St. Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109 AD): His Contributions to the Intellectual Developments on Medieval Scholasticism

Hendra Thamrindinata
Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia;
PhD Student at Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Belgium

Correspondence email: hendra.thamrindinata@uph.edu

Abstract

Medieval scholasticism, considering its perennial influence for six centuries in the European universities, is an important intellectual power that deserves to be taken into account. In order to obtain a clearer picture of medieval scholasticism, it is necessary to have a precise understanding on the contributions of early medieval scholastic theologians who have laid the foundation for its subsequent developments. Therefore, this article will elaborate the thought of St. Anselm of Canterbury by analyzing his relevant works conceptually, discovering aspects of his thought which are foundational and significant for the subsequent intellectual developments of medieval scholasticism, exposing these aspects in detail, and tracing their influences on later theologians or periods. This elaboration finds four aspects of his thought and will expose it in detail: his view on faith seeking understanding, on teaching methodology, on the doctrine of satisfaction, and on the necessity of incarnation and satisfaction. The detailed exposition of these four aspects will substantiate the title conferred on him by Ulrich G. Leinsle as "the father of scholasticism."

Keywords: Medieval, scholasticism, faith, reason, satisfaction, absolute necessity, hypothetical necessity

Introduction

The Middle Ages is an important period in the history of Christian thought both in terms of its intellectual developments and the impacts of these developments on the subsequent periods in the church history. The most significant of these developments are the establishment of the first universities in the world such as Bologna, Paris, Oxford, Cambridge, and Heidelberg, and the flowering of the scientific studies of theology in the universities known as scholasticism in which the relationship between faith and reason are clarified, the methods of theological inquiry based on the confluence of logical and linguistic analyses are discovered and sophisticated, and the main doctrines of Christian faith are elaborated systematically.[1]

---

[1] Following the new revisionist scholarship on post-reformation scholasticism pioneered by, *inter allia*, Richard A. Muller in Richard A. Muller, "The Problem of Protestant Scholasticism," in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, ed. Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001),

Concerning medieval scholasticism in particular, there are tendencies in the older scholarship to ignore its intellectual impacts for the subsequent centuries by giving, for example, a little space to it in the course of general introductions to the history of philosophy, by emphasizing its breakdown in the dawn of Enlightenment, or by discussing only one or two of its well-known figures such as Thomas Aquinas or Duns Scotus. Nevertheless, recent scholarship has shown the indispensability of medieval scholasticism for understanding not only Christian thought in particular but also European thought as a whole since scholasticism is an intellectual power which occupies and dominates European universities for six centuries from 1200 to 1800, from the early Middle Ages to the early modern era.[2]

The foundation of medieval scholasticism had been laid since the fourth century by St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430) in his thought on the relation between *auctoritas* and *ratio* in which *auctoritas*, as an act of divine grace, demands faith while prepares human for *ratio*,[3] on the interpretation of Scripture as the basis for theological studies and the principal way by which theology is carried on as science, and on the program of theological education laid down in his famous *De doctrina christiana* in which theology is aimed at begetting, nourishing, defending, and strengthening the faith while the Graeco-Roman Liberal Arts education which formerly functions propaedeutically for philosophy, now is utilized as a preparation for understanding Scripture.[4] On this account, his influences are tremendous for the medieval scholasticism. The medieval scholastic theologians conferred their respect to him as the dignified *doctor ecclesiae*, they made continual references to his writings in their academic disputations, and the *magistri* of the early and high scholasticism established their theological views upon his foundation.[5]

However, in a mutually complementary way each of these theologians to a lesser or greater extent have contributed as well to the initialization, development, and enrichment of scholasticism with their own peculiarities, especially the ones from the early phase of medieval scholasticism. The prominent among these are Duns Scotus Eriugena (d. ca. 880)

---

53 and his *magnum opus* Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725*, 2nd ed., IV vols., (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003); Ulrich G. Leinsle in Ulrich G. Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, trans. Michael J. Miller (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010), 9; and Willem J. van Asselt et al in Willem J. van Asselt et al, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, trans. Albert Gootjes (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011), 6-8, this article views scholasticism as an academic "method which is characterized, both on the level of research and on the level of teaching, by the use of an ever recurring system of concepts, distinctions, definitions, propositional analyses, argumentational techniques, and disputational methods" practiced in the medieval and early modern universities rather than as a certain theology or philosophy (a definition by Lambertus M. De Rijk, a medieval scholar, quoted from his work *Middeleeuwse wijsbegeerte* in Van Asselt et al, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, 7).

[2] Antonie Vos, "Scholasticism and Reformation," in *Reformation and Scholasticism*, ed. van Asselt et al,99-104.

[3] "*Auctoritas fidem flagitat et ratione pareparat hominem*," quoted from Leinsle, *Introduction*, 21.

[4] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 20-28.

[5] Van Asselt et al in Van Asselt et al, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, 64 divide the middle ages into three periods based on the utilization of scholastic method in the medieval universities: early scholasticism which extends from eleventh to twelfth century, high scholasticism from thirteenth to fourteenth, and late scholasticism from fourteenth to fifteenth.

who is famous for his four steps scientific method of division, definition, proof, and recapitulation aimed at casting aside all possible contradictions in theological truth, Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) for his view on the relation between faith and reason in his adagium *fides quarens intellectum*, Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1141) for his emphasis on theology as wisdom and way of life, Peter Abelard (1079-1142) for his conception of theology as argumentative, linguistic, and logical examination of authoritative texts, Gilbert of Porreta (d. 1154) for this metaphysical grammar of discourse about God, and Peter Lombard (d. 1160) for his *Quatuor libri sententiarum*.[6] Having a precise understanding of the contributions of these early scholastic theologians will enable us to have a clearer picture on the intellectual developments of medieval scholasticism.

In this article, I will choose one of these early medieval scholastic theologians and will elaborate certain aspects of his thought. The question which will be answered in this elaboration: how foundational and significant are these aspects for the subsequent developments of medieval scholasticism? I will analyse his relevant works conceptually, discover aspects of his thought which are foundational and significant, expose these aspects in detail, and trace their influences on later theologians or periods. Although it is difficult to cull a flower among the most beautiful ones, yet upon a consideration of their lives and works, St. Anselm of Canterbury to a significant degree can be considered as having the prominence. Having analysed his relevant works, I find four aspects of his thought which are foundational and significant for the subsequent developments of scholasticism. Therefore, I will expose these four aspects in detail. I will begin by narrating briefly Anselm's life and important works for providing a context for my exposition. Then, the four significant aspects of his thought will be exposed in detail including the traces of their respective influences on later theologians or periods. Lastly, a conclusion will be given. The flow of this exposition will eventually show that the title conferred on him by Leinsle as the "Father of Scholasticism," is not without substance.[7]

The Life and Works of St. Anselm of Cantebury and His Influences

Anselm was born in 1033 in Aosta (part of today's Italy).[8] After his mother's death, he travelled to France and initiated himself into the Benedictine monastery at Le Bec in 1056 at the age of 26 and to be a monk a year later.[9] Then, he submerged himself into the study of Scripture and theology under the tutelage of Lanfranc of Pavia who in Leinsle's estimation is "the most important logician of his day"[10] and into an intense monastic spirituality. He has a noble character and peaceable attitude toward friends and foes, but also assertive on true principles.[11]

---

[6] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 74-102.

[7] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 79.

[8] Jasper Hopkins, "Anselm of Canterbury," in *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, eds. Jorge J.E. Gracia and Timothy B. Noone (United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2002), 138.

[9] Hopkins, "Anselm of Canterbury," 138.

[10] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 79.

[11] G.R. Evans, "Anselm's Life, Works, and Immediate Influence," in *the Cambridge Companion to Anselm*, eds. Brian Davies and Brian Leftow (Cambridge, England: Cambridge Universtity Press, 2004), 9-10.

In 1063, he was elected by his fellow monks to replace Lanfranc as Prior of Bec and in 1078 as abbot.[12] In his period of abbacy, he discharged his duty faithfully in teaching the monks of Bec by developing their mind and soul until they resembled philosophers.[13] Because of his love of learning and peculiar style of teaching that emphasized the analytical reasoning process through question-centered approach, during his fifteen years of abbacy, he has drawn more than one hundred and eighty monks to Bec.[14] Some of them will later deeply cultivate and widely spread his thought. After 10 years of teaching and study, he started to write. His total writings included 11 treatises or dialogues, three meditations, nineteen prayers, and 374 letters.[15] Among these writings, the important and impactful ones for future generation are *Monologion*, a work on the meditation of the divine being which was more philosophical; *Proslogion* that contained his famous ontological argument written in a unique style of prayer; *Cur Deus homo* which was very influential in the Middle Ages wherein he proposed a new theory of satisfaction; *Epistola de incanatione verbi* that contained his most careful elaboration on the relation between faith and reason;[16] and his four short treatises *De grammatico*, *De veritate*, *De libertate arbitrii*, and *De casu diaboli* which took a form of dialogue between a teacher and his student and was utilized in training his students in the techniques of intellectual inquiry.[17] Two features marked all these works: first, they were an implementation of his *Monologion* principle of *sola ratione*,[18] which was an effort of seeking truth by reasoning apart from Scriptural authority[19] and second, their extreme vigilant composition.[20] These features were responsible for the lasting influences of these writings.

Fifteenth years later (1093), Anselm was elected as the Archbishop of Canterbury. During this archbishopric period, he encountered the world in a wider extent though at the expense of his academic tranquility that he has cultivated for so long a time in Bec and during this period too, because of his assertive attitude in holding the principle of *rectus ordo* in the case of investiture of Archbishop office and his loyalty to Pope Urban II,[21] he clashed with the Kings of England and took twice exile to Rome. In the period of his first exile, he wrote two important treatises *Cur Deus homo* and, on the request of the Pope for the purpose of rebutting the Greek church related to *Filioque* controversy, *De processione spiritus sancti* that he would finish four years later.[22] After his last exile (1103), he returned to England in 1106 and

---

[12] Hopkins, "Anselm," 138.

[13] Evans, "Anselm," 11.

[14] K.M. Staley, '*Exemplum Meditandi*: Anselm's Model for Christian Learning," in *Faith Seeking Understanding: Learning and the Catholic Tradition*, ed. George C. Berthold (Manchester, New Hampshire: Saint Anselm College Press, 1991), 207.

[15] Hopkins, "Anselm," 138.

[16] Staley, '*Exemplum*," 212.

[17] Marilyn McCord Adams, "Anselm on Faith and Reason," in *the Cambridge Companion to Anselm*, eds. Brian Davies and Brian Leftow (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 3.

[18] Hopkins, "Anselm," 140.

[19] S.N. Deane, trans., *Saint Anselm: Basic Writings* (La Salle, Illinois: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1962), 35.

[20] Evans, "Anselm," 11.

[21] Evans, "Anselm," 19.

[22] Evans, "Anselm," 21-22.

reconciled with the King, Henry I. He died a peaceful death on April 21st, 1109 and buried in Canterbury Cathedral.[23]

According to G.R. Evans, Anselm's influences in his time and in a period after his death are more in his popular spiritual and devotional writings rather than on his theological-philosophical ones due, perhaps, to their profundity and impracticality for quoting.[24] However, his philosophical-theological ideas can be traced in the thoughts of later important medieval thinkers: Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1141), Peter Abelard (1079-1142), William of Auxerre (d. 1231), Alexander of Hales (d. 1245), Henry of Ghent (ca. 1217-1293), and Duns Scotus (1266-1308).[25] Among his contributions, there were four areas that I considered as foundational and significant for the subsequent developments of scholasticism in medieval and early modern scholasticism: his principle of faith seeking understanding, his teaching methodology, his doctrine of satisfaction, and his thought on the necessity of incarnation and satisfaction.

Faith Seeking Understanding

Anselm's *fides quarens intellectum* is what causes him to be called the "Father of Scholasticism."[26] In my opinion, this is reasonable. Anselm's own words on this principle is stated in *Proslogium*, chapter 1:

> I do not endeavor, O Lord, to penetrate thy sublimity, for in no wise do I compare my understanding with that; but I long to understand in some degree thy truth which my heart believes and loves. For I do not seek to understand that I may believe, but I believe in order to understand. For this also I believe… that unless I believed, I should not understand. (Anselm, Proslogium, chapter 1) [27]

Actually, Augustine has mentioned the similar principle in his *Homilies on the Gospel of John*, *Tract. XXIX.6*:

> To the same purpose what the Lord here also added as He went on—"If any man is willing to do His will, he shall know concerning the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from myself." What is the meaning of this, "If any man be willing to do His will"? But I had said, if any man believe; I gave this counsel: If thou hast not understood, said I, believe. For understanding is the reward of faith. Therefore do not seek to understand in order to believe, but believe that thou mayest understand; since, "except ye believe, ye shall not understand". (St. Augustine, Tractates on the Gospel according to John XXIX.6) [28]

---

[23] Hopkins, "Anselm," 139.

[24] Evans, "Anselm, 24-25.

[25] Evans, "Anselm, 26-28.

[26] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 79.

[27] Deane, *Saint. Anselm*, 6-7.

[28] St. Augustine, *Lectures or Tractates on the Gospel according to St. John XXIX.6* (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers [NPNF]* 1/7:184 translated by John Gibb and James Innes) in Christian Classics Ethereal Library, accessed April 3rd, 2018, http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf107.iii.xxx.html.

This similarity suggests a strong possibility of Anselm's dependence on Augustine although he does not directly quote him.[29] However, in what follows it will become clear that, if it is true, it is not a mere reproduction since Anselm will reinterpret and apply it in his own distinctive intellectual context. Compared to Augustine, Anselm lives in an intellectual context shaped by Carolingian educational reform, he reads the works of Augustine and Boethius (d. 524 AD), and he is under the tutelage of the most important logician of his day. These factors heavily influence his notion on the relation between faith and understanding and the result is a remarkable balanced view.

Firstly, it is Anselm's conviction that, considering man's sinfulness, faith is the absolute precondition for understanding. Through faith, the heart is purified and is motivated to observe the word of the Lord in a humbly obedience. Then, through this purification and motivation, the eyes are illuminated to perceive the deep things of faith.[30] This is what Anselm interprets as experiencing the faith and only he who has experienced the faith will be enabled to understand.[31] Anselm compares unbelievers who argue with believers to bats or owls that argue with eagles about the sunlight.[32] Moreover, in line with Augustine, Anselm wholeheartedly trusts that the experiences of faith is only possible because of grace. Faith is possible by grace since man can only believe whenever the uprightness of will is restored to him and through this uprightness he responds to the Word. The preaching itself is also by grace since the preacher is sent by the Lord. Thus, preaching, uprightness of will, faith, and understanding are ultimately by grace.[33]

Secondly, it is Anselm's conviction that reason must be utilized to explain and justify the truth of faith methodically[34] since believers and unbelievers seek for the rational foundation of faith.[35] This conviction is embodied in his two treatises *Monologion* and *Proslogion* which are aimed at proving by necessary reason (*ratione necessariae*) apart from Scripture the nature and existence of the divine being.[36] However, what Anselm means here should not be misunderstood as undervaluing the Scripture. To the contrary, as will be shown in the next point, Scripture for him is the highest authority. But, it is necessary to understand

---

[29] Anselm mentions honorably Augustine's works in the Preface of *Monologion* and in *Epistola de incarnatione verbi*, chapter 6.

[30] Anselm, *The Incarnation of the Word* in Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis, Minnesota: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), 268, accessed April 3rd, 2018, http://jasper-hopkins.info/DeIncarnatione.pdf.

[31] Anselm, *The Incarnation of the Word*, 269.

[32] Anselm, *The Incarnation of the Word*, 268.

[33] Anselm, *The Harmony of the Foreknowledge, the Predestination, and the Grace of God with Free Choice* in Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis, Minnesota: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), 557, accessed April 3rd, 2018, http://jasper-hopkins.info/DeIncarnatione.pdf.

[34] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 80.

[35] Anselm, *Why God Became a [God-] Man, Book I* in Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis, Minnesota: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), 303, accessed April 3rd, 2018, http://jasper-hopkins.info/DeIncarnatione.pdf.

[36] Anselm, *The Incarnation*, 279.

the apologetical context of the treatises[37] wherein Anselm attempts to demonstrate that the truth of Scripture can be perceived and affirmed by human mind, either unbeliever or believer, since it had been created as the mirror of divine being and can successfully investigate the truth.[38] Accordingly, interpreted in this context, necessary reason should be defined as a reason which is so formidable as to be able to remove the obstacles for assenting the truth of Scripture.[39] Yet, Anselm also acknowledges the limitation of reason. In *Cur Deus homo* book 1, chapter 25 he explains that necessary reason has limitation to comprehend even the reason for the truth of its own reasoning[40] and in *Proslogion*, chapter 11 that reason is unable to delve into the depth of divine mystery.[41]

Thirdly, related to the relation between Scripture and reason, Anselm, on the one hand, clearly affirms the authority of Scripture as the judge of the truth of reason. In *De concordia* third controversy, chapter 6 he asserts a principle that reasoning must be proved by Scripture either expressly by its own words or implicitly by not denying it since Scripture is "the authority for all rationally derived truths."[42] So, whenever a reasoning is clearly contradicted by Scripture, however unassailable it is, it must be rejected as truth.[43] On the other hand, Anselm also affirms the role of reason related to Scripture. In *De processione* chapter 11 Anselm asserts a principle that not only the express statements of Scripture ought to be accepted but also the implicit ones which have been inferred by "rational necessity" as long as this inference is not contradicted by "rational considerations."[44] However, he does not mean that reason is also the judge of Scripture but only to examine *the reasoning* inferred from Scripture.

This balanced view of faith and understanding has a significant impact for medieval scholasticism. Three aspects, at least, can exemplify this. Firstly, medieval scholastic methods reflect an effort of scholastic thinkers to strive for balance between faith and understanding. The primacy of faith as embodied in the high reverence for *auctoritas* is balanced with scientific inquiries.[45] Whenever *auctoritas* is explained in a *lectio* by utilizing all possible intellectual equipment, it needs to be explained reverently based on the principle *exponere reverenter*[46] and whenever the *sententiae* of the Fathers is compiled, the principle *diversa, non adversa* needs to

---

[37] The apologetic nature of these works is clear in the Preface of each. *Monologion*'s format is argument based on *ratione necessariae* apart from the Scripture with one of its aims to "meet such simple and almost foolish objections" (*Monologium*, Preface in Deane, *Saint. Anselm*, 36) and *Proslogium* provides single argument for proving the existence of God aimed at, in addition to believers, "the fool" (*Proslogium*, chapter II in Deane, *Saint. Anselm*, 7).

[38] Deane, *Saint. Anselm*, 131-132.

[39] Anselm, *The Incarnation*, 279.

[40] Anselm, *Why God Became a [God-] Man, Book I*, 348.

[41] Deane, *Saint. Anselm*, 18.

[42] Anselm, *The Harmony*, 558.

[43] Anselm, *The Harmony*, 558.

[44] Anselm, *The Procession of the Holy Spirit* in Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis, Minnesota: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), 502, accessed April 3rd, 2018, http://jasper-hopkins.info/DeIncarnatione.pdf.

[45] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 20.

[46] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 56.

be presupposed.[47] Secondly, this balance is also reflected by the attitude of the medieval thinkers in their teachings and writings. Peter Abelard is a good example. As a man famous with his logical rigorousness, even to the extent of interpreting theology as an "argumentative, linguistic, and logical examination of authority texts,"[48] yet he still promotes the necessity of arguing without contradicting the faith.[49] He uses Anselm's words from *Epistola de incarnatione verbi* in his *Theologia summi boni* to express his opposition to those who misuse dialectic against God.[50] Lastly, the debates on the appropriation of Aristotle's view of science into medieval universities reflect clearly efforts of engaged thinkers to preserve the balance of faith and understanding. Although they try to accommodate Aristotle's view into theology in term of its scientific method, all of them are one, first, in their high reverence for theology as the fruit of divine revelation, as the mistress, and as instrumental for achieving the aims of beatific contemplation of God or sanctity of life and, second, in their common consent of the incomparability of Aristotle's view as mundane science to theology as *sapientia* or *scientia* based on divine revelation.[51]

Teaching Methodology

Anselm's principle of arguing by necessary reason apart from the authority of Scripture within the spirit of *fides quarens intellectum* is exemplified methodically in his teaching. The four question-centered treatises: *De grammatico*, *De libertate arbitrii*, *De casu diaboli*, and *De veritate* demonstrate the methodology vividly in a form of dialogue between teacher and student.[52]

One representative example is *De grammatico*. The student asks the question about whether expert-in-grammar is a substance or quality.[53] The teacher does not directly answer the question but asks the student to prove both sides of the answer by using the formula "suffice to prove that … but on the other hand …".[54] Here, the student utilizes syllogistic reasoning for the first answer and refers to the authority for the second. Finally, he ends up in a dilemma and requests the teacher to show the truth. But, the teacher again asks the student to formulate his own objection to what he has proven.[55] The student uses syllogistic reasoning again for this purpose. The teacher evaluates the reasoning and deems it as not following from the premises. Then, he guides the student step by step in a reciprocal-dialogical way to evaluate the validity of his reasoning, the soundness of his premises, and to identify the error

---

[47] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 55.

[48] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 91.

[49] In Latin, "saltem aliquid verisimile atque humane rationi vicinum, nec sacrae fidei contrarium proponere." (Leinsle, *Introduction*, 91)

[50] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 93.

[51] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 147-181.

[52] Adams, "Anselm on Faith and Reason," 40.

[53] Anselm, *De grammatico* in Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury, translated by Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis, Minnesota: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), 132, accessed April 3rd, 2018, http://jasper-hopkins.info/DeIncarnatione.pdf.

[54] Anselm, *De grammatico*, 132

[55] Anselm, *De grammatico*, 133.

in the whole process.[56] The student, finally, realizes that the problem is he has mechanically drawn the conclusion from premises without firstly defining the meaning of his premises and making clear distinction among different senses the word "expert-in-grammar" could assume. At the conclusion, the teacher advices the student to not depend on the result of this reasoning with "stubborn persistence even if by weightier arguments someone else could destroy them and could prove something different."[57] But, at least, he has been benefited from the skills of argumentation acquired in this process.

It is very clear from this example that Anselm's method is to actively engage student in a learning process by developing his analytical capacity and skills of inquiry, and not only to depend blindly on the authority. Though at last he is the one who will give the final word, yet the reciprocal-dialogical process has benefited the student much as well as his advice for a moderate and flexible attitude in encountering possible questions in the future.

Although the method is not too novel in the context of Carolingian educational reform, it is still one of the important contributions to scholastic instructional system in its own stead since this method lays foundation for the famous *quaestio* method[58] which has significant place in the scholastic teaching and research.[59] Anselm's contribution lies in the fact that he does not only expose a method, but also apply it to solve various theological-philosophical questions (reasoning on the proper category, the nature of truth, the case of the devil, and the problem of free choice). So, if Peter Abelard is regarded as the first to apply *quaestio* to theology[60] and *Summa theologica* of Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) is a sophisticated application of *quaestio* in a dogmatic manual,[61] Anselm seems to have provided the way and, to a certain degree, can be seen as the precursor. In addition, this method also lays foundation for the development of another genre of scholastic method, *disputatio*.[62] One of Anselm's students, Gilbert of Crispin (c. 1055-1117), has translated Anselm's theory of satisfaction, worked out in his treatise *Cur Deus homo*, into a *disputatio* addressed to the Jewish (*Disputatio iudei et christiani*) in which the method elaborated in the *disputatio* similar to the one used in the treatise, and is regarded as a model for the future scholastic genre of *disputatio*.[63]

It is not without reason, therefore, that Marilyn Adams states that Anselm is "a pioneer-representative of a methodological translation that came to full flower in the thirteenth and fourteenth century universities … moving from lecture (*lectio*) to method of question and disputation.."[64]

---

[56] Anselm, *De grammatico*, 134-151.

[57] Anselm, *De grammatico*, 162.

[58] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 39-43.

[59] Van Asselt et al, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, 61-62.

[60] Van Asselt et al, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, 61.

[61] Van Asselt et al, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism*, 68-70.

[62] Leinsle, *Introduction*, 39-43.

[63] Dunthorne, Judith, and Rachel, *Anselm of Canterbury and the Development of Theological Thought, c. 1070-1141*, (Durham theses, Durham University, 2012), 82, accessed March 31st, 2018, http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/6360/.

[64] Adams, "Anselm on Faith and Reason," 47.

Doctrine of Satisfaction

This doctrine is one of Anselm's well-known legacies for the church beside his ontological argument and "had a greatest impact on thought in the early twelfth century."[65] The summary of this doctrine is given in *Cur Deus homo* book 2, chapter 18. Basically, it is an answer to the question why Christ has to become man. For Anselm, it is because man by his sin has dishonored God and owed a debt that he ought to satisfy for his restoration but cannot, which is God's justice, either by himself or by any other man except by God himself, therefore, it was necessary for God to become sinless man by assuming human nature into the oneness of His person in Jesus Christ so that man who with respect to his nature ought to satisfy for his transgression but is unable to, will be the one who with respect to his person is able to. In this way, this satisfaction of the debt will effect not only man's restoration to God but also have an infinite value.[66]

The intellectual impact of this theory is not only caused by its novelty but, more importantly, by its reasonableness compared to the almost universally accepted ransom theory or *ius diaboli* of Pope Gregory in the Western church.[67] It has fostered discussions among scholastic theologians of the twelfth century, and not less than as important scholastic theologians as Hugh of St.Victor and Peter Abelard admired the reasonableness of its argument[68] though Abelard later will formulate his own moral influence theory of satisfaction.[69] Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153), Odo (1060-1113) and Herman of Tournai (c.1091-1147), inspired by this theory, have rejected the ransom theory.[70] In addition, the discussions of this theory have also ignited the popularization of disputation genre. Not only Crispin's work, other disputations based on *Cur Deus homo* are published afterwards: the anonymous *Dialogus inter christianum et iudeum de fide catholica* (between 1123 and 1148), *Tractatus de incarnatione contra iudeos* (1111) by Guibert of Nogent (c. 1055-1124), *Disputatio contra iudaeum Leonem nomine de adventu Christi filii dei* (c. 1106-13) by Odo of Tournai, and *De incarnatione Iesu Christi domini nostril* by Herman of Tournai.[71]

However, the impact of this theory is not only limited to the Middle Ages, it has also proceeded forward to the sixteenth century. It is discussed and embraced by the Reformers. Among them are Calvin who elaborates it comprehensively in his *Institutes*.[72] For him the mediator has to be God because "It was his task to swallow up death. Who but the Life could do this? It was his task to conquer sin. Who but very Righteousness could do this? It was his task to rout the powers of world and air. Who but a power higher than world and air could do this? Now where does life or righteousness, or lordship and authority of heaven lie but

---

[65] Dunthorne et al., *Anselm of Canterbury*, 12.

[66] Deane, *Saint. Anselm*, 278-279.

[67] Roger E. Olson, *The Story of Christian Theology* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 323.

[68] Dunthorne et al., *Anselm of Canterbury*, 13-14.

[69] Olson, *The Story*, 328-329.

[70] Dunthorne et al., *Anselm of Canterbury*, 14.

[71]Dunthorne et al., *Anselm of Canterbury*, 83-107.

[72] John Calvin, *Institutes of Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battle (2 vols; Louisville, KY, and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1960), II.12.1-3.

with God alone?"[73] and He has to be man as well because "man, who by his disobedience had become lost, should by way of remedy counter it with obedience, satisfy God's judgment, and pay the penalties for sin. Accordingly, our Lord came forth as true man and took the person and the name of Adam in order to take Adam's place in obeying the Father, to present our flesh as the price of satisfaction to God's righteous judgment, and, in the same flesh, to pay the penalty that we had deserved."[74]

After Calvin, this theory is still quite influential among Reformed scholastic theologians in the late sixteenth to the seventeenth century to the degree that it is codified in the Heidelberg Catechism (1563) in QA 12-19 and Westminster Confession of Faith (1647) in chapter VIII, article 5 and 7 as the standard theory of satisfaction of Reformed theology. In addition, the well-known *Synopsis purioris theologiae* (1625), a dogmatic manual of the seventeenth century Dutch Reformed scholastic theology which is used widely in all universities of the Dutch Republic, evidences Anselm's influence as well in its conception on satisfaction (disputation 29th, thesis 4) in which satisfaction is defined as the deed of Christ as God and man ($\theta\varepsilon\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\sigma\nu$) by which He, on our behalf, "paid all the penalties that were owed for our sins, and by bearing and removing them he made full satisfaction to God's justice…"[75]

The Necessity of Incarnation and Satisfaction

One last significant contribution of Anselm for the subsequent developments of scholasticism is his view on the necessity of incarnation and satisfaction that he elaborated in *Cur Deus homo* book 2, chapter 5,17 and 18. The question that he proposes in the beginning of *Cur Deus homo* reveals the crux of the problem that he is going to solve in the entire treatise:

> For what reason and on the basis of what necessity did God become a man…and by His death restore life to the world…seeing that He could have accomplished this restoration either by means of some other person or else by merely willing it?
> [76]

Attempting a solution to this question, Anselm distinguishes several kinds of necessity and evaluates what necessities can be the reason for incarnation and satisfaction. In the first

---

[73] John Calvin, *Institutes of Christian Religion*, II.12.2.

[74] John Calvin, *Institutes of Christian Religion*, II.12.3.

[75] Henk van den Belt, ed., *Riemer A. Faber*, trans., Disputation 24-42, vol. 2, in *Synopsis of a Purer Theology: Latin Text and English Translation*, ed. Andreas J. Beck, William den Boer, Riemer A. Faber (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 183. The Leiden's *Synopsis purioris theologiae* or *Synopsis of Purer Theology* is a summary of Reformed orthodox theology published in 1625 as a commemoration for the Synod of Dort (1618-1619). It is composed from a series of scholastic disputations presided by four Leiden professors of theology (Johannes Polyander (1568-1646), Antonius Walaeus (1573-1639), Antonius Thysius (1565-1640), and Andreas Rivetus (1572-1651)) and publicly defended by their students. This manual of Reformed theology becomes the standard of dogmatic in the universities of Dutch Republic during the 17th century and its last Latin edition (6th edition) is published at the end of the nineteenth century by Dutch Reformed theologian Herman Bavinck (1854-1921).

[76] Anselm, *Why God Became a [God-] Man, Book I* in Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis, Minnesota: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), 300, accessed April 3rd, 2018, http://jasper-hopkins.info/DeIncarnatione.pdf.

place, there are two kinds of necessity: the compulsion and the prevention. Both kinds are grouped into what Anselm term as proper necessity (*necessitas propria*). The relationship between both is that what is compelled to be is prevented from not to be and what is compelled not to be is prevented from to be.[77] Concerning this necessity, Anselm is of the opinion that it cannot be applied to God since God is not compelled to do something nor prevented from doing something externally, He does nothing out of this proper necessity.[78] His will does not subject to it, rather it is this necessity that subjects to His.[79] When in certain places the language of necessity is applied to God, it does not necessarily mean that the necessity lies in God, rather it means that the necessity lies in other things outside Him which prevent them to actualize something contrary to His will. So, if it is said that it is necessary that God always speaks truth or never tells lie, it has to mean that God's steadfastness to preserve the truth is so strong that it is necessary that there are no other things can cause Him not to speak the truth or to tell lie.[80] In addition to this proper necessity, Anselm also defines what he terms as improper necessity (*necessitas impropria*). In *Cur Deus Homo* book 2, chapter 5, Anselm states that when God does something, for example, saves us out of the necessity of avoiding dishonor, this has to be interpreted as out of the necessity of maintaining His honor which is no other than the unchangeability of His honor.[81] This unchangeability is from himself or from His own nature and not from other, therefore it can only be improperly understood as necessity or improper necessity. Therefore, if He saves us out of this improper necessity, He is not compulsed to doing so nor prevented from doing so externally, it is solely on account of His own nature.

In *Cur Deus homo* book 2, chapter 17 Anselm proposes another necessities: antecedent and subsequent. The former is the necessity that causes or compels its subsequent while the latter is the necessity that arises from the subsequent itself. When it is said that the sun shines because it is necessary for it to shine, then this is the antecedent necessity. But when it is said that because we are speaking, it is necessary that we are speaking, this is the subsequent necessity.[82] Wherever there is antecedent necessity, there has to be subsequent necessity as well, yet it is not the case that wherever there is subsequent necessity, there has to be antecedent. So, because it is the nature of the sun to shine, it is necessary for it to shine, yet it is not the case that whenever we speak, it is necessary for us to speak though it is necessary that we speak. Anselm, then, applies this distinction to the issues of incarnation and satisfaction. For him incarnation and satisfaction are necessary because of the subsequent necessity, not antecedent. If incarnation and satisfaction happen then it is necessary that they happen, not that it is necessary for them to happen. If it is asked what is the ultimate cause of this necessity, it is because God wills them to happen. In other words, there is no necessity precedes His will but His will always precedes the necessity. Thus, incarnation and

---

[77] Anselm, *Why God Became a [God-] Man, Book II* in Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson (Minneapolis, Minnesota: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000), 377-378, accessed April 3rd, 2018, http://jasper-hopkins.info/DeIncarnatione.pdf.

[78] Anselm, *Why God Became a [God-] Man*, 353.

[79] Anselm, *Why God Became a [God-] Man*, 376.

[80] Anselm, *Why God Became a [God-] Man*, 378.

[81] Anselm, *Why God Became a [God-] Man*, 353.

[82] Deane, *Saint. Anselm*, 275-277.

satisfaction happen because He wills them to happen, and when they happen it is a necessity that they happen, but not for them to happen. Anselm supports this exposition from John 10:18 concerning Christ's power over His own life.[83] Thus, it becomes clear that for Anselm, although human restoration could happen with whatever way possible considering God's will, it actually happens in the way of incarnation and satisfaction on the basis of improper necessity and subsequent necessity.

Anselm's use of distinctions (proper, improper, antecedent, subsequent) to solve the issues of the necessity of incarnation and satisfaction here provides a model which will be followed by later medieval scholastic theologians, even by the Reformers in the sixteenth century, when they attempt to solve the same issues or other issues concerning God and the necessity. Aquinas (1225-1274) in his *Summa theologiae*, for example, when discussing whether God wills something necessarily, also distinguishes two kinds of necessity: absolute necessity and the necessity by supposition.[84] The former parallels to what Anselm defines as antecedent necessity and the latter subsequent necessity. Duns Scotus (1266-1308) in the late Middle Ages proposes two kinds of necessity as well when encountering the issue of necessity in relation to God: the necessity of consequence and the necessity of consequent.[85] The former is identical to Aquinas's necessity of supposition and the latter to his absolute necessity.[86] Calvin in the *Institutes* also discusses the question of *Cur Deus homo* and uses scholastic distinction as well to solve the problem of why it is necessary for the mediator to be God and man. For him this necessity is not in the absolute sense or absolute necessity as if the mediator was constrained to be God and man, rather this necessity has stemmed from the divine decree.[87] Calvin's position is similar to Anselm in which there is no necessity in the sense of compulsion or antecedent as the reason or basis for incarnation, but it is by the subsequent necessity which is preceded by the divine will. Here, Calvin concurs with Anselm to give prominence to God's freedom in incarnation while at the same time open the possibility for the necessity but not in the sense of compulsion or absolute.[88]

---

[83] Deane, *Saint. Anselm*, 277.

[84] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 1a.19.3.

[85] A.Vos et al, trans., *John Duns Scotus: Contingency and Freedom, Lectura I 39* (Dordrecht/Boston: Kluwer, 1994), 132-134 (no. 58).

[86]These two kinds of necessity, consequent and consequence, are a well-known scholastic distinction utilized to solve the ontological problem of necessity and contingency. The former can best be represented with the logical implicative relation $p \rightarrow Nq$ in which the necessity operator is on the consequent and expressed the absolute necessity while the latter with $N (p \rightarrow q)$ in which the necessity operator is on the implicative relation itself as a whole and expressed the hypothetical necessity. The absolute necessity is ontologically represented by a necessitated system and for some theologians are not representative of the Christian ontological view that prefers to see reality as contingent, while the hypothetical necessity for the same theologians is a representation of Christian view in which all propositions in the implicative relation are contingent and only become necessity whenever the necessity operator, in this case divine will or decree, is imposed on them. See A.Vos et al, *Contingency and Freedom*, 23-38.

[87] Calvin, *Institutes*, II.12.1.

[88] Not all scholars agree with this position, there are others who prefer to state the difference between Calvin and Anselm in their views on the necessity of incarnation and satisfaction. However, from my study of Anselm's *Cur Deus homo* as presented before, it is clear that the freedom of divine will while at the same time the possibility for necessity in incarnation becomes the concern of both.

Anselm's influence in this aspect also penetrates into the seventeenth century Reformed scholastic theology as exemplified again by Leiden *Synopsis*. In its 29th disputation, thesis 34, Antonius Thysius (1565-1640), the presided professor of the disputation and one of the authors of the *Synopsis*, solves the question on the necessity of Christ's satisfaction by distinguishing between absolute and hypothetical necessity.[89] For Thysius, the satisfaction is a necessity in both sense. In the former, it is absolute insofar as it concerns God's nature since He is the God who hates sin and cannot let forgiveness be offered without satisfaction, so the satisfaction is necessary in this sense. In the latter, it is hypothetical insofar as it concerns God's decree since He has decreed to punish sinners with death and to sent His own Son to die on the Cross on their behalf in order to make satisfaction, so satisfaction is necessary in this sense as well. Thysius's use of distinction between absolute and hypothetical necessities here reflects his acquaintance with Anselm's work and distinction. His definition of absolute necessity parallels to Anselm's improper necessity while of hypothetical necessity parallels Anselm's subsequent necessity.

Conclusion

In this paper I have shown four aspects of Anselm's thought which are foundational and significant for the subsequent developments of scholasticism. The first among these is his discourse on *fides quarens intellectum* which has sharply clarified the relationship between faith and reason wherein faith, made possible by divine grace, is the absolute precondition for reason while reason is to explain and justify the truth of faith. In this relation, he has also defined the role of Scriptures as the ultimate judge for the truth of reason though the reasoning inferred from Scriptures itself has to be examined by reason. This clear exposition on the relationship between faith and reason has preoccupied the mind of medieval scholastic theologians to strive for balance between faith and reason in their scientific inquiries as can be evidenced in their principles of *exponere reverenter* and *diversa, non adversa* when they deal with *auctoritas*. Nevertheless, Anselm's contributions are not only confined in this area, his teaching methodology as well which aims at developing student's analytical capacity and skills of inquiry by actively engaging him in a reciprocal-dialogical way in order to evaluate the validity of his reasoning, the soundness of his premises, and the possibility of error in his whole process of reasoning has paved the way for the development of scholastic instructional system in the future to a significant degree. In addition, his doctrine of satisfaction which has explained convincingly both the reason for God to incarnate as θεανθρωπον and the restoration of man to God as a payment of debt or satisfaction has a great impact on medieval scholastic theologians, even on the sixteenth century Reformers and the seventeenth century Reformed scholastic theologians to the point that its reasonableness has replaced the place long occupied by the ransom theory in the Middle Ages and is codified in Reformed confessions. Lastly but not the least, the solution that Anselm proposes for the question of the necessity of incarnation and satisfaction by distinguishing the proper necessity from the improper one, the antecedent necessity from the subsequent one in order to preserve God's freedom, yet still open to the fact that incarnation and satisfaction have been actualized in reality, has been followed not only by medieval scholastic theologians, but also by the Reformers and the seventeenth century Reformed scholastic theologians though by utilizing other kinds of distinction which is only different in form, yet substantially similar to the one

---

[89] Henk van den Belt, *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, 201

proposed by Anselm. Therefore, in all these four aspects of Anselm's thought, the substance of the title "the Father of scholasticism" conferred on him by Leinsle has acquired its fullness.

However, this article has only introduced aspects of Anselm's thought which are foundational and significant for the intellectual developments of scholasticism in a broad outline. It is not an in-depth study of these aspects. Therefore, considering that each of these aspects does have a worthiness in itself to demand further studies whether in the form of synchronic or diachronic in-depth historical studies, it seems that further researches are necessary. In addition to synchronic or diachronic in-depth historical studies, these researches could also focus on other important medieval and seventeenth century figures and delving further into his thoughts on these four aspects or other aspects which can clarify the intellectual development of scholasticism in medieval and seventeenth century.

References

Berthold, George C., ed. *Faith Seeking Understanding: Learning and the Catholic Tradition*. Manchester, NH: Saint Anselm College Press, 1991.

Calvin, John. *Library of Christian Classics Volume XX: Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Edited by John T. McNeill. Translated by Ford Lewis Battles. Vol. I. 2 vols. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1960.

Davies, Brian, and Brian Leftow, . *The Cambridge Companion to Anselm*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2004. https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL0521807468

Deane, S. N., trans *Saint Anselm: Basic Wirtings*. La Salle, IL: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1962.

Dunthorne, Judith, Rachel. *Anselm of Canterbury and the Development of Theological Thought, c. 1070-1141*. Durham, NC: Durham University, 2012.

Hopkins, Jasper. *A Companion to the Study of St. Anselm*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1972.

Hopkins, Jasper, and Herbert Richardson, . *De Grammatico*. Minneapolis, MN: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000.

Hopkins, Jasper, and Herbert RIchardson, . *The Harmony of the Foreknowledge, the Predestination, and the Grace of God with Free Choice*. Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury. Minneapolis, MN: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000.

Hopkins, Jasper, and Herbert Richardson, . *The Incarnation of the Word*. Minneapolis, MN: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000.

Hopkins, Jasper, and Herbert Richardson, . *The Procession of the Holy Spirit*. Minneapolis, MN: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000.

Hopkins, Jasper, and Herbert Richardson, . *Why God Became a Man Book I*. Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury. Minneapolis, MN: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000.

Hopkins, Jasper, and Herbert Richardson, . *Why God Became Man. Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatires of Anselm of Canterbury*. Minneapolis, MN: The Arthur J. Banning Press, 2000.

Innes, John Gibb and James. "*Lectures or Tractates on the Gospel According to St. John XXIX.6 (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers [NPNF] 1/7:184.*" Accessed April 3, 2018. http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf107.iii.xxx.html.

Leinsle, Ulrich G. *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*. Washington, DC.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010.

Olson, Roger E. *The Story of Christian Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999.

Scotus, John Duns. *Contingency and Freedom*. Edited by A. Vos Jaczn, H. Veldhuis, A. H. Looman-Graaskamp, E. Dekker, & N. W. Den Bok. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer, 1994.

Thomas, Aquinas Saint. *Summa Theologiae*. McGraw-Hill, 1967

Van den Belt, Henk, ed. *Synopsis purioris theologiae/Synopsis of a Purer Theology: Latin Text and English Translation, vol.2, Disputation 24-42*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2016. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004328679