PETER LOMBARD, STEPHEN LANGTON, AND THE SCHOOL OF PARIS
THE MAKING OF THE TWELFTH-CENTURY SCHOLASTIC BIBLICAL TRADITION

By MARK J. CLARK

This study documents the discovery of Peter Lombard's long-thought-to-be-lost lectures on the Old Testament, which were hidden in plain view in the Old Testament lectures of Stephen Langton, who lectured on the Lombard's lectures. The presence in the Lombard's lectures on Genesis of the logical theory of supposition, the single greatest advance in logical theory during the High Middle Ages, means that those lectures not only postdate the Sentences but also represent the beginning of a radical advance in speculative theology that would continue to develop through the end of the High Middle Ages. This means in turn that lectures on the Bible from the 1150s to 1200, and in particular those of the School of Paris, headed by Peter Lombard, play a central role in one of the greatest speculative developments — logical, philosophical, and theological — of the Middle Ages.

In this study, I share the first fruits of my investigation into the complicated manuscript tradition that preserves the massive biblical corpus long attributed to Stephen Langton, itself the largest portion of "the mountain of manuscripts that constitute the biblical legacy of the School of Paris and its successors."[1] I show that Langton's Old Testament corpus is not exclusively his but rather constitutes the culmination of a heretofore unknown and unsuspected twelfth-century tradition of lecturing on the Bible in which orality and the oral transmission of the lectures of other masters lies hidden beneath most writings preserved in the extant manuscripts. I show too that the proximate foundations for Langton's lectures date to the 1150s, when the lectures of a preeminent Parisian master were passed on in the schools and used by Stephen Langton as the foundation for his own.

These foundational lectures were by a master so well known and universally respected that no one, neither the masters who succeeded him nor their own students, needed to specify his name: everyone knew who he was; he was referred to simply as "magister." More importantly still, everyone knew his lectures. The name that comes immediately to mind is Peter Lombard, the preeminent Parisian master during the 1150s, and the evidence presented in this study connects Stephen Langton's biblical corpus directly to lectures on the Old Testament that can now with confidence be attributed to Peter Lombard. These biblical

[1] Mark J. Clark, "The Biblical *Gloss*, the Search for Peter Lombard's Glossed Bible, and the School of Paris," *Mediaeval Studies* 76 (2014): 57–113, at 113. The present study constitutes a sequel to the one published by *Mediaeval Studies* in 2014.

Traditio 72 (2017), 171–274

doi:10.1017/tdo.2017.2

lectures of Peter Lombard were "embedded" in lectures on different Old Testament books that have long been attributed to Langton. This study brings to light two reasons why they were never found and why their very existence was never before now even suspected by scholars. The first is that no scholar imagined that the Lombard's biblical lectures would have been passed on and preserved orally in the lectures of his students. The second is that scholars missed the unmistakable signs in Langton's corpus of those earlier foundational lectures.

The existence of this oral tradition has radical consequences for our understanding of four crucial twelfth-century scholastic legacies. The first three, the biblical *Gloss*, Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, and Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica*, are well known, at least by reputation; the fourth consists of Peter Lombard's lectures on the Old Testament (to be distinguished from those on the Psalms and the Pauline epistles), long thought to be lost and hence unknown to scholars until now. Finally, there is evidence to suggest that this deep-rooted twelfth-century oral biblical tradition was taken over and passed down in all of its fullness and complexity to the thirteenth century by Hugh of St. Cher and the Dominicans who composed his Postills on the Bible.

In showing all of this, I introduce as well the first fruits of a radically different approach to editing and interpreting the extant manuscript tradition of the High Middle Ages. It is owing to this novel approach that even the limited evidence that I present and rely upon for this study suffices for knowledge certain enough to overturn existing theories about Langton's biblical legacy. For this reason and to support such a bold and novel claim, a preliminary word about method and approach is in order here.

The whole Lachmannian approach to editing presupposes the ability to get back to a primitive model that is commonly supposed to be the best expression of authorship and authorial intention.[2] It further assumes that from that primitive model all subsequent and hence imperfect copies have derived. To a great extent, the evidence for the existence and integrity of the original copy is the feature of collatability of extant witnesses, whether in manuscripts or early printed editions. The fundamental assumption is that the author produced a text meant to be read, or in other words a book.

The scholastic manuscript, however, was not a "book" in our sense of the word and thus escapes for the most part Lachmannian editorial method, a sign that the

[2] The classic modern discussion of Lachmannian editorial method are the articles of Sebastiano Timpanaro: "La genesi del metodo del Lachmann, pt. 1," *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 31 (1959): 182–228 and "La genesi del metodo del Lachmann, pt. 2," *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 32 (1960): 38–63, translated as: Sebastiano Timpanaro, *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method*, ed. and trans. Glenn W. Most (Chicago and London, 2005). For a concise but standard account of Lachmann's contribution to editorial method, see L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1991), 187–89.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholasticism of the High Middle Ages was not primarily a book culture, as has been commonly supposed by scholars editing medieval manuscripts; instead, the vast majority of scholastic texts preserved from this period are rather the products and vestiges of an oral culture.[3] And here I must be precise, lest I be misunderstood to be repeating in banal fashion what every medievalist knows, namely, that Scholastic classroom teaching was oral.[4] Rather, the point that I am making is that few if any scholars have viewed, interpreted, or edited the extant manuscripts that preserve Scholastic teaching as the records of orality. For editorial purposes the difference is revolutionary, since features in texts long viewed to be anomalous will henceforth instead be viewed as predictable features of oral discourse embedded in texts.

In the present study, which does not bear on editorial method and practice, this *Gestalt* shift in how to view the relationship between oral teaching and extant manuscript traditions has made all the difference in approaching and interpreting the history that lies underneath and that explains Langton's manuscript corpus. Those scholars such as Lacombe and Smalley who approached Langton's corpus assumed it to be the product of books.[5] So too the Franciscans who edited Peter Lombard's *Sentences* three times in one century and who searched high and low for his works on the Bible were thinking in terms of and looking for books.[6] They had no idea that the Lombard's oral teaching on the Bible was transmitted orally, through the teaching of Comestor, Langton, and others.

I divide my study into four main parts and a conclusion. In the first, I review scholarship on Langton's Old Testament lectures up to the present day, all of

[3] My colleague at CUA, Professor Tim Noone, and I, after decades of trying to apply Lachmannian editorial method to medieval manuscripts and the scholastic works that they preserved — he working on the 1250–1350 period, I on the 1150–1250 period — came independently to the conclusion that Lachmannian editorial method does not apply to the vast majority of scholastic texts. We shall publish shortly a monograph in which we present and document our thesis that the High Middle Ages were primarily an oral culture and that scholars interested in any of the scholastic texts produced during that time must differentiate carefully between Lachmannian editorial method and technique.

[4] See, to cite but one example of many that could be adduced for this common knowledge, Lesley Smith speaking of Abelard's teaching in her monograph, *The* Glossa Ordinaria*: The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary* (Leiden and Boston, 2009), 6: "It is a resolutely oral exercise in an oral tradition of teaching."

[5] Copious evidence in support of this statement is adduced below in Part One of this study.

[6] Ignatius Brady, the editor of the third and most recent critical edition of the *Sentences*, is explicit on this point: he and his predecessors had scoured extant manuscripts looking for the volumes containing the Lombard's lectures on the Bible. Ignatius Brady, ed., *Magistri Petri Lombardi Parisiensis Episcopi sententiae in IV libris distinctae* (Grottaferrata, 1971–1981), vol. 1, Prolegomena to *Sententiae*, 2, 22*–23*. See also: Ignatius Brady, "The Three Editions of the 'Liber Sententiarum' of Master Peter Lombard (1882–1977)," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 70 (1977): 400–411.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which depends on foundational researches conducted by George Lacombe and Beryl Smalley.

In the second, I show Langton's use of and dependence on the lectures of an illustrious predecessor for his own lectures. The evidence presented leaves no doubt that the prefatory materials here considered actually contain not only Langton's lectures but also those of another master, whose prologues and lectures served as the foundation for his own.

In the third, I present evidence from the predecessor's lectures, both prologues and on biblical books, and from Langton's lectures on the same, that leaves no doubt about the authorship and date of some of those foundational lectures. The author whose lectures Langton lectured upon is none other than Peter Lombard, whose lectures date to the 1150s and, as I show in Part Three, postdate his *Sentences*.[7]

In the fourth, I consider the consequences of these many discoveries for medieval scholarship on a variety of topics: about Peter Lombard, his writings, and his career; about the biblical *Gloss* during the 1150s and how it developed; about Peter Comestor and the *Historia scholastica*; about Stephen Langton, his writings, and the transition between the schools of Paris to the University; about the theological legacy of the School of Paris up to Hugh of St. Cher and the Dominicans under his supervision; and about future scholarship in general on the Bible and theology at least up to 1250.

A brief conclusion summarizing the main findings of the study follows.

Part One: Langton's Old Testament Lectures

Historiography and State of the Question

The last time scholars attempted a comprehensive examination of Langton's entire manuscript corpus was 1930, when George Lacombe, in Part I, and Beryl Smalley, assisted by Alys Gregory, in Part II, published their preliminary investigations on the commentaries of Stephen Langton.[8] To Lacombe fell the task of listing manuscripts for various works as well as analyzing and describing what

[7] The Lombard's incorporation of the logical theory of supposition into his lectures on Genesis, which is nowhere to be found in the *Sentences*, is sufficient proof of the former's later date. I shall shortly publish another study in which I show that the Lombard incorporated a great deal of his earlier teaching on the *Sentences* into his lectures on the Bible, at least in his treatment of the hexameron. That study will update and complete an earlier study ("Peter Comestor and Peter Lombard: Brothers in Deed," *Traditio* 60 [2005]: 85–142) in which I showed that Peter Comestor relied on the Lombard's treatment of the hexameron in the *Sentences*. From editing the Lombard's later lectures on Genesis, it is now evident that Peter Comestor was relying directly on the Lombard's lectures on Genesis and only indirectly on the *Sentences*.

[8] George Lacombe, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part I," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 5 (1930): 1–151. Beryl Smalley and

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

he supposed to be Langton's commentaries on the *Historia scholastica*,[9] what he called Langton's postills on Peter Lombard's own glosses on the Pauline epistles,[10] and what he called Langton's postills on the rest of the Old Testament.[11] To Smalley fell the task of analyzing the manuscript tradition, which she aptly described as of "the most astonishing variety."[12]

Individual parts of Langton's work have since received a considerable amount of attention from scholars. Phyllis B. Roberts produced an edition and study of some of Langton's sermons in 1968.[13] A watershed moment was 1994, when Riccardo Quinto published his doctoral thesis, an up-to-date overview of Langton's academic career and work.[14] Working with Sten Ebbesen, Gilbert Dahan, and others, Quinto launched and sustained, until his tragic death some years ago, what can only be described as a renaissance in Langton scholarship. Notable fruits of this renaissance are the recent volume published in 2010, *Étienne Langton: Prédicateur, bibliste, théologien*, which gathers together studies from a Langton conference held in Paris in September, 2006[15] and the magisterial first volume of Langton's *Quaestiones*, jointly edited by Riccardo Quinto and Magdalena Bieniak and published in 2014.[16] In spite of Quinto's death, the latter volume promises continued progress for Langton scholarship, since Bieniak is committed

Alys Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 5 (1930): 152–266.

[9] Lacombe, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part I," 18–51.

[10] Ibid., 52–63.

[11] Ibid., 64–147.

[12] Smalley and Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II," 152.

[13] Phyllis B. Roberts, *Stephanus de Lingua-Tonante: Studies in the Sermons of Stephen Langton* (Toronto, 1968).

[14] Riccardo Quinto, *"Doctor Nominatissimus": Stefano Langton (†1228) e la tradizione delle sue opere*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, Texte und Untersuchungen, n.s. 39 (Münster, 1994). The comprehensive bibliography Quinto provides in this volume for all studies bearing on Langton up to 1994 remains invaluable.

[15] Louis-Jacques Bataillon, Nicole Bériou, Gilbert Dahan, and Riccardo Quinto, eds., *Étienne Langton: Prédicateur, bibliste, théologien*, Bibliothèque d'histoire culturelle de Moyen Âge 9 (Turnhout, 2010). This volume provides a twofold advantage of an attempt at comprehensive coverage of Langton's life and work and an up-to-date bibliography for each topic.

[16] Stephen Langton, *Quaestiones Theologicae, Liber I*, ed. Riccardo Quinto and Magdalena Bieniak, Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi 22 (Oxford, 2014). This volume represents a major advance in our understanding of Langton's *Quaestiones theologiae*, since Quinto and Bieniak establish to the greatest extent possible an accurate understanding of the manuscript tradition for these collections of questions. Thus, the actual text of the first book of Langton's *Quaestiones* is preceded by a detailed introduction, 231 pages in length, most of which explicates the complex and variegated tradition of the different versions of Langton's theological questions. Ibid., 1–231.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to carrying on the work of editing the remainder of Langton's corpus of theological *quaestiones*.[17]

The former volume would seem to be even more relevant to this inquiry, since it contains six studies explicitly devoted to Langton's exegetical corpus.[18] To those six studies must be added Bataillon's examination of the content of Langton's sermons that dealt with the twelve minor prophets, which adds considerably to our knowledge of the manuscript tradition preserving these works.[19] Somewhat paradoxically, however, no study in the volume subjects the pioneering studies of Lacombe and Smalley to critical scrutiny.

The reason for this is provided by Gilbert Dahan, author of the study broadest in scope in the entire volume, which takes for its subject the entirety of Langton's biblical corpus and his mode of commenting and interpreting the Bible.[20] Dahan addresses himself to the central importance of Langton's biblical corpus within the Middle Ages considered as a whole.[21] I touch upon one portion of Dahan's

[17] The British Academy has undertaken to publish all of Langton's *Quaestiones theologicae* in five volumes, and Bieniak's receipt of a large research grant from the European Union to support the ongoing work of her and her team will go a long way to ensuring continuing and rapid progress of this project. Bieniak is also leading a collaborative effort, together with Francesco Siri and other outstanding scholars formerly in Quinto's circle, to edit Langton's lectures on the Lombard's *magna glosatura* on the Pauline epistles.

[18] Those six, all in Part II ("Étienne Langton, exégète de la Bible") of the same volume, Louis-Jacques Bataillon, Nicole Bériou, Gilbert Dahan, and Riccardo Quinto, eds., *Étienne Langton: Prédicateur, bibliste, théologien* are: Gilbert Dahan, "Les commentaires bibliques d'Étienne Langton: Exégèse et herméneutique," 201–39; Martin Morard, "Étienne Langton et les commentaires-fantômes: Le cas du commentaire des Psaumes," 241–84; Emmanuel Bain, "Étienne Langton, commentateur des Proverbes," 285–326; Timothy Bellamah, "The Lament of a Preacher: Stephen Langton's Commentary *Super Threnos*," 327–52; Giovanna Murano, "Chi ha scritto le *Interpretationes hebraicorum nominum*?" 353–71; Mark J. Clark, "The Commentaries of Stephen Langton on the *Historia scholastica* of Peter Comestor," 373–93.

[19] Louis-Jacques Bataillon, "Les Douze Prophètes enseignés et prêchés par Étienne Langton," in *Étienne Langton: Prédicateur, bibliste, théologien*, 427–47. For Langton's preaching Bataillon based his study upon two reports of a sermon given on 31 October 1199, the Eve of All Saints. Ibid., 427–28. For Langton's glosses on the twelve minor prophets, Bataillon examined numerous manuscripts for each of five groups listed in Stegmüller's *Repertorium Biblicum*. See Friedrich Stegmüller, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*, vol. 5, *Commentaria R–Z* (Madrid, 1955), 283–93, numbers 7841–908. From this examination, he not only learned that there are four series and not five, as Stegmüller supposed, but also that versions C and D (the third and fourth, respectively) are only extracts from A. Bataillon, "Les Douze Prophètes enseignés et prêchés par Étienne Langton," 428–30, providing multiple references to Stegmüller's *Repertorium Biblicum* in notes 12–19. One can only rue the fact that Père Bataillon, now deceased, did not decide to get to the bottom of the tangled web of the manuscript traditions of all of Langton's Old Testament glosses!

[20] Gilbert Dahan, "Les commentaires bibliques d'Étienne Langton: Exégèse et herméneutique," in *Étienne Langton: Prédicateur, bibliste, théologien*, 201–39.

[21] Ibid., 201–4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

study, below in Part Three, since he provides at the end of his study a transcription of what he considers to be Langton's "Moral Prologue" to the Pentateuch, which also forms part of the central evidence for this study.[22]

Dahan is explicit about his decision not to essay coming to grips either with the manuscript research or with the findings of the twin studies published in 1930 by Lacombe and Smalley, which as he notes were amplified over time by Smalley in other studies, including her monograph, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*.[23] Dahan's observation in this regard is as crucial as it is accurate, since not only does the rest of Smalley's scholarly output depend to a great extent on the research and findings presented in these studies but so also does most of the edifice of biblical scholarship produced under her direct influence during the second half of the twentieth century and to the present day.[24]

Like so many scholars, however, Dahan assumes that the foundation for Smalley's scholarly corpus, namely, her manuscript research, is sound. He notes that to attempt an examination of the foundational 1930 studies of Lacombe and Smalley would require several years of dedicated study of the manuscript tradition preserving Langton's corpus.[25] And he gives his opinion that such an effort would not be worth the trouble, given what he describes as the richness of those studies and the few holes that would be found in their findings after such exhaustive work.[26]

It turns out, however, that this view, namely, that any serious examination and verification of Smalley's manuscript work would not be worth the trouble, is mistaken. Quite the contrary, investigation of the manuscripts reveals that Smalley's

[22] Dahan, "Les commentaires bibliques d'Étienne Langton: Exégèse et herméneutique," 237–39. I provide a working edition of this prefatory material herein as well, since it is central to my analysis. I show below that the prologue in question, *Tabernaculum Moysi*, is not Langton's but rather Peter Lombard's. I show also that it is not a "moral" prologue but rather the Lombard's introduction to the Pentateuch.

[23] "Tout d'abord, il aurait été bon de faire un point général sur la tradition manuscrite des commentaires d'Étienne Langton: le travail remarquable de George Lacombe et Beryl Smalley est paru en 1930; plusieurs études de Beryl Smalley (y compris son livre *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*) ont affiné la matière, non seulement sur le plan heuristique mais aussi sur celui des procédures exégétiques." Ibid., 202.

[24] A long line of scholars have founded their work on the Bible in the Middle Ages explicitly on the foundation constructed by Smalley. The list is too long to provide names here. In truth, she founded a school of sorts.

[25] "Malgré l'utilité apparente de la chose, je ne pourrai pas proposer ici une mise à jour des études de 1930; il aurait fallu pour cette tâche plusieurs années exclusivement consacrées à l'examen de la tradition manuscrite des commentateurs bibliques de Langton." Ibid., 202.

[26] "Je me demande si cela en vaut vraiment la peine, tant la publication de Lacombe et Smalley est riche et ne paraît comporter que peu de lacunes." Ibid. Dahan does signal his intent to subject to critical scrutiny Smalley's typology of Langton's commentaries, that is, full, literal, and moral, which he maintains remains true only for the historical books of the Old Testament. Ibid.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

manuscript research was neither as thorough nor as sound as so many scholars like Dahan have supposed. In fact, the evidence presented below not only shows that many of Smalley's conclusions about what she found in the manuscripts, including her central theory about Langton's biblical corpus, are false, but it also raises serious questions about the quality of her work with manuscripts in general.

Before providing the evidence that documents these claims, it will be helpful first to review briefly the central findings in the studies of Lacombe and Smalley. I do so in four subsections, beginning (in subsection A) with an account, principally in Smalley's own words, of her central thesis about Langton's biblical corpus, namely, that he wrote an original commentary or commentaries, in which he treated both the literal and moral senses of Scripture, and that these "full" or "integral" commentaries were subsequently divided by others into separate literal and moral commentaries. I then review (in subsection B) the essentials of Lacombe's study of Langton's Old Testament corpus, providing a concise summary of his classification of the extant manuscripts containing that corpus.[27] There follows a brief summary of Smalley's classification of the same (in subsection C).[28] I conclude the review and this introduction (in subsection D) with a fuller account of the discussion, both by Lacombe and Smalley, of the prefatory materials to Langton's Old Testament works, since these are the focus of the present study.

A. The Smalley Thesis

Smalley's study follows that of Lacombe, and she wastes no time in presenting what she considers to be the state of the evidence and the key questions left unanswered by her colleague:

> In part one of these studies Mgr. Lacombe has described the mss. containing Langton's commentaries on the Historical Books of the Old Testament, and grouped them according to their incipits. His work reveals the most astonishing variety of tradition, to which fortunately we were able to supply a key. After much difficulty a threefold distinction has been obtained. There are three types of commentary: "full," literal, and moral, the "full" being a combination of the other two types. All three, it has been shown, clearly originated in the same recensions. It remains to determine the relationship between them. Is the full commentary the parent or the offspring of the literal and moral? Does it represent the first draft or is it a compilation? Mgr. Lacombe gives reasons for favouring the claims of the full commentary to priority. We decided that I should take up the problem

[27] Lacombe dealt with the whole of Langton's Old Testament corpus, excluding the Psalms, in Chapter III of his lengthy study. See Lacombe, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part I" (n. 8 above), 64–147.

[28] Although their studies on the commentaries of Langton were meant to be complementary, Smalley's was founded on that of Lacombe and differed notably in the determinacy of its conclusions. For that reason, I begin with Lacombe's findings and then present Smalley's.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> at exactly the point where he left it and make a detailed study of the relationship between the "full," literal, and moral types.[29]

She then answers these questions, pointing out the difficulties in supposing compilation rather than division:

> From the first there was a strong common sense argument in favour of the full type of commentary's being the original, the parent and not the descendant of the other two. The work involved in separating the literal and moral senses, and copying them down as excerpts, one at a time, would be appreciably less than the work of compilation. The latter would imply copying from two works at once, perpetually finding and refinding the place. In the full commentaries no discoverable rule is observed as to proportion or division between literal and moral sections. The length of each passage chosen for explanation varies to suit the author's convenience, he may take a sentence or several complete episodes as his unit to comment first in the literal, then in the moral sense. It is almost incredible that a compiler would not have used, in every case, the simple arrangement found only in Chronicles, which is a briefer, more summary work than the other books; the whole of the first book of Chronicles at once is commented literally, then morally. The second is treated in the same way. The method followed in the other commentaries, of proceeding by arbitrary divisions, one step at a time, which would be natural to the author of an original work, becomes incomprehensible in a compiler.[30]

By the close of the main part of her study, it is clear that Smalley's mind is made up and that any doubts she may have had have been resolved. She writes as though wholly convinced that Langton composed the original, "full" commentaries and that subsequently unknown persons divided these into separate literal and moral commentaries: "Whatever we think of the results, we cannot but sympathize with the objects of those who divided the unwieldy 'full' commentaries into the literal and moral series."[31]

Smalley, both in posing the question of the order of Langton's corpus and in considering whether the "full" commentary came first or last, is thinking clearly in terms of books written by an author, books that are subsequently either divided or compiled. Both her analysis and her conclusion presuppose a single author, Langton, whose biblical works, referred to both by Lacombe and Smalley as commentaries, were first composed by Langton and subsequently divided by someone other than Langton into separate literal and moral works.

In considering Smalley's theory and the assumptions beneath it, namely, that Langton was an author who produced "books," it will prove helpful to keep in mind all that has been learned about the *Historia scholastica*, which Langton

[29] Smalley and Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II" (n. 8 above), 152.
[30] Ibid., 153–54.
[31] Ibid., 182.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not only lectured upon but edited while Comestor was still alive.[32] Lacombe applied Smalley's theory to what he believed to be two separate "commentaries" by Langton on the *History*, one literal and the other moral.[33] I showed Lacombe's theory to be false.[34] All three of the versions of Langton's course on the *Historia scholastica* (an initial set of lectures, a first revision of those lectures, and a final revision) are, not surprisingly, literal, since the *Historia scholastica* itself is dedicated exclusively to the literal sense of Scripture.[35]

More interesting for the purposes of this study is the fact that the *History* was itself the product of lectures, by Comestor, Langton, and many other masters including, as we learn below, Peter Lombard. In truth, the *History* was the product of a scholastic oral culture in which it was constantly revised and amended, by Comestor, Langton, and other masters who lectured upon it.[36] Langton was in Paris much earlier than scholars, who have credited 1180 as the date when Langton incepted, have previously recognized.[37] Quinto, however, showed this to be no more than a guess.[38]

[32] See Mark J. Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica*: 1150–1200* (Toronto, 2015), in which it is shown that Langton, who not only revised his initial lecture course on the *History* twice but also edited the *History* before 1176, while Comestor was still teaching, was arguably as important as Comestor in the formation, transformation, and dissemination of that work in the schools of Paris from 1170 to 1200.

[33] Lacombe, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part I," 18–51.

[34] Mark J. Clark, "The Commentaries on Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* of Stephan Langton, Pseudo-Langton, and Hugh of St. Cher," *Sacris erudiri* 44 (2005): 301–446, at 321–22.

[35] Ibid. I continued to refine our knowledge of the collaboration of Comestor and Langton on the *History* in a series of articles published between 2007 and 2010: "Stephen Langton and Hugh of St. Cher on Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica*: The Lombard's *Sentences* and the Problem of Common Sources," *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* 74 (2007): 63–117; "Peter Comestor and Stephen Langton: Master and Student, and Comakers of the *Historia scholastica*," *Medioevo* 35 (2010): 123–50; "The Commentaries of Stephen Langton on the *Historia scholastica* of Peter Comestor," in *Étienne Langton: Prédicateur, bibliste, théologien* (n. 15 above), 373–93; "Le cours d'Étienne Langton sur *l'Histoire scolastique* de Pierre le Mangeur: Le fruit d'une tradition unifiée," in *Pierre de Troyes, dit Pierre le Mangeur, maître du XIIe siècle*, ed. G. Dahan, Bibliothèque d'histoire culturelle du Moyen Âge 12 (Turnhout, 2013), 243–66.

[36] This is a central finding of *The Making of the* Historia scholastica*: 1150–1200*.

[37] Thus, Colish writes: "In theology, our one datum from that period is Stephen Langton's inception sermon as master in 1180." Marcia Colish, "Scholastic Theology at Paris around 1200," in *Crossing Boundaries at the Medieval Universities: Intellectual Movements, Academic Disciplines, and Societal Conflict*, ed. Spencer A. Young, Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 36 (Leiden, 2011), 31–50, at 29, noting the importance of this date in the work of Nancy Spatz. See Nancy K. Spatz, "Evidence of Inception Ceremonies in the Twelfth-Century Schools of Paris," *History of Universities* 13 (1994): 3–19, at 4, 6–7, and 10–13. For the text of the sermon, see Phyllis B. Roberts, ed., *Selected Sermons of Stephen Langton* (Toronto, 1980), 17–34.

[38] Riccardo Quinto, "La constitution du texte des *Quaestiones theologiae* d'Étienne Langton," in *Étienne Langton: Prédicateur, bibliste, théologien*, 525–62, at 554 and n. 84:

In fact, his lectures on the *History* predate 1176, as does his first revision of those lectures; Langton even revised the text of the *Historia scholastica* while Peter Comestor, whom Langton constantly praises as his Master, was still alive and was himself revising the *History*.[39] If as it seems Langton was already fulfilling the duties of a theologian prior to 1176, then in fact his studies in the Arts Course place him in Paris already in the 1160s.[40] He may have been in Paris even before then, since the evidence presented below will leave no doubt that he considered Peter Lombard, who died in 1160, his own master.[41]

Throughout this study, we shall have to keep this oral scholastic culture and this recently established chronology firmly in mind, for both will prove essential in unraveling the tangle of Langton's biblical corpus. The former is helpful for establishing not only the order of Langton's biblical opinions but also the context for those opinions. The latter, namely, the chronology of Langton's Parisian residence in general and of the versions of his course on the *History* in particular, proves to be of central importance, since as I show below in Part Three, the lectures upon which Langton founded his own lectures on the Bible are also, together with the biblical *Gloss*, the foundation for the *Historia scholastica* itself, put together over the course of the 1160s.[42]

"Nous avons déjà rappelé la demonstration donnée par Mark Clark que la première version du commentaire de Langton sur *l'Histoire Scolastique* de Pierre le Mangeur ne peut pas être postérieure à 1176. … Langton doit donc avoir commenté cette œuvre quand il était encore un étudiant. Quant au moment où il devint maître, nous n'avons aucune certitude: l'année 1180 comme date de sa leçon inaugurale — hypothèse qui a acquis petit à petit un status de quasi-évidence — est simplement le fruit d'une série de conjectures avancées par Maurice Powicke et reprises par Phyllis B. Roberts (voir *"Stephanus de Lingua-Tonante": Studies in the Sermons of Stephen Langton*, Toronto, 1968, p. 1, note 6 et p. 224; la leçon inaugurale est datée de 1180 avec moins de nuances dans l'édition: Ph. B. Roberts, *Selected Sermons of Stephen Langton*, Toronto, 1980, p. 15)."

[39] Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica, 187–253. Langton's second and final revision of his course on the *History* dates to 1193.

[40] Ibid., 170–71.

[41] A more precise estimate of the time of Langton's arrival in Paris to begin the Arts course awaits a determination of whether his lectures on Comestor's *Historia scholastica* were delivered at the beginning of his career as a theologian or subsequent to other theological work. This will only be determined through systematic editing of Langton's entire corpus. Somewhat remarkably, though, studies relying explicitly on the already-discredited chronology for Langton's Parisian career proposed by Powicke in 1928 and subsequently endorsed by Smalley, Baldwin, and others continue to appear. See, for example, Suzanne LaVere, *Out of the Cloister: Scholastic Exegesis of the Song of Songs; 1100–1250* (Leiden and Boston, 2015). Unfortunately, such ignorance of proven facts about Langton's career and corpus ends up undermining research that might otherwise be meritorious. See my review of LaVere's monograph to appear in *The Journal of Mediaeval Latin* (2017).

[42] For a recent assessment of the central importance of the biblical Gloss to Comestor's *History*, see my study: "Peter Comestor's *Historia Genesis* and the Biblical *Gloss*," *Medioevo* 39 (2014): 135–70.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

B. Lacombe's Classification of the Manuscripts Preserving Langton's Old Testament Corpus

Lacombe was under no illusions about the difficulty of assessing Langton's enormous extant biblical corpus:

> There is no medieval writer who has left more varied and enormous literary remains than Langton.... When brought face to face with the 120 odd mss. which contain these commentaries, the 100 incipits of what purports to be this work, it seems incredible that anyone should have written so much. It looks as if Langton glossed the Bible not once, but twice and perhaps three times.[43]

Lacombe was right to be suspicious about the possibility of one person's authoring so much. I show below in Part Two of this study that the extant corpus attributed unanimously to Langton by the tradition is not all his. Lacombe, however, who did not know this, endeavored "to get some order out of this chaos of mss."[44] In his view, the "mass of ms. material can be classified through external resemblances into a certain number of homogenous groups," yet Lacombe admits that "this does not preclude diversities within each group."[45]

Ultimately, Lacombe classifies the manuscripts into five general groups, a scheme based upon how the biblical books are organized within the manuscripts. The cautiousness of his language and the many caveats he adds make clear that he is well aware that his method of classification is unusual and provides at best only a rough approximation.[46] Lacombe assigns a letter to each group. Group A contains either the Pentateuch or individual books within it or the Heptateuch (group A^I), group B includes Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, or Joshua through Maccabees (B^I), group C the Pentateuch plus Joshua through Maccabees, group D the prophets, major and minor, and group E collections containing both the historical books together with the prophets.[47] To group F are assigned the many manuscripts preserving what Lacombe refers to as collections without order.[48]

---

[43] Lacombe, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part I" (n. 8 above), 64.

[44] Ibid., 65.

[45] Ibid., 64.

[46] Thus, he writes: "This mass of ms. material can be classified through external resemblances into a certain number of homogenous groups; though this does not preclude diversities within each group, as will be seen later. To permit the reader to understand this classification, to appreciate the problems which arise from the ms. tradition, and to control the arguments which will be based thereon, it seems advisable to give a detailed description of a characteristic ms. in each class. Again it will be necessary to tabulate, to visualize, so to speak, this tradition. We must therefore abandon the usual method of grouping the mss. according to the libraries in which they are preserved, and classify them, as far as possible, according to their external family relations." Ibid., 64.

[47] Ibid., 65–66.

[48] Ibid., 66–67.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lacombe provides incipits and explicits for all of the manuscripts in each of the five ordered collections (A through E).[49] But he admits that he himself only looked at the manuscripts of class B, those "containing Joshua, Judges, Ruth."[50]

Having classified the manuscript corpus into five quasi-ordered groups and one without discernible order and having provided incipits and explicits for all known manuscripts in the so-called five ordered groups, Lacombe continues his examination of Langton's Old Testament corpus with the following admission:

> In spite of a certain amount of external classification, it is evident that there still remains a great deal of disorder in this manuscript tradition. We must make due allowance for variations in the incipits which mislead us into thinking that a difference in *incipit* indicates a different work.[51]

He then comments on the bewildering variety of incipits that begin Langton's works on various biblical books. Even after attempting to order these incipits themselves, Lacombe faces the same problem of a multiplicity of commentaries: "However, even after a certain amount of order has been established by a classification of the incipits, it still looks as if Langton glossed the Old Testament not once but two separate times."[52]

Ultimately, however, Lacombe ends up endorsing wholeheartedly Smalley's theory about Langton's Old Testament corpus:

> The contention that the original form of these glosses is that found in the Peterhouse ms. 112 and the other mss. belonging to the same family, will be conclusively proved by Miss Smalley's collations of the various mss. of Langton's Gloss on the Historical Books of the Old Testament. In her studies she shows that frequently enough either the moral or the literal Commentary will contain a word, a phrase, or a section, which, meaningless in the context, gives satisfactory sense when found in its place in the full Commentary. This argument leaves no doubt that the original form of Langton's gloss is to be found in the complete form — literal and moral — which is preserved in Peterhouse ms. 112 at Cambridge, in ms. lat. 384 of the Bibl. nat. at Paris, and in ms. 294 of Chartres.[53]

In a footnote, Lacombe provides an example of the sort of evidence that he deems conclusive: "where the moral commentary on Ruth, as found in Paris, Bibl. nat. lat. 510, contains much of the matter which should be proper to the literal commentary, and vice versa."[54] In spite of his notable caution, therefore, Lacombe ends with certainty.

[49] Ibid., 67–80.
[50] Ibid., 69.
[51] Ibid., 80.
[52] Ibid., 81.
[53] Ibid., 85.
[54] Ibid., 85 and n. 1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lacombe, however, does leave open the question of whether Langton or another editor accomplished the division of the "full" versions into separate literal and moral commentaries.[55] He is inclined to think that someone other than Langton was responsible for doing so, writing that it "seems very doubtful that it was the work of Langton himself" and noting that "the excerpts are too slavishly literal, and show no signs of the retouches which an author would inevitably make in the course of such a task."[56] He concludes by pointing out that "the incoherencies already noted would hardly exist if the work had been done by Langton" but that "more light will be thrown on this problem by Miss Smalley, who is studying this point in great detail."[57]

C. Smalley's Classification of the Manuscripts Preserving Langton's Old Testament Corpus

We are now familiar with Smalley's typology for Langton's Old Testament corpus, but it remains to be seen which manuscripts belong to which classification. Given that this study treats only prefatory materials that introduce the five books of Moses, I restrict my discussion here to her treatment of the manuscripts preserving the Pentateuch. These suffice to illustrate Smalley's actual manner of proceeding, since she relies upon them extensively in her analysis.

It is worth noting that Smalley begins that analysis as cautiously as Lacombe, writing: "I have attempted to apply Mgr. Pelzer's rules to the Langton commentaries. No definite conclusions could be obtained without a thorough collation of all the mss, but I shall briefly indicate the problems centreing [*sic*] round each commentary from those mss. which I have examined."[58] Smalley, however, did not stick to this cautious manner of proceeding nor to her plan of indicating problems and leaving definitive statements until after comprehensive collation of all the manuscripts.

Smalley starts off as follows: "We may begin with the Pentateuch. Identical copies are in Peterhouse, Cambridge 112; Trinity College, Cambridge 86; Trinity, Oxford 65; Chartres 294; Durham A. I. 7 (for all except Genesis)."[59] She provides in a footnote her basis for claiming that certain copies are identical: "I test the identity of two works by collating the incipits, explicits, and some other passage."[60]

---

[55] Ibid., 85: "The evidence does not permit us to affirm whether this dissociation of the Commentary with its fourfold sense of Scripture into its constituent parts was the work of Langton or of a contemporary editor."

[56] Ibid.: "It … seems very doubtful."

[57] Ibid.

[58] Smalley and Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II" (n. 8 above), 152.

[59] Ibid., 167.

[60] Ibid., 167 and footnote 3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This statement makes plain first that Smalley had adopted a test that was seriously inadequate for her intended purpose, and second that she had moved a long way in just fifteen pages from her initial statement that "no definite conclusions could be obtained without a thorough collation of all the mss."[61]

I am myself convinced that Smalley's initial statement was correct and that the only way to sort out definitively the relations between these and the many other extant manuscripts preserving Langton's corpus will be to edit them critically, such that the various redactions are sorted out. For now, however, it suffices to note that the transcriptions of the extensive prefatory materials in each manuscript (except for Chartres 294, destroyed in World War II) suggest startling diversity rather than identity with respect to the works contained in the manuscripts grouped together by Smalley.[62]

Besides asserting their identity, Smalley also notes that these manuscripts, together with three others that contain only certain books from the Pentateuch, contain commentaries that "are all 'full' (both literal and moral)."[63] The "full" works contained in these eight manuscripts constitute her "Group One."[64]

Smalley then discusses what she considers to be the products, first literal and then moral, of the supposed division of the "full" version containing both. Paris, BNF, lat. 14414 and Mazarine 177 are the manuscripts listed by Smalley as the former products of this division; each contains "a literal commentary on the whole Pentateuch."[65] Because the prefatory materials in both of these manuscripts are minimal, neither features prominently in the evidence presented below in Part Two of this study. But because both manuscripts are central to showing how Langton's Old Testament biblical corpus came to have the form that is seen in the extant manuscripts, a few words are warranted here about each.

In fact, the formatting of the lectures in these two manuscripts is sufficient by itself to call into question Smalley's overall theory of a division.[66] The lectures in Mazarine 177 indicate rather that Langton's corpus underwent the same process

[61] Ibid., 152.

[62] Prologues and prefatory materials are by no means predictive of what will be found in the main body of medieval works, but in this case they suffice to make plain the impossibility of Smalley's theory. Moreover, I cite examples from lectures on the biblical books themselves sufficient to show that the prefatory materials in the case of Langton's Old Testament corpus are typical and not atypical in relation to those lectures.

[63] Smalley and Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II," 167. Smalley lists the other three and their contents as follows: "Brit. Mus. Royal 2 E. 12 has Deuteronomy, Bibl. Nat. 374 Exodus, Bibl. Nat. 384 is a volume containing two mss. bound ogether [*sic*], the first of these has Leviticus." Ibid.

[64] Ibid., 166–69.

[65] Ibid., 168.

[66] By "formatting" I mean the place of the lectures on the folios and specifically whether they are written in the main columns on each folio or copied into the margins. Where and how lectures and glosses are copied into a manuscript — and in most cases we are dealing with

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of accretion so typical of any scholastic context in the High Middle Ages. Like the earliest manuscripts preserving the *Historia scholastica* and Langton's course on the same, these manuscripts reveal multiple layers of addition in the marginal notes which, as in the manuscripts of the *History*, preserve the record of lectures and glosses that originated separately from those already in the main columns of the manuscripts.[67]

Although Smalley groups Mazarine 177 and BNF, lat. 14414 together, she says nothing about how the lectures are found in the manuscripts. It is clear, however, from preliminary transcriptions of all the prefatory materials in both manuscripts, including portions of Genesis, that Mazarine 177 preserves in the main columns very early lectures on Genesis by Langton, who refers unmistakably both to Comestor's *History* and to the lectures identified below as those of Peter Lombard.[68] The glosses added in the margins of Mazarine 177 supplement and expand those lectures. By contrast, the lectures in BNF, lat. 14414 preserve a tradition that encompasses both the original lectures in Mazarine 177 and the added marginal glosses together with additional material from the primitive lectures predating Comestor's *Historia scholastica*, identified below as those of Peter Lombard; the two manuscripts, therefore, are collatable, at least up to a certain point. But the format of the glosses in Mazarine 177 — one set is found written continuously in the main columns of the manuscript, whereas another set is copied into the margins — reveals that those two sets of glosses originated separately.[69]

In short, how these two manuscripts are related to each other suggests a much more complicated history than Smalley's theory, and her placing these two manuscripts together in the same "group," would suggest. Whatever the true history of their provenance — and this will only be revealed by careful editing — the one

copies of lectures — reveals a great deal about how the manuscript came to have the form or "formatting" it now has.

[67] Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica (n. 32 above), 109–254.

[68] For multiple references by Langton to Comestor's *History*, see Mazarine 177, fol. 7r^{b}. For Langton's reference to the lectures of the predecessor, whose lectures and identity both he and his students take for granted, see Mazarine 177, fol. 2r^{a}, where speaking to his students about the four senses of Scripture Langton refers unmistakably to his predecessor's method of lecturing on the senses of Scripture: "et alias tres prosequitur et dupliciter secundum allegoriam." That the reference refers to the lectures preserved in Cambridge MS, Corpus Christi 55, discussed at length below, is shown both by the practice of that earlier lecturer, which accords perfectly with Langton's description to his students, and with that first lecturer's own description of his practice: "allegorice dupliciter legitur" (Corpus Christi 55, fol. 1v^{a}). For these and all observations related to these two manuscripts discussed in this study I am indebted to my colleague, Dr. Joshua Benson, with whom I am editing the lectures on Genesis in all the manuscripts attributed to Stephen Langton. He and I, working together with Alexander Andrée of the University of Toronto, are preparing editions of these many lectures.

[69] The process, therefore, is very much like that displayed in the extant manuscripts of the *Historia scholastica*. See Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica, 157–86.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

certainty, discernible at a glance, is that the original form of these "literal" lectures was not, as Smalley insists, an integrated whole subsequently copied and divided into parts.[70] They are rather the records, the written vestiges, of lectures, founded one on top of another, of different theological masters.

As regards the other product of the alleged division, the moral half, Smalley does nothing more than list the four manuscripts containing the so-called moral version of the Pentateuch: "The moral Pentateuch is in Bibl. Nat. 355 and Arras 68. Lincoln College, Oxford 15 has the moral Genesis. Bibl. Nat. 385 the moral Numbers and Deuteronomy."[71] I do not address in this study the prefatory materials preserved in these manuscripts, although I do show that the prologue *Tabernaculum Moysi*, which I transcribe and translate below, is not a "Moral Prologue."

Smalley concludes her survey of the manuscripts containing the Pentateuch by mentioning three manuscripts that she deems to contain variant versions: Cambridge MS, Corpus Christi 55; British Library, Royal MS 2 E xii; and Durham Cathedral MS, A. I. 7. About the first, Corpus Christi 55, Smalley, like Lacombe, says very little.[72] Since the contents of this manuscript are featured extensively below, both in Parts II and III, nothing more will be said about it here.

About the second, British Library, Royal MS, 2 E xii, Smalley says only that it "has a Genesis identical with Corpus 55, except for the prologue"[73] and remarks for the second time that it "is notable that the Royal Deuteronomy, which follows Genesis, is identical with the first group, not the second."[74] By the second group Smalley understands the variant version contained in Cambridge MS, Corpus Christi 55; she means therefore that Royal MS, 2 E xii contains works that belong to two different groups: its Genesis to the second or variant group and the Deuteronomy that follows to the first or regular group.[75]

Smalley is wrong that British Library, Royal MS, 2 E xii is identical with Corpus Christi 55 apart from the prologue. If one compares the lectures on Genesis in these two manuscripts from the beginning, one sees right away that

[70] Smalley says nothing about the relationship of these two manuscripts to Durham MS A. I. 7 and other allegedly identical manuscripts preserving "full" commentaries on the Pentateuch that she names. But careful collation reveals that Mazarine 177 and BNF, lat. 14414 are related to Durham MS A. I. 7 and those other manuscripts in ways that seem to have escaped Smalley's notice altogether.

[71] Smalley and Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II" (n. 8 above), 168.

[72] I provide all she does say below in Part Two, where the importance of this manuscript is treated in detail.

[73] Smalley and Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II," 168.

[74] Ibid., 167 and 168.

[75] Ibid., 168–69.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

they are not identical.[76] Royal 2 E xii does have material common to Corpus Christi 55 but also has material not in the other manuscript. This is fascinating in itself, but the prologues in Royal 2 E xii make the contents of this manuscript even more interesting. A number of these prologues appear before the lectures on Genesis, and from examining this manuscript I know that they are of great interest for several reasons.

The first is that the prologue that begins, "In Exodo legitur," is also preserved in BNF, lat. 14415 and 14435, two manuscripts of great interest because the lectures on Genesis preserved in them are also collatable with those in Royal 2 E xii and dependent on those in Corpus Christi 55. This British Library manuscript, therefore, is very clearly related to those two Paris manuscripts.[77]

Because of the connection to Cambridge MS, Corpus Christi 55, British Library, Royal MS, 2 E xii and all of its contents — the British Library catalog lists the contents as anonymous postills not only on Genesis and Deuteronomy but also on Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Jeremiah, Hosea, and Baruch — will need to be studied thoroughly. Smalley says nothing about the other books in the manuscript, but each will have to be classified in relation to the lectures on the same book in all known manuscripts attributed to Langton. The same holds true for the prologues and the lectures on Genesis, whose relationship to the lectures preserved in other important manuscripts will also need to be sorted out carefully.

The third manuscript listed as containing a variant is Durham Cathedral MS, A. I. 7, which Smalley had previously classified with Group One except for the commentary on Genesis contained therein.[78] When she discusses it in connection with the variant versions, she addresses herself specifically to Genesis:

> A third variant of Genesis is Durham A. I. 7. This is very much fuller — at least in the Hexemeron [*sic*], the only section I have examined — than either of the other two groups. Certain passages would give the impression that "one" is a drastic abbreviation of "three" (Durham), since "three" contains various instances of consecutive lines identical with "one"; I could not find any identity between "two" and "three." "Three" makes the best sense; that is to say, if there is any

[76] A comparison of the material in Corpus Christi 55, at fol. 1r^{b} with that in Royal 2 E xii, at fol. 2v^{a} suffices to make this clear.

[77] In fact, during the time period following my submission of this study and its publication, we have ascertained from preliminary editing of these manuscripts that the lectures preserved in British Library MS, Royal 2 E xii and in BNF, lat. 14415 and 14435 are very early lectures of Stephen Langton on Genesis, which depend upon and incorporate much of the lectures on Genesis preserved in Cambridge MS, Corpus Christi 55. These latter lectures both predate and postdate Comestor's *Historia scholastica*, since although they are also attributable to Langton, who lectured on Genesis after the *Historia scholastica*, they also incorporate earlier lectures that predate the *History*. I discuss some of this earlier lecture material, below in this study, when I set forth the evidence for Peter Lombard's authorship of the original lectures.

[78] Ibid., 167.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> connection between "one" and "three," we might start from the hypothesis that "three" was the original, and that "one" had been unskilfully [*sic*] cut down from "three." On the other hand there are passages where "one" and "three" differ not only in wording but even in matter; they might be two different works. It is not the same kind of variance as that between "one" and "two," where the matter corresponds but not the words.[79]

I will have much more to say, below in Part Three, about the contents of this manuscript relative to those in Cambridge MS, Corpus Christi 55 and in other manuscripts deemed by Smalley to be part of her Group One. Smalley herself, following the paragraph just quoted, mentions and quotes a passage from the lectures on Genesis in Durham A. I. 7, analyzed in detail below in Part Three when I discuss the question of authorship, that would have clarified for her right away the relationship of the lectures contained in that manuscript to those contained in Corpus Christi 55, but she never checked the corresponding passage in the latter manuscript.[80] For now, let it suffice that Smalley's observations about the Genesis materials by themselves indicate a complicated tradition, at least for Genesis. Since in her own words "the prologues to Genesis present a distinct set of problems as baffling as those connected with the main commentary,"[81] let us turn our attention to what Lacombe and Smalley have to say about them.

D. Lacombe and Smalley on the Prologues

Lacombe notes the extreme diversity of the prologues for many of the biblical books in the manuscripts attributed to Langton. Since those leading up to Genesis constitute the proper focus of this study, it seems fitting to quote Lacombe about the diversity of the incipits for Genesis:

> The MS of Durham A. I. 7 begins: Volavit ad me unus de Seraphim et tulit cum forcipe calculum ignitum de altare [*sic*][82] ad purgandum labia mea. It is only after 17 lines that the prologue reaches: Quod Dominus precepit Moysi facere tabernaculum coopertum V cortinis hinc [*sic*][83] et inde etc. which is practically the ordinary incipit of the prologue to Genesis in most of the mss. More disconcerting still is the same Commentary on Genesis hiding behind the incipit: in Exodo XXXVI° capitulo: Facies michi altare; this is the prologue to Genesis in Brit. Mus. Royal

[79] Ibid., 169–70.

[80] Ibid., 170. The passage in question has a reference to "magister noster" which, as I show below, is invaluable. I provide, below in Part Two, a transcription of the entire passage as well as a comprehensive summary of Smalley's discussion of it.

[81] Ibid.

[82] The reading in the manuscript is the grammatically correct noun in the ablative case, "altari." I provide a full transcription of the prologue to Genesis in Durham A. I. 7, below in Part Two, subsection B.

[83] The reading in the manuscript is the correct one: "huic et inde." Lacombe simply misread the manuscript in these places.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> 2 E XII, f. 1 and Paris, Bibl. nat. ms. lat. 14435, f. 147[a];[84] it is the second prologue to Genesis in Peterhouse 112 and is likewise found at the bottom of f. 1 in Chartres ms. 294 in a simplified form: Facies michi altare. Thus we have four incipits for Genesis.[85]

Lacombe is wrong about the number of incipits for Genesis in the manuscripts attributed to Langton — he does not include the abbreviated introductions to *Frater Ambrosius* found in a number of manuscripts — and he gives no indication that he is aware of the diversity of prologues within works sharing the same incipit. He does, however, recognize that the incipits and prologues are not necessarily indicative of the works to which they are attached.[86] He puzzles over why the prologues introducing the literal and moral versions would refer to all four senses of Scripture yet does not pursue the matter in depth other than to express serious doubt about Langton's authorship of such a prologue.[87] His main concern is to introduce Smalley's typology.[88]

Smalley's treatment of the prologues is fuller yet still falls well short of any in-depth examination. She notes the justness of Lacombe's puzzlement over the seeming lack of fit between the prologues, all of which for every book of Scripture mention the various senses of Scripture, and the literal and moral versions, which seem to be restricted to just one sense.[89] She notes further that "this is merely one

[84] Here again Lacombe, who must have been working very hastily, misrepresents a manuscript. Paris MS, BNF, lat. 14435, for the portion provided here by Lacombe actually reads as follows (at the top of fol. 147r[a]): "In Exodo legitur trigesimo septimo capitulo: *facies* mihi *altare*." I provide a full transcription of this prologue as well, below in Part Two, subsection B. The first two prologues in this manuscript and in BNF, lat. 14415 are closely related to those in British Library, Royal MS, 2 E xii, which I examined in person this summer.

[85] Lacombe, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part I" (n. 8 above), 80.

[86] Ibid., 83: "In dealing with prologues and incipits, however, a certain cautiousness is necessary. Prologues are attached to works and detached from them with disconcerting facility; at times different prologues hide the same work."

[87] Ibid., 84–85: "It is incomprehensible that Langton himself should have composed a prologue for a purely moral gloss — the mystical sense of number had too strong a hold on the medieval mind."

[88] Ibid., 82–86.

[89] See Smalley and Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II" (n. 8 above), 154, where, speaking of her tripartite classification, she writes: "Conclusive proof however, must start from the inner coherence of the works themselves. We may begin with the prologues. Mgr. Lacombe has noticed the discussion of the double sense of the Scriptures in Langton's prologue to Genesis. This same distinction is drawn in the prologue to almost every one of the books commented. Langton stresses the need for an adequate understanding of the letter, the basis, he says, of the spiritual exposition. As Mgr Lacombe observes, Langton's remark would be pointless if he only intended to comment on the moral, and not *both* the literal and moral senses. Only the full and the moral commentaries, it may be explained, have this prologue; it does not apply to the literal."

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

example of the curiously incomplete and haphazard nature of the literal and moral commentaries as compared with the full type."[90] And she concludes her general discussion of all of the supposed Langton prologues with a description and classification that in her view lends support to her theory of a tripartite classification resulting from the division of a "full" original into partial and imperfect literal and moral versions. Speaking of the former "full type," she writes:

> In the latter each book is prefaced by a prologue of Langton's own composition, followed by the Hieronymian prologue (if it exists of that particular book) with Langton's explanatory comments on it. The literal commentaries have only the Hieronymian prologues, the moral only Langton's with their unfulfilled promise of the twofold exposition of the text. In the full commentaries the second prologue follows the first with some connecting formula such as "Hieronymus huic libro premittit proemium," and possibly some information about St. Jerome's purpose and the circumstances of his writing. In the moral commentaries we occasionally find this formula still attached to the last words of Langton's prologue, as in the full type. It is quite out of place, being followed, not by St. Jerome's prologue, but by the opening words of the text. The effect produced is naturally that of a hiatus, and points to a process of separation rather than of compilation.[91]

The disconnect noticed by both Lacombe and Smalley is in fact real, although there is no *a priori* reason for thinking that it suggests separation or division rather than compilation or addition. As will be seen below, both in Parts II and III, the evidence makes clear that the truth is far more complicated than Smalley supposed.

Smalley also discusses the prologues to Genesis, noting that they "present a distinct set of problems as baffling as those connected with the main commentary."[92] Nevertheless, she gives a determinate classification. She divides the prologues to Genesis into two classes, A and B, but subdivides class A into three variants.[93] Since these materials constitute the focus of this study, it would be useful to repeat here her analysis of the four groups that she identifies:

> Thus we have four types of prologue altogether. We have prologue B, and we have three variant versions of prologue A. They are not textually identical but have

[90] Ibid., 154–55.

[91] Ibid.

[92] Ibid., 170.

[93] Ibid., 170–71: "Peterhouse 112 and Chartres 294 each give two prologues which I shall call A and B. In Peterhouse 112 f° 1^b, B follows A without any break. There is nothing, except the reiteration of ideas, to show that we have two prologues instead of one. Chartres 294 f° 1r gives A, only in the text proper; B is written in the breadth of the margin along the foot, in the same hand as the text. The other mss. of group 'one' omit B altogether. Of group 'two,' Royal 2. E. XII has B only; Corpus 55 has no B, but a variant of A. Durham A. I. 7 also omits B. It has a prologue beginning with ten lines which are peculiar to this MS, the remainder is practically identical with the A of group 'one.'"

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> enough resemblance in substance to be described under the one heading "A." The "A" and "B" forms have much in common, but in the judgment of Mgr. Lacombe they are distinct compositions rather than variant versions of the same composition. One possible theory is that A, with its insistence on the significance of the number five, was the original prologue to the Pentateuch. B starts from an allegory which deals with the Scriptures as a whole, then reproduces more shortly some of the observations on the Pentateuch and other matters to be found in A, and ends with a few introductory remarks on Genesis, similar to those in A. The original A may have been rewritten with the object of providing a prologue which would be suitable as an introduction, not only to the Pentateuch, but to a long series of commentaries following after; thus we get B. This would account for the difference between A and B. The three mss. containing B actually do continue beyond the Pentateuch.
>
> The Durham form of A would serve as well as B for this purpose. The additional ten lines deal with another aspect of the Scriptures in their entirety, and so give the prologue a wider application than to the first five books immediately following. We return to the old question. What is the relationship between "one" "two" and "three"?[94]

Smalley does not provide transcriptions of these prologues, and her classification and discussion is difficult to follow without the texts to which she is referring in plain view. I provide all relevant texts, below in Part Two, except for Chartres 294, destroyed in the World War II, but, since this was very closely related to Peterhouse 112, the key manuscript for Smalley's conclusions about how to classify Langton's entire corpus, we shall still have the same basic evidence that was available to her to form our own conclusions. Even though that evidence has led me to drastically different conclusions, it will still be useful to have her theory of the prologues handy, since it manifests a very different way of approaching these materials.

Part Two: Langton and the School of Paris
His Reliance on the Lectures of an Illustrious Predecessor

The first and most important discovery to be shown is that the vast corpus of biblical material preserved in the complicated manuscript tradition attributed to Langton is not all by Langton but is founded upon the work of another master.[95] The second and related discovery is that the biblical corpus preserved in the manuscript tradition unanimously attributed to Langton consists entirely of lectures,

[94] Ibid., 171.

[95] I am grateful for the help of my colleagues, Joshua Benson and Tim Noone, who generously agreed to help me sort out the patently complex state of Langton's biblical corpus. Noone's view that Langton's corpus may be even more complicated than that of Duns Scotus, whose extant corpus was so complicated that it took decades to unravel, provides a fair estimation of the difficulties presented by the manuscript tradition preserving Langton's biblical corpus.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rather than "commentaries" or "postills," the designations for Langton's works used by Lacombe and Smalley and, following them, by scholars to the present day. In fact, as we shall see, Langton's lectures are part of a tradition of lecturing. They form part of a "School of Paris" in the sense that Langton, like Comestor and other masters, founded his classroom lectures on those of an illustrious predecessor. He did so by lecturing on that master's lectures.

The whole story, therefore, is much more complicated than has heretofore been supposed or imagined. Rather than a series of books composed by and attributable to individual masters, which were then passed on as books, we have instead in the manuscripts the record of an oral tradition passed down from master to master in the mid-twelfth-century schools of Paris. We find Peter Lombard reporting the oral teachings of other masters.[96] We find Peter Lombard referring to his own teaching on Colossians.[97] We find Stephen Langton reporting the oral teaching of both Peter Comestor and Peter Lombard.[98] The evidence to be presented, which suggests that Brady barely scratched the surface on what there is to know about Peter Lombard's career, is itself complicated. Indeed, how that oral tradition was passed down raises fascinating questions of how to edit these texts, for that "passing down" takes many forms. Orality, however, is the theme: we find ourselves, arguably for the first time, understanding just how oral a culture was the twelfth century.[99]

A. Langton's Old Testament Lectures: The Tip of an Iceberg

The evidence presented in this and the next section will show that Corpus Christi MS 55 not only preserves lectures by Langton but also contains earlier

[96] One such occurrence is fascinating, since we read in BNF, lat. 14435, fol. 147v[a]: "FAMOSISSIMA MENSA, ut dixit Magister Iohannes Saresberiensis, legitur in libro Valerii Maximi." By his own admission, John of Salisbury crossed to France in 1136 to study in Paris. Peter Lombard here refers to him as Magister, which is certainly a reference to be investigated. It is worth mentioning in this context that my colleague Tim Noone and I are tracing the scholastic trail of the logical theory of supposition, discussed at some length in this study, which makes its first known appearance in the lectures on the Bible of Peter Lombard and which was developed in the logical schools founded by Peter Abelard. John of Salisbury is a central figure in that scholastic trail that leads directly from Peter Abelard to Peter Lombard, and so the Lombard's reference to his oral teaching here is especially valuable.

[97] I discuss this passage, which is found in the same two manuscripts just cited, BNF, lat. 14415 and 14435, below in Part Three.

[98] For the former, see Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica (n. 32 above), 157–253. I document the latter, below in Part Three, subsection A.ii.

[99] This nuances Jaeger's view that oral culture died in the twelfth century. C. Stephen Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950–1200* (Philadelphia, 1994), 325–26.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lectures upon which Langton founded his own.[100] Indeed, this evidence will reveal that the carefully crafted prologue, *Tabernaculum Moysi*, that introduces the lectures on Genesis in this manuscript is not by Langton but is rather by an illustrious predecessor, whose identity both Langton and his students take for granted, whom I show below to be Peter Lombard.

Somehow, the uniqueness of this manuscript's contents has been completely overlooked. Lacombe lists it in Group C (Pentateuch plus Joshua to Maccabees) of his classification, noting the addition of Isaiah.[101] He quotes its title, "Stephanus Langton super Vetus Testamentum," noting that the same title is shared in many of the manuscripts preserving works attributed to Langton.[102] Yet it is obvious that Lacombe never examined its contents, even preliminarily, for had he done so he could not have failed to notice the uniqueness of its prefatory materials relative to those in other manuscripts attributed to Langton, much less the startlingly unique character of the lectures on the biblical books themselves. Indeed, we can be confident of this in spite of his silence, since he does not mention this manuscript when he discusses the bewildering variety of incipits for the different versions of the prologues to Genesis.[103]

Smalley too says very little about this manuscript, although what she does say is characteristically determinate. Like Lacombe she notes its title, writing that it "has a 'full' Pentateuch ascribed to Langton" and adding that "the remaining books are certainly his."[104] Curiously, she makes the following observation: "There are passages identical with the first group in this Pentateuch, but with a great deal of divergence."[105] I say curiously, because the evidence presented below shows that, had she examined that divergence even a little bit, she would never have thought, much less asserted so confidently, that the contents of this manuscript were exclusively Langton's.

Finally, Cambridge MS, Corpus Christi 55 is never discussed in the recent collection of studies from a Langton conference held in Paris in September 2006

[100] This manuscript is available online through the Parker Library. I am very grateful to Elizabeth Dumas and Steven Archer of the Corpus Christi Library in Cambridge, who graciously provided me with access, personal and digital, to this manuscript.

[101] Lacombe, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part I" (n. 8 above), 65.

[102] Ibid., 81.

[103] Ibid., 80. That he did not do so is paradoxical in the light of his own salutary advice to "make due allowance for variations in the incipits which mislead us into thinking that a difference in *incipit* indicates a different work." Ibid. Presumably he himself was misled by an *incipit*, "Tabernaculum Moysi," shared in common with other manuscripts. We shall never know, but what is certain is that Lacombe gives no indication that he is aware of the unique contents of this manuscript.

[104] Smalley and Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II" (n. 8 above), 168.

[105] Ibid.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and published in 2010.[106] It is, however, listed, together with other Cambridge manuscripts supposed to preserve works of Langton, in Appendix II of an article on Stephen Langton and the Victorines.[107]

It is, therefore, safe to say that Cambridge MS, Corpus Christi 55, long assumed to contain yet another copy, albeit a variant version, of Langton's Old Testament lectures, has been overlooked by scholars. Its inside cover records the following list of the contents of the lectures contained within:

In quinque libros Moysi
In Josue
In Iudicum
In Ruth
In quattuor libros Regum
In duos libros Paralipomenon
In Tobiam
In Iudith
In Hester
In Esdras
In libros Machabeorum
In Isaiam

Except for Esdras, which in the Old Testament normally follows the Books of Kings and precedes Tobit, Judith, and Esther, and except for Isaiah, the final item here named, the list seems a straightforward index of the first part of the Old Testament.

Three facts make this particular list interesting. The first is its close resemblance to the Old Testament books contained in the *Historia scholastica*. The Old Testament portion of the *History* omits First and Second Paralipomenon, includes brief histories of Ezechiel and Daniel, and omits Isaiah. The list is otherwise identical.

The second is its striking resemblance to the order of the Old Testament books lectured on by Langton. Cambridge MS, Peterhouse 112, after the heading "Stephanus Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus et sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinalis super Bibliam," has the following index of Old Testament books lectured upon by Langton:

[106] Bataillon, Bériou, Dahan, and Quinto, eds., *Étienne Langton: Prédicateur, bibliste, théologien* (n. 15 above).

[107] Rainer Berndt, SJ, "Étienne Langton et Les Victorins ou L'Embarras des Lacunes," in *Étienne Langton: Prédicateur, bibliste, théologien*, 125–63, at 159. I would be remiss not to point out that this particular study must be approached with considerable caution, since the author seems to ascribe to Stephen Langton lectures on the Gospels known to have been given by Peter Comestor. Ibid., 142, 145, 150, 151, and throughout.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Genesis
Exodus
Leviticus
Numeri
Deuteronomium
Josue
Iudicum
Ruth
Regum
Tobiam
Iudith
Hester
Esdras
Machabeorum
Isaiam

Smalley repeats several times that both Comestor and Langton seem to have followed Hugh of St. Victor's prescription for which historical books to study and in which order.[108] That seems right, but as I show below the more proximate source is the lectures of Peter Lombard on the Old Testament, which are embedded in Langton's lectures and appear to be the basis both for Comestor's *History* and Langton's lectures on the Old Testament.

The third is the overlap with the list of books known to have been glossed by Peter Lombard. The record provided by the obituary notice of the Church of St. Mary (the old church that was replaced by the Cathedral of Notre Dame, built by Maurice de Sully, the Lombard's successor as Bishop of Paris) lists both the entire New Testament and in the Old Testament, besides the well-known Psalter, "the five books of Moses, the four major prophets, the twelve minor prophets, the Song of Songs, Job, Esther, Tobit, Judith, the Book of Wisdom, Sirach, his *Sentences* and Gratian's *Decretum*."[109] If one adds the lectures on the major and minor prophets in Peterhouse 119 — the lectures on Isaiah

[108] Smalley and Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II," 161, where, speaking of Langton, Smalley observes: "It is rather interesting to note that he seems to have expounded the Sacred Books in much the same order recommended by Hugh of St. Victor to those who would study their allegorical significance." Smalley repeats the same observation in her monograph. Quoted and translated by Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3rd rev. ed. (Oxford, 1984), 198.

[109] Ignatius Brady, ed., *Magistri Petri Lombardi Parisiensis Episcopi sententiae in IV libris distinctae* (n. 6 above), vol. 1, Prolegomena, 20*, quotes it verbatim: "Insuper habuimus omnes libros eius glosatos, scilicet: Novum Testamentum totum; in Vetere Testamento: Psalterium, quinque libros Moysi, quatuor maiores Prophetas, duodecim minores, Cantica, Iob, Hester, Thobiam, Iudith, librum Sapientie, Ecclesiasticum, Sententias eiusdem et Decreta Gratiani."

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

therein are collatable with those preserved in Corpus Christi 55 — it would appear that we have a good basis for comparison, at least for the Old Testament.

To make the analysis to be presented herein easier to follow, I first provide the text of the lectures containing these prefatory materials in Cambridge MS, Corpus Christi 55 — I have divided the lectures themselves into separate paragraphs to make the internal divisions easier to see — and then furnish a translation of the entire text, which is also divided into paragraphs and presented with the original Latin text.

Because the manuscript contains a defective copy of the original lectures, I have emended its text in several places, but I alert the reader to the most important of these by means of footnotes explaining the emendation:

> Prologus in Genesim.
> *Tabernaculum* Moysi coopertum erat quinque cortinis et quinque cortinis. Tabernaculum Moysi est militans Ecclesia. Quinque cortinae sunt quinque libri Moysi, qui sunt nobis ad ornatum et ad refrigerium contra aestum vitiorum et ad munimentum contra intemperiem[110] aërium[111] tempestatum. Unde non vacat quod Dominus iussit cortinas esse distinctas quattuor coloribus: bisso retorta, iacincto, purpura, cocco[112] bis tincto. Quattuor colores figurant quattuor modos legendi: istoricum; allegoricum; anagogicum; tropologicum. Istoria figuratur per bissum retortam et bene dicit "retortam," ut fortis sit. Istoria enim fundamentum est, et ideo bene figuratur per bissum retortam. Allegoria figuratur per iacinctum, tropologia per purpuram, per coccum bis tinctum[113] anagoge, et bene dicit "bis tinctum," quia cum[114] coccus semel tingitur in via[115] et iterum tingitur in patria.[116]
>
> Prologue to Genesis.[117]
> Moses's tent was covered by five curtains and five curtains.[118] Moses's tent is the Church militant. The five curtains are the five books of Moses, which serve for us

[110] The manuscript reads "temperiem," which would mean temperance or moderation. The context, however, clearly requires "intemperiem," and the copyist of this manuscript, or another copyist somewhere up the line, made a simple mistake. Whenever that mistake was made, the lecturer clearly meant "intemperiem."

[111] The manuscript reads "aereum," which would mean of bronze or copper.

[112] The copyist substituted "croco," from "crocus," saffron of a yellowish-orange color, for the scarlet-colored berry named in Exodus.

[113] The copyist again substitutes "crocus/m" for "coccus/m," and in the manuscript we find: "crocum bi sticum." This is an indication either that the copyist of these lectures could not understand what he was reading, or it could mean that the original reporter was not able to hear what was said.

[114] The "quia" and the "cum" are both found in the manuscript, even though they duplicate each other in meaning "since." This is almost certainly a vestige of the original lecture, which would have had such imprecisions in it.

[115] The reference here is to Christian status as sojourners on earth.

[116] The reference here is to the heavenly homeland.

[117] Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are my own.

[118] The lecturer here recalls the ten curtains, which were joined together in five pairs to cover the huge tent of Moses, described in Exodus 26:1–3 and 36:8–10.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> as adornment, for cool refreshment against the summer heat of the vices, and for fortification against the inclemency of stormy weather. Whence it is not for nothing that the Lord God ordered that the curtains be distinguished by four colors: by wrapped cotton linen; by reddish violet; by royal purple; and by twice-dyed scarlet. These four colors depict the four ways of reading <Scripture>: historical; allegorical; anagogical; and tropological. History is depicted by wrapped cotton linen, and Moses does well to say "wrapped," so that it is strong. For history is the foundation and is therefore well depicted by wrapped cotton linen. Allegory is depicted by the Hyacinth flower, tropology by royal purple, anagogy by twice-dyed scarlet, and Moses does well to say "twice-dyed," since the scarlet berry is dyed once on the road of this life and is dyed again in the Fatherland.

The lecture is prefaced by the words "Prologue to Genesis," but the opening lines make plain that the lecturer has in mind an introduction to the entire Pentateuch. Making use of the references in Exodus to the five pairs of curtains covering the tent of Moses, he equates these to the five books of the Pentateuch, which in his elegant words serve both for graceful adornment of Scripture and for proof against the vices. The four colors named in Exodus as the distinguishing feature of the curtains introduce the fourfold division of Scripture. History, the foundation depicted by tightly wound cotton linen, is strong. Allegory and tropology are depicted by beautiful colors, the unique tint of the hyacinth flower and royal purple, respectively. Like history, anagogy, the sense of Scripture that comprises the last things, gets special attention. The lecturer wants his hearers to have in mind the admonition of Moses, whose twice-dyed scarlet berry reminds us of our Christian status as sojourners here on earth — we are as the lecturer puts it "on the road" — and also of our true fatherland in heaven.

The lecturer continues his discourse founded upon these curtains as follows:

> Item non vacat quod legitur cortinas factas esse opere plumario id est acu cuius una extremitas perforata est, alia vero acuta. Per quam figurantur, dico, adventus Christi: primus in quo erat lancea perforatus. Unde: *videbunt in quem transfixerunt*. Et secundus in quo punget et puniet.[119] Omnia ergo quae fiunt in sancta Ecclesia debent fieri opere plumario. Debemus enim habere unum oculum ad primum adventum ad minuendum timorem, <et alteram oculum ad secundum adventum ad incitandum timorem> et ita semper simus inter duas molas, et videamus, ne altera <altera> impingeretur.[120]
>
> Likewise it is not for nothing that we read that the curtains had been fashioned by the work of an embroiderer, that is, by a needle whose one end is pierced, while the

[119] The manuscript reads "pinet." The copyist evidently could not read the grapheme.

[120] I am grateful to my colleague, Joshua Benson, who noticed this omission by *homeoteleuton* in the text preserved in Corpus Christi 55, which I have rectified with a text approximating that of the original. This was easy to accomplish from the context, which makes perfectly clear what is missing. The emended text, therefore, makes much better sense than that preserved in Corpus Christi 55, which would otherwise be unintelligible.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> other is sharp. Through this are depicted, I say, the comings of Christ: the first, in which he was pierced by a lance. Whence: they will look upon him whom they have pierced. And a second coming, in which he will sting and punish. Everything, therefore, which is done in the Holy Church must be done by the work of an embroiderer. For we should have one eye towards the First Coming for diminishing fear, <and the other towards the Second Coming for inciting fear>, and let us be always thus between two millstones, and let us keep watch, lest by the one the other be impinged.

In continuing to develop his chosen theme of the five pairs of curtains covering the tent of Moses, the lecturer speaks of the fine quality of the work that made the curtains: the work has been accomplished in the best possible fashion, by embroidery done by hand. This interpretation allows our lecturer to make use of the imagery of a needle, whose two ends, the one perforated and the other razor sharp, depict Christ himself, his side pierced by a spear, on the one hand, and coming to judge the living and the dead, on the other. The work of the Church, therefore, like the curtains on Moses's tent, has to have the same quality, and all Christians must look backwards and forwards: to Christ's passion and death on the cross, which gives us courage and attenuates fear; and to his Second Coming, when Christ himself will do the stinging.

The lecturer continues to use the ten curtains covering the tent of Moses to develop his introduction to the Pentateuch, but now he begins to focus on the other five.

> Vel alia quinque cortinae sunt quinque libri Moysi aliter intellecti. Duplex enim est intellectus: literalis et spiritualis. Cortinae autem iungebantur per ansulas et circulos. Per "ansulas" intelliguntur promissa Veteris Testamenti; per "circulos" Novi Testamenti. Et nota quod quinquaginta erant ansulae, per quod nobis datur intelligi quod omnia quae facimus debemus referre ad remissionem in praesenti et ad quietem in futuro.
>
> Or the other five curtains are the five books of Moses otherwise understood. For the understanding of these books is twofold: literal and spiritual. By the hooks holding up the curtains we understand the promises of the Old Testament; by the rings those of the New Testament. And note that there were fifty hooks, through which are given to understand that everything which we do we should refer to the remission of sins in our present state and to the repose of the blessed in our future state.

These are "the five books of Moses otherwise understood," namely, by both the literal and the spiritual senses. And for the latter our lecturer, explicating the hooks and rings that held up the five pairs of curtains on Moses's tent, contrasts the promises of the Old Testament, symbolized by the hooks, with those of the New, symbolized by the rings. The number of hooks is also significant, for as with the scarlet berry which is dyed twice, one on the road of this life and a second time in Heaven, and also with the embroiderer's needle, whose two ends

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

depict the First and Second Comings of Christ, the number fifty points to both states, to the forgiveness of our sins in this life and to beatitude in the next.

It is worth emphasizing that there is no separation of the Bible and theology in this lecturer's introduction. His systematic explication of the significance of the curtains covering Moses's tent not only introduces the Pentateuch in expert fashion but also keeps his hearer's attention on the historical and spiritual realities that truly matter: Christ's incarnation and death on the cross together with our own actions, redeemed by Christ's suffering, and those of the Church in this passing life; and Christ's Second Coming and the Final Judgment together with our own eternal destiny.

So too just as the lecturer repeatedly emphasizes the connection between this life and the next, he also connects explicitly the Old and New Testaments in developing his theme:

> Isti quinque libri significati sunt in Evangelio per quinque panes hordeaceos. Ordeum enim quinque[121] habet proprietates: tenacis est paleae, humilis culini, cibus est iumentorum, aristam habet pungentem, et frangibilem. Quinque modo libri Moysi humilis culini, quia literaliter promittunt temporalia, et ita serpunt iuxta terram. Tenacis sunt paleae, quia spiritualis intellectus vix separatur a literali, sed ex quo separatur dulcis, sicut medulla hordei. Cibi sunt iumentorum id est rudium. Vel pungentes erant, quia lex inferebat mortem, ut ait Apostolus. Item frangibilis erat lex, quia parum durans superveniente nova.
>
> Those five books were signified in the Gospel through the five barley loaves. For barley has five properties: it has an extremely firm and hard chaff, it is found in humble kitchens, it is the food of beasts of burden, the beard of its grain is stinging, and it can be broken into pieces. The five books of Moses found in the Pentateuch are only of a humble kitchen, since they promise according to their literal sense earthly things, and thus they creep along the ground. Their chaff is firm and hard, since their spiritual understanding can scarcely be separated from their literal understanding, but when the one is separated from the other it is sweet, just like the pith of barley. Those five books are the foodstuffs of beasts of burden, that is, of the untutored. Or they were stinging, since the law carried with it death, as the Apostle says. In the same way, that law was breakable, since with the coming of the new law, which transcended the old, it lasted for only a short time.

Turning from five pairs of curtains that covered the tent of Moses, the lecturer finds another prominent scriptural five but this time in the New Testament, namely, the five barley loaves made use of by Jesus in the miracle of the loaves and the fishes. These signify aptly the five books of Moses, for barley and the Pentateuch share the same five properties. Like barley, the Pentateuch is low

[121] I have supplied "quinque," the correct reading, since the manuscript has only a vacant space (a *spat. vac.* in editorial parlance). The copyist could not read the grapheme here and left the space blank as a result.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and humble; in stark contrast to the Gospel, it promises only earthly things. Indeed, the Old Law, brought by Moses, carried with it death until it was transcended by the New Law, brought by Jesus.

At this point in his introduction, the lecturer concludes his explication based upon scriptural artifacts such as the curtains covering Moses's tent and the barley loaves multiplied miraculously by Jesus. But he continues to develop his theme of the connection between the five books of Moses and the Gospel:

> Vel quinque libri Moysi dicuntur pentatheuchus, et dicitur a "penta," quod est quinque, et "teucus," quod est volumen. Primus dicitur Genesis Graeco vocabulo, quia agit de generatione veteris Adae. In primo libro Novi Testamenti scilicet in Matthaeo agitur de generatione novi Adae. Ita in primo libro Veteris Testamenti agitur de creatione caeli et terrae, antequam agatur de generatione, ita in Matthaeo primus agitur de caelo et terra et de illis qui sunt caeli id est boni, et de illis qui sunt terrae id est mali, antequam perveniatur ad generationem Christi. Et quia Moyses vidit in Spiritu Christum esse descensurum de generatione Abrahae, ideo magis inmoratur in generatione Abrahae quam in alia.
>
> Or the five books of Moses are called "pentateuchus" and this is said from "penta," which is "five," and "teucus," which is "volume." The first book is called Genesis after a Greek word, since it treats about the begetting of the Old Adam. In the first book of the New Testament, namely, in Matthew's Gospel, we find treated the begetting of the New Adam. Moreover, just as in the first book of the Old Testament the creation of heaven and earth is treated, before it treats of the first begetting, so too in Matthew heaven and earth are first treated and also those things that are of heaven, that is, of the good, and of those things that are of earth, that is, of the bad, before it arrives at the begetting of the Christ. And since Moses saw in the Spirit that Christ would be descended from the line of Abraham, therefore the Pentateuch dwells at greater length on the begetting of Abraham than on that of any other person.

Having contrasted the limitations of the Pentateuch as compared with the fullness of truth found in the Gospel, the lecturer here shows the extent of the similarity and parallelism between the two. They constitute two parts of the same story that stretches from the creation of heaven and earth, whose sequel was the begetting of Adam, to the story of redemption through the new Adam, Jesus Christ, recounted in the Gospels.

The lecturer now concludes his carefully crafted introduction of the Pentateuch with a threefold commendation. I translate all three parts at one time, since it is this tripartite encomium that will serve as conclusive evidence that Langton is not the lecturer whose introduction we have been studying:

> Item ad commendationem Pentatheuci sufficiat quod Dominus temptationem Diaboli ad nihil avit per auctoritates sumptas de Pentatheuco scilicet de Deuteronomio.
>
> Vel alia est commendatio huius libri de hoc quod dicitur in Spiritu: *capite libri*, id est bibliotecae, *scriptum est de me*, quia per terminum supponentem supponitur

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> Filius Dei, per hunc scilicet "principio." Est enim sensus "*in principio*," id est "in Filio *creavit Deus*," id est Pater.
>
> Vel alia est commendatio eiusdem, que in principio Genesis vocatur distinctio trium personarum: persona Filii ubi dicitur, "*in principio*"; persona Patris ubi dicitur, "*creavit Deus*"; persona Spiritus[122] ubi dicitur, "*Spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas*."
>
> Likewise, let it suffice for the commendation of the Pentateuch that our Lord brought the temptation of him by the Devil to nought through authorities taken from the Pentateuch, namely, from Deuteronomy.
>
> Or there is another commendation of the Pentateuch from that which is said in the Spirit: *in the first part of the book*, that is, of the Bible, *it was written about me*, since through the suppositing term there is understood through supposition the Son of God, namely, through this suppositing term, "*beginning*." For here is the sense of "*in the beginning*," that is, "in the Son God created," that is, the Father.
>
> Or there is another commendation of the Pentateuch, which in the beginning of Genesis is called the distinction of the three Persons of the Trinity: the Person of the Son where it is said, "*in the beginning*"; the Person of the Father where it is said: "*God created*"; the Person of the Spirit where it is said: "*the spirit of the Lord was borne over the waters*."

This tripartite commendation of the Pentateuch is noteworthy for several reasons. First is our lecturer's wide-ranging command and use of Scripture. He first notes our Lord's use of quotations from Deuteronomy to frustrate the Devil's temptation in the desert. He then quotes the Psalms, connecting the language of Psalm 39:8 to the Bible in general and to the opening verse of Genesis in particular. Third, he explicates those opening verses of Genesis, showing how those verses reveal the Trinity itself.

The second noteworthy feature of this threefold commendation is its rhetorical structure, which anticipates and matches perfectly the substance of the third commendation, in which the Trinity itself is seen in the opening lines of Genesis.

The third noteworthy feature of this tripartite commendation is the lecturer's use of the language of supposition theory together with the language of terminist logic to explain what he calls the "suppositing term" of the opening line of Genesis, namely, "beginning," from the phrase "in the beginning." Speaking through the Spirit, the Psalmist, presumably David, utters the line: "in the first part of the book it was written about me." Taking the reference to "book" to refer to the Bible itself, the lecturer understands "beginning" in the opening words of the Bible in Genesis to refer to Jesus, the Son of God. He does so

[122] I supplied here the correct reading, "spiritus," since the manuscript has "patris." What happened is clear enough: the copyist made a mistake that all copyists make, an eye-skip error, and repeated "patris" after "persona." In this case, his eye skipped backwards.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

through the theory of supposition (*suppositio*), by which medieval thinkers understood a word's actual meaning in a specific context, as distinct from its signification (*significatio*), its meaning apart from any such context.

The lecturer's use of this technical language of supposition and terminist logic from the *logica modernorum* is as interesting as it is important from the standpoint of dating these lectures and determining their authorship. For this reason, and because the presence of supposition theory in these lectures is likely to transform our understanding not only of the place of the Bible in medieval theology but also to tear down disciplinary barriers between those medievalists who study logic and medieval philosophy, on the one hand, and the many medievalists who tend to ignore medieval logical developments, on the other hand, a brief historiographical summary of scholarship on supposition theory is warranted here.

The standard and best account of the development of supposition theory and terminist logic during the twelfth century remains that of De Rijk.[123] His first volume, *On the Twelfth-Century Theories of Fallacy*, traces the influence of Aristotle's *Sophisti elenchi* on the development of medieval logic and shows that the doctrine of fallacy was one of two basic foundations of the logic developed by the *terministae*. In his second volume, *The Origin and Early Development of the Theory of Supposition*, De Rijk argues that the other foundation, namely, developments by medieval thinkers of the theory of grammar, was even more central to the development of terminist logic.

The grammatical basis of terminist logic has particular bearing on the questions of date and authorship because, building on the seminal studies of Hunt, De Rijk argued for the central importance of Petrus Helias, who is known to have been teaching in Paris around 1142 and who may have lived until 1166, in the development of grammatical theories of language that led to the development of the *logica modernorum*.[124] Eminent scholars continue to debate whether De Rijk was correct in identifying twelfth-century grammatical developments as an important source for the origins of supposition theory. In a study published in 1981, Ebbesen argued against twelfth-century grammar as a formative basis for the logical theory of supposition.[125] Subsequently Kneepkens, in a study published in 1987, added to the case that the roots of logical supposition theory

[123] Lambertus Marie De Rijk, *Logica Modernorum: A Contribution to the History of Early Terminist Logic*, 2 vols. (Assen, 1962).

[124] Ibid., vol. 2, pt. 1, *The Origin and Early Development of the Theory of Supposition*, 229–34, citing here and throughout the volume Richard William Hunt, "Studies on Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries, I: Petrus Helias and His Predecessors," *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 1 (1941–43): 194–231.

[125] Stan Ebbesen, "Early Supposition Theory (12th–13th century)," in *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 3 (1981): 35–48. See also Yukio Iwakuma and Stan Ebbesen, "Logical-Theological Schools from the Second Half of the 12th Century: A List of Sources," *Vivarium* 30 (1992): 173–210.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

were likely related to grammatical discussions of Priscian's use of the word *suppositum*.[126] Quite recently, Ebbesen graciously acknowledged the force of the argument advanced by Kneepkens, while at the same time expressing his own reservations.[127]

Scholars have also looked to twelfth-century theological sources in the ongoing hunt for the origins of supposition theory. Valente has argued repeatedly and forcefully for the school of Gilbert de la Porrée as the likeliest and earliest place for the origins of supposition theory in the twelfth century.[128] In particular, her research into the origins of supposition theory focuses on the *Summa Zwettlensis*.[129] Stephen F. Brown, another preeminent historian of medieval philosophy

[126] Corneille Henri Kneepkens, "*Suppositio* and *Supponere* in 12th-Century Grammar," in *Gilbert de Poitiers et ses contemporains aux origines de la Logica Modernorum: Actes du septième symposium européen d'histoire de la logique et de la sémantique médiévales, Poitiers 17–22 Juin 1985*, ed. J. Jolivet and Alain de Libera (Naples, 1987), 325–51, at 341–42. Pinborg and Nielson had already advanced the same hypothesis, as did Alain de Libera in the same volume in which Kneepkens argued that the trail led back from the grammarian of the later twelfth century, Petrus Helias, who used the word "supponere," to Gilbert of Poitiers. See Jan Pinborg, "Review of L. M. de Rijk, *Logica Modernorum* II," *Vivarium* 6 (1968): 155–58; idem, *Logik und Semantik im Mittelalter: Ein Überblick* (Stuttgart, 1972), 47–49; Lauge Olaf Nielsen, *Philosophy and Theology in the Twelfth Century: A Study of Gilbert Porreta's Thinking and the Theological Expositions of the Doctrine of the Incarnation during the Period 1130–1180*, Acta Theologica Danica 15 (Leiden, 1982), 105; Alain de Libera, "Logique et théologie dans la Summa quoniam homines d'Alain de Lille," in *Gilbert de Poitiers et ses contemporains aux origines de la Logica Modernorum*, 437–69, at 455.

[127] See Stan Ebbesen, "Early Supposition Theory II," in *Medieval Supposition Theory Revisited*, ed. E. P. Bos in collaboration with H. A. G. Braakhuis, W. Duba, C. H. Kneepkens, and C. Schabel (Leiden, 2013), 60–78, at 61.

[128] Luisa Valente, *Logique et Théologie: Les écoles parisiennes entre 1150 et 1220* (Paris, 2008), at 275–96. Valente has produced many fine studies on logic and language during the second half of the twelfth century. See for example: Luisa Valente, "Langage et théologie pendant la seconde moitié du XIIe siècle," in *Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, ed. Stan Ebbesen (Tübingen, 1995), 33–54; eadem, "Fallaciae et théologie pendant la seconde moitié du XIIe siècle," in *Medieval Analyses in Language and Cognition: Acts of the Symposium, The Copenhagen School of Medieval Philosophy, January 10–13, 1996*, ed. Stan Ebbesen and Russell Friedman (Copenhagen, 1999), 207–36; eadem, "'Cum non sit intelligibilis, nec ergo significabilis': Modi significandi, intelligendi ed essendi nella theologia del XII secolo," *Documenti e Studi sulla Tradizione Filosofica Medievale* 11 (2000): 133–94; eadem, "Aequivoca oder Univoca? Die essentialen Namen in der Trinitätstheologie um die Wende des 12. Jahrhunderts," in *Logik und Theologie: Das Organon in arabischen und im lateinischen Mittelalter*, ed. Dominik Perler and Ulrich Rudolph (Leiden and Boston, 2005); idem, "La théologie grammaticale: Pierre le Chantre, Alain de Lille, Prévostin de Crémone," in *Philosophie et Théologie au Moyen Âge*, vol. 2, ed. Olivier Boulnois (Paris, 2009), 177–92.

[129] See also Luisa Valente, "Logica et teologia trinitaria in Pietro Lombardo e nel trattato porretano Summa Zwettlensis," in *Pietro Lombardo: Atti del XLIII Convegno storico internazionale, Todi, 8–10 ottobre 2006* (Spoleto, 2007), 23–50; eadem, "Talia sunt subiecta qualia praedicata permittunt: Le principe de la suppositio et son évolution dans la théologie du XIIe siècle," in *La Tradition médiévale des catégories (XIIe–XVe siècles)*, ed. Joël Biard

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and theology and an expert on the use and development of supposition theory before and after Ockham, also urged scholars to look to the theological literature of the twelfth century for the origins of supposition theory.[130] In this regard, it is worth noting that both Ebbesen and Valente think that Langton is a key figure in the early history of supposition theory but date Langton's use of it to the 1180s/1190s.[131]

To this day, therefore, the chronology of the origins of the logical theory of supposition remains a subject of doubt and debate. Valente, resting her chronological argument upon Häring's date for the *Summa Zwettlensis*, argues for the 1150s.[132] Ebbesen, however, believes that such an early date rests on a doubtful attribution and that the *Summa Zwettlensis* dates instead to the 1170s.[133] Ebbesen's critical review of the dates of all of the logical treatises edited and tentatively dated by

---

and Irène Rosier-Catach (Louvain, Paris, and Dudley, MA, 2003), 289–311; eadem, "Praedicaturi supponimus: Is Gilbert of Poitiers' Approach to the Problem of Linguistic Reference a Pragmatic One?" *Vivarium* 49 (2011): 50–74.

[130] He did so in a study published in 1993 centered around Walter of Chatton's discussion in his *Lectura* of the question posed by Peter Lombard in the fourth distinction of the first book of the *Sentences*, namely, whether God begot God. Stephen F. Brown, "Medieval Supposition Theory in Its Theological Context (with an Edition of Walter Chatton's *Lectura*, I, d.4, q.1, aa.1–2)," *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* 3 (1993): 121–57, citing at 122 and in n. 5 Peter Lombard, *Sententiae* 1.4.1, ed. Ignatius Brady (Grottaferrata, 1971), 77, line 21. After reviewing the little that was known about the twelfth-century origins of supposition theory from De Rijk's magisterial research, Brown suggested that scholars interested in tracing those origins would do well to investigate discussions of Trinitarian and Incarnational theology in twelfth-century theological literature. Ibid., 121–23. This study confirms the prescience of Brown's insight.

[131] According to Ebbesen, Langton "had developed a fairly complex theological theory of supposition in the 1180s/1190s, with a distinction between *suppositio essentialis* and *suppositio personalis* at its centre. I wondered aloud whether this meant that the logical distinction between simplex and personalis had its origin in theology. If this were so, the logical use of the notion of *suppositio* might be as late as the 90s, or possibly even later, depending on how many of De Rijk's early dates of logical treatises could be raised, and by how much. Of course, if simplex and personalis were artists' creations from the 70s or early 80s, Langton might have been inspired by the artists." Ebbeson, "Early Supposition Theory II," 65. See also Luisa Valente, "Logique et théologie trinitaire chez Étienne Langton: 'res,' 'ens,' suppositio communis et propositio duplex," in *Étienne Langton: Prédicateur, bibliste, théologien* (n. 15 above), 563–85.

[132] Luisa Valente, "Supposition Theory and Porretan Theology: Summa Zwettlensis and Dialogus Ratii et Everardi," *Vivarium* 51 (2013): 119–44, reprinted in *Medieval Supposition Theory Revisited*.

[133] Stan Ebbesen, "Early Supposition Theory II," 72, n. 43: "I am inclined to think that the *Summa Zwettlensis* is a work from about the 1170s. Häring's date 'before 1150' rests on his very doubtful attribution of the work to one Peter of Poitiers/Vienna…. If I am right, the *Summa* is approximately contemporary with Peter of Poitiers's *Sententiae*, in which *supponere* is used in a relevant way, but without any developed system of types of supposition," citing Valente's reliance on Häring's date.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

De Rijk provides the latest summary and overview of all available research into the chronology of the early development of logical supposition.[134] His summary is worth quoting in full here owing to its relevance to the present study:

> A host of questions concerning the dates of the relevant texts remain unresolved, but this is what I think the available evidence points to at this moment: The main outlines of the story about supposition remain as in 1967, but the dates change. First, the birth of supposition theory took place in the very late twelfth century. The first signs of what was to come appear in the 1170s, but in logic centered around the notion of appellation, while supposition was becoming a key notion in theology. A stage with a fairly developed terminology for types of supposition is not reached till about the 1190s, when also *suppositio* begins to outmanoeuvre *appellatio*, though this was to be a slow process. The majority of our early texts that teach or employ supposition, English and continental alike, were composed in the thirteenth century.[135]

It is noteworthy that Ebbesen here also speculates about the use of supposition theory in theological texts.

The theological texts quoted above in this study and others still to be quoted below show that the unnamed lecturer referred to in Langton's lectures on the Bible and his knowledge of supposition theory provide evidence crucial to resolving these longstanding and ongoing debates about the origins and dates of this logical development so central to the most important developments in medieval philosophy and theology. I shall take up the thread of this discussion once again, below in Part Three, when I consider in more detail the related questions of the authorship and date of these lectures. For now it suffices to note that the discussion of supposition theory and terminist logic in the preface to these lectures is of great importance not only in dating these lectures and determining their author but also in providing one of the earliest known examples of the use of terminist logic in twelfth-century theology.

Having set forth the prefatory materials that precede the lectures on Genesis in Cambridge manuscript, Corpus Christi 55, it is time to turn our attention to Langton's own lectures and prologue built upon that of his predecessor. In this case, however, rather than proceeding from start to finish, we shall start from the close of those prefatory lectures, since this will enable us to see clearly that Langton did not give the lectures recorded in Corpus Christi 55.

B. Comparison of Langton's Lectures with Those of His Predecessor on These Prefatory Materials

In the manucripts thus far known to me, besides the prologue just presented from Corpus Christi 55, which begins *Tabernaculum Moysi*, there are six or

[134] Ibid., 68–72.
[135] Ibid., 72.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

seven different and later prologues, all attributed to Langton but not all by Langton. All of those by Langton presuppose and are founded upon the Corpus Christi prologue that begins *Tabernaculum Moysi*: two branches of another version of *Tabernaculum Moysi*, both by Langton and both modeled explicitly upon the version in Corpus Christi 55; one version of *Volavit ad me*, also by Langton, which is yet another variation on the same theme but later and much expanded; one version of *In Exodo legitur*, also related to the *Tabernaculum Moysi* found in Corpus Christi 55 but in a different way — the author of this prologue may be either Langton or his authoritative predecessor — and two or three versions of *Frater Ambrosius*.[136]

In this study, the aim of which is to show only that Langton founded his own lectures on the Bible on those of an illustrious predecessor, I shall restrict myself to comparing the prologue of Langton that begins *Tabernaculum Moysi* with that of his predecessor, since this will suffice to accomplish that aim. A separate study, which will sort out the relationship between all of Langton's prologues and also between his prologues and those of his predecessor, will follow.

i. Langton and his Predecessor: *Tabernaculum Moysi*

I shall begin with a brief remark about the two branches of the Langton version of *Tabernaculum Moysi*, which is constructed upon the *Tabernaculum Moysi*, the lectures on his predecessor, found in Corpus Christi 55. These two branches are themselves collatable with each other. The Langton version is found in the following six manuscripts that I have examined: Arras BM, 68, Cambridge Trinity College, B. 3. 7, Charleville BM, 210, Paris, BNF, lat. 355, Oxford, Trinity College Lat. 65, and Oxford, Lincoln College Lat. 15.[137] In four of these manuscripts, namely, Arras 68, Charleville 210, Oxford, Lincoln College Lat. 15, and Paris, BNF, lat. 355, lectures exclusively devoted to the moral sense of Scripture follow immediately after the prologue, *Tabernaculum Moysi*, transcribed below.

[136] Since these latter have to do directly with the lectures on *Frater Ambrosius* that follow the prefatory materials treated in this study, I shall say nothing about them here other than to note their evident diversity and orality. We shall publish in the near future a study featuring all of these prologues and clarifying their authorship, purpose, and relationship one to another.

[137] Dahan provides a transcription of this prologue, taken from BNF, lat. 355, as an addendum to his study of Langton as exegete. Dahan, "Les commentaires bibliques d'Étienne Langton: Exégèse et herméneutique" (n. 18 above), 237–39. He lists it as and considers it to be Langton's prologue to the so-called Moral Commentary on the Pentateuch, doubtless since in BNF, lat. 355 it precedes lectures on the moral sense. Ibid., 237. But the fact is that this prologue is no such thing. It is, as I shall now show, Langton's introduction to the Pentateuch, founded upon the introduction to the same of his distinguished predecessor, contained in Corpus Christi 55.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The remaining two manuscripts, Cambridge B. 3. 7 and Oxford, Trinity College Lat. 65, are also obviously related to each other: they share most of the same variants. Both are evidently copies and were either copied from the same model or from each other.[138] In contrast to the format of the manuscripts just named, in which the prologue precedes directly lectures on the moral sense on Genesis, the prologue in these two manuscripts precedes copious lectures on *Frater Ambrosius* and *Desiderii mei*.

One obvious difference between the two branches is the following text not found in the latter two manuscripts:

> Hystoria est quae narrat rem prout gesta est. Allegoria est quae per unum factum aliud figurat. Tropologia est quae quid faciendum sit ostendit. Anagoge refertur ad supernam civitatem. Ista quattuor inveniuntur in hoc nomine Ierusalem: historice est civitas illa materialis; allegorice Ecclesia militans; tropologice anima fidelis; anagogice Ecclesia triumphans.

This insert, doubtless a note added subsequently to a copy of the original lecture, is a cogent disquisition on the four senses of Scripture, which we find in the middle of an existing explication of those same four senses. We can be sure that it is a later addition to the prologue, since there is no discernible basis for supposing a copyist's mistake in omitting it. The supposition of an intentional addition, combined with the fact that this branch of Langton's *Tabernaculum Moysi* precedes lectures on *Frater Ambrosius* and *Desiderii mei*, which themselves precede lectures on Scripture that are evidently constructed on those found in Corpus Christi 55, inclines me to consider this a separate branch of Langton's version of *Tabernaculum Moysi*, consciously adapted to different circumstances. But whatever the historical truth of the origins, all the manuscripts preserve the same language showing Langton's reliance on the *Tabernaculum Moysi* contained in Corpus Christi 55.

To make that abundantly clear, I juxtapose here the closing section of Langton's *Tabernaculum Moysi* with that found in Corpus Christi 55, re-presented here for purposes of convenience:

> End of *Tabernaculum Moysi* in Corpus Christi 55:
>
> Item ad commendationem Pentatheuci sufficiat quod Dominus temptationem Diaboli ad nihil avit per auctoritates sumptas de Pentatheuco scilicet de Deuteronomio.
>
> Vel alia est commendatio huius libri de hoc quod dicitur in Spiritu: *capite libri*, id est bibliotecae, *scriptum est de me*, quia per terminum supponentem supponitur Filius Dei, per hunc scilicet "principio." Est enim sensus "*in principio*," id est "in Filio *creavit Deus*," id est Pater.

[138] I have not yet collated enough material to know which is true, although I will know for certain once I have gotten well into the lectures on the Pentateuch.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Vel alia est commendatio eiusdem, que in principio Genesis vocatur distinctio trium personarum: persona Filii ubi dicitur, "*in principio*"; persona Patris ubi dicitur, "*creavit Deus*"; persona Spiritus[139] ubi dicitur, "*Spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas*."

Likewise, let it suffice for the commendation of the Pentateuch that our Lord brought the temptation of him by the Devil to nought through authorities taken from the Pentateuch, namely, from Deuteronomy.

Or there is another commendation of the Pentateuch from that which is said in the Spirit: *in the first part* (literally, "in the head") *of the book*, that is, of the Bible, *it was written about me*, since through the suppositing term there is understood through supposition the Son of God, namely, through this suppositing term, "*beginning*." For here is the sense of "*in the beginning*," that is, "in the Son created God," that is, the Father.

Or there is another commendation of the Pentateuch, which in the beginning of Genesis is called the distinction of the three Persons of the Trinity: the Person of the Son where it is said, "*in the beginning*"; the Person of the Father where it is said: "*God created*"; the Person of the Spirit where it is said: "*the spirit of the Lord was borne over the waters*."

End of *Tabernaculum Moysi* as found in Arras 68, Cambridge B 3 7, Charleville 210, Paris, BNF, lat. 355, and Oxford, Trinity College Lat. 65:

Item ad commendationem huius libri facit quod Dominus confundit Diabolum iaculis Pentateuci, quando temptavit eum. Sumpsit enim tres auctoritates de Deuteronomio et eum confutavit.

Item facit ad commendationem huius libri quod dicitur: *in capite libri scriptum est de me*. Dicit Christus in psalmo *in capite libri* scilicet bibliotecae, quia ibi dicitur *in principio creavit Deus caelum et terram*. Et haec dictio "principio" supponit pro Filio.

Item facit ad eius commendationem quod per hoc quod dicitur "*in principio*" huius libri manifeste exprimitur trinitas personarum: *in principio creavit Deus*. Ille terminus "principio" supponit pro Filio, ille terminus "Deus" pro Patre; ubi dicitur "*et spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas*" Spiritus Sanctus supponitur.

Likewise for the commendation of this book is the fact that our Lord confounded the Devil with the darts of the Pentateuch, when the Devil tempted him. For our Lord took up three authorities from Deuteronomy and refuted him conclusively.

Likewise for the commendation of this book there is what is said: *in the first part* (literally "in the head") of this book it was written about me. Christ says in the psalm (Ps. 39:8): in the first part of this book, namely, of the Bible, since there it is said: *in the beginning God created heaven and earth*. And this word "*beginning*" supposits for the Son.

[139] I supply here the correct reading, "spiritus," since the manuscript has "patris." What happened is clear enough: the copyist made a mistake that all copyists make, an eye-skip error, and repeated "patris" after "persona." In this case, his eye skipped backwards.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> Likewise is the fact for the commendation of this book that, through that which is said "*in the beginning*" of this book, there is expressed manifestly the Trinity of persons: *in the beginning God created*. That term "beginning" supposits for the Son; that term "God" for the Father; where it is said "*and the Spirit of the Lord was borne over the waters*" the Holy Spirit is supposited.

Comparison of these two endings from two different *Tabernaculum Moysi* prologues makes plain a number of striking facts. First and most strikingly, in Langton's version of the prologue, *Tabernaculum Moysi*, Langton and his students rely on the author of the earlier prologue of the same title without mentioning his name. There is evidently no need: everyone knows who he is. Langton and his students, therefore, take for granted the authority of the person whose lectures are the basis for Langton's. These lectures are authoritative — Langton would not take them as the basis for his own lectures if their authority were not taken for granted — and their author is so well known that he need not be identified here at the beginning of the lectures. Combined with the fact that Langton routinely cites his authorities, including Peter Comestor, the Master of the *Histories*, the title Langton frequently uses to refer to his master, this means that the author of these earlier lectures has surpassing authority. He is, whoever he is, the authority *par excellence*.

The second fact to note is that both authors, Langton's authoritative predecessor and Langton himself, are lecturing. The language of the illustrious master whose lectures are preserved in Corpus Christi 55 is unmistakably oral. This can be glimpsed even from this brief excerpt taken from the end of the prologue, in which our lecturer's phraseology ("let it suffice") and rhythym ("Vel alia est commendatio," "Vel alia est commendatio") are those of a speaker rather than a writer. The same is true of Langton, whose repetitive speech patterns are those of someone lecturing: "Item facit ad commendationem," repeated three times. I shall adduce more and even decisive evidence below, but for now it is important to remember the oral context for all of this transmission of learning that was established above. We are in a world of lecturers, whose own lectures are passed down and adopted as the basis for those of successive masters.

The third fact, by now obvious, is the dependence of the version or versions found in the five manuscripts listed above on that found in Corpus Christi 55. This dependence is impossible to miss. The original lecturer speaks on his own authority: "let it suffice for the commendation of the Pentateuch"; "there is another commendation of the Pentateuch," etc. Langton, by contrast, relies on his predecessor's authority and reports what the original lecturer said: "he commends." Moreover, he follows closely his authority's outline, repeating the same points in the same order. Langton does no more than restate the three points made by our authoritative lecturer. No one who reads the two sections juxtaposed above could miss either the clear dependence of the one upon the other or the difference in authorship. We shall see below, when authorship and date are considered, that Langton also follows closely his predecessor's lectures. For now,

however, it suffices to note the explicit and striking dependence of Langton and his students on the authority whose lectures they are using. We are in a "school," not in the sense of adherence to a doctrine, but rather in the sense of a tradition of teaching passed on from one master to another.[140]

Somehow, Lacombe and Smalley both missed these obvious yet crucial differences between the *Tabernaculum Moysi* found in Corpus Christi 55 and the version or versions of the prologue headed *Tabernaculum Moysi* found in the other manuscripts listed by and cited by them. It is clear that if either scholar read these manuscripts, he or she did so superficially, yet Smalley's claims and conclusions about these very materials were not only determinate but false. We can already be sure that the assumption of Dahan and so many scholars that Smalley's manuscript research was so sound as to preclude subsequent investigation is no longer tenable. Smalley's manuscript research as such can no longer be the assumed point of departure for scholars interested in the Bible in the Middle Ages; it is evident that it needs to be checked carefully.

What we learn here about the dependence of Langton's *Tabernaculum Moysi* on that of his predecessor from the unmistakable language of the end of these two prologues is confirmed by a comparison of the rest of the two prologues: Langton's *Tabernaculum Moysi* is founded explicitly upon the *Tabernaculum Moysi* of the author whose lectures he and his students took as the basis for his own. So as to make comparison easier, I juxtapose the individual parts of each prologue that are related one to another. I highlight in bold what Langton added, and I underline key changes in wording. Such a comparison leaves no doubt that Langton's prologue was consciously modeled after that of his illustrious predecessor; indeed, we see that he followed the same order:

> Corpus Christi 55:[141]
> Tabernaculum Moysi coopertum erat quinque cortinis et quinque cortinis. Tabernaculum Moysi est militans Ecclesia. Quinque cortinae sunt quinque libri Moysi, qui sunt nobis ad ornatum et ad refrigerium contra aestum vitiorum et ad munimentum[142] contra intemperiem aërium tempestatum.

[140] Different versions of these same three "Langton" commendations are found in the lectures preserved in Durham A. I. 7, at fol. 1r[b]. This manuscript preserves the prologue entitled "Volavit ad me," which for the same reasons adduced herein must also be by Langton. Durham A. I. 7, therefore, preserves a different set of lectures by Langton introducing the Bible. Our oral tradition is not only multilayered in the sense that it consists of lectures by different masters, but it is also complicated owing to the preservation of different sets of lectures by the same master, in this case Langton.

[141] Since I have already provided translations for each part of the prologue that heads Corpus Christi 55, I re-present here only the Latin text for ready comparison with that in Langton's version.

[142] The word "munimentum" used by the lecturer in Corpus Christi 55 is worth noting here, since it is also a favorite word of Peter Comestor in constructing his prologues. It appears prominently in Comestor's explication of the prologues to John's Gospel, with

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Langton's *Tabernaculum Moysi*:
Tabernaculum Moysi coopertum erat quinque cortinis et quinque cortinis, **quae erant tabernaculo ad refrigerium contra aestum solis et ad ornatum et ad defensionem contra aëris intemperiem**. Tabernaculum istud est militans Ecclesia. Quinque cortinae sunt quinque libri Moysi **litteraliter intellecti**, qui sunt Ecclesiae ad refrigerium contra incentiva vitiorum et ad ornatum virtutum et ad defensionem contra intemperiem malignorum spirituum.

Langton here substitutes "defensionem" and makes several other changes in wording as well. He also adds several phrases to his predecessor's text. Nonetheless, it is obvious that he and his students are starting with that predecessor's lectures — we know from copying errors that Langton and his students have a copy in front of them — as a base text for Langton's own lectures. There can be no question of an original book that is divided. Instead, we have a series of lectures, one set built on top of another. The process, which is one of accretion, is quintessentially scholastic.

Corpus Christi 55:
Unde non vacat quod Dominus iussit cortinas esse distinctas quattuor coloribus: *bisso retorta, iacincto, purpura, cocco bis tincto*. Quattuor colores figurant quattuor modos legendi: istoricum; allegoricum; anagogicum; tropologicum. Istoria figuratur per bissum retortam et bene dicit "retortam," ut fortis sit. Istoria enim fundamentum est, et ideo bene figuratur per bissum retortam. Allegoria figuratur per iacinctum, tropologia per purpuram, per coccum bis tinctum anagoge, et bene dicit "bis tinctum," quia cum coccus semel tingitur in via et iterum tingitur in patria.

Langton's *Tabernaculum Moysi*:
Non vacat **etiam** quod Dominus iussit cortinas fieri ex quattuor **pretiosis** coloribus **scilicet** *ex bisso retorta, hyacintho, purpura, et cocco bis tincto*, quae figurant quattuor modos legendi **Sacram Scripturam**: hystorice; allegorice; tropologice; anagogice. [**Hystoria est quae narrat rem prout gesta est. Allegoria est quae per unum factum aliud figurat. Tropologia est quae quid faciendum sit ostendit. Anagoge refertur ad supernam civitatem. Ista quattuor inveniuntur in hoc nomine Ierusalem: historice est civitas illa materialis; allegorice Ecclesia militans; tropologice anima fidelis; anagogice Ecclesia triumphans**.] Per bissum retortam propter fili fortitudinem designatur hystoria, quae firma debet esse et fortis et etiam fundamentum allegoriae, **sed illi qui transeunt minus sufficienter exponentes litteram non habent bissum retortam, immo filum simplex in cortina tabernaculi id est Ecclesiae**. Per hyacinthum designatur allegoria. **Hyacinthus enim aërii coloris est**. Per purpuram designatur tropologia, **quae invitat nos ad honestam conversationem. Purpura enim flammeum habet colorem**. Per coccum bis tinctum **significatur** anagoge, et significat caritatem quae in praesenti tingitur et in futuro.

---

which Comestor begins his own lectures on the Glossed John. Clark, "The Biblical *Gloss*, the Search for Peter Lombard's Glossed Bible, and the School of Paris" (n. 1 above), 100. Comestor may have picked it up from this lecturer, since as I show below the lectures preserved in Corpus Christi 55 are also the basis for Comestor's *Historia scholastica*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The story is the same for this next portion of the two prologues. Langton, using the lectures of his predecessor as the foundation for his own, repeats to some extent those lectures but adds to and expands them. The single biggest expansion is the text on the four senses of Scripture (bracketed to show its status as a note added to the text), which must have been added by Langton (or another master) after his initial lectures and which is found in the tradition prefixed to one branch of the tradition preserving his lectures on all of the senses of Sacred Scripture.

There are, however, other fascinating additions to the previous master's lectures that were found in Langton's original lectures, notably his warning that "those who cross over <from one sense to another> expositing the literal sense less sufficiently have not the wrapped cotton linen, but rather a simple thread in the curtain of the tent, that is, of the Church." Langton also connects tropology to the traditional Christian theme of *honestam conversationem* or conversion to a life modeled after Christ. And he modifies slightly his predecessor's theme, presented in the final sentence of the excerpt from Corpus Christi 55, of the contrast between the road of this life and the fatherland of the next, making explicit reference to the charity that must guide the former and constitute the latter. But the most important phenomenon to note is that Langton is expanding on the lectures of his predecessor, even as he explicates them. We have here a master consciously elaborating the teaching of another master.

> Corpus Christi 55:
> Item non vacat quod legitur cortinas factas esse opere plumario id est acu cuius una extremitas perforata est, alia vero acuta. Per quam figurantur, dico, adventus Christi: primus in quo erat lancea perforatus. Unde: *videbunt in quem transfixerunt*. Et secundus in quo punget et puniet. Omnia ergo que fiunt in sancta Ecclesia debent fieri opere plumario. Debemus enim habere unum oculum ad primum aduentum ad minuendum timorem, <et alterum oculum ad secundum aduentum ad incitandum timorem>, et ita semper simus inter duas molas, et videamus, ne altera <altera> impingeretur.

> Langton's *Tabernaculum Moysi*:
> Non vacat **etiam** quod cortinae factae erant opere plumario id est acuali. **Pluma enim dicitur acus. Acus enim significat Christum et opera omnia nostra, et omnem scientiam nostram debemus referre ad Christum. Bene autem per acum significatur Christus**. Acus enim duas habet extremitates: unam perforatam, aliam pungentem. Et Christus in primo adventu perforatus fuit in pedibus manibus et latere. In secundo autem punget malos, quando dicet: *ite maledicti etc*. **Prima ergo pars acus incitat spem, secunda timorem**. Et ista duo necessaria sunt, ut scilicet spes sit cum timore. Et ita ista acu omnia vestimenta nostra debemus consuere, quia in omni operatione nostra spem et timorem habere debemus.

The teachings in these prologues are fascinating. The image of the needle serves beautifully to reference Christ, his passion and death, and his second coming. Both masters evidently have Christology at the center of their introductions to Scripture and the Bible. But I must here pass over the teaching and images

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

presented, since their substance would detract from my immediate purpose, which is to show that Langton is following his predecessor's outline faithfully in lecturing and in explicating *Tabernaculum Moysi*.

Several details, however, are important to point out. First, we see in this excerpt from Corpus Christi 55 conclusive proof that he is lecturing; the insertion of "dico" puts this beyond doubt. Second, even though Langton is tracking closely his predecessor's language and explication, he expands it significantly, adding phrases and changing others. He makes the same points but much more expansively.

The significance of this for Smalley's theory cannot be overstated. Her hypothesis of a book authored by Langton that was subsequently divided by unknown successors paints a picture of Langton's corpus as evolving from large to small. The truth, as we see clearly from this juxtaposition of the lectures of Langton's predecessor and of Langton himself, is the opposite. The lectures upon which Langton founds his own are at least in these passages far more concise. His predecessor lectures in a pithy style; he makes his points and develops his argument in a succinct fashion.

By contrast Langton, incorporating those lectures, expands and develops them considerably in his own way. The styles of the two masters are manifestly diverse. We see this especially since they are explicating the same points. The very fact of one set of lectures constructed on another set indicates accretion and enlargement in size of the corpus. Add to this Langton's more expansive style, and we are faced with a phenomenon that is precisely the opposite of what Smalley proposed.

> Corpus Christi 55:
> Vel alia quinque cortinae sunt quinque libri Moysi aliter intellecti. Duplex enim est intellectus: literalis et spiritualis. Cortinae autem iungebantur per ansulas et circulos. Per "ansulas" intelliguntur promissa Veteris Testamenti; per "circulos" Novi Testamenti. Et nota quod quinquaginta erant ansulae, per quod nobis datur intelligi quod omnia quae facimus debemus referre ad remissionem in praesenti et ad quietem in futuro.
>
> Langton's *Tabernaculum Moysi*:
> **Item** aliae quinque cortinae **eidem** sunt quinque libri Moysi alio modo intellecti scilicet spiritualiter. Coniunctae autem erant istae cortinae cum aliis per ansulas et circulos, quia per promissiones Veteris Testamenti et per promissiones Novi Testamenti coniungitur spiritualis intelligentia litterali. Notandum autem quod ibi erant quinquaginta ansulae, quia omnia ista debemus ad quietem futuram referre. Quinquaginta enim significant remissionem.

Langton here follows his predecessor's outline and language very closely, expanding very little but mainly changing only the phraseology. He makes the exact same points. In the next section of the prologue, however, Langton expands his predecessor considerably, inserting what seems to be a miniature sermon on preaching into the middle of the former's outline.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Corpus Christi 55:
Isti quinque libri significati sunt in Evangelio per quinque panes hordeaceos. Ordeum enim quinque habet proprietates: tenacis est paleae, humilis culini, cibus est iumentorum, aristam habet pungentem, et frangibilem. Quinque modo libri Moysi humilis culini, quia literaliter promittunt temporalia, et ita serpunt iuxta terram. Tenacis sunt paleae, quia spiritualis intellectus vix separatur a literali, sed ex quo separatur dulcis, sicut medulla hordei. Cibi sunt iumentorum id est rudium. Vel pungentes erant, quia lex inferebat mortem, ut ait Apostolus. Item frangibilis erat lex, quia parum durans superveniente nova.

Langton's *Tabernaculum Moysi*:
Item isti **etiam** quinque libri significati sunt per quinque panes hordeaceos **quibus Dominus pavit quinque milia hominum, ut habemus** in Evangelio. **Ibi enim dicitur quod, cum Iesus vidit multitudinem magnam venire ad se, dixit ad Philippum: *unde ememus panes, ut manducent hi.* Et respondit Philippus: *ducentorum denariorum panes non sufficiunt etc.* Dixit autem Andreas Domino: *Est puer unus hic qui habet quinque panes hordeaceos et duos pisces.* Et Dominus ad illos: *facite homines discumbere etc.* Et repleverunt de fragmentis *duodecim cophinos.* Moraliter sic Philippus interpretatur os lampadis. Et gerit typum praedicatorum. Quando ergo praedicator videt homines esurientes fame verbi Dei et cogitat in animo — unde habebo scientiam qua possim illos reficere — tunc dicit ei Dominus in corde: *unde ememus panes, ut manducent hi*? Et per hoc quod Dominus communicat se ei, insinuat quod ipse est cooperator noster in operibus bonis, et debet respondere praedicator: *ducentorum denariorum panes non sufficient.* Per centum significatur perfectio, et notatur ibi duplex perfectio quasi diceret nec perfectio scientiae sive doctrinae, nec etiam perfectio operis sufficit pascere, sed dicit Andreas: *est puer unus hic etc.* Simili modo dicat praedicator et hoc, si sit Andreas id est virilis in opere et frater Simonis scilicet Christo obediens: *est puer unus hic*, quasi parvam et minus sufficientem habens doctrinam. Si velit loqui de aliqua auctoritate quinque librorum Moysi, dicat: *est puer unus hic* habens unum panem hordeaceum. Si de psalmis et prophetis, dicat: *est puer unus hic* habens unum piscem. Et si ita faciet, Dominus in tantum multiplicabit praedicationem suam quod sufficiet illis quibus praedicat. Et etiam in tantum de residuo habebit quod poterit praedicare etiam immundissimam vitam habentibus, et hoc est replere duodecim cophinos de fragmentis. Sed notandum quod bene dicit, *est puer unus hic*, quia praedicator mundam et etiam angelicam vitam ducere debet. Unde legitur in Apocalypsi quod Iohannes accepit librum de manu angeli, quia angelicam vitam debet habere a quo subditi accipiunt doctrinam.** Bene autem per panes hordeaceos significantur libri Moysi. Hordeum enim est culini humilis et lex quodammodo repebat circa terram, quia tantum temporalia promittebat.

Item hordeum est cibus iumentorum, **ita et lex est cibus Iudaeorum**, quia rudes erant in lege.

Item hordeum est tenacis paleae. Vix enim elicitur farina a palea, sed cum fuerit separata dulcissima est. Eodem modo spiritualis intelligentia vix elicitur a cortice litterae, sed cum fuerit elicita dulcissima est.

Item hordeum habet aristam pungentem, et ita lex pungebat. **Graves enim erant manus Moysi. Ibi enim dicitur *oculum pro oculo etc.* et huiusmodi**.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Apart from the insertion of the extended sermon-like disquisition on preaching, Langton again follows his predecessor's outline very closely, making only small changes. Of the five properties of barley named in the original — it has a rough shell, it is found in humble kitchens, it serves as the food of beasts, it has a stinging endpoint, and it is crushable — Langton repeats all but the last. Langton restates the opening point that the five books of Moses are well signified by the five barley loaves, presumably to make sure that his students follow that original outline.

The principal difference between the two texts is the extended disquisition on preaching, a brilliant and systematic exposition of the miracle of the loaves and fishes that connects each of the elements not only to the duties of a preacher but also to the parts of the Bible upon which he must preach. Although we cannot dwell on its substance here, Langton's exposition has many elements that will surely be of interest to historians and theologians alike.

> Corpus Christi 55:
> Vel quinque libri Moysi dicuntur pentatheuchus, et dicitur a "penta," quod est quinque, et "teucus," quod est volumen. Primus dicitur Genesis graeco vocabulo, quia agit de generatione veteris Adae. In primo libro Novi Testamenti scilicet in Matthaeo agitur de generatione novi Adae. Ita in primo libro Veteris Testamenti agitur de creatione caeli et terrae, antequam agatur de generatione, ita in Matthaeo primus agitur de caelo et terra et de illis qui sunt caeli id est boni, et de illis qui sunt terrae id est mali, antequam perveniatur ad generationem Christi. Et quia Moyses vidit in Spiritu Christum esse descensurum de generatione Abrahae, ideo magis inmoratur in generatione Abrahe quam in alia.

> Langton's *Tabernaculum Moysi*:
> Item isti quinque libri Moysi appellantur pentateuchus a "penta," quod est quinque, et "teucos" **sive "teuca**," quod est volumen **quasi continens in se quinque volumina**. Notandum autem quod liber iste dicitur Genesis, et hoc secundum Graecos. **Secundum enim Hebraeos dicitur bresith. Hebraei enim vocant libros suos a principio librorum. Bresith enim idem est quod in principio**. Et notandum quod sicut in hoc libro agitur de generatione veteris Adae, ita in Matthaeo, qui est liber primus Novi Testamenti, agitur de generatione novi Adae id est Christi. Et sicut hic praemittitur de generatione caeli et terrae, antequam agatur de generatione Adae, eodem modo in Matthaeo praemittitur de generatione caeli id est bonorum et terrae id est malorum, antequam agatur de generatione novi Adae.

In this, the penultimate part of his prologue, Langton again follows closely the exposition of his predecessor in the prior *Tabernaculum Moysi* prologue. He expands his predecessor's ideas, filling them out, and changes language and phraseology, but the dependence of the latter prologue upon the former is unmistakable. Langton uses the whole of the prior prologue in his own lecture: he shows himself to be a faithful disciple to the unnamed master.

I have already quoted the final portions of the lectures on *Tabernaculum Moysi*, showing Langton's repetition and endorsement of his predecessor's tripartite

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

commendation of the Pentateuch. From beginning to end, therefore, we find in these prologue-lectures on the text beginning *Tabernaculum Moysi* a one-to-one correspondence between those of Langton's predecessor and the two branches of Langton's own lectures as preserved in the tradition known to me. Langton took and used the lectures on *Tabernaculum Moysi* of the illustrious but unnamed master as the basis of his own lectures on the same theme.

Langton and his students, therefore, had copies of that master's lectures, to which he referred as he proceeded to lecture on those lectures, directing his students to the remarks and insights of his predecessor.[143] Everyone in the lecture hall knew whose lectures were being lectured upon by Langton: his predecessor was so illustrious that he needed no identification. We see clearly, therefore, an oral tradition that is taken for granted by all. It was in other words well established by the time that Langton delivered his own lectures.

Dahan concedes legitimacy to Smalley's tripartite typology (full and integrated, subsequently divided into literal and moral) as applied to the historical books of the Old Testament but questions its legitimacy with respect to others.[144] The evidence just presented, however, suggests that Smalley was asking the wrong questions about the entirety of Langton's Old Testament biblical corpus. It should be clear already, even from such evidence, that Smalley's theory about a single author whose work was subsequently divided is no longer sufficient. There may yet prove to be division — we will not know the whole picture until everything is edited — but the underlying reality is the typically scholastic story of accretion. The fact is that we have a scholastic context very much akin to that in which the *Historia scholastica* developed: a succession of masters, each lecturing on common texts, copies of which were diffused and used throughout the schools. Those copies could have taken and doubtless did take many forms, ranging from expansive explications such as those we have seen here to reductions focused on explications of individual senses of the Bible.

The point to be emphasized here is that Smalley, who did not realize that she was looking at manuscripts that recorded a living and rapidly developing

[143] Here we see the nexus between the original orality and the layers of orality embedded in the surviving texts, copies of lectures available to Langton and other masters. Editors and interpreters of such texts must be aware of multiple levels of error, some attributable to orality and some to copying. It is a complex reality, much more so than has been realized to date.

[144] "Le seul point sur lequel il faudrait s'interroger (et ma communication essaiera d'apporter une réponse à cette question) est celui de la typologie des commentaires proposée par Beryl Smalley: commentaires complets, commentaires littéraux, commentaires spirituels. Certes, la tradition manuscrite montre que cette typologie reste juste, mais elle ne concerne que les livres historiques de l'Ancien Testament. Pour les autres, il faudrait sans doute reprendre celle que propose George Lacombe d'une manière non systématique et non sans exprimer lui-même bien des doutes." Dahan, "Les commentaires bibliques d'Étienne Langton: Exégèse et herméneutique," 203.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

magisterial oral tradition and that encapsulated the teaching of multiple masters, posited a theory far too simplistic to account for the complexities of the underlying reality. With that oral, quintessentially scholastic context firmly in mind and with the knowledge that we have (at least) two authors and sets of lectures, copies of which are defective in places, we can now turn our attention to the question of the identity of our original lecturer.

Part Three: Peter Lombard's Biblical Lectures the Cornerstone of the School of Paris

If I have intentionally postponed (in Parts I and II) naming with certainty the master whose lectures Langton took as the foundation for his own, it is because I wanted to let the evidence for identifying that master speak for itself. Thus far, the evidence presented has shown only that Langton and his students were using the lectures of an unnamed predecessor for his own lectures. To be sure, the fact that Langton adopted this predecessor's lectures as the basis for his own together with the fact that he and his students took for granted the identity of that predecessor bespeaks authority and prestige. Whoever he was, Langton's predecessor was a master of considerable reputation.

For some time, I myself debated with colleagues the question of the identity of Langton's predecessor, since it seemed to me that the evidence suggested two principal candidates: Peter Lombard and Peter Comestor. On the one hand, reading through the lectures preserved in Corpus Christi 55 persuaded me that they also served as a crucial and proximate source for the *Historia scholastica*, which would mean that they predated the *History*.[145] On the other hand, the related fact that the list of books lectured upon in Corpus Christi 55 so closely mirrors the order in which Comestor treats those same books in the *History* seemed sufficient justification to consider seriously the possibility that Comestor, Langton's acknowledged master, had lectured on those same Old Testament books before the *History* itself came into existence.

But the evidence now to be presented settles the issue: there can no longer be any doubt that Langton and his students used, to an extent yet to be determined, the lectures on the Bible of Peter Lombard. I present here decisive proof for a number of books (Genesis, Judith, Tobit). But the same evidence is everywhere to be found, since Langton refers continually to the teachings of the master who is none other than Peter Lombard. Moreover, Comestor, who is not the principal object of this study, also appears to have founded his *Historia scholastica* on

[145] To establish this here would double the length of an already lengthy study, since the evidence is copious. Let it suffice to note here simply my distinct impression that these lectures, together with the biblical Gloss, constitute one of Comestor's most important sources for the *History*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Lombard's lectures. To gather all of that evidence together is well beyond the scope of this study and those soon to follow. The fact is that we shall have to edit all of the lectures contained in these many manuscripts to ascertain the full extent to which the Lombard's lectures on the Bible served as the foundation for those of his successors in the schools of Paris.[146] But the evidence here presented suffices to identify the master upon whose biblical lectures Langton founded his own. Like Comestor, Langton had and used the lectures of Peter Lombard.[147]

This is not to say that all questions have been answered about the biblical lectures of Peter Lombard in those of Stephen Langton: far from it. The lectures in the manuscripts used by Lacombe and Smalley and already available to us, especially those at the center of the puzzle, the Cambridge manuscripts, Corpus Christi 55 and Peterhouse 112/119, Durham manuscript, A. I. 7, and Oxford manuscript, Trinity lat. 65, pose a number of thorny questions that will only be answered by comprehensive editing.[148] It would, therefore, be premature to say anything too determinate about the relationships between these lectures on different Old Testament books without first gathering all available evidence. That said, there is a common underlying story: these manuscripts preserve only lectures, and they preserve lectures, whether in whole or in part, by more than one master.[149] The same lectures, at least for certain books, form the basis for and therefore predate Comestor's *Historia scholastica*.[150] The story is unquestionably one of the accretion of multiple layers of lectures, starting in the 1150s and continuing to 1200.

We have already seen that our unnamed lecturer was a master so prestigious that Langton felt no need to identify him to his students. Everyone knew his name. But we do have reliable evidence for identifying Peter Lombard as our unnamed lecturer.

---

[146] My colleagues, Joshua Benson at CUA and Alexander Andrée at Toronto, and I have already begun to edit Comestor's *Historia Pentateuchi* and the many versions of Langton's lectures on the Pentateuch.

[147] Clark, "The Biblical *Gloss*, the Search for Peter Lombard's Glossed Bible, and the School of Paris," 81–113.

[148] For the latter two manuscripts, while in Durham I profited from the personal assistance of Richard Gameson, who graciously shared with me his catalog descriptions as well as the following bibliographic information: Richard Gameson, *The Medieval Manuscripts of Trinity College Oxford: A Descriptive Catalogue* (Oxford, forthcoming); and idem, *The Medieval Manuscripts of Durham Cathedral Library: A Descriptive Catalogue* (in progress).

[149] Langton's lectures on Genesis manifestly presuppose those of an earlier master, but to say more we shall have to edit the lectures on the other books preserved in Corpus Christi 55: the remainder of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the four Books of Kings, the two books of Chronicles or Paralipomenon, Tobit, Judith, Esther, Ezra, Maccabees, and Isaiah.

[150] Comestor takes over verbatim many of the glosses contained therein and systematically mines the teachings. The lectures preserved in Corpus Christi 55 may prove to be his principal source for the *History*, as important as the biblical Gloss. All those that ultimately prove to be lectures of Peter Lombard must predate his death in 1160.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A. Authorship

The evidence presented in this subsection is twofold: that provided by the Lombard himself and that provided by Langton. We find the former hidden as it were in plain view in Langton's lectures on *Frater Ambrosius*. We find the latter in Langton's lectures on Genesis and Tobit. As I show in subsection ii, Smalley knew of this latter evidence but missed its significance.

There are of course many ways to prove authorship, ranging from sources used to attributions in manuscripts, but the gold standard is internal evidence and at the top of that same gold standard is self-identification that can be trusted.[151] Since we have that here, we shall let Peter Lombard speak for himself.

i. Peter Lombard's Identification of Himself

The Lombard's remarks occur in the middle of his lectures on *Frater Ambrosius*, which are preserved to a great extent unchanged as the foundation for Langton's lectures on the same.[152] To make those remarks more intelligible, it would be helpful to have the section of *Frater Ambrosius* upon which he is lecturing at hand:

> Nisi forte rusticum Petrum, rusticum dicimus et Iohannem, quorum uterque dicere poterat: etsi inperitus sermone, non tamen scientia. Iohannes rusticus,

[151] The number of unknown authors who claimed the name of a famous author for their own work is very high, and the business of self-identification is a well-known cottage industry for the vast literature produced by "pseudos": Pseudo-Dionysius, the many Pseudo-Bedes and Pseudo-Langtons. But there is internal evidence and self-identification that can be verified, which is precisely what will be presented here.

[152] Apart from the evidence presented in this section, proof of this statement must await another study, which will be of necessity as lengthy as this one. The reason for this is that we now know from our editing the order of the many layers of the lectures, at least for Genesis and all of the prefatory materials, that constitute the School of Paris. As I indicate below, the lectures preserved in the main columns of Corpus Christi 55 are the primitive, although the biblical Gloss on Genesis is the principal source for these lectures and could thereby be deemed the primitive. Comestor's *Historia Genesis* is next in chronological line, and this supplants the biblical Gloss as a source for the literal/historical sense, as the marginalia in Corpus Christi 55 make plain. It should be noted that Comestor's *History* is invaluable precisely because the lectures preserved in Corpus Christi 55, attributed to Langton, preserve two layers of lectures: those predating and serving as the foundation for Comestor's *History*, which as I show in this section are the Lombard's; and those that postdate and presuppose the *History*, which are Langton's. Langton continues to use the Lombard's lectures in multiple sets of lectures, on Genesis as on other Old Testament books, that build upon each other starting in the 1170s and continuing up to 1200. There are at least ten discrete layers of oral lecturing, all of which constitute one Parisian tradition, between the 1150s and 1200, and owing to our editing we can now show their authorship, order, and chronology. Hence the length of the study to come of this biblical material that constitutes the principal theological bridge between the death of Abelard and Hugh of St. Victor in 1141 and the work of Praepositionus and others that launches the thirteenth century.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> piscator, indoctus? Et unde illa, obsecro: *in principio erat uerbum, et uerbum erat apud deum, et deus erat uerbum*? λόγος Graece multa significat — nam et uerbum est et ratio et supputatio et causa uniuscuiusque rei — per quae sunt singula, quae subsistunt; quae uniuersa recte intellegimus. Hoc doctus Plato nescivit, hoc Demosthenes eloquens ignoravit. *Perdam*, inquit, *sapientiam sapientium et prudentiam prudentium reprobabo.*[153]
>
> Unless perhaps we call Peter a country bumpkin and John too, both of whom were able to say: "even if unskilled in speech, not however knowledge." John a country bumpkin, a fisherman, unlearned? And whence these words, I ask: *in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was the Word*? "Logos" in Greek means many things — for it means not only "word" but also "account" and "computation" and "the cause of each and every thing" — through which are those individual things that exist. All of these meanings we rightly understand <about the Word>. This the learned Plato did not know, about this eloquent Demosthenes was ignorant. *I shall destroy*, he says, *the wisdom of the wise, and the prudence of the prudent I shall condemn as evil.*

The key fact for us to note from this passage is Jerome's discussion of John and the beginning of his Gospel, which proves to be the centerpiece of the discussion of the passage both in the Lombard's lecture on it and in Langton's.

We find the Lombard's glossing of this text preserved in Paris MS, BNF, lat. 14415, at folio 2r[a] in the midst of lectures on *Frater Ambrosius* at Paris MS, BNF, lat. 14415, at Paris MS, BNF, lat. 14435, and at British Library MS, Royal 2 E xii:

> HOC DOCTUS PLATO NESCIVIT quod dixi[154] de Johanne contra[155] super Epistolam ad Colossiensem fere in principio super <illud> *ut impleam verbum*

[153] *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*, ed. Isidore Hilberg (Vienna, 1910), Epistula 53, 449.16–19. Note that the Lombard had the version of this text, documented in the apparatus of the CSEL edition, that includes the word "doctus." Jerome concludes by citing 1 Corinthians 1:19 to make his point.

[154] In both BNF manuscripts, we find "dixi," first-person singular, whereas in the British Library manuscript, we find "dicit," third-person singular. My reason for choosing the former over the latter is simple and straightforward: all three manuscripts depend on the lectures on Genesis preserved in Corpus Christi 55, which is the primitive. The direction, therefore, runs from Corpus Christi 55, the primitive, which has abundant and first-person language, to those three, which preserve that language, and as a consequence it is evident that "dixi" was the original lecturer's language, such that "dicit" is a routine copying error made by a scribe who misunderstood the minims in the exemplar. Further evidence for this line of reasoning is the fact that BNF, lat. 14435 is on one branch of the stemma, while BNF, lat. 14415 and Royal 2 E xii are on the other. Both branches, therefore, have "dixi," which must mean that this was the reading up the line in the common exemplar. It is also probative that all three manuscripts preserve the first-person plural "dicimus" of the original lecturer in this passage. Finally, the fact that the context of the whole passage, which makes clear that the Lombard is referring to his own earlier lectures, confirms decisively my choice of this reading.

[155] In all three manuscripts "contra" appears, which could stand for the adverb "contra," as I present it here, or as an abbreviation for the noun, "contrarium." In either case, the

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> *Dei: mysterium quod fuit absconditum a saeculis et generationibus*. Dicit Augustinus quod in quodam codice Platonis a Graeco in Latinum translato invenit ipse *in principio erat verbum et verbum erat apud Deum*. Responsum: dicimus quod illud forte ut somniando dixit. Impossibile enim fuit quod absque spirituali revelatione habuerit distinctionem Personarum. PERDAM INQUIT quasi dico quod Plato nescivit.[156]
>
> THIS THE LEARNED PLATO DID NOT KNOW, which I said about John as a "contra" in the Letter to the Colossians, <which may be found> almost in the beginning of my remarks about that passage: *that I may fulfill the word of God*: *the mystery that was hidden from the beginning of time and for all generations*. Augustine says that in a certain manuscript of Plato translated from Greek into Latin he himself found: *in the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God*. Response: we say that he said this perhaps as he was dreaming. For it was impossible that <Plato> apart from a spiritual revelation could have grasped the distinction of the divine persons. I SHALL DESTROY HE SAYS as if, I say that Plato did not know.

This passage is at once fascinating and crucial, because the lecturer speaks consistently in the first person. He refers to a "contra" that he spoke in his own work on Paul's Epistle to the Colossians; he even provides his student hearers with the location of the *Contrarium*: just around the beginning of his remarks on the Pauline text that begins, "*that I may fulfill the word of God*."

Moreover, our lecturer identifies with precision what he is opposing, in this case Augustine's discussion of the opening lines of John's Gospel in the *Confessions* (book 7, chapter 9), where Augustine famously recounts that he found in the books of the Platonists persuasive evidence that they knew that "in the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God" but that he found no evidence that the philosophers knew of the Incarnation.

Finally, our lecturer identifies with precision the substance of his "Contrary": Augustine had to have been dreaming when he said this, for knowledge of the triune God would have been an impossibility for the philosophers apart from a spiritual revelation. The "Contrary," therefore, focuses on whether or not the philosophers had any knowledge of the Trinity.

We find confirmation that our speaker is in fact Peter Lombard from two sources. The first is the text to which he refers his students, namely, the Lombard's Gloss on Colossians, the text of which I present here in relevant part from two

meaning is clear. Langton, whose lectures on this passage refer clearly to those presented here, speaks in terms of a "contrarium."

[156] I am grateful to my colleague in the School of Theology and Religious Studies at CUA, Joshua Benson, who first discovered this passage while transcribing and who authorized me to cite it herein.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

different manuscripts: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 268, beginning at folio 140v[a], and Paris MS, BNF, lat. 650, beginning at folio 213v[b]:[157]

> *QUAE DATA EST MIHI IN VOBIS* unum est enim a meis discipulis praedicatum est vobis quantum si a me ipso ministrum evangelii inter gentes a Deo per Christum factum se esse dicit. Ad quid autem ostendit, scilicet ut mysterium a Deo ceptum per idoneum servum impleatur, quod ignotum a saeculis sint scilicet mysterium nativitatis ex Deo et nativitatis ex Maria et salvationis gentium et totius operis Christi. Unde subdit *UT IMPLEAM* quasi *data est mihi* dispensatio ad hoc, *UT IMPLEAM* id est impletum ostendam. *VERBUM* id est dispositionem vel ordinationem *DEI* id est quod Deus praeordinavit de vobis gentibus vos scilicet per Christi incarnationem salvari. Hoc dicit ne videatur salus non esse promissa gentibus, quia Verbum est mysterium id est occultum, quia si notum erat *in prinicipio erat verbum* nusquam erat lectum *verbum caro factum est* etc. quae ad sacramentum incarnationis pertinent. Unde: *abscondisti haec a sapientibus et revelasti ea parvulis*.[158] "Quosdam enim Platonicorum libros ex Graeca lingua in Latinam versos vidi et ibi legi non quidem his verbis sed hoc quidem omnino multis et multiplicibus suaderi rationibus quod *in principio erat Verbum et Verbum erat apud Deum*. Sed quod *verbum caro factum est* non legi. Indagavi quippe in libris varie dictum esse quia Filius sit in forma Patris sed quod se exinanivit non habetur in illis."[159] Recte ergo illud verbum dicitur mysterium id est occultum quod Verbum a Deo fuit occultum quia absconditum fuit a saeculis id est a principio saeculorum.
>
> *WHICH WAS GIVEN TO ME FOR YOU.* For it is one thing that was preached to you by my disciples, as much as if he says that he was made a minister of the Gospel among the peoples by God through Christ. And to what end he shows, namely, that the mystery begun by God may be fulfilled by a suitable servant, that which was not known from the beginning of time, namely, that there be

[157] I provide here an eclectic text based on two manuscripts to ensure that the text is accurate and complete, since each manuscript contains errors. I make use of these two manuscripts, rather than providing the edition of the Lombard's lectures on Colossians reproduced in the Patrology ("In Ep. ad Colossenses," PL 192: 270D–272B, at 267A et seq.) for the sake of scholarly probity. The Lombard's lectures on Colossians have never been edited critically, and although the text reproduced in the Patrology serves perfectly well the purpose of supporting my arguments in this study (since it reports the Lombard's engagement with Augustine's reading of the books of the Platonists as regards the mystery of the Incarnation), nevertheless it differs sufficiently from that found in the manuscripts to warrant caution about presenting either as in fact the Lombardian original. As is well known, those who cite the texts reproduced in the Patrology as authoritative do so at their peril. For this reason, I present here the text found in the manuscripts, since that in the Patrology is readily available to any interested reader.

[158] Like Augustine, the Lombard provides this quotation from the Gospels (Matthew 11:25 and Luke 10:21), but, unlike Augustine, the Lombard places the quote in the middle, rather than at the end, of his explication.

[159] Here the Lombard quotes Augustine, apparently from memory, since although there are substantial portions that are verbatim, the whole quotation is a capsule summary of a much longer passage taken from book 7, chapter 9 of the *Confessions*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> the mystery of the Nativity from God and of the Nativity from Mary and <that> of the salvation of the Gentiles and <that> of the whole work of Christ. Whence he adds, *THAT I MAY FULFILL*, as if to say, *THERE WAS GIVEN TO ME* stewardship for this, *THAT I MAY FULFILL*, that is, that I may show it fulfilled. *THE WORD* that is the arrangement or regulating of God, that is, what God preordained about you Gentiles, namely, that you be saved through the Incarnation of Christ. This he says lest salvation seem not to have been promised to the Gentiles, since the Word is a mystery, that is, something hidden, since if it was known, *in the beginning was the Word*, nowhere was it read, *and the Word became flesh*, etc., which pertains to the sacrament of the Incarnation. Whence: *you hid these from the wise and revealed these things to the little*. "For I read certain books of the Platonists translated from the Greek language into the Latin, and there I read, not indeed by these words but this certainly I was altogether persuaded, by many and various arguments, that *in the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God*. But that *the Word became flesh* I did not read. I was to be sure on the trail in books where it had been said in various ways that the Son is in the form of the Father, but that he emptied himself of his glory is not found in these books." Rightly therefore that Word is called a mystery, that is, something hidden, because the Word was hidden by God that had been hidden away from time without end, that is, from the beginning of time.

We should note first the explicitly Christological context that provides the framework for the Lombard's response to Augustine. The Lombard refers to a series of mysteries: that of Christ's nativity from God, that of his nativity from Mary, that of the salvation of the Gentiles, and finally that of the whole work of Christ.

Christology also provides the substance of the Lombard's explication of Paul's statement that he was commissioned to fulfill the word of God, which even though it does not seem to have promised salvation to the Gentiles, nevertheless intends their salvation through Christ. The Lombard repeats that the word of God is a mystery, before introducing John's famous prologue. The Lombard makes clear that even if it was known that "*in the beginning was the Word*," nowhere else was it read that "the Word was made flesh."

It is at this point that the Lombard switches into the first person, but he is not speaking for himself. Rather, he is mouthing and restating Augustine's own words, as the Augustinian original makes clear:[160]

> Et primo volens ostendere mihi, quam resistas superbis, humilibus autem des gratiam et quanta misericordia tua demonstrata sit hominibus via humilitatis, quod verbum tuum caro factum est et habitavit inter homines, procurasti mihi per quendam hominem immanissimo typho turgidum **quosdam Platonicorum libros ex Graeca lingua in Latinam uersos, et ibi legi non quidem his uerbis, sed**

[160] For ease of comparison, I have highlighted in bold letters the words and phrases "borrowed" from Augustine by the Lombard. I do not provide a translation of the Augustinian original, since readers can see at a glance the Lombard's appropriation of Augustine's own language. Translations of the *Confessions* are in any case readily available elsewhere.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hoc idem omnino multis et multiplicibus suaderi rationibus, quod *in principio erat uerbum et uerbum erat apud deum et deus erat uerbum*: *hoc erat in principio apud deum; omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil, quod factum est, in eo vita est, et vita erat lux hominum; et lux in tenebris lucet, tenebrae eam non comprehenderunt*; *et quia hominis anima, quamvis testimonium perhibeat de lumine, non est tamen ipsa lumen, sed verbum deus est lumen uerum, quod inluminat omnem hominem uenientem in hunc mundum; et quia in hoc mundo erat, et mundus per eum factus est, et mundus eum non cognovit.*

Quia uero in sua propria venit et sui eum non receperunt, quotquot autem receperunt eum, dedit eis potestatem filios dei fieri credentibus in nomine eius, non ibi legi.

Item legi ibi, quia Verbum, Deus, non ex carne, non ex sanguine non ex voluntate viri neque ex voluntate carnis, sed ex Deo natus est; **sed quia Verbum caro factum est** et habitavit in nobis, **non** ibi **legi**.

Indagavi quippe in illis litteris varie dictum et multis modis, quod sit filius in forma Patris non rapinam arbitratus esse aequalis Deo, quia naturaliter id ipsum est, sed quia semet ipsum **exinanivit** formam servi accipiens, in similitudine hominum factus et habitu inventus ut homo, humiliavit se factus oboediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis: propter quod Deus eum exaltavit a mortuis et donavit ei nomen, quod est super omne nomen, ut in nomine Iesu omne genu flectatur caelestium, terrestrium et infernorum et omnis lingua confiteatur, quia dominus Iesus in gloria est Dei Patris, non habent illi libri.

Quod enim ante omnia tempora et supra omnia tempora incommutabiliter manet unigenitus filius tuus coaeternus tibi et quia de plenitudine eius accipiunt animae, ut beatae sint, et quia participatione manentis in se sapientiae renovantur, ut sapientes sint, est ibi. Quod autem secundum tempus pro impiis mortuus est et filio tuo unico non pepercisti, sed pro nobis omnibus tradidisti eum, non est ibi.
Abscondisti enim haec a sapientibus et revelasti ea parvulis, ut venirent ad eum laborantes et onerati et reficeret eos, quoniam *mitis est et humilis corde*, et diriget mites in iudicio et docet mansuetos vias suas videns humilitatem nostram et laborem nostrum et dimittens omnia peccata nostra. Qui autem cothurno tamquam doctrinae sublimioris elati non audiunt dicentem: *discite a me, quoniam mitis sum et humilis corde, et invenietis requiem animabus vestris*, etsi cognoscunt Deum, non sicut Deum glorificant aut gratias agunt, sed evanescunt in cogitationibus suis et obscuratur insipiens cor eorum; dicentes se esse sapientes stulti facti sunt…. Inveni haec ibi et non manducavi. Placuit enim tibi, domine, auferre opprobrium diminutionis ab Iacob, ut maior serviret minori, et vocasti gentes in hereditatem tuam.

The Augustinian original is manifestly the source for the Lombard's restatement, and it is interesting to see the Lombard adopting Augustine's voice without any indication to his students that he is doing so. Moreover, it is also interesting to note that he condenses and reorganizes the Augustinian original to suit his own purposes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Lombard's use of the word "contra" or "contrarium," which indicates a dispute with Augustine, may seem puzzling at first, since both men seem to agree completely. They certainly agree that the philosophers, even if they knew about God as *logos*, had no idea about the mysteries surrounding the Incarnation. Moreover, they both seem to agree that God's calling of the Gentiles was also hidden, apart from Revelation. But the Lombard's objection focuses specifically on knowledge of the Trinity, and there is ample justification in the Lombard's closing words, which are his own — "Rightly therefore that Word is called a mystery, that is, something hidden, because the Word was hidden by God that had been hidden away from time without end, that is, from the beginning of creation" — to support an understanding of a dispute with Augustine (even if based on a misunderstanding of Augustine) over how much the philosophers apprehended the Trinity.

The most important point for this study is that the Lombard's reference in his lectures on *Frater Ambrosius* to his Gloss on Colossians makes perfect sense, since it correlates to the teaching there. Indeed, at this point we can be certain that the author of the Gloss on Colossians and the lecturer quoted at this point in the lecture on *Frater Ambrosius* are one and the same person, namely, Peter Lombard, since he clearly refers his student auditors in his lectures on the latter to this particular discussion in the former.

Independent confirmation not only that Peter Lombard was responsible both for the Gloss on Colossians and this part of the lecture on *Frater Ambrosius* but also that the Lombard's explication of this passage in his Gloss on the Colossians was understood clearly as a "contra," an objection, comes from our second source: Langton's lectures on *Frater Ambrosius*, quoted here from Cambridge MS, Peterhouse 112, at fol. 1v[b]:

> Hoc doctus Plato nescivit ita Augustinus dicit super Iohannem se legisse quosdam libros Platonis translatos de Graeco in Latinum in quibus multis rationibus persuadebat Trinitatem personarum. Respondeo: Plato scivit hoc non certa sed quadam scientia aenigmatica et exili qualem non habent Christiani. Et licet sciret hoc *in principio erat* etc., tamen nescivit totum hoc: *in principio erat Verbum et Verbum erat apud Deum et Verbum caro factum est*. Nullus enim philosophorum ad noticiam incarnationis Verbi et sic (si *in cod.*) ad noticiam Trinitatis potuit penetrare, ut dicit Augustinus. Item Contrarium legitur super Epistolam ad Colossenses circa principium fere super illum textum, *ut impleam verbum Dei*. *mysterium* etc., ut dicit Glossa, "mysterium, id est occultum, quia si erat notum, *in principio erat Verbum* etc." Ibi dicit Augustinus quod Plato hoc scivit. Ad hoc dici potest quod ipse nescivit hoc certa scientia.
>
> This the learned Plato did not know thus Augustine says on John, that he read certain books of Plato translated from Greek into Latin, in which by many arguments he came to know the Trinity of Persons. I respond: Plato knew this not by certain knowledge but by a certain enigmatic and feeble knowledge of the kind that Christians do not have. And although it was permitted that he know this,

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> *in the beginning there was*, etc., nevertheless he did not know this whole: *in the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word became flesh*. For none of the philosophers was able to penetrate to the knowledge of the incarnation of the Word and thus to the knowledge of the Trinity, as Augustine says. Likewise, a "Contrary" is read in the Letter to the Colossians, in the beginning right around that text, *that I may fulfill the word of God*. MYSTERY, etc., as the Gloss says, "mystery, that is hidden, since if it was known, *in the beginning was the Word*, etc." There Augustine says that Plato knew this. To this it can be said that Plato did not know this with certain knowledge.

In this passage Langton, in walking his own students through the controversy, gives us everything we need to understand what was happening in his classroom. He first summarizes the heart of the matter, paraphrasing and summarizing Augustine even more concisely than had the Lombard, making clear that the issue has to do with knowledge of "the Trinity of Persons." He then gives his own pithy solution, namely, that Plato and his students, although they may have had some sort of knowledge of the mystery of the Trinity, nevertheless never attained to the certain knowledge possessed by Christians owing to revelation. In this Langton seems to side with Augustine, splitting the difference as it were with a distinction between different kinds of "knowledge." At the same time, he does not stray far from the Lombard's point of view, for even if the philosophers knew about the Word featured in John's prologue, they did not have the whole text; and since they had no possible knowledge of the Incarnation, it follows, as Augustine says, that they did not penetrate to knowledge of the Trinity. At this point in his explication of this line of *Frater Ambrosius*, Langton's students had the whole argument in a nutshell.

Happily for us, he continues by referring them to two authoritative sources. First, his next line ("Likewise, a 'Contrary' is read in the Letter to the Colossians, in the beginning right around that text, that I may fulfill the word of God.") makes plain that he and his students are familiar with and indeed that Langton is presupposing the Lombard's lecture on *Frater Ambrosius* in his own. The fact that Langton uses his master's very words in referring his own students to the relevant passage in the Lombard's Gloss on Colossians is helpful, since it confirms the conclusion that Langton and his students have the Lombard's text. It also puts beyond doubt the identity of the lecturer preceding Langton's own lectures on *Frater Ambrosius*: Langton's use of language taken from that original lecture and his retention of the reference to the Gloss on Colossians is definitive. Here again, we see that there is no need to name Peter Lombard. His identity and connection to both sources is taken for granted.

Second, in quoting explicitly from the Lombard's Gloss on Colossians ("MYSTERY, etc., as the Gloss says, 'mystery, that is hidden, since if it was known, *in the beginning was the Word*, etc.'"), Langton reveals to us that he and his students are familiar with that source, whether by impressive memory or by

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

means of copies available to them, as he is lecturing: they have instant access to both of the Lombard's treatments of this issue! This should not surprise us in the least given the Lombard's preeminent reputation among his successors in the schools.

The juxtaposition of these two sources in Langton's twelfth-century classroom should, however, abash us a bit. Modern scholarship has taken for granted that the Lombard's glosses on the Psalms and the Pauline epistles, both of which have survived independently, constituted his sole "biblical" legacy worth mentioning.[161] Yet had scholars looked at the work of his successors to assess whether or not this was true, they would have found here, on the very first folio of the manuscript upon which, as Lacombe tells us, Smalley based her entire theory of Langton's biblical corpus, clear evidence that our modern theory of the Lombard's biblical legacy is not true.[162]

Instead, we learn what we should have suspected all along, namely, that the Lombard's successors in the schools would have made full use of his entire body of work.[163] Small wonder then that we find the Lombard's reference to his own teaching side-by-side with Langton's references to the master's teachings.[164] Moreover, we not only have two generations but rather three generations of oral teaching preserved on the same folio, since in this same lecture preserved in these same two manuscripts we find Peter Lombard's reference to the oral teaching of John of Salisbury.[165]

Not surprisingly, Langton's own lectures on Colossians are founded on the Lombard's.[166] In those lectures, Langton brings the whole discussion back full circle by providing the broader context from Jerome's *Frater Ambrosius* and by situating

[161] Smith's recent summary is typical of all recent scholarship on the Lombard. Smith, *The* Glossa Ordinaria (n. 4 above), 78.

[162] Lacombe, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part I" (n. 8 above), 84.

[163] We find this same evidence in lectures on *Frater Ambrosius* preserved in BNF, lat. 14415 and 14435, the contents of which are as we have seen related not only to Corpus Christi 55 but also to Royal 2 E xii.

[164] On the very next column we find the phrase, "Magister vero dicit quod credit istud dictum esse …": BNF, lat. 14415, fol. 2r^{b}; BNF, lat. 14435, fol. 148r^{a}.

[165] The texts and folio numbers are provided above in n. 96.

[166] This is clearly seen from the lemmata, which are taken directly from the Lombard's Gloss on Colossians. This transcription is from the manuscript Olomouc 146, near the bottom of fol. 81r^{b}: "*secundum dispensationem quae data est mihi in vobis* gentibus mihi in Actibus Apostolorum … quod A MEIS DISCIPULIS respondet glosa tacite obiectioni *UT IMPLEAM* et ID EST IMPLETUM OSTENDAM etc. praeordinavit dico hic vos scilicet gentes PER CHRISTI INCARNATIONEM SALVARI hoc ut philosophis secretum fuit et absconsum NON ESSE PROMISSA GENTIBUS acquisitis SED NOTUM ERAT aliquibus *IN PRINCIPIO ERAT VERBUM* NUSQUAM ERAT LECTUM *VERBUM CARO FACTUM EST* ETC. QUAE AD SACRAMENTUM INCARNATIONIS PERTINENT quasi et si deitatem (*dup. et corr. ex* divinitatem *in cod.*) philosophi noverunt, non tamen

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the whole developing twelfth-century oral tradition that we have just seen in the context of Jerome's original "Contrarium":

> QUOSDAM ENIM etc. quasi unde dico quod notum erat philosophis *in principio erat Verbum*, quia QUOSDAM ENIM PLATONICORUM LIBROS EX GRAECA LINGUA IN LATINAM[167] VERSOS VIDI <ET IBI>[168] LEGI dicit Augustinus NON QUIDEM HIS VERBIS SED HOC QUIDEM OMNINO ET MULTIS ET MULTIPLICIBUS SUADERI RATIONIBUS QUOD *IN PRINCIPIO ERAT VERBUM ET VERBUM ERAT APUD DEUM*. Ergo Plato et eius discipuli cognoverunt quod *in principio erat Verbum et Verbum erat apud Deum*, sed Ieronymus dicit contrarium in prologo illo super Bibliotecam super Ambrosium etc., ibi ubi dicit: "Iohannes rusticus, piscator, indoctus," et "unde illa," vox, "obsecro: *in principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum?* Hoc doctus Plato nescivit, hoc Demosthenes eloquens ignoravit."
>
> FOR CERTAIN BOOKS, etc. as if, whence I say that it was known to the philosophers that *in the beginning was the Word*, since FOR I SAW CERTAIN BOOKS OF THE PLATONISTS TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK LANGUAGE INTO LATIN AND READ THERE, SAYS AUGUSTINE, NOT INDEED BY THESE WORDS BUT THIS CERTAINLY I WAS ALTOGETHER PERSUADED, BY MANY AND VARIOUS ARGUMENTS, THAT *IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE WORD AND THE WORD WAS WITH GOD*. Therefore Plato and his disciples knew that *in the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God*. But Jerome says the contrary in that prologue on the Bible entitled "On Ambrose," there where he says: "John a country bumpkin, a fisherman, unlearned?" and, in that utterance, "And whence these words, I ask: *in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was the Word*? This learned Plato did not know, about this eloquent Demosthenes was ignorant."

Langton, however, then provides his own solution, one obviously related to the one presented so concisely in his lectures on *Frater Ambrosius*:

> Sed illud contrarium potest solvi per hoc quod Ieronimus dicit, "Hoc doctus Plato nescivit." Non enim dicit, "Hoc Platonici nesciverunt." Augustinus vero dicit se legisse "*in principio erat Verbum* etc." in libris Platonicorum et non in libris Platonis. Id est melius, licet Plato et eius discipuli aliquam scintillam scientiae habuerunt quod *in principio erat Verbum* etc. et quasi somniantes persuadere. Volverunt tamen versum, nisi somniantes respectu noticiae quam iam habent Christiani, et habuit hoc Plato ex libris Moysi in Egypto, quod Platonica suae dixit esse inventionis. …
>
> But that "Contrary" can be solved through the very thing that Jerome says, "This the learned Plato did not know." For he does not say, "This the Platonists did not know." In truth, Augustine says that he read "*in the beginning was the Word*" in the books of the Platonists and not in the books of Plato. This is

Christi incarnationem nec eius … nec eius humanitatem. Unde nomen continens et explicans mysterium incarnationis et passionis dictum est ineffabile."

[167] The reading in the manuscript is "Latina," which I have amended for obvious reasons.

[168] The reading in the manuscript is "ubi," which I have also amended.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> better, although Plato and his disciples had a certain glimmer of knowledge that *in the beginning was the Word*, etc., and as if dreaming were persuaded. Nevertheless, they turned this verse around, except for sleeping in respect to the knowledge that Christians now have, and Plato had this from the books of Moses in Egypt, which the Platonists said were of his own invention....

Langton here goes back to the original source for a distinction that lets Augustine off the hook so to speak: the distinction is to be found in Jerome's original language. Moreover, Langton is still following his master's trail in using the language of dreaming, but here he applies it to the Platonists and not, as does the Lombard, to Augustine himself. It is not immediately clear from this passage whether it predates or postdates Langton's lectures on *Frater Ambrosius*; that remains to be determined. Nevertheless, what is crystal clear is how closely all of these lectures are related and also how they form a unified tradition.

Although we have a great deal still to learn about that tradition, we can already see its broad outlines. For one thing, we know that it is oral from start to finish. For another, we know that it is multilayered with the lectures of one master serving as the basis for those of another. In the present case, we find Langton and his students referring to the Lombard on Colossians as the Gloss. We know from his own directions to his students that the Lombard's Gloss on Colossians predates his lectures on *Frater Ambrosius*, just as we shall learn below, both from Langton's lectures on *Frater Ambrosius* and the Lombard's lectures on Genesis, that those lectures also postdate the *Sentences*. These lectures, therefore, will prove invaluable to anyone interested in the Lombard's thought and career, since their contents will provide scholars with a basis for comparing all of his prior works and for assessing the development of that thought.

It is important to note that the same person responsible for the lectures on *Frater Ambrosius* just considered is also the lecturer for the comprehensive lectures on all of the senses of Genesis preserved in Corpus Christi 55. We know this from an abundance of editorial evidence, but it suffices here merely to note the transition between the lectures on *Frater Ambrosius* and those on Genesis: "Sequitur *IN PRINCIPIO*."[169] The copyist here records the lecturer's going on from one text to another, in this case from *Frater Ambrosius* to the beginning of Genesis. The word "sequitur" serves as an oral transition. By contrast, in Langton's early lectures on Genesis, which, just like the lectures on *Frater Ambrosius* discussed above, presuppose those in Corpus Christi 55, even though most of the lecture material in Corpus Christi 55 is taken over verbatim by Langton, this word is omitted.[170] The reason for this is obvious. Langton, lecturing himself,

[169] Corpus Christi 55, fol. $1r^b$.

[170] See Paris MS, BNF, lat. 14415, fol. $3r^b$, Paris MS, BNF, lat. 14435, fol. $148v^b$, and British Library MS, Royal 2 E xii, fol. $10r^b$. Comparison of the lectures on Genesis preserved in these three manuscripts with those in Corpus Christi 55 show that this transition is one of

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

had no need to repeat this one-word transition employed by his illustrious predecessor.

Langton does, however, let us know that he is thoroughly familiar with the teaching methods of his illustrious predecessor. In later lectures on Genesis, which also presuppose those in Corpus Christi 55, Langton, while discussing the four senses into which he customarily divides Scripture, remarks to his students that the anonymous master whose lectures they are following, whom we now know to be Peter Lombard, explicates history, allegory, and tropology but does so twice for allegory.[171] The Lombard himself, in explicating the opening line of Genesis in those lectures, tells his students that he is doing precisely that which Langton later attributes to him.[172] Indeed, this is the very practice that the Lombard customarily follows in the lectures on Genesis preserved in Corpus Christi 55. The Lombard's self-identification, therefore, is amply corroborated both by his own lectures on Genesis and by multiple lectures by Langton on the same book.

In short, the Lombard's self-identification, repeated subsequently and attested in multiple ways by Langton, is invaluable when combined with the certainty that the same individual is also responsible for the lectures on Genesis preserved in Corpus Christi 55. We have the best possible evidence for a secure attribution, namely, that of the Lombard himself and the masters who founded their own teaching on his. There is, however, other evidence for the identity of Peter Lombard as the anonymous master responsible for these lectures, namely, that provided by Comestor and Langton in considering the opinions of their venerable master.

ii. Stephen Langton's Identification of his Predecessor

If the Lombard's self-identification leaves no doubt that Langton had his lectures on *Frater Ambrosius*, then the evidence to be presented in this section shows

---

the few words omitted by Langton. Benson and I will shortly publish a study setting forth the comprehensive evidence that establishes the order and relationship between the lectures on Genesis in Corpus Christi 55, Peter Comestor's *Historia Genesis*, and Langton's first lectures on all four senses of Scripture.

171 "Item: nota quod quattuor sunt partes Sacrae Scripturae: historia quae narrat rem prout gesta est, allegoria quae per unum factum aliud figurat, tropologia quae quid faciendum sit ostendit. **Et illas tres prosequitur et dupliciter secundum allegoriam** (emphasis supplied). Anagogice refertur ad supernam ciuitatem. Ista quattuor inueniuntur in hoc nomine Ierusalem: historice est ciuitas illa materialis, allegorice Ecclesia militans, tropologice anima fidelis, anagogice Ecclesia triumphans." Text quoted from Bodleian MS, Trinity College 65, fol. 3v^{b} and from Cambridge MS, Trinity College 86 (B. 3. 7), fol. 8r$^{a–b}$.

172 "Allegorice dupliciter legitur istud: de Ecclesia, de Sacra Scriptura. De Ecclesia sic: *In principio*, id est in Filio, *creavit caelum et terram* id est Ecclesiam." Cambridge MS, Corpus Christi 55, fol. 1v^{a}.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that Langton and his students had the Lombard's lectures on Tobit and Genesis and of other Old Testament books at their disposal. Most of this evidence was actually known to Smalley, who cited it and relied upon it in her study of Langton, but, as we shall see, she did not look closely enough at the manuscripts to understand its significance.

The first such evidence has to do with the captivity of Tobit, narrated in the opening verses of the Book of Tobit, which I present here for the convenience of ready comparison:

> Tobit (1:1) Tobias ex tribu et civitate Nephtali, quae est in superioribus Galilaeae supra Naasson, post viam quae ducit ad occidentem in sinistro habens civitatem Sephet (1:2) cum captus esset in diebus Salmanasar regis Assyriorum, in captivitate tamen positus, viam veritatis non deseruit.
>
> Tobias, of the tribe and inhabitants of Nephtali, which is located in upper Galilee above Naasson, past the road that leads westward keeping the settlement of Sephet on your left, after he had been captured, during the reign of Salmanasar King of the Assyrians, although he was in captivity, nevertheless he did not abandon the way of truth.

Smalley found a passage in Exeter College MS 23 (at fol. 1^b), which preserves lectures by Langton on Tobit, Judith, Esther, and the Minor Prophets, and in which Langton refers to his master's objection: "Hic obicit magister de quodam contrario quod ad presens pretermittimus"[173] (Here the Master raises an objection about a certain "Contrary," which for the present we will pass over). She considered but rejected the possibility that Langton was referring to Comestor in the *History*: "The Manducator sometimes referred to as 'the master in the histories' would not be meant, since he does not raise an objection at this point."[174] I show below that she was wrong, decidedly so, about the latter point: Comestor actually repeats the objection in the first few lines of his *Historia Tobiae*. If she did read this section in the *History*, she could not have read it closely. In any case, the master to whom Langton refers is not Comestor but rather Peter Lombard.

In my study showing that Peter Comestor incorporated Peter Lombard's prologue to John's Gospel into his lectures on the glossed John, I reviewed in detail the history of Smalley's position on the question of how to interpret references

[173] Smalley and Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II" (n. 8 above), 179. The full passage, which is found at fol. $1r^b$ of this manuscript, makes plain that Langton is lecturing and also makes plain to his students the context for Lombard's objection: "Qui captus esset in diebus Salmanasar regis Assiriorum etc. Per istud patet quod ante captivitatem factum est istud quod hic dicitur. Nota quod hic obicit Magister de quodam contrario, quod ad praesens praetermittimus." I am grateful to Joanna Bowring, College Librarian for Exeter College, Oxford, for helping me to obtain digitial photos of this manuscript.

[174] Ibid.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to "magister" in Comestor's lectures.[175] Initially convinced that all such references were to Comestor's master, she subsequently changed her mind, inexplicably and without evidence.[176] In doing so she erred — her initial position was correct — and this error led her (and Brady following her) to miss the significance of what is clearly a reference by Comestor to his master, Peter Lombard, and his master's prologue to John's Gospel.[177]

In the present instance, we are faced with a reference in Langton's lectures on Tobit to his "magister." Smalley is right that Langton refers to Comestor, his master, as "magister Historiarum," but Langton also frequently refers to Comestor simply as "magister."[178] It would, therefore, be significant, were the objection not raised in the *History*.[179] But it is so raised, and Smalley clearly overlooked the fact that Peter Comestor's treatment of this episode takes full account of the lectures that we are now about to examine. I will come back to this below. For now, it suffices simply to note that Comestor had the lectures of Peter Lombard, upon which his own student, Langton, founded his own.

To understand the discussion that follows it will be helpful to juxtapose Smalley's discussion of Langton's lectures on Tobit and her remarks about several important manuscripts with her comments on this particular passage in Tobit 1:2:

> Beryl Smalley on Tobias and two manuscripts, Peterhouse 112 and Corpus Christi 55:
> The commentaries on Tobias, Judith and Hester may be treated as a group…. Variant versions, full, are … Peterhouse 112 and Corpus 55 form a third group also full.[180]

> Beryl Smalley on Tobit 1:2:
> Comment on Tobias 1:2. "When he was made captive in the days of Salmanasar King of the Assyrians." Chartres 294, fol. 178[a] and Bibl. Nat. 510 fol. 55[a], representing the first three groups, discuss the opinion of the Interlinear Gloss which suggests that Tobias was captured with the two tribes, instead of with the ten tribes. "Nota quod non est captus cum duabus tribus [*sic*] sed cum x, et tamen Interlinearis Glosa videtur velle quod cum duabus, quia dicit 'inter alios adductus.'"[181]

[175] Clark, "The Biblical *Gloss*, the Search for Peter Lombard's Glossed Bible, and the School of Paris" (n. 1 above), 82–88.

[176] Ibid.

[177] Ibid.

[178] Ibid.

[179] The beginning of the *Historia Tobiae*, in which this episode is explicated, may be found at Vienna MS, fol. 133r[b] and at Paris MS, BNF, lat. 16943, fol. 111r[b]. These are the two earliest extant manuscripts of the *History*. The former closely approximates the text that Langton used for his lectures before 1176. See Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica (n. 32 above), 157–86.

[180] Smalley and Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II," 178.

[181] Ibid., 178–79.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Smalley, who treats Tobit with Judith and Esther as one group, classifies the lectures in Peterhouse 112 and Corpus Christi 55 together. Here she is correct; these two manuscripts are collatable, at least in part, as we are about to see. Somehow, however, Smalley missed that the very objection of the master referred to by Langton is found in both manuscripts, as is the "contrary" that Langton tells his students they are passing over for the moment. I provide here a single Latin text for the lecture in question, corrected to adjust for copying errors and accompanied by an English translation:[182]

> Original lectures as found in Corpus Christi 55 and Peterhouse 112:
> *Cum captus esset in diebus Salmanasar* Nota quod non est captus cum duabus tribubus sed cum decem, tamen glosa interlinearis videtur velle quod cum duabus quae dicit "inter illos abductus," de quibus dicitur: *primo tempore alleviata terra Zabulon et terra Nephtali* etc.[183] Prima autem duarum tribuum captivitas facta est per Teglaphalasar; secunda decem tribuum per eundem, qui et Salmanasar. Si ergo diceretur quod captivitatus esset a Teglaphalasar, reduceretur etiam ad Sennacherib, quia eius pater captivavit eum, et ita haec hystoria incipit a captivitate Salmanasar, sed non determinatur sub quo terminata sit. **Sed obicitur** (emphasis supplied): infra dicitur quod filius eius captivatus est cum patre, et ita in cantico eius dicitur: *Ierusalem civitas Dei castigavit te Dominus*.[184] Loquitur ibi de captivitate Ierusalem, sed illa facta est per Nabugadnezzar. Ergo Tobias vixit ultra captivitatem Ierusalem, quia Nabugadnezzar. **Sed contra** (emphasis supplied): hoc stare non potest ad litteram, quia sexto anno regni Ezechiae facta est captivitas decem tribuum, et regnavit undetriginta annis, ergo remanserunt viginti duo anni, et quinquaginta quinque de Manasse, duo de Amon, de Josia triginta unus, et post, anni filiorum eius, scilicet viginti usque ad destructionem Ierusalem, et ita patet quod plures anni fuerant a captivitate decem tribuum usque ad captivitatem Ierusalem quam legatur ille habuisse Tobias, et ita nullatenus potest esse verum quod vixerit usque ad destructionem Ierusalem secundum computationem annorum. Et hoc verum est; mistice tamen ita dicitur….
>
> English translation:
> *After he had been captured, during the reign of Salmanasar* Note that he was not captured with two tribes but with ten. That interlinear gloss seems to favor the former reading, namely, that he was captured with two, which says "abducted among others," about which it is said: *in the beginning the lands of Zabulon and Nephtali were dealt leniently with*, etc. But the first captivity of the two tribes was accomplished through Tilgath-pileser; the second, of the ten tribes,

[182] My text is based on Corpus Christi 55, fol. 208r[a] and Peterhouse 112, fol. 155r[b]. In the interests of brevity, I will not here note the variants, many of which clearly indicate copying errors that show the lectures in both manuscripts to be copies. The text that I present is eclectic by necessity, since it should be as easy to understand as it was in the lectures, defective copies of which were subsequently made. I do, however, provide the references for the biblical passages quoted in the lecture.

[183] The quotation is from Isaiah 9:1.

[184] Tobit 13:11.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> through the same, who is also Salmanasar.[185] If therefore it were to be said that he had been captured by Tilgath-Pileser, he would also have been brought back to Sennacherib, since his father captured Tobit, and thus this history[186] begins from the captivity wrought by Salmanasar. But it is not clear under whose reign it ended. **But it is objected** (emphasis supplied): it is said below that his son was captured with his father, and so in his canticle it is said: *O Jerusalem, city of God, the Lord has chastised thee.* He is speaking there about the captivity of Jerusalem, but that was accomplished by Nebuchadnezzar. Therefore Tobit lived beyond the captivity of Jerusalem, wrought by Nebuchadnezzar. **But against** (emphasis supplied) <this it must be said>: this understanding cannot stand according to the letter, since in the sixth year of the reign of Hezekiah there occurred the captivity of the ten tribes, and he reigned for twenty-nine years. Therefore, there remained twenty-two years, and fifty-five for Manassas, two for Amon, thirty-one for Josiah, and afterwards, the years of his sons, namely, twenty up to the destruction of Jerusalem, and so it is evident that more years elapsed from the time of the captivity of the ten tribes to the time of the captivity of Jerusalem than our man Tobit is read to have had, and so in no way can it be true that Tobit lived to the destruction of Jerusalem according to this computation of years. And this is true; understood mystically however, it is said….

I have highlighted the objection ("Sed obicitur") and the contrary ("Sed contra") to make it easy to see that Langton's words to his students — "Hic obicit magister de quodam contrario quod ad presens pretermittimus" — must be related to this original lecture. The "master" raised an objection, namely, that Tobit survived the destruction of Jerusalem, about a certain "contrary," which as we see makes clear from the computation of years that such a thing was not possible according to the letter of Scripture. Langton clearly knows and is basing his own lecture on Tobit upon this earlier lecture. Here again, even though Smalley discerned that for Tobit, Peterhouse 112 and Corpus Christi 55 form a third group, she overlooked crucial evidence in these lectures that can help us ascertain their authorship.

Again, it is obvious that we have here in Corpus Christi 55 and in Peterhouse 112 the teachings of the master referred to by Langton in his lectures on Tobit preserved in Exeter College MS 23. We have the objection raised and we have the contrary discussed at length. The question that remains, though, is who is the master raising the objection and discussing the contrary. Is it Peter Lombard? We have several helpful clues that indicate that Peter Lombard is in fact the master responsible for the original lectures.

First, it is clear from Comestor's treatment of this same issue in the *History* that he is not the master here referred to by Langton. Indeed, the beginning of his *Historia Tobiae* makes plain that, like Langton, Comestor had those same lectures

[185] Actually a different ruler, Shalmanezer V.

[186] The reference is to the "history of Tobit," which interestingly enough anticipates the structure of Comestor's *Histories*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of this master whose identity everyone in his and in Langton's circle knows. Indeed, Comestor's treatment is a summary of the heart of the whole matter; he gets straight to the points made by the "master." To make this abundantly clear, I will present here several excerpts that are unmistakably based on the lectures of our "master":[187]

> Incipit historia Tobiae:
> Historia Tobiae exordium habuit in captivitate decem tribuum quam fecit Salmanasar. Quo vero tempore terminum habuerit non satis lucet. Videtur enim secundum litteram historiae Tobias vixisse post excidium Ierusalem et incendium Templi. Ait enim in cantico suo: *Ierusalem civitas Dei castigavit te Dominus*.

> Here begins the history of Tobit:
> The history of Tobit had its beginning in the captivity of the ten tribes which Salmasar accomplished. But at what time this history had its end there is not sufficient light. For it seems, according to the letter of the history of Tobit, that he lived past the destruction of Jerusalem and the burning of the Temple. For Tobit says in his canticle: *O Jerusalem, city of God, the Lord has chastised thee*.

No student ever summarized more concisely the lecture of his teacher, point by point, than Comestor does here. He provides for his own students a medieval version of Cliff's Notes. He has condensed the original, but his reliance on it, both in outline and in substance, is unmistakable. For while it is true that Comestor does not use the word "objection," he nevertheless presents the very same objection found in the original lecture in a nutshell: Tobit's own canticle reveals that he knew of the destruction of Jerusalem in 580 BC, and therefore he must have lived past this date. Here again, Smalley somehow overlooked the very evidence, both in Comestor and in Langton, necessary to understand not only the chronology but also and even more importantly the relations between and among the various layers of this tradition.

It is of course possible that Comestor is here summarizing his own lectures, which would make him our master. But the solution that he pursues, even as it reveals more explicit borrowing from the same lectures, cuts against such an identification. After supplying the rest of the passage from Tobit following the passage just quoted (Tobit 13:11) — "*Benedic Deum saeculorum, ut raedificet in te tabernaculum suum, et revocet ad te omnes captivos*" (Tobit 13:12) — Comestor here paraphrases and condenses key passages from the fourteenth chapter of the Book of Tobit to make his own lemmata, a mixture of Scripture and scriptural paraphrase, in accordance with his standard mode of proceeding in the *History*:[188] "*In* diebus *autem mortis suae*, cum praediceret filiis suis de reditu captivorum, ait: terra

[187] Here again, I present an eclectic text, based on Vienna MS 363, at fol. 133r^{b}, and on Paris MS, BNF, lat. 16943, at fol. 111r^{b}.

[188] Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica, 84–156.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

deserta replebitur et *domus Dei, quae in ea incensa est, iterum raeedificabitur.*"[189] He then gets to his own way of resolving the problem, which is far more determinate than that of our unnamed master:

> Sic[190] vero attendamus terminum vitae Tobiae filii Tobiae. Fuit enim terminus hystoriae, quae fuit ei terminus vitae. Non inveniemus descendisse historiam ad plus ultra tempora Iosiae. Ponamus enim filium cum patre captivatum sexto anno Ezechiae et avinculum esse; cum nonaginta novem annis tantum vixerit, circa vicesimum annum Iosiae mortuus est.
>
> In this fashion, then, let us attend to the end of the life of Tobit, son of Tobit. For there was an end to a history, which was for him the end of his life. We shall not find that his own history extended past the times of Josiah. For let us posit that the son had been captured and enchained with the father in the sixth year of the reign of Hezekiah; when he had lived only for ninety-nine years, around the twentieth year of the reign of Josiah, he died.

Comestor's solution reveals clearly the traces of the original master's lecture. Like that master, he emphasizes the crucial detail of the capture of the son, Tobias, together with his father of the same name, during the sixth year of the reign of Hezekiah, although he does so in a different manner. But he gives his students a determinate solution not found in the lectures of our master, namely, that Tobit the son lived to be ninety-nine years old and that he died during the twentieth year of the reign of Josiah.

That original lecturer had emphasized both the objection and the contrary, around which he structured the entire lecture. Moreover, our master gave no solution. He merely made sure that his students understood the impossibility of reading the evidence in the Book of Tobit too literally as regards Tobit's lifespan. By contrast, Comestor's agenda is different. He summarizes, neatly as we have seen, that whole initial lecture but then goes on at some length: filling out the scriptural background, positing a precise solution, and finally discussing at some length Jerome's treatment of the history of Tobit.[191]

Any possible doubt, however, about the chronology and order of the lectures is removed by Langton, whose lectures on this passage in Tobit show clearly that we have three discrete layers of lecturing. Moreover, the fact that Langton

[189] Cf. Tobit 14:5–6: "In hora autem mortis suae vocavit ad se Tobiam filium suum, et septem iuvenes filios eius nepotes suos, dixitque eis: prope erit interitus Ninivae. Non enim excidit verbum Domini, et fratres nostri, qui dispersi sunt a terra Israel, revertentur ad eam. Omnis autem deserta terra eius replebitur, et domus Dei, quae in ea incensa est, iterum reaedificabitur."

[190] I have to note this variant, "sic," since I am reading against both manuscripts, which have "si." But I do so since it is obvious that the reading in these two manuscripts is a copying error.

[191] I omit this final portion of Comestor's explication as irrelevant to the question before us.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

incorporates into his own lectures whole chunks of the original master's lectures, just as we saw in his lectures on *Frater Ambrosius*, where Peter Lombard identifies himself, clinches the matter in my view, at least for Tobit. I have not been able to consult Chartres MS 294 (named by Smalley but destroyed in World War II). I did, however, examine BNF, lat. 510, the other manuscript mentioned by Smalley.

In the lectures attributed to Langton on Tobit in BNF, lat. 510, we find a concise mixture of the original master's lecture and Comestor's treatment in the *History*. Langton of course knew the *History* as well as anyone not named Comestor, having lectured upon it and revised its text before 1176, while Comestor was still alive.[192] He revised his course on the *History* a second time in 1193, when he was a mature master.[193] It would, therefore, be surprising, if he did not take some account of Comestor's teaching on the subject of Tobit.

He clearly does, but what is far more interesting is the extent to which Langton in this lecture follows the outline of the original master's lecture while incorporating all of Comestor's main points. I highlight in bold lines taken directly from the original master's lecture and underline those clearly redolent of Comestor's explication in the *History*:

> BNF, lat. 510, fol. 55v[a]:
> *In diebus Salmanassar* Si inveniatur quod captivatus fuerit a Teglatfallassar exponendum est id est a regno eius vel attribuit filio quod pater fecit, et ita patet quod hystoria Tobie initium habuit a captivitate facta per Salmanassar. Ubi autem finem habuit ignoramus. **Videtur autem quod duraverit usque ad captivitatem Ierusalem, quia infra dicetur in cantico: *Ierusalem civitas Dei castigavit te Dominus* etc**. Et ibi loquitur de reductione populi in Ierusalem, et ita videtur quod Tobias vixerit quando captivatus est populus Ierusalem. **Sed hoc falsum est, quia quando captivatus est Tobias, filius eius captivatus est cum eo**, et filius vixit nonaginta novem annis. Et Samaria destructa est **sexto anno Ezechie, et postea regnavit Ezechias triginta tribus annis, et Manasses filius eius quinquaginta quinque, et Amon duobus annis, et Josias triginta**, et ita sunt centum decem anni, et ita patet quod non vivebat Tobias, et ita non vidit captivitatem.
>
> *In the days of Salmanasar* If it should be found that Tobit had been captured by Tilgath-pileser, this must be explained, that is, from his reign, or what the father did was attributed to the son, and so it is clear that the history of Tobit had its beginning from the captivity wrought by Salmanasar. But when that history had its end is something we do not know. But it seems that he endured all the way up to the captivity of Jerusalem, since it is said below in his canticle: *O Jerusalem, city of God, the Lord has chastised thee*, etc. And he speaks there about the subjection of the people in Jerusalem, and thus it appears that Tobias was alive when the people of Jerusalem were captured. But this is false, since when Tobias was captured, his son, Tobias, was captured with him, and the son lived for ninety-nine years. And Samaria was destroyed in the sixth

[192] Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica, 187–253.
[193] Ibid.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> year of the reign of Hezekiah, and afterwards Hezekiah reigned for thirty-three years, and Manasses his son for fifty-five, and Amon for two years, and Josias for thirty, and so these add up to one hundred and ten years, and thus it is clear that Tobias was not still living, and therefore did not see Jerusalem's captivity.

There is no need to go through the details, for the highlighting makes clear at a glance which lines Langton got from which master. Langton's lecture is a straightforward mixture of the original master's lecture and Comestor's account of Tobit's "history" in the *History*. Langton's students get our original master's clear proof that Tobit could not have lived to see the destruction of Jerusalem; they also get Comestor's teaching that, although we are ignorant of the end of the history of Tobit, we nevertheless know that he lived to the age of ninety-nine and was captured with his father during the sixth year of the reign of Hezekiah. Langton adds some details too, filling in the picture for both masters: Samaria was destroyed at the same time that Tobit and his father were captured, and Tobit would have had to have lived more than one hundred and ten years to have seen Jerusalem's destruction.

Most important for our purposes, this lecture by Langton on Tobit, which is preserved in BNF, lat. 510, made available to his students three generations of oral teaching: that of the original master, that of Comestor, and that of Langton himself. Langton's combining of the first two layers reveals that they are different in origin: Comestor was not responsible for both but rather represents a middle stage. The original lectures predate Comestor and the *History*.

Two other manuscripts known to me preserve lectures by Langton on Tobit: BNF, lat. 14414 and Mazarine 177, which as I noted above are formatted differently but are clearly related. The lecture preserved in these two manuscripts is patently different from that preserved in BNF, lat. 510. We know, therefore, that Langton lectured on this text several times after his lecture preserved in Exeter College MS 23. The common thread, however, is the layering, for here again we can distinguish three levels of lectures on Tobit.[194] This time, however, the three levels represented differ slightly. The first remains the original master's lecture, which is taken over verbatim for the most part; the second, discernible by the few changes in wording that Langton here makes (highlighted in bold to make obvious at a glance), is Langton himself in his lectures preserved in BNF, lat. 510; and the third is made up of the few sentences from Langton's earlier lecture on Tobit that he has incorporated into this lecture. I underline these. There is no reason to provide an English translation, since this lecture tracks so closely the earlier master's lecture, which is translated above:

[194] For the convenience of the reader, I again present here an eclectic text based on that found in both of these manuscripts: BNF, lat. 14414, starting at fol. 99v^{b}, and Mazarine 177, starting at fol. 79v^{a}.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cum captus esset in diebus Salmanassar Nota quod non est captus cum duabus tribubus sed cum decem, et tamen glosa interlinearis videtur velle quod cum duabus, **quia** dicit "inter alios adductus," de quibus dicitur: *primo tempore alleviata est terra Zabulon et terra Nephtali*. Prima autem duarum tribuum captivitas facta est per Tegla Phalassar, secunda decem tribuum per eundem, qui et Salmanasar dicitur. Et si ergo diceretur quod captivatus fuerit a Tegla Phalasar, reduceretur etiam ad Sennacherib, quia pater eius captivavit eum, et ita patet quod hystoria Tobiae initium habuit a captivitate facta per Salmanasar, sed non determinatur sub quo terminata sit. Secundum hoc *in diebus Salmanasar* expone sic id est a regno eius vel attribuitur filio et pater fecit, sed ex isto et sequentibus orietur contrarium. Infra dicitur quod filius captivatus est cum patre et de filio dicetur in fine huius libri quod nonaginta novem annorum erat quando mortuus est, **et infra in cantico eius dicet Tobias de Ierusalem filio suo**: *Ierusalem civitas Dei castigavit te Dominus* etc. **Ergo** loquitur ibi de captivitate Ierusalem, sed illa facta **fuit** per Nabugodonosor, et ita videtur ex serie textus quod Tobias filius vixerit ultra captivitatem Ierusalem per Nabugodonosor factam. **Quod** stare non potest **cum annis eius** ad litteram. **Sexto anno enim Ezechiae captivatus est; sunt decem tribus cum quibus captivatus est Tobias et filius eius**,[195] et regnavit Ezechias undetriginta annis, ergo remanserunt viginti tres anni, et quinquaginta quinque de Manasse filio eius, et duo de Amo, de Josia triginta unus, et post, anni filiorum eius, scilicet undecim, usque ad destructionem Ierusalem, et ita patet quod plures anni fuerunt a captivitate decem tribuum quam legatur filius Tobiae habuisse, et ita nullatenus **potuit vivere** usque ad destructionem Ierusalem **filius Tobiae** secundum computationem annorum, et hoc verum est. **Illa ergo quae dicetur infra dicta sunt prophetice**.

It is fascinating news indeed, not only to learn for sure that Langton lectured more than once on the literal sense of Tobit — it seems from what we have just seen that he did so at least three times, if we count the lecture in Exeter 23 — but also to discover how he did so. Comestor and the *History* disappear without a trace in this lecture, perhaps because Langton treats Comestor's version three times in his own course on the *History*, or perhaps for another reason. Whatever the reason, his doing so is as interesting as it is unexpected.

Even more interesting is the fact that the earlier master's lecture again takes center stage. If one were not paying close attention, one might even think that here we had a version, slightly adapted, of that original lecture. But Langton's use of his own earlier lecture renders any such supposition impossible. What is striking is that the enduring influence of the original master's lecture becomes more and more evident. Comestor based his treatment of Tobit's "history" explicitly upon it, even if in a summary fashion. Langton then combined it with

[195] Here we find the one major variant between the two manuscripts in this section. For the text just highlighted in bold, "**Sexto anno enim Ezechiae captivatus est; sunt decem tribus cum quibus captivatus est Tobias et filius eius**," Mazarine 177 has instead: "Sexto enim anno Ezechiae captivatae sunt decem tribus cum quibus captivatus est Tobit et filius eius." This may mean two different branches of the same lecture.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Comestor's treatment. Then, returning to the same subject in a later lecture, Langton abandons Comestor altogether and gives a lecture that very closely resembles that original.

Smalley found a second reference in Langton's lectures on Tobit to the teaching of our mysterious "magister." It concerns the admonition of the angel recorded in Tobit 7:12: "dixit ei angelus: Noli timere dare eam isti, quoniam huic timenti Deum debetur coniunx filia tua; propterea alius non potuit habere illam" (the angel said to him: Do not be afraid to give her to this man, since to one fearing God is owed your daughter as a wife; for this reason another was not able to have her). As her remarks show, Smalley was positive that the master referred to by Langton was neither Comestor nor the Lombard:

> For the second passage I have unfortunately only the version of group IV and cannot compare them with the others. On Tobias VII.12 "Be not afraid to give her to this man, for to him who feareth God is thy daughter due to be his wife. Therefore another could not have her," the question is raised whether Sara was given in marriage to Tobias as a reward of his merits. If we concede this point, then it must be allowed that man may be worthy of a temporal reward. Exeter 23, f° 5d: "Sed an meritis Tobie debebatur uxor illa? Si ita, ergo a simili potest homo mereri temporalia. Quod bene concedit magister. Mystice legitur hoc …" the subject is abruptly changed. **This "magister" is neither the Lombard nor the Manducator** (emphasis supplied). It is quite possible that one of the first group might here have a "questio" "whether man may merit temporal rewards," which is answered in the affirmative.[196]
>
> Since writing the above I have been able to compare the passage in Exeter 23 with Bibl. Nat. 510 f° 59d. The result is quite satisfactory; there is a questio: "hoc videtur homo meretur temporalia, quare non similiter uxorem bonam, cum ex gratia sit, quod concedimus…."[197]

The question raised, again found by Smalley in Exeter 23, which we now know to be one of Langton's earlier lectures on Tobit, is "whether by Tobit's merits that wife was owed to him?" And the answer — "If so, then it follows that man is able to merit temporal rewards" — was conceded, according to Langton, by our master. Smalley thought that the same question and answer were seemingly granted by Langton in BNF, lat. 510, which we now know to be later than those in Exeter 23.

Smalley, however, not only mistranscribes this passage in BNF, lat. 510, but fails to quote the passage in its relevant context. In fact, the excerpt that she quotes, which seems to indicate Langton's concession of the very point conceded by the original master, is misleading when quoted apart from its context. The truth is nearly the opposite: Langton is actually calling into serious doubt the

[196] Smalley and Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II" (n. 8 above), 179.
[197] Ibid., in n. 1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

point conceded by the original master. Here is the passage, corrected and in its full context:

> BNF, lat. 510, fol. 59v[b]:
> *Alius non potuit habere illam*, immo potuit, sed non habuit. Solutio: quando impeditum est, ne fiat aliquid, dicitur illud non posse fieri. Unde in Iohanne (Jn. 12:39): *non poterant credere* id est obstinatione impediti sunt, ne crederent. Similiter hic. *Non potuit* id est impedimentum fuit, ne haberet. Sed nota quod dixit: *huic timenti Deum debetur coniunx; propterea alius non potuit eam habere*. Estne verum causaliter? Meruitne ille habere hanc uxorem? Hoc videtur. Homo enim meretur temporalia, quare non similiter uxorem bonam? Cum ex gratia sit, quod concedimus. Sed estne vera illa locutio causaliter? Estne verum istud: quia virgo portavit Christum, propterea nulla alia portare potuit? De talibus dubitari potest si causaliter accipiatur; si consecutive accipiatur non est dubium.
>
> *Another was not able to have her*, rather he was able but did not have. Solution: when there is an obstruction, to prevent something from happening, we say that that something is not possible. Whence in John: *they were not able to believe*, that is, by their obstinacy, they were prevented from believing. Likewise here. *He was not able*, that is, there was an impediment to his having her. But note that he said: *to one fearing God is owed a wife; for this reason another was not able to have her.* Is this true in terms of causation? Did Tobit deserve to have this wife? This seems to be. For man merits temporal goods, why not likewise a good wife? Although it be for beauty? This we concede. But is that statement true in terms of causation? Is this also true: since a virgin bore the Christ, on that account no other female was able to bear <him>? About such matters there is reason to doubt whether they should be understood in terms of causation; there is, however, no reason whatsoever to doubt whether they should be understood in terms of one thing following another.

Langton's lecture, although it clearly presupposes the original master's lecture, goes in a very different direction. He calls into question right away the original point conceded by the master, namely, that by reason of merit man deserves temporal rewards owing to the passage in Tobit. Specifically, Langton questions whether the passage in Tobit can be understood causally, as it seemingly was by our master, and he himself expresses serious doubts about the matter to his own students. Indeed, he presses rigorously the logical distinction between actual causation and mere temporal sequence.

We know, however, that this lecture is by a more mature Langton, one who has already lectured on Tobit. He and his students are still starting from the original master's lectures, but in this lecture he is independent. We see the exact same thing in the second revision of his course on the *History*, accomplished in 1193, where he disagrees with Comestor and corrects him freely.[198] We should, however, be able to trace the whole discussion, from beginning to end, which

[198] Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica, 231–50.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

would likely help us to understand how Langton's views evolved as they did. It turns out that we can in fact do so.

We find the original master's lecture preserved in both Corpus Christi 55 and Peterhouse 112:[199]

> *Noli timere dare eam isti quam huic timenti Deum debetur filia tua* Per hoc videtur quod bona coniunx alicui iusto detur ex meritis, sicut alia temporalia. *Propterea alius non potuit habere illam.* Impedimentum fuit peccatum illorum quo minus eam haberent, quia coniunx debita erat alii. Simile dicitur in Iohanne: *propterea non poterant credere* id est obstinatione impediti erant, ne crederent.
>
> *Do not be afraid to give her to this man, she whom as your daughter is owed to one who fears God* Through this it seems that a good wife should be given to someone just on account of his merits, just as other temporal goods. *For this reason another was not able to have her.* The impediment was the sin of those, which prevented their having her, since she was owed as a spouse to another. A similar thing is said in John: *for this reason they were not able to believe*, that is, by their obstinance, they were impeded from believing.

We find here the same story as above. Had Smalley looked at either of these two manuscripts, she would have found right away the source for Langton's statement in Exeter 23. We see that Langton has again taken over chunks of the original master's lecture wholesale, quoting whole passages verbatim. We also see the reason for the discussion in his lecture in BNF, lat. 510: our master speaks in terms of causation ("quia") when he explicates Tobit 7:12.

The source for the discussion of temporal rewards owed by merit is unmistakable. What about the identity of the lecturer? As we have seen, Smalley dismisses the possibility that it is either Comestor or the Lombard. She does not say so, but it is certainly possible that she checked the *History*, which says nothing whatsoever about the matter.[200] But it is evident that she did not look at the lectures on Tobit in BNF, lat. 14414 and Mazarine 177, which we know to preserve a lecture by Langton later than those in Exeter 23 and in BNF, lat. 510. These reveal that Langton's disagreement with the master's position, something that as we have seen she was unaware of, continued to develop (I highlight in bold material adopted directly from the original master's lecture; as before, I underline material Langton has retained and developed from his earlier lecture, preserved in BNF, lat. 510).[201]

> **Quoniam huic timenti Deum debetur coniunx filia tua, propterea alius non potuit habere illam.** Nota haec verba scrupulum habere, primo illud: huic timenti Deum

[199] As always, I here present one text based on both manuscripts: Corpus Christi 55, starting at fol. 211v^{a}, and Peterhouse 112, starting at fol. 157r^{b}.

[200] See Vienna 363, at fol. 134v^{a}, or BNF, lat. 16943, at fol. 112r^{b}–v^{a}.

[201] The text here presented is eclectic, taken from BNF, lat. 14414, at fol. 100v^{b}, and Mazarine 177, fol. 80r^{b}.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

debetur coniunx filia tua, ergo quod timebat Deum merebatur illam habere uxorem, ergo haec fuit causa quare eam habuit, ergo haec est vera: haec debetur huic in uxorem illo demonstrato scilicet timere Deum, ergo iste meruit istam uxorem. Quod probo: homo meretur bonum temporale, et temporalia merito hominis debentur, ergo cum uxor bona sit, et donum egregium debetur huic ex meritis. Quod bene concedimus, et hanc concedimus ex meritis huius debetur huic merito debiti et congrui. Vel propterea debetur, quia scilicet timebat Deum alius dicitur septem prae mortuis non poterat habere illam. Hoc falsum, immo poterat. Respondeo: res autem difficultatem notat vel habet et **impedimentum** magnum, **ne fiat**, et si etiam fieri possit, dicitur tamen non posse. **Simile in Iohanne** de Iudeis **dicitur: propterea non poterant credere**. Respondeo: sensus est non poterant id est **obstinatio eorum impediebat eos**. Unde Augustinus ita glosat: non poterant id est nolebant, sed numquid haec vera similiter: quia Beata Virgo fuit predestinata ut pareret Christum, propterea nulla alia eum peperit a simili et hic. Respondeo: si propterea sit causale in huiusmodi locutionibus, dubitationem habet. Si vero sit consecutivus, tunc planum est.

Since to this man who fears God your daughter is owed as a wife; for this reason another was not able to have her. Note that these words have a subtlety to them, first there: to this man fearing God is owed your daughter as a wife, therefore because he feared God he deserved to have that wife, therefore this was the cause why he had her, therefore this is true: this woman is owed to this man as a wife, once the former has been demonstrated, namely, that he fears God, therefore Tobit merited that wife. This I prove: a man merits a temporal good, and temporal goods by the merit of a man are owed, therefore since a wife is a good, an outstanding gift is owed to this man by reason of his merits. Which we willingly concede, and we grant this wife by reason of the merits of this man is owed to this man by the merit of something owed and fitting. Or for this reason it is owed, namely, that he feared God another this refers to the seven men who died beforehand attempting to marry Sarah was not able to have her. This is false, the truth is that another was able. I respond: this thing notes a difficulty or has also a large impediment, lest it should happen, and even if it were possible, it is said nevertheless not to be possible. A similar thing is said in John about the Jews: for this reason they were not able to believe. I respond: the sense is they were not able, that is, their obstinacy impeded them. Whence Augustine glosses this: they were not able, that is, they did not want to, but surely it is not true that this is similarly true: that the Blessed Virgin was predestined to give birth to the Christ, for this reason it follows that no other woman bore him, etc. I respond: if "for this reason" is causal in expressions of this kind, a doubt is raised. But if it is consecutive, then it is plain.

We can see at a glance the material from this lecture that Langton uses and expands from his earlier lecture preserved in BNF, lat. 510. The principal difference between the earlier and the later lectures is the extent to which Langton explicates by means of logic the discussion in the former. For our purposes what is most important is that Langton's positions relative to those of our master were already staked out in the lectures preserved in BNF, lat. 510: he agreed with that master's explication of the related passage in John's Gospel but

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

forcefully disagreed with the notion, which he took to be set forth in that original lecture, that the central passage at issue in Tobit should be understood causally.

The fact is that we have three layers again, but this time they are different: the original master, then Langton (in BNF, lat. 510), then another lecture by Langton (preserved in BNF, lat. 14414 and Mazarine 177), who incorporates and elaborates the substance of his earlier lecture. Comestor is not in this particular picture, but we still need definitive proof that Comestor is not our original master, that the lectures preserved in Corpus Christi 55 and Peterhouse 112/119 are not his. Fortunately, we have it, and it is Langton who provides it, but not in these lectures.

I show in my monograph on the making of the *Historia scholastica* that Langton routinely provides valuable information about who is responsible for which texts in the ongoing development of the *History*. It is in fact his copious textual testimony that made it possible not only to see that the the *History* itself was a work in progress, added to regularly by Comestor, Langton, and other masters, but also that he himself had adapted the actual text of the *History* itself, even while Comestor was still alive.[202] Turning to his lectures on the *History*, which predate 1176, we find that the young theologian Langton again gives us the information that we need to know for sure that Comestor is not the original lecturer.

For one thing, we know that Langton the young theologian is familiar with the whole controversy over Tobit's lifespan, since he summarizes it succinctly in the beginning of his own lecture on Comestor's *Historia Tobiae*:[203]

> HISTORIA ETC. Iste inquit et filius eius eodem nomine … scilicet Tobias, quorum historia incipit a patre et terminatur in morte filii. Pater vero, ut supradiximus, iuxta opinionem quorundam captivatus est cum duobus tribubus a Teglafalasar rege Assyriorum, sed verior est opinio quae dicit postea captivatum esse cum decem per Salmanasar filium eius.
>
> HISTORY, ETC. This man, he says, and his son of the same name … namely, Tobit, whose history begins from the father and ends in the death of the son. The father, however, as we said above, according to the opinion of some was captured with the two tribes by Tegla Phalasar, King of the Assyrians, but the truer opinion is that which says that he was captured afterwards with the ten tribes by Salmanasar, the son of that king.

Langton, as we have seen, had both the original master's lectures and Comestor's version, but we have not yet established when he had them. Here we see that even before 1176 he had these sources for his lectures on Comestor's *History*. The reporter's use of "inquit" in the first line refers to Langton's own speaking. The remainder of Langton's introduction in the lecture makes plain that, in addition to

[202] Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica, 205–13.

[203] The transcription that follows of Langton's lecture is taken from BNF, lat. 14417, at fol. 147r[a].

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Comestor's *Historia Tobiae*, he also had the original master's lecture as well, either at hand or in his memory, since he quotes directly from it and explains why the Book of Tobit will be read allegorically rather than literally.[204] We know, therefore, that Langton, lecturing prior to 1176, is already familiar with the original master's lectures.[205]

It is now time to review the evidence adduced for identifying Peter Lombard as the anonymous but preeminent lecturer whose lectures Comestor and Langton take as the basis for their own. The first and best evidence, namely, Peter Lombard's self-identification, confirmed and corroborated subsequently by Langton's own lectures, is sufficient by itself to attribute to Peter Lombard not only the prologue *Tabernaculum Moysi*, which is meant as an introduction to the Pentateuch, but also the lectures on Genesis that follow it in Corpus Christi 55.

The second, which is also persuasive, is the weight given to the anonymous magisterial opinions discussed and relied upon by Comestor, Langton, and their students. These opinions all predate Comestor's *Historia scholastica* and form the basis for it. As we have just seen, Langton in his own lectures on the Old Testament makes use of them repeatedly over the course of his scholastic career and assigns them weight at least equal to that of those in the *History*, which he also privileges as an authority. Add to this the weighty fact that this primitive lecture material, in Genesis as in other books, forms the foundation for the magisterial lectures both of Comestor and of Langton, and a consistent picture emerges

[204] BNF, lat. 14417, at fol. 147r[a]: "Et tunc dicenda fuit eius historia in captivatione illa vel statim post, sed quia nimium incidens esset, nolumus irrumpere tractatum Regum, sed ad finem tanquam spiritualem tractatum reservavimus quod ex libro Tobiae perpenditur, cum vidisse eversione Templi et ruinas Ierusalem, allegorice determinabitur in libro vel alio modo, **nam ad litteram stare non potest**, etiam si fiat prorelatio annorum filii quanta fieri possit rationabiliter a tempore captivitatis decem tribuum de filio habetur in libro quod scilicet annos vixerit."

[205] Langton is equally familiar with Comestor's prologues. At the start of his lecture on Judith, Langton identifies for his students the author of the prologue that introduces the *Historia Iudith* in Comestor's *History*. Langton provides first the incipit of the prologue and then says who authored the prologue: "HANC HYSTORIAM praefatio est magistri. Paula, inquit, mulier fuit Romae." (The text here transcribed is taken from Arsenal 177, at fol. 107v[a].) The reporter again interposes, signaling Langton's speech, but the crucial detail is Langton's statement that the prologue that begins "Hanc historiam" is that of the "magister." The question of course is whom he means. Langton refers to Comestor frequently as "magister" or "magister historiarum" — in his course on the *History* the former is much more frequent — and as we have seen in his lectures (on *Frater Ambrosius* and on Tobit) Langton also speaks frequently of a master. In this case, the reference to his master in Judith is invaluable, because we find the prologue beginning "Hanc historiam" in both of the earliest extant manuscripts of the *History*, both of which predate 1183: in BNF, lat. 16943, beginning at the bottom of fol. 124r[a], and in Vienna 363, at the top of folio 147r[b]. We know, therefore, that in referring to the master here at the start of his lecture on Judith, Langton means Comestor.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of an outstanding magisterial authority from the generation preceding Comestor and, shortly thereafter, Langton.

The third and final evidentiary basis is the prologues that both Comestor and Langton attribute to this same "anonymous" master. In a recent study, I showed beyond any reasonable doubt that Peter Comestor had and used Peter Lombard's newly composed prologue to John's Gospel.[206] Comestor told his students that the "Master" had composed this prologue to serve as a better introduction to John's Gospel than all those available.[207] In Part Three, above, we learned that Langton, in his lectures on *Frater Ambrosius*, Jerome's letter and the traditional Christian *accessus* to the Pentateuch, had and used Peter Lombard's own lectures on *Frater Ambrosius*, in which the Lombard referred to his own gloss on Colossians. In Part One, above, we saw that Langton, in his own lectures introducing the Bible, made use of a library of prologues composed for this very purpose by a master so preeminent that his identity was known to all. All of these prologues betray a common feature that is new to the schools: they each take their point of departure from a line of Sacred Scripture, which is then explicated to develop the theme of the prologue.

All of this "prologue" evidence suggests that this practice may have started with our unnamed master, and both Comestor and Langton bear witness to Peter Lombard as its originator. We shall have to wait, of course, for comprehensive editing to say anything more conclusive, but it is at least fair to say that preliminary evidence raises the possibility that Peter Lombard undertook to remake the entire Christian tradition in the Latin West of *accessus* to the Bible, an 800-year old tradition that had remained unchanged since the late-fourth century.[208]

Given these three types of evidence, the identification of Peter Lombard as the master whose teaching forms the basis for that of Comestor and Langton appears very secure indeed. I am myself persuaded that our so-called anonymous master was not anonymous in the least, that everyone knew and took for granted both his identity and his magisterial authority, and that we have found in Langton's biblical lectures, if not all of them, at the least substantial portions of Peter Lombard's long-thought-to-be-lost lectures on the Old Testament.[209] And if we scholars reflect a bit, we must ask ourselves: how could it be otherwise? How is it possible that the Lombard's lectures on most of the Bible could have been

[206] Clark, "The Biblical *Gloss*, the Search for Peter Lombard's Glossed Bible, and the School of Paris" (n. 1 above), 81–110.

[207] Ibid., 88–110.

[208] My colleague, Joshua Benson, has already transcribed many of the prologues introducing the Bible by both the Lombard and by Langton, an enormous corpus in itself. I am profoundly grateful for the help that he has given me in unlocking this treasure.

[209] Given that Comestor also had the Lombard's prologue to John's Gospel, it is likely that he also had the Lombard's lectures on the New Testament at his disposal for his own lectures on the four glossed Gospels.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lost? The only way that it seemed possible until now is because for centuries medievalists and manuscript scholars have been thinking in terms of books rather than in terms of lectures. Had we thought about it for even a minute, we would have gone straight to the works of the Lombard's many students, and there we would have discovered what has long been hidden in plain view.

It is hard to imagine that any other Parisian master from the 1150s could inspire and influence both Comestor and Langton to such a degree that they would each choose to found some portion of their biblical teaching on that other master's legacy to the exclusion of the Lombard. It is in fact almost impossible to imagine either master's incorporating large verbatim chunks of that other master's lectures into his own, as we know that Langton incorporated huge chunks of the Lombard's in his lectures on *Frater Ambrosius* and Tobit, when the Lombard's were available. It is even harder to imagine Langton's lecturing on Tobit at least three times and in the latest of the three suppressing not only the teaching of his own beloved master, Peter Comestor, but also his own, in favor of some master other than Peter Lombard.

Let us be skeptics for a minute and suppose that the lecture material clearly predating Comestor's *Historia scholastica* in Corpus Christi 55 (and in other manuscripts whose contents are collatable with those) is not that of Peter Lombard — we already know for sure that some of this lecture material is the Lombard's — but rather those of another master. If so, we will have discovered the lectures of a Parisian master of the 1150s so preeminent that he rivaled the Lombard to such an extent that the Lombard's own students used his lectures instead of the Lombard's for certain books. This seems preposterous, especially given the extent to which Langton relies on and reveres the Lombard's lectures in all that we have seen thus far.

The simplest explanation is the best: we have not only substantial portions of the Lombard's lectures, to an extent yet to be determined, embedded in Langton's massive corpus of lectures; these lectures from the 1150s form the foundation upon which an entire edifice of oral teaching is built. Comestor builds the *History* upon the foundation of the Lombard's lectures. Langton relies on both the Lombard and Comestor but returns time and again to the Lombard's original. If this is right, and it is hard to imagine that it is not, then both Comestor and Langton passed on the Lombard's teaching on the most of the Bible to the thirteenth century, Comestor by means of the *Historia scholastica*, and Langton by means of all of his many lectures.

At this point in this study, to multiply examples from more books of the Old Testament in which every layer of the whole oral tradition is set forth would be tedious, even though those examples are in some cases even more probative. Smalley, for example, noticed a reference to "magister noster" in Langton's lectures on Genesis in Durham A. I. 7, which she opined could be neither the

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lombard nor Comestor, since neither "the Lombard in the *Sentences*, nor the Comestor in the *Histories* suggest such a solution."[210] She even goes so far as to write that she "cannot find any mention of this in the glosses on the likely texts in Genesis, nor in a gloss on Exodus XII.3, referred to by Langton further down in his discussion of the same question."[211]

As we would expect at this point, however, having seen Smalley repeatedly make claims contradicted by the evidence, the whole layered oral tradition is in plain view in the manuscripts. We find Peter Lombard's original discussion and solution of the problem preserved in Cambridge, Corpus Christi 55, at fol. 2v^{b}; in BNF, lat. 14415, at fol. 6r^{b}; and in BNF, lat. 14435, at fol. 151r^{a}.[212] Notwithstanding Smalley's assertions to the contrary, we find the Lombard's views discussed and summarized by Peter Comestor in the sixth chapter of his *Historia Genesis*.[213] And again notwithstanding Smalley's assertions to the contrary, we find the same, much more fully developed, in other lectures on Genesis by Langton, where he again repeats whole parts of the Lombard's lecture in his own.[214] It is all in plain view, accessible even to a cursory reading.

---

[210] Smalley and Gregory, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton, Part II" (n. 8 above), 168. The reference noticed by Smalley, which refers to the state of the moon at its creation, is at Durham A. I. 7, fol. 9v^{b}.

[211] Ibid.

[212] "Item queritur quota fuerit luna quando creata est? Dicimus secundum glosam quod quarta decima id est quota est quando est quarta decima, sed quando est quarta decima recto diametro apponitur soli, et in mane creata est cum sole, ergo tunc apponebatur recto diametro soli, non ergo in nocte sequenti plena erat, quia non opponebatur soli, sicut et mane. Propter hoc dicunt quidam quod sol creatus est in mane et luna in nocte sequenti. Aliter potest dici quod simul creata sunt, et in nocte sequenti fere opponebatur recto diametro soli, et ille de sanctis; quantum ad theologos non impedit."

[213] "FACTA ergo *LUMINARIA POSUIT* DEVS UT LUCEANT *IN FIRMAMENTO CAELI ET ILLUMINENT TERRAM*, sed non semper, ET DIVIDANT *LUCEM AC TENEBRAS*. Quod autem luna in plenilunio facta sit ex alia translatione perpenditur, que sic habet: *Et luminare minus in inchoatione noctis*. In principio autem noctis non oritur luna nisi pansilenos, id est rotunda. Inde perpenditur quia sol factus est mane in oriente, et facto uespere luna in initio noctis similiter facta est in oriente. Volunt tamen quidam quod simul facti sint, sol in oriente, luna in occidente, et sole occidente luna sub terram rediit in orientem in inchoatione noctis." Comestor here takes language directly from the Lombard's lectures.

[214] Langton's other lecture is preserved in Cambridge, Peterhouse College 112, at fol. 3v^{b}, BNF, lat. 14414, at fol. 100r^{b}, Mazarine 177, at fol. 3r^{a}, and in Bodleian, Trinity 65, at fol. 8r^{a}. Langton's discussion, the style of which is by now recognizable, is as follows: "Item: quota sit luna luna cum creata est? Quaestio: videtur quod plena sit creata sed decima quarta et mane diei fuit creata. Ergo tunc fuit opposita soli. Tunc enim est plena, quando soli directe opponitur, ergo in nocte sequente sole et luna non fuerunt oppositi, ergo luna non fuit tunc plena scilicet in initio noctis. Sed si luna tunc fuit plena, ut dicitur, potest quaeri quare potius debuit esse prima quam in creatione sua? Item: tanta fuit creata quanta ipsa est nunc in inchoatione noctis. Ergo plena. Ergo tunc fuerunt oppositi, sol in oriente et luna in occidente, ergo etiam in sero non fuit plena. Respondeo: luna creata fuit in occidente et plena, et in nocte

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There is, however, one other report by Langton of the Lombard's teaching that is worth mentioning here, since in this case he reports the Lombard's teaching in the *Sentences*:[215]

> DOMINI SUNT VERBA qui dicit hoc in Sententiis de quarto libro aliquam agat de penitentia in margine illius capituli: Solet etiam quaeri utrum pravi sacerdotes etc.
>
> THE LORD'S ARE THE WORDS He who says this treats in the *Sentences* about penance, in the fourth book, in the margin of that chapter. It is also customary to be investigated whether bad priests, etc.

There are several interesting points to be made about this passage. The first is that it reveals that Langton and his students had an early version of the Lombard's *Sentences*. We know this because Langton provides to his students only a chapter number and no distinction, which shows that the reference must be early, prior to the time when the books were ordered by distinctions.[216] Given Langton's habit of identifying for his students texts at various stages of their development, we are likely to learn from Langton's lectures (and the Lombard's) a great deal more about the *Sentences* at an earlier stage of its development than we now know.

The second is that we here see the *Sentences* as a taught text. We know this, because the version that Langton is using has the teaching at issue in the margins. Indeed, the margins are where we find teachings added to texts, which then make their way into the texts themselves. This is the story told by the manuscripts of the *History*.[217] And I suspect strongly that we would find the same story in the manuscripts of the *Sentences*. The edition that we now use of the *Sentences*, the third such edition produced in the last 120 years and the product of the tireless

---

sequenti non fuit plena, sed pene plena, nec Ecclesia laborat circa huiusmodi minutias. Tamen posset dici quod fuit creata in principio noctis scilicet in principio principatus sui, sicut sol, et non fuit mane creata cum sole."

[215] We find this passage in Cambridge, Peterhouse College 112, fol. $2r^b$, which we know preserves one of Langton's lectures, in contrast to the other lectures preserved therein, which are by the Lombard. Langton quotes the same passage but in a different content in the body of his lectures preserved in Durham A. I. 7, at fol. $3v^b$, bottom. This shows that Langton made various use of the Lombard's teaching.

[216] Brady hypothesizes that this division into distinctions was accomplished early in the thirteenth century and guesses that this was done by Alexander of Hales. Ignatius C. Brady, "The Distinctions of Lombard's Book of Sentences and Alexander of Hales," *Franciscan Studies* 25 (1965): 90–116. See also idem, "The Rubrics of Peter Lombard's *Sentences*," *Pier Lombardo* 6 (1962): 5–25. Brady's hypothesis, however, is no more than a guess, especially since he was wholly unfamiliar with the twelfth-century teaching tradition founded on the Lombard's lectures that forms the basis for this study. It is of course possible that Brady's guess will be proven right, but much editing remains to be done before anything definitive is known.

[217] Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica (n. 32 above), 157–86.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholarship of the great Franciscan scholar, Ignatius Brady, reveals no trace of the oral origins of the *Sentences* as a taught text. This study reveals the extent to which the Lombard's teaching, like that of his predecessors in the schools, in Laon, Paris, and doubtless elsewhere, was oral.

As admirable as Brady's edition is, it would be worth our while to look again at the manuscripts preserving the *Sentences*, since it would certainly be revealing to understand with more precision how it came to be and the form in which the *Sentences* were taught decade by decade over the course of the second half of the twelfth century. The fact that the distinctions, which are commonly thought to be the essential divisions in the *Sentences*, were added by another master long after the Lombard's lifetime, shows just how little we know about the Lombard's text, as he and his successors taught it.

B. Dates

The certain identification of Peter Lombard as the author of the lectures upon which Langton lectured settles the date, at least to the extent of a *terminus post quem*. The Lombard died in 1160, and so the lectures that are his must date to the 1150s or before. Since they evidently postdate not only Langton's *magna glosatura* on the Psalms and on the Pauline epistles but also the *Sentences*, the great likelihood is that they date to the later 1150s. But comprehensive and critical editing of these lectures will doubtless result in some surprises as regards the dating of the Lombard's entire corpus.

The key text for establishing secure dating and for identifying with precision which portions of Langton's lectures are the Lombard's is Comestor's *Historia scholastica*, for those lectures in Langton's that predate the *History* and form a foundational source for it cannot be Langton's but must instead be the lectures of Lombard, upon which Langton based his own.

All of Langton's lectures will themselves also have to be dated with precision — we will of course be able to order them in relation to each other, as we have in this study, according to the state of the questions and opinions treated therein — but this will prove to be less difficult owing to the fact that we have precise dates for each of the three versions of Langton's course on the *Historia scholastica*, where he treats much of the same material to be found in his many lectures on the Old Testament.

Part Four: Consequences for Scholarship of These Discoveries

The discovery that Stephen Langton, like Peter Comestor, had and used the lectures of Peter Lombard on the Old Testament has many ramifications for our understanding of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and indeed of scholastic culture and practice in general. This corpus of heretofore unknown and unstudied evidence will affect our understanding of the twelfth century as a whole, for so

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

great a figure was Peter Lombard that he literally redirected the entire course of theology, if by theology we mean what he and all twelfth-century masters understood, namely, a common project founded on the Bible and spilling over into an oral tradition of asking questions and applying logical tools, new and old, that would bear extraordinary fruit in the thirteenth century and beyond.

It begins to look very much as if Peter Lombard were the Janus of the twelfth century. On the one side, all of the various scholastic streams from the first half of the twelfth century that flowed into Paris were gathered up by him and his circle of students: grammatical-logical developments; lectures on the Gloss spanning most of the Bible; theological questions of every kind; collections of theological sentences; and finally the long and venerable Christian tradition of glossing the Bible itself. Much of this inheritance, far more than has ever been suspected, was oral. Oral teaching preserved from Laon and from other centers of cathedral-based learning was brought to Paris. So too, the oral teaching of other masters whose teaching the Lombard either heard in person or inherited in the forms of lectures recorded and preserved, became part of the Parisian inheritance of learning. All such streams seem to have been gathered into his multifaceted interests and expertise and became the subject of his own lectures.

On the other side, this massive amount of learning continued to flow outwards from him in streams of remembered teaching that would transform in many ways the scholastic landscape of the second half of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. By means of the little evidence seen so far from his Old Testament biblical lectures, we can see the emergence of supposition theory and terminist logic, the precise state of the biblical Gloss in the Lombard's lecture halls, and the full flowering of the scholastic method in those same lecture halls, where the Lombard organized not only the tradition of sentence collections but also the enormous library of questions raised by the biblical text.

It would appear that Peter Lombard, in spite of the many recent scholarly works celebrating his greatness, has been underestimated by scholars, if such a thing is possible, for no scholar has imagined that he had the authority and expertise to redo the 800-year old tradition of *accessus* to the entire Bible.[218] No scholar has dreamed that the Lombard systematized and gathered into one work the whole of Christian theology, including the massive Christian tradition of glossing the Bible. Finally, no scholar has divined that Peter Lombard

[218] For the Lombard on the *Sentences*, see Marcia Colish, *Peter Lombard*, 2 vols., Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 41 (Leiden, 1994). For more recent, general introductions to the Lombard and his *Sentences*, see Philipp W. Rosemann, *Peter Lombard* (New York, 2004), and idem, *The Story of a Great Medieval Book: Peter Lombard's "Sentences"* (Toronto, 2007). See also the magisterial introductions in Silano's recent translations of all four volumes of the *Sentences*: *Peter Lombard, The Sentences*, trans. Guilio Silano, 4 vols. (Toronto, 2007–2010).

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

himself was at the base of the entire theological project that would flourish and grow so impressively in the three centuries after his death, that he was responsible not only for the *Sentences* but for the redirection and refoundation of the entire Christian tradition of biblical exposition, from the Gloss to the *History* to the unbroken tradition of lecturing on the Bible itself.

A. The Scholarship of the Past

Two large and influential twentieth-century scholarly streams must now be reconsidered and to a great extent discarded. The first is the division between so-called speculative and biblical-moral theology spawned by Martin Grabmann with the publication of his *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode* in two volumes in 1911.[219] Grabmann divided twelfth-century theologians into two separate groups, the one speculative (Peter Lombard, Hugh of St. Victor, Peter Abelard, Robert of Melun, and Peter of Poitiers) and the other practical (Peter the Chanter, Peter Comestor Stephen Langton, et al.), centered on interest in the Bible and morality.[220] Over the course of the twentieth century influential scholars such as Chenu, Smalley, and Baldwin adopted and reinforced Grabmann's division.[221]

With the discovery that Peter Lombard himself viewed his work on the *Sentences* and his multifaceted work on Sacred Scripture as two sides of the same coin, there is no reason to give any credence whatsoever to Grabmann's division, based as it was on the relationship of various thinkers to Peter Lombard himself. Had Grabmann himself seen in the opening pages of the Lombard's lectures on Genesis the first known application of supposition theory and terminist logic to the discussion of the Trinitarian theology, had he seen in the Lombard's lectures on the whole of the Old Testament the unending succession of theological *quaestiones*, *solutiones*, and *responsiones*, could he have proposed such a division? It seems unlikely.

At the very least the notion of a twelfth-century split between speculative theology, on the one hand, and biblical theology, on the other hand, which Grabmann based on the work of Peter Lombard himself, must now be dead and buried once and for all. It has no basis whatsoever in fact. The truth, as we now know, is the

[219] Martin Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, 2 vols. (Freiburg in Breisgau, 1911), where Grabmann spoke of a biblical-moral direction in theology that originated with Peter the Chanter: "Die von Petrus Cantor ausgehende biblisch-moralische Richtung der Theologie." Ibid., 2:476–77.

[220] Ibid.

[221] Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Introduction à l'étude de saint Thomas d'Aquin*, 2nd ed. (Montreal and Paris, 1954); Smalley, *Study of the Bible* (n. 108 above), 196–97; John Baldwin, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and his Circle*, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1970), 1:25–29 and 43–46.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

opposite: theology for Peter Lombard, as for his students and immediate successors, was a unified project founded first and foremost on the Bible and its historical sense. That said, it is undeniable that thirteenth-century thinkers argued over such a division in theology. The Oxford Dominican, Richard Fishacre, for example, who was active in the decade following Hugh of St. Cher at Paris, distinguishes explicitly in the prologue to his *Sentences* commentary, between *aspectus* and *affectus*, doctrine and morals, and argues that Lombard's *Sentences* was the proper locus for the former.[222] Other equally prominent scholastic thinkers, such as Robert Grosseteste, by then Bishop of Lincoln, criticized such a view.[223] The historical reality as it unfolded during the course of the thirteenth century is undoubtedly complex, but we now know that for Peter Lombard at least no such division existed. Moreover, if over time scholastic theologians saw the wisdom of considering theological questions apart from the biblical text, there is no reason to suppose that any of them ever lost the sure knowledge that the Bible was the foundation for all Christian theology.

The second and even more influential stream that must be reconsidered in the light of this study is the scholarly legacy of Beryl Smalley, whose *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* is such a standard work that it is still required reading for graduate students, even those in biblical departments.[224] I was myself inspired by this famous work of Smalley's to undertake the study of Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* and the Bible in the 1150–1250 period. Her chapter in that work entitled "Masters of the Sacred Page," in which she deals with Peter Comestor, Peter the Chanter, and Stephen Langton, was for many years my guiding light for research. For this reason, it is painful to acknowledge that the manuscript work that is famously the basis for Smalley's many studies may be altogether unreliable.

As the evidence presented throughout this study shows, one finds time and again that the manuscripts do not in fact support Smalley's arguments and assertions based upon them. Most troubling is the abundant evidence that she seems to have read very little of what is in the manuscripts upon which she ostensibly relied to support her all-too-determinate claims. All manuscript scholars make mistakes, but the evidence presented in this study about the quality of Smalley's work with manuscripts has nothing to do with simple mistakes. Instead, we see a systematic failure to examine the contents of the manuscripts, even preliminarily. Any

[222] See R. James Long, "The Science of Theology according to Richard Fishacre: Edition of the Prologue to His Commentary on the Sentences," *Mediaeval Studies* 34 (1972): 71–98, at 71–72, relevant text of Fishacre at 96–97.

[223] Ibid., 72.

[224] My colleague at Catholic University of America, Dr. Bradley Gregory, a specialist in Old Testament Wisdom literature, tells me that Smalley's monograph was required reading for graduate students studying the Bible in the Department of Theology at Notre Dame during his time there.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholar who so wishes could verify with little time or trouble my findings in this regard, since every passage that I have transcribed for this study, and indeed all of the evidence presented, is found in the opening folios of the manuscripts cited and relied upon by Smalley for the many determinate conclusions that have turned out to be baseless. A few minutes of reading would have sufficed to alter and, one hopes, to discard her theories; one can only suppose that she worked either in extreme haste or that she assumed that whatever cursory reading she did do in those manuscripts sufficed to understand the whole. Neither hypothesis is reassuring.

Were Smalley a scholar of little influence, there would be no reason to point this out. The fact is, however, that scholars, myself included, have long taken her manuscript work at face value, and many studies by fine scholars — the list is long and continues to be added to yearly — presuppose the solidity of Smalley's research. Dahan's assumption that Smalley's manuscript work was so thorough that there would be little left to do is typical and represents the view of the many scholars who have simply taken its quality for granted.[225] Synthetic studies on the Bible in the Middle Ages based explicitly on Smalley's legacy continue to appear regularly — Lesley Smith's monograph on the biblical Gloss, Frans van Liere's *An Introduction to the Medieval Bible*, and Suzanne LaVere's monograph, *Out of the Cloister: Scholastic Exegesis of the Song of Songs: 1100–1250*, are three conspicuous examples published within the past decade alone — which presuppose without question the solidity of Smalley's manuscript work and her conclusions based thereon.[226] No better example could be adduced to document the unquestioning acceptance of Smalley's scholarly legacy than an article published in 2015 by De Gruyter, which purports to survey all scholarship on the medieval Bible since Smalley's death in 1984.[227] The authors, Ocker and Madigan, presuppose without question the quality of Smalley's scholarship, which they view as a solid foundation; neither suspects that the many studies that they cite with approval may well be founded on sand.

The findings in this study raise the unfortunate possibility that, to whatever extent those many studies rely on Smalley's manuscript research, to that same extent they may themselves be suspect. At the very least, following this study

[225] "Je me demande si cela en vaut vraiment la peine, tant la publication de Lacombe et Smalley est riche et ne paraît comporter que peu de lacunes." Dahan, "Les commentaires bibliques d'Étienne Langton: Exégèse et herméneutique" (n. 18 above), 202.

[226] Suzanne LaVere, *Out of the Cloister: Scholastic Exegesis of the Song of Songs* (n. 41 above); Frans van Liere, *An Introduction to the Medieval Bible* (Cambridge, 2014); and Lesley Smith, *The* Glossa Ordinaria (n. 4 above). Smith is candid about the fact that she presents no original research but rather gathers together the research and findings of Smalley and those scholars who have founded their studies on those of Smalley. Ibid., 15.

[227] Christopher Ocker and Kevin Madigan, "After Beryl Smalley: Thirty Years of Medieval Exegesis, 1984–2013," *Journal of Biblical Reception* 2 (2015): 87–130.

we now know that all of Smalley's work must be checked; this is especially true where manuscripts are concerned. Henceforth, none of her conclusions based on manuscript work can be taken for granted.

Certainly, all that Smalley wrote about Stephen Langton must be revised in the light of the manuscript corpus that preserves Langton's works. Her chapter on the so-called Masters of the Sacred Page, one of the centerpieces of her famous monograph, can no longer stand: she had no idea that Peter Lombard was the foundation and centerpiece of what I call the School of Paris, nor that Langton's work was so inextricably tied to the Lombard's own. And it is obvious that her manuscript research, such as it was, barely scratched the surface of the one body of evidence indispensable for understanding the study of the Bible in the cathedral schools, and most especially in Paris, from 1150 onwards.

B. The Scholarship of the Future

Quite apart from the scholarly legacies of Grabmann and Smalley, it is evident that what scholars have long taken to be complete understandings of twelfth- and thirteenth-century works and figures must now be viewed as partial. For no figure is this more true than Peter Lombard, for what we have to learn from what we ultimately recover of his lectures on much of the Old Testament (and on the New, should we discover those lectures as well) will also likely rewrite much of what we know about the biblical Gloss, about Peter Comestor and his *Historia scholastica*, about Stephen Langton, and about the transmission of this Parisian tradition into the thirteenth century. To show just how much we have to learn from these lectures, I shall provide in this subsection sample evidence taken from the opening folios of the Lombard's lectures on Genesis, which shows beyond question the extent to which historiography on all of these works and figures will have to be revised.

i. Peter Lombard

We have already seen clear evidence from Langton's lectures that he and his students had a version of the *Sentences* that reflected the record of an oral tradition of lectures, multilayered like that of the *History*. Doubtless we shall find a great deal more of such evidence, since Langton habitually reveals his own knowledge of the positions and habits of his masters.[228] Far more important, however, is the discovery that the Lombard's lectures on the Old Testament postdate not only his lectures on Paul — as we have seen, this is clearly the case for Colossians — but also his lectures on and subsequent codification of the *Sentences*.

[228] Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica (n. 32 above), 172–98.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Colish shows that the Lombard was least original in the *Sentences* in his treatment of creation and the hexameral materials.[229] Brady himself makes this clear enough when he documents that in treating Genesis 1–3, Peter Lombard actually depended on the *Gloss*, and not on original sources, for the first twenty-four distinctions (as well as distinction 29) in Book Two.[230] There is certainly no evidence that the Lombard made use in Book II of the *Sentences* of the new logic, supposition theory and terminist logic, which we know to have made its way to Paris around the mid-twelfth century. Indeed, his treatment of Trinitarian persons and relations is standard and straightforward Augustinian fare, as we see also from the key section in Book I where the Lombard discusses the Trinity in connection with Genesis 1:1:

> Nunc vero ad propositum redeamus, et ad ostendendam personarum pluralitatem atque essentiae divinae unitatem alias Sanctorum auctoritates inducamus. — Moyses dicit: *In principio creavit Deus caelum et terram*, per Deum significans Patrem, per principium Filium. Et pro eo quod apud nos dicitur Deus, hebraica veritas habet Elohim, quod est plurale huius singularis quod est El. Quod ergo non est dictum El, quod est Deus, sed Elohim, quod potest interpretari dii sive iudices, ad pluralitatem personarum refertur.[231]

[229] Marcia Colish, *Peter Lombard* (n. 220 above), 1:336.

[230] Peter Lombard, *II Sent.* (Grottaferrata, 1971), 329, apparatus to dist. 1 and throughout for individual instances. This finding, however, is subject to a caveat, namely, that Brady relied on a very late version of the biblical Gloss. We must acknowledge the possibility that the Lombard's lectures on the Bible influenced many other books of the Gloss than the Psalms and the Pauline epistles and that we may find the order of borrowing and influence to be the other way around. Brady's treatment of the Lombard's sources and in particular of his use of the Gloss in his magisterial edition may have to be redone.

[231] Ibid., *I Sent.* (Grottaferrata, 1971), 65. Peter Comestor relies upon this very passage for his own hexameral treatment in the *History*. See Mark J. Clark, "Peter Comestor and Peter Lombard: Brothers in Deed" (n. 7 above). In saying that the Lombard in this section of the *Sentences* is using "straightforward Augustinian fare," I do not mean to imply that Augustine was his immediate source. There are any number of proximate sources through whom the Lombard could have received this teaching. See, for example, the following passage from Hugh of Amiens, a near contemporary of Peter Lombard: "Inde per Moysen scriptum est: 'Creavit Deus.' Pro hac voce quam dicimus Deus, in hebreo 'elohim' scribitur. Elohim vero apud Hebreos vox est pluralis, sed idioma linguae latinae hoc transferre non potuit. Sic est enim apud Hebreos, 'bara elohim,' ut si verbum ex verbo transferas, latino sermone contra morem porteat dici 'creavit dii.' Unde sciendum est, quia vox illa elohim Deum significans enunciatione plurali, non tamen plures deos ponere potuit, quod determinat apud Hebreos vox adiecta singularis, ed est 'bara,' quod est apud latinos 'creavit.' Hunc sermonem hebraicum catholici nostri recte si postium pie defendunt, qui trinitatem quae Deus est in unitate simplici predicant adorari, quam representat eis vox singularis adiecta pluarli, id est 'bara elohim.'" "Hugonis Archiepiscopi Rothomagensis Tractatus in Hexaemeron Libri Tres in Genesim I–III," in F. Lecomte, "Un commentaire scripturaire du XIIe siècle: Le 'Tractatus in Hexaemeron' de Hugues d'Amiens (Archevêque de Rouen 1130–1164)," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 25 (1958): 227–94, edition at 235–94 and text presented here in part 6 at 240.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In this passage the Lombard repeats the traditional interpretation of Genesis 1:1, according to which the word "God" refers to the Father and the word "beginning" to the Son, but there is no indication that he is using supposition theory or terminist logic to arrive at this conclusion. Indeed, for most of the Christian tradition, as I document in several studies, in the explication of the opening line of Genesis and the Bible, interpreting the word "beginning" to refer to the second person of the Trinity is an allegorical rather than a literal understanding of Genesis 1:1.[232]

That story changes radically in his lectures, both on *Frater Ambrosius* and on Genesis. For the former, as we have seen, the language of supposition theory and terminist logic is front and center in the Lombard's commendations of the Pentateuch, explicitly in the second and implicitly in the third:[233]

> End of *Tabernaculum Moysi* in Corpus Christi 55:
> Vel alia est commendatio huius libri de hoc quod dicitur in Spiritu: *capite libri*, id est bibliotecae, *scriptum est de me*, quia per terminum supponentem supponitur Filius Dei, per hunc scilicet "principio." Est enim sensus "*in principio*," id est "in Filio *creavit Deus*," id est Pater.
>
> Vel alia est commendatio eiusdem, que in principio Genesis vocatur distinctio trium personarum: persona Filii ubi dicitur, "*in principio*"; persona Patris ubi dicitur, "*creavit Deus*"; persona Spiritus[234] ubi dicitur, "*Spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas*."
>
> Or there is another commendation of the Pentateuch from that which is said in the Spirit: *in the first part* (literally, "in the head") *of the book*, that is, of the Bible, *it was written about me*, since through the suppositing term there is understood through supposition the Son of God, namely, through this suppositing term, "*beginning*." For here is the sense of "*in the beginning*," that is, "in the Son created God," that is, the Father.
>
> Or there is another commendation of the Pentateuch, which in the beginning of Genesis is called the distinction of the three Persons of the Trinity: the Person of the Son where it is said, "*in the beginning*"; the Person of the Father where it is said: "*God created*"; the Person of the Spirit where it is said: "*the spirit of the Lord was borne over the waters*."

[232] Mark J. Clark, "The Commentaries on Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* of Stephan Langton, Pseudo-Langton, and Hugh of St. Cher" (n. 34 above), 342–63. See also idem, "The *Fortuna* of the Prologue to the Gospel of John in Four Important, Twelfth-Century Texts: The Glossed John, Peter Comestor's Lectures on the Glossed John, Comestor's *Historia scholastica*, and Langton's Course on the *History*," *Archa Verbi*, *Subsidia 11*, ed. Fabrizio Amerini (Münster, 2014), 111–28, and especially 113–16.

[233] For the convenience of the reader I provide here again the relevant texts and translations.

[234] I supplied here the correct reading, "spiritus," since the manuscript has "patris." What happened is clear enough: the copyist made a mistake that all copyists make, an eye-skip error, and repeated "patris" after "persona." In this case, his eye skipped backwards.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There is no mistaking the difference between the Lombard's treatment of Genesis 1:1 and of Trinitarian agency in creation in the *Sentences* and in this lecture: these passages introduce something altogether new. Moreover, it is evident from the manner in which the Lombard takes for granted the familiarity of his students with the language of supposition theory and terminist logic that these are already well known.

As in his lectures on *Frater Ambrosius*, we find analysis based on supposition and the logic of terms in the Lombard's treatment of agency in creation in the beginning of his lectures on Genesis itself:

> His visis procedamus, IN PRINCIPIO. Hoc nomen "*principium*" quandoque tenetur tantum essentialiter et dicitur de tribus personis respectu creaturarum; quandoque ponitur essentialiter significatione et personaliter suppositione, ut patet in quęstione, De Trinitate; quandoque ponitur personaliter significatione et personaliter suppositione; et quandoque supponit sic pro Patre, ut ibi: *In principio erat verbum* etc., quandoque pro Filio, ut hic: *In principio creavit* etc., quandoque pro Spiritu Sancto. Ista diversitas satis alibi patet.
>
> Sic ergo lege, IN PRINCIPIO, temporis, vel ante sęcula, vel in Filio, contra hoc quod dicit "temporis." Sic alibi dicitur: "nihil creavit in tempore." Solutio: "nihil creavit in tempore" id est infra tempus.
>
> These things having been seen, let us proceed, *In the beginning*. This name "beginning" is sometimes held only essentially and is said of the three persons <of the Trinity> with respect to creatures; sometimes it is posited essentially in signification and personally in supposition, as is clear in the question, on the Trinity; sometimes it is posited personally in signification and personally in supposition; and sometimes it supposits for the Father thus, as there: *In the beginning was the Word*, etc., sometimes for the Son, as here: *In the beginning God created*, etc., sometimes for the Holy Spirit. This diversity is sufficiently clear elsewhere.
>
> Thus, therefore, read, In the beginning, of time, or before all ages, or in the Son, against that which is said "of time." Thus elsewhere it is said: "he created nothing in time." The solution: "he created nothing in time," that is, within time.

There is a lot here, theologically, logically, and philosophically, that is nowhere to be seen in the *Sentences*.[235] The Lombard and the students in his lecture hall now have at their disposal logical tools that must not have been widely available at the time he treated creation in his most famous work. That changed dramatically by the time he lectured on Genesis and the rest of the Bible. Indeed, we see in these lectures that the whole framework for discussing agency in creation and the various possible interpretations of Genesis 1:1 changed radically. The Lombard

[235] Ebbesen found references in Langton's lectures on the Bible to the personal supposition and signification relied upon in this passage but dated them to much later in the twelfth century. Ebbesen, "Early Supposition Theory II" (n. 128 above), 65, referring to his earlier study: idem, "The Semantics of the Trinity according to Stephen Langton and Andrew Sunesen" (n. 127 above).

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

end ups with essentially the same traditional interpretive options but gets there using different tools. De Rijk places the origins of supposition theory and terminist logic "in the second half of the twelfth century."[236] As noted above, Ebbesen, Valente, and other scholars who have continued the investigation have not been able to agree on when precisely within that half century. The Lombard's use of supposition theory, which must date to sometime during the 1150s, gives us a much more precise date for these logical developments.

Both lectures, therefore, those on *Frater Ambrosius* and those on the opening lines of Genesis, reveal a significant gap between the Lombard's teaching in the *Sentences* and his later teaching, which is far more sophisticated. This necessarily raises a question about the standard chronology for the dating of the Lombard's works in general and of the *Sentences* in particular. These lectures must predate the Lombard's death in 1160, yet scholars date the *Sentences* just a few years earlier.

Brady, following Van den Eynde and relying on scattered scraps of evidence, assigns what he refers to as the composition (*compositio*) of the *Sentences* to the years between 1155 and 1158.[237] More recently Doyle, without adducing any evidence or authority other than Brady, is more specific, writing that the Lombard's *Sentences* were "released for publication and introduced in Peter's classroom in 1156."[238] In truth, however, Van den Eynde, Brady, and the scholars who have followed them have all estimated this chronology based on correlations between a few passages in the *Sentences* and either a very few passages in other works of the Lombard or the little that is known for certain about the Lombard's career. With respect to the former, since neither the Lombard's gloss on the Psalms nor that on the Pauline epistles has been edited, scholars have had very little to go on. These lectures on the Old Testament promise a great deal more in terms of what we can date with certainty, since they represent clear development in his thought. With respect to the latter, they will almost certainly add to what we know for certain about the Lombard's career. Moreover, Langton's tendency to provide full information about the state of texts at various times will augment by degrees of magnitude the data we now have about the Lombard's career and works.

There is another issue raised regarding the *Sentences* besides that of a possibly erroneous chronology. The evidence presented in this study suggests that Brady

[236] De Rijk, *The Origin and Early Development of the Theory of Supposition* (n. 125 above), 19.

[237] "Conclusio ergo nostra est quod compositio Sententiarum certissime annis 1155–1158 assignanda est." Brady, ed., *Magistri Petri Lombardi Parisiensis Episcopi sententiae*, vol. 1, Prolegomena (n. 6 above), 126*. Before coming to that conclusion Brady reviews all evidence known to him. Ibid., 122*–26*.

[238] Matthew Doyle, *Peter Lombard and His Students* (Toronto, 2016), 97.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Doyle and all the other specialists who have written on Peter Lombard's *Sentences* (Colish, Rorem, Rosemann, Zier, et al.) may not have the whole picture in thinking that the *Sentences* were composed and then published, for it may prove true that the *Sentences* became the *Sentences* through lectures and over the course of years during which the Lombard lectured and taught.[239] It is no aberration that Langton, lecturing on the Bible between 1170 and 1200, had a version or versions of the *Sentences* that still reflected those oral origins and the process of gradual accretion.

My own guess is that the *Sentences* continued to be added to by other masters long after Peter Lombard's death, just as happened with Peter Comestor and the *Historia scholastica*. Whatever the truth of that guess, which remains to be investigated, it is certain that Langton knew of the Lombard's *Sentences* as a work in progress, just as he had specific knowledge of Comestor's *History* as a work in progress.[240] It follows that Langton too is likely to add to what we know about the Lombard's career and about his teaching on various matters at different points in his career.

Even from the little bit seen so far, we have already learned a great deal. We know that the Lombard's thought on creation developed over time and in significant ways before his teaching career ended. We know too that he and his students were already taking for granted the new logic, that of terms and its correlative, supposition theory. So too we learn of the existence of a question, "On the Trinity," also likely to be by Peter Lombard, which is related to the analysis he presents in his lectures. Last of all for now, we learn something else of fundamental importance from these lectures about how the Lombard taught: his method of lecturing on the Bible in these lectures is to pose questions, respond to them, and then offer solutions. His lectures are replete with *quaestiones*, *responsiones*, and *solutiones*.

Dahan makes a distinction between what he refers to as "true commentaries" on the biblical Gloss that appear near the end of the twelfth century and earlier works on the Bible, such as those by Peter Comestor, that do not have the same mature form.[241] Prescinding from the word "commentary," which is, as we have seen, misleading to the extent it implies learning transmitted primarily in

[239] These scholars are by no means wrong, since in his prologue to the *Sentences*, the Lombard refers clearly to them as a written work: "in labore multo ac sudore volumen Deo praestante compegimus ex testimoniis veritatis in aeternum fundatis in quattuor libris distinctum." Peter Lombard, *Prologus*, *Sent.* (Grottaferrata, 1971), 4, lines 13–15. His description, however, is not in the least inconsistent with his delivering lectures on the *Sentences* over a period of time, nor with a theory of oral provenance.

[240] Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica (n. 32 above), 157–253.

[241] "Il ne s'agit pas d'un commentaire de celle-ci: à la fin du XIIe siècle, nous trouvons des œuvres qui sont de vrais commentaries de la *Glossa ordinaria*, surtout sur les épîtres pauliniennes (il s'agit en fait de la *Magna glossatura* de Pierre Lombard) mais aussi sur d'autres livres." Gilbert Dahan, "Une leçon biblique au XIIe siècle: Le commentaire de

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

writing, we can state with confidence that the presence of a fully developed scholastic method in the lectures of Peter Lombard on the Bible during the 1150s calls into question scholarly assumptions about the chronology of scholastic practices and their development. At the very least, the presence in these biblical lectures of the latest logical tools and of a fully formed scholastic method suggests an earlier development in the schools than is commonly supposed.

All this we learn from the opening sentences of his lectures on Genesis: it is obvious that we can expect to learn a great deal more about Peter Lombard, about his works, and about his career from the lectures preserved in Corpus Christi 55 and in other manuscripts that preserve the same.

ii. The Biblical Gloss

These lectures are also likely to transform what we know about the biblical Gloss in general and about its role in Parisian theological teaching in particular, for they form the basis for the teaching on the Bible of the School of Paris from 1150 to 1200. Our editing already shows that the lectures on Genesis preserved in the main columns of Corpus Christi 55, substantial portions of which we now know to be by Peter Lombard, take the biblical Gloss as the principal source to be explicated. The notes entered into the margins of that same manuscript make clear that at least for the literal/historical sense of Scripture, Comestor's *History* has already supplanted the biblical Gloss as authoritative. Langton's many lectures confirm that Comestor's *History* had displaced the Gloss for much teaching. That said, the biblical Gloss continues to be cited and used, even in lectures on the Sentences dating to the mid-thirteenth century.[242] The story, even from the little that we can already see, is one of rapid development and nuanced evolution, but what is absolutely clear is that Peter Lombard's lectures on the Bible are at the bottom of the whole story.

Contrast this with the standard view of Peter Lombard's contribution to the Gloss, set forth by Smith in her recent monograph, according to which "Peter Lombard began making commentaries on the Psalms and Pauline epistles, using the Gloss as a source, and incorporating all of the Gloss material into his own work."[243] Smith makes no mention whatsoever of the Lombard's having lectured upon most of the rest of the Bible. The discovery of his long-lost lectures on

Pierre le Mangeur sur Matthieu 26, 26–29," in *Ancienne Loi, Nouvelle Loi*, ed. J.-P. Bordier, Littérature et revelation au Moyen Âge 3 (Paris, 2009), 19–38, quotation at 23.

[242] Benson, Noone, and I know this from our editing of a number of the principal sources for Albert, Bonaventure, and Thomas Aquinas on the *Sentences*, namely, John of La Rochelle, Hugh of St. Cher, and Odo Rigaldus, among others.

[243] Smith, *The* Glossa Ordinaria (n. 4 above), 78, citing in n. 93, among other authorities, Brady, Prolegomena to *Sent.* 2, 46*–93*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Bible, therefore, which are replete with specific references to the Gloss, alters that standard view for good.

It is even possible that Peter Lombard played an important role in the development of the text of the Gloss for books other than the Psalms and the Pauline epistles. Smith does not mention this possibility, and her silence on this subject is understandable, since in a series of three articles published in the 1930s Smalley famously demolished the thesis of Hans Hermann Glunz, set forth in his *History of the Vulgate in England*,[244] that Peter Lombard was responsible for the biblical Gloss.[245] Instead, Smalley pointed to Laon as the likely place for the origins of the Gloss, although the story of its origins is much more complicated than she ever suspected.[246] But if Smalley was right to dismiss Peter Lombard and Paris as the person and place responsible for the Gloss's origins, she was nevertheless wrong, at least logically, to dismiss the relevance of Peter Lombard and Paris for the development of the text of the Gloss. In fact, the insights of Glunz about the importance of Peter Lombard for the Gloss may prove to be correct after all in this sense: for certain books, what happened to the text of the Gloss at Paris at the hands of Peter Lombard may be quite significant.

This is especially true since scholars know next to nothing about what happened to the Gloss in Paris in the middle of the twelfth century. The view long held by scholars that the Gloss was early on a stable text has now been discarded by those doing the manuscript work necessary to edit individual books. The story is much more complex: the text for some books, John's Gospel for example, appears to stabilize early on, while the text for many others is quite fluid. For Matthew's Gospel, we may have as many versions as we have manuscripts. Owing to this textual dynamism, we shall have to produce many different editions of the Gloss for different books of the Bible at different times, so as to provide snapshots as it were of its text in various decades. Because we know so little of what

[244] Hans Hermann Glunz, *History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon* (Cambridge, 1933).

[245] See Beryl Smalley, "Gilbertus Universalis, Bishop of London (1128–34) and the Problem of the 'Glossa ordinaria' I," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 7 (1935): 235–63; eadem, "Gilbertus Universalis, Bishop of London (1128–34) and the Problem of the 'Glossa ordinaria' II," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 8 (1936): 24–60; and eadem, "La *Glossa ordinaria*: Quelques prédécesseurs d'Anselme de Laon," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 8 (1937): 24–60.

[246] Andrée makes it clear that the question of the origins of the biblical Gloss is much more complicated than Smalley and her followers have suspected and that scholarship on the Gloss needs to be redone. Alexander Andrée, "Anselm of Laon Unveiled: The *Glosae svper Iohannem* and the Origins of the *Glossa Ordinaria* on the Bible," *Mediaeval Studies* 73 (2011): 217–60. See also his review of Smith's monograph: Alexander Andrée, "Laon Revisited: Master Anselm and the Creation of a Theological School in the Twelfth Century," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 22 (2012): 257–82.

happened to the text of the Gloss in Paris in the mid-twelfth century, the information about the text and format of the Gloss to be gathered from these lectures, which predate 1160, is likely to be both considerable and important.

I should note that, unlike Comestor's lectures on the glossed Gospels or Langton's lectures on most of the books of the Old Testament, the lectures preserved in Corpus Christi 55 (and in the other manuscripts known to us thus far that contain the same lectures) are not on the biblical Gloss but rather on the Bible itself. Nevertheless, because the Lombard refers to the Gloss so frequently and provides to his student auditors such precise information about its contents, often making clear whether he is referring to a marginal or to an interlinear gloss, we shall be able to compare the state of the biblical Gloss for each book of the Bible lectured upon by the Lombard during the 1150s with the text used in their lectures on the *Gloss* by Comestor, Langton, and other masters in the schools in the decades following the Lombard's death in 1160. That promises to fill a huge gap in our knowledge.

It may be that scholarly attention has focused for far too long on the manuscripts of the Gloss itself and that scholars should instead focus their efforts on the use of the Gloss. We now know that the Gloss was widely used as a set text for teaching, at least throughout the second half of the twelfth century. Besides the copious lectures of Comestor on the four glossed Gospels and those of Langton on most of the Old Testament, we are even discovering lecture courses on the biblical Gloss by anonymous masters. Almost all of these lectures are as yet unedited and unstudied — to my knowledge only one such work, Langton on Chronicles, has been edited[247] — yet this corpus of manuscripts is our only way forward for understanding not only how the Gloss was used after 1150 but also how its text developed. The fact that Peter Comestor, Stephen Langton, and doubtless other masters as well had the Lombard's lectures at their disposal as they lectured on the biblical Gloss makes them a resource of considerable importance for our understanding of the Gloss in the twelfth century.

Finally, these lectures also promise to revise our understanding of the use of the Gloss well into the thirteenth century, which at least from our editing of three principal sources for Albert, Bonaventure, and Aquinas, namely, the lectures on the *Sentences* of John of La Rochelle, Hugh of St. Cher, and Odo Rigaldus seems to have sustained its importance.[248] In these lectures we find the biblical

[247] Stephen Langton, *Commentary on the Book of Chronicles*, ed. Avrom Saltmann (Ramat-Gan, 1978).

[248] Joshua Benson, Timothy Noone, and I are well into editing Book I, Distinctions 3 and 4, and Book II, Distinction 24 of the lectures on the *Sentences* of these three masters. Since Noone has discovered a thirteenth-century manuscript preserving Book II of Bonaventure's lectures on the *Sentences*, which not only has *pecia* markings but also has a note indicating that it was copied *ex originali*, which means that it was copied from the original at the stationer's in Paris, our plan is to reedit that same distinction in Bonaventure's work as well.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gloss cited frequently and for a variety of biblical books, both from the Old and New Testaments.[249] The recent volumes dedicated to the so-called "commentaries" — here again, I bracket this word, since there is not the slightest evidence that the works attributed to Alexander of Hales, John of La Rochelle, Hugh of St. Cher, Odo Rigaldus, and other such masters are anything other than lectures, copies of which then circulated — on the *Sentences* make no mention whatsoever of the biblical Gloss.[250] Our research, however, indicates that the Gloss is an important source for understanding this developing tradition of lecturing on the *Sentences*. Given the potential importance of Peter Lombard for the development of the Gloss itself, this should come as no surprise.

iii. Peter Comestor and the *Historia scholastica*

In an article published in 2005 I showed that Peter Comestor relied on the Lombard's *Sentences* for his treatment of the first three chapters of Genesis, both in terms of outline and substance.[251] Moreover, the Lombard's *Sentences* provides one of the key twelfth-century contexts for the whole of Comestor's *History*.[252] With the discovery of these lectures on the Old Testament by Peter Lombard, we now have an even more direct link to the work of Comestor's master, for not only does the order of books lectured upon by the Lombard match closely the order in the *Historia scholastica* but Comestor also routinely borrows directly from these lectures, often in verbatim fashion, for the *History*.[253] That should not surprise us in the least, for he was no doubt present

Thereafter, we intend to do the same for Books I, III, and IV as well, in order to establish a stemma codicum for each book.

[249] We are grateful to Riccardo Saccenti, who has graciously shared with us his *Repertorium* of works on the *Sentences*, which is intended to replace that of Stegmüller.

[250] For recent introductions to the commentarial tradition on the Lombard's *Sentences*, see *Mediaeval Commentaries on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard*, vol. 1, ed. Gillian R. Evans, and vol. 2, ed. Philipp W. Rosemann (Leiden, 2002 and 2010).

[251] Mark J. Clark, "Peter Comestor and Peter Lombard: Brothers in Deed" (n. 7 above). This article, while correct in its findings, will have to be revised to this extent. The Lombard's *Sentences* were only the remote source for Comestor's hexameral treatment; the proximate source were the Lombard's lectures on Genesis, which themselves depended greatly on the *Sentences*.

[252] Clark, *The Making of the* Historia scholastica (n. 32 above), 15–22.

[253] These borrowings seem at first glance to be of such an extent that the Lombard's lectures may prove to be one of the principal foundations of the *Historia scholastica*. I do not wish to say more here. Once I have worked my way through most of the Pentateuch, I will be in a position to speak with certitude. For now, all I can say for sure is that Comestor seems to have made liberal use of these lectures.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at the Lombard's lectures, just as he had been for his master's lectures on the *Sentences*.[254]

The discovery of the Lombard's lectures on the Old Testament could not be more timely for the business of editing the *Historia scholastica*. We are well on our way to an edition and translation of the *History* based upon the earliest extant manuscripts.[255] This edition will be much richer owing to these lectures, which appear to be (together with the biblical Gloss) Comestor's source of first resort. Should Peter Lombard's biblical lectures prove to be as important for the *History* as they appear at first glance, then the medieval legend that made of Peter Lombard and Peter Comestor brothers will seem that much more apt.[256] Certainly, Peter Lombard will deserve even more acclaim, since he will have proven to be the foundation for the entire theological curriculum adopted by the incipient university, and Comestor's works, his lectures on the four glossed Gospels to be sure but especially the *Historia scholastica*, will henceforth be seen as part of the Lombard's tremendous legacy. We may even be able to begin to understand and to appreciate the *History*'s importance and popularity in the schools long after Comestor's death.

Finally, Comestor's *History* will be invaluable in determining which sections of Langton's lectures on the Bible are actually the Lombard's. Whatever material predates the *History* cannot be Langton's. Conversely, that which postdates it cannot be the Lombard's.[257]

iv. Stephen Langton

This study, which begins with Langton and ends with Peter Lombard, also makes clear that Langton's biblical corpus must henceforth be considered a priority for understanding the study of the Bible during the High Middle Ages, founded as it is squarely upon the biblical legacy of Peter Lombard. This is true even

[254] See Brady's comments in *Magistri Petri Lombardi Parisiensis Episcopi sententiae* (n. 6 above), 2:39*–44*, esp. 39* ("Non sine scandalo [minimo quidem] quosdam modernos invenimus qui adhuc credant quod Magister Petrus Comestor, decanus Trecensis, Parisius venerit solummodo post mortem Lombardi [3 maii 1160], et quidem anno 1164, quando Magistro Odoni successerit in officium cancellarii Parisiensis Ecclesiae"). See also Brady, "Peter Manducator and the Oral Teachings of Peter Lombard, " *Antonianum* 41 (1966): 454–90.

[255] Alexander Andrée and I are collaborating on this project. The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies is scheduled to bring out the first volume, on the Pentateuch, in 2019.

[256] On the medieval legend started by Godfrey of Viterbo that made Peter Lombard, Peter Comestor, and Gratian brothers, see Joseph de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XIIe siècle*, 2nd rev. ed., Museum Lessianum, Section historique 10 (Bruges, 1948), 214, 285. See also Colish, *Peter Lombard* (n. 20 above), 1:16 and n. 5.

[257] In editing the Pentateuch, for example, Alexander Andrée, Joshua Benson, and I are already making daily use of the *History* as a chronological divide to determine whose lectures we are editing, the Lombard's or Langton's.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

though it may occasionally prove difficult in the end to know where the Lombard ends and Langton begins. The prosopographical work of sorting out the many references to "magister" found in the manuscripts and also of sorting out the even more numerous references to anonymous authorities ("quidam dicunt," "sunt qui dicunt," etc.) will be as indispensable as it is likely to be fruitful: for establishing chronologies of various opinions and disputes, for solidifying attributions, and for understanding the tradition of lecturing on the Bible that developed throughout the second half of the twelfth century.

This study also reveals that we have heretofore understood very little of this developing tradition. It is clear that Smalley did not understand Langton's corpus; it is equally clear that she did not look at it very closely. As a consequence, all that she wrote about Stephen Langton and most of what she wrote about Peter Lombard and the Bible (together with whatever has been repeated by other scholars on the same subjects) can and should be discarded. We are starting anew. That said, we do have some valuable information:

1. Like Peter Comestor, Stephen Langton had Peter Lombard's prologues that served as new introductions to the Bible as a whole, to large sections of the Old Testament such as the Pentateuch, and to individual books as well;
2. the Lombard, therefore, may well have undertaken a comprehensive reformation of the Christian tradition of *accessus* to the Bible that was founded principally on Jerome, his predecessor by almost 800 years;
3. Stephen Langton and his students were also thoroughly familiar with the contents of Peter Lombard's lectures on the Old Testament, copies of which were circulating in Paris;
4. the Lombard's lectures on the Old Testament still survive in manuscripts containing works attributed to Langton;
5. his lectures on the New Testament likely survive in Peter Comestor's lectures on the four glossed Gospels.

None of this should surprise us, given that it doubtless mirrors exactly the situation with respect to the Lombard's *magna glosatura* on the Psalms and the Pauline epistles. What I found for Colossians, namely, that Langton not only founds his lectures on those of the Lombard but also incorporates whole chunks of those original lectures into his own, will, I predict, be the invariable pattern for all of this biblical material. What would be shocking would be a situation in which the Lombard's lectures were available and Langton did not use them.

Langton's own works, part of a tradition that is manifestly complicated, must nevertheless now be edited critically, ideally together with the lectures on the Bible and the Gloss of Peter Lombard and Peter Comestor, respectively. The three

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

versions of Langton's course on the *Historia scholastica* will be especially helpful in this regard, as we have just seen, since they give us precise information about his opinions at certain times: two predate 1176 and the final revision dates to 1193. Owing to my familiarity with this material, I can see at a glance material common to all three versions of that course on the *History* and to his lectures on the Old Testament. By comparing Langton's explication of this common material in the various works that preserve it, we will be able to establish a timetable for the development of Langton's views on the many questions and difficulties that he revisited over the course of his career.

v. Hugh of St. Cher

This study is not the place for any kind of in-depth evaluation of the extent to which the multilayered oral tradition discovered here made its way into the so-called Postills of Hugh of St. Cher and the Dominicans under his supervision in the 1230s. There is, however, room to show that Hugh and his Dominicans had the same lectures by Peter Lombard that Comestor and Langton had. We can do so readily by comparing teaching on the first line of Genesis ("in principio creavit Deus caelum et terram"), which we can accomplish briefly, since we reviewed above the Lombard's teaching, using supposition theory, on this very passage regarding the philosophical problems raised by the teaching in the interlinear glosses that God created heaven and earth "in tempore."

In the beginning of those Postills, in the exposition of the first line of Genesis, we find the following: "Interlinearis dicit quod creavit in tempore. Contra alibi: Nihil creavit in tempore. Solutio: Nihil creavit in tempore id est infra tempus."[258] The Lombard discusses the same issue in the *Sentences* (in Book II, Distinction 2, chapter 1) but in different and less precise terms.[259] But returning to the Lombard's lectures preserved in Corpus Christi 55 and three other manuscripts, we find the source used verbatim by the Dominicans: "Sic ergo lege, *IN PRINCIPIO*, temporis, vel ante saecula, vel in Filio, contra hoc quod dicit 'temporis.' Sic alibi dicitur: 'nihil creavit in tempore.' Solutio: 'nihil creavit in tempore' id est infra tempus." Is it possible that they took this from an intermediate source? Certainly, although I have not found this part of the Lombard's lecture repeated either in Comestor or Langton. Far more likely is the supposition that Hugh and the Dominicans had the Lombard's original lectures on the Bible, just like Comestor and Langton.

[258] Hugonis de Sancto Caro, *Opera omnia in universum Vetus et Novum Testamentum*, 8 vols. (Venice, 1754), 1:2, in Gen. 1:1.

[259] Peter Lombard, *II Sent.* (Grottaferrata, 1971), 336, where the Lombard discusses the creation of the angels.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This raises the tantalizing possibility that the School of Paris was transmitted to the thirteenth century in one piece, from beginning, that is, the Lombard's lectures, to end, that is, Langton's massive corpus of lectures, founded as it was on those earlier lectures. If true, the thirteenth-century masters and students would have inherited this multilayered oral tradition of teaching on the Bible and the Gloss together with the biblical Gloss itself as it developed in Paris under Peter Lombard, the Lombard's *Sentences*, and Comestor's *History*, which would mean that Peter Lombard exercised an influence on the High Middle Ages undreamed of, even by those scholars who have most championed him. It would also mean that we have our work cut out for us in editing the works of the Lombard, of Comestor, and of Langton, since the School of Paris, the existence of which was not even known to scholars until quite recently, would be by far the most important twelfth-century legacy to the remainder of the High Middle Ages. Those works, so long either unknown or ignored, must now become a priority for scholars interested in that era.

Conclusions

In a recent study I showed why the search for the Lombard's long-lost glosses on most of the glossed Old Testament (hereinafter "Lombard's Old Testament lectures") had gone astray.[260] Conducted first by Beryl Smalley and subsequently by the great editor of the *Sentences*, Ignatius Brady, the search derailed from the start owing to crucial mistakes in interpretation by Smalley and the adoption by both scholars of fallacious tests for authenticity of attribution.[261] Observing that "what happened to this collection of glosses is one of the great mysteries of medieval theology,"[262] I proposed that the search be reopened, noting that, apart from all four of Comestor's lectures on glossed Gospels, "the next obvious place in which to look will be the biblical commentaries of Stephen Langton."[263] As the evidence presented in this study shows, the corpus so long attributed to Langton was indeed the right place to look.

It is now also clear that the question of whether the High Middle Ages were primarily an oral culture, as opposed to a written or book culture, bears directly on the survival of Peter Lombard's missing biblical corpus in the extant works of Stephen Langton. Brady himself came around to a firm belief that the Lombard's

[260] Clark, "The Biblical *Gloss*, the Search for Peter Lombard's Glossed Bible, and the School of Paris" (n. 1 above), 60–81. By the Lombard's Old Testament lectures, I do not of course mean to refer to his well-known Great Gloss on the Pauline epistles and the Psalms, which survive in many manuscripts, but rather to his lectures on most of the glossed Old Testament.

[261] Ibid.

[262] Ibid., 58.

[263] Ibid., 110.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

library, bequeathed in his last will and testament and recorded in the Cartulary of Notre Dame, the predecessor to the present-day Cathedral, contained not only his own personal copy of the *Sentences* and Gratian's *Decretum* but also his own glosses on most of the Bible.[264] He hypothesized that either the Lombard's students had purchased the volumes for use in their own lectures or the Canons of St. Mary's had sold them to pay for debts.[265] In discussing the disappearance of the Lombard's glossed Bible, Colish mentions the second possibility, speculating that "they were sold by his successor to the see of Paris, Maurice of Sully."[266] It is now apparent, however, that, whatever the fate of the Lombard's personal library, his Old Testament lectures survived owing to that oral culture.

The evidence presented in this study shows clearly that they survived in two ways: they were passed on orally, just as were the lectures of Anselm of Laon and other masters before and after the Lombard. And copies of those lectures, whether authorized by the Lombard or not, were made, some from reports and others from memory, assisted by good notes. Augustine famously complains that copies of his works were being made and circulated even before they were finished. Anselm of Bec, that noted eleventh-century Augustinian, makes the same complaint about the copying of his own works. But both authors were complaining about the unauthorized copying and dissemination of their written work, which had not necessarily issued from lectures or conferences. Indeed, neither Augustine the North African bishop nor Anselm the English abbot lived and wrote in a scholastic milieu so thoroughly oral as that of the mid-twelfth-century Paris in which Peter Lombard, the preeminent Master of Theology, lived and lectured.

The Lombard had many students, and many others besides Peter Comestor heard his lectures. It is to this twelfth-century oral tradition that we owe the survival of the Lombard's lectures on the Bible. We know now that Comestor had the Lombard's prologues on John (and in all probability all four Gospels).[267] I have shown herein that Langton and his students had and used copies of the Lombard's lectures, both prologues to and lectures on the Old Testament. I have also shown that those copies, as all copies, were defective in places owing to copying errors. It strains credibility to suppose that Comestor and Langton were the only two students to have and use copies of the Lombard's lectures on the Bible. Now that we know where to look, more evidence is sure to come to light. Nonetheless, Langton's

[264] Brady, Prolegomena to 2 *Sent.* (n. 6 above), 2:7*.

[265] Ibid., 22*–23*.

[266] Colish, *Peter Lombard*, 1, 29, citing in n. 44 Brady, Prolegomena to *Sent.* 2, 22*–23* where she notes that the sale of the Lombard's books might have been connected to Maurice of Sully's need for funds to build Notre Dame cathedral.

[267] Clark, "The Biblical *Gloss*, the Search for Peter Lombard's Glossed Bible, and the School of Paris," 107–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

corpus, which is enormous, constitutes a gold mine for scholars. Just as Langton has proven to be our most valuable source for understanding the early history of Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica*, so too it turns out that he may be, along with Comestor himself, our most valuable witness to the Lombard's oral teaching: on the Bible and on the *Sentences*.

My sincere hope is that the discovery that the massive corpus of works attributed to Langton in the extant manuscripts is not all his and that Langton founded his own lectures on those of Peter Lombard, whole sections of which we also now have, will soon lead other scholars and students to undertake serious study of the large corpus of manuscripts that is the legacy of the School of Paris. David Luscombe, who has done so much fine work on the first half of the twelfth century, once teased me at a conference that I work on the boring half of the twelfth century. But the discovery of the School of Paris and of the extent of its ambitions and influence will I hope alter that picture a bit. At the very least Peter Lombard can now be claimed by all of his students and successors, notwithstanding Grabmann's long-accepted views.

A second and related hope is that the Bible and theology will henceforth be viewed by scholars as inseparable and studied together. That Peter Lombard viewed the Bible as of supreme importance is no longer debatable. His magnificent prologues introducing the Bible and the Pentateuch make plain enough his views. Stephen Langton too, who together with his students had and used the Lombard's entire corpus, clearly endorsed the same integrated view of theology. In studying them separately, twentieth-century and twenty-first-century scholars have missed not only the unity of that project but also its essential outlines. We put logic on the one side and moral questions on the other, a mistake Peter Lombard and his Parisian successors never made. If we wish to understand them correctly, we will have to study their work as it existed in the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries. It is a historical fact that twelfth- and thirteenth-century masters treated all manner of questions, be they historical, logical, philosophical, theological, etc., whenever they arose in their classrooms. Modern scholars, therefore, cannot hope to understand those thinkers without studying their works in their entirety.

This leads to my third and final hope for this study, which is that scholars will begin to rethink how medieval manuscripts are viewed. I am confident that the evidence I present herein for oral transmission is only the tip of an iceberg, long hidden from sight owing to the simple but erroneous assumption that we scholars were making about how learning was transmitted during the High Middle Ages. Indeed, at the heart of this study stands a revelation about the formation of schools in twelfth-century Paris. Grabmann thought that the salient feature of the scholastic method was logic, but this study suggests something even more central, namely, whether or not a master's lectures were adopted by his successors

as the basis for their own. The Lombard's lectures on the Bible (apart from those on the Psalms and the Pauline epistles) were "lost" for so long because we did not know where to look. We were looking for and thinking in terms of books.

If it is right that learning was transmitted primarily orally during the High Middle Ages, and that orality is the kernel from which most surviving writings arose, then we also have a new and powerful key for understanding and interpreting its culture and norms. Smalley thought that the works of Andrew of St. Victor and his embrace of the literal sense were unique.[268] Following her lead, scholars have edited and studied all of his works.[269] But no twelfth-century master made Andrew's works the basis for his own.

By contrast, we see the lectures of Anselm of Laon preserved in collections of *Sentences* and in the works that become the biblical Gloss, and we then see the appearance of this tradition in Parisian lectures, including those of the Lombard.[270] We see the biblical Gloss serving as the basis for classroom lectures, and, even when that ceases, we see that lecturers on the *Sentences* in the 1230s, 1240s, and 1250s still have it at their fingertips and on their lips. We see the Lombard's own lectures, on the *Sentences*, on the Pauline epistles, on the Psalms, and on other books of the Old Testament, adopted as the basis for the lectures of his successors. The same holds true for Comestor and the *History*, upon which Langton lectures. Langton's lectures on the *History* and on the Bible are in turn passed on by Hugh and the Dominicans. This goes on in an unbroken line through the thirteenth century and well into the fourteenth.[271] The

[268] The extent to which his views on the literal sense are in any way unique remains an open-ended question: the lectures preserved in Corpus Christi 55, which Langton adopted as the basis for his own and which may all prove to be by Peter Lombard, alternate between explication of the literal and moral senses of Scripture. Many of the lectures attributed to Langton do the same. We shall have to edit the corpus of the School of Paris that came out of the cathedral before we have any idea how unique Andrew was, if in fact he was.

[269] The following editions have appeared to date: *Expositio super Heptateuchum*, ed. Charles Lohr and Rainer Berndt, CCM 53 (Turnhout, 1986); *Expositio super Danielem*, ed. Mark Zier, CCM 53F (Turnhout, 1990); *Expositio in Ezechielem*, ed. Michael Alan Signer, CCM 53E (Turnhout, 1991); *Expositiones historicae in libros Salomonis*, ed. Rainer Berndt, CCM 53B (Turnhout, 1991); *Expositio hystorica in librum regum*, ed. Frans van Liere, CCM 53A (Turnhout, 1996); and *Super duodecim prophetas*, ed. Frans van Liere and Mark Zier, CCM 53G (Turnhout, 2007).

[270] See Cédric Giraud, *Per verba magistri: Anselme de Laon et son école au XIIe siècle* (Turnhout, 2010). See also Alexander Andrée's review essay, "Laon Revisited: Master Anselm and the Creation of a Theological School in the Twelfth Century" (n. 248 above).

[271] It is likely that the decade 1330–40, when paper finally becomes cheaper, represents a turning point in this regard. Duba notes the number of quickly produced *reportationes* made possible by the ready supply of paper that is much less expensive than parchment. William Duba, "The Forge of Doctrine: The Academic Year 1330–1331 and the Rise of Scotism at Paris" (Habilitation thesis, Fribourg, 2016), 45–50, 179–82, and cites on the subject of "the diffusion of paper codices" at 29, n. 10, the study of Uwe Neddermeyer, *Von der*

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

transmission of knowledge is oral from first to last, at least in the sense that orality is the kernel out of which writings, some of them polished and some of them not, take shape.

Landgraf wrote long ago, in speaking about the formation of "Schools" in the early Scholastic period, that "the common element is a text that served as the basis for subsequent elaborations."[272] He was right, but what he did not suspect was just how oral the whole scholastic tradition already was. As a consequence, in speaking of the "literature" of the early Scholastic period and in specifying genres of "texts," he listed "Sentence Collections," "Commentaries on Sacred Scripture," and the like. Like everyone else, Landgraf was thinking in terms of books. This study, which hints at the extent to which almost all scholastic transmission of knowledge during this period was oral, at least in origins, modifies Landgraf's view in this way: granting that he was right about the knowledge of one master serving as the base for that of his successors in the schools, we now know that what was passed on were the lectures. Some of these, like those that became the Lombard's *Sentences* or Comestor's *History*, resulted eventually in a stable text that was itself passed on. But this was the end result of a scholastic process and method that was in its origins and essence oral.

We now know that there really was a School of Paris, not in the sense of a common doctrine but rather in the sense of a tradition of teaching and lecturing, carried on by one master after another. Peter Lombard was its founder, and Peter Comestor and Stephen Langton two distinguished successors who carried forward the Lombard's foundational teaching. There are doubtless others whose works we shall now look at in quite a different light. They too may prove to be important contributors to this scholastic tradition that came out of the cathedral schools in Paris.

Whatever we discover, one thing is abundantly clear. The manuscripts that preserve the teaching on the Bible of the School of Paris and that hold the key to understanding the development of theology in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and beyond, which have for so long lain unstudied and unedited in libraries around the world, must now be edited and studied, if we are serious about understanding not only Scholasticism but the place of the Bible in the theology of the High Middle Ages as well. The truth is that the teaching on the Bible of the School of Paris, founded on that of Peter Lombard, fills a longstanding gap in our

Handschrift zum gedruckten Buch: Schriftlichkeit und Leseinteresse im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit; Quantitative und qualitative Aspekte, Buchwissenschaftliche Beiträge aus dem Deutschen Bucharchiv München, Band 61, vol. 1 (Wiesbaden, 1998), 256–67.

[272] "L'élément commun est un texte qui servait de base aux élaborations ultérieures." Artur Landgraf, *Introduction à l'histoire de la littérature théologique de la scolastique naissante*, trans. Louis-B. Geiger, revised and updated by Albert-M. Landry (Paris, 1973), 26. Originally published as *Einführung in die Geschichte der theologischen Literatur der Frühscholastik* (Regensburg, 1948).

https://doi.org/10.1017/tdo.2017.2 Published online by Cambridge University Press

knowledge of medieval theology between 1141, the year in which both Abelard and Hugh of St. Victor died, and the start of the thirteenth century, when Praepositinus and other masters undertook the long speculative advance in medieval philosophy and theology that was not to diminish before 1350. Until now medievalists interested in medieval theology have assumed that the Lombard's *Sentences* filled this gap and have largely ignored as superfluous lectures on the Bible dating to the second half of the twelfth century.

The discovery of the Lombard's lectures on the Bible, however, and the startling discovery that they not only postdate but greatly surpass the theological teaching of the *Sentences* owing to their incorporation of the newly invented logical theory of supposition renders that conventional narrative obsolete. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that the introduction of supposition theory revolutionized Trinitarian theology. Before now, no scholar has ever suspected that the roots and foundation of that great thirteenth-century speculative advance are to be found in twelfth-century lectures on the Bible. We now know otherwise, and the real work of understanding not only the study of the Bible in the Middle Ages but the full story of the development of medieval philosophy and theology must now begin.

The Catholic University of America

Keywords: Stephen Langton, Logic, Peter Lombard, Medieval Bible and Theology, Supposition Theory