposed first draft of *Cur Deus homo* in 1930 ("La première rédaction du *Cur Deus homo* de S. Anselme," *Recherches de science religieuse* 20 [1930], 162–66). (My thanks to Dr. Jean-Louis Quantin, Paris, who supplied me with a copy of this.) After reading this article, in 1932 Schmitt flirted with Druwé's idea, speculating that this was the text referred to by Anselm in *Ep.* 209, which he dated to before 1097 (see n. 119). Druwé's edition and extended discussion, *Libri sancti Anselmi Cur Deus homo prima forma inedita* (Rome, 1933), provoked Rivière's review and a subsequent debate. Rivière was not convinced, though he notes that some other reviewers were (pp. 368–69). By 1935 Schmitt too had changed his mind (see n. 112); none the less early recensions held a continuing allure for him.

¹¹¹ Malchus, *Epp. Anselmi* 207 (Schmitt, 4:101–2), probably written around the end of 1097 or very early in 1098. Malchus was an Irishman of good family, and a monk of Winchester cathedral priory, when chosen as bishop and sent to Archbishop Anselm for consecration towards the end of 1096; the consecration took place at Canterbury on 28 December (Eadmer, *Historia nouorum in Anglia*, pp. 87–88 [Rule, pp. 76–77]; *Epp. Anselmi* 201, 202).

any other.¹¹² The reasoning is hardly plausible. It seems more probable that the letter, written late in 1097 or early in 1098, refers to an occasion when Malchus had heard Anselm preach in England.¹¹³ Papal recommendation surely helped spread the demand for the book, and evidently beyond the pope's immediate circle. Did Urban's copy serve as an exemplar from which many copies were reproduced? Perhaps, but there is no textual evidence to support that possibility.¹¹⁴ How, if at all, did Anselm respond to the letter from Bishop Malchus? No copies of such texts survive from Ireland.

¹¹²F. S. Schmitt, "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Anselms *Cur Deus homo*," *Theologische Revue* 34 (1935), 217–24, at col. 223. (My thanks to Dr. Joerg Pelzer, Heidelberg, who obtained a copy of this for me.)

¹¹³Eadmer, *Historia nouorum in Anglia*, pp. 101–2 (Rule, p. 89), and *Vita Anselmi*, 2.25 (Southern, pp. 100–1), tells us that Anselm landed at Wissant and "post dies" arrived at Saint-Bertin (some 60 km distant); here he stayed as a guest at the abbey of Saint-Bertin for five days ("quinque inibi dies morati sumus"), leaving on the sixth day ("sexto die"). Southern, p. 101n, dates his arrival to 10 November and his departure, ignoring the medieval convention of inclusive counting, to 16 November. During this time he dedicated an altar for the canons of the cathedral in Saint-Omer but returned to the abbey to lodge. The abbey is just outside the walls of the town. Fröhlich's itinerary shows Anselm at Saint-Omer (the town) from 10 to 17 November 1097 (*Letters of Saint Anselm*, 1:339); both Biffi's itinerary and Brett's have ca. 10–16 November at Saint-Bertin (I. Biffi, "Cronologia della vita e delle opere di Anselmo," *Anselmo d'Aosta. Lettere* (Milan, 1988–1993), 3:507–21, at p. 514; M. Brett and J. A. Gribbin, *English Episcopal Acta 28 Canterbury 1070–1136* (London, 2004), p. 98). They differ by one day on the night of Anselm's channel-crossing (8 or 9 November). The greatest difficulty is weighing the "post dies" from Wissant to Saint-Bertin, but the journey need not take more than a day or two; it looks as if it is possible that Anselm was at Saint-Bertin on St. Martin's day, 11 November 1097. Schmitt later allowed (4:101n.) that the address could have been given a year later, at Rome in the November following the Council of Bari, but the allusive reference to Pope Urban's recommendation is insufficient basis for supposing that Malchus had attended on the pope himself. Indeed, it seems improbable that Malchus would be in either France or Rome without explaining himself, and if he were, it is odd that he should refer to Anselm's going away. Fröhlich is more likely correct in supposing that Malchus heard Anselm preach on 11 November 1096 and wrote more than a year later, from Ireland, after news of Anselm's exile had reached him (*Letters of Saint Anselm*, 2:151). Anselm's whereabouts on that date are unknown, and Malchus is as likely to have been already in Canterbury as Anselm is to have been at Winchester. Fröhlich's dating of the letter itself "c. 1099" appears to be simply inferred from its place in Schmitt's sequence. The letters that refer to Malchus (*Epp.* 201, 202, 207) are known only from the Canterbury archive.

¹¹⁴*Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* is found in two copies from Italy, but neither copy reflects primary circulation. One, BAV MS Rossi 343 (saec. XII¹), has a group of texts that could not have been assembled as early as 1098, among them Eadmer's *De beatitudine caelestis patriae*, based on a sermon delivered by Anselm at Cluny (Southern and Schmitt,

Meanwhile, in southern Italy in the heat of the turbulent summer of 1098,¹¹⁵ the archbishop in exile has completed another book, “his greatest intellectual achievement,”¹¹⁶ *Cur Deus homo*. It was again dedicated to Pope Urban II, who may have been the first recipient of a primary copy. Schmitt restored to its place at the head of the work an address to the pope preserved among Anselm’s Nachlaß and in manuscripts not favoured for the edition of the text itself.¹¹⁷ Anselm explains in the preface how this work, begun in England but interrupted by the crises that led him to choose exile in 1097, was finished in Italy, more hastily and more briefly than he would have chosen, “propter quosdam qui, antequam perfectum et exquisitum esset, primas partes eius me nesciente sibi transcribebant” (“on account of some people who were making copies for themselves, without my knowledge, of the first parts of the work before it was complete or polished”).¹¹⁸ As with the early

Memorials, pp. 31–34, 271–91, not citing this copy). The Christ Church source of its texts is further indicated by the distinctive agreement of the text of *Or. 7* with that in the collected works (Wilmart, “Les propres corrections,” *RTAM* 2 (1930), 202). The other, now Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS VII D. 11, contains only works by Anselm; Schmitt proposed a date saec. XIII, but a catalogue has revised this date to saec. XII/XIII (*Manoscritti francescani della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli* [Quaracchi, 1971], 1:30–31).

¹¹⁵ During the summer both Anselm and Pope Urban were drawn to the siege of Capua, as Eadmer relates in both his *Vita Anselmi*, 2.32–3 (Southern, pp. 109–12), and in his *Historia nouorum in Anglia*, p. 110 (Rule, p. 97). Abbot John took Anselm to Sclavia to escape the heat (*Vita Anselmi*, 2.29 [Southern, p. 106]).

¹¹⁶ Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, p. 77.

¹¹⁷ Printed under the heading, “Commendatio operis ad Vrbanum papam II” (Schmitt, 2:39–41), inc. “Quamuis post apostolos,” but in Gerberon’s edition it had appeared as a preface to *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* (PL 158:259–61), a position it occupies in two manuscripts noted by Schmitt. The status of this text is discussed in F. S. Schmitt, “La lettre de saint Anselme au pape Urbain II à l’occasion de la remise de son *Cur Deus homo* (1098),” *Revue des sciences religieuses* 16 (1936) 129–44 (text, 143–44). It was copied from Anselm’s archive in London, Lambeth Palace, MS 59, fol. 178r and in its close relative, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 135 (saec. XII^{2/4}, made for Anselm of Bury); but it is omitted from the Canterbury collected works in Bodl. MS Bodley 271. Schmitt recorded eight copies in which it stands after the preface, after the *capitula*, or at the end of *Cur Deus homo*, with which it most likely belongs. Although it has no superscription, the text addresses Urban in the closing words and presents to him “subditum opusculum,” a phrase echoed as “opus subditum” in the opening words of *Cur Deus homo*. The manuscripts that transmitted this text (noted by Schmitt, 2:39) were found to have nothing else to contribute to the editing of the work (*ibid.*, 2:38), a sign, perhaps, that they reflect later editing rather than deriving from the primary copy sent to the pope. In the light of Anselm’s concern over prefaces, expressed in this work and elsewhere, we may wonder why this dedicatory letter was not more securely fixed to the text.

dialogues and the *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, we find Anselm complaining just as a secular master might complain about his students, impatient for his books and forestalling their completion. But the archbishop was not surrounded by importunate pupils. Was this surreptitious copying at Canterbury by the monks? If so, a year of exile separated the problem from the solution. Or was his writing-desk rifled in Saint-Bertin, Cluny, Lyon, Rome, as he made his way south? When did he decide to publish? We do not know, but he twice uses the verb *edere* in this preface, and he clearly regards the work as now permanently available, by whatever means. He requests, “hanc praefatiunculam cum capitulis totius operis omnes qui librum hunc transcribere uolent ante eius principium ut praefigant postulo” (“I beg all who will want to make a copy of this book to include at the front this little preface and the table of chapter-headings of the whole work”), so that anyone might discern the book’s contents from the start. In the following year, if the dating is correct, still in exile but now back at Lyon with his friend Archbishop Hugh and able to receive letters from Bec, he replies promising a copy of the new work.¹¹⁹

Librum quem ego edidi, cuius titulus est Cur Deus homo, domnus Edmerus, carissimus filius meus et baculus senectutis meae, monachus †Becci, cui tantum debent amici mei quantum me diligunt, libenter ecclesiae Beccensi ut filius eius transcribit.

¹¹⁸ Anselm, *Cur Deus homo*, preface (Schmitt, 2:42); see above, n. 3.

¹¹⁹ Anselm, *Ep.* 209 (Schmitt, 4:104). Schmitt suggests that this letter and *Ep.* 208 were written in the summer of 1099, since Anselm did not leave Rome until after the Council in the Vatican in April of that year (Eadmer, *Historia nouorum in Anglia*, p. 130 [Rule, p. 114]). Anselm was in Lyon when Pope Urban II died on 29 July 1099. Eadmer, who accompanied Anselm in exile, was a distinguished scribe, but a monk of Christ Church, Canterbury, not of Bec. Schmitt, “Zur Chronologie der Werke,” *RB* 44 (1932), 346n, wanted to emend “Edmerus” to “Elmerus”; he inferred from *Ep.* 60 that Aelmer (d. 1137), an Englishman, later prior of Christ Church, had been a monk of Bec in the 1070s; at the same time he dated this letter before Anselm first went into exile in 1097, for it refers to the king’s stopping the passage of letters to Bec, and inferred, “Um das vollendete Werk kann es sich also nicht handeln”; this led him into speculation that Elmer had copied the “*primae partes*” composed in England, perhaps to be equated with what Druwé thought was a first recension (see above, n. 110), but he later abandoned this idea. For it was Eadmer, not Aelmer, who was the “*baculus senectutis*.” In the edition, therefore, 3:104–5n, he proposed to emend “Becci” to “*Ecclesiae Christi*” (“*Eccl. Xi.*?”) and to replace “*ut filius*” with “*uelut filius*.” The letter survives only in two copies (VC) from Bec, so a local error in their parent is possible. It is easier to believe that Anselm meant to say that, though a monk of Canterbury, Eadmer is glad to act as if he were a monk of Bec than that he intended, in error, to say that a monk of Bec will act as a monk of Bec should. The error may be attributed to a copyist at Bec.

The book that I published, entitled *Cur Deus homo*, Dom Eadmer my dearest son and the prop of my old age, a monk of †Bec, to whom my friends owe as much as they have love for me, will gladly copy for the church of Bec as her own son.

This letter was addressed to Boso, the monk of Bec who had most urged Anselm to write *Cur Deus homo* and who was given the role of interlocutor in it, someone to whom (one might imagine) a copy would have been sent at the earliest opportunity.¹²⁰ The verb *edidi* is in the perfect tense: Anselm adheres to the notion that the work was published when he was in Italy, but it seems that only now is a copy being made for Boso and the monks of Bec. It is made clear here that the copy was not for Boso personally but, as one might expect, for the community, who would presumably value this slim booklet, the single work, in Eadmer's elegant Christ Church hand.¹²¹ Even so it seems to have been disposed of when such booklets were superseded by a set of Anselm's collected works – at least it is invisible in the twelfth-century library catalogue from Bec.¹²² There is no letter to the prior of Christ Church to tell us whether a copy had already been sent there, and the book is not mentioned in Anselm's letter from Lyon to the archdeacon of Canterbury, to which Eadmer added a personal postscript.¹²³ If this is hasty publication, then it suggests that the most familiar and friendly channels were not necessarily the first priority in publishing.

¹²⁰ Later, Anselm again wrote to Boso, saying, “cum in libro *Cur Deus homo*, quem ut ederem tu maxime inter alios me impulisti, in quo te mecum disputantem assumpsisti, ...” (“when you read in the book *Cur Deus homo* which you more than anyone urged me to publish and in which I have given you the role of interlocutor, ...”) (Anselm, *De conceptu uirginali et de originali peccato*, prologue; Schmitt, 2:139). Boso remained at Bec during Anselm's first exile, as we learn from his Life, as written by Milo Crispin (PL 150:726B). From 1106 until 1109 Boso remained with Anselm at Canterbury, and he would in due course become prior and later abbot of Bec himself.

¹²¹ On Eadmer as a copyist and calligrapher, see T. Webber, “Script and manuscript production at Christ Church, Canterbury, after the Norman Conquest,” in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. R. G. Eales and R. Sharpe (London 1995), pp. 145–58, at pp. 148–52; M. Gullick, “The scribal work of Eadmer of Canterbury to 1109,” *Archaeologia Cantiana* 118 (1998), 173–89.

¹²² The twelfth-century catalogue of the library at Bec records only the two volumes of treatises and a third volume of letters; G. Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn, 1885), p. 262, nos. 82–84.

¹²³ Anselm, *Ep.* 208 (Schmitt, 4:102–3). Eadmer's postscript may be a sign that he had written the letter, presumably at Anselm's dictation, and felt free to add a few words in his own name. This seems more probable than that it was written by Anselm himself, or by another secretary, and then handed to Eadmer to add his own words.

While at Lyon in 1099 and 1100, Eadmer tells us, Anselm wrote two more works, both the result of his further thinking about the incarnation.¹²⁴ One of them, titled *De conceptu uirginali et de peccato originali*, was addressed again to Boso.¹²⁵ One copy survives as a booklet of a single quire, now BL MS Burney 357 fols. 5–12 (saec. XII^{1/4}).¹²⁶ This text evidently joined *Cur Deus homo* in its primary circulation, as appears from an early booklet from Durham cathedral priory, containing only these two works.¹²⁷ They are also paired in another surviving manuscript, written at Farfa, whose Italian provenance may provide a clue to the widening early distribution of Anselm's works.¹²⁸ The second work from this period was a return to his

¹²⁴ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, 2.44 (Southern, p. 122).

¹²⁵ Anselm, *De conceptu uirginali et de peccato originali* (Schmitt, 2:137–73).

¹²⁶ Four booklets, now bound together as BL MS Burney 357, formed part of a volume of ten booklets in the second half of the twelfth century; when it was broken up in the nineteenth century, four were kept together as Burney 357, two as Burney 341, and the other four as separate items, Burney 246, 285 (on which see below, p. 53), 295, and 344. There is a late-twelfth-century table of contents for the gathered volume, now Burney 357 fol. 24v, which has the *ex libris* of the Cistercian abbey of Thame Park (N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* (London, 1941), p. 104; 2nd edn (London, 1964), p. 188).

¹²⁷ Cambridge, Jesus College, MS Q.G. 16 (cat. 62), fols. 86–118, is a booklet of four quires, each of eight leaves, from the beginning of the twelfth century. It contains only *Cur Deus homo* and *De conceptu uirginali*. It was probably this manuscript, still an independent booklet, that was entered in a booklist (ca. 1160) simply as “Cur Deus homo;” B. Botfield, *Catalogi ueteres librorum ecclesiae cathedralis Dunelm. Catalogues of the library of Durham cathedral, at various periods, from the Conquest to the Dissolution*, Surtees Society 7 (1838), pp. 1–10, at p. 3). A mid- to late-twelfth-century table of contents shows that it was soon bound with a booklet of Boethius on the Trinity (fols. 2–15) and another booklet (fols. 16–85), also saec. XII in, of seven quires, each of ten leaves, containing Anselm's *Monologion*, *Proslogion*, and the exchange with Gaunilo, *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, and the three dialogues *De ueritate*, *De libertate arbitrii*, and *De casu diaboli*. The manuscript was not used by Schmitt.

¹²⁸ Now Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Vittorio Emanuele, MS 159 (Farf. 11) (Farfa, saec. XII^{1/4}), a booklet of eight quires in small format, 200 × 120 mm, 23 lines per page (rising to 30 lines at the end of the booklet to fit the text within the last quire), contains *Cur Deus homo* (fols. 1r–42v, imperfect at beginning and end through loss of leaves) and *De conceptu uirginali et originali peccato* (fols. 43r–62v, imperfect at beginning). Schmitt used it only for the latter text. In a published description, G. Brugnoli dated the writing to saec. XIlex, which appears audacious for texts composed in 1098 and 1099/1100 (“Catalogus codicum Farfensium,” *Benedictina* 6 [1952], 287–303 [Farf. 1–9], and 7 [1953], 85–120 [Farf. 10–33], 287–94 [index] [at vol. 7, pp. 85–86]). This booklet is now bound with a copy of Isidore's *Quaestiones in Vetus testamentum* (fols. 63r–217v); both were made at the same place and time, reusing the parchment of an eleventh-century lectionary; P. Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area grafica romanesca (secoli X–XII)* (Alessandria, 1987), pp. 266–70.

contemplative style, *Meditatio redemptionis humanae*.¹²⁹ It has little visible independent circulation, surviving mainly in manuscripts that contain the sequence of prayers and meditations. In one case, however, mentioned above, we have found it added to an already existing booklet.¹³⁰ And another booklet appears to have combined it with the other two works published during the years 1098–1100.¹³¹ The piece is so short that its primary circulation may have differed little from that of a public letter.

Anselm's next work was presumably first sketched in Italy, but Eadmer provides no context for its publication. He goes into some detail about its origin, reporting how Anselm delivered a major speech, at Bari in October 1098, to the Council whose purpose was to refute the Greek view on the procession of the Holy Spirit. The circumstances are set out in his *Historia nouorum in Anglia*, but he gives no details of the argument, "eo quod ipsemet Anselmus postmodum inde diligentius atque subtilius tractans egregium opus scripsit, idque per multa terrarum loca ubi eiusdem erroris fama peruenit ab amicis suis rogatus direxit" ("because Anselm himself later wrote a famous work treating the question carefully and subtly, which at the suggestion of his friends he sent out to many of the places where rumour of that error reached").¹³² Such a speech would not have been made off the cuff, and Anselm may well have started with a written sketch for it. The finished work was published under the title *De processione Spiritus Sancti*; no preface has been preserved to give us an authorial context.¹³³ Eadmer's work dates in the main from the years 1109–1114,¹³⁴ so that there is the

¹²⁹ The title *Meditatio redemptionis humanae*, used by Eadmer, is also found in the collected works; Schmitt reports only one other copy with this reading, and other copies vary (Schmitt, 3:84). Bodl. MS Rawlinson A. 392 (T), which Schmitt incorrectly reported as omitting this text, has the heading "Meditatio redemptionis nostre" (fol. 74v). Later copies often have the title *Meditatio animae Christianae*, taken from the incipit.

¹³⁰ Bodl. MS Rawlinson A. 392, fols. 74v–77r; see above, p. 32.

¹³¹ Oxford, St. John's College, MS 158 fols. 1–38 (saec. XII^{3/4}), contains *Cur Deus homo*, *Meditatio de redemptione humana* under the title *Meditatio anime Christiane* (from the opening words, "Anima christiana"), and *De conceptu uirginali et de originali peccato*, the three works composed in 1098, 1099, and 1100. Although relatively late and now imperfect at the end, it appears possible that this was copied from a booklet reflecting near contemporary circulation.

¹³² Eadmer, *Historia nouorum in Anglia*, p. 120 (Rule, p. 106). In the Life, he is much more concise, *Vita Anselmi*, 2.34 (Southern, pp. 112–13).

¹³³ Anselm, *De processione Spiritus Sancti* (Schmitt, 2:179–219).

¹³⁴ Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, pp. 298–300; idem, *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, pp. 414–16. On manuscript evidence for Eadmer's revision of the work after 1114, see M. Brett, "A note on the *Historia nouorum* of Eadmer," *Scriptorium* 33 (1979), 56–58.

possibility of hindsight, but the natural sense is that *direxit* means much the same as *edidit*, used with reference to *Cur Deus homo*: as soon as the work was complete, Anselm sent unsolicited copies wherever he thought Greek views might have found a hearing. The only internal evidence of date is his reference to what he wrote “in epistola ad uenerabilis memoriae Vrbanum papam de incarnatione uerbi” (“in the letter to the late Pope Urban on the incarnation of the word”), which cannot have been written before Urban’s death on 29 July 1099.¹³⁵ In 1101, when Hildebert of Lavardin, bishop of Le Mans, wrote to Anselm in England, he mentions that, “Apulorum relationibus didici uos in concilio Barensi sermonem habuisse de spiritu sancto” (“I learnt from the account of the Apulians that you had preached on the Holy Spirit at the Council in Bari”), and he asked Anselm to write his argument “succincto tractatu” (“in the form of a concise treatise”).¹³⁶ Anselm sent a copy to Hildebert, who acknowledged the book with pleasure but without specific comments.¹³⁷ Anselm’s only surviving letter to Hildebert, which may have been written between the two from him,

¹³⁵ Anselm, *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, ch. 9 (Schmitt, 2:204).

¹³⁶ Hildebert, *Epp.* 2.9 (PL 171:216–17), and also adopted into one manuscript of Anselm’s correspondence, *Epp. Anselmi* 239 (Schmitt, 4:146–47). Hildebert’s visit to Rome, Sicily, and Apulia and the generosity of the Normans there are described in the twelfth-century *Gesta* of the bishops of Le Mans in Le Mans, MS 224 (saec. XII) (excerpted from Mabillon in PL 171:92–93; ed. G. Busson and A. Ledru, *Actus pontificum Cenomannis in urbe degentium* [Le Mans, 1902], pp. 404–5). He did not leave Le Mans for Rome until about November 1100, after the death of King William Rufus in England (2 August 1100) and the recovery of Le Mans by Count Elias of Maine more than three months later. He was received in Sicily by Count Roger I, who died 22 June 1101; Roger was commemorated as a benefactor by the cathedral of Le Mans (G. Busson and A. Ledru, *Nécrologe-Obituaire de la cathédrale du Mans* [Le Mans, 1906], p. 141). A letter written to Abbot Hugh of Cluny says that he was at Île-Saint-Honorat, i.e. the abbey of Lérins, northbound, at Whitsun, 9 June, in what must have been 1101 rather than 1107 as dated by his editors (*Epp.* 3.9; PL 171:287–98). This chronology was deduced by A. Dieudonné, “Hildebert de Lavardin, évêque du Mans, archevêque de Tours (1056–1133),” published in seven instalments in *Revue historique et archéologique du Maine* 40–42 (1896–1898), and reprinted as *Hildebert de Lavardin, évêque du Mans, archevêque de Tours (1056–1133). Sa vie, ses lettres* (Paris, 1898), pp. 111–13 = 41 (1897), 222–24. (My thanks to Dr. William Stoneman, Harvard, for a copy of pages from this book.) The Apulians who spoke to Hildebert recollected the speech with approval and were presumably, therefore, not those susceptible to Greek influence, to whom Anselm directed copies of the book.

¹³⁷ Hildebert, *Epp.* 2.9 (PL 171:216–17), and *Epp. Anselmi* 240 (Schmitt, 4:148). The letter is assigned on no particular evidence to the summer of 1102. Hildebert appears to have admired *Cur Deus homo*, for he wrote an eighteen-line verse-summary of it, “Cur Deus homo,” ed. A. B. Scott, Teubner (1969), p. 32 (no. 40); there is no evidence as to when he did this.

mentions that, since Hildebert had asked to see some of his works, “praesumimus uobis mittere quaedam quae, ut puto, nondum uidistis” (“we have presumed to send to you something which I think you will not have seen”).¹³⁸ Robert de Torigny inferred that Hildebert’s letter had provided the stimulus to write up the discussion, which is surely unlikely.¹³⁹ The delay since Bari makes it improbable in the first place; and, if the bishop of Le Mans had been a decisive influence, I think Anselm would have added a prefatory dedication.

Another of Anselm’s letters refers to *De processione Spiritus Sancti*. Walram, bishop of Naumburg in Saxony, had written to Anselm for advice on responding to certain *Graeci*.¹⁴⁰ Anselm replied and sent a copy of this work, “opusculum uobis misi quod de spiritus sancti processione edidi” (“I sent you the little work that I published on the procession of the Holy Spirit”). Walram’s response was retained in the archive at Canterbury, together with a copy of Anselm’s answer, and both were transcribed into a volume of Anselm’s letters copied there in the 1120s.¹⁴¹ The dating of these letters is unclear. Eadmer makes no reference to them. Schmitt, apparently relying on their placing in the letter collection, dated them to ca. 1106–1107, but this is not a reliable guide.¹⁴² The possibility exists, therefore, that this

¹³⁸ Anselm, *Ep.* 241 (Schmitt, 4:149–50); this letter was not included in Hildebert’s letter collection. Schmitt presumed from the sequence of letters in London, Lambeth Palace, MS 59, that this was a response to *Ep.* 240. If so, then it accompanied the despatch of further works, but there is no internal reason to read it so, and Schmitt consistently overstated the authority both of the Lambeth manuscript and of the sequence of letters.

¹³⁹ Robert de Torigny, in his obituary of Anselm (see n. 50), “duodecimus [sc. liber] qui et ultimus illi, tractatus fuit de processione Spiritus Sancti; confutauerat enim Grecos in Barensi concilio, negantes Spiritum Sanctum a Filio procedere, unde sumpta materia, rogatu Hildeberti Cenomanorum episcopi, hunc librum composuit” (William of Jumièges, 6.9 [van Houts, 2:74–77]); doubted by Schmitt, “fraglich ist es indes, ob Anselm wirklich erst auf Anregung Hildeberts diese Abhandlung verfaßt hat” (“Zur Chronologie der Werke,” *RB* 44 [1932], 348).

¹⁴⁰ Naumburg, on the river Saale, began in the eleventh century as a castle of the margraves of Meissen; the church was established in 1021 and, with papal consent, the cathedral was moved from Zeitz in 1028. Walram was bishop from 1090 until his death, 12 April 1111; W. Fröhlich, “Bischof Walram von Naumburg. Der einzige deutsche Korrespondent Anselms von Canterbury,” *Analecta Anselmiana* 5 (1976), 261–82.

¹⁴¹ Anselm’s letters are numbered as *Epp.* 415 and 417 by Schmitt but printed among the treatises (Schmitt, 2:221–32, 239–42); the letter of Walram, *Ep.* 416, is printed with them (Schmitt, 2:233–38). See nn. 143, 144.

¹⁴² His further reasons for thinking that the exchange followed Anselm’s return from exile are opaque: “In dem Schreiben des Waleramnus werden in der Diözese des hl. Anselm geordnete Zustände vorausgesetzt, so daß wir entweder die Zeit nach der ersten oder zweiten

exchange belongs to the opening years of the century when the work *De processione Spiritus Sancti* was new. It forms the only evidence for Anselm's personally sending any of his works to Germany. The subject matter and treatment no doubt explain why the two letters to Walram were included in Anselm's collected works with the titles *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati* (Ep. 415) and *Epistola de sacramentis ecclesiae* (Ep. 417). The first also had some independent circulation, for BL MS Burney 285, fols. 1–12 (saec. XII^{1/4}), is a single quire with this text on its own, under the rubric, "Incipit epistola Anselmi de sacrificio azimi et fermentati." The letter was read as a treatise, rounding off his arguments against the Greeks. This double line of transmission, among the letters and among the treatises, must in some sense reflect what Anselm chose to do with the texts.

The Canterbury evidence tells one story. The three letters were presumably kept and copied with other letters. This is the main, but not exclusive, route of transmission for the surviving letter from Walram.¹⁴³ Schmitt's selection of manuscripts gives a similar impression for *Epistola de sacramentis ecclesie*, though this is misleading.¹⁴⁴ The editor of the collected works may have drawn on the archive of letters for copying *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati* and *Epistola de sacramentis ecclesie* among

Verbannung annehmen müssen. Für die Zeit nach der zweite Verbannung (von Herbst 1106 an) bürgt die Stellung der Briefe in Anselms Korrespondenz" ("Zur Chronologie der Werke," *RB* 44 [1932], 348–49). I can see nothing in the letter of Walram that alludes to Anselm's exile, so that the arrangement of the letters appears to be the sole basis for Schmitt's dating.

¹⁴³ The three letters (Epp. 415–17) apparently survive together, following *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, and among other works of Anselm, in BAV MS Chigi A. VI. 184 (saec. XIV/XV) (Schmitt, "Prolegomena," pp. 224*–225*); Walram's letter (Ep. 416) is otherwise reported only from the twinned Canterbury manuscripts (LP) of the letter collection, so the Chigi copy appears to be the only witness to another line of transmission.

¹⁴⁴ Schmitt's edition of *Epistola de sacramentis ecclesiae* (Ep. 417) used five copies deriving from the archive of Anselm's letters, the copy in the Canterbury collected works, and one other, Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 1547 (saec. XII², Troyes, collegiate church of Saint-Étienne), where it accompanies the three early dialogues and four later works, *Cur Deus homo*, *De conceptu uirginali*, *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, and *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati*. Why the Troyes manuscript was used for Epp. 415 and 417 but not for other the works is beyond guessing; why indeed was it used at all? The identical group of texts is found together in Chartres, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 194 (saec. XIIin), of which Schmitt says, "eine der besten und frühesten der Hss. für die Gesamtwerke ("Prolegomena," p. 215*); lacking the early and the late works, this grouping cannot fairly be described as "die Gesamtwerke," but in spite of this high judgement Schmitt used it only for *De libertate arbitrii*. The plain fact is that *Epistola de sacramentis ecclesie* is found in other manuscripts of the letters and in more than a few manuscripts of the treatises. Schmitt's selection of manuscripts appears arbitrary.

the treatises. Other manuscript evidence, however, shows that *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati* was also circulated at an early date alongside *De processione Spiritus Sancti*. Schmitt used three copies that reflect the pairing of these two texts in primary circulation. BL MS Royal 5 E. v, fols. 50–73 (saec. XII^{1/4}) is a booklet of three quires, now lacking its blank outer leaves, of Norman or French origin, containing precisely this pairing and offering what Schmitt judged to be an excellent text. BNF MS lat. 5305 fols. 49–110 (saec. XIIin, Beauvais), fols. 49r–67r, again presents the same two texts; in this case the booklet was extended with a copy of a long poem by Fulcoius of Beauvais (fols. 67v–110r). More importance, however, has been attached to Arras, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 484 (cat. 805), a booklet of sixty-three leaves, in a Christ Church hand of the early twelfth century (saec. XII^{1/3}). This contains Anselm's *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, here preceded by *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati*; the format is small, 185 × 130 mm (written area 125 × 85 mm), with only twenty lines per page; and the text shows a certain amount of contemporary erasure and correction. A booklet written at Canterbury is recognizable from its writing in a way that booklets from Bec are not, an advantage for us when trying to understand such copies of Anselm's later writings. Here we may have a primary copy as it was sent out from Canterbury to Arras, two new works together, for Lambert, first bishop of Arras (1093–1115) – a present, perhaps, but not a presentation copy to be kept so much as a basic text to be recopied into a more permanent form.

Schmitt made much of this copy, suggesting that “sie ist eine mit dem Originalbrief gleichzeitig entstandene Kopie, die Anselm für sich anfertigen und mit seinem Handexemplar der Schrift *De processione Spiritus Sancti* zusammenbinden ließ.”¹⁴⁵ This implies a date of writing between the publication of the text in 1099 and Anselm's death in 1109. I suspect that Schmitt was mistaken, both as to this being Anselm's working copy and as to the “original” status of the copy of the letter to Walram. First, he was wrong in identifying the hand as that of Thierry, monk of Canterbury, to whom he also mistakenly attributed the collected works in Bodl. MS Bodley 271 and the collected letters in Lambeth Palace, MS 59.¹⁴⁶ These manuscripts, rather than being written almost simultaneously under Anselm's supervision between 1104 and 1109, as Schmitt wishfully conjectured, are likely to be later: Bodley 271 may date from the second

¹⁴⁵ F. S. Schmitt, “Eine dreifache Gestalt der *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati* des hl. Anselm von Canterbury,” *RB* 47 (1935), 216–25, at p. 219.

¹⁴⁶ Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, 68n, 238n. See further below, pp. 73–77.

decade of the century, Lambeth 59 is probably later still, though apparently not later than 1124.¹⁴⁷ Second, the physical evidence of the Arras booklet does not square with Schmitt's notion of binding together two codicologically separate texts. Third, the mid-twelfth-century inscription on fol. 1r will hardly bear the interpretation he imposed. While he correctly read "lib. s. mar. at^eb." as the *ex libris* inscription of the cathedral at Arras, "Lib(er) S. Mar(ie) Atreb(atensis)," his notion that the preceding words, written by the same Arras librarian, "lib. anselmi cantuariens. archiep.," represented a memorial of Anselm's former personal ownership is untenable.¹⁴⁸ Fourth, the striking out of a passage on fol. 5r–v, does not represent authorial revision; the copyist had found a substantial omission in his exemplar, which he filled from another source, adding the missing portion at the end of his copy.¹⁴⁹ The same omission occurs, uncorrected, in Glasgow, University Library, MS Hunter 244 (?Italy, saec. XII), another slim volume though in a larger format, containing four works of Anselm, *Cur Deus homo*, *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, and *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati*, as well as other texts by Peter Damian, Honorius of Regensburg, and Marbod of Rennes. Schmitt regarded the Glasgow manuscript as a first recension, though it appears to me rather to be characterized by omissions; he thought the Arras text was one step further towards completion, with this single major authorial addition. I prefer to read the textual evidence as a sign that both copies go back to one used at Canterbury in the production of Anselm's works for dissemination during the years immediately after 1100. The Glasgow copy reflects, though not at first hand, the defective exemplar also used by the copyist of the Arras manuscript, but the latter has corrected his against a more accurate exemplar. The fact that copies were being made at Christ Church from a defective exemplar when a sound text was available may

¹⁴⁷ See below, p. 75 and n. 199.

¹⁴⁸ "war im Besitz des hl. Anselm" (Schmitt, "Prolegomena," p. 213*). This and other *ex libris* by the same hand are illustrated by R. G. Gameson, "The earliest books of Arras cathedral," *Scriptorium* 61 (2007), 233–85 (Pl. 29a, 29b, 31c, and for this one 34b). The librarian's preference was to write the *ex libris* at the top left of a blank opening recto, but in MS 484 the text begins on fol. 1r with no opening *titulus*; the librarian supplied this vague *titulus* as part of the *ex libris*, which consequently wraps at the outer margin.

¹⁴⁹ The striking out is illustrated in Schmitt's edition, vol. 2, facing p. 230; the marginal note reads, "Quae hic desunt, require in secundo folio ad hoc signum Ø." The copyist had written the opening lines of § 5 and the closing lines of § 6, omitting from p. 228, line 25 to p. 231, line 4; what he had written of these two sections is struck out and their text written complete on fols. 6v–9v.

allow us to infer that more than one exemplar was in use and perhaps even that more than one copy was being made at the same time.

Anselm had used the period of his first exile for literary work. During his second exile, from April 1103 to September 1106, he seems to have composed only letters, and those that survive are mostly on ecclesiastical business. He was, however, still disseminating copies of his works. It was only at the end of 1104 that he asked Ernulf, the former schoolmaster but since ca. 1096 prior of Christ Church, to arrange for a copyist with a clear hand to make a copy for Pope Paschal of *Cur Deus homo* together with *De conceptu uirginali*, a pairing of texts attested in the manuscript tradition.¹⁵⁰ Another letter, datable probably to 1104, thanks Matilda of Canossa, countess of Tuscany, for her help in his difficulties; with it Anselm sent from Lyon, at her request, a copy of his *Orationes siue Meditationes*, which, significantly for us, he had expected her already to possess.¹⁵¹

mandauit michi celsitudo uestra per praedictum filium nostrum Alexandrum quia orationes siue meditationes quas ego dictaui, et putabam uos habere, non habebatis; et ideo mitto uobis.

Your highness has sent word to me through our son Alexander that you do not possess copies of those prayers and meditations that I composed and had thought you to have, so I send them to you.

This copy was identified by Wilmart as the parent of a branch of the tradition of these works in Italy and more conspicuously in Austria and southern Germany.¹⁵² This inference rests on another letter to Countess Matilda, prefixed to the *Orationes* in some members of a group of manuscripts, a letter which introduced the copy sent by Anselm and invited her to allow copies to be made for any who wanted them. One of the extant copies was made early in the twelfth century at the abbey of Zwiefalten in Baden-Württemberg, more than 500 km from Canossa.¹⁵³ The composing of

¹⁵⁰ Anselm, *Ep.* 349 (Schmitt, 5:288–89). See above, p. 49, for two booklets containing the same pair of works.

¹⁵¹ Anselm, *Ep.* 325 (Schmitt, 5:256–57).

¹⁵² A. Wilmart, “Le recueil de prières adressé par saint Anselme à la comtesse Mathilde,” *RB* 41 (1929), 35–45, repr. in his *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du moyen âge latin* (Paris 1932), pp. 162–72; O. Pächt, “The illustrations of St. Anselm’s Prayers and Meditations,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 19 (1956), 68–83.

¹⁵³ Printed by Wilmart, “Le recueil,” 39, repr. in *Auteurs spirituels*, p. 166, from two copies. He offered a very early date for the small booklet, now Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, MS Theol. 4^o 234 (saec. XII in, Zwiefalten), 85 leaves, 195 × 135 mm (written area 155 × 100 mm), 23 lines per page. A still earlier dating, saec. XI/XII, was proposed by Karl Loeffler, *Die Handschriften des Klosters Zwiefalten* (Linz, 1931), no. 154.

this letter to Matilda appears to have made Anselm decide now to treat the series, some of which had been in circulation for many years, as a complete work and to add a preface; in composing this preface, he reused much of the wording from his letter to Countess Matilda.¹⁵⁴ Whether this was done in 1104 or later, after his return to England, is not certain. The set of prayers and meditations was now complete. The final placing of the third meditation and of the two prayers added last, *Oratio ad Deum* (*Or.* 1) and *Oratio ad accipiendum corpus Domini et sanguinem* (*Or.* 3), is not entirely secure, because the arrangement in the manuscript sent to Countess Matilda was not followed in the Canterbury collected works.¹⁵⁵

His judgement that the handwriting is characteristic of the abbey might indicate a copy made from a circulating exemplar. Dr. Herrad Spilling advises me that the date is better expressed as saec. XII^{1/4}; I am indebted to her for more detailed information on the content of the manuscript, revealing that the letter to Matilda is placed at the end, that the text begins with the heading, “Meditationes edite ab Anshelmo Cantuariensi archiepiscopo” (fol. 2r), followed by “Domine, Deus meus, da cordi meo te desiderare,” i.e. the opening section of Ps. Augustinus, *Meditationes de spiritu sancto* (PL 40:901–9), already added to Anselm’s *Orationes*; there is also one minor deviation from the order of this group in that *Or.* 3 follows *Or.* 2, 4 instead of preceding them. Wilmart’s second copy is a rather later booklet, Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 289 (saec. XII^{3/4}, ?Traunkirchen). Adding reference to later copies in Leipzig, UB, MS 369 (saec. XIII^{ex}), fol. 5r, and Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 190 (saec. XIII/XIV, Heilbronn), fol. 52r, Schmitt, 3:4, printed the letter as a variant prologue to the *Orationes* without adding it to the collection of letters. Nine manuscripts of this group provided Wilmart with decisive textual evidence in support of his establishing which *Orationes* and *Meditationes* were authentic. More manuscripts of the same branch have been discovered; the letter is also found in Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 967 (saec. XV), fol. 225r, and Nürnberg, Stadtbibliothek, MS Cent. II 50 (saec. XV), art. 9.

¹⁵⁴The shared wording might have passed in either direction. If the preface existed already, Anselm tailored it to the circumstances as a letter to the Countess. I prefer to think that the letter was composed first; it was adapted for use as a preface and appears as such in the collected works, Bodl. MS Bodley 271, fol. 139r. The evidence of transmission is not decisive. What has swayed me is the feeling that Anselm would have written afresh for the Countess and not recycled an existing preface; but what he wrote for her could be adapted for the world.

¹⁵⁵The manuscript evidence divides. The copies representing the collection sent to Countess Matilda provide the sequence *Or.* 1, *Medit.* 3, *Or.* 3, 2, 4–19, *Medit.* 1–2 (Wilmart, “Le recueil,” 43–44, repr. in *Auteurs spirituels*, pp. 170–71; Schmitt reports two copies of this family, his G and L). This appears to be the nearest we have to Anselm’s final intention. The Canterbury collected works, on the other hand, has the sequence *Or.* 2, 4–19, *Medit.* 1–2, followed by *Or.* 1; *Medit.* 3 appears elsewhere in the volume; and *Or.* 3 is found at the end of the book, after *Quomodo grammaticus*. This reflects the sequence before *Medit.* 3 and *Or.* 1 and 3 were added. Schmitt set out to follow the Canterbury collected works, “als festen Kern” (“Gebete und Betrachtungen,” *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, 2:173), but he avoids its haphazard ending. He justifies his placing of *Or.* 1 and *Or.* 3 in purely systematic terms:

Towards the end of his life Anselm was still writing. Eadmer dates the treatise *De concordia praescientiae et praedestinationis* to the period between Anselm's fever at Bury St. Edmunds in April and May 1107 and the meeting of the king's council at London in August of that year.¹⁵⁶ The incomplete booklet, now BL MS Add. 57971 (saec. XII^{1/4}), which carries this work alone in a near contemporary hand, became accessible to study as recently as 1973.¹⁵⁷ In linking the writing of this work with Anselm's illness Eadmer adds a detail which is relevant to all that has gone before: in writing this, he says, "contra morem moram in scribendo passus est" ("contrary to his usual practice he suffered some interruption in the writing of this work"), on account of his infirmity. In other words Anselm habitually wrote quickly. This was certainly his way with the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* in 1077. Eadmer had been with Anselm since he became archbishop and knew his methods. It is a sign that we should be chary of accepting Schmitt's

"auch die später entstandenen und daher in den Hss. nachgetragenen Gebete Or. 1 und 3 müssen ihren hierarchischen Platz in der Reihe der Gebete erhalten. Or. 1, die an Gott (Vater) geht, muß an die erste Stelle treten, und Or. 3, ein Kommuniongebet, nach dem Gebet an Christus" (ibid., 177–78). He might, however, have compared their early placing in the Matilda family. He tells us that "Wilmart setzt in seinem Manuskript die Or. 1 und 3 an den Schluß, noch nach den Medit. 1 und 2, wo sie zufälligerweise in **B** nachgetragen sind. Medit. 3, die in **B** unter den systematischen Werken steht, folgt ihnen als letztes Stück" ("Gebete und Betrachtungen," *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, 2:178). In the nearest thing we have to an edition by Wilmart, the French translation by Dom A. Castel, with introduction by Dom A. Wilmart, *Méditations et prières de Saint Anselme* (Paris, 1923), he placed *Or. 1* at the beginning and *Or. 3* at the very end, after the three meditations. I should prefer to follow the Matilda family, thinking that Anselm placed his last words (prologue, *Or. 1*, *Medit. 3*, *Or. 3*) at the front of the sequence already established for the rest (*Or. 2*, 4–19, *Medit. 1–2*), when arranging the book for the countess. Wilmart's discussion of *Or. 7*, one of the first prayers sent to Gundulf (see n. 24), identifies a group of manuscripts with three significant additions that date back before 1104 (his B); the text prepared for Countess Matilda (his C) has three small additions; and three more small additions are found in the collected works and its descendants (his D) ("Les propres corrections," *RTAM* 2 [1930], 192–203). This at least shows that Anselm retouched the master-copy of that prayer after 1104.

¹⁵⁶ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, 2.62–63 (Southern, pp. 139–40).

¹⁵⁷ The booklet was in quires of 12 in a small format, 200 × 125 mm, 21 or 22 lines per page; the first quire is lost, and the last leaf of the extant third quire has also gone, so it is impossible to be certain that the booklet did not comprise more than four quires and a single work, though the format certainly suggests a primary booklet of forty-eight small leaves. The two significant breaks in the text are marked by a coloured initial and a heading in red ink (fols. 6r, 8v). Michael Gullick judges the hand to be that of a Norman accustomed to working in England, and marginal notes from the fifteenth and sixteenth century show that the book was then in England. It was shown to the British Library in 1951 by its then owner, A. W. Lewis, of Loughborough, and it was bought from Quaritch in 1973.

interpretation of a very early recension of *De concordia*.¹⁵⁸ We should probably also discount any notion that *Cur Deus homo* was laboured over between 1093 and 1097 before being finished in 1098. It was presumably composed in two bursts, one in 1097 before he left England, the other, as we know, at Sclavia.

Having ended this survey of Anselm's literary career, it is time to draw together those points that have a bearing on his emergence as a publishing author. His interest in the accurate copying of texts was emphasised by Eadmer, and the letters provide evidence that Anselm wanted his own work

¹⁵⁸ F. S. Schmitt, "Eine frühe Rezension des Werkes de Concordia des hl. Anselm von Canterbury," *RB* 48 (1936), 41–70, makes an elaborate case that *De concordia*, contrary to what Eadmer says, was "fast eine Lebensarbeit," with *De ueritate* and *De libertate arbitrii* reconsidered as part of the process ("sie waren ursprünglich als Teile des Werkes *De concordia* gedacht"). The principal manuscript evidence is four passages found together in two manuscripts from the Bavarian abbey of Windberg, now Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 22273 (saec. XII), fols. 41v–44v, and clm 22291 (saec. XII), fols. 106r–108v; to which he soon added a third copy in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 553 (saec. XII¹), fols. 78v–80v ("Ein weiterer Textzeuge für die I. Rezension von de Concordia des hl. Anselm," *RB* 48 (1936), 318–20). These had hitherto been regarded as excerpts from *De concordia*. Schmitt made comparisons for § 2 with a paragraph in Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 652 (saec. XIII), fol. 263v, and for § 3 with a passage in the Canterbury letter-collection, London, Lambeth Palace, MS 59, fols. 188v–189r. This last is one of several philosophical fragments in the manuscript (see below, p. 76), and it appears to be an authentic sketch on the subject of the will; the same topic appears in a different manner at the beginning of *De humanis moribus* (see n. 180; Southern and Schmitt, *Memorials*, p. 39, and comment, *ibid.*, p. 9). The close agreement with § 3 of Schmitt's texts from Windberg is clear from his edition (*RB* 48 (1936), 62–68), which also shows the parallels with *De concordia*. Jasper Hopkins accepted the argument that "the earliest drafts contain parts of *De libertate*, as well as a projected section of *De ueritate*. One may conjecture that copies were made, unsanctioned by Anselm, before he had settled on *De ueritate* as an independent work" (*Companion to the Study of St. Anselm*, p. 13). It seems to me more probable that sketches made in 1107 and not destroyed were copied into Lambeth 59 and also lie somewhere in the textual history of the Anselm manuscripts in Windberg. These also include a copy of the archive version of *Ep.* 97 (BSB MS clm 22291, fols. 105r–106r), here noted by Schmitt (*RB* 48 [1936], 44) but not mentioned in the edition of the letters. Schmitt also noted another sketch in a parallel with *De concordia*, from Trier, MS 728 (saec. XII), fol. 136v, "Si mihi transituro fluuio" (printed by Schmitt, *RB* 48 [1936], 69–70); again, this keeps company (fol. 137r–139r) with two philosophical fragments also found in Lambeth 59, "Est considerandum" (Lambeth 59, fol. 161r, 187r; *Memorials*, pp. 334–38), "Velle eisdem sex modis" (Lambeth 59, fol. 188r; *Memorials*, p. 351). The real question is one of transmission.

to be copied accurately.¹⁵⁹ One letter in particular from Anselm's second exile offers a remarkable insight into the attention he paid to a correct text. Replying to a written inquiry from the copyist Thierry at Canterbury, Anselm instructs him to write, in copying chapter 4 of his treatise *De conceptu uirginali*, the words of a quotation from St. Paul exactly as in the letter.¹⁶⁰ He did not need to explain the circumstances; the point must have been clear to the recipient, even if it is not to us. We have even seen him concerned with the quality of hand written by a copyist.¹⁶¹ In another revealing letter to Thierry, which appears to refer to the correction of copies of his own works, Anselm shows an awareness that error is spread by copying and therefore, where correction has been made in an exemplar, correction is also required in copies already made.¹⁶² Richard Southern long ago pointed out that Anselm's "letters about copying books show that he had the instincts of a careful and acquisitive librarian."¹⁶³ The concern with an accurate text might better be attributed to his role as an author who sought to ensure that his works would reach their audience as he intended them to.

Anselm's prefaces are not merely conventional but tell his reader about the circumstances in which he wrote and the aims of his writing; at the point when he decided to add a preface to *Monologion*, he chose to be seen as an author, and in continuing to write circumstantial prefaces he joined generations of authors in shaping his own literary biography. His expressed concern that his prefaces should be copied with their texts was a concern for the integrity of his writing, while his use of a table of chapter-headings and his concern that these too should be copied with the work reflects a desire to let the reader know that he has a complete text in front of him as well as to provide an aid to comprehension and navigation.¹⁶⁴ Schmitt, always looking for signs of an early recension, attached importance to copies that lacked preface or chapter-headings. Since these are authorial and integral, we should expect them to be present even in primary booklets, and we find that the manuscript evidence largely bears this out. The want of prefaces and

¹⁵⁹ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, 1.8 (Southern, p. 15), identifies Anselm with the contemporary concern to improve the corrupt texts that had hitherto been available.

¹⁶⁰ Anselm, *Ep.* 334 (Schmitt, 5:270); below, p. 73.

¹⁶¹ Anselm, *Ep.* 349 (Schmitt, 5:288–89); above, p. 55.

¹⁶² Anselm, *Ep.* 379 (Schmitt, 5:322–23).

¹⁶³ Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, p. 17. One may cite as an example the directions to Brother Maurice (*Epp.* 42, 43, 60). Anselm took an active part in finding books to send to Lanfranc in Canterbury (*Epp.* 23, 25–6, 66).

¹⁶⁴ Anselm, *Cur Deus homo*, preface (Schmitt, 2:42); above, p. 47 and n. 118.

chapter-headings may therefore witness to the sort of premature copying Anselm complains of.

Still more distinctive is Anselm's express concern with titles and headings. Unlike many writers, who allowed their work to travel with no deliberate title, Anselm appears to have chosen titles with some care and deliberation, and where it can be tested, this choice was made only when the work was finished and published.¹⁶⁵ By the time he was writing *De ueritate*, after settling on final titles for *Monologion* and *Proslogion*, Anselm usually refers to his own works by title and in so doing appears to assume their availability to his readers.¹⁶⁶ The great majority of Anselm's writings have secure titles, evidently transmitted as part of the text from the period of their primary publication.

The only persistent variations are trivial, between *Quomodo grammaticus* and its opening words, *De grammatico*, and between Anselm's *De libertate arbitrii* and the more Augustinian *De libero arbitrio*. The titles "De fide trinitatis" and "De trinitate" are attested for *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*; the text-historical evidence does not make clear whether these variants date

¹⁶⁵ This emerges from the correspondence about *Monologion* and *Proslogion* (above, pp. 17–19). His prefaces will sometimes refer to his giving the work a name or title: "quem tractatum ... de casu diaboli titulau, quoniam ..." (Schmitt, 1:173); "secundum materiam de qua editum est, Cur Deus homo nominau" (Schmitt, 2:42). The exceptional works that do not have stable titles are *Quomodo grammaticus sit substantia et qualitas*, to which Anselm himself later, in the preface to the three dialogues, referred by its opening words as *De grammatico*, "quartum [sc. tractatum] quem simili modo edidi ... cuius initium est de grammatico" (Schmitt, 1:173), and *Meditatio* 3, titled *Meditatio redemptionis humanae* by Eadmer and the collected works but otherwise known under a variety of titles. In the case of *De libertate arbitrii*, the title *De libero arbitrio* is in use by the 1120s.

¹⁶⁶ So, in *De ueritate* he cites *Monologion* by title (Schmitt, 1:177); in *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* he refers to both *Monologion* and *Proslogion* (Schmitt, 2:20, 34); in *Cur Deus homo* he mentions something said "in epistola de incarnatione Verbi ad dominum papam Vrbanum directa" (Schmitt, 2:105); in *De conceptu uirginali* he refers to what he had said "in libro Cur Deus homo" and "in Cur Deus homo" (Schmitt, 2:139, 162), and in both *De ueritate* and *De casu diaboli*, "sufficienter puto me ostendisse in tractatu quem feci de casu diaboli, sed de iustitia plenius in illo quem edidi de ueritate" (Schmitt, 2:147); in *De processione Spiritus Sancti* he cites *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* (Schmitt, 2:204); in *De concordia* he refers again and in similar words to *De ueritate* and *De libertate arbitrii*, "priorem uero in tractatu quem feci de ueritate, alterum uero in eo quem edidi de hac ipsa libertate" (Schmitt, 2:256), but also "in tractatu de libertate arbitrii puto me ostendisse" (Schmitt, 2:267), "quod dixi in tractatu de ueritate" (Schmitt, 2:284), as well as "in tractatu de casu diaboli et in libello quem de conceptu uirginali et de originali peccato intitulau" (Schmitt, 2:258). We have seen that the letters also refer to various works by title (*Epp.* 209, 334, 349).

back to the disputes with Roscelin, but they accurately reflect the subject of the debate. We have seen that the early titles *Exemplum meditandi de ratione fidei* and *Fides quaerens intellectum* are still found in copies made after Anselm had adopted the titles *Monologion* and *Proslogion*. They may signal that the accompanying text descends from a very early stage in the publication, even though that does not constitute an early recension. In the case of *Fides quaerens intellectum*, examples can be found as late as the fifteenth century. Similarly, instances of *De ratione fidei* and *Alloquium* in later medieval booklists may disguise other descendants of early copies of *Monologion* and *Proslogion*.¹⁶⁷

Viola saw the big picture here clearly enough, though he did not seek to support it with the evidence of the manuscripts: “Anselme apparaît soucieux de prendre sur lui la responsabilité de ses écrits et il s’occupe sérieusement des modalités de leur édition: c’est lui qui les range et les met ensemble, c’est lui qui leur impose le titre définitif lorsqu’il constate que ses ouvrages circulent déjà sans titre ou avec un titre provisoire, c’est lui qui désigne et délimite le public qui doit avoir accès à ses ouvrages.”¹⁶⁸

But does he not go too far in this final point? Rather, it seems to me, we do not get any sense of systematic distribution to a chosen public or of control that would define who could and who could not read Anselm’s writings. The author recognizes that a work, once published, could not easily be recalled.¹⁶⁹ Dissemination takes over. He more than once assumes that works he has already put into circulation would be available to certain people, but it is assumption without knowledge, for this can emerge in a context where the expected dissemination has failed. In 1104 Anselm was sending his *Orationes siue Meditationes* to the Countess Matilda precisely because she had not already obtained a copy.¹⁷⁰ Around the same time, Anselm asked the monks at Canterbury to make a fair copy of *Cur Deus*

¹⁶⁷ The library list of 1396 from the Yorkshire Cistercian abbey of Meaux includes “Anselmus de ratione fidei, et alia.” D. N. Bell, *The Libraries of the Cistercians, Gilbertines, and Premonstratensians* (London, 1992), p. 79, Z14.332, which is likely to be *Monologion*, perhaps at the start of a collection of other works of Anselm. The late-fourteenth-century catalogue from Peterborough abbey includes the title “Alloquium Anselmi archiepiscopi Cantuariensis” (K. Friis-Jensen and J. M. W. Willoughby, *Peterborough Abbey* [London, 2001], p. 95, BP21.105h), the only work of Anselm in a miscellaneous volume. The date of the books need not be as late as the catalogues that record them, but neither is likely to be a primary booklet.

¹⁶⁸ Viola (see n. 11 above), “Un écrivain pèlerin,” p. 374.

¹⁶⁹ See above, p. 18 and n. 45.

¹⁷⁰ See above, p. 56 and n. 151.

homo and *De conceptu uirginali* for Pope Paschal.¹⁷¹ Neither work was new and a score of letters had already passed between Anselm and Paschal: had he assumed the pope would already have copies?

After many pages of discussion applied to an author for whom the evidence is exceptionally full, we still do not accurately know what Anselm did by way of publishing any individual work. We do know that he gave copies to some friends, including monks such as Brother Maurice in his own community; and he provided copies in answer to requests from those who approached him personally. Requests might come from far away: the abbot of La Chaise-Dieu in the Auvergne, for example, had come across Anselm's prayers and meditations through two young men of Bayeux.¹⁷² Fraternity among Benedictines may have played an early part, but it was certainly not exclusive. We know that he expected copies to disseminate quite quickly: those sent to Hugh at Lyon, for example, he thought might already have passed beyond recall.¹⁷³ We know too that he may have sent unsolicited copies to some people. In the case of *De processione Spiritus Sancti* Eadmer suggests that copies were sent out even where their reception might not be certain. The principle of the chain-letter would result in multiple copies widely dispersed. But how many copies might someone in Anselm's position – prior, abbot, archbishop, with ample resources for copying – think it appropriate to give away? We have no real idea, but it would be a fair guess to think that he might put more copies into circulation than a would-be author of lesser standing. A letter to Brother Maurice with a list of twenty names of people to be sent copies would transform our picture, but no such letter exists. For the most part, Anselm simply refers to the fact that people, sometimes many people, have copied this work or that: this anonymous, almost impersonal, way of referring to dissemination is surely disingenuous,

¹⁷¹ See above, p. 56 and n. 150.

¹⁷² See above, p. 13 and n. 27.

¹⁷³ When Hugh died in 1106, he left a score of books, and much else, to the cathedral church, recorded in the necrology of Lyon as recopied in the early fourteenth century; the books included eight works of Anselm but not the two early works that we know he was given: “librum [?! libros] Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi de ueritate, de libertate <arbitrii>, 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” (M.-C. Guigue, *Obituarium Lugdunensis ecclesiae. Nécrologe des personnages illustres et des bienfaiteurs de l'Église métropolitaine de Lyon du XIe au XVe siècle* [Lyon, 1867], p. 129). It may be supposed that the books were still at this date primary booklets, though it is possible that Hugh had had them bound, or even copied, into a single volume. The absence of *Monologion* and *Proslogion* could result either from overlooking a stray booklet or shortening the list of contents of a bound volume.

since copies could not be made without access to exemplars. And who do we suppose these nameless people were? They were hardly all monks of Bec or Canterbury, who would presumably have had access to his works in the cloister library. This way of referring to dissemination as if it were accidental may be a way of modestly avoiding mention of the fact that *editio* involved the deliberate circulation of copies for copying. I have suggested above, on the basis of a defective reading in two copies of *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, that more than one exemplar might have been in use at Canterbury to provide for simultaneous copying. This implies rapid production, whether to achieve the author's goal in distributing copies or to satisfy external demand. Errors spread into copies, and during Anselm's second exile the copyist Thierry appears to have been engaged in a campaign of collation and correction.¹⁷⁴ The need to tackle error so high up in the line of transmission is itself significant. It suggests that haste, more likely caused by the volume of work than by simple urgency, had overwhelmed care in copying. Editors may need to be aware that quick success could be an early threat to textual fidelity. An exploration of textual data with this issue in view – of necessity paying attention to details that an editor focused only on the best witnesses may prefer to avoid – might just show up more evidence for the exemplars that lie behind groups of twelfth-century copies.

Publication obviously might take place quickly, though in Anselm's case we do not have the evidence easily to track the rapid diffusion of any particular work. None the less, it was not necessarily the result of a single act of *editio*. That authorized the initial dissemination of copies, but copies might still be made and distributed by the author's copyists over an extended period. We know that primary copies were sent out by Anselm long after initial publication; we have seen Countess Matilda of Canossa and Pope Paschal II as late recipients. Another aspect of Anselm's distribution of primary copies is scarcely something one would expect: he appears to have fallen into the habit of putting out copies of two works in the same booklet. Two surviving examples have the paired texts *Cur Deus homo* and *De conceptu uirginali*, exactly the pairing Anselm arranged for Pope Paschal. No fewer than four surviving booklets present the pairing of *De processione Spiritus Sancti* and *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati*. Such pairings may also be seen within larger groupings as several works came to be bound or copied together. These particular examples may all go back to the circulation of copies in the time between his two periods of exile, when these works were fresh, an opportune time when he had the resources available to

¹⁷⁴ Anselm, *Ep.* 379 (Schmitt, 5:322–23)

meet a high demand, increased by his connexion with Pope Urban and his Continental travels. We do not have the early evidence to prove that *Monologion* and *Proslogion* were already paired in this way in the 1080s, but the three dialogues clearly were seen as a group, almost a single work. The request to Prior Ernulf to supply a good copy of two works to Pope Paschal in 1104 shows that Canterbury remained a centre of production even during the second exile, though Anselm was also able to get a copy of *Orationes siue Meditationes* made in Lyon for Countess Matilda. The late addition of a preface to *Orationes siue Meditationes* must represent a kind of consolidation of the authorial imprimatur for works long in circulation, but there is no evidence that he revised his works after publication. We have seen that sketches might sometimes be given select circulation, though surely not after the work was finished – two limitations that would have restricted availability – and Anselm also tells us that works were copied before he regarded them as ready. But having decided that a work was finished and published, Anselm, unlike some writers, let go of it.¹⁷⁵

But the story does not end with death. The posthumous success of a medieval writer's works could vary enormously, but in Anselm's case deliberate steps were taken to ensure that his written teachings lived on.

Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi archiepiscopi* was meant to sustain Anselm's reputation as teacher and saint. His *Historia nouorum in Anglia* was a complementary work, showing how as archbishop Anselm had fought for the principle of a church free from secular control. Anselm's legacy as an author was fostered in three particular ways. First, his students wrote works in his style, even under his name, and it is a moot point whether they drew on his oral teaching or on sketches that he had chosen not to work up for publication himself. Secondly, there was indeed a Nachlaß. The best known aspect of this is the archive of letters that remained at Canterbury, but other

¹⁷⁵ A contemporary example of someone who did not let go is Gilbert Crispin, who continued to revise his working-text of *Disputatio iudaei et christiani*; the editor suggests that we have copies deriving from this archetype at six distinct points in its development (Abulafia and Evans, *Works of Gilbert Crispin*, pp. 2–6). It is, however, curious that the earliest state of the text is that represented in Gilbert's collected works, where one might rather have expected its final state. These exist now in a unique copy, London, British Library, MS Add. 8166 (saec. XII). The contents encourage one to assume that it was made at Westminster, and the possibility of a Westminster provenance hangs on the fact that this book was given by Henry Petrie (1772–1842) together with MS Add. 8167 (saec. XIII), which does have the *ex libris* of Westminster abbey. Neither consideration amounts to positive evidence.

sketches or fragments were found and recopied. William of Malmesbury appears to have made some use of this material. Thirdly, two volumes produced at Canterbury bear witness to a final phase, up to fifteen years after the archbishop's death, when the monks prepared a one-volume collection of his published writings and a collection of letters from his archive. I shall take these three topics briefly in turn.

Writing in the 1120s at Saint-Evroul, Orderic refers not only to Anselm's teaching at Bec but adds that at the insistence of his friends (*inquirentibus amicis*) Anselm published (*edidit*) books of great subtlety and depth. He mentions by title *De trinitate* (that is, *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*), the three linked dialogues *De ueritate*, *De libertate arbitrii* (here titled *De libero arbitrio*), and *De casu diaboli*, and finally *Cur Deus homo*.¹⁷⁶ In the same passage, Orderic also relates:

Omnia uerba eius utilia erant et beniuolos auditores aedificabant. Dociles discipuli epistolas tipicosque sermones eius scripto retinuerant, quibus affatim debriati non solum sibi sed et aliis multis non mediocriter profecerunt. Hoc Guillelmus et Boso successores eius multipliciter senserunt, qui tanti doctoris sintagmata insigniter sibi hauserunt, et sitientibus inde desiderabilem potum largiter propinauerunt.

All his words were useful and edified his willing listeners. His eager students kept in writing his letters and figurative discourses, filling themselves to intoxication with them, which were a benefit not only to themselves but to many others. His successors William and Boso were fully aware of this, and having themselves been refreshed by the works of this great teacher they prepared a desirable draught for all who thirsted after them.

With letters about monastic life, we have seen that selected letters were evidently given authorized circulation while Anselm was still abbot of Bec and continued to be read years later. The mention of *typici sermones* must refer to Anselm's teaching through *similitudines*, something mentioned also by William of Malmesbury.¹⁷⁷ Followers went to some effort to document Anselm's oral teachings. Some of his sermons, for example, were also written up by a monk of Canterbury named Alexander, and a revised text was presented to Anselm's nephew, also called Anselm, abbot of San Saba in Rome, who was in England as papal legate from June to September 1115.¹⁷⁸ Eadmer too aimed to preserve the flavour of Anselm's discourse.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁶ Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, Book 4 (ed. Chibnall, 2:296–97).

¹⁷⁷ William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, 1.65 (Winterbottom, p. 196), reports Anselm's delight in using *similitudines*.

¹⁷⁸ Alexander of Canterbury, *Liber ex dictis Anselmi*, ed. F. S. Schmitt and R. W. Southern, *Memorials of St. Anselm* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 108–95. Alexander's *Dicta*, chs. 1–20, now Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 457 (saec. XII^{2/4}), fols. 1r–72v, written in the

No such fruits can be attributed to William and Boso, Anselm's successors at Bec, named by Orderic. A written text of *similitudines* has survived, and this has been thought more likely to be unfinished work by Anselm himself than the writing of a reporter of his oral teaching.¹⁸⁰ It was presumably at Canterbury that this collection of *similitudines* was expanded with material from Alexander's *Dicta* to produce the popular *Similitudines Anselmi*.¹⁸¹ Anselm's disciples also prepared an expanded *Orationes siue Meditationes*, which likewise achieved considerable popularity.¹⁸² How far Anselm's *typici sermones* had actually been committed to writing by himself or taken down in writing by his hearers we do not know, but there is no evidence for any manuscript circulation in his lifetime.

Anselm undoubtedly left behind him something in the nature of an archive. This archive may have included approved exemplars of his published treatises. He kept copies of his letters, both at Bec and at Canterbury, and it has long been thought that in the winter of 1092–1093 he set about editing a collection of his letters as prior and abbot. The letters he

Christ Church hand, are paired with a collection of miracle stories (chs. 21–52) about Archbishop Anselm, fols. 73r–115v (*Memorials*, pp. 196–268). The prefatory letter addresses the younger Anselm as “uenerabilis abba et sancte Romane ecclesie legatus,” hence Rule's dating of the text to 1115 (Rule, *Eadmeri Historia nouorum in Anglia*, p. lxxv). Eadmer is one of the fundamental sources concerning this legation (Dorothy Whitelock, M. Brett, and C. N. L. Brooke, *Councils and Synods with other documents 1 AD 871–1204* [Oxford, 1981], pp. 708–16). The younger Anselm returned with legatine authority in August 1116 and remained there until January 1120, but he was not permitted to cross into England (*ibid.*, pp. 716–17). An earlier version (1109 × 1115), shorter, in a different sequence, and without dedication, survives in an early-thirteenth-century copy, now Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 316, fols. 194v–207r (Southen and Schmitt, *Memorials*, pp. 20–24); one would like to know from what exemplar this was copied and how it had survived.

¹⁷⁹ Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, pp. 217–26, 362–66; *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, pp. 382–94.

¹⁸⁰ *Liber de humanis moribus per similitudines*, ed. F. S. Schmitt and R. W. Southern, *Memorials of St. Anselm* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 39–104. The earliest copy of this work, together with the related *De XIII partibus beatitudinis*, now BL MS Royal 5 F. IX, fols. 3–56 (saec. XII¹, ca. 1110 × ca. 1130), was bound with a near contemporary copy of Anselm's later works and a selection of his letters, fols. 57–196.

¹⁸¹ *Similitudines Anselmi*, circulated widely, but there has been no critical edition since Gerberon (PL 159:605–708); this version incorporated material from Alexander of Canterbury's writing-up of Anselm's sermons, and, since these *dicta* were used in a form closer to the text of CCC 316 than that of CCC 457, Southern and Schmitt, *Memorials*, p. 13, date the expansion of the *Similitudines* earlier than 1115.

¹⁸² J.-F. Cottier, *Anima mea: Prières privées et textes de dévotion du moyen âge latin. Autour des prières ou méditations attribuées à saint Anselme de Cantorbéry (XIe–XIIe siècle)* (Turnhout, 2001).

wrote as archbishop in King William II's time were not carefully preserved, whereas those from King Henry I's reign formed a major quarry at Canterbury.¹⁸³ This archive also included letters to Anselm and even copies of letters concerning his business, though Anselm evidently had a view on what was worth keeping and what was not.¹⁸⁴ After the archbishop's death Eadmer was able to draw on the archive, but not a single original letter has survived. The archive appears also to have contained a small amount of sketches and jottings, some of them relating to works that were written up and published, others apparently drafts on ideas that must have interested Anselm at some point but which he neither developed into a published work nor destroyed. It is difficult to know what sense can be made of this Nachlaß. It had limited influence and there is no reason to think that it was long preserved as an archive.

Three books, however, show interest in giving some of it a permanent shape. The difficulty of precise dating makes it impossible to be sure that one can discuss them in the order in which they were made, and it is possible that further work on scribes will continue to change our view of this activity. The three books are Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 271 (*SC* 1938), fols. 1–166 (**B**), which I have referred to already as the Canterbury collected works; London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 59 (**L**), the Canterbury collected letters; and London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 224 (**M**), a combined collection of works and letters made by William of Malmesbury and a group of copyists who worked with him. There are good reasons to date the last two within the five years 1119 × 1124, and it is likely that **M** is older than **L**. There is no similar evidence for dating **B**, but the evidence of

¹⁸³ There has been a certain amount of debate over the status of the letter-collections, especially between R. W. Southern on the one hand and those who adhered to Schmitt's notion that Anselm himself directed the organization of the collections. Southern's position is summed up, "Towards a history of Anselm's letters," in his *Saint Anselm. A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 458–81; previously printed in Italian in *Anselmo d'Aosta. Figura europea* (Milan, 1989), pp. 269–89, and in *Anselmo d'Aosta. Lettere*, 1:89–98, 2:85–96. The transmission of letters outside the main collections has been the subject of misguided study by W. Fröhlich, "The letters omitted from Anselm's collection of letters," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 6 (1983) [1984], 58–71 (repr. as "The design of Anselm's collection of letters," in Fröhlich, *Letters of Saint Anselm*, 1:39–52). The possibility that recipients, like Bishop Osmund at Salisbury (above, p. 25), may have preserved the letters they received did not enter into consideration. Much fresh work on the textual evidence is presented by S. K. Niskanen, *The Letter Collections of Anselm of Canterbury*, Ph.D. diss. (Helsinki, 2009).

¹⁸⁴ Anselm, *Ep.* 379 (Schmitt, 5:322–23), writing from Bec to Thierry, who served him as copyist at Canterbury; see below, p. 73. He refused to send copies of letters addressed by Henry I to Pope Paschal, saying, "non intelligo utile esse si seruentur."

its script and decoration argues for a similar date with the possibility that it may be a little earlier or even a little later. Southern thought that **L** could not have existed when William of Malmesbury put together his collection of letters – supposing that, if **L** had existed, William would have used it – and he therefore regarded **L** as later than **M**. The same argument, for what it is worth, applies to **M** and **B**. Would William of Malmesbury have made his own collection of Anselm's works if he could simply have obtained a copy of the one made at Canterbury? We cannot answer the question in that form. What is evident is that William put together a set of works and letters that was not dependent on the collected volumes made at Christ Church.

William made for himself, and for the library at Malmesbury, a collection of most of Anselm's works, now Lambeth Palace, MS 224 (**M**), partly in William's own hand, partly by several copyists who worked with him also on other books. Its texts start with *Monologion* and its accompanying letter to Lanfranc, *Proslogion* and the exchange with Gaunilo, *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, and *Cur Deus homo*; the later works *De conceptu uirginali* and *De concordia* follow, all in chronological order; and then *Si malum nichil est*, the first sketch towards *De casu diaboli*; there follows the third meditation, *Meditatio redemptionis humanae*, *Quomodo grammaticus* under the title *De grammatico*, and the group of three dialogues with their collective preface, *De ueritate*, *De libertate arbitrii* under the title *De libero arbitrio*, and *De casu diaboli*. The remainder of the original manuscript is made up of more than two hundred letters (fols. 122v–155r, 155r–172r) and the beginning of *De processione Spiritus Sancti*.¹⁸⁵

William's letter collection was thought by Southern to derive directly from the originals and copies in the archive. This idea was encouraged by what he says about the immense series of letters between Anselm, the pope, and the king; he did not quote from them in his historical works, referring his reader instead to Eadmer.¹⁸⁶ Knowledge of the scale of the entire letter-

¹⁸⁵ The description by M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the library of Lambeth Palace. The Mediaeval Manuscripts* (Cambridge, 1932), pp. 364–68, may be supplemented by N. R. Ker, "William of Malmesbury's handwriting," *EHR* 59 (1944), 371–76, and R. M. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge, 1987, 2nd ed. 2003), pp. 86–88. Three works composed before Anselm became archbishop include that style in their rubrics, *Monologion*, *Quomodo grammaticus*, and the preface to the three dialogues. The unfinished copy of *De processione* was continued, and further works added, in the fourteenth century (fols. 175v–210r).

¹⁸⁶ William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, 1.59 (Winterbottom, p. 182): "Epistolarum seriem, quae in immensum porrigitur, apostolici ad regem et Anselmum, et Anselmi ad regem, et regis ad Anselmum, hic non placuit intexere. Volentibus legere liber

collection in comparison with the forty-odd quoted by Eadmer helped to persuade Southern that William drew directly on the extensive archive.¹⁸⁷ That need not be so. Niskanen's collations suggest that William derived his letters from two existing letter collections and from Eadmer.¹⁸⁸ Of particular interest, however, are his marginal notes about a few of Anselm's correspondents, information that was not inferrable from the letters and suggests that he was able to draw on some informed comment.¹⁸⁹ A precise date for William's compilation is impossible to achieve, but it was not certainly before 1124.¹⁹⁰ Uninfluenced by Southern's idea that William had

Edmeri copiam fatiet; quas ideo uir ille apposuit ut ..." ("The letters, which form an immense corpus, from pope to king and to Anselm, from Anselm to the king, and from the king to Anselm, I have chosen not to incorporate here. Eadmer's book will provide plenty for those who wish to read them. He included them so that ...").

¹⁸⁷ Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, p. 223n, "there are many peculiarities in the text of the letters which show that he had access to a primitive collection or drafts, no doubt at Canterbury"; these peculiarities are not defined. He discusses his view of William's work more fully in *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, pp. 400–1, 470–73. Here he quotes the passage from William at p. 471 in a footnote, but the emphasis in his own text is different; we are concerned, he says, with William's "use of Eadmer's *Historia nouorum*, and more particularly with the evidence it gave him that a large body of Anselm's correspondence had survived.... In his *Gesta Pontificum*, ... he mentions the great abundance of Anselm's correspondence which lay at Canterbury. He still referred readers who wished to read Anselm's letters to Eadmer's *Historia nouorum*, but he seems also to have become an enthusiastic student of Anselm's works, and thoroughly imbued with a realization of the importance of the Anselmian material which he had found at Canterbury" (p. 471). Southern has misinterpreted the mention of an immense series of letters, for William here refers *only* to the papal and royal correspondence quoted by Eadmer. The statement is not evidence that William knew material remaining at Canterbury, still less that **M** was copied directly from archived letters.

¹⁸⁸ Niskanen, *Letter Collections of Anselm of Canterbury*, pp. 56–68, shows that William's three main sources were Eadmer, the edited letters in **F**, BL MS Royal 5 F. IX (saec. XII¹, ca. 1110 × ca. 1130), fols. 57–196, and a copy of the early collection now represented by **N**, BL MS Cotton Nero A. VII (saec. XI/XII), fols. 41–112.

¹⁸⁹ It is one of the odder aspects of Schmitt's reportage of manuscripts that he will cite **M** for these notes without reporting **M**'s readings or even mentioning that there is a copy of the letter in **M**: see, for example, his source-notes on *Ep.* 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 17, though for none of these letters is **M** used as a source. In the case of *Ep.* 1, he does not even mention William's note, "Lanfranco postquam fuit archiepiscopus" (London, Lambeth Palace, MS 224, fol. 128r).

¹⁹⁰ The dating of William's collection has been narrowed to 1119 × 1124, though the second term is untenable. Niskanen points out that the reference in Lambeth Palace, MS 224, fol. 162r, against headings for two of Pope Paschal's letters to Anselm (*Epp. Anselmi* 222, 223), "require in decretis pontificum" (noted by Southern, *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, p. 472, but thought to refer to a lost compilation), refers to William's augmented *Liber pontificalis*,

privileged access to Anselm's archive, Schmitt made little use of this

known to us from two later copies (Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, pp. 119–20); the letters of Pope Paschal are included in only one of the two. This work was apparently edited by William in 1119, which becomes our *terminus a quo*.

Southern's *terminus ad quem* is William's reference in *Gesta pontificum* in 1124 to the immense series of Anselm's letters, though it must be remembered that Southern allowed that to denote the archive as a whole, where William in fact refers only to the papal and royal correspondence quoted by Eadmer. Niskanen has shown that a visit to Canterbury is not necessary to explain the letters collected in **M**, with the result that **M** could be, but need not be, later. A date in the 1120s is compatible with the evidence of script: Thomson's account of manuscripts made for and by William sees this as "transitional," better made than the early books, but not as professional as those to follow; in a personal communication, he tells me that in his judgement the book itself appears more likely to date from the early 1120s than earlier. It is, however, not necessary to infer that **M** had been made when William wrote his *Gesta pontificum*.

Southern produced involved arguments for dating William's access to letters at Canterbury based on his perceived use of Canterbury materials, though we do not know how often he visited Canterbury. The range 1120 × 1123 is favoured by Southern, *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, pp. 400, 459, 470–71, 473; he subsequently shifts to ca. 1120, *ibid.*, pp. 479–80. His reasoning depends on his own argument for the dating of the revision of the Canterbury primatial forgeries, restated *ibid.*, pp. 360–62, but first set out in R. W. Southern, "The Canterbury forgeries," *EHR* 73 (1958), 193–207. The limits are after January 1120, when Archbishop Ralph and Eadmer returned to England and responded to the crisis in the primacy dispute by "finding" papal privileges (*Historia nouorum in Anglia*, pp. 309–10; Rule, pp. 260–61); before William of Malmesbury deployed the forged privileges, quoted in full in *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, 1.30–39 (Winterbottom, pp. 62–85), which was composed in 1124–1125. Southern noted that, in his earlier *Gesta regum Anglorum*, 3.294 (Mynors, Thomson, and Winterbottom, 1:528), William refers to the dispute as active, mentioning too that material had recently come to hand (*EHR* 73, 220n, presumably translating William's "irrepsit materia," though Mynors construes the phrase differently, "a fresh topic has intruded"), some of which he quotes. This is in large part earlier than *Gesta pontificum*, though not earlier than 1124 (Mynors, Thomson, and Winterbottom, 2:xvii–xviii). In a review, "Sally Vaughn's Anselm: an examination of the foundations," *Albion* 20 (1988), 181–204 (at p. 198n), written while he was at work on *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, Southern followed R. M. Thomson's dating of two visits to Canterbury by William of Malmesbury, the first in the period 1109 × 1115 (when he made use of Eadmer's *Historia nouorum* and *Vita Anselmi* in their early forms, quoted in *Gesta regum*), the second in the period 1122 × 1125 (when he saw the texts as revised in 1122, quoted in *Gesta pontificum*) (Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, pp. 72–73). William's deployment of early and late forms of Eadmer's works in two of his own works, both completed in 1124–1125, needs more clarification. Thomson elsewhere observes that William copied the forgeries from the later version of Eadmer but revised the text against Eadmer's source (*ibid.*, pp. 132–33). Thomson's case that William used the forgeries at Canterbury in 1122 × 1125 is secure, but one cannot argue, as Southern does, from this to a date for Lambeth 224, for nothing in this manuscript was deployed in either *Gesta*.

manuscript, with the result that its affinities are not visible in his *apparatus criticus*; he dated it only to “ante a. 1143,” i.e. before William’s death, making it appear less early than it is. William’s texts of the treatises have not been shown to derive from exemplars at Christ Church, for William himself says that Anselm’s books were popular throughout the Latin world, and he may have obtained copies from several places.¹⁹¹ He also knew the *Orationes siue Meditationes*, though this work was not copied here with the treatises.¹⁹² Indeed, he shows a fuller knowledge of the works than any other outsider at so early a date.¹⁹³

¹⁹¹ William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, 1.65 (Winterbottom, p. 196), says that Anselm’s deep learning is shown by his books, “quibus iam dudum decedente liuore orbis latinus successit fauor” (“which have become popular throughout the Latin world, for malice has long since lost its edge”). A basic test of availability is provided by R. G. Gameson, *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (c. 1066–1130)* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 42–43. From his census, he counts works represented by five or more copies; Anselm has two works represented by seven copies, three works by six copies, and two works by five copies, not counting letters which appear in no fewer than fifteen books. Of the handful of contemporary writers in Gameson’s list, no other is represented by more than a single work.

¹⁹² William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, 1.46 (Winterbottom, p.112), “Orationum et meditationum eius instantiam indicat liber de his” (“his dedication to prayer and meditation is shown by his book on the subject”); this section is much indebted to Eadmer, but the manner of his reference is such that it cannot be simply based on what is said in *Vita Anselmi*, 1.8 (Southern, p. 14). Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, p. 47 n. 59, further notes that William cites the long prayer to the Virgin, *Or.* 7, in his later *De laudibus et miraculis beatae Virginis Mariae*, I (b) (ed. José María Canal, *El libro De laudibus et miraculis S. Mariae de Guillermo de Malmesbury* [Rome, 1968], pp. 47–172, at p. 56, and in *Claretianum* 8 (1968), 71–242, at p. 120).

¹⁹³ The list of works owned by Archbishop Hugh of Lyon perhaps underrepresents reality (see n. 173). The lists of works provided by Robert de Torigny and by Orderic have been mentioned above (see nn. 50, 176). Two bibliographers, closer in time to Anselm, were on the lookout for new literature and took an interest. Sigebert (d.1112), monk of Gembloux, and Honorius of Regensburg (d. after 1139) both compiled lists of ecclesiastical writers and their works. Sigebert mentions six of Anselm’s early works, *Monologion*, *Proslogion*, the three dialogues, and *Quomodo grammaticus* (the last apparently only on the basis of the reference to it in the preface to the three dialogues), and five of the later works, *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, *Cur Deus homo*, *De conceptu uirginali et de originali peccato*, *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, and the *Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati*; he mentions also “grandiusculum uolumen meditationum uel orationum” (“a fairly big book of meditations or prayers”), and adds, “Qui eius notitia uel presentia usi sunt, eum etiam alia plura scripsisse dicunt” (“people who knew him or met him say that he also wrote many others”). The only treatise not mentioned is Anselm’s last, *De concordia*, which may not even have been written when Sigebert finished his list (Sigebert of Gembloux, *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, ch. 168, ed. J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica* [Hamburg, 1718], repr. with notes from the edition of A. Le Mire, *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica siue nomenclatores VII ueteres* [Antwerp,

Schmitt set little value on the testimony of William's compilation of letters, since he believed that the letter collection in Lambeth Palace, MS 59, fols. 1–190 (L), was made at the very end of Anselm's own life in 1109 and had far greater authority. Likewise with the treatises, Schmitt believed that the collected works that is now Bodl. MS Bodley 271 (*SC* 1938), fols. 1–166 (B), was in progress in 1104 under Anselm's direction from exile and outweighed almost all other witnesses in authority. He assigned both manuscripts to the hand of Anselm's copyist at Canterbury, Thierry, to whom Anselm gave instructions by letter from exile.¹⁹⁴ It was, I think, M.R. James, who first realised the potential importance of these two manuscripts, which he dated to "near" Anselm's lifetime.¹⁹⁵ Wilmart too, persuaded as much by the excellence of the text as by the handwriting, was willing to date Bodley 271 to before 1109, speculating, "je ne serais nullement surpris que le manuscrit 271 soit, pour ainsi dire, le monument imaginé par la piété des moines de Christ Church au retour de l'archevêque en Angleterre (fin d'août 1106)."¹⁹⁶ Schmitt's argument from a visible correction in fol. 99v, at the

1639–1649] in PL 160:547–88; ed. R. Witte [Bern / Frankfurt, 1974], p. 102 [ch. 169]). His location in Brabant meant that he was certainly within reach of Anselmian books. Honorius mentions the *Monologion* but not the *Proslogion*; *De libertate arbitrii* and *De casu diaboli* but not *De ueritate*; he appears not know the Meditations and Prayers; and of the later works he mentions only *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*, *Cur Deus homo*, *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, and *De concordia* (Honorius Augustodunensis, *De luminaribus ecclesiae*, 4.15, ed. J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica* (Hamburg, 1718), repr. PL 172:197–234). Honorius had been a follower of Anselm, coming to England in the 1090s, hearing him preach, and using his works extensively in his own early treatise, the popular *Elucidarius*; he has been described as "one of the earliest and most effective vehicles whereby St. Anselm's works reached Germany and the Empire" (V. I. J. Flint, *Honorius Augustodunensis of Regensburg*, *Authors of the Middle Ages* 6 [Aldershot, 1995], p. 2).

¹⁹⁴ F. S. Schmitt, "Die unter Anselm veranstaltete Ausgabe seiner Werke und Briefe: die Codices Bodley 271 und Lambeth 59," *Scriptorium* 9 (1955), 64–75. Thierry is named in scribal verses in Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B. 3. 32 (saec. XII¹) (BC4.19).

¹⁹⁵ "Copies of some of his works of a date near his own lifetime have survived, which were in the library, and it is a reasonable suggestion that future editors of Anselm should pay special attention to these volumes, which ought to preserve a specially good text" (M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903), p. xxxi). The manuscripts are specified at p. 506. The first editor to use Bodley 271 printed only a short excerpt from the *Proslogion* from it (A. Daniels, *Quellenbeiträge und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Gottesbeweise im dreizehnten Jahrhundert*, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* 8/1–2 [1909], pp. 5–6). He was drawn to it by James, but accepted Falconer Madan's erroneous dating of the hand to saec. XII².

¹⁹⁶ Wilmart, "Les propres corrections," *RTAM* 2 (1930), 189–204, at p. 201. His note congratulates Schmitt for having based his 1929 edition of *Cur Deus homo* on this witness.

point in *De conceptu uirginali* referred to in *Ep.* 334, was dismissed by Southern, who thought the manuscript could not be earlier than about 1120. More detailed work on the scribes and artist of Bodley 271 has shown that it could date from the 1110s, perhaps even a little earlier, perhaps a little later. The making of the collected treatises was most likely due to the precentor of Christ Church, whose duties included responsibility for the library. Eadmer himself was precentor, and a connexion is obviously tempting. Eadmer, it must be remembered, was on the Continent with Archbishop Ralph between September 1116 and January 1120. A close dating remains elusive.¹⁹⁷

It is notable that the sequence of the works corresponds closely to what may be inferred from other evidence: *Monologion* and *Proslogion*, the three dialogues with their preface, *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* and *Cur Deus homo*, *De conceptu uirginali*, *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, and the two related letters to Walram are arranged in date of writing. The last *Meditatio* follows (fols. 125v–127v), which is contemporary with *De conceptu uirginali*. Then *De concordia* concludes the treatises. The *Orationes siue Meditationes* were copied in a different hand, which also wrote *Quomodo grammaticus*, and at the very end *Oratio ad accipiendum corpus Domini et sanguinem*. The arrangement reflects knowledge of the order of composition, but that need not demand authorial input; it is almost the same as Eadmer's. A decision was evidently taken to exclude, for example, some letters that serve as additional prefaces – to *Monologion* and to *Cur Deus*

¹⁹⁷ Schmitt, "Die unter Anselm veranstaltete Ausgabe," pp. 67–69; Southern, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer*, p. 238n.; I. D. Logan, "MS Bodley 271: establishing the Anselmian canon?," *Saint Anselm Journal* 2 (2004), 67–80, examines the alteration at fol. 99v. Schmitt hung too much on it, Southern oversimplified, but it can hardly prove that work was going on in 1104. The inclusion of *De concordia* in the main hand makes that nearly impossible, and it is in any case implausible to argue for authorial direction from exile. Logan seeks to identify other work by the same three scribes. The principal scribe has been tentatively identified as the same who wrote the profession of Abbot Alebold of Bury St. Edmunds to Archbishop Ralph in 1114 (T. Webber in Brett and Gribbin, *English Episcopal Acta 28 Canterbury 1070–1136* (see n. 113), p. lxiv). It is not possible to say whether this is earlier or later than the work on Bodley 271, though Logan is eager to affirm the identification and to push the dating back to 1107 × 1114, before the profession. The scribe is identified as Samuel from an illuminated initial in a two-volume set of Josephus (now Cambridge, University Library, MS Dd. 1. 4 + St. John's College, MS A. 8), and he appears to have had a long career from the 1090s into and perhaps beyond the 1110s. Decoration in Bodley 271 and in the Josephus has been attributed to the same artist by T. A. Heslop, "Dunstanus archiepiscopus and painting in Kent around 1120," *Burlington Magazine* 126 (1984), 195–204, at p. 200; parallels with more closely datable examples give the artist a career that extends from before 1114 until after 1125. The outcome is that it would be rash in the present state of knowledge to accept a date narrower than the extended 1110s.

homo – and to include the letters to Walram as treatises. The two aspects of the manuscript that appear most significant are the decision to add the prayers and the hard-to-place *Quomodo grammaticus* at the end of the theological works, as if they were not part of the original plan, and the sequence of the final prayers, which does not match the arrangement of those sent to Countess Matilda. One may expect the volume to reflect the exemplars used to make copies for circulation, perhaps even of the master copies that served as the basis for Maurice’s earlier corrections. How long these were retained is not known, but they cannot be identified in the later medieval library catalogue.¹⁹⁸

Lambeth Palace, MS 59, fols. 1–190, is chiefly a collection of letters (fols. 1r–160v), written with less care and many more corrections and alterations than are found in the collected works. It is likely to be a little later in date than **B**, probably from the early 1120s, and therefore roughly contemporary with **M**.¹⁹⁹ The compilers of this manuscript also chose to

¹⁹⁸ A catalogue made in the time of Prior Henry of Eastry survives, datable with some probability to 1326 (ed. M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* [Cambridge, 1903], 13–142; a new edition is in preparation). Of ten entries for Anselm, the only survivors are the collected works (BC4.62) and the collected letters (BC4.71). One that might have been an early grouping contained only *Monologion*, *Proslogion*, *Orationes et meditationes*, and *Quomodo grammaticus* (BC4.64), which might be compared with an early copy of the first three, Arras, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 455 (cat. 1021), from the abbey of Saint-Vaast. The immediately preceding entry describes another small grouping, *De ueritate*, *De libertate arbitrii*, *De casu diaboli*, together with *Cur Deus homo* and *De conceptu uirginali* (BC4.63). These just might have been two early volumes in an evolving series at Christ Church.

¹⁹⁹ Expert opinion on the script is agreed that Schmitt’s view of this manuscript could not be correct; for example, R. G. Gameson, “English manuscript art in the late eleventh century: Canterbury and its context,” in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. R. G. Eales and R. Sharpe (London, 1995), pp. 95–141, at pp. 119–20n, who favoured a date after 1120. The scribes of Lambeth 59 have not yet been studied as much as earlier Christ Church scribes, so palaeographical precision is not available. It is held that **L** served as the exemplar of **P**, now BNF MS lat. 2478, at a time before **L** received its final additions (Southern, *Saint Anselm. A Portrait*, p. 459). Niskanen points out that **P** is datable from its list of popes, written in one hand to Gelasius II (d. 29 January 1119), with Calixtus II (d. 13 December 1124) added, and Honorius II (d. 13/14 February 1130) added later. Calixtus’s name was probably added as the living pope no later than 1124, or just possibly as the most recently deceased, but it was surely added before the death of Honorius; it follows that **P** was copied from **L** probably before 1124 and certainly before 1130. Southern dated Lambeth 59 to the later 1120s, but his initial premise was the notion that this letter collection could not have existed when William of Malmesbury formed his own or he would have used it. His dating of William’s letter collection was further based on the false premise that William had direct access to Anselm’s archive between 1120 and 1124 (see n. 190).

insert, evidently as an afterthought, drafts and other oddments (fols. 160r–186v, and continuing on the original end-leaves, fols. 187r–190r). The letter commending *Cur Deus homo* to Pope Urban (fol. 178r) and a sketch towards *De concordia* (fol. 188r–v) have already been mentioned in passing.²⁰⁰ There are a number of other letters, one deed, records from two London councils, verses in honour of Anselm, even verses attributed to Anselm, a copy of Eadmer’s *Scriptum de beatitudine uitae perennis sumptum de uerbis beati Anselmi*, a form of death-bed confession, and so on. There are also philosophical passages on various topics with no headings and no clear status.²⁰¹ These appear to be unpublished sketches by Anselm, some of them possibly relating to his thinking ahead of writing other works, some of them perhaps sketches towards unfulfilled intentions. With some drafts or sketches, authenticated by their being in Anselm’s archive as well as by the manner of their thought, it remains a matter of real uncertainty when they were written or where they should be situated in the development of Anselm’s thinking. For example, the sketches (for want of a better word) beginning “Quattuor modis dicimus aliquid” (fols. 169v–171v) and “Plura sunt de quibus” (fols. 171v–175r) were thought to relate to *Cur Deus homo* when first published. More intelligible discoveries have come from the same Canterbury archive, either through the main letter collections or through William of Malmesbury, not through the compilers of this miscellany.²⁰² It is possible that others besides William and the compilers of **L** had access to the

²⁰⁰ See nn. 117, 158.

²⁰¹ These are mostly printed in F. S. Schmitt, *Ein neues unvollendete Werk des hl. Anselm von Canterbury*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters 33/3 (1936), 22–43; reprinted in Southern and Schmitt, *Memorials*, pp. 334–51, with some further material omitted in 1936. Schmitt’s early edition reorganizes a substantial stretch (fols. 171v–175r), but his marginal references (IV. 1, IV. 2, IV. 9, etc.) allow one to restore manuscript order, which is retained in *Memorials*, pp. 341–51. In 1936 Schmitt thought that this material represented sketches on certain concepts preparatory to the writing of *Cur Deus homo*. In 1969 he and Southern wrote, “We simply print here a few texts which were closely associated with Anselm’s name and teaching in Anglo-Norman monasteries in the years after his death. They preserved his habit of mind and helped to carry his influence into the general stream of twelfth-century piety” (*Memorials*, p. 35). This is a strange claim for scraps that appear to have had no circulation. Apart from the texts in Lambeth 59, their miscellany includes material from four other manuscripts, which demands more explanation than “must come from a source very near Anselm himself” (*ibid.*, p. 303).

²⁰² The passage attached to *Ep.* 97, the first part to be written of what would become *De casu diaboli*, forms § 11 in the finished work, survives through the letter collection **LPEV** (see n. 52 above). The first draft of *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* equates to what became chs. 1–6 in the final text and was found by William of Malmesbury, presumably though not demonstrably at Canterbury (see n. 105 above).

archive while it existed. Two passages from **L** are also found in Trier, Stadtbibliothek, MS 728, along with fourteen letters, one of them unique to this grouping.²⁰³ But without such an obvious connexion in the manuscript transmission, how are we to know whether something was part of Anselm's archive? The letter that accompanied *Cur Deus homo* when it was sent to Pope Urban survived not only here but also with some copies of the work itself: if they do not derive from the primary copy sent to the pope, then it seems that a reader may have copied this letter, and known what it was, though it was not treated as part of the published work and was not copied with it in Bodley 271.

Schmitt set great store by the readings of this manuscript of the collected works, but its value as a witness must be separated from the question of its role in the tradition of the texts. Schmitt took only a haphazard interest in later manuscripts. He did, however, make use of one two-volume set of Anselm's works, now Edinburgh, University Library, MS 104, from Reading abbey. Its arrangement differs from the Canterbury collected works, and it includes, for example, the letter to Lanfranc prefixed to *Monologion*, which the Canterbury editor did not. Sets of the theological works circulated widely in the mid to late twelfth century, and it would be desirable to know whether such collections derive from the Canterbury tradition or are the fruit of independent local bringing together of scattered works. The question whether the collected works was itself copied and distributed by the monks of Canterbury was not addressed by Schmitt. Proof of descent from Bodley 271 may be difficult to establish. In the case of one prayer, *Oratio 7 ad sanctam Mariam*, Wilmart argued that the readings of Bodley 271 were widely influential in the later English transmission.²⁰⁴ I am not convinced that this is the correct explanation of its sharing widespread readings. Collections of Anselm's treatises tend to show much variation in their exact contents and in the order in which they are presented. This is more likely to result from independent drawing together of works circulating in booklets

²⁰³ The group of letters in Trier 728 (saec. XII², Germany), fols. 103r–136v, comprises *Epp.* 101, 112, 417 (*Epistola de sacramentis ecclesiae*), 121, 168, 258, 231, 37, 65, 160, 161, 188, 281, 285. These are also found together in Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS 8386–96 (cat. 1111), fols. 170–220 (saec. XII^{ex}, Germany or Flanders rather than England), fols. 216v–217v. *Ep.* 168 to Gunnhild, daughter of King Harold of England, is found only in these two (R. Sharpe, “King Harold's daughter,” *Haskins Society Journal* 19 [2008], 1–27, at p. 11). On the philosophical fragments (fols. 136v–139r), see n. 158 above, where reference is given to a passage unique to this manuscript which Schmitt regarded as a sketch towards *De concordia*.

²⁰⁴ Wilmart, “Les propres corrections,” *RTAM* 2 (1930), 199–200, 201–3.

than from failure to follow the arrangement of an available and authorized collected works. There is little conspicuous reason to think that the collected works prepared at Canterbury played any major role in determining the form in which the works circulated in the twelfth century and after. It is likely to follow that the guardians of Anselm's reputation and archive did not succeed in improving the quality of texts in circulation, and they certainly did not ensure a consistent corpus of authentic works. Already, when the Canterbury collected works is still fresh and William of Malmesbury is forming his own collection, we find books that show a distinctly secondary use of Anselm's writings. So Bodl. MS e Musaeo 112 (*SC* 3578), made at Bury St. Edmunds for Prior Baldwin, ca. 1108 × 1125/1126, has three works from different periods annexed to a copy of Jerome's commentary on Matthew's gospel.²⁰⁵ The three works are *De libertate arbitrii*, already titled *De libero arbitrio*, *De concordia praescientiae et praedestinationis*, and *De conceptu uirginali et de originali peccato*, evidently chosen to continue Jerome's emphasis on the reality of free will. They may have been copied from a collected works provided to Bury by the monks of Canterbury; but, though there are points of contact with the readings of B, I do not think it can be established that this is textually descended from that manuscript.²⁰⁶ It is clear that from the 1120s onwards Anselm's works were copied in accordance with the resources, interests, and whims of the librarians and readers who had the copies made.

My object here has been to use Anselm as an example of a late-eleventh-century author who successfully put into circulation a whole series of works

²⁰⁵ Dated by R. M. Thomson, "The library of Bury St. Edmunds abbey in the eleventh and twelfth centuries," *Speculum* 47 (1972), 617–45, at pp. 629–30; Baldwin became prior 1108 × 1114 and was no longer prior in 1125/6; the main hand is that of a recognizable copyist at work ca. 1125–35 during a period of significant book-production at Bury. These works of Anselm take up six quires at the back of the book; though physically separable from the Jerome commentary, they are begun by the same scribe in exactly the same format, and they appear to have been always bound together.

²⁰⁶ The monks of Bury in the later twelfth century had a volume listed as 'Libri Anselmi archiepiscopi' (R. Sharpe and others, *English Benedictine Libraries: The Shorter Catalogues* (London, 1996), p. 54, B13.18), which may have stood in the same relation to **B** as Bury's copy of the collected letters (**E**) did to **L** at Canterbury. The latter is thought to have been made for the archbishop's nephew, Anselm, abbot of Bury from 1121 to 1148. Schmitt was unaware of the relatively early date of the manuscript but he none the less reports the readings of MS e Mus. 112 as **O**; it shares a handful of noteworthy readings with **B** and other witnesses (e.g. Schmitt, 1:205, 213), but it does not share the few individual errors reported from **B**.

in the course of a long career. Engagement with the detail of how we have come to understand the sequence and dating of one writer's works should not divert attention from the exemplary purpose. The story of Anselm as author serves to illustrate how one can approach a medieval writer in, to use a current phrase, real time, and not simply with the hindsight of his completed oeuvre. The testimony of Anselm's letters and prefaces is what first drew me to use him as an example, but the more I engaged with Schmitt's edition and his essays, the more it became clear that there is a remarkable range of manuscript evidence surviving for aspects of Anselm's writing that we cannot normally expect to see for an author of this period. The discovery of the unfinished draft for *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* was merely the first of several finds that showed how much remained in Anselm's archive that he himself did not regard as ready for publication. Making sense of how that material has come down to us is an unfinished task. Understanding the manuscript transmission beyond identifying the earliest or best witnesses did not detain Schmitt, and one is left with much uncertainty over the twelfth-century transmission of even the major writings. The primary stages, however, are at least visible in several cases, and these manuscripts show that works came into circulation as they were written. Readers, or librarians, in due course sought to gather works together. The Canterbury collected works will always provide an editorial prop, and its value in this respect is not diminished by the fact that it was not necessarily made under instruction from the author. But the works were also brought together into collected works in different places at different times and from different materials. The legacy of the primary stage of transmission may remain perceptible long after the works have been brought together into library books. Tracing exactly where is a task for an editor. Appreciating how an author initiated the dissemination of his works, and recognizing how the manuscript books on which we now rely came into being, is central to the historical understanding of medieval books and the historical reading of medieval texts. The blend of authorial initiative and uncontrolled diffusion is probably something that can be accepted as the way publication usually went. Some writers had fewer contacts than Anselm, or their potential audience was less receptive; some writers may have been more acute at soliciting attention, perhaps because they needed patronage; some were far less successful than Anselm, and in some cases short-lived success may have left us without the evidence to judge. The story of how Anselm published his writings will not be a universal guide to the way it always happened, but his

works and the manuscripts that have preserved them provide us with an unusually vivid body of evidence for exploring the subject.

Richard Sharpe, University of Oxford

Table 1: Early Booklets of Anselm's Works

There is still no census of Anselm manuscripts. Such a census should pay attention to features that may bear on the codicological ancestry of the texts. Schmitt's "Verzeichnis der benutzten Handschriften" ("Prolegomena," pp. 213*–225*) provides only brief notes on sixty-seven manuscripts collated in part or in whole for his edition, while his piece "Zur Entwicklung der Textgestalt in den einzelnen Werken" (ibid., pp. 63*–67*) is extremely brief and incomplete even in relation to his own work, omitting, for example, *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi*. The older published catalogues often do not provide sufficient information on format and collation for one to tell whether a book is made up of booklets, and even newer ones will not provide information in the use of chapter-headings. The dating of hands is not always reliable, but even the most expert eye would need closely related examples and dating-evidence to support the sort of close dating that would help here. No less important is the need for the transcription of *tituli*, since the form of title used may betray an early origin; for the early works the presence or absence of Anselm's archiepiscopal title may be significant, though it could easily have been added even in an early copy from a primary booklet. The following list depends in large part on catalogues and as such may need revision if a census is undertaken. I have set my limit at manuscripts that have been dated no later than the first quarter or third of the twelfth century.

A. Possible primary booklets containing a single work

shelfmark	date and provenance	contents	notes
BNF lat. 13413 fols. 1–57	saec. xi ex. (Schmitt 1077 × 1082) Sées OSB	<i>Monologion</i> ("Exemplum meditandi de ratione fide") Preceded by letter to Lanfranc	very early title

shelfmark	date and provenance	contents	notes
Bodl. Rawl. A. 392 fols. 78–86 now 240 × 165 (205 × 115)	saec. xi ex. (Schmitt 1085) Troarn OSB	<i>Quomodo grammaticus</i>	no chapter headings
Bodl. Rawl. A. 392 fols. 87–100 now 240 × 165 (205 × 115)	saec. xi ex. (before ca. 1090) (Schmitt 1085) Troarn OSB	<i>De ueritate, De libertate arbitrii</i>	no preface or chapter headings; want of third dialogue makes it possibly an unauthorized text
Bodl. Rawl. A. 392 fols. 48–77 now 240 × 165 (200 × 115)	saec. xi ex. (before ca. 1100) (Schmitt 1085) Troarn OSB	<i>Orationes</i>	lacks preface and final prayers
Cambridge Trinity College, B. 1. 37 fols. 74–97 210 × 150 mm	saec. xii in. Salisbury cathedral	<i>Monologion</i> preceded by letter to Lanfranc	
Cambridge Trinity College, B. 1. 37 fols. 1–26, 98–105, 27–37 210 × 150 mm	saec. xii in. Salisbury cathedral	<i>Cur Deus homo</i>	
BL Burney 357 fols. 5–12 210 × 120 mm (185 × 100)	saec. xii ¼ England	<i>De conceptu uirginali et de peccato originali</i>	
BL Burney 285 fols. 1–12 210 × 120 mm (190 × 110)	saec. xii ¼ England	<i>Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati</i>	
BL Add. 57971 200 × 125 mm	saec. xii ¼ (not before 1107)	<i>De concordia praescientiae et praedestinationis</i>	
Stuttgart Theol. 4 ^o 234 195 × 135 mm (150 × 95)	saec. xii ¼ (not before 1104) written and owned at Zwiefalten OSB	<i>Orationes siue Meditationes</i>	
uncertain examples			
Verdun BM 70	saec. xii (ca. 1125 or a little later) written at St. Albans	<i>Orationes siue Meditationes</i>	single work, but precise contents unlisted; lacks preface

shelfmark	date and provenance	contents	notes
Copenhagen, Gl. kgl. S. 3394 170 × 100 mm	saec. xii med. or later (ca. 1140–1190) Germany, owned at Liesborn OSB	<i>Cur Deus homo</i>	small format, 61 leaves, single work, but too late itself to count as primary
Sankt-Gallen 287 190 × 130 mm	saec. xii owned at Sankt- Gallen	<i>Cur Deus homo</i>	small format, 60 leaves, single work, but no closer dating in print
BAV Vat. lat. 532 fols. 81–226, at 219v–226v 300 × 125 mm	saec. xii ? Christ Church Canterbury OSB	<i>Proslogion</i> (“Fides querens intellectum”)	without preface or chapter headings; added at the back of a volume of Cassian’s <i>Conlationes</i> ; Schmitt merely speculative on origin?

B. Early booklets containing more than one work

shelfmark	date and provenance	contents	notes
Metz 245 fols. 103– 119	saec. xi ex. (after 1084) Saint-Arnoul OSB, Metz	<i>Orationes</i>	incomplete set added at the back of a booklet of John of Fécamp
Cambridge Trinity College B. 1. 37 fols. 46–73 210 × 150 mm	ca. 1086 × 1100, probably ca. 1093 Salisbury cathedral	<i>Proslogion</i> , <i>Sumptum ex eodem libello</i> , “Cur Deus magis,” <i>Epistolae</i> (15)	without exchange with Gaunilo
Arras BM 455 (cat. 1021) 200 × 125 mm	saec. xi ex. Saint-Vaast OSB	<i>Monologion</i> , <i>Proslogion</i> , <i>Orationes</i>	
Bodl. Rawl. A. 392 fols. 1–47 now 240 × 165 mm	saec. xi ex. Troarn OSB	<i>Monologion</i> preceded by letter to Lanfranc, <i>Proslogion</i> with Gaunilo	
Cambridge Trinity College B. 1. 37 fols. 38–45 210 × 150 mm	saec. xii in. Salisbury cathedral	<i>De incarnatione Verbi</i> , <i>Ep. 65 ad Willelmum</i>	

shelfmark	date and provenance	contents	notes
BL Harley 203 fols. 29–52 205 × 140 mm	saec. xii in. Norman scribe	<i>De incarnatione Verbi</i> , <i>Proslogion</i> (“Fides querens intellectum”)	without exchange with Gaunilo
Douai 354 fols. 1–109 230 × 150 mm	saec. xii in. Marchiennes OSB	<i>Cur Deus homo</i> , Preface and <i>De ueritate</i> , <i>Monologion</i> , <i>Proslogion</i> with Gaunilo, <i>De incarnatione Verbi</i> (“De fide trinitatis ad Vrbanum”), excerpts from two works of Guibert de Nogent	perhaps several booklets
Cambridge Jesus College QG 16 (cat. 64), fols. 16–85 190 × 125 mm	saec. xii in. owned at Durham cathedral OSB ca. 1160	<i>Monologion</i> , <i>Proslogion</i> with Gaunilo, <i>De incarnatione Verbi</i> , <i>De ueritate</i> , <i>De libertate arbitrii</i> , <i>De casu diaboli</i>	early treatises only
Cambridge Jesus College QG 16 (cat. 64), fols. 86–118 190 × 125 mm	saec. xii in. owned at Durham cathedral OSB ca. 1160	<i>Cur Deus homo</i> , <i>De conceptu uirginali et de peccato originali</i>	regular pairing
Rome BNC 159 (Farf. 11) fols. 1–62 200 × 120 mm	saec. xii in. Farfa OSB	<i>Cur Deus homo</i> , <i>De conceptu uirginali et de peccato originali</i>	regular pairing
BL Royal 5 E. v fols. 50–73 230 × 115 mm	saec. xii ¼ Normandy or France	<i>Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati</i> , <i>De processione Spiritus Sancti</i>	regular pairing
BNF lat. 5305 fols. 49–110	saec. xii ¼ Beauvais cathedral	<i>Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati</i> , <i>De processione Spiritus Sancti</i> , Fulcoius of Beauvais	regular pairing

shelfmark	date and provenance	contents	notes
Arras 484 (cat. 805) 185 × 130 mm	saec. xii ¼ written at Christ Church, owned at Arras cathedral	<i>Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati, De processione Spiritus Sancti</i>	regular pairing
Glasgow UL, Hunter 244 265 × 200 mm	saec. xii ? Italy	<i>Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati, De processione Spiritus Sancti</i>	regular pairing; apparently descended from same exemplar as Arras 484
Chartres 194 220 × 155 mm	saec. xii in.	<i>Cur Deus homo, De conceptu uirginali et de peccato originali, De processione Spiritus Sancti, Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati</i>	two early pairings
Rouen A. 366 (cat. 539) 255 × 160 mm	saec. xii in. Jumièges OSB	<i>De ueritate, De libertate arbitrii, De casu diaboli, De incarnatione Verbi, Monologion, Proslogion with Gaunilo, De conceptu uirginali et de peccato originali, De processione Spiritus Sancti</i>	archiepiscopal title in the headings of <i>De ueritate</i> and <i>Proslogion</i> ; absence of <i>Cur Deus homo</i> suggests not a growing collected works but several booklets
Abp Hugh of Lyon	given to Lyon cathedral not later than 1106 (p. 63 n. 173)	<i>De ueritate, De libertate arbitrii, De casu diaboli, De incarnatione Verbi, Cur Deus homo, De conceptu uirginali et de originali peccato, De processione Spiritus Sancti, Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati</i>	three or four early booklets?

shelfmark	date and provenance	contents	notes
Exeter Cathedral 3520 pp. 1–234 now 225 × 135 (170 × 95)	saec. xii in.	<i>De ueritate, De libertate arbitrii, De casu diaboli, Epistola de incarnatione Verbi, Cur Deus homo, Medit. 3</i> (“De anima christiana”), <i>De conceptu uirginali et de peccato originali, Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati, Quomodo grammaticus, Or. 15, 17</i>	
Oxford, Jesus College, 4, fols. 1–57 225 × 140 mm (175 × 115)	saec. xii ¼ owned at Pershore OSB	<i>De ueritate, De libertate arbitrii, De casu diaboli, De conceptu uirginali et de peccato originali, Epistola de incarnatione Verbi, Monologion</i> (part)	lacks coherent sequence
Rouen U. 148 (cat. 540) 165 × 110 mm	saec. xii	(begins imperfect) ‘De libero arbitrio’, <i>De casu diaboli</i> , Life of St. Opportuna of Sées (BHL 6339)	three dialogues alone, small format, worth investigation
Bodl. e Mus. 112, pp. 243–336 230 × 165 mm (175 × 100)	ca. 1108 × 1125/6 (ca. 1120–40), made at Bury St Edmunds	(following Jerome on Matthew) ‘De libero arbitrio’, <i>De concordia praescientiae et praedestinationis, De conceptu uirginali et de originali peccato</i>	selected for theme

Table 2: Chronology of Anselm's Works

dates	works	early witnesses	notes
before 1070	first monastic letters, such as <i>Epp.</i> 2, 37	Hereford P. I. 3	pp. 10, 29
before or after 1070	first <i>Orationes siue Meditationes</i>		limited circulation attested by letters pp. 11–15
uncertain	<i>Deploratio uirginitatis male amissae</i> (<i>Medit.</i> 2)		dated before 1070 by Southern p. 13
1077	“Exemplum meditandi de ratione fidei”	BNF lat. 13413	pp. 18–19, 23
1077–1078	“Fides quaerens intellectum”	BL Harley 203	pp. 19, 24
in or after 1083	<i>Monologion</i> , <i>Proslogion</i> as published	Cambridge Trinity B. 1. 37	pp. 17–19, 23–24
uncertain	extended <i>Orationes siue Meditationes</i>	Metz 245 Bodl. MS Rawl. A. 392	pp. 13–14, 32–33
early 1080s	<i>Quomodo grammaticus</i>	Bodl. Rawl. A. 392	p. 22
after 1083	<i>De ueritate</i> , <i>De libertate arbitrii</i> , <i>De casu diaboli</i>	Bodl. Rawl. A. 392	after the publication of <i>Monologion</i> pp. 20–21, 31–33
1078 × 1093	select monastic letters	Trinity B. 1. 37	pp. 26–30
ca. 1092–1093	Bec letter collection	BL Cotton Nero A. vii	p. 38–39
ca. 1092–1093	“Cur Deus magis” and other sketches	Cambridge Trinity B. 1. 37	pp. 25–27, 42–43
1093–1094	<i>Epistola de incarnatione Verbi</i>	Cambridge Trinity B. 1. 37 BL Harley 203	pp. 24, 28, 36–40
1098	<i>Cur Deus homo</i>	Cambridge Trinity B. 1. 37	pp. 46–48
1099	<i>De conceptu uirginali et de peccato originali</i>	BL Burney 357 fols. 5–12	p. 49
1100	<i>Meditatio redemptionis humanae</i>		pp. 49–50
1099 × 1101	<i>De processione Spiritus Sancti</i>		pp. 50–51
1101 × 1103 ?	<i>Epistola de sacrificio azimi et fermentati</i>	BL Burney 285 fols. 1–12	pp. 52–54

dates	works	early witnesses	notes
1101 × 1103 ?	<i>Epistola de sacramentis ecclesiae</i>		pp. 52–54
1104	<i>Orationes siue Meditationes</i> sent to Matilda of Canossa; preface and final prayers added?	Stuttgart Theol. 4° 234	pp. 56–57
1107	<i>De concordia praescientiae et praedestinationis</i>	BL Add. 57971	pp. 58–59