

TOIVO J. HOLOPAINEN

University of Helsinki, Finland

Faculty of Theology

ON THE TWO VERSIONS OF THE *PROSLOGION*O DWÓCH WERSJACH *PROSLOGIONU*

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the two-phase publication of the *Proslogion* and its significance for understanding the nature of Anselm's endeavour in the treatise. The introduction highlights the importance of making sense of the peculiar combination of argument and devotion in the treatise. It also pays attention to an important recent article by R. Sharpe (2009), which effectively shatters the authoritativeness of the editorial matter in F. S. Schmitt's edition of Anselm's works. The second part offers a critical discussion of Schmitt's and Sharpe's views concerning the early versions of the *Monologion* and *Proslogion*. The third part investigates the evidence related to the publication history of the *Proslogion*, arguing that Anselm incorporated all the additional features, including the exchange with Gaunilo, at the same time. To elucidate why the publication history of the *Proslogion* is vital for the interpretation of the treatise, the last part of the paper offers an outline explaining Anselm's objectives in the two-phase publication. It is proposed that the *Proslogion* should be read as Anselm's subtle attempt to defend and justify the kind of rational method that he had been using in the *Monologion*.

W artykule zostało podjęte zagadnienie dwóch etapów wydania *Proslogionu* oraz ich znaczenie dla zrozumienia istoty przedsięwzięcia podjętego przez Anzelma w tym traktacie. We wprowadzeniu podkreślono znaczenie rozumienia wyjątkowego połączenia w traktacie argumentacji i modlitwy. Zwrócono też uwagę na nowy, ważny artykuł R. Sharpe'a (2009), który w przekonujący sposób podważył materiał redakcyjny w wydaniu dzieł Anzelma zredagowanym przez F.S. Schmitta. W drugiej części krytycznie omówiono opinie Schmitta i Sharpe'a dotyczące pierwotnych wersji *Proslogionu* i *Monologionu*. W trzeciej części zbadano argumenty dotyczące historii publikacji *Proslogionu*, przekonując, że Anselm wprowadził w tym samym czasie wszystkie dodatkowe elementy włącznie z wymianą zdań z Gaunilo. W celu wyjaśnienia wagi historii wydania *Proslogionu* dla interpretacji traktatu, w ostatniej części artykułu podjęto próbę wskazania, czym mógł się kierować Anselm w dwóch etapach publikacji. Proponuje się by *Proslogion* był odczytywany jako subtelna próba obrony i uzasadnienia racjonalnej metody zastosowanej w *Monologionie*.

1. Introduction

Anselm's *Proslogion* is one of, if not the most controversial work in the history of philosophy and theology. Why is this the case? What is in the *Proslogion* that makes the treatise able to arouse such debate? To begin with, the *Proslogion*

is generally seen as something worth arguing about. Quite a large number of scholars think that Anselm in the *Proslogion* treats important issues in a profound way, and that he has something to teach the philosophers and theologians of our time, even if one does not agree with him. The existence of people thinking like this also gives impetus to those whose interest in Anselm is more of a historical or antiquarian kind. Further, some quite particular interpretive issues are related to the *Proslogion*. Scholars read the treatise in various ways, having different views about what the important issues treated by Anselm are and what his position on them is. The differences in interpretation, for their part, are made possible by the characteristics of the *Proslogion* as a text. The main body of the *Proslogion* is a devotional exercise, a prayer. At the same time, the *Proslogion* as a whole includes features which are untypical of the form of prayer, say, as represented by the other prayers that Anselm composed. Some strongly argued passages are included in the main body of the *Proslogion*, notably in the treatment of God's existence in Chapters 2-4, and the devotional exercise is encircled by additional elements that cannot be found in Anselm's other prayers: the preface, chapter division and the appendices at the end. There are some features in the *Proslogion* that point in different directions, and the interpretation of the treatise will depend on the choices that the interpreter makes along the way: where one starts from, what features of the text one chooses to take into account, and what relative significance one gives to each element.

A major interpretive issue is that of understanding the peculiar combination of argumentation and devotion presented in this treatise. There is relatively little explicit discussion about this in the current literature, but one can perceive two basic approaches. On one hand, there is the conventional approach that concentrates exclusively or almost exclusively on Anselm's argumentation about God in the *Proslogion*. Typically, the supporters of this approach are mainly interested in the Chapters 2-4 of the treatise as well as the exchange between Anselm and Gaunilo related to them. It may be acknowledged that the *Proslogion* is a prayer, but this has been judged to be a secondary feature of the text, which does not affect the interpretation of the arguments and need not be taken into account in academic discussion, even if it may be personally significant to some scholars. This approach has been common in Anselm scholarship within Anglophone analytical philosophy. On the other hand, there is a group of approaches in which the devotional nature of the *Proslogion* has been perceived as essential for the interpretation of the arguments in the treatise. The fideistic and mystical interpretations of the *Proslogion* by Karl Barth and Anselm Stolz, respectively, are classical examples of such approaches, and various interpretations along these lines have been presented in recent decades. However, even though many scholars are firmly convinced that the devotional framework must affect any interpretation of the arguments in the *Proslogion*, it is difficult to perceive an emerging consensus about how it does this.¹

¹ John Hick and Arthur C. McGill (eds.), *The Many-Faced Argument: Recent Studies on the Ontological Argument for the Existence of God* (New York: Macmillan, 1967), can still serve

As I read the *Proslogion*, it seems to me that the conventional view of the relationship between the argumentation and devotion is correct up to a certain point.² At the core of the *Proslogion* is a “single argument” (*unum argumentum*), the discovery of which Anselm announces in the preface. According to Anselm, with the aid of this single argument it is possible to prove both God’s existence and everything that the Christians believe about the Divine Essence. Even though Anselm introduces this argument by using it in a devotional exercise, it can be shown that he considers it to be rational. The single argument in itself does not depend on the devotional framework any more than the arguments in Anselm’s first treatise, the *Monologion*, and it is also well known that Anselm intended the arguments in that work to be based on reason alone (*sola ratione*). The significance of the devotional framework is not that it would somehow qualify the central arguments in the *Proslogion* or lift them to a new plane. The single argument stands or falls quite independently of the devotional framework. Regarding the independence of the argument, the conventional approach is basically correct and the fideistic and mystical approaches (as characterized above) are mistaken. However, the conventional approach must be deemed incomplete as well, as it fails to give any substantial account of the significance of the devotional exercise. To understand the *Proslogion*, one should be able to make sense of its combination of argumentation and devotion, and saying that the argumentation does not depend on the devotional framework is only the first step in that direction.

In some of my previous papers I have worked toward an explanation of the *Proslogion* that can make sense of its combination of argumentation and devotion.³ Reflecting on the single argument is a central component of the explanation. In addition, the (projected) explanation can be characterized as historical and rhetorical: historical because it seeks to relate the *Proslogion* to the concrete historical situation in which the treatise was composed and calls attention to the particular

as a useful introduction to the different lines of interpretation. See especially McGill’s article *Recent Discussions of Anselm’s Argument*, 33-110. There are also more balanced and sophisticated accounts. See, e.g., Marilyn McCord Adams, *Anselm on Faith and Reason*, in B. Davies and B. Leftow (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Anselm* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 32-60.

² My attempts to interpret the *Proslogion* include: Toivo J. Holopainen, *Dialectic and Theology in the Eleventh Century*. Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 54 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), chapter 5 *Anselm of Canterbury: the Monologion and Proslogion*, 119-155; idem, *Anselm’s Proslogion as an Attempt at Contemplating God*, in C. Viola and J. Kormos (eds.), *Rationality from Saint Augustine to Saint Anselm* (Piliscsaba, Hungary: Pázmány Péter Catholic University, 2005), 185-95; idem, *Logic and Theology in the Eleventh Century: Anselm and Lanfranc’s Heritage*, in G. E. M. Gasper and H. Kohlenberger (eds.), *Anselm and Abelard: Investigations and Juxtapositions* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2006), 1-16; idem, *Anselm’s Argumentum and the Early Medieval Theory of Argument*, “Vivarium” 45 (2007), 1-29; and idem, *The Proslogion in Relation to the Monologion*, “The Heythrop Journal” 50 (2009), 590-602.

³ See Holopainen, *Anselm’s Proslogion as an Attempt*; idem, *Logic and Theology*; and idem, *The Proslogion in Relation*. In my own judgement, the explanation I am working toward is for the most part consonant with Marilyn Adams’s explanation (see note 1). However, whereas she concentrates on understanding the internal logic of Anselm’s thinking, I have a lively interest in the historical circumstances and their significance for understanding the *Proslogion*.

way in which the treatise was published, and rhetorical because it reads the *Proslogion* as Anselm's attempt to bring about some opportune effects in particular audience. The main point in the explanation is to take the *Proslogion* as a subtle attempt to defend and justify the kind of rational method that Anselm had been using in the *Monologion*. This view about the purpose of the *Proslogion* allows us, I maintain, to appreciate both the devotional exercise in the main body of the treatise and the additional elements around it, and it can also explain why Anselm introduced the single argument in the way he did. The last part of this paper will delineate some main features of the explanation in question.

Because the explanation of the *Proslogion* that I am developing has a strong historical aspect, its viability depends on the factuality of certain historical claims. Importantly, it builds on an unconventional evaluation of Lanfranc's intellectual contribution.⁴ The facts about the early manuscripts of Anselm's works and their publication history are also highly relevant. There have been made significant advances in the scholarship in this area. Until recently it has been acceptable to look at the edition of Anselm's works by F. S. Schmitt⁵ as an authoritative source for their textual history, and that is what I have been doing. In particular, I have relied on Schmitt's critical apparatus for the earlier versions of the *Monologion* and the *Proslogion*. An important recent article by Richard Sharpe⁶ effectively shatters the authoritativeness of the editorial matter in Schmitt's edition. Specifically, Sharpe rejects Schmitt's account of the earlier recension of the *Proslogion*. It will no longer do to determine questions about the textual history of the *Proslogion* by simply appealing to Schmitt. Consequently, most of this paper will be dedicated to doing some groundwork for an historical interpretation of the *Proslogion* by discussing the publication history of Anselm's first two treatises in the wake of Sharpe's article.

2. Schmitt and Sharpe on earlier recensions

According to Schmitt's edition, at least two authorial versions of the *Proslogion* should be distinguished. One of them which is given in the main text, is the final version. It consists of a preface, list of chapters,⁷ body of the text divided into twenty-six chapters,⁸ as well as three appendices: an extract repeating the text

⁴ See below, Section 4.

⁵ *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, ed. F. S. Schmitt, 6 vols (Edinburgh: Nelson, 1946-1961). Reprint in 2 vols (Stuttgart: Frommann, 1968). I will refer to Schmitt's edition by volume and page and, in some cases, line, e.g. "S I, 93.6-10" refers to volume I, page 93, lines 6-10. The *Monologion* is in S I, 1-87, and the *Proslogion* with the appendices in S I, 89-139.

⁶ Richard Sharpe, *Anselm as Author: Publishing in the Late Eleventh Century*, "The Journal of Medieval Latin" 19 (2009), 1-87.

⁷ Prooemium, S I, 93-94; Capitula, S I, 95-96.

⁸ The edition gives the headings also at the beginning of each chapter. In the early manuscripts the headings were only given in the list of chapters, and there were numbers in the margin to indicate where the chapter begins. Schmitt does not indicate this in connection with the *Proslogion*, but the account given in the apparatus at *Monologion* 1, S I, 13 applies also here.

of Chapters 2-4, with the heading *Sumptum ex eodem libello* (“An Extract from This Same Little Work”, hereinafter *Sumptum*); a criticism of the argument in Chapters 2-4 by some unidentified author, with the heading *Quid ad haec respondeat quidam pro insipiente* (“What Someone Replies to This on Behalf of the Fool”, hereinafter *Pro insipiente*); and, Anselm’s reply to the criticism, *Quid ad haec respondeat editor ipsius libelli* (“What the Author of the Little Work Replies to This”, hereinafter *Responsio*).⁹ An early witness to the final version, according to Schmitt, is what he calls manuscript T, Oxford Bodleian Rawlinson A 392, which he dates to ca. 1085.¹⁰ In addition to the final version, Schmitt postulates an earlier recension, or actually two or more earlier recensions, and offers a partial documentation of them in the critical apparatus under the title *priores recensiones*.¹¹ The manuscripts related by Schmitt to the earlier recension(s) have some common features, but there are also notable differences between them. The common features include the following: there is no preface, no list of chapters and no appendices, and the title *Fides quaerens intellectum* is used. To put it differently, these manuscripts include only the main body of the *Proslogion*, i.e. the devotional exercise, as well as the title. The manuscripts of the putative early recension(s) differ in that they offer numerous different readings of the body of the text, especially in the Chapters 2 and 25.¹²

In the *Monologion*, Schmitt distinguishes between the earlier recension and the final version. An early witness to the final version is, again, the manuscript T. The earlier recension is witnessed by two manuscripts, of which more important is S, Paris lat. 13413, dated by Schmitt to 1077-1082.¹³ The main differences between the two versions can be found in what is now Chapter 1 of the treatise. According to Schmitt’s apparatus, what is now the first paragraph of Chapter 1 previously used to serve as a kind of short introduction; Chapter 1 began from what is now the second paragraph. Anselm apparently also changed the order of some sentences and added a remark about the tentative nature of his conclusions.¹⁴ Another notable difference is that in the earlier recension the treatise was entitled *Exemplum meditando de ratione fidei* (“An Example of Meditating on the Reason of Faith”).¹⁵ In other respects these two versions are rather similar. The preface

⁹ *Sumptum ex eodem libello*, S I, 123-124; *Quid ad haec respondeat quidam pro insipiente*, S I, 125-129; *Quid ad haec respondeat editor ipsius libelli*, S I, 130-139.

¹⁰ See S I, 3 (Index siglorum).

¹¹ See S I, 91 (Index siglorum) and the apparatus in S I, 93-122. Schmitt does not actually indicate how many different versions of the *Proslogion* should be postulated. Because the apparatus related to the earlier version(s) is entitled *priores recensiones* (in the plural), it would seem that there should be at least two earlier versions, but Schmitt makes no attempt to distinguish them. After Sharpe’s criticism, one is tempted to think that the use of the plural serves to hide from view some difficulties in Schmitt’s grounds for postulating the earlier version(s).

¹² See the apparatus at *Proslogion* 2, S I, 101-102 and *Proslogion* 25, S I, 118-120.

¹³ See S I, 3 (Index siglorum) and the apparatus in S I, 7-15. There are some minor changes later in the work as well.

¹⁴ See the apparatus at *Monologion* 1, S I, 13-15.

¹⁵ See the apparatus at *Monologion* 1, S I, 13.

and the list of chapters can already be found in the earlier recension, which is also the case for the letter of dedication addressed to Lanfranc. However, this letter is not included in most of the manuscripts representing the final version, even though it is included in T.¹⁶

Sharpe's criticism of Schmitt's account of the textual history of the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* is related to his general evaluation of Schmitt's editorial work. As far as Anselm's treatises are concerned, it seems that Sharpe does not see much to criticize in the main text of Schmitt's edition. However, the edition's "use of manuscript evidence leaves a great deal to be desired." Schmitt anticipated in the first volume of the edition that he would later publish a "Ratio editionis", but he never did that. As a replacement for it, a collection of Schmitt's previous articles was reprinted, with some new material, in the 1968 reprint of the edition, but this account is wanting. "There is no survey of the manuscript evidence, no explanation of [Schmitt's] choice of manuscripts, no attempt to understand their relationships," and so on. "Nor can the accuracy of [Schmitt's] reporting be trusted."¹⁷ One of the lessons to be learnt from Sharpe's article is that Anselm's works were first circulated as small booklets, and such booklets were often subsequently bound together into books.¹⁸ As a result, different parts of the same manuscript may be of different origin and date. Schmitt on some occasions failed to take this possibility into account, which led to errors about dating and provenance. Some cases of Schmitt's dating are tendentious guesses.¹⁹ After the discovery of an early version of Anselm's *Epistola de incarnatione verbi* in 1931, Schmitt was constantly on the watch for earlier recensions of Anselm's works. Possible signs of an earlier recension are the lack of preface and chapter headings as well as the use of early forms of the titles. Sharpe judges that Schmitt sometimes allowed an enthusiasm for earlier recensions to distort his understanding.²⁰ According to Sharpe, Anselm as a rule did not revise his works once they were completed. "[H]aving decided that a work was finished and published, Anselm, unlike some writers, let go of it."²¹ "[C]ontrary to the trend of Schmitt's thinking, nowhere among Anselm's writings is there clear-cut evidence that Anselm revised any work to a significant degree after it was finished and published."²² Sharpe is unwilling to acknowledge any "earlier recension" of Anselm's works, if an "earlier recension" means an earlier version put into public circulation by Anselm. The earlier versions that exist for some of Anselm's treatises are to be explained in other ways: they may be

¹⁶ *Epistola ad Lanfrancum archiepiscopum*, S I, 5-6; *Prologus*, S I, 7-8 (in the earlier recension, however, it was called "Pro(o)emium"); *Capitula*, S I, 9-12.

¹⁷ Sharpe, *Anselm as Author*, 7.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, e.g., 30-32.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, e.g., 23-24 and 30-33.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 24, 43-44 (note 110) and 60-61.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 65.

²² *Ibid.*, 43.

the result of surreptitious copying or of limited private copying with Anselm's permission.²³

Sharpe's criticism of Schmitt's editorial work is severe. Perhaps I should not express a general opinion here, as I do not work with manuscripts, but I do find most of what Sharpe says convincing. However, I also have some major doubts. It seems to me that Sharpe has not given a fair hearing to the putative earlier recensions of the *Monologion* and *Proslogion*. It also seems to me that there is strong evidence of Anselm revising both of these works in a significant way after their publication or, rather, that Anselm published these treatises twice. It is not possible to go into much detail here, but I will try to give a general idea of some of the main issues.

Sharpe makes some well-founded critical points about Schmitt's evidence for the different recensions of the *Monologion* and *Proslogion*. Most importantly, he points out that the group of manuscripts that Schmitt used as witnesses for the *priores recensiones* of the *Proslogion* "[does not] represent a distinct recension at all."²⁴ Sharpe offers no detailed discussion to substantiate this claim, and it is noteworthy that he speaks of an earlier recension (singular) and not of earlier recensions (plural). However, even a layman can agree that Sharpe is right about the main point: in no way can the different readings in Schmitt's apparatus (say, in Chapter 2 of the *Proslogion*) be explained in a sensible manner by postulating either one or more earlier recensions. It is at this juncture that Sharpe makes his remark about Schmitt allowing his understanding to be distorted,²⁵ and I cannot disagree. In addition, Sharpe offers convincing criticism of some cases of Schmitt's dating for the central manuscripts. Schmitt's early witness for the final version of the *Monologion* and *Proslogion*, the manuscript T, actually consists of four booklets that have been bound together. Schmitt's judgement of the early date of the manuscript is correct, but his dating to ca. 1085 is just a guess. The manuscript as a whole can derive from 1099 at the earliest, because Anselm's *Meditatio redemptionis humanae* is included in it. All four booklets appear to date "from the late eleventh or perhaps early twelfth century". Palaeographical arguments do not exclude the possibility that the booklet containing the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* could have derived from as early as the late 1080s, but we have no grounds for such an early dating.²⁶ As for Schmitt's main witness for the earlier recension of the *Monologion*, manuscript S, Sharpe again agrees that it is an early manuscript. However, Schmitt's dating of the manuscript, 1077-1082, is "a tendentious guess". In this case also, the manuscript consists of several booklets. Sharpe dates the booklet containing the copy of the *Monologion* to ca. 1080-1120.²⁷

²³ Ibid., e.g., 2, 21, 42-43 and 65.

²⁴ Ibid., 24.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid., 30-33.

²⁷ Ibid., 23.

One may at first get the impression that these points amount to a devastating criticism of Schmitt's construal of the textual history of the *Monologion* and *Proslogion*. However, this need not be the case. Even though Schmitt's apparatus for the *priores recensiones* turns out to be highly misleading, there is still a very real possibility that an earlier recension of the *Proslogion* did exist and that Schmitt was right about some of its central features. And even though Schmitt's datings for manuscripts such as T and S turn out to be narrow and somewhat biased, they are still important early witnesses, what Sharpe also admits. What is more, in various places Sharpe presents remarks that show that he is willing to follow Schmitt a long way.

Sharpe also holds that two different versions of both of Anselm's earliest treatises need to be distinguished. This becomes clear from the table "Chronology of Anselm's Works" that Sharpe provides as an appendix to his article.²⁸ In addition to listing Anselm's works in chronological order, Sharpe mentions early witnesses to many of the works. Three consecutive items in the list are as follows:

1077 – "Exemplum meditandi de ratione fidei" – BNF lat. 13413

1077-1078 – "Fides quaerens intellectum" – BL Harley 203

inorafter 1083–*Monologion, Proslogion* as published–Cambridge Trinity B. 1.37.

The list shows that Sharpe not only thinks that early versions of the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* did once exist, he also thinks that early witnesses to them have survived. The witness for early version of the *Monologion* is none other than Schmitt's manuscript S. The witness for early version of the *Proslogion* is Schmitt's manuscript H – a copy of the *Fides quaerens intellectum* that Schmitt dated to the end of the twelfth century but it is actually much earlier, from the first quarter of the century. This copy of the treatise consists of a mere devotional exercise and a title. In addition to the title *Fides quaerens intellectum*, another title "Prosologion" (*sic*) is added by other hand.²⁹ The list in the appendix reflects Sharpe's understanding of the main features of the publication history of these two treatises. The birth of the *Monologion* and the *Proslogion* "as published" took place in or after 1083; by implication, the earlier versions were not published. It is also interesting that Sharpe uses italics for the final titles of the treatises and quotation marks for the earlier titles. According to Sharpe, in Anselm's case giving a title to a treatise goes together with its publication. Because the earlier versions were not published, they cannot have titles *tout court* but at most "provisional titles". Sharpe lets us understand that the early versions of the treatises were circulated anonymously under provisional titles, and that Anselm strongly restricted their circulation before publication.³⁰

As Sharpe accepts Schmitt's manuscripts S and H as witnesses to the earlier versions of the *Monologion* and *Proslogion*, and he expresses no reservations about the trustworthiness of these witnesses, it seems that he is indeed willing

²⁸ See *ibid.*, 86-87.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 24 (note 62) and 28, and S I, 93 (Index siglorum).

³⁰ Sharpe, *Anselm as Author*, 17-20.

to follow Schmitt a long way. Regarding both the *Monologion* and the *Proslogion*, Sharpe seems to agree with Schmitt about what elements were included in their earlier version. (Such elements as the title, dedicatory letter, preface, chapter headings, and appendices are concerned.) As my projected interpretation of the *Proslogion* depends precisely on what elements were included in the different versions of the treatise, Sharpe's view on the earlier version of the *Proslogion* suits my purposes as well as Schmitt's. Actually, Sharpe's view suits me better, because it makes it unnecessary to toil to make sense of the incongruous readings in Schmitt's apparatus.

Even though I am satisfied with what Sharpe's article implies about the content of the earlier versions of the *Monologion* and *Proslogion*, I have several objections about how he describes the publication history of these treatises. Sharpe lets us understand that the early versions of the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* were circulated anonymously under provisional titles and that Anselm strongly restricted their circulation before the official publication in or after 1083. He also claims that the *Monologion* was "still untitled" when Anselm sent it to Abbot Rainaldus at an early stage.³¹ Starting from the last point, Anselm's letter to Rainaldus implies nothing concerning the title of the treatise.³² Sharpe's contention that it did not have a title is a tendentious guess. A more plausible guess would be that the treatise was entitled *Exemplum meditando de ratione fidei*, but we cannot claim it with certainty. The contention that the circulation of the early version of the *Proslogion* was restricted by Anselm is another guess. Anselm's letter to Rainaldus indeed suggests that he wanted to restrict the circulation of the *Monologion*, but in the case of this treatise there are particular reasons why Anselm might have wanted to act in that way: the *Monologion* is based on a bold, emphatically rational method and includes some disputable doctrinal formulations. None of these factors are operative in the case of the *Proslogion*'s early version, there is also no evidence for the restriction of its circulation. The contention that the treatises were circulated anonymously is, again, a guess as far as the *Proslogion* is concerned, whereas Anselm's authorship of the *Monologion* was clear from an early stage because he identified himself as the author in the letter of dedication addressed to Lanfranc.³³ As for the titles of the early versions, why should we think they were not meant to be permanent? The account provided by Anselm in the preface to the *Proslogion* is poor evidence: of course Anselm had to treat the old titles as provisional when he

³¹ Ibid.

³² *Ep.* 83, S III, 207-208. Anselm does not mention the title of the *opusculum* he sends, but there was no particular reason to mention it.

³³ *Epistola ad Lanfrancum archiepiscopum*, S. I, 5.4-5: "frater ANSELMUS Beccensis, vita peccator, habitu monachus." In the preface to the *Proslogion* (S I, 94.2-13), Anselm tells us that when he changed the titles of the treatises he also appended his name to the title, because he had been urged to do so by Archbishop Hugh and others. This invites the reader to infer, as Sharpe does, that the treatises were previously circulated anonymously. Yet the inference is not secure, because it does not take into account the other possible devices for conveying the name of the author.

was introducing new ones.³⁴ It could also be suggested that *Exemplum meditandi de ratione fidei* had a more provisional character whereas *Fides quaerens intellectum* was intended to be permanent. Also Sharpe's suggestion that the earlier versions of the treatises were not published in a real sense is a one-sided postulation. The preface and letter of dedication in *Exemplum meditandi de ratione fidei* clearly show that it is a published work; Anselm's attempt to affect the way in which it is circulated does not make it "unpublished". From the preface to the *Proslogion* one gains the impression that the original titles of these two treatises had been given in view of circulation beyond Anselm's immediate control. Both works had already been presented to the public.³⁵

Next, it is essential to comment on Sharpe's choice of Cambridge Trinity College B. 1. 37. as the early witness for the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* "as published". Sharpe introduces the third booklet in this manuscript as "what may in reality be the earliest extant manuscript of the *Proslogion*", and he argues, plausibly enough, for the dating of this booklet to ca. 1093.³⁶ In three other booklets that derive from the same period and "in no case later than the early twelfth century", there are other works of Anselm, including the *Monologion*.³⁷ A peculiar feature of the copy of the *Proslogion* in this manuscript is that it has the *Sumptum* as an appendix without the *Pro insipiente* and *Responsio*.³⁸ Sharpe finds this highly significant. On these grounds, he says that Anselm's exchange with Gaunilo may have taken place as late as the early 1090s.³⁹ Obviously, this is also a major reason why Sharpe does not take seriously the possibility that the booklet including the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* in Schmitt's manuscript T could derive from the 1080s.⁴⁰ If the exchange with Gaunilo has been given given a late dating, any manuscript containing the exchange cannot be very early. Although it is difficult to have certainty about this, I find Sharpe's reasoning highly problematic. I can see some point in copying the *Sumptum* separately, but I cannot see any point in copying it immediately after the main text of the *Proslogion* unless it is followed by the *Pro insipiente* and *Responsio*. Rather than seeing this as a very early copy of the final version, I would treat it as a case of defective copying. The mixed nature of the contents of the booklet supports this kind of verdict.⁴¹ Schmitt may be right in holding that T includes the earliest extant copies of the final versions of the *Monologion* and *Proslogion*.

³⁴ *Proslogion*, Prooemium, S I, 94.2-7.

³⁵ *Proslogion*, Prooemium, S I, 94.2-7. Anselm's instruction in the preface to the *Monologion* that those disseminating the work should ensure that the preface and the list of chapters also be copied (S I, 8.21-26) was already included in the early version of the treatise.

³⁶ Sharpe, *Anselm as Author*, 25-26 and 82.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 30.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 25 and 82.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 35.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 30-33.

⁴¹ See *ibid.*, 25.

Finally, let us return to Sharpe's assertion that Anselm was not in the habit of revising his works "to a significant degree" after they were published.⁴² One of the reasons why Sharpe does not see the changes in the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* as counter-evidence is that he tends to think that the early versions of these treatises were not "published" in a relevant sense. As we have seen, Sharpe's position is vulnerable to criticism at this point. However, it may also be that Sharpe is mainly thinking of certain kinds of revising. It appears that he does not consider such measures as adding of a preface or adding of a list of chapters to be revisions. This way of thinking can be justified in many cases, but it depends on the kind of work and the kind of addition. In what follows, we will examine more closely what kind of case the *Proslogion* offers. Regarding what is now Chapter 1 of the *Monologion*, Anselm made changes that Sharpe also should count as revisions, but Sharpe fails to comment on them and the degree of their significance.

3. The additions to the *Proslogion*

If Sharpe's early witness to the final version of the *Proslogion*, Cambridge Trinity College B. 1. 37., is discarded as a case of defective copying, the early manuscript tradition together with Anselm's account in the preface to the *Proslogion* gives grounds for thinking that the treatise was published twice, in two different versions. On the first occasion, ca. 1077-1078, Anselm published a devotional exercise under the title *Fides quaerens intellectum*. On the second occasion, in 1083 or after, Anselm published the final version of the treatise including the preface, the list of chapters and the main body of the text divided into twenty-six chapters as well as three appendices: the *Sumptum*, *Pro insipiente* and *Responsio*. For some time, the final version was entitled *Alloquium de ratione fidei* ("An Address on the Reason of Faith"), but Anselm then changed the title into *Proslogion*.⁴³ The early manuscript tradition testifies to these two versions of the *Proslogion*. No early manuscript has been identified that would include the preface and the list of chapters but no appendices, or that would include the appendices but no preface and list of chapters. (Cambridge Trinity College B. 1. 37. is exceptional in that it includes the preface, the list of chapters and one of the appendices, the *Sumptum*, but, as was said, it should probably be treated as a case of defective copying.⁴⁴)

In what follows, I will argue that the early manuscripts reflect the publication history of the *Proslogion* in a reliable manner and that the *Proslogion* was

⁴² *Ibid.*, 43.

⁴³ See *Ep.* 109, S III, 242.7-12. See also below.

⁴⁴ One could speculate, purely hypothetically, that Trinity College B. 1. 37. (or its exemplar) was surreptitiously copied at a point of time when Anselm was preparing to reply to the *Pro insipiente* and had ordered a new copy including the *Sumptum* to be made. In that case, B. 1. 37. would be a version that Anselm would not have intended for publication. If I understand Sharpe's intentions correctly, he would rather say that the *Sumptum* is not part of the exchange with Gaunilo but rather an independent appendix. Hence, it could have been added at the same time as the preface and the list of chapters.

published twice. However, some further argument is needed here, as there are possible complications. First, it is worth considering whether BL Harley 203 gives us a correct idea of the content of the early version. Assuming that this is the case, we should secondly consider whether all of the additions in the final version of the *Proslogion* were incorporated into it at the same time. Reflecting on the latter question is particularly important, because it is often assumed that there were not two, but three consecutively published versions of the *Proslogion*: first there was a devotional exercise with a title, then Anselm added the material at the beginning (preface and list of chapters), and in the third stage Anselm added the appendices at the end (the *Sumptum*, *Pro insipiente* and *Responsio*).⁴⁵ More complicated scenarios could also be presented because the preface and the list of chapters do not depend on each other, chapter numbers could have been introduced without chapter headings, the appendices could have been added before the material at the beginning, and the *Pro insipiente* and *Responsio* could have been added without the *Sumptum*. However, I agree with Sharpe in thinking that Anselm did not want to publish many consecutive different versions of the *Proslogion*. It is plausible to treat the material at the beginning as one item and the appendices at the end as another, with the question being: in what order did Anselm add these items to the *Proslogion*? Is it the case that the second published version of the *Proslogion* included the front matter, but not the appendices? Or is it so that it included both the front matter and the appendices? Or, should we rather say that the second version included only the appendices, and that the version with the front matter is actually the third published version of the *Proslogion*?

When I ask whether BL Harley 203 gives us a correct idea of the early version of the *Proslogion*, I mean the possibility of defective copying. As Sharpe points out, it was not always certain that front matter like prefaces and lists of chapters were copied along with the work. In the preface to the *Monologion*, Anselm specifically asks that the preface be copied before the list of chapters.⁴⁶ Could it be the case that the *Fides quaerens intellectum* originally included a preface and a list of chapters but that these were omitted when BL Harley 203 (or its exemplar) was copied? There is clearly no conclusive evidence for discarding this possibility altogether, but two arguments can be presented to diminish the (already low) probability of this supposition.⁴⁷ Firstly, we know that the preface included in the final version was not a part of the early version, because the last two paragraphs make it clear that they were written afterwards. If there was a preface, it was at least partly different. One could expect that traces of such an earlier preface would have survived. Schmitt was interested in earlier recensions, but he did not find any material related to an earlier preface, and as far as I know neither has anyone

⁴⁵ This was also my view until some years ago. Holopainen, *The Proslogion in Relation*, 601.

⁴⁶ See Sharpe, *Anselm as Author*, 17, and *Monologion*, Prologus, S I, 8.21-26.

⁴⁷ There are also some further grounds: Gaunilo's criticism includes no reference to the preface. If the first paragraph of the preface had already existed, it is likely that Gaunilo would have referred to the description of the single argument in some way.

else. Secondly, the *Fides quaerens intellectum* is a complete and meaningful whole even without the front matter, and it fits well with Anselm's first published works, which were prayers. If the collection of prayers that Anselm later published gives us any idea of what the early prayers looked like, they would consist of a title, like "Prayer to St Mary when the mind is weighed down with heaviness", and the actual text of the prayer divided into paragraphs.⁴⁸ It seems that prefaces and chapter headings did not belong to the genre, but that Anselm might often have made introductory remarks in a covering letter. In what follows, I assume that BL Harley 203 and the other witnesses give us a correct idea of what was included in the early version of the *Proslogion*.

Moving to the additions that Anselm made afterwards, one of the facts about the textual history of the *Proslogion* is that the appendices were not part of the first published version. Eadmer maintains that the criticism composed by someone, i.e. the *Pro insipiente*, was sent to Anselm by one of his friends. Anselm composed a reply, the *Responsio*, and ordered that both the *Pro insipiente* and *Responsio* be appended at the end of the work in further copies.⁴⁹ It is natural to assume that the *Sumptum* was added at the same time.⁵⁰ In some early twelfth-century manuscripts the author of the *Pro insipiente* has been identified as Gaunilo, a monk from Marmoutier.⁵¹ It has recently been suggested that Gaunilo need not have been a historical person at all, and that the *Pro insipiente* could have been composed in Anselm's own environment.⁵² But even if we suppose that both sides of the debate were fashioned in Anselm's own workshop, the idea of adding the "debate" probably occurred only afterwards. And even if it were part of Anselm's original plan, he surely would have first circulated the work without the appendices in order to create the necessary time span for making and receiving a response. Whatever the case may be, the appendices were not part of the first version of the *Proslogion*.

Neither Anselm nor Eadmer gives information when the exchange with Gaunilo took place and whether the addition of the appendices at the end was done before or after or simultaneously with the addition of the front matter. Formally, the front matter and the appendices do not presuppose each other. In the appendices, there are no direct references to the preface. Further, there are no references to chapter numbering or chapter headings, and none to the *Monologion*. The appendices do not formally assume acquaintance with anything more of Anselm's work than the body of the text in the *Proslogion* itself. On the other hand, there is no reference to the appendices in the preface or in the list of chapters. If Anselm gave an order that the *Pro insipiente* and *Responsio* should be appended

⁴⁸ *Oratio* 6, *Oratio ad sanctam MARIAM cum mens est sollicita timore*, S III, 15-17.

⁴⁹ Eadmer, *The Life of St Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury (Vita Anselmi)*, I, 19, ed. and tr. R. W. Southern (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 31.

⁵⁰ If the *Sumptum* was already added before the exchange with Gaunilo, as Sharpe appears to believe, it was nevertheless not part of the early version.

⁵¹ See, e.g., Sharpe, *Anselm as Author*, 34.

⁵² See Ian Logan, *Reading Anselm's Proslogion: The History of Anselm's Argument and its Significance Today* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 116. Cf. Holopainen, *The Proslogion in Relation*, 601.

to the copies of the work, the most likely place where one would expect to find that order would be in the preface, but it is not there – nor anywhere else in Anselm’s oeuvre. As far as formal references are concerned, it is possible that the appendices were added before the front matter, but it is also possible that they were added later or at the same time.

Even though the front matter and the appendices do not formally presuppose each other, there are some interesting internal connections between them. One of the main points in the preface is the announcement of the single argument which Anselm had discovered. He explains that after having completed the *Monologion*, he made the observation that it consisted of an interconnected chain of many arguments, and it occurred to him to ask:

whether perhaps a single argument could be found which would require no other [argument] than itself for proving itself and which would suffice by itself to demonstrate that God truly exists and that He is the Supreme Good (needing no one else, yet needed by all else in order to exist and to fare well) and whatever we believe about the Divine Substance.⁵³

Anselm describes the difficult quest for an argument that would meet this description. When he eventually found it, he composed the work that follows the preface to share the joy brought by this argument. The account is well known, and the readers of the *Proslogion* often assume that they understand what Anselm says. However, the description of the single argument is more opaque than commentators usually realize. Anselm claims that he has found a super-argument which proves not only God’s existence but also everything that Christians believe about the Divine Substance. The claim about proving God’s existence is obviously related to Chapters 2-4 of the work, but what about the other believed statements that the single argument should prove? If this is a reference to *Proslogion* 5-26 (or 5-23), are there grounds for saying that “whatever we believe” about the Divine Substance is proved there, and that it is all done with a “single argument”? And what does Anselm mean when he states that the single argument “require[s] no other [argument] than itself for proving itself”? Commentators often prefer to gloss over this statement. Studying the main body of the *Proslogion* does not give us much help: no mention is made of a “single argument”, the expression “whatever we believe about the Divine Substance” is not used, and there is no explanation of how an argument can be used for “proving itself”. In the *Responsio*, however, Anselm offers explanations of these issues. The term “single argument” is not used there either, but *Responsio* 10 explains how the expression “whatever we believe about the Divine Substance” should be construed and how the phrase “that than which a greater cannot be thought” can serve as a means in proving everything that the single argument should prove:

⁵³ *Proslogion*, Prooemium, S I, 95.6-10: “... si forte posset inveniri unum argumentum, quod nullo alio ad se probandum quam se solo indigeret, et solum ad astruendum quia deus vere est, et quia est summum bonum nullo alio indigens, et quo omnia indigent ut sint et ut bene sint, et quaecumque de divina credimus substantia, sufficeret.”

For the signification of this utterance [viz., “something than which a greater cannot be thought”] contains so much force that what is spoken of is, by the very fact that it is understood or thought, necessarily proved to exist in reality and to be whatever ought to be believed about the Divine Substance. For we believe about the Divine Substance whatever can in every respect be thought of as better [for something] to be than not to be. For example, it is better to be eternal than not to be eternal, better to be good than not to be good – or, rather, to be goodness itself than not to be goodness itself. But that than which something greater cannot be thought cannot fail to be anything of this kind. Therefore, it is necessarily the case that that than which a greater cannot be thought is whatever ought to be believed about the Divine Being.⁵⁴

The importance of this passage as a key to interpreting the argument in the *Proslogion* has been widely recognized in recent scholarship, but there are different views of its implications. In contrast, the passage where Anselm explains how an “argument” can “prove itself”, in *Responsio* 5, has received almost no attention.⁵⁵

Anselm, then, offers an interesting but opaque description of the single argument in the preface, and in the *Responsio* he, as if inadvertently, gives explanations of the opaque formulations that he had used in the preface. Did all this take place by happenstance, or should we see some design here? For my own part, I am convinced that much of it was intended by Anselm, but I also think that he had good luck that a monk from Marmoutier wrote a criticism. From the point of view of understanding Anselm’s single argument, the preface and the *Responsio* complement each other in a crucial manner. Given that the single argument is a very central feature in the *Proslogion*, this constitutes a strong grounds for holding that the preface and the *Responsio* were added at the same time, there being no notable evidence to the contrary.

The remarks related to the single argument are also important when judging whether Anselm revised the *Proslogion* “to a significant degree” between the early version and the final version. Of course, Anselm’s single argument was already present also in the early version. However, at this stage the audience had no clue that it should pay attention to a single argument. The announcement of the single argument in the preface, supported by the explanations in the *Responsio*, is an important piece of new information that should considerably affect the way in which the main text in the work is read. In the case of the *Proslogion*, the addition

⁵⁴ *Responsio* 10, S I, 138.30-139.8: “Tantum enim vim huius prolationis in se continet significatio, ut hoc ipsum quod dicitur, ex necessitate eo ipso quod intelligitur vel cogitatur, et revera probetur existere, et id ipsum esse quidquid de divina substantia oportet credere. Credimus namque de divina substantia quidquid absolute cogitari potest melius esse quam non esse. Verbi gratia: melius est esse aeternum quam non aeternum, bonum quam non bonum, immo bonitatem ipsam quam non ipsam bonitatem. Nihil autem huiusmodi non esse potest, quo maius aliquid cogitari non potest. Necessae igitur est quo maius cogitari non potest esse, quidquid de divina essentia credi oportet.” English translation from the *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, tr. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis: Banning Press, 2000), 130-131.

⁵⁵ For the significance of *Responsio* 5, see Holopainen, *Anselm’s Argumentum*, 23-29.

of the preface and the appendices is not a trivial thing, as it serves to provide an interpretational key not available in the main text. We shall later return to some other differences between the early version and the final version.

The starting point for the present discussion of the additions to the *Proslogion* was the observation that the manuscript tradition gives evidence of two published versions of the *Proslogion*, namely, a devotional exercise with the title *Fides quaerens intellectum*, and the final version with the preface, the list of chapters, and the appendices at the end. I have tried to argue that the manuscript tradition reflects the publication history of the *Proslogion* in a reliable way and that the *Proslogion* was published only twice, not three times or more. As soon as the preface appeared, there was also the exchange with Gaunilo. If my argument is sound, the exchange with Gaunilo and the publication of the final version can be dated to no later than ca. 1083-1085. This dating is based on Anselm's two letters to Hugh, Archbishop of Lyon.⁵⁶ Together with the first letter, Anselm sends two of his works without mentioning their titles. In the second letter, it is mentioned that the works are the *Monologion* and the *Proslogion*. Anselm sent this letter at a point in time when he had just coined these titles; the copies sent to Hugh turn out to be entitled *Monoloquium de ratione fidei* and *Alloquium de ratione fidei*. Anselm asks Hugh to change the titles and correct the relevant passage in the preface to the *Proslogion*.⁵⁷ This shows that the preface was in existence. The date ca. 1085 can serve as a *terminus ad quem*, because Anselm indicates that he had not yet written other works and it would be difficult to move the date of the composition of *De veritate* and *De libertate arbitrii* to much after 1085.⁵⁸ As no copies of the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* with the titles *Monoloquium de ratione fidei* and *Alloquium de ratione fidei* have survived, it is probable that Anselm used these titles only for a very short time. Schmitt appears to have been right in claiming that the development of the *Proslogion* had come to an end by ca. 1085. It is possible that the booklet containing the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* in the manuscript T derives from roughly this time, as Schmitt believed, but it may also be somewhat later.

4. A probable story

To provide an explanation of why the publication history of the *Proslogion* is important for an interpretation of the treatise, I will end the paper by offering a sketch that relates the historical context with Anselm's objectives during the two phases of the treatise's publication. Many broad issues are involved, and it is in the nature of these matters that at many points only a probable story can be told. As intimated, my view is that Anselm's main objective in the publication of the *Proslogion* was to defend and justify the rational method that he had used in his first treatise, the *Monologion*. For a proper idea of the historical context

⁵⁶ *Ep.* 100 and *Ep.* 109.

⁵⁷ *Ep.* 109, S III, 242.7-12.

⁵⁸ See also Sharpe, *Anselm as Author*, 17-18 and 20.

we need to go a bit further back, to the treatise *De corpore et sanguine domini* (ca. 1063, hereinafter *De corpore*), attributed to Lanfranc, as well as to the relationship between Anselm and him.

There are fundamental mistakes in the standard accounts regarding the question what kind of treatise *De corpore* is and how the relationship between Anselm and Lanfranc should be understood at different stages. It is customary to think that Lanfranc was an eminent dialectician who made a groundbreaking attempt to apply logical notions to theological analysis and that he therefore exerted a major influence on his foremost pupil, Anselm, even though he was not prepared to engage in rationally oriented speculation as strongly as Anselm. The treatise *De corpore* has served as a cornerstone for the appreciative evaluation of Lanfranc and his contribution.⁵⁹ However, this account is based on a whole series of misperceptions. It is highly questionable whether the relationship between Lanfranc and Anselm should at all be conceived as that of a teacher and a pupil. Anselm had received a thorough education elsewhere before he arrived at Lanfranc's school at the Abbey of Bec and started serving there as Lanfranc's associate. It is also questionable whether the attribution of *De corpore* to Lanfranc is justified, even though he undoubtedly was the one who published the treatise. Namely, there is a very real possibility that Anselm, Lanfranc's highly talented workmate, was heavily involved in its composition. Thirdly, and for our present purposes it is the most important issue, *De corpore* is not a kind of work that it is assumed to be. It is actually a cleverly constructed rhetorical attack against Berengar of Tours, and it is rhetorical to such an extent that it is doubtful whether it should be seen as a serious theological contribution at all. "Lanfranc" uses rhetorical devices to mislead the audience about various kinds of issues, including the historical facts, the views of his opponent, and the interpretation of the authoritative writings.⁶⁰ All examples of the logical argument analysis in *De corpore* turn out to be sophistic.⁶¹ For understanding of the background of the *Proslogion*, the important aspects in *De corpore* are its attitudes toward the rational analysis of faith and the use of authoritative writings in theological argumentation. Even though more detailed and more balanced formulations are also evident, the general tenor of the treatise regarding these matters is that applying reason in matters of faith is irreverent and potentially leading to heresy, whereas relying on authoritative writings is orthodox

⁵⁹ Views of this nature have been maintained in the Anglophone scholarship above all by the highly influential studies of Sir Richard Southern. R. W. Southern, *Lanfranc of Bec and Berengar of Tours*, in R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin and R. W. Southern (eds.), *Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), 27-48; idem, *Saint Anselm and his Biographer: A Study of Monastic Life and Thought 1059–c. 1130* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 12-26; idem, *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 14-32, 39-59.

⁶⁰ Toivo J. Holopainen, 'Lanfranc of Bec' and Berengar of Tours, in D. Bates (ed.), *Anglo-Norman Studies 34. Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2011* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012), 105-121. See also idem, *Logic and Theology*, 4-11, and idem, *The Proslogion in Relation*, 598-600.

⁶¹ Holopainen, *Dialectic*, 59-67.

and pious.⁶² *De corpore* is a highly persuasive rhetorical treatise and would obviously influence attitudes with respect to the faith and reason issue at the Abbey of Bec in the 1060s and 1070s.

Anselm's method in the *Monologion* is exactly opposite to what *De corpore* recommends. Anselm self-consciously bases his argument in this work on reason alone, and even though a Christian reader will at many points recognize allusions to familiar texts, he systematically avoids referring or appealing to any authoritative writings in the course of his presentation.⁶³ Arguing "by reason alone", Anselm seeks to establish a major fragment of the Christian beliefs, including views about the nature of the divine essence, the Trinity and creation.⁶⁴ Still using the same method, Anselm examines what the relation of rational creatures to the supreme being should be, and how the eternal destiny of rational creatures, in particular human beings, depends on whether they act as they should.⁶⁵ The intentions of the *Monologion* are highly consonant with monastic purposes. From one point of view, the aim of the exercise is to show that dedicating one's life to striving toward the triune God is the only rational choice, and that it can be shown to be the only rational choice even without appealing to the authoritative writings of Christianity. For obvious reasons, however, Anselm was worried about the reception of this work.

As is well known, Anselm sent the manuscript of the work to Lanfranc, already then Archbishop of Canterbury, for examination and approval. He also asked Lanfranc to give the work a title.⁶⁶ The following episode and its consequences are another topic in which there are misunderstandings. Some points are clear. Lanfranc did not give his immediate approval to the work, and he suggested that Anselm should at some point strengthen his presentation by adding references to the authoritative writings. Anselm, for his part, declined to make such amendments.⁶⁷ But what happened after that? It is often assumed that the negotiations between Anselm and Lanfranc ended in an impasse, Anselm published the treatise without Lanfranc's consent, and this had unfavourable effects on their future relations. There are two reasons for rejecting this account as a misperception. First, the idea that the negotiations ended in an impasse rests on the groundless assumption that the course of events is exhaustively documented in the letters that have survived. This is not confirmed. In fact, Anselm's last letter concerning this topic reveals that both he and Lanfranc hoped for an opportunity to discuss the matter face-to-face.⁶⁸ Second, Anselm would soon circulate the treatise with a letter

⁶² Holopainen, *Logic and Theology*, 8-9, and idem, *The Proslogion in Relation*, 598-600.

⁶³ Anselm explains the method in *Monologion*, Prologus, S I, 7.5-11. See also *Monologion* 1, S I, 13.5-11.

⁶⁴ *Monologion* 1-63, S I, 13-74.

⁶⁵ *Monologion* 66-78, S I, 77-85.

⁶⁶ *Ep.* 72, S III, 193-194.

⁶⁷ Lanfranc's letter to Anselm has not come down to us, but its content can be inferred from Anselm's reply, *Ep.* 77, S III, 199-200.

⁶⁸ *Ep.* 77, S III, 200.33-36.

of dedication addressed to Lanfranc at its head. Because the existence of such a letter would normally imply that the person addressed would have sanctioned the work, it is hardly conceivable that Anselm would use such a letter if he knew that the work had not been approved by Lanfranc.

A more probably story is as follows. Anselm and Lanfranc did indeed meet and discuss the way this treatise should be published. In the autumn of 1077, Lanfranc conveniently sojourned in Normandy for several weeks and visited the Abbey of Bec at least twice.⁶⁹ He shared Anselm's concern about the reception of the treatise, and together they tried to find ways to soften the impact of the rational method used in this treatise. As a result, Anselm added to the treatise three new elements in which different kinds of rhetorical devices were used to mould the way in which the treatise and its author would be seen, namely, the letter of dedication, the preface, and the title *Exemplum meditandi de ratione fidei*. The letter of dedication makes it clear that Anselm is a great admirer of Lanfranc and a reasonable man who readily accepts criticism.⁷⁰ The preface, among other things, makes Anselm's fellow monks responsible for the rational method, and the positive reception of the work by these devout men is a precedent for how any future reader should react.⁷¹ On the other hand, Anselm establishes to the potential critics of this treatise the formidable requirement that they should be well-versed in Augustine's *De trinitate*.⁷² Both the preface and the title insinuate that the treatise should be seen as belonging to the genre of meditation.⁷³ The expression *ratio fidei* in the title, is by itself a contribution to the faith and reason issue. When texts such as *De corpore* might easily suggest that reason (*ratio*) and faith (*fides*) are strongly opposed to each other, the expression *ratio fidei* proposes that this need not be the case, because there is "reason of faith" or "reason in faith", an internal intelligibility of the content of faith (or the object of faith) that is, at least to some extent, open to rational analysis. With these additional elements, Anselm allowed his brainchild to have limited circulation.

Anselm wanted to do more to justify his rational approach and to counteract the general attitudes that *De corpore* shaped, by offering an appealing alternative. In principle, the alternative was already there in the *Monologion*, but this treatise was too academic and too difficult for the audience of *De corpore*, and it contained offending features. Anselm would have to introduce his rational method in a more attractive context and format. The argumentation in the *Monologion* was presented from the viewpoint of a person not yet knowing the Christian truth, and some readers might find this viewpoint awkward. Anselm would have to offer a text in which the perspective is pronouncedly Christian. The unembellished and arid

⁶⁹ H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc: Scholar, Monk, and Archbishop* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 207, 211. See also Holopainen, *The Proslogion in Relation*, 599-600 and 602.

⁷⁰ *Epistola ad Lanfrancum archiepiscopum*, S I, 5-6.

⁷¹ *Monologion*, Prologus, S I, 7.2-12 and 8.5-7.

⁷² *Ibid.*, S I, 8.8-14.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, S I, 7.2-7. Previously, in *Ep.* 77 (S III, 199.18), Anselm referred to it as a "*disputatio*", not a "*meditatio*".

mode of presentation in the *Monologion* speaks mainly to the intellect of the reader. The new text should speak to the heart of the reader as well, and should be at least as persuasive rhetorically as *De corpore*. The *Monologion* had done nothing to motivate a quest for rational arguments supporting the Christian view. The new text should provide a justification for that quest, and it should be a pious one. The *Monologion* is a lengthy treatise, and the reconstruction of the Christian view in it is produced in a complex concatenation of many different arguments. The new text should be much shorter and be based on fewer arguments.

Anselm began to look for a single argument through which both God's existence and everything that Christians believe about the Divine Essence could be proved. At the same time, he started working on a text in the form of a prayer, a devotional exercise, which would provide a pious justification of the quest for rational arguments. The latter task went well, whereas finding a single argument that would satisfy him proved more difficult. In the end, he found what he was looking for, and it did not then take long to finish the work.

Even though Anselm had composed the new text in view of facilitating a broader circulation of the *Monologion*, he first published it independently with the suggestive title *Fides quaerens intellectum*. The circulation of the first treatise still was limited, whereas the new text was allowed to spread freely. The devotional exercise in the new text advertises understanding as a suitable goal for Christian believers in the present life. Even though the word "contemplation" is not used in this exercise, its main theme is the contemplation of God.⁷⁴ The ultimate end of human existence is the contemplation of God "as He is" in the life to come. This kind of contemplation is not yet possible in our earthly existence, but it is possible to move towards it, and one way of doing so is to engage in a more modest kind of contemplation, namely, the contemplation of truths about God by seeking to understand what is believed about him.⁷⁵ Anselm let the new text have its effect for some time. From the beginning, it was Anselm's intention to republish the text later in another format, but there is no way of knowing how precise his plans about this were. If Gaunilo was a real person acting independently of Anselm, his intervention caused a change in Anselm's plans.

At a second stage, Anselm published the *Monologion* and *Proslogion* in their final form as a pair of works. By juxtaposing these two treatises, Anselm makes both of them appear in a new perspective. The titles *Monoloquium de ratione fidei* and *Alloquium de ratione fidei*, and later *Monologion* and *Proslogion*, suggest that the main difference between these treatises is in the mode of presentation; the underlying methodology is the same. The careful juxtaposition of these treatises in the preface to the latter makes the same point. As a result, the reader is encouraged

⁷⁴ There are two important references to "contemplation" in the final version: *Proslogion*, Prooemium, S I, 93.21-94.2: "...sub persona conantis erigere mentem suam ad contemplandum deum et quaerentis intelligere quod credit, subditum scripsi opusculum" and *Proslogion*, Capitula, S I, 95.2: "I. Excitatio mentis ad contemplandum deum." (i.e., the heading of Chapter 1).

⁷⁵ See Holopainen, *Anselm's Proslogion as an Attempt*, and idem, *The Proslogion in Relation*, 595-597.

to see also the *Monologion* as an expression of faith seeking understanding, and, indeed, this is consonant with Anselm's intentions when first publishing the treatise. On the other hand, the *Proslogion* in its final form gently helps the reader to appreciate that uncovering and presenting rational arguments is the core of what Anselm means by "faith seeking understanding". The devotional exercise in the main body of the *Proslogion* says little about what reason's role in the search of understanding is, but Anselm does indicate that the functioning of reason is based on divine illumination.⁷⁶ In the preface, Anselm draws the reader's attention to the fact that a single argument lies at the core of the *Proslogion*. The exchange with Gaunilo serves to underline the rational character of the arguments in the treatise, and Anselm provides pieces of information that make it possible to identify the single argument. However, he lets much depend on the reader's diligence and acumen. As a devotional exercise, the *Proslogion* is meant to be read repeatedly, and readers' understanding of what faith seeking understanding consists in is supposed to grow along with their understanding of the considered theological subject matter.

Słowa kluczowe: Anselm z Canterbury, Proslogion, Monologion, wiara i rozum, manuskrypty

Keywords: Anselm of Canterbury, Proslogion, Monologion, faith and reason, manuscripts

⁷⁶ *Proslogion* 14, S I, 111-112.