



Anselm, Dialogue, and the Rise of Scholastic Disputation

Author(s): Alex J. Novikoff

Source: *Speculum*, APRIL 2011, Vol. 86, No. 2 (APRIL 2011), pp. 387-418

Published by: The University of Chicago Press on behalf of the Medieval Academy of America

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41105591>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

[https://www.jstor.org/stable/41105591?seq=1&cid=pdf-](https://www.jstor.org/stable/41105591?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)

[reference#references_tab_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/41105591?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



The University of Chicago Press and Medieval Academy of America are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Speculum*

JSTOR

Anselm, Dialogue, and the Rise of Scholastic Disputation

By Alex J. Novikoff

The Italian-born Lanfranc of Pavia (c. 1005–89) and his more illustrious pupil and compatriot Anselm of Bec (c. 1033–1109) have long been considered pivotal figures in the theological and especially philosophical developments of the late eleventh century. Long ago dubbed the “father of Scholasticism”¹ on account of his attempts to harmonize reason and faith, Anselm has occasioned increasing scrutiny in recent years as scholars have begun to target the cultural and pedagogical (as opposed to strictly philosophical) role of Anselm and his milieu in the early stages of the twelfth-century renaissance.² In a particularly stimulating

This article was written in the summer of 2009, on the basis of earlier work, during my term as a Lindsay Young Visiting Research Fellow at the Marco Institute for Medieval and Renaissance Studies at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. I wish to thank the Marco Institute for electing me to that fellowship and the medievalists there for their hospitality. A very preliminary version of my ideas was shared at the Fourth Medieval History Seminar hosted by the German Historical Institute in Venice in October 2005, and I am grateful to the conveners and the participants of that wonderful seminar for their feedback and encouragement. For their comments and helpful suggestions on earlier drafts of this article I would especially like to acknowledge Edward Peters, the editors of *Speculum*, and the anonymous reviewers for the journal, and in particular the heroic efforts of “Reader B.”

¹ Martin Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, 2 vols. (Freiburg, 1909), 1:7. See also the remarks of R. W. Southern, “St Anselm of Canterbury: His Mission of Reconciliation,” in *Anselm: Aosta, Bec and Canterbury. Papers in Commemoration of the Nine-Hundredth Anniversary of Anselm’s Enthronement as Archbishop, 25 September 1093*, ed. D. E. Luscombe and G. R. Evans (Sheffield, 1996), p. 24.

² A leading example of this recent attention to monastic learning in the age of Anselm is *Teaching and Learning in Northern Europe, 1000–1200*, ed. Sally N. Vaughn and Jay Rubenstein, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 8 (Turnhout, 2006), with further bibliographic orientation in the excellent introduction by the editors. The locus classicus for a sweeping historical assessment of Anselm remains R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge, Eng., 1990), the author’s second biography of Anselm, although a number of elements of Southern’s portrayal of Anselm have been modified by subsequent scholarship (cited below); in this essay I endeavor to continue that modification, but in a different direction. Giles E. M. Gasper, *Anselm of Canterbury and His Theological Inheritance* (Aldershot, Eng., 2004), considers the relatively unexplored realm of Anselm’s use of patristic authorities (other than Augustine). A diverse appraisal of Anselm’s significance for the modern world is offered in *Saint Anselm—A Thinker for Yesterday and Today*, ed. Coloman Viola and Frederick van Fleteren, Texts and Studies in Religion 90 (Lewiston, N.Y., 2002), which presents papers given at a 1990 conference on Anselm. Still very useful because of the range of historical themes touched upon are the proceedings from the 1982 Anselm conference held at Bec: *Les mutations socio-culturelles au tournant des XIe–XIIe siècles*, ed. Raymonde Foreville (Paris, 1984), although it is perplexing that so little attention has since been paid to the sociocultural atmosphere of monastic learning. For fresh introductions to Anselm’s philosophy see Sandra Visser and Thomas Williams, *Anselm* (Oxford, 2008); and *The Cambridge Companion to Anselm*, ed. Brian Davies and Brian Leftow (Cambridge, Eng., 2004), both of which focus almost exclusively on Anselm’s philosophy. The bibliography pertaining to the intellectual renaissance of the twelfth century is vast and fairly well known, but for the often-overlooked nineteenth-century origins of the term and the concept see Alex J.

interdisciplinary exploration of the cognitive relation between builders and their craft and masters and theirs, Charles M. Radding and William W. Clark have advanced an intriguing model suggesting that theologians and Romanesque builders of the eleventh and twelfth centuries were part of a larger transformative development in which thinkers and artisans developed new methods for solving new problems; these new methods, in turn, transformed practitioners of a craft into members of new and distinct disciplines.³ The verdict is still out on the precise nature of those important developments, but especially vexing is the question of the abbey of Bec's importance and influence under Lanfranc and Anselm during these changing times. As a leading scholar of Anselm has recently put it, "The character of the school of Bec emerges as a riddle to be solved. What was its focus, what did its teachers teach, and how long did it last?"⁴ Recent studies have modified Richard Southern's portrayal of the curriculum of Anselm's school at Bec as largely devoted to monastic ideals and demonstrated that history and law were also studied, that a good number of students went on to become able administrators, and that Anselm may have unwittingly contributed to the rise of courtly love.⁵ Much of the fog surrounding the authorial publication and dissem-

Novikoff, "The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century before Haskins," *Haskins Society Journal* 16 (2005), 104–16.

³ Charles M. Radding and William W. Clark, *Medieval Architecture, Medieval Learning: Builders and Masters in the Age of Romanesque and Gothic* (New Haven, Conn., 1992). Obviously, this work resurrects and develops an argument first proposed by Erwin Panofsky, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism* (Latrobe, Pa., 1951). See also Charles M. Radding, *A World Made by Men: Cognition and Society, 400–1200* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1985), a work unfairly ignored perhaps because of its misleading correlation between modern educational theory and the medieval experience but with an important discussion of Lanfranc. Not to be ignored in the context of how medieval architecture encodes a shift in the way medieval thinkers perceived their relationship with their world is the eminently accessible book by Philip Ball, *Universe of Stone: A Biography of Chartres Cathedral* (New York, 2008). An even bolder case for bringing neuroscience and human biology into the realm of history (and vice versa) has been made recently by another medievalist: Daniel Lord Smail, *On Deep History and the Brain* (Berkeley, Calif., 2008).

⁴ Sally N. Vaughn, "Among These Authors Are the Men of Bec: Historical Writing among the Monks of Bec," in *Essays in Medieval Studies*, 17: *The Uses of History*, ed. Allen J. Frantzen (Chicago, 2000), pp. 1–18, at p. 3. The overall history of Bec is much in need of a fresh assessment; the foundational study remains A. A. Porée, *Histoire de l'abbaye du Bec*, 2 vols. (Évreux, 1901).

⁵ In these areas the scholarship of Sally Vaughn is preeminent. On the study of history at Bec see Vaughn, "Among These Authors." For the suggestion that law was also taught at Bec, by both Lanfranc and Anselm, see eadem, "The Concept of Law at the Abbey of Bec, 1034–1136: How Law and Legal Concepts Were Described, Taught and Practiced at Bec in the Time of Lanfranc and Anselm," in *Law and Learning in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the Second Carlsberg Academy Conference on Medieval Legal History 2005* (Copenhagen, 2006), pp. 167–80; as well as eadem, "Anselm of Bec: The Pattern of His Teaching," pp. 99–127, and Priscilla D. Watkins, "Lanfranc at Caen: Teaching by Example," pp. 71–97, both in *Teaching and Learning*, ed. Vaughn and Rubenstein. On the administrative careers of the students at Bec see again Vaughn, "Anselm, Lanfranc, and the School of Bec: Searching for the Students of Bec," in *The Culture of Christendom: Essays in Commemoration of Denis L. T. Bethell*, ed. Marc A. Meyer (London, 1993), pp. 155–81. In an extension of her earlier work on Anselm and his correspondence with women, Vaughn has most recently approached Anselm as having developed theological theories that were foundational to the development of the twelfth-century concept of courtly love: Sally N. Vaughn, "Saint Anselm and His Students Writing

ination of Anselm's writings has recently been cleared by Richard Sharpe's meticulous analysis in "Anselm as Author," revealing a careful and more deliberate editorial planning on Anselm's part than previously recognized.⁶ However, even amidst the gathering attention directed toward these figures and their cultural context, it is the most basic and obvious feature of Lanfranc's and Anselm's written record that has been the most undeservedly neglected: their use of dialogue and its correlation to the early development of Scholastic disputation. To be sure, the revival of dialectic in the eleventh century and especially in the twelfth has long been known and rather well charted, particularly with regard to the growth of theology as an academic discipline.⁷ What follows is a somewhat more focused line of inquiry. Looking beyond the well-trodden ground of Anselm's philosophy and theology and instead examining his pedagogical innovations, this essay explores Anselm's contribution to the development of literary dialogue and to the origins of the Scholastic *disputatio*, both valuable tools indeed in his philosophical and theological endeavors.⁸ Anselm's influence as a prolific author of dialogues can especially be observed in a younger generation of writers and thinkers who studied with him or directly sought to imitate his style and whose oeuvres need also to be considered. By examining the circle of Lanfranc and Anselm, the methods embodied by their teachings, and the writings they produced, this essay aims to show that the Scholastic dialectical methods, later so prominent in medieval universities, have their origins within the general milieu of monastic learning. More specifically, these methods will be shown to have their origins in Lanfranc's and Anselm's engagement with dialogue and disputation at the school of Bec.

about Love: A Theological Foundation for the Rise of Romantic Love in Europe," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 19 (2010), 54–73.

⁶ Richard Sharpe, "Anselm as Author: Publishing in the Late Eleventh Century," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 19 (2009), 1–87. Also relevant is the recent edition and translation of three important texts from the early twelfth century that deal with the position of Bec in relation to episcopal and ducal authorities: *Three Treatises from Bec on the Nature of Monastic Life*, ed. Giles Constable, trans. Bernard S. Smith, Medieval Academy Books 109 (Toronto, 2008).

⁷ The classics in this field remain J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XII^e siècle*, 2nd ed., Museum Lessianum, Section historique, 10 (Bruges, 1948; repr., Brussels, 1969); and M.-D. Chenu, *La théologie au douzième siècle*, 3rd ed., Études de Philosophie Médiévale 45 (Paris, 1976). For a treatment of dialectic in the writings of four of the authors discussed in this paper see Toivo J. Holopainen, *Dialectic and Theology in the Eleventh Century*, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 54 (Leiden, 1996). Studies of later Scholastic disputation, particularly university disputation, pay little or no regard to the antecedents of the form; its origins are always assumed, never explained. See, for example, Olga Weijers, *La "disputatio" à la Faculté des arts de Paris (1200–1350 environ): Esquisse d'une typologie*, Studia Artistarum 2 (Turnhout, 1995); and Bernardo C. Bazàn et al., *Les questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologie, de droit, et de médecine*, Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental 44–45 (Turnhout, 1985), both valuable studies of the period they cover but largely silent on the genesis of disputed questions and disputation.

⁸ The notion of "philosophy" itself during this period is also being rethought from the perspective of the history of education. See C. Stephen Jaeger, "Philosophy, ca. 950–ca. 1050," *Viator* 40 (2009), 17–40.

LANFRANC

Lanfranc's biography, what little we know of it, echoes with the timeless qualities of an intellectual success story. He was born in a town in northern Italy, lost his parents at an early age, and in his youth traveled north in search of greater educational and professional opportunities.⁹ There is some evidence that Lanfranc was already a successful disputant in the law courts in his native region of Lombardy, though it is difficult to know precisely what that entailed.¹⁰ The Ottonian influence on the region also assured him of an education in the liberal arts before he left for France in the early 1030s, one perhaps inclusive of what Stephen Jaeger has described as the "charismatic pedagogy" of the cathedral schools.¹¹ His eventual arrival in Normandy is not altogether surprising given that Pavia itself lay on the pilgrimage route to Rome, and when still in Italy he would have seen pilgrims traveling both to and from Normandy and England.¹² One tradition tells of his having heard Berengar of Tours incognito but left, already convinced of the unsoundness of his teaching.¹³ Apocryphal or not, the story foretells the later disputes that would elevate Lanfranc's teachings to the high stage of papal and international politics. He settled at the newly founded monastery of Bec in Normandy where he proved himself a competent and devoted member of the community. He was speedily appointed prior (c. 1045), giving him oversight of both the internal and the external affairs of Bec. On account of his rising reputation as a teacher and the need to raise money for the development of the abbey, Lanfranc began to admit outside students who were not destined to remain in the monastic milieu.¹⁴ An early student at the monastic school of Bec was Gilbert Crispin, a future abbot of Westminster, who described the "clerks, sons of dukes, and the most celebrated masters of the schools of Latin learning" who came flocking to Lanfranc, attracted by the reputation

⁹ On Lanfranc's career see most recently H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc: Scholar, Monk, and Archbishop* (Oxford, 2003). Still indispensable is Margaret T. Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec* (Oxford, 1978). The diversity of Lanfranc's contributions is explored in *Lanfranco di Pavia e l'Europa del secolo XI*, ed. Giulio d'Onofrio (Rome, 1993). Much of what we know about Lanfranc's early life comes from the *Vita Lanfranci* published in PL 150:29–58, translated in Sally N. Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec and the Anglo-Norman State, 1034–1136* (Woodbridge, Eng., 1981), pp. 87–111.

¹⁰ See Radding, *A World Made by Men*, esp. pp. 156–86; and discussions in Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, pp. 5–8; and Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec*, pp. 4–15. More recently, Anders Winroth has argued that the origins of legal education are to be sought in the twelfth century and not in the eleventh. See Winroth, "The Teaching of Law in the Twelfth Century," in *Law and Learning in the Middle Ages*, ed. Helle Vogt and Mia Münster-Swendsen (Copenhagen, 2006), pp. 41–62, which builds on his pioneering work on Gratian: *The Making of Gratian's Decretum*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, 4th ser., 49 (Cambridge, Eng., 2001).

¹¹ C. Stephen Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950–1200* (Philadelphia, 1994).

¹² Frank Barlow, *The English Church, 1000–1066: A History of the Later Anglo-Saxon Church*, 2nd ed. (London, 1979), pp. 12–13 and 20–22.

¹³ Cited in Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, p. 9.

¹⁴ See especially Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec*, chaps. 2–3. On Lanfranc's educational and administrative influence in neighboring Caen see Watkins, "Lanfranc at Caen."

of the place.¹⁵ At a tense moment during the investiture conflict in 1059, even Pope Nicholas II sent for Lanfranc's help, praising Lanfranc for his skills and reputation as a master of rhetoric and dialectic.¹⁶ And that indefatigable observer and chronicler of ecclesiastical history Orderic Vitalis lavished praise on Lanfranc's abilities, saying that "by intellect and learning Lanfranc would have won the applause of Herodian in grammar, Aristotle in dialectic, Cicero in rhetoric, Augustine, Jerome, and the other commentators on the Old and New Testaments in scriptural studies."¹⁷ Both during his lifetime and afterwards, Lanfranc was a teacher whose verbal skills were highly regarded and widely prized.

Lanfranc's success also earned him his detractors. During his years as prior of Bec he became involved in a feud with Berengar of Tours over the exact nature of the Eucharist.¹⁸ Berengar initiated the dispute by suggesting that the miracle of the sacrament represented a spiritual and not material transformation. The sources for his unorthodox views were two similarly entitled works written by two monks at the famed Carolingian monastery of Corbie in the ninth century.¹⁹ Berengar adopted the view of the later author, Ratramnus (whose views Berengar believed came from John Scotus), that saw the eucharistic elements as sacred signs that betokened an inner reality communicated to the recipient's soul, not

¹⁵ Gilbert Crispin, *Vita Herluini*, ed. G. R. Evans, in *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster*, ed. Anna Sapir Abulafia and G. R. Evans, *Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi* 8 (Oxford, 1986), p. 197.

¹⁶ Pope Nicholas II was consecrated in January 1059 and began almost at once to lay down lines of political and ecclesiastical development that altered the general development of papal government. He was working toward a new procedure for papal elections that would diminish, if not virtually eliminate, imperial participation in papal elections. The letter is reproduced in Southern, *Saint Anselm*, pp. 32–33, and translated at pp. 20–21. See also Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, esp. pp. 41–45.

¹⁷ Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1968–80), 2:251. All translations of this text are from Chibnall.

¹⁸ A considerable body of literature exists on this now-famous dispute, in part because it led to the doctrine of transubstantiation. Especially important is Jean de Montclos, *Lanfranc et Béranger: La controverse eucharistique du XI^e siècle*, *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Études et Documents*, 37 (Leuven, 1971). See also Holopainen, *Dialectic and Theology*, chaps. 3–4; and A. J. Macdonald, *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine* (London, 1930). A useful summary of the debate is given in the recent study by Charles M. Radding and Francis Newton, *Theology, Rhetoric, and Politics in the Eucharistic Controversy, 1078–1079: Alberic of Monte Cassino against Berengar of Tours* (New York, 2003), chap. 1.

¹⁹ In his *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, c. 831–33 (printed in PL 120:1255–1350), Paschasius Radbertus insisted that the body of Christ as received in the sacrament was identical both with the earthly body that the incarnate Christ took from Mary and with the body now in heaven that is eternally glorified. Some ten years later, another monk from the same abbey of Corbie, Ratramnus, replied in a similarly entitled work (PL 121:125–70) to specific questions put to him by Emperor Charles the Bald. Ratramnus maintained that the bread and wine of the Eucharist, after consecration, did not become the body and blood of Christ in an actual or material sense, as Radbertus had taught, but only in a spiritual sense. Other works dealing with the Carolingian controversy include Celia Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and Art of Christ's Passion* (Cambridge, Eng., 2001); and Paul H. Jones, *Christ's Eucharistic Presence: A History of the Doctrine*, *American University Studies* 7/157 (New York, 1994). David Ganz, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance*, *Beihefte der Francia* 20 (Sigmaringen, 1990), provides a useful overview of the monastery during the period but does not go into the controversy. See also John F. Fahey, *The Eucharistic Teaching of Ratramn of Corbie*, *Pontificia Facultas Theologica Seminarii Sanctae Mariae ad Lacum, Dissertationes ad Lauream*, 22 (Mundelein, Ill., 1951).

the historical body of Christ. As early as 1049 the content of Berengar's teaching was provoking suspicion. In a letter to the king of France, Theoduin of Liège expressed concern that Berengar was saying that the historical body and blood of Christ were not present in the Eucharist and, further, that he was questioning the very efficaciousness of the sacraments.²⁰ That same year Berengar wrote to Lanfranc challenging his orthodoxy, ostensibly because Lanfranc had condemned the eucharistic view of John Scotus. Berengar did not just question Lanfranc's position; he challenged him to a public debate, "if an opportunity should arise for us," so that he might hear for himself what Lanfranc believed. Berengar heightened the wager by allowing Lanfranc the pleasure of assembling "whomever you may wish as competent judges or as hearers."²¹ Pope Leo IX, who was then in the midst of a campaign aimed at reforming the church, made the issue public when he summoned the two opponents to a council in 1050. There Lanfranc ably defended himself, and by doing so augmented his prestige, while the pronouncements of the absent Berengar were condemned. At Tours, however, Berengar continued to teach and publicize his views. Further councils at Vercelli, Brionne, and Rome were convened in an effort to stamp out Berengar's heresy.²² At these occasions Lanfranc was able to use his dialectical skills and elevate to a new level the emerging art of disputation. "In the most learned disputations (*profundissimis disputationibus*)," Orderic Vitalis later wrote, Lanfranc "publicly worsted Berengar at Rome and Tours, forcing him to pronounce anathema on all heresy and to profess the true faith in writing."²³ The intricacies and details of this much-discussed theological debate are beyond the scope of this paper, but broadly speaking Lanfranc employed dialectic to a greater extent than Berengar, who relied more strictly on the tools of grammar.²⁴ Lanfranc also argued his position by making use of the account of the physical universe elaborated in Aristotle's *Categories*, which had become known in the Latin West in the schools of northern France in the tenth century.²⁵ Significantly, one of Lanfranc's most influential works resulted from this prolonged dispute: an epistolary dialogue entitled *De corpore et*

²⁰ Theoduin's letter to Henry I of France is printed in PL 146:1439–42.

²¹ The Latin text is printed in R. B. C. Huygens, "Textes latins du XIe au XIIIe siècle," *Studi medievali*, 3rd ser., 8 (1967), 456, with discussion by Huygens and Jean de Montclos, pp. 451–59. See also Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec*, p. 66.

²² The last synod condemning Berengar and his teachings took place in Rome in 1078–79 during the pontificate of Gregory VII. A treatise written against Berenger by Alberic of Monte Cassino resulted from this synod. Once thought lost, it has been identified and translated by Radding and Newton, *Theology, Rhetoric, and Politics*, pp. 123–70.

²³ *Ecclesiastical History*, 2:252–53.

²⁴ Holopainen, *Dialectic and Theology*, chap. 3, challenges the notion that Lanfranc was systematic or responsible in his application of dialectic to theology. Nevertheless, in his commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, Lanfranc is even more explicit in his identification of dialectic and philosophy as a rational method and related inquiry. See his *Commentarius in Epistolas Pauli*, PL 150, esp. cols. 323–24. A closer examination of Lanfranc's commentary on Paul is offered below, pp. 394–95.

²⁵ Southern, *Saint Anselm*, p. 48. See also Giulio d'Onofrio, "Respondeant pro me: La dialectique anselmienne et les dialecticiens du haut moyen âge," in *Saint Anselm*, ed. Viola and van Fleteren (above, n. 2), pp. 29–49. On the medieval reception of Aristotle's *Old Logic* see John Marenbon, "Glosses and Commentaries on the *Categories* and *De interpretatione* before Abelard," in *Dialektik und Rhetorik im früheren und hohen Mittelalter: Rezeption, Überlieferung und gesellschaftliche*

sanguine Domini.²⁶ Addressed to Berengar, whom Lanfranc decries as “an enemy of the Catholic Church,” the work was not written until after Lanfranc left Bec for Caen, probably sometime in the early 1060s.²⁷

The exact reasons for the work’s composition remain vague. Lanfranc seems to have written it on his own initiative to controvert Berengar’s teaching and as a rejoinder to Berengar’s derogation of apostolic authority.²⁸ A statement in the opening chapter suggests that, before writing, Lanfranc had wished to engage “in a more secretive debate (*clandestinis disputationibus*)” with Berengar, as had taken place in Brionne, but that Berengar refused.²⁹ There is no evidence from Berengar’s side to corroborate this assertion. Surely Berengar’s defeat and humiliation by the multiple councils that condemned him meant that no further debate was necessary. Yet the controversy originally erupted, we recall, when in a letter Berengar challenged Lanfranc to a public debate. Perhaps Lanfranc, in leaving a written record of his victory over Berengar, decided to return the favor. The prefatory statement might therefore be rhetorical, like the fictitious, but plausible, dialogue between Lanfranc and Berengar that follows. What seems clear is that the literary framework of the anti-Berengarian polemic was a direct result of the prolonged dispute and would-be disputations between the two adversaries. In that regard it bears a curious resemblance to the *Disceptatio sinodalis* of Lanfranc’s contemporary Peter Damian (also of north Italian origin and training),³⁰ a dialogue purporting to be a synodal procès-verbal between the imperial counsel (*Regius advocatus*), representing the antipope Honorius II, and the defense attorney for the Roman church (*Defensor Romanae ecclesiae*), representing Pope Alexander II at a critical juncture in ecclesiastical politics.³¹ Given current events, Peter’s dialogue was evidently written to influence the synod to be held in Augsburg in October 1062, where it was hoped the schism between the pope and antipope would be resolved. The fictitious hearing in the form of a dialogue (one

Wirkung antiker Gelehrsamkeit, vornehmlich im 9. und 12. Jh., ed. Johannes Fried, *Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, Kolloquien*, 27 (Munich, 1997), pp. 21–49.

²⁶ PL 150:407–42.

²⁷ The work has been dated as early as 1061 and as late as 1068. The various proposals are summarized by Holopainen, *Dialectic and Theology*, p. 45 n. 6. An important discussion connecting this famous Eucharistic debate to the devotion to Christ in his humanity is Rachel Fulton, *From Judgment to Passion: Devotion to Christ and the Virgin Mary, 800–1200* (New York, 2002), pp. 121–41, although the portrayal of Lanfranc and his polemic is somewhat more acerbic than I would agree with.

²⁸ Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, p. 64. A note in some German manuscripts says that he was prompted by his sometime pupil at Bec or Caen, Theodoric of Paderborn. See also Montclos, *Lanfranc et Bérenger*, p. 196.

²⁹ PL 150:407.

³⁰ A prolific author, Damian has been the focus of sustained scholarly attention. Most recently see Patricia Ranft, *The Theology of Work: Peter Damian and the Medieval Religious Renewal Movement* (New York, 2006); see also Stephan Freund, *Studien zur literarischen Wirksamkeit des Petrus Damiani*, MGH Studien und Texte 13 (Hannover, 1995), who situates Damian’s writings amidst other eleventh-century polemicists.

³¹ Formerly treated as a separate work, the *Disceptatio sinodalis* is now recognized as belonging to Letter 89. A critical edition of the Latin text can be found in *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. Kurt Reindel, 4 vols. (Munich, 1983–93), 2:541–72.

of two polemical tracts in dialogue form) allowed Peter Damian to explore in depth the significance of the papal election decree of 1059 and to assert his own position on the relationship between church and state in this period.³² There is, of course, an important distinction: whereas Peter's polemic was composed for a specific occasion and quickly became obsolete, Lanfranc's epistolary dialogue on the Eucharist enjoyed great popularity in the years following his death. Its posthumous success helped to influence what would shortly come to be known as the doctrine of transubstantiation, and it remained an oft-cited text throughout the Middle Ages.³³ It is a striking fact that two contemporary theologians of north Italian origin should deliberately cast their polemics in the form of a dialogue in an age just prior to the Scholastic debates of the twelfth century, for it is precisely this spirit of pro and contra that will predominate in the later *quaestiones disputatae*.

Some of the enduring success of Lanfranc's anti-Berengarian dialogue clearly had to do with its argumentation and literary form. Guitmund of Aversa, a former student of Lanfranc's and a member of Pope Gregory's reform circle, later composed a treatise that likewise targeted the unorthodox views of Berengar.³⁴ Entitled *De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in Eucharistia*, this treatise quotes several passages from Lanfranc's polemic and reasserts many aspects of the doctrine that had been developing to counter Berengar.³⁵ Not coincidentally, it also assumes the form of a dialogue, here between Guitmund and another monk named Roger. The format of the dialogue eventually breaks down when Guitmund launches excitedly into a lengthy explanation of the miracle and meaning of the Eucharist and draws on Augustine for authority in backing his statements. However, the strong reliance on proving his points according to reason ("ratione") and via debate (Guitmund refers to the beginning of "disputationis nostrae" as following the example of Augustine) is evidence enough that a spirit of rational dialogue was becoming a preferred medium for arguing about theology. As medievalists well know, both reason (*ratio*) and debate (*disputatio*) would in the course of the twelfth century become hallmarks of the Scholastic method.

Lanfranc's contribution to dialogue and disputation is not restricted to his debate with Berengar and the epistolary dialogue on the Eucharist that the controversy provoked. Close analysis of the text of his commentaries, particularly his commentary on St. Paul, reveals the broader scope of his educational and

³² Peter Damian's other dialogue was his so-called *Antilogus contra Iudaeos* (Letter 1 in Reindel's critical edition), which takes up questions relating to the Jewish-Christian controversy, a complicated and lengthy topic that for reasons of space cannot be discussed at length here.

³³ It was Hildebert of Lavardin, a contemporary of Berengar if not his pupil, who first used the term transubstantiation. See his *Sermones* 93, PL 176:776. On the early development of the theory of transubstantiation see Hans Jorissen, *Die Entfaltung der Transsubstantiationslehre bis zum Beginn der Hochscholastik*, Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 28/1 (Münster, 1965); and, for its later development, Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, Eng., 1991).

³⁴ See Robert Somerville, "The Case against Berengar of Tours—A New Text," *Studi gregoriani* 9 (1972), 55–75, who discusses Guitmund's text and the wider context of his writing.

³⁵ PL 149:1427–94. The work was written sometime between 1073 (when Gregory was elected pope) and 1078 (when the synod in Rome was convened again to debate Berengar's position).

dialogical advances.³⁶ Written at an early stage in his career, perhaps shortly after his conversion to the monastic life and when he was still newly acquainted with patristic sources and theology, the commentary text itself indicates its use as a teaching guide. In the commentary, a question-and-answer format is developed around Paul and his opponents. Lanfranc repeatedly interjects phrases such as “it is as if someone said (*quasi quis diceret*)” to help the reader reconstruct the debate between Paul and his opponents. Evidently Lanfranc viewed the progression of Paul’s argument as a series of answers to questions, as if readers had in their possession the written account of one side of the dialogue between Paul and his questioners.³⁷ Someone asks Paul a question, and Paul answers. Prior to about 1050, this fusion of dialectical procedure with Scripture within a commentary was not common.

Lanfranc’s exegetical method of glossing Paul is significant in at least two respects: it reflects an important development in the medieval understanding of Scriptures, and it reveals something of the classroom setting of an eleventh-century monastic school. A recent study of the manuscripts and glosses of Lanfranc’s Pauline commentary yields some pertinent conclusions: “Dialogue was central to the commentary’s format and to Lanfranc’s method. The glossed format operated as a type of dialogue with the primary text. Two voices, Lanfranc’s and Paul’s, contributed to the reader’s (or listener’s) comprehension of the text’s meaning. But essentially, Lanfranc’s attention to the element of debate between Paul, his opponents, and his audience, indicates something about the rules and methods followed in Lanfranc’s classroom.”³⁸ Indeed disputation in the classroom for the purpose of understanding was as important to Lanfranc’s hermeneutics as were his public debates (and epistolary disputation) with his academic rival and theological foe Berengar. A younger contemporary of Lanfranc, Sigebert of Gembloux, admiringly describes the manner in which Lanfranc explicated the apostle Paul “according to the laws of dialectic (*secundum leges dialecticae*).”³⁹ It was precisely this combined study of arts and theology that gave Lanfranc and the monastery of Bec its reputation (*fama*) across Europe in the late eleventh century.⁴⁰ And it was precisely this endeavor, with even greater attention to the power of dialogue and disputation in a classroom setting, that allowed Anselm to achieve his theological, philosophical, and pedagogical success.

³⁶ The text of the commentary on the Pauline Epistles is printed in PL 150:105–406. A recent and detailed study of Lanfranc’s commentary and its manuscript tradition is Ann Collins, *Teacher in Faith and Virtue: Lanfranc of Bec’s Commentary on Saint Paul*, Commentaria 1 (Leiden, 2007).

³⁷ Collins, *Teacher*, pp. 92–93. Similar conclusions are also reached by Giulio d’Onofrio, *Vera philosophia: Studies in Late Antique, Early Medieval, and Renaissance Christian Thought*, Nutrix 1 (Turnhout, 2008), chap. 4, esp. pp. 223–26.

³⁸ Collins, *Teacher*, pp. 203–4.

³⁹ Sigebert of Gembloux, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, PL 160:582–83.

⁴⁰ Contra Margaret Gibson, who argues that the school of Bec lasted only a few years after its foundation by Lanfranc, Sally Vaughn has done the most to argue for its continuity and reputation, while admitting that the nature of this school remains a puzzle. (See the works cited above in nn. 5 and 9.) Stimulating interdisciplinary perspectives on this general development in medieval Europe are offered in *Fama: The Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe*, ed. Thelma Fenster and Daniel Lord Smail (Ithaca, N.Y., 2003).

ANSELM, PART 1

Anselm, first of Aosta, then Bec, and finally Canterbury, is the critical hinge on whom many aspects of late-eleventh-century intellectual life turned. Like Peter Damian and Lanfranc a generation earlier, Anselm was born in Italy, orphaned young, and undertook a journey north in search of greater educational opportunities. Like Lanfranc, he was clearly exposed to some form of secular learning in his native region for Orderic Vitalis tells us that Anselm arrived at Bec “laden with the gold and treasures of Egypt—that is the learning of secular philosophers.”⁴¹ After wandering for several years in Burgundy, Anselm settled in 1059 at the new abbey of Bec in Normandy, where he, too, was attracted by the teaching reputation of Lanfranc.⁴² His conversion to the monastic life thus coincides approximately with Lanfranc’s controversy with Berengar. Curiously, Anselm never wrote about his teacher’s handling of the eucharistic debate, although, in his *Cur Deus homo* nearly forty years later, he followed Lanfranc’s early lead and offered the first explicit reference to Aristotle in a theological work. Most importantly, when Anselm arrived at Bec in 1059, “he became part of an intellectual scene full of debate and conflict,” an important aspect of which was occupied by rival methods of employing grammar and dialectic in theological arguments.⁴³ This overall intellectual climate, as Richard Southern and Pierre Riché rightly noted some years ago, deeply influenced Anselm’s intellectual development.⁴⁴ But how exactly this climate translated to Anselm’s method and legacy no one has yet explained.

When Lanfranc eventually left for the monastery at Caen, later to become archbishop of Canterbury, Anselm succeeded him as head of the school. As prior of Bec, Anselm read widely the works of the church fathers, particularly Augustine, and he continued to expand the library’s holdings. His first work, the *Monologion*, reflects a close reading of Augustine’s *De Trinitate*. Anselm describes the work as a *meditatio* on the divine being. But by meditation Anselm specifically meant the inner dialogue and deliberation that were characteristic of Augustine’s spirituality:

Some of my brothers have persisted in asking me to give them an example of meditation, by writing down some thoughts on the divine essence and other related matters, which I have communicated to them in my regular discussions (*colloquia*). They asked that nothing should be put forward on the authority of Scripture, and in this I have

⁴¹ *Ecclesiastical History*, 2:295.

⁴² Anselm’s intellectual debt to his teacher Lanfranc was very great indeed. His devotion to Lanfranc is vividly described, perhaps with some exaggeration, in Eadmer’s *Vita Anselmi*. See also the meticulous reconstruction of the student-teacher relation done by Southern, *Saint Anselm*, chaps. 2–3. Southern’s subsequent comment that Anselm, on first meeting Lanfranc at age twenty-six, was “a fairly mature drop out, who had so far failed in everything he had undertaken” is perhaps a bit harsh, but it underscores the extent to which Lanfranc could and would shape Anselm’s career; see R. W. Southern, “The Relationship between Anselm’s Thought and His Life at Bec and Canterbury,” in *Saint Anselm*, ed. Viola and van Fleteren (above, n. 2), pp. 9–26, at p. 12.

⁴³ Southern, *Saint Anselm*, p. 52.

⁴⁴ Ibid. Pierre Riché, “La vie scolaire et la vie pédagogique au Bec au temps de Lanfranc et de Saint Anselme,” in *Les mutations socio-culturelles*, ed. Foreville (above, n. 2), pp. 213–27.

consulted their wishes, rather than my own capacity or the nature of the subject. They also asked that whatever conclusion was reached in the course of each investigation should be expressed in plain language with intelligible arguments and simple disputation (*simplicique disputatione*), so that the necessary conclusions and clear truth of the matter would be clearly expressed.⁴⁵

These opening words in the prologue to the *Monologion* point to what would quickly become recurring features of Anselm's method of inquiry: dialogue and disputation. These, along with an unprecedented commitment to demonstrating Christian truth by reason alone (*sola ratione*), formed the critical elements in Anselm's pedagogical innovations at this "enigmatic" school at Bec.⁴⁶ Anselm later explained his simultaneous reliance on and departure from Augustine along similar lines in a letter to Lanfranc:

It was my intention throughout the whole of this disputation (*disputationem*) to assert nothing that could not be immediately defended either from canonical writers or from the words of St. Augustine. And however often I look over what I have written, I cannot see that I have asserted anything other than this. Indeed no reasoning of my own, however conclusive it seemed, would have persuaded me to be the first to presume to say those things that you have copied from my work in your letter nor several other things besides. St. Augustine proved these points in the great discussions in his *De Trinitate*, so that I, having as it were uncovered them in my shorter chain of argument, say them on his authority.⁴⁷

Anselm did not listen to his former teacher's criticisms that he should cite his authorities more explicitly, and this further distanced the two men.⁴⁸ These words also point to some more profound lessons that Anselm extracted from his close reading of Augustine.⁴⁹ Even a work cast in the form of a meditation was, for Anselm as it was for Augustine, a dialogue with oneself. Anselm was indeed indebted to Augustine, and for Lanfranc that fact necessitated additional references. From Anselm's perspective, all further reflections on the matter of the divine being, even if originally stimulated by a reading of Augustine, were the result of an inner dialogue (or disputation as he calls it) and did not merit any citation beyond the bare essentials. Very much like his commitment to proving Christian doctrine *sola ratione*, Anselm was also venturing to demonstrate his propositions (indeed most of his philosophy) by means of inner disputation alone.

Anselm's exploration into the dialogical process of learning grew steadily following his initial meditations, and this development needs to be seen in the context

⁴⁵ Anselm, *Monologion*, in *S. Anselmi opera omnia*, ed. Franciscus Salesius Schmitt, 6 vols. (Seckau, 1938–61), 1:7. All translations of Anselm are my own unless otherwise stated.

⁴⁶ The novelty of Anselm's reliance on reason as an aid to faith has been much commented upon by historians, theologians, and philosophers alike. For a fresh assessment see Marilyn McCord Adams, "Anselm on Reason and Faith," in *The Cambridge Companion to Anselm*, ed. Davies and Leftow (above, n. 2), pp. 32–60.

⁴⁷ Anselm of Canterbury, *Epistola* 77, in *Opera omnia*, 3:199–200.

⁴⁸ See Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, pp. 208–13, for a discussion of the epistolary correspondence between Anselm and Lanfranc regarding the *Monologion*.

⁴⁹ Gasper, *Anselm of Canterbury* (above, n. 2), especially emphasizes Anselm's debt to other patristic sources in addition to Augustine.

of his teaching and administrative responsibilities. One of Anselm's decisions as prior following Lanfranc's departure for Caen was apparently to discontinue the practice of admitting the local nobility, although it is important to stress that this did not mean an immediate end to the admittance of outside students. Indeed, the assumption that the school reverted to being a strictly internal establishment for the monks of Bec is partly what has led previous scholars to presume the short-lived nature of the school and thrown them off the scent of Anselm's more sustained and widespread pedagogical innovations.⁵⁰ Rather, there must have been a gradual process whereby eventually most of the students became monks instead of laymen, for Orderic Vitalis tells us that both clerics "and laymen came to sit at the feet of the renowned philosopher."⁵¹ This diversity in the kinds of students who came to Bec, as I shall show below, was intimately connected with Anselm's development of the teaching program that students and monks at the monastic school underwent.

Anselm's method of instruction, as far as it can be reconstructed from his writings and those of the monks who knew him, was to hold a Socratic form of debate with his pupils in which the participants in the dispute argue out the issues.⁵² Evidence for this comes from his theological and philosophical works that are cast in the form of a dialogue between master and pupil. To be sure, the dialogue genre extends back to antiquity, and it was used effectively (as a weapon of polemic) by Lanfranc and by Lanfranc's north Italian contemporary Peter Damian, but over his career Anselm went on to write more dialogues than any Latin Christian author since Augustine.⁵³ No fewer than seven works of Anselm

⁵⁰ On this initiative see most recently G. R. Evans, "Anselm's Life, Works, and Immediate Influence," in *The Cambridge Companion to Anselm*, ed. Davies and Leftow, pp. 10–11. Cf. the first biography of Anselm by R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm and His Biographer: A Study of Monastic Life and Thought, 1059–c.1130* (Cambridge, Eng., 1963), pp. 30–31.

⁵¹ *Ecclesiastical History*, 2:295. See also Eadmer, *The Life of St Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. and trans. R. W. Southern (London, 1962), henceforth cited as *Vita Anselmi*, 22, pp. 39–40, who says that Anselm's reputation spread across Normandy, France, and Flanders and that "from every nation there rose up and came to him many noblemen, learned clerks, and active knights offering themselves and their goods to the service of God in the monastery." It is certainly true, however, that more monks professed under Anselm than under Lanfranc, as the profession list clearly demonstrates. See Porée, *Histoire de l'abbaye du Bec* (above, n. 4), 1:629–31.

⁵² See the perceptive remarks by Richard Campbell ("The Systematic Character of Anselm's Thought," in *Les mutations socio-culturelles*, ed. Foreville, pp. 553–54): "What I find striking about Anselm's arguments, whether in the more philosophical works or in the more theological, is the way they always proceed within the context of *what someone says*. . . . In the dialogue form adopted in many of the later works all of the statements are, of course, owned by one or other of the participants. . . . Anselm is not indulging in idle speculation or intellectual games; he will only consider propositions which are 'owned' by one speaker. . . . Even in the *Monologion*, where the protagonist is most shadowy, and which Anselm tells us was written in the manner of one arguing with himself, it is clear that the questions raised are designed to clarify what is inherent in the domain of discourse within which Anselm was speaking." See also Southern, "The Relationship," pp. 11–12: "Anselm's approach to theology is through the discussions, mounting experiences, and the final triumphs of thought and experience in friendship."

⁵³ The foundational study of the dialogue genre is Rudolf Hirzel, *Der Dialog: Ein literarhistorischer Versuch*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1895), which, however, offers minimal consideration of the medieval dialogue. A more satisfactory look at medieval dialogues, but again from the vantage point of

take the literary form of a dialogue, as well as several others attributed to him but of dubious authenticity.⁵⁴ *De grammatico* is the earliest (c. 1060–63) of these dialogues and concerns, not grammar in the sense that the title implies, but the section in Aristotle's *Categories* that deals with substance—the same section that provided the philosophical basis for Lanfranc's reply to Berengar.⁵⁵ Anselm's purpose was, of course, much different from that of his teacher: he hoped to offer an introduction to the acts of speech and judgment that are the subject matter of all logic. As such, it is the only one of Anselm's works that does not treat a theological question.⁵⁶ Like his later works, there is nothing overtly disputational—that is, confrontational—about the work, although the student (*discipulus*) does display his mental and rhetorical acumen in a less than reverent manner: “Do not be quick to contradict what I am going to say,” the student interjects in the early lines of the discussion, “but allow me to bring my speech to its conclusion, and then either approve it or improve it.”⁵⁷ The discussion over Aristotle's syllogisms comes to a close when the teacher in the dialogue applauds the student's progress but warns him against the power wielded by other dialecticians:

Since you know how vigorously the dialecticians (*dialectici*) contend, in our day, with the problem you have proposed, I do not want you to cling so tightly to the points we have made that you would hold to them with stubborn persistence even if by weightier arguments someone else could destroy them and could prove something different. But should this destruction occur, you would not deny that at least our disputing (*disputandi nobis*) has benefited us in the practice of argumentation.⁵⁸

The student of *De grammatico* (as well as the lesson he learns) is quite unlike the students found in Anselm's later works. One plausible reason for this,

philosophy and with consideration of individual philosophers (or works) rather than emerging trends, is *Gespräche lesen: Philosophische Dialoge im Mittelalter*, ed. Klaus Jacobi, ScriptOralia 115 (Tübingen, 1999). Recent considerations on the decline of the dialogue genre following Augustine are to be found in *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity*, ed. Simon Goldhill (Cambridge, Eng., 2008). A useful repertory of medieval Latin dialogues, but beginning too later to consider the Anselmian contribution, is Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann, *Lateinische Dialoge, 1200–1400: Literaturhistorische Studie und Repertorium*, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 37 (Leiden, 2006). On the earlier end, an elegant investigation of early-medieval monastic dialogue is offered by Jacques Fontaine, “Le genre littéraire du dialogue monastique dans l'Occident latin des Ve et VIe siècles,” in *The Spirituality of Ancient Monasticism*, ed. Marek Starowieyski (Kraków, 1994), pp. 228–50 (I am grateful to Manu Radhakrishnan for bringing this article to my attention). See also the general remarks by Eileen Sweeney, “Anselm und der Dialog: Distanz und Versöhnung,” in *Gespräche lesen*, pp. 101–24; and the theoretical discussion of the dialogue genre by Peter von Moos, “Gespräche, Dialogform und Dialog nach älterer Theorie,” in *Gattungen mittelalterlicher Schriftlichkeit*, ed. Barbara Frank, Thomas Haye, and Doris Tophinke, ScriptOralia 99 (Tübingen, 1997), pp. 235–60.

⁵⁴ This total counts only those works that are overtly cast as dialogues between two characters. As I argue above (pp. 396–97), the early meditations and the *Monologion* in particular could also be included within the spirit of dialogue as they are essentially internal dialogues.

⁵⁵ The authoritative commentary on this early work is Desmond Paul Henry, *Commentary on De grammatico: The Historical-Logical Dimensions of a Dialogue of St. Anselm's*, 2 vols., Synthese Historical Library 8 (Dordrecht, 1974).

⁵⁶ John Marenbon, *Early Medieval Philosophy (480–1150): An Introduction* (London, 1988), p. 102.

⁵⁷ Anselm, *De grammatico*, in *Opera omnia*, 1:146.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

Richard Southern has suggested, may be that the work was written for, or to reflect, the sort of pupils who were not yet monks but who were sent to Bec to learn dialectic rather than theology before Anselm ended the external policy of the school.⁵⁹ If that is the case, one can well understand why Anselm might have preferred to exclude the less reverent secular student portrayed in *De grammatico* from the more pious and devoted monks of the later dialogues. The form and content of Anselm's dialogues may therefore serve as windows onto the current issues that engaged him in discussions with his students. In fact, Anselm's biographer Eadmer seems to confirm this when he states that the treatise was written in the form of a disputation with a disciple ("cum discipulo . . . disputantem") precisely because he was dealing with the questions of dialectic.⁶⁰

Anselm continued to adhere to the dialogue form in *De veritate*, *De libertate*, and *De casu diaboli*, a trilogy that he intended to be copied and read in that order.⁶¹ Much more compliant and open to instruction are the "student" interlocutors of these dialogues: "If I cannot do anything else," the student in *De veritate* humbly states, "I will at least help by being a good listener."⁶² The general form of investigation in these three dialogues is the same: a student presents issues in need of clarification to the teacher, who then patiently explains them. The titles of these works are less at odds with the subject matter than in *De grammatico*: *De veritate* deals with various conceptions of truth, *De libertate* with freedom of choice and its relation to sin and grace, and *De casu diaboli* with the status of the devil and the differences between good and evil angels. In none of these works is a name given to the student or teacher. The student throughout remains an anonymous pupil in search of greater understanding of the Christian faith. Although it has been established that these three philosophical dialogues were written after *De grammatico*, it is also clear that Anselm conceived of all of these dialogues in connection with a student's education. Indeed, in the preface to the three philosophical dialogues Anselm states as much:

At different times in the past I wrote three treatises pertaining to the study of Sacred Scripture. They are similar in having been written following the question-and-answer form (*interrogationem et responsionem*) with the person inquiring designated as "the Student," and the person answering, "the Teacher." I wrote a fourth work in a similar style, which begins with the words "De grammatico" and which is not without use to those who need to be introduced to dialectic, but because it pertains to a different study from these three, I do not wish to number it with them. . . . Although I did not compose these treatises one right after the other, nevertheless their subject matter (*materia*)

⁵⁹ Southern, *Saint Anselm*, p. 65.

⁶⁰ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi* 1.19, p. 28. Of some relevance to the overall thrust of this paper is Alain Galonnier's important discussion of how *De grammatico* anticipates later logical *sophismata* treatises. See Galonnier, "Sur quelques aspects annonciateurs de la littérature sophismatique dans le *De grammatico*," in *Anselm*, ed. Luscombe and Evans (above, n. 1), pp. 209–28, esp. p. 210, where he notes, "Nous touchons peut-être ici à la difficulté majeure du dialogue sur *grammaticus*, et probablement à ce qui détourne souvent de lui l'intérêt que manquent d'attacher à ses pages la plupart des historiens de la logique médiévale: le fond s'y dilue dans la forme."

⁶¹ The best overall discussion of these treatises is to be found in Jean-Robert Pouchet, O.S.B., *La rectitudo chez Saint Anselme: Un itinéraire augustinien de l'âme à Dieu* (Paris, 1964).

⁶² Anselm, *De veritate*, in *Opera omnia*, 1:177.

and their similarity in the disputational form (*similitudo disputationis*) require that they be written together as a unit and in the order in which I have listed them.⁶³

Anselm is explicit in calling attention to the fact that his didactic writings, even if not necessarily treating the same subject, are conjoined by their literary form and purpose; they all belong to the same stated educational and intellectual program.

In 1078 Anselm was promoted from prior to abbot of the monastery of Bec, a position he held for the next fifteen years. His biographer Eadmer stresses the administrative burdens that befell Anselm during his tenure as abbot and consequently says nothing about his literary productivity during these years, but Richard Sharpe has recently reaffirmed that it was most likely during this fifteen-year period that Anselm composed (or least drafted) his first four dialogues.⁶⁴ In 1093 Anselm was selected to succeed, once again, his former teacher Lanfranc, this time as archbishop of Canterbury. The move, like Lanfranc's appointment before him, was a clear result of the closer ties between Normandy and England following the 1066 conquest. Anselm, however, did not wish to leave Bec and accepted the position only after making his reluctance known. The obstinacy of William Rufus and the pressure placed on Anselm by the initiatives of Pope Urban II meant controversy for the newly appointed archbishop. Unable and unwilling to break his allegiance to Pope Urban II for King Rufus, who supported the antipope, Anselm soon found himself a political exile seeking protection at the papal court.⁶⁵ There he completed his magisterial *Cur Deus homo* (c. 1098), a work that, as its title suggests, seeks to explain why an all-powerful and perfect God became human.⁶⁶ Undoubtedly the most famous of his dialogues, *Cur Deus homo* is Anselm's only work to name the student, Boso, who is in dialogue with him.⁶⁷ The first chapter, quoted below in its entirety, also reveals something of Anselm's purpose in explaining Christian doctrine through dialogue:

I have often and most earnestly been requested by many, both in person and by letter, that I hand down in writing the proofs of a certain doctrine of our faith which I am accustomed to give to those who make inquiry; for they say that these proofs please them, and they regard them as satisfactory. They make their request not in order to

⁶³ Anselm, *Praefatio*, in *Opera omnia*, 1:173–74. It should be pointed out that most translations of this preface elide the word “disputationis” from the sentence, simply rendering the phrase “in similar form” or “in similar style.” While Anselm is clearly using the word *disputatio* in a more benign sense than the word would come to have later in the twelfth century, its repeated use in his texts should not go unnoticed.

⁶⁴ See Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, esp. 1.26–28, pp. 44–48. On the dating of these works see Sharpe, “Anselm as Author” (above, n. 6), pp. 15–23. See also Southern, *Anselm and His Biographer*, p. 66.

⁶⁵ His exile notwithstanding, Anselm's competence and experience in the world of politics should not be underestimated. On this very able aspect of Anselm see especially Sally N. Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan: The Innocence of the Dove and the Wisdom of the Serpent* (Berkeley, Calif., 1987), passim.

⁶⁶ An essential guide to this important work is *Cur Deus homo: Atti del Congresso anselmiano internazionale, Roma, 21–23 maggio 1998*, ed. Paul Gilbert, Helmut Kohlenberger, and Elmar Salmann, *Studia Anselmiana* 128 (Rome, 1999), whose forty-seven contributory essays attest to the work's enduring scholarly interest.

⁶⁷ Southern, *Saint Anselm*, p. 203.

approach faith by way of reason (*per rationem*), but in order that they may be pleased by understanding and contemplating those things that they believe and so that they may as best as possible always be prepared to convince anyone who demands of them an explanation for that hope which is in us. Unbelievers habitually raise this problem against us and ridicule Christian simplicity as absurd. Many believers also ponder this in their hearts. And so the following problem comes about: for what reason and on the basis of what necessity did God become a man, and by his death (as we believe and affirm) restore life to the world, when he could have done this by means of some other being, angelic or human, or merely by his will? Not only learned men but also many unlearned men ask about this problem and seek to know its solution. Many individuals therefore persist in asking that this problem be handled; and in spite of the fact that the investigation seems very difficult, the solution is intelligible to everyone and is commendable because of the usefulness and elegance of the reasoning. Therefore, even though the holy Fathers have said what ought to be sufficient, I will nevertheless endeavor to show to those who inquire what God has seen fit to disclose to me about this topic. And since those things that are investigated by the method of question and answer (*interrogationem et responsionem investigantur*) are clearer and more acceptable to many minds, especially slower minds, I will take as my fellow disputant (*disputantem*) the one who has been urging me on more insistently than any other, so that in the following manner Boso may question and Anselm reply.⁶⁸

Anselm is in fact engaging in multiple dialogues, not one. The first, the theological justification for the work, is Anselm's attempt to provide a rationally sustainable answer about the faith of Christians to the doubts and accusations of unbelievers, and Christians as well. (Whether these unbelievers include Jews and Muslims or are restricted to pagans and heretics is a matter of some scholarly dispute.)⁶⁹ The second dialogue, which can be seen as both a pretext for the first and an example of his method of inquiry, is the alleged conversation Anselm undertook with his philosophically astute student Boso. In the earlier dialogues, the nameless participants play only a very subordinate part in the development of the argument. "Boso's part in the *Cur Deus Homo*," Southern remarks, "is quite different: the central argument of the whole work, in its first formulation, is put into his mouth."⁷⁰ Boso himself, and his brother, had come to Anselm in search of answers to their *perplexae quaestiones*.⁷¹ Through Boso, Anselm was effectively conversing with representatives of the newly organized secular schools in

⁶⁸ Anselm, *Cur Deus homo*, in *Opera omnia*, 2:47–48.

⁶⁹ For an argument in favor of Anselm's anti-Jewish position see Gilbert Dahan, "Saint Anselme, les juifs, le judaïsme," in *Les mutations socio-culturelles*, ed. Foreville (above, n. 2), pp. 521–34. Opposite this interpretation is Anna Sapir Abulafia, "St. Anselm and Those outside the Church," in *Faith and Identity: Christian Political Experience*, ed. David Loades and Katherine Walsh, Studies in Church History, Subsidia, 6 (Oxford, 1990), pp. 11–37, who argues against either Jews or Muslims being the target of Anselm's polemic. See also the detailed discussion in Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley, Calif., 1999), pp. 167–79, who takes a more moderate position and posits a "contrived, hermeneutically crafted Jew in Anselm's thought," here at p. 178. See also the essays by Gerhard Gäde and Josep Manuel Udina I Cobo in *Cur Deus homo*, ed. Gilbert et al.

⁷⁰ Southern, *Saint Anselm*, p. 203.

⁷¹ Boso's early life is described in the *Vita Bosonis*, PL 150:725–26. See also Southern, *Saint Anselm*, p. 202 n. 7.

northern France, Laon chief among them. Indeed there is considerable evidence that Anselm's statements in *Cur Deus homo* reflect an engagement with the skepticism of contemporary masters.⁷² Especially intriguing is Anselm's stated belief that the method of question and answer will prove effective even for persons of slower minds, in contrast to the Rule of St. Benedict (chap. 2), which advocated teaching by words only for receptive monks and by example for the duller ones.⁷³ Who exactly are these slower-minded individuals of whom Anselm speaks? How does this statement fit into Anselm's larger project of theology and instruction? How did this Socratic method of investigation impact the writings of his students and followers? These questions go to the heart of the Anselmian contribution to dialogue and disputation in the late eleventh century and can only be fully answered by considering other works of Anselm, including the works attributed to him, and the works of his students.

ANSELM, PART 2

Eadmer reports that Anselm in his *Proslogion* was searching for a single irrefutable proof of the existence of God, one that would be more convincing still than the "chain of many arguments" he had developed in his *Monologion*.⁷⁴ This ambitious theological endeavor, which resulted in his celebrated ontological proof of the existence of God, did not meet with universal approval. Gaunilo, a monk from neighboring Marmoutier, responded to Anselm's arguments with an equally famous rebuttal, foreshadowing according to some the Kantian refutation of the ontological argument some seven centuries later.⁷⁵ Writing to Anselm "on behalf of the Fool" (for in the *Proslogion* Anselm postulated that only a fool could not see his reasoning), Gaunilo challenged the single-argument proof for the existence of God.⁷⁶ Gaunilo's critique did not result in any dialogue per se, from Gaunilo or Anselm, but the intellectual debate did provoke a detailed and no less original reply from Anselm. "Since my arguments are not attacked by the Fool, against whom I directed my treatise," Anselm writes, "but by an intelligent and orthodox Christian on behalf of the Fool, it will suffice to reply to the orthodox Christian."⁷⁷ The resulting supplement, which Anselm later insisted accompany the circulation of his *Proslogion*, was a point-by-point response to

⁷² See Southern, *Saint Anselm*, pp. 202–5.

⁷³ For Lanfranc this is the method of teaching stressed by Watkins, "Lanfranc at Caen" (above, n. 5).

⁷⁴ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi* 1.19, pp. 29–30. Both works belong to the years between 1076 and 1078.

⁷⁵ The resulting dispute with Gaunilo was the second such debate to occur in Anselm's career. In his later years as abbot of Bec, around 1089, Anselm became involved in a dispute with Roscelin of Compiègne (an eventual teacher of Abelard), who charged him with heresy. The dispute resulted, after several attempts, in Anselm's treatise *De Incarnatione Verbi*.

⁷⁶ The theology and logic of the debate, with which I am only incidentally concerned here, are closely analyzed by Jasper Hopkins, "Anselm's Debate with Gaunilo," in *Analecta Anselmiana: Untersuchungen über Person und Werk Anselms von Canterbury*, ed. F. S. Schmitt, 5 vols. (Frankfurt am Main, 1969–76), 5:25–53. See also G. R. Evans, *Anselm and Talking about God* (Oxford, 1978), chap. 3.

⁷⁷ Anselm, *Opera omnia*, 2:130.

Gaunilo's criticisms. In the response Anselm presented a philosophical or theological issue and then expounded upon it until the issue was considered settled. Central, again, to Anselm's rebuttal is the idea that reason, debate, and proper argumentation will prevail on his side: "Let those who have even a minimal knowledge of debate and argumentation (*disputandi argumentandique*) come to my defense. For is it reasonable (*rationabile est*) for someone to deny what he understands because it is said to be identical with that which he denies because he does not understand?"⁷⁸ In retrospect, this work must be seen as an early example of the Scholastic method of investigation later embodied in the twelfth-century *quaestiones* and thirteenth-century *summae*. Anselm never abandoned the meditative procedure of investigation (and inner dialogue) that he first laid out in his *Monologion*, but the reply to Gaunilo does belong to Anselm's broader theory of argumentation, one that would prove especially popular in the burgeoning secular schools in northern France.

Anselm is most frequently discussed in connection with his ontological proof of the existence of God (a term made popular by Kant in the eighteenth century) and his original application of reason to demonstrating the truths of Christian doctrine. But no less important to his thought was the potency of intellectual debate, both literary and real. In addition to his didactic treatises written in dialogue form, Anselm clearly regarded disputation as an integral component of his philosophy and methodology. A consideration of his vocabulary helps to illustrate this point. In the corpus of his writings Anselm employed the verb *disputare* and its accompanying noun forms on over forty occasions.⁷⁹ While the meaning of this term clearly varies from a simple "discussion" or "conversation" to a more intense "dispute" or "debate," there is a clear parallel between the form of his writings and the vocabulary he employs. As innovative as *what* Anselm was teaching was the *method* by which he taught. From his earliest meditation to his last letters, with several real debates in between, Anselm consistently referred to his rational investigations and dialectical argumentations in terms of a *disputatio*. Not surprisingly, then, the effects of this dialectical procedure stood out to all who met Anselm in person, particularly those who learned from him. There is hardly anything more clear in the contemporary reports about Anselm than his need to develop his thoughts by talking: the monk "Gundulf listened to him at Bec, Guibert of Nogent listened to him on his visits to Flay, Eadmer at Canterbury, and they all said the same thing—his talk was irresistible."⁸⁰ Everyone wanted him to talk and to dispute, leaving no difficulties unraveled and no student unconvinced. Anselm's biographer stresses that "everyone therefore who could enjoy his conversation was glad to do so, for on any subject they wished he had heavenly counsel ready for them." Even William the Conqueror, "stiff and terrifying" to everyone around him, was made amiable in his personal encounters with the abbot of Bec, "so that to everyone's surprise he seemed an

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 137.

⁷⁹ For these figures I rely on *A Concordance to the Works of St. Anselm*, ed. G. R. Evans, 4 vols. (Millwood, N.Y., 1984), s.vv. *disputabo* to *disputet*.

⁸⁰ Southern, *Saint Anselm*, p. 119.

altogether different man when Anselm was present.”⁸¹ The charismatic pedagogy that Stephen Jaeger has identified for the Ottonian courts of this period would seem to be very much a part of Anselm’s character.

Richard Southern, in his otherwise magisterial studies of Anselm, tended to minimize both Lanfranc’s influence on this particular method of philosophical investigation and the overall influence exerted by Anselm’s predilection for rational dialogue.⁸² But that is a serious underestimation of an important cultural mutation that Southern was in fact among the first to recognize. Once again Orderic Vitalis proves a worthy commentator; in an oft-quoted but often-underappreciated passage of his *Ecclesiastical History*, he describes with amazement the achievements of both Lanfranc and Anselm:

A great store of learning in both the liberal arts and theology was assembled by Lanfranc in the abbey of Bec, and magnificently increased by Anselm so that the school sent out many distinguished scholars and also prudent pilots and spiritual charioteers who have been entrusted by divine providence with holding the reins of the churches in the arena of this world. So by good custom the monks of Bec are so devoted to the study of letters, so eager to solve theological problems and compose edifying treatises, that almost all of them seem to be philosophers; and by association with them, even with those who pass as illiterates and are called rustics (*rustici*) at Bec, the most erudite doctors can learn things to their advantage.⁸³

Orderic is not merely praising the learning that resided at the school at Bec; he is praising how learning was undertaken (i.e., it was active, not passive) and the fact that it was diffused. Even illiterate peasants (“rustici”) carried forth into the world a spirit of philosophy that could be attained nowhere else. A dearth of contemporary evidence prevents one from knowing more about the day-to-day activities of Anselm’s teachings, but if the comments of Orderic Vitalis and the testimonials of Anselm’s students are any indication, a liberal education with a focus on debate and philosophical inquiry was more pronounced at Bec than at perhaps any other monastic or cathedral school of the time.

If there is no doubt about the authenticity of Anselm’s above-mentioned works, there is doubt about the authenticity of several later works that have long been assigned to him and whose authorship is now frequently given as “Pseudo-Anselm.” Because they circulated under Anselm’s name and were considered representative of Anselm’s thought by his immediate and later followers, they merit some consideration.⁸⁴ This is especially the case because they also happen to take the literary form of a dialogue or disputation. Four works fall into this category. *De custodia interioris hominis*, formerly believed to be part of a treatise ascribed

⁸¹ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi* 31, pp. 55–56.

⁸² Southern, *Saint Anselm*, p. 119, and again in chap. 18.

⁸³ *Ecclesiastical History*, 2:296–97. Note here that the words Orderic chooses at the end of the quotation (“et ex colloquutione eorum etiam qui uidentur inter eos illiterati et uocantur rustici”) seem to imply that even peasants (“rustici”) who were not monks had been taught at Bec, again suggesting that Anselm’s teaching appealed to students of diverse ranks. See also above, n. 51.

⁸⁴ The arduous task of distinguishing the genuine Anselmian works from the spurious ones was begun in 1923 by Dom André Wilmart. His articles from 1923 to 1932 laid the foundations on which all later scholars have built.

to Hugh of St. Victor, is a short dialogue on the spiritual realities of the faith with an emphasis on God and the certainty of his existence.⁸⁵ It contains the allegory of the soul and its forces, the four cardinal virtues guarding it, and the messengers Fear and Love narrating their vision of heaven and hell.⁸⁶ An untitled “monastic dialogue” between a Benedictine monk and Christ on the spiritual virtues of poverty also circulated under the authorship of Anselm, as did the much later (possibly Franciscan) *Dialogus Beatae Mariae et Anselmi de Passione Domini*, which purports to record a revelation to Anselm in which the Virgin herself answered the saint’s queries on the events of the Passion.⁸⁷ Finally, the work that bears the closest resemblance to Anselm’s hand, even if its authorship remains uncertain, is the *Disputatio inter Christianum et Gentilem*.⁸⁸ This disputation between a Christian and a pagan (synonymous with gentile) on the Incarnation is clearly modeled on Anselm’s *Cur Deus homo*, only here the pagan opens the dialogue by specifically inquiring after the rationale of the Incarnation.⁸⁹ His tacit acceptance of God and the Incarnation coupled with his explicit rejection of the authority of the Bible creates difficulty in assigning a specific religious or nonreligious affiliation to this “gentile.” As Anna Sapir Abulafia remarks, “It is almost as if our author has not yet quite made up his mind whether his Pagan will be Boso or one of the *infideles* Boso represents.”⁹⁰ Over the course of the discussion the Christian urges the pagan to accede to faith if only temporarily so that he may be able to understand. Pseudo-Anselm thus uses Anselm’s axiom of belief as a way to understand (*credo ut intelligam*), but he also goes further. As the discussion turns to the question of why a God-man had to be born of a virgin, and of his divinity more generally, the Christian insists that these truths are plain and visible to any “rational being.” In confronting the problem of how to convert an unbeliever to faith, the Christian is going significantly beyond the limits set by Anselm. As Abulafia again remarks, “Pseudo-Anselm is not urging belief so that knowledge can be imparted; he is using knowledge as a weapon to

⁸⁵ A critical edition of this text on the basis of five manuscripts has been made by R. W. Southern and F. S. Schmitt, eds., *Memorials of St. Anselm*, Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi 1 (London, 1969), pp. 354–60.

⁸⁶ For manuscript material on the literary history of this allegory see Wolfgang Becker, “The Literary Treatment of the Pseudo-Anselmian Dialogue *De custodia interioris hominis* in England and France,” *Classica et mediaevalia* 35 (1984), 215–33.

⁸⁷ The authenticity of this work has long been doubted. It is listed as Pseudo-Anselm in PL 159:272–90. The argument for its Franciscan attribution is made by Amy Neff, “The *Dialogus Beatae Mariae et Anselmi de Passione Domini*: Toward an Attribution,” *Miscellanea Franciscana* 86 (1986), 105–8.

⁸⁸ The disputation exists in at least ten manuscripts of which the earliest dates to the second half of the twelfth century and was likely produced at the Benedictine abbey of Maria Laach near Koblenz. For the manuscripts see B. Blumenkranz, ed., *Gisleberti Crispini Disputatio Iudei et Christiani*, *Stromata Patristica et Mediaevalia* 3 (Utrecht, 1956), p. 7.

⁸⁹ A thirteenth-century manuscript of the text from the British Library is transcribed by Constant J. Mews, “St Anselm and Roscelin: Some New Texts and Their Implications. I. The *De Incarnatione Verbi* and the *Disputatio inter Christianum et Gentilem*,” *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 58 (1991), 55–98, at pp. 86–98.

⁹⁰ Anna Sapir Abulafia, “Christians Disputing Disbelief: St Anselm, Gilbert Crispin and Pseudo-Anselm,” in *Religiongespräche im Mittelalter*, ed. Bernard Lewis and Friedrich Niewöhner, *Wolfenbütteler Mittelalter-Studien* 4 (Wiesbaden, 1992), pp. 131–48, at p. 143.

force someone to believe.”⁹¹ There is more. In at least one version of this *disputatio*, the characters’ headings actually change midway through the dialogue from *Christianus* and *Gentilis* to *Magister* and *Discipulus*.⁹² This shift in nomenclature is surely not haphazard. It is supported by a transitional moment in their conversation. Immediately after the gentile recognizes and admits his error (“fateor me hoc usque errasse”), the Christian confidently assures his fellow disputant that the Lord “will open himself up to us because we ask questions, as long as we in turn patiently follow the questions and kind answers (*interrogando et beniuole respondendo*) provided by the authority of Holy Scripture, just as we might follow a father’s lead.”⁹³ The dialogue reads like the climactic scene of a screenplay: “I ask you, Father,” *Fidelis* (formerly *Gentilis*) humbly responds, “that you now not treat me like an outsider, but that with you as teacher and me as student you instruct me, as a father instructs his son, to become closer to my salvation.”⁹⁴ The turning moment (and indeed conversionary moment) in the non-Christian’s attitude toward Christian truth is thus highlighted by a sudden transition from codisputant (one who disputes with or against the representative of Christianity) to “faithful” student (one who asks questions in search of answers). His conversion to Christianity toward the end of the dialogue, for there was by this point no reasonable alternative but to convert, is crystallized by his proclamation that he cannot fathom how anyone could remain an unbeliever. And thus, via form and content, the didactic lesson imparted by the teacher to his student is clear.

The dialogues attributed to Anselm differ from each other in their subject matter and in the tone of their discussions, but they all present a central and persuasive aspect in the Anselmian approach to thinking about faith: namely, it is through conversation, interrogation, indeed disputation that a more accessible explanation of doctrine can be articulated and achieved. In point of fact it matters less who the interlocutors in the dialogue actually are than what intellectual positions they stand for and what emerges from their discussions.⁹⁵ If these points are made anonymously in works purporting to be by Anselm, they are equally evident in the writings of Anselm’s known disciples.⁹⁶ The best known among these are Gilbert Crispin, a former student at Bec, and Honorius Augustodunensis,

⁹¹ Ibid., p. 145.

⁹² In fact, in the London manuscript transcribed by Constant Mews, the gentile becomes *Fidelis* and *Discipulus fidelis* as well as simply *Discipulus*. See Mews, “St Anselm and Roscelin,” p. 96.

⁹³ Citing the text in Mews, “St Anselm and Roscelin,” p. 95: “*Christianus*. Deo gratias quod iam non loquimur infideli et contradicenti, sed ei qui etsi ualuerimus exprimere quod credimus a fide tamen Christi nullo umquam modo separabitur; sed aderit dominus qui linguas infantium facit desertas, ut aperiat nobis quod querimus, dum inuicem patienter interrogando et beniuole respondendo auctoritatem sanctarum scripturarum, quasi patronum adducem sequimur.”

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 96: “*Fidelis*. Rogo pater, ne me iam quasi alienum habeas, sed sicut pater filium, magister discipulum me familiariter salutem meam doceas.”

⁹⁵ For example, the gentile in Pseudo-Anselm’s *disputatio* is of no clear religious or nonreligious persuasion when he begins his dialogue with the Christian. His conversion to Christianity and the lessons he learns, however, are very clear.

⁹⁶ A useful treatment of Anselm’s impact on other authors of the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries is G. R. Evans, *Anselm and a New Generation* (Oxford, 1980), although the question of the dialogue form is not considered at any length. An important complement to that study is also by

an important disseminator of Anselm's thought, both writers of innovative and influential dialogues.⁹⁷

GILBERT CRISPIN

Gilbert Crispin (c. 1045–1117) came from a noble Norman family. From a very early age he was associated with the monastery of Bec, where his family had close ties. There he came under the tutelage of both Lanfranc and Anselm. When Lanfranc was made archbishop of Canterbury, Gilbert was called upon to become the fourth abbot of Westminster. Gilbert is the author of treatises on monasticism, the Eucharist, and simony and of a *vita* of Abbot Herluin (the founder of Bec), all of which reveal the liberal arts training he acquired as a monk at Bec. His most famous work is his *Disputatio Iudei et Christiani*, composed most likely in 1092 or 1093.⁹⁸ Whereas nearly all of Gilbert's other works are extant in only one manuscript, the *Disputatio* survives in over thirty manuscripts, of which twenty date from the twelfth century.⁹⁹ By Gilbert's time the *ad-versus Judaeos* genre of writings had been in continuous existence for nearly a millennium, and from a theological and exegetical perspective Gilbert contributed nothing original to that long-standing tradition of polemic. A large selection of the *Disputatio* deals with the validity of Mosaic law, the Incarnation, the coming of the Messiah, and the propriety of using images like the crucifix to adorn

Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford, 1980).

⁹⁷ Discussion of Anselm's students here is necessarily selective, but an honorable mention should be given to Ralph, prior of Rochester and abbot of Battle (fl. 1107–24), who composed theological dialogues and meditations in a style that is clearly derived from Anselm. Indeed, he owed his circulation throughout the Middle Ages to the mistaken attribution of his writings to Anselm. The longest and most important of his dialogues were a sequence of discussions between Nesciens and Sciens and between Inquirens and Respondens. In a manner similar to Gilbert Crispin's dialogue between a Christian and a pagan (see below, p. 411), the discussion between Nesciens and Sciens starts with a skeptic who refuses to believe anything for which he has not the evidence of his eyes. The discussion gradually leads him to accept the evidence of his other senses and then, finally, to posit the existence of an invisible intelligence as a source of knowledge (a First Cause). For Ralph's career and writings see *The Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, ed. and trans. Eleanor Searle (Oxford, 1980), pp. 116–32; and Southern, *Saint Anselm*, pp. 372–76. A further dialogue, "De peccatore qui desperat," in an early-twelfth-century manuscript from Rochester appears to have been prepared under Ralph's direction, if not written by Ralph himself. See George F. Warner and Julius P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections*, 2 (London, 1921), p. 22; and J. F. Cottier, "Le recueil apocryphe des *Orationes sive meditationes* de Saint Anselme: Sa formation et sa réception en Angleterre et en France au XIIe siècle," in *Anselm*, ed. Luscombe and Evans (above, n. 1), pp. 285–86. For valuable discussions of other students and other aspects of Anselm's teaching see the contributions by Sally N. Vaughn, Bruce C. Brasington, Jay Rubenstein, William L. North, and John S. Ott in *Teaching and Learning*, ed. Vaughn and Rubenstein (above, n. 2). Additional students from Bec who went on to administrative careers are given in Vaughn, "Anselm, Lanfranc, and the School of Bec" (above, n. 5).

⁹⁸ The *Disputatio Iudei et Christiani* has been edited several times. All references here are to the edition by Anna Sapir Abulafia in *Works of Gilbert Crispin* (above, n. 15).

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. xxvii.

churches.¹⁰⁰ These topics were all familiar themes of the Jewish-Christian controversy. The Christian levels the familiar accusations of Jews' misreading Scripture that had been made countless times before, and the content of the Jew's argument is fully in line with the arguments contained in other Jewish-Christian disputations and Jewish biblical exegesis. Why the extraordinary popularity of Gilbert's disputation? Naturally, the main attraction of the work must be sought in where it differs from previous attempts at the same *adversus Judaeos* genre.

A unique feature of Gilbert's enterprise is the space allotted to the Jew in the discussion. Unlike earlier examples of Jewish-Christian disputations, the Jew is allowed to speak at length both in defense of his own position and in opposition to the arguments of the Christian. A possible source for this seemingly balanced discussion is Gilbert's assertion that the disputation is the result of an actual conversation that he had had in London with a Jewish merchant from Mainz. Some have challenged that such a conversation ever took place, suggesting that the work is instead a creation of Gilbert's literary imagination, but Gilbert's most recent editor maintains that some version of the recorded disputation did actually take place.¹⁰¹ Gilbert's intentions in the work are implicitly and explicitly professed in the dedicatory lines to his teacher Anselm:

I send to your fatherly prudence a little book I recently wrote that puts in writing what a certain Jew said when disputing with me (*mecum disputans*) in defense of his law against our faith and what I replied to his objections in favor of our faith. I do not know where he was born, but he was educated in Mainz, and he was well versed even in our law and literature and had a mind practiced in Scriptures and disputations against us. He often used to come to me as a friend both to do business and to see me, since, for certain things I was very necessary to him. Whenever we came together, we would soon begin talking in a friendly spirit about Scriptures and our faith. One day, God granted both him and me greater leisure than usual, and we began questioning each other (*inter nos questionari*), as was our custom. Because his objections were consequent and logical, and since he explained with equal consequence his former objections, while my reply met his objections toe to toe and by his confession seemed equally supported by the testimony of Scriptures, some of those who were present requested that I preserve our little debate (*nostram disceptationunculam*) so that they may be of use to others in the future.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ Further nuance to Gilbert Crispin's discussion of images in the context of the Jewish-Christian debate can be found in Jean-Claude Schmitt, *The Conversion of Herman the Jew: Autobiography, History, and Fiction in the Twelfth Century*, trans. Alex J. Novikoff (Philadelphia, 2010), pp. 124–38.

¹⁰¹ Abulafia in *Works of Gilbert Crispin*, pp. xxvii–xxx. An attempt to reconstruct that conversation is presented in Anna Sapir Abulafia, "The *Ars disputandi* of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster," in *Ad fontes: Opstellen aangeboden aan Prof. Dr. C. van de Kieft*, ed. C. M. Cappon et al. (Amsterdam, 1984), pp. 139–52.

¹⁰² *Disputatio Iudei et Christiani*, in *Works of Gilbert Crispin*, p. 9: "Paternitati et prudentie tue discutiendum mitto libellum, quem nuper scripsi, pagine commendans que Iudeus quidam olim mecum disputans contra fidem nostram de lege sua proferebat et que ego ad obiecta illius pro fide nostra respondebam. Nescio unde ortus, sed apud Maguntiam litteris educatus, legis et litterarum etiam nostrarum bene sciens erat, et exercitatus in scripturis atque disputationibus contra nos ingenium habebat. Plurimum mihi familiaris sepe ad me ueniebat, tum negotii sui causa, tum me uidendi gratia, quoniam in aliquibus illi multum necessarius eram; et quotiens conueniebamus, mox de Scripturis ac

The mention that this Jew was experienced in Jewish-Christian disputations is, if the statement can be taken at face value, a very early indication that disputations of the sort witnessed in later centuries were already beginning to take shape in the eleventh century.¹⁰³ Rhetorically, the preamble also serves to set the bar high for the Christian. When he scores points against the Jew in the disputation that ensues, he is not merely voicing what is already known to Christians; he is also outdisputing a talented representative of the opposite side. One statement that is readily confirmed is “the friendly spirit (*amico animo*)” of their debate, for even though the Jew does (in some manuscript versions) eventually convert at the end—like Pseudo-Anselm’s disputation, there is no reasonable alternative at the end—a certain level of mutual respect is maintained throughout. The politeness of their exchanges, which is not generally a common feature of anti-Jewish disputational writings, may indeed, as has been suggested, be a sign of the original conversation on which the work is based. It may equally be a consequence of the Anselmian approach to arriving at truth through open dialogue. In a sense, the same problem of derivation that presents itself with Justin Martyr’s second-century *Dialogue with Trypho*, which was purportedly the result of an actual exchange, resurfaces with Gilbert Crispin. Here, however, there is a markedly different context with which to work. Scholars have long known that much of Gilbert’s writings display the mark of his teachers Herluin, Lanfanc, and Anselm, and that training helped to prepare him for the difficult task of maintaining the noble ideals of Bec in the wholly dissimilar surroundings of royal Westminster.¹⁰⁴ Specifically, Richard Southern has highlighted the relation between Gilbert’s *Disputatio Iudei et Christiani* and Anselm’s *Cur Deus homo*, positing that Gilbert’s encounters with Jews played a role in Anselm’s formulation of the Jewish opposition and that Anselm in turn provided some of Gilbert’s ideas on the Incarnation.¹⁰⁵ Certainly the reason-based discussion of why God became man in Gilbert’s *Disputatio* is a nod to Anselm. But there is also within Gilbert’s oeuvre the distinct flavor of Anselm’s question-and-answer method, and one cannot but wonder whether Gilbert was writing in view of the same “slower-minded” persons who had compelled Anselm to adopt the dialogue form.

de fide nostra sermonem amico animo habebamus. Quadam ergo die, solito maius mihi et illi Deus ocium concessit, et mox, unde solebamus, inter nos questionari cepimus. Et quoniam, que opponebat, conuenienter satis et consequenter opponebat, et ea, que opposuerat, non minus conuenienter prosequendo explicabat, nostra uero responsio uicino satis pede ad proposita illius respondebat, et Scripturarum eque testimonio nitens eidem ipsi concessu facilis esse uidebatur et approbanda, rogauerunt, qui aderant, ut memorie darem hanc nostram disceptatiunculam, fortasse aliquibus profuturam.”

¹⁰³ Exchanges between Jews and Christians can be found earlier in the eleventh century but are of a more primitive and formulaic sort. See Anna Sapir Abulafia, “An Eleventh-Century Exchange of Letters between a Christian and a Jew,” *Journal of Medieval History* 7 (1981), 153–71.

¹⁰⁴ J. Armitage Robinson, *Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster: A Study of the Abbey under Norman Rule*, Notes and Documents relating to Westminster Abbey 3 (Cambridge, Eng., 1911), pp. 11–12. Gilbert still awaits a more recent and more comprehensive evaluation of his life and writings.

¹⁰⁵ R. W. Southern, “St. Anselm and Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster,” *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 3 (1954), 78–115.

The disputation between a Jew and a Christian was followed by another disputation, the *Disputatio Christiani cum Gentili*.¹⁰⁶ This disputation tells the story of Gilbert's attending a secret meeting of "philosophers" in London where he became involved in a debate with a pagan.¹⁰⁷ Like the opponent in *Cur Deus homo*, the "gentile" of this disputation is unwilling to accept either Jewish or Christian law. The Christian in turn agrees to proceed according to the dictates of reason (*ratio*) rather than biblical authority. The discussion that ensues, however, falls considerably short of the announced goal.¹⁰⁸ First, the gentile himself retreats from his earlier position and states that they each know the sacred texts of the other. Second, and perhaps on account of this fact, the Christian invokes Anselm's logic and implores the gentile to "submit to faith for a little while, for, in yielding to faith, you may come to understanding."¹⁰⁹ The remaining debate focuses largely on the proper interpretation of biblical evidence, and it is on this basis that some commentators have seen in the gentile a "rational Jew" or even a Muslim.¹¹⁰

Gilbert Crispin devoted considerable place in his writings to religious controversy, but he also wrote three other dialogues dealing with more purely Christian themes. Here, too, the Anselmian influence is present. A dialogue on the fall of Satan, *De angelo perduto*, constitutes the work that is theologically closest to Anselm. Its resemblance to Anselm's *De casu diaboli* is evident in the very beginning where Gilbert's unnamed questioner asks how it came about that Satan did not "stand fast in the truth" (John 8.44). In other passages it seems likely that Gilbert is articulating points Anselm made in his teaching at Bec but that did not find their way into his finished works. Their meetings at Westminster in 1086 and 1092/93, when Anselm was a guest of Gilbert's, may have also contributed to the development of Gilbert's writings on the devil. "Whether or not Anselm brought Gilbert a copy of the *De Casu Diaboli*," G. R. Evans explains, "it is clear that his recollections of the schoolroom at Bec were vividly revived by his conversations with Anselm."¹¹¹ A later treatise on the Holy Spirit, *De Spiritu Sancto*, is cast in the form of a dialogue between a teacher (*Magister*) and student (*Discipulus*). Here the similarities to Anselm's writings are fewer, the work's main reliance being on Augustine. Gilbert did, however, send the finished work to Anselm accompanied by a letter requesting that he resolve the final question raised by the *Discipulus*, namely, whether the Son only was made man.¹¹² No response from Anselm survives, but Gilbert's gesture is paradigmatic of the

¹⁰⁶ *Disputatio Christiani cum Gentili*, in *Works of Gilbert Crispin*, pp. 61–87.

¹⁰⁷ Note the interesting resemblance between this setting and Orderic Vitalis's description of the intellectual milieu at Bec quoted above (p. 405).

¹⁰⁸ See the discussion of Gilbert Crispin in Cohen, *Living Letters* (above, n. 69), pp. 180–85.

¹⁰⁹ *Works of Gilbert Crispin*, p. 65: "Cede paulisper fidei, nam cedendo fidei, uenies ad cognitionem tante rei." Also cited in Cohen, *Living Letters*, p. 184 n. 45.

¹¹⁰ For the Jewish element in Gilbert's gentile see Abulafia, "Christians Disputing Disbelief" (above, n. 90), p. 137. On the (rather unlikely) possibility of the disputant being a Muslim see Julia Gass, "Anselm von Canterbury: Zur Begegnung und Auseinandersetzung der Religionen," *Saeculum* 17 (1966), 296.

¹¹¹ *Works of Gilbert Crispin*, p. xxxv.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. xxxvi.

intellectual exchange that shaped both of their works. The third theological dialogue, *De Altaris Sacramento*, treats the thorny issue of the Eucharist, which Lanfranc had disputed with Berengar and which Anselm had avoided altogether.¹¹³

HONORIUS AUGUSTODUNENSIS

The figure of Honorius Augustodunensis (c. 1070–c. 1140) is as enigmatic as he is important and overlooked. Among the many unknowns in his life are his place of birth, his location of study, and the source of his eponym (Autun, Canterbury, Augsburg, Regensburg, and Aosta have all been suggested).¹¹⁴ Some have conjectured, mainly on the basis of his adherence to John Scotus Eriugena's cosmology and Anselm's theology, that he was of Insular origin, but that theory cannot be verified and must remain doubtful. A more recent hypothesis suggests that Honorius (originally Henricus) might have come originally from Aosta, a member of the same minor nobility of Savoy as Anselm.¹¹⁵ What does seem clear is that he lived and wrote in England for a considerable period of time, some of it in Anselm's Canterbury, before relocating to Regensburg sometime before 1130. There he became a Benedictine monk and joined with the circles of reformers that included such notables as Rupert of Deutz (himself the author of an anti-Jewish dialogue). It is during his years in Regensburg that Honorius played a critical role in disseminating to a German audience the ideas, methods, and reforming ideals of Anselm.¹¹⁶ During his life and for centuries afterwards, Honorius was one of the most deeply influential writers in the West.¹¹⁷

Honorius is silent about nearly all aspects of his autobiography, except one: his authorship. In his own last-named treatise, the *De luminaribus ecclesiae*, Honorius proudly claims authorship of twenty-two “by no means despicable” works.¹¹⁸ The quantity of his output is equaled by its diversity; it includes reformist, polemical, liturgical, cosmological, didactic, and exegetical treatises. No fewer than five of his works assume the form of a dialogue.¹¹⁹ At least five other

¹¹³ See G. R. Evans, “Gilbert Crispin on the Eucharist: A Monastic Postscript to Lanfranc and Berengar,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 31 (1980), 28–43. Gilbert's discussion of the validity of simoniacal consecration serves as a prelude of sorts to his later and longer treatise *De simoniaciis*.

¹¹⁴ A detailed statement about Honorius's career is given in V. I. J. Flint, *Honorius Augustodunensis of Regensburg*, *Authors of the Middle Ages* 6 (Aldershot, Eng., 1995), esp. pp. 16–23.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 32–33.

¹¹⁶ Jeremy Cohen has recently called attention to Honorius's contribution to the medieval Christian idea of the Jew in his commentary on the Song of Songs. See Cohen, “*Synagoga conversa*: Honorius Augustodunensis, the Song of Songs, and Christianity's ‘Eschatological Jew,’” *Speculum* 79 (2004), 309–40. Notwithstanding some obvious parallels, Cohen also points out (p. 326) that Honorius's commentary does not betray the influence of Anselm's *Cur Deus homo* or of the anti-Jewish polemics of Anselm's disciples Gilbert Crispin, Odo of Cambrai, and Guibert of Nogent.

¹¹⁷ Flint, *Honorius*, p. 1.

¹¹⁸ PL 172:232–34; quoted and translated in Flint, *Honorius*, p. 3.

¹¹⁹ *Clavis physicae*, *Elucidarium*, *Libellus octo quaestionum de angelis et homine*, *Inevitabile sive De praedestinatione et libero arbitrio dialogus*, and *Scala Coeli major*. A handlist of surviving Latin manuscripts for these works can be found in Flint, *Honorius*, pp. 65–88.

works, also in dialogue form, are possibly his as well.¹²⁰ Each of Honorius's works is deserving of its own attention, and in some cases badly needing an editor, but several of his dialogues are particularly useful in tracing the use of the form for didactic purposes. Standing in a class of its own is the *Elucidarium*, also sometimes referred to as the *Dialogus de summa totius Christianae theologiae*.¹²¹ It is the first of Honorius's many writings.¹²² Cast in the form of a dialogue between master and student, the *Elucidarium* was translated into all the vernacular languages of the medieval West and survives in well over three hundred medieval manuscripts, making it "arguably the most revealing and important of all of Honorius's writings."¹²³ Certainly, it was the most widely read. The length, structure, and literary form of the work recall the Anselmian style: "I have often been asked by a fellow student to explain certain little questions" is how Honorius begins the prologue.¹²⁴ Like Anselm, Honorius opens with a short introduction in which he explains the circumstances of the work and sets out his intentions, a practice that extends to his exegetical commentaries as well.¹²⁵ By composing this work, Honorius continues, he hopes "to leave for posterity (*transmittere posteritati*)" questions that have already been "debated (*disputata*)" orally and that, when read, will prove useful and pleasing to others and to God. The work is didactic and dogmatic, intended to set out in simple terms for a less-than-advanced reader all the important principles of the Christian faith. In this sense, the work is encyclopedic as well.

A similar explication precedes a later, longer, and more philosophically profound work by Honorius, the *Clavis physicae*. This work was composed in the form of a dialogue between student and teacher, Honorius divulges, "because to the greatest philosophers, such as Socrates, Plato, and Cicero, not to mention our own Augustine and Boethius, it seemed to be the teaching method that offered the most power when introducing a subject."¹²⁶ Given that Honorius had almost certainly not read Plato but knew him only secondhand, it is striking how

¹²⁰ *De vita vere apostolica dialogorum libri V, Cognitio vitae, De anima et de Deo, De esu volatilium*, and *De musica*.

¹²¹ An edition of the text accompanied by a thorough examination of its manuscript tradition was done by Yves Lefèvre, *L'Elucidarium et les lucidaires: Contribution, par l'histoire d'un texte, à l'histoire des croyances religieuses en France au moyen âge*, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 180 (Paris, 1954).

¹²² In at least two manuscripts it is incorrectly attributed to Lanfranc. See Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec* (above, n. 9), p. 242.

¹²³ Flint, *Honorius*, p. 35.

¹²⁴ Lefèvre, ed., *L'Elucidarium*, p. 359: "Saepius rogatus a condiscipulis quasdam quaestiunculas enodare, importunitati illorum non fuit facultas negando obviare, praesertim metuens illo elogio multari si creditum talentum mallet in terra silendo occultari."

¹²⁵ In his exegetical writings Honorius thus also contributed to the early Scholastic *accessus ad auctores*. See A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. (Aldershot, Eng., 1988), chap. 2; and E. Ann Matter, *The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity* (Philadelphia, 1990), pp. 60–64.

¹²⁶ Honorius Augustodunensis, *Clavis physicae*, ed. Paolo Lucentini, *Temi e Testi* 21 (Rome, 1974), p. 3: "Cuius stilum ideo verti in dialogum quia summis philosophis, Socrati scilicet et Platoni ac Tullio nec non nostro Augustino et Boetio, visum est id genus docendi quam maximam vim optinere introducendi."

conscious he and Anselm before him are of their appropriation of the Socratic method. The *Clavis physicae* is one of Honorius's cosmological treatises, and it takes as its subject an explication (some will say simplification) of John Scotus Eriugena's *Periphyseon* (860s), also a dialogue.¹²⁷

Three other dialogues between master and pupil, the *Libellus octo quaestionum*, the *Scala Coeli major*, and the *Cognitio vitae*, as well as several other treatises not in the form of a dialogue, also draw heavily from the philosophy of Eriugena. Formerly ascribed to Augustine, the *Cognitio vitae* is particularly interesting for its relation to Anselm's thought and method. Based largely on Anselm's *Monologion*, it follows Anselm in his logical proof of the existence of God, in the importance placed on "the light of right reason," and in the relationship between teacher and student. Here the work is actually constructed as a discourse between master and pupil. In answer to the pupil's question of why some students are slower to learn ("quaedam [animae] tardior est ad discendum"), when all minds have the same nature (again recalling Anselm's prefatory remarks in *Cur Deus homo*), Honorius used the familiar metaphor of the sealing wax and candle.¹²⁸ The wax represents the malleable material of the mind, which needs study, training, and the flame of truth for it to be impressed. The metaphor of the wax seal is a very old one—that other great writer of dialogues, Plato, described the mind as like a block of wax that would take the impression of our perceptions and thoughts. Honorius, however, seems to have inherited his understanding from his teacher Anselm, who used it in one of his letters; according to Eadmer, Anselm likened the malleability of a young man, neither too young nor too old, to a piece of wax that is neither too soft nor too hard.¹²⁹ The metaphor of the seal and the wax struck a chord with many medieval authors, and, as Brigitte Bedos-Rezak has shown, seals came to occupy important social and symbolic functions at precisely this time in the intellectual development of medieval Europe.¹³⁰ It can be found in a number of twelfth-century authors, including Honorius's contemporary Hugh of St. Victor, who said that our imitation of the saints is the imprinting of their lives in us just as a seal molds the wax on which it is pressed.¹³¹ Honorius uses this opportunity to articulate his own pedagogical creed, one that employs the spirit of

¹²⁷ See the learned discussion of bodily resurrection in both the *Clavis physicae* and the *Elucidarium* in Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336* (New York, 1995), pp. 137–55.

¹²⁸ *Cognitio vitae*, PL 40:1005–32.

¹²⁹ Letter 4, in *Opera omnia*, 3:104; Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi* 1.11 and 1.22, pp. 20–21 and 37–38.

¹³⁰ Brigitte Bedos-Rezak, "The Social Implications of the Art of Chivalry: The Sigillographic Evidence (France, 1050–1250)," in *The Medieval Court in Europe*, ed. Edward R. Haymes, Houston German Studies 6 (Munich, 1986), pp. 142–75, reprinted with new pagination in her *Form and Order in Medieval France: Studies in Social and Quantitative Sigillography*, Collected Studies Series 424 (Aldershot, Eng., 1993), no. 6; and eadem, "Medieval Identity: A Sign and a Concept," *American Historical Review* 105 (2000), 1489–1533.

¹³¹ Hugh of St. Victor, *De institutione novitiorum* 7, PL 176:932–33. See also Caroline Walker Bynum, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*, Publications of the UCLA Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies 16 (Berkeley, Calif., 1982), pp. 97–98; and Sally N. Vaughn, *St. Anselm and the Handmaidens of God: A Study of Anselm's Correspondence with Women*, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 7 (Turnhout, 2002), p. 32, and chap. 2 where she suggests that Anselm's educational ideas originated with the model of his mother.

investigative philosophy instilled in him by Anselm in order to go beyond the more inward rationale of his teacher, explaining that in matters of instruction the teacher who is outside the student's mind can only plant and water the seeds of knowledge. It is truth dwelling within the mind that creates wisdom.¹³²

Wax seals and instructional dialogue are more than fleeting moments of compositional insight for Honorius (or Anselm). A further illustration of Honorius's debt to his teacher Anselm, as well as his departure from him, can be observed in another work that likewise turns on the metaphor of the seal, his *Sigillum Sanctae Mariae*, a commentary on the Song of Songs from a Marian perspective that was composed sometime in the first decade of the twelfth century and probably while Honorius was still a resident in England (and possibly while Anselm was exiled from Canterbury, 1103–7).¹³³ In good Anselmian fashion, the questions that motivated the composition of the work are explained in the prologue as originating in Honorius's students: grateful for the illumination shown them in the earlier *Elucidarium*, the "assembly of students" beg their master to undertake a new work that explains why certain texts are read on the feast of Mary "although they do not pertain to her at all."¹³⁴ This deceptively simple question, as Rachel Fulton has argued, "was no less than revolutionary," for what they were asking for in effect was the reasoning behind the liturgy. And what Honorius proposed, contrary to the tradition of the Fathers such as Gregory the Great and Bede, was to read the Song of Songs "as a dialogue not between Christ and the soul or Christ and the Church but, rather, between Christ and his Mother."¹³⁵ Fulton has also argued that Honorius was writing in response to questions suggested to him in part by the prayers of Anselm and that these questions had their roots in devotional, rather than primarily exegetical, concerns.¹³⁶ Here again, I might emphasize that Honorius's method rests on an original understanding of dialogue within the commentary tradition and that his inspiration for blending prayer and dialogue under the umbrella metaphor of a wax seal appears to derive from Anselm. Indeed, Honorius's Marian and dialogical reading of the Song of Songs evokes Anselm's devotionally original meditations and his own dialogue *Cur Deus homo*, which Honorius explicitly refers to in the *Sigillum*. As Fulton has further shown, the resulting commentary can be seen as a drama unfolding in two acts, as Honorius endeavors to make the conversation between the Queen of Heaven and her celestial bridegroom audible while at the same time

¹³² *Cognitio vitae*, PL 40:1024–25.

¹³³ Here again one must rely on the work of Flint, *Honorius*, pp. 2–3, 8–14, 16, 28–34, 42, 52–53, 73–75, and 78–79.

¹³⁴ Honorius Augustodunensis, *Sigillum Sanctae Mariae*, PL 172:495–518. For an English translation of this work see *The Seal of Blessed Mary*, trans. Amelia Carr, Peregrina Translations Series 18 (Toronto, 1991).

¹³⁵ Fulton, *From Judgment to Passion* (above, n. 27), pp. 248–49.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 251. Fulton, accepting a theory proposed by Valerie Flint, suggests (pp. 286–88) that the work was intended to gain the favor of the very pious Queen Matilda of England (1080–1118) and that it was Matilda who was responsible for arranging Honorius's appointment to a canonry in Regensburg, thereby launching his career. Moreover, Fulton argues, Matilda may have been inspired by Honorius's *Sigillum* to create her own, literal, seal—"the earliest extant of any English queen" (p. 288). I find both arguments tantalizing and plausible.

exciting a devotion to her by recollecting for his audience her role at the Judgment (and thus terrifying his readers enough so that they would pay attention and pray for her intercession).¹³⁷ In the fourth and final scene of this drama Mary is found to be pleading on behalf of “her people,” the Jews, as they approach the seat of Judgment.¹³⁸ Christ assures her, “If she [Synagoga] be a wall, let us build upon it,” and the Virgin promises, “I will be a wall for them.”¹³⁹ The scene is somewhat surprising, for Jews figure as villains in a number of the miracle stories that were, already in Honorius’s lifetime, making their way into the more popular collections. Yet concerns for Jewish objections to Christianity, and in particular the Incarnation, were precisely the topic of (live) debate that had concerned Anselm and another student, Gilbert Crispin, in the latter’s conversations with the Jew from Mainz. As Fulton has argued, “There is little doubt that [Anselm] was well aware of the arguments that Jews of his day brought forward against this most Christian doctrine, if not from conversations with Jewish scholars himself . . . , then most definitely from conversations with his friend Gilbert Crispin.”¹⁴⁰ If contemporary Jews insisted that the doctrine of the Incarnation was nothing short of an insult to God and that the height of that insult was that God had confined himself within a woman’s womb, then to defend Mary’s purity as both virgin and mother was to champion the idea that God might deign to become human and that he did so literally through a woman. This point had even greater contemporary resonance in the area where Honorius would spend a good portion of his career (Regensburg) as so many Jews had recently perished at the hands of the crusaders in 1096 for refusing to convert and accept baptism. In a work not a dialogue but deeply dialogical, Honorius effectively braids the different strands that I have traced through the teachings of Anselm: deep devotion expressed through conversation and dialogue, an exegetical method that uses dialogue (and in this instance a Marian reading of the Song of Songs) to explain to students the deeper meanings of the liturgy, and a heightened awareness of the Jewish objections to Christian doctrines such as the Incarnation that were the topics of current debate.

The second half of the eleventh century witnessed profound changes in the institutional and intellectual landscape of western Christendom. Major forces in these changes were the figures of Lanfranc and Anselm. Lanfranc’s participation, indeed his central role, in the controversy over the Eucharist brought him fame as one of the leading dialecticians of his time and led him to write an influential dialogue, a cleverly constructed polemic that sets in writing the sort of theological disputation that was current during the eleventh-century ecclesiastical reform. As an educator at Bec and commentator on Paul, Lanfranc developed early on a technique for merging exegesis with dialogue. The disputational

¹³⁷ Ibid., pp. 274–75.

¹³⁸ *Sigillum Sanctae Mariae*, PL 172:515–16.

¹³⁹ Ibid., col. 516, and quoted in Fulton, *From Judgment to Passion*, p. 280.

¹⁴⁰ Fulton, *From Judgment to Passion*, p. 284. Fulton goes on to suggest that Honorius might actually have been party to such conversations and that, as a student of Anselm at Canterbury, he could not help knowing about them.

quality of his Pauline glosses can be seen as an early glimpse into the Scholastic (one might say proto-Scholastic, for the secular schools of the twelfth century had yet to appear) methods of learning that would be developed most immediately by Anselm, and most famously by the generation of Abelard, for whom irreverent disputation was the very source of so many of his calamities.¹⁴¹ Lanfranc's mentorship of Anselm was for this reason central to the eleventh-century development of theology and philosophy. As prior and abbot of Bec, Anselm developed further than anyone before a method of engaging students through verbal interrogation and literary dialogue. His productivity in the latter regard was instrumental in spreading his novel ideas and methods across Europe, an accomplishment that was helped in no small measure by his students Gilbert Crispin and Honorius Augustodunensis and by the anonymous author(s) Pseudo-Anselm, whose immensely popular dialogues are testaments to Anselm's success.¹⁴² In addition to his much-emphasized reliance on reason and logic, Anselm's contribution to medieval thought and writing can clearly be seen in his revival and reworking of a dialogical/disputational quality of inner meditation. The problem of unbelievers that had confronted Augustine and that had led him to debate publicly with Manicheans and to write treatises (some of them in dialogue form) in order to counterattack their challenges was raised again in the writings of Anselm and Gilbert, but now with the challenges posed by pagans, unnamed heretics, and especially Jews. This controversy continued to generate an abundance of literature and later produced actual debates (public disputations) between Christians and Jews.¹⁴³ Thus by the time of Anselm's death, the seeds for an arena of academic and religious dispute were widely sown. It is revealing that the most widely circulated texts of Anselm, Gilbert, and Honorius were each written in dialogue form. All three writers, and Lanfranc, too, valued rational investigation, dialogue, and disputation as a successful strategy for arriving at (and dem-

¹⁴¹ The connection between Anselm and Abelard has been explored before, most notably by David Luscombe, but almost always centers upon the issue of the relation between reason and faith and their particular positions on theological questions such as atonement. The specific use of dialogue and disputation has largely escaped comment. See David Luscombe, "St Anselm and Abelard," *Anselm Studies* 1 (1983), 207–29; idem, "St. Anselm and Abelard: A Restatement," in *Saint Anselm*, ed. Viola and van Fleteren (above, n. 2), pp. 445–60; and also Michael Clanchy, "Abelard's Mockery of St. Anselm," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 41 (1990), 1–23. But see also the remarks by Lutz Geldsetzer, "'Sic et non' sive 'sic aut non': La méthode des questions chez Abélard et la stratégie de la recherche," in *Pierre Abélard: Colloque international de Nantes*, ed. Jean Jolivet and Henri Habrias (Rennes, 2003), pp. 407–15; and those by Constant J. Mews, "Peter Abelard and the Enigma of Dialogue," in *Beyond the Persecuting Society: Religious Toleration before the Enlightenment*, ed. John Christian Laursen and Cary J. Nederman (Philadelphia, 1998), p. 28.

¹⁴² Dialectic as such was not entirely new. There is some evidence for it at the earlier school of Reims and in John Scotus Eriugena. What is new and different with Bec is the systematic application of such methodologies, as shown by its use by so many from Bec, coupled with the new emphasis on reason.

¹⁴³ In addition to generating a large corpus of twelfth-century anti-Jewish writings, the Jewish-Christian debate also yielded some well-known public debates or trials that followed the Scholastic model of disputation. The Paris Talmud trial of 1240 and the Barcelona disputation of 1263 are the best known of such public debates, although there is ample evidence for others as early as the twelfth century. See, for instance, the 1179 disputation of Ceuta edited by Ora Limor, *Die Disputationen zu Ceuta (1179) und Mallorca (1286)*, MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch. 15 (Munich, 1994), pp. 135–66.

onstrating) Christian truth. It is this arena of educative dialogue and intellectual dispute that the next generation of thinkers, teachers, and debaters inherited and out of which grew, in time, the methods and practices most emblematic of the medieval university.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴ The full history of Scholastic disputation has not yet been written, and scholars remain largely dependent on the pioneering work of Martin Grabmann (above, n. 1), now over one hundred years old. The topic is daunting, in part because it crosses over several academically divided areas of study. As I have here endeavored to show, disputation emerged from the monastic milieu at Bec and the circle of Anselm and was only subsequently taken up and institutionalized in the schools and universities of later generations. The evolution of disputation over the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is the subject of my forthcoming study, *The Culture of Disputation in Medieval Europe* (University of Pennsylvania Press).

Alex J. Novikoff is an Assistant Professor of History at Rhodes College in Memphis, TN 38112 (e-mail: novikoffa@rhodes.edu).