

AN EARLY VERSION OF PETER LOMBARD'S LECTURES ON THE *SENTENCES*

BY MARK J. CLARK

The discovery of a copy (in Lincoln MS 230) of Peter Lombard's lectures on the Sentences in three books (starting with the hexameral discussion that follows the treatise on the angels in the four-book version edited by Brady) makes possible for the first time investigating the development of the Lombard's theological teaching during his Parisian teaching career and the fortuna of that teaching outside of Paris. The fact that the Lombard began his early-career lectures on the Sentences in precisely the same place as he began his lectures on Genesis means that all of his teaching originated with Scripture. Moreover, the fact that Lincoln MS 230 is one of many early copies of the Lombard's Parisian teaching found in English cathedral libraries — Lincoln's Cathedral Library has another manuscript containing another copy of the Sentences, Lincoln MS 31, this one on four books, almost certainly copied within the Lombard's lifetime — has revealed the inadequacy of Brady's edition for scholarly understanding of the Lombard's career and teaching. Until now, no scholar paid much attention to the fact that Brady's choice of manuscripts was largely arbitrary and that his edition reflected the state of the Lombard's text around the time of Bonaventure in the mid-thirteenth century. Thus this discovery makes clear that the Sentences, like Gratian's Decretum and Comestor's History, developed over time. The Sentences were not, as so long assumed, a book written by the Lombard late in his career but rather the product of lectures delivered over the course of his career. The discovery of a treasure trove of English manuscripts preserving the Lombard's earliest extant Parisian teaching will enable scholars for the first time to trace the origins

I am grateful to the British Academy for its grant of a Visiting Fellowship, which made possible the research that led to the findings presented in this study. I am especially indebted to Professor Nicholas Vincent, who together with the School of History of the University of East Anglia agreed to sponsor me. Professor Vincent's advice was invaluable, as he had himself spent considerable time in all of the cathedral libraries that I visited. Professor Katy Cubitt, the Head of the School of History, went out of her way to make me welcome and, a medievalist herself, helped me with crucial gaps in my knowledge. I must also thank not only other historians — Professors David D'Avray, Philippa Hoskin, and Rod Thomson each deserve my gratitude for going out of their way to assist me with this research — but also the librarians, archivists, and other staff at the cathedral libraries that I visited, often for weeks at a time: Canterbury, Lincoln, Worcester, Hereford, Exeter, and in London at Lambeth Palace. Cressida Williams at Canterbury, Claire Arrand at Lincoln, David Morrison at Worcester, Rosemary Firman at Hereford, and Ellie Jones at Exeter all deserve my special thanks both for their gracious hospitality and for going the extra mile with me and my work. Finally, I would be remiss not to thank heartily as well the many staff members who assist the History Department at the University of East Anglia: Rachel Cole, Melanie Watling, Danielle Shaw, Richard Delahaye, and Janette Darbon. Their support and gracious assistance were invaluable to me.

Traditio 74 (2019), 223–247
© Fordham University 2019
doi:10.1017/tdo.2019.2

and development of the institutional practices of the cathedral school of Paris right up to the time of its transformation into the University of Paris.

In this study I introduce what is likely to be the earliest version of the *Sentences* yet brought to the attention of scholars. The version in Lincoln Cathedral MS 230 is one of the first fruits of my stated intention to have another look at early manuscripts of the *Sentences*.¹ Ignatius Brady relied upon thirteen manuscripts for his edition of the *Sentences*, eight of which he dated to the twelfth century; of this twelfth-century group, he relied on four as the most important for his edition.² Not one, however, was produced or copied during Peter Lombard's lifetime.³

It is noteworthy that none of the thirteen manuscripts relied upon by Brady are English, even though Peter Lombard's teaching career at Paris fell squarely within a century of intensive Anglo-Norman relations. The question should at least be asked whether Brady or any of his Franciscan predecessors who produced editions of the *Sentences* even had a look at the numerous copies of the works of Peter Lombard in England. In fact, copies of the Lombard's *Sentences* and of his works on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles abound in English cathedral libraries even now, centuries after so many were removed following the Dissolution.⁴ A very large number of those that I have examined during the past six months were copied during the twelfth century, and of these quite a few are very early indeed. I would not be at all surprised if some of these English manuscripts containing copies of the Lombard's various works prove to be the earliest in existence.

¹ See Mark J. Clark, "Peter Lombard, Stephen Langton, and the School of Paris: The Making of the Twelfth-Century Scholastic Biblical Tradition," *Traditio* 72 (2017): 171–274, at 251, where I mentioned the need "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."

² Ignatius Brady, ed., *Magistri Petri Lombardi Parisiensis Episcopi sententiae in IV libris distinctae* (Grottaferrata, 1971–81), Prolegomena to *Sent.*, 1 (1971), 131*–136*. The critical edition published by Brady was the third edition of the *Sentences* produced by the Franciscans within a hundred years. See Ignatius Brady, "The Three Editions of the 'Liber Sententiarum' of Master Peter Lombard (1882–1977)," *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 70 (1977): 400–411.

³ Brady rejected on solid grounds the supposed date of 1158 for Troyes MS 900, long considered the oldest extant manuscript containing the Lombard's *Sentences*. See Brady, Prolegomena to *Sent.* 1 (1971), 130*–131*.

⁴ On the removal of manuscripts from English libraries, the classic study, brief but tremendously informative, is that of Neil Ker, "The Migration of Manuscripts from English Medieval Libraries," in his *Books, Collectors and Libraries: Studies in Medieval Heritage*, ed. Andrew G. Watson (London, 1981), 459–69. On the dispersal of manuscripts from English monastic libraries, see James Carley, "The Dispersal of the Monastic Libraries and the Salvaging of the Spoils," in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*, Volume I, to 1640, ed. Elizabeth Ledham-Green and Teresa Webber (Cambridge, 2006), 265–91.

Lincoln Cathedral Library alone has two manuscripts preserving copies of the *Sentences* that are demonstrably older than any considered by Brady and his Franciscan editorial predecessors. Lincoln MS 31, donated by Bishop Robert of Chesney to Lincoln Cathedral Library upon his death in 1166, was copied in all likelihood during Peter Lombard's lifetime. Indeed, I show below that Robert, who may have studied with Peter Lombard in Paris before his election to the see of Lincoln in December of 1148, may have received from his former master two copies of the *Sentences*. The first was Lincoln MS 31, the second, the subject of this study, Lincoln MS 230, which preserves a much earlier copy of the *Sentences* in three books rather than four.⁵ I show below that the version of the *Sentences* preserved in Lincoln MS 230 likely dates to the years 1146–48, which would mean that Peter Lombard began teaching the *Sentences* much earlier than Brady or indeed any other scholar has supposed.⁶

There are two parts to this study. In the first, after examining part of an early chapter of the first book of “Sentences” in Lincoln MS 230, I set forth a text and translation of three full chapters from the same book in what we, the editors, are calling the *Versio primitiva* of the *Sentences*.⁷ I juxtapose these chapters, both the Latin text and an English translation, with the corresponding passages in Book II in Brady's edition. I also compare and discuss the sources used in both versions. I include as well a table sent to me by Riccardo Saccenti, which juxtaposes the first

⁵ For full descriptions of each manuscript, see Rodney M. Thomson, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library* (Cambridge, 1989), 23 (for MS 31) and 189–90 (for MS 230). For the latter manuscript, Thomson supposed, mistakenly, that it preserves Books II–IV of the *Sentences*, since he took for granted, seemingly like every other scholar, that Brady had edited a “standard” version. Although the question of the extent to which the version edited by Brady is standard is beyond the limited scope of this study, I can report that, of the forty or so manuscripts containing copies of the *Sentences*, either complete or partial, that I examined during the past six months in England, no more than a handful match the version in Brady's edition in terms of how the chapters are organized. I am not of course speaking about the division into distinctions, which took place sometime during the thirteenth century. The numerous manuscripts in English cathedral libraries whose internal organization differs markedly from the version edited by Brady suggests that scholars have been misled in assuming that the *Sentences* were standardized in any real sense. Only diligent and painstaking manuscript researches will establish with precision when such standardization actually occurred and where, for it is manifestly possible that it occurred at different times in different places.

⁶ The scholarship on Peter Lombard during the past quarter century is all based upon Brady's edition, the second part of which appeared in 1981. See especially Marcia Colish, *Peter Lombard*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1994); Philipp W. Rosemann, *Peter Lombard* (Oxford, 2004); and *Peter Lombard, The Sentences*, trans. Giulio Silano, 4 vols. (Toronto, 2007–10).

⁷ I am grateful to Joshua Benson and Riccardo Saccenti for agreeing to work with me in producing an edition and accompanying translation of this *Versio primitiva* of the *Sentences*. Benson will edit and translate Book III (Book IV in later versions), and Saccenti Book II (Book III in later versions). I here provide chapters from Book I, since that is the book that I myself am editing.

chapter from Book II of the *Versio primitiva* with that in Book III of Brady's edition and thus shows that the story is the same in the other books as well.⁸ My objective is threefold: to leave no doubt that the copy of the *Sentences* in MS 230 is an early version of the *Sentences*; to show that the *Sentences* were composed for lectures; and finally to show that the *Sentences* were a work in progress, developed to a great degree over time and even within the Lombard's lifetime.

Once the *Versio primitiva* in Lincoln MS 230 has been edited and made available, we can turn our editorial attention to Lincoln MS 31, which would enable us to trace the development of the *Sentences* during Peter Lombard's lifetime. There may well be other copies of the *Sentences* in England or elsewhere that are as early as, or even earlier than, Lincoln MSS 31 and 230.⁹ Certainly Hereford O.VIII.9, which preserves a twelfth-century copy of the *Sentences* and which may be related to Lincoln MS 31 through a common Parisian exemplar, will also have to be examined at great length and probably edited. For now, however, we must content ourselves with showing the development of the *Sentences* from the *Versio primitiva* to the version edited by Brady.¹⁰

In the second and briefer part of this study, I discuss the historical circumstances surrounding Lincoln MS 230, both as regards what it teaches us about the Lombard's theological teaching in Paris and its presence in Lincoln Cathedral Library. In particular I set forth and discuss the available evidence that relates to dating the version of the *Sentences* in Lincoln MS 230. An ancillary benefit of this discussion is that the evidence presented herein for the dates of the lectures Peter Lombard delivered on the text in Lincoln MS 230 also bears upon scholarly estimates for the dates both of Burgundio of Pisa's Latin translation of John Damascene's *De fide orthodoxa* and the second recension of Gratian's *Decretum*.

⁸ I am grateful to Saccenti as well for sending me the fruits of his own preliminary editing and for permission to share them here.

⁹ It is obvious that English cathedral libraries may not be unique in possessing numerous early versions of the *Sentences*. For this reason, Riccardo Saccenti is undertaking to examine manuscripts in cathedral libraries in Italy, Switzerland, and Austria.

¹⁰ During my last visit to Lincoln Cathedral Library I was able to examine Lincoln MS 31 at some leisure, and my preliminary investigations suggest that, although much, if not most, of the text of the version of the *Sentences* in Lincoln MS 31 matches that in the version edited by Brady, the organization of that text bears minimal relation to that in Brady's edition. I am loathe to say more than this at present, for Lincoln MS 31 contains but one of very many copies of the *Sentences* in English cathedral libraries that differ markedly and in many respects from that edited by Brady. It is likely that several at least of the earliest of those manuscripts will need to be edited and also that many, if not most, of the others will have to be studied in some detail, before any scholar can hazard an educated opinion about the state of the various versions of the *Sentences* during and after Peter Lombard's lifetime.

PETER LOMBARD'S EARLY LECTURES ON THE *SENTENCES*: THE *VERSIO PRIMITIVA*

The current first folio of the version of the *Sentences* preserved in Lincoln Cathedral MS 230, like those at the very end of the codex, is damaged and difficult to read in places, both front (recto) and back (verso). I have, however, been able to read or reconstruct most of its text. This manuscript is, as I show below, a replica copy of a Parisian exemplar in three books, clearly marked throughout on facing folios as L–I, L–II, and L–III. The Lombard's transitions between Books I and II and between Books II and III leave no room to doubt that this proto-version of the *Sentences* was composed and organized in three books, and not four.¹¹ Thus, what we know from Brady's edition as Book I of the *Sentences* did not yet exist.

Instead, Book I of the *Versio primitiva* begins with a very brief account of the angelic creation: the so-called treatise on the angels in Book II of Brady's edition did not yet exist either.

Pet. Lomb., I *Sent.*, *Versio primitiva* (Lincoln MS 230, fol. 1r):

Item Gregorius in libro *Dialogorum*: quid est quod ibi nesciant qui scientem omnia sciunt? Sed accipiendum est de his quorum cognitio beatum faciunt cognitorem, ut sunt ea quae ad mysterium Trinitatis pertinent et unitatis.

Likewise Gregory in his *Book of Dialogues*: what is it that they do not know there, who know the truth in everything. But this must be understood about those things the knowledge of which renders the knower blessed, as are those things that pertain to the mystery of the Trinity and its unity.

Pet. Lomb., II *Sent.*, Dist. 11, cap. 2.10 (ed. Brady, 1971, p. 383, lines 26–30):

Gregorius quoque in libro *Dialogorum* ait: quid est quod ibi nesciant, ubi scientem omnia sciunt? Videtur dicere quod omnia sciunt angeli et nihil sit quod nesciant. Sed accipiendum est hoc de his quorum cognitio beatum facit cognitorem, ut sunt ea quae ad mysterium Trinitatis et unitatis pertinent.

I cannot read the few words that precede this passage at the top of what I have called folio 1r, but it seems obvious that one folio at least is missing, for those words, albeit illegible, are nevertheless clearly a continuation of what came before. It seems likely to me that the Lombard's *Versio primitiva* began earlier in what would ultimately become what we know as Chapter 2 of Distinction 11. Another sign of this is the word *Item* that begins the passage quoted but not the corresponding passage in the Brady edition. *Item* translates roughly in English to *likewise*, and here it is clear that the Lombard, like all twelfth-century lecturers, was using it in standard classroom fashion to signal his interest in another in a series of related points about whatever topic he was addressing, in

¹¹ At fol. 40r, where Book II begins, we find the heading: "Incipit liber secundus de incarnatione Verbi," and at 101v, where Book II ends, we find at the bottom of the folio the following transition: "Incipit liber tertius de signis sacramentalibus et de eis quae ipsis adiacent et postremo de Resurrectione."

this case the knowledge of the angels. The substance and format of the five full chapters to be presented herein will make clear that these are not guesses: we have here the end of a full chapter's discussion of angelic knowledge.

One advantage afforded by the juxtaposition of this passage from the *Versio primitiva* with the corresponding passage in Brady's edition is that the order and direction of the texts are clearly revealed. The former is the primitive version, to which Lombard later added the middle sentence about Gregory's point: "He seems to say that the angels knew everything and that there is nothing that they did not know." Another advantage is that we get immediate insight into the Lombard's manner of teaching the theological sentences, in this case one from Gregory in the *Dialogues*, that he was presenting to his students for discussion. The sentence is presented, and then the Lombard gives his view as to how it should be understood.

The basic story is already clear even in this brief excerpt, but to remove any doubt and to accomplish all three of my stated goals, I will here present and discuss four full chapters: three from early in Book I of the *Versio primitiva*, and the first chapter from Book II. For each I set forth first the full text of each chapter as it appears in Lincoln MS 230, prefixed with the simple headings the Lombard used to introduce his discussion, and then an English translation for the whole. To facilitate comparison of this early version with the version in Brady's edition, I then subdivide the three chapters from Book I, juxtaposing each excerpt with the correlative texts in the version of the *Sentences* edited by Brady and highlighting in bold keywords, phrases, and sentences in the textual excerpts from Brady's edition. In this way the reader can see at a glance how the *Versio primitiva* changed, what was added to or subtracted from it, and how the Lombard developed the *Sentences* over time.

In the first chapter presented, the Lombard addresses the question how to understand the references in the opening lines of Genesis to "heaven and earth" and to the "darkness over the abyss," always a vexing question as the sun had not yet been created.

Pet. Lomb., I *Sent.*, *Versio primitiva* (Lincoln MS 230, fol. 1r–v):

... **illa temporis corporalia creata sunt ... De tenebrarum duplici significatione.**

Postquam **CREAVIT DEUS CAELUM** id est angelicam naturam primo informem, ut superius **dictum est, ET TERRAM** id est confusam quattuor elementorum materiam. Quam nomine, ut Augustinus *Contra Manichaeos*, ideo appellavit <Moyses>, quia <inter > quattuor elementa ipsa minus speciosa est. Quam etiam *abyssum* appellavit dicens: **ET TENEBRAE ERANT SUPER FACIEM ABYSSI**, sed confusa erat, non habens distinctas species. Super quam **FEREBATUR SPIRITUS DOMINI**, sicut voluntas artificis super rebus faciendis apud se disponit, quia proponebat ipsam in species distinctas formare. Haec quippe aqua appellatur, quia omnia haec terrena crescentia ab aqua id est ab humida incipiunt nasci et formari. Ita ab illa confusa producuntur.

Et tunc erant *TENEBRAE* id est lucis absentia. Nihil enim sunt tenebrae quas sola lucis absentia facit, sicut silentium omnis sonitus exterminatio, et loci inanitas est absentia omnis corporis. Sed quia *TENEBRAE* dupliciter dicuntur vel distinguitur, Augustinus pro absentia lucis hoc nomen [L230, fol. 1v] intellexit. Ubi autem dicit, *benedicite, lux et tenebrae, Domine*, ibi accipitur pro aëris obscura qualitate. *TENEBRAE ERANT SUPER FACIEM ABYSSI*, quia nondum lux erat, quae postea primo die formata est.

Afterwards *GOD MADE HEAVEN*, that is, angelic nature, unformed at first, as was said above, *AND EARTH*, that is the confused matter of the four elements. This Moses called by name, as Augustine says in his *Against the Manichees*, for the reason that among the four elements the earth is less beautiful. This he also called *the abyss* saying: *AND DARKNESS WAS OVER THE FACE OF THE ABYSS*, but it was confused, not having its distinct forms. Over which *WAS BORNE THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD*, just as the will of an artisan arranges in itself over the things to be made, since he was proposing that his will form those things into distinct species. And at that time there was *DARKNESS* that is the absence of light. For the darkness that the absence of light alone makes is nothing, just as silence is the destruction of all sound, and the emptiness of a place is the absence of every body. But since *darkness* is said or distinguished in a twofold manner, Augustine understood this name as the absence of light. But where Scripture says, *bless the Lord, ye light and darkness*, there it is understood as the dusky quality of air. *DARKNESS WAS OVER THE FACE OF THE ABYSS*, since light did not yet exist, which afterwards was formed on the first day.

A few simple observations can be made before I present this chapter in a fractured form so as to be able to compare it with the corresponding texts in Brady's edition. First, we see right away that Peter Lombard was lecturing, as indicated by his words "ut superius dictum est," which refer to what "was said above." Second, the explication is brief and straightforward. The Lombard weaves the scriptural lemmata into his explication in the same fashion as twelfth-century lecturers on the Bible. In fact, he lectured on Genesis himself in precisely this fashion.¹²

¹² I shall submit for publication two studies that document in far greater detail Stephen Langton's practice throughout his career of lecturing not only on the Bible but also on Peter Lombard's biblical lectures, a discovery first introduced in Clark, "Peter Lombard, Stephen Langton, and The School of Paris" (n.1 above). The first ("Peter Lombard, Stephen Langton, and Twelfth-Century Cathedral Schools in England and Paris"), which treats the Anglo-Norman context for the ubiquity of the Lombard in the cathedral schools of England during the twelfth century and the related sending of Stephen Langton to Peter Lombard by countrymen in Lincolnshire who had already studied in Paris with Peter Lombard, is finished and will shortly be submitted for publication, either as an article in two parts to a journal or as a monograph. In it I set forth in cogent fashion all of the various kinds of evidence that show Langton's career-long reliance upon and incorporation of the Lombard's biblical lectures into his own. The second ("The Prologues of Stephen Langton [and Peter Lombard] Introducing the Bible: Introduction") is a publication tentatively accepted by

When we work through the individual parts of this narrative, the relation to the later version of the *Sentences* edited by Brady is plain to see.

Postquam *CREAVIT DEUS CAELUM* id est angelicam naturam primo informem, ut superius dictum est, *ET TERRAM* id est confusam quattuor elementorum materiam.

Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, Dist. 12, cap. 3.1 (ed. Brady, 1971, p. 385, lines 12–17):

Quomodo per intervalla temporis res corporales conditae sint. Secundum hanc itaque traditionem, ordinem atque modum creationis formationisque rerum inspiciamus. Sicut supra memoratum est, **in principio creavit Deus caelum, scilicet angelicam naturam, sed adhuc informem**, ut quibusdam placet; **et terram, id est illam confusam materiam quatuor elementorum.**

The first sentence corresponds to chapter 3 of distinction 12 in Brady's edition. The Lombard changed the phrase, "ut superius dictum est," to "Sicut supra memoratum est." The later version adds an introductory sentence stating the question and his intention — the Lombard speaks in his own voice using the first person, plural ("let us look at") — to consider the traditional question of the order and manner of creation. But there is no mistaking the correspondence of the *Versio primitiva* with the version edited by Brady, since the Lombard uses the same words and phrases. Nor is there any doubt about the direction, which the additions make plain.

The correspondence between the *Versio primitiva* and the edition of the *Sentences* edited by Brady is not always so easy to see, for in many cases the later version is not only supplemented but reorganized. Moreover, the Lombard not infrequently changed his wording, as in the next section:

Quam nomine, ut Augustinus *Contra Manichaeos*, ideo appellavit < Moyses >, quia < inter > quattuor elementa ipsa minus speciosa est. Quam etiam abyssum appellavit dicens: *ET TENEBRAE ERANT SUPER FACIEM ABYSSI*, sed confusa erat, non habens distinctas species. Super quam *FEREBATUR SPIRITUS DOMINI*, sicut voluntas artificis super rebus faciendis apud se disponit, quia proponebat ipsam in species distinctas formare. Haec quippe aqua appellatur, quia omnia haec terrena crescentia ab aqua id est ab humida incipiunt nasci et formari. Ita ab illa confusa producuntur.

the editorial committee of the British Academy for publication in the *Auctores Britannici*. In the Introduction to that volume, in which the many prologues introducing the Bible, the Pentateuch, and Genesis throughout Langton's many and various lectures are edited and translated, I revise Langton's biography and existing historiography on his Parisian teaching career based on recent manuscript discoveries including those discussed in this article. I also present the evidence that not only sorts out the order of and relation among the nine traditions known to me of Langton's lectures on those prologues and on Genesis but also that establishes Langton's habit of lecturing on the biblical lectures of Peter Lombard throughout his career. Those lectures of Peter Lombard on Genesis correlate closely with the doctrinal teaching and wording in the *Versio primitiva* of the *Sentences*, featured in this study.

Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, Dist. 12, cap. 3.2 (ed. Brady, 1971, p. 385, lines 18–20, 22–23 — p. 386, lines 1–4, 6–8):

Quam nomine *terrae*, ut ait Augustinus, *Contra Manichaeos*, ideo appellavit Moyses, «quia terra inter omnia elementa minus est speciosa». ... **Eandem etiam vocat abyssum dicens: *Et tenebrae erant super faciem abyssi, quia confusa erat et commixta, specie distincta carens.*** «Eadem etiam materia informis dicta est *aqua*, super quam *ferebatur spiritus Domini*, sicut superfertur **fabricandis rebus voluntas artificis**» «quia subiacebat bonae voluntati Creatoris quod formandum perficiendumque inchoaverat». ... **Haec ideo dicta est *aqua*, quia omnia quae in terra nascuntur, sive animalia, sive arbores vel herbae et similia, ab humore incipiunt formari atque nutriri.**

There is repetition here sufficient to recognize immediately the parentage of the *Versio primitiva*, as in the first passage highlighted in bold, where the Lombard changed only a word here and there but not the syntax: “Quam” to “Eandem,” “appellavit” to “vocat,” “quia” to “sed,” etc. Yet there is also refinement of wording, as in the next phrase, when the Lombard substituted “specie distincta carens” for “non habens distinctas species” or as in his substitution of “fabricandis rebus voluntas artificis” for his earlier “voluntas artificis super rebus faciendis.”

Instances like the latter help us to see the progression from the Lombard's initial paraphrasing of his source, in this case an interlinear gloss taken from the biblical Gloss (Biblical Glossa, Glossa interlinearis in Gen. 1.2 (Valenciennes 19, fol. 2v^b): “*ET SPIRITUS DOMINI FEREBATUR SUPER AQUAS Sicut sapientia artificis superfertur faciendo operi*”), to his later expression of the same idea. Indeed, comparison of passages in which the Lombard is expressing the same idea reveals the growing precision of his teaching over time. Thus, he starts in the *Versio primitiva* with the phrase — “Haec quippe aqua appellatur, quia omnia haec terrena crescentia ab aqua id est ab humida incipiunt nasci et formari” — which becomes a more expansive and specific statement of the same: “Haec ideo dicta est *aqua*, quia omnia quae in terra nascuntur, sive animalia, sive arbores vel herbae et similia, ab humore incipiunt formari atque nutriri.”

As one might expect, the Lombard not infrequently reorganized material over time, as in the next part of this chapter:

Et tunc erant *TENEBRAE* id est lucis absentia. Nihil enim sunt tenebrae quas sola lucis absentia facit, sicut silentium omnis sonitus exterminatio, et loci inanitas est absentia omnis corporis. Sed quia *TENEBRAE* dupliciter dicuntur vel distinguuntur, Augustinus pro absentia lucis hoc nomen [L230, fol. Iv] intellexit. Ubi autem dicit, *benedicite, lux et tenebrae, Domine*,¹³ ibi accipitur pro aëris obscura qualitate. *TENEBRAE ERANT SUPER FACIEM ABYSSI*, quia nondum lux erat, quae postea primo die formata est.

¹³ Dan. 3:72.

Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, Dist. 12, cap. 3.3 (ed. Brady, 1971, p. 386, lines 16–21):

Et tunc erant tenebrae, id est lucis absentia. Augustinus: Non enim tenebrae aliquid sunt, sed ipsa lucis absentia. Sicut silentium non aliqua res est, sed ubi sonus non est, silentium dicitur. Et nuditas non aliqua res est, sed in corpore ubi tegumentum non est, nuditas dicitur. Sicut et inanitas non est aliquid, sed inanis dicitur esse locus, ubi non est corpus, et inanitas absentia corporis.

He uses here many of the same words and phrases but changes the order, moving Augustine's discussion of darkness as a privative to earlier in his treatment and expanding, in the final sentence, what had been a concise adaptation ("et loci inanitas est absentia omnis corporis") of a passage from the biblical Gloss (Biblical Glossa, Glossa marginalis Bedae attributa in Gen. 2.17, Valenciennes 19, fol. 14r^b.1: "*De ligno autem scientiae boni et malae ne comedas. ... Sed ex contrariis contraria noscuntur, ut ex plenitudine inanitas et auditum de silentio iudicamus.*"), into a more forceful and complete closing statement based upon the same ("Sicut et inanitas non est aliquid, sed inanis dicitur esse locus, ubi non est corpus, et inanitas absentia corporis").

In the next chapter of the *Versio primitiva*, the Lombard treated in concise fashion two questions: why the primordial matter is called unformed in the opening line of Genesis and where it was. He dealt with the first question in one sentence, before posing the second question and dealing with it expeditiously, as we see in reading through this brief chapter:

Pet. Lomb., *I Sent.*, *Versio primitiva* (Lincoln MS 230, fol. 1v):

Quare illa materia dicitur informis et ubi subsisterit aequaliter.

Illa materia dicta est nondum formata, non quia omnino esset sine forma — omne enim corporeum aliquam habet formam — sed quia non distinctam et apertam habebat formam qualem modo videmus. Si quaeritur ubi substitueret tunc illa informis materia, dicimus ubi nunc. Illud terrenum elementum in medio positum erat caeteris circumquaque in medio cuiusdam nebulae oppansis, ut apparere non posset erantque in altum extensa in quantum nunc finitas corporae naturae pertingit. Pars spissior inferius, levior et subtilior superius existebat. De quo superiori aëre putant quidam aquas quae super firmamentum sunt creatas fuisse.

Why that matter is called unformed and where it subsisted equally.

That matter was called not yet formed, not because it was altogether without form — for every bodily thing has a certain form — but because it did not have a clear and distinct form such as we now see. If the question is raised where that unformed matter then subsisted, we say where it is now. That earthly element had been placed in the middle of the others spread around it on all sides in the middle of a certain cloud, so that it could not appear, and the others were extended into the upper atmosphere to the full extent that the finitude of corporeal nature now stretches. The thicker part emerged lower, the lighter and subtler part higher. From which higher part of the upper atmosphere certain thinkers suppose that the waters that are above the firmament had been created.

Just how concisely the Lombard treated these two questions in his early lectures on the *Sentences* is seen from a comparison with distinction 12, chapter 5 of the later version edited by Brady.

The Lombard's introduction to this chapter in the *Versio primitiva* ("**Quare illa materia dicitur informis et ubi substiterit aequaliter**") becomes in the version edited by Brady chapter 5, section 1 of distinction 12:

Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, Dist. 12, cap. 5.1 (ed. Brady, 1971, p. 387, lines 9–14):
Duo hic consideranda sunt: quare illa materia confusa sit dicta informis, et ubi ad esse prodiit quantumque in altitudine ascenderit. De qua priusquam tractemus, duo nobis discutienda occurrunt: primum, **quare illa materia confusa informis dicatur, an quia omni forma caruit an propter aliud; secundo, ubi ad esse prodierit et quantum in altum ascenderit.**

The same words and questions are repeated, albeit at greater length and with, it must be said, a good bit of repetition. Brady thought that this first section of chapter 5 in distinction 12 bore some resemblance to one of the first passages in Hugh of St. Victor's *De sacramentis*, which could be true in some remote sense.¹⁴ The proximate source, however, is obvious.

The Lombard developed at some length the first sentence of this chapter in the *Versio primitiva*, incorporating the same words, phrases, and ideas into what in Brady's edition is section 2 of chapter 5 in distinction 12:

Illa materia dicta est nondum formata, non quia omnino esset sine forma — omne enim corporeum aliquam habet formam — sed quia non distinctam et apertam habebat formam qualem modo videmus.

Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, Dist. 12, cap. 5.2 (ed. Brady, 1971, p. 387, lines 15–26):

Ad primum brevis responsio*. Ad illud igitur quod primo positum est breviter respondentem, **dicimus illam primam materiam non ideo dictam fore informem quod nullam omnino formam habuerit, quia non aliquid corporeum tale existere potest, quod nullam habeat formam;** sed ideo non absurde informem appellari posse dicimus, **quia in confusione et permixtione quadam subsistens, nondum pulchram apertamque et distinctam receperat formam, qualem modo cernimus.** Facta est ergo illa materia in forma confusionis ante formam dispositionis. In forma confusionis prius omnia corporalia materialiter simul et semel sunt creata; postmodum in forma dispositionis sex diebus sunt ordinata. — Ecce absolutum est quod primo in discussione propositum fuit, scilicet quare illa materia dicatur informis.

In the later version we see clearly that the Lombard developed the *Versio primitiva* through lectures: "To that issue, therefore, that was first taken up briefly responding, we say that. ... " Peter Lombard is talking, and the later version edited by

¹⁴ Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, Dist. 12, cap. 5.1 (ed. Brady, 1971, p. 387): "*Fons partis primae capituli quinti secundum Brady*: 'Cap. 5, num. 1. Quaestio aequaliter suggeritur ab Hugone, *De sacram.*, I, I, 5 (PL 176, 190 A).'"

Brady, just like that in Lincoln MS 230, preserves his oral speech in a text. Why would it not develop in this way over time, given that, as I show below, he lectured for at least thirteen or fourteen years on the *Sentences*? Indeed, the repetition that is here once more seen in the later version edited by Brady — three times consecutively Peter Lombard hammers home the central point of the confused state of the unformed matter — points to oral discourse, for writers are more precise.

By this point in our comparison it will likely come as no surprise to learn that the rest of this chapter in the *Versio primitiva*, in which as noted above the Lombard addressed the question of the location of that primordial matter, constitutes the third section of chapter 5 in distinction 12 in Brady's edition:

Si quaeritur ubi substitueret tunc illa informis materia, **dicimus** ubi nunc. Illud terrenum elementum in medio positum erat caeteris circumquaque in medio cuiusdam nebulae oppansis, ut apparere non posset erantque in altum extensa inquantum nunc finitas corporeae naturae pertingit. Pars spissior inferius, levior et subtilior superius existebat. De quo superiori aëre putant quidam aquas quae super firmamentum sunt creatas fuisse.

Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, Dist. 12, cap. 5.3 (ed. Brady, 1971, p. 387, line 27–p. 388, line 14):

Hic ad id quod secundo quaerebatur respondet. Nunc superest quod secundo proponebatur explicare, ubi scilicet illa materia substiterit et quantum in altitudine porrigebatur. Ad quod, nihil temere asserentes, **dicimus** quod illa prima rerum omnium moles, quando creata est, ibidem ad esse videtur prodiisse, ubi nunc formata subsistit. Eratque terrenum hoc elementum in imo loco, eodemque medio subsidens, ceteris in una confusione permixtis; eisdemque circumquaque in modo cuiusdam nebulae oppansis, ita obvolutum erat, ut apparere non posset quod fuit. Illa vera tria in una permixtione confusa, circumquaque suspensa, eousque in altum porrigebantur, quousque nunc summitas corporeae naturae pertingit. Et sicut quibusdam videtur, ultra locum firmamenti extendebatur illa moles, quae in inferiori parte spissior atque grossior erat, in superiori vero rarior et levior atque subtilior existebat; de qua rariori substantia putant quidam fuisse aquas quae super firmamentum esse dicuntur. Talis fuit mundi facies in principio, priusquam reciperet formam vel dispositionem.

The language of lecturing remains, as we find the same “dicimus” in both versions. And, if we break both versions into component parts, we can trace with exactitude the Lombard's use of the same words and phrases, sometimes paraphrased and frequently elaborated, from one version to the next.

Si quaeritur ubi substitueret tunc illa informis materia, **dicimus** ubi nunc.

... **ubi** scilicet **illa materia substiterit** et quantum in altitudine porrigebatur. Ad quod, nihil temere asserentes, **dicimus** quod illa prima rerum omnium moles, quando creata est, ibidem ad esse videtur prodiisse, **ubi nunc** formata subsistit.

Illud terrenum elementum in medio positum erat caeteris circumquaque in medio cuiusdam nebulae oppansis, ut appareri posset erantque in altum extensa inquantum nunc finitas corporeae naturae pertingit.

Eratque **terreum hoc elementum** in imo loco, **eodemque medio** subsidens, **ceteris** in una confusione permixtis; eisdemque **circumquaque in modo cuiusdam nebulae oppansis**, ita obvolutum erat, **ut apparere non posset** quod fuit. **Illā vera tria** in una permixtione confusa, circumquaque suspensa, **eousque in altum porrigebantur, quousque nunc summitas corporeae naturae pertingit.**

Pars spissior inferius, levior et subtilior superius existebat. De quo superiori aëre putant quidam aquas quae super firmamentum sunt creatas fuisse.

That the *Versio primitiva* is the basis for the later version is patent. It may not be in fact the earliest version of the Lombard's *Sentences*, although given what we know for sure about its dates, discussed below, it would be quite difficult to imagine a version of the *Sentences* that preceded it. But that its text served as the basis for the Lombard's fashioning of the version edited by Brady cannot reasonably be disputed.

That the *Versio primitiva* is a text closely related to lectures is also patent. It is manifestly a text pregnant with the language of the classroom. The Lombard is raising questions and then addressing them concisely, considering alternative positions and then stating his own. It reads very much like a transcript of an in-class lecture. Was it a text that came about from transcriptions of lectures? Or was it a text composed by Peter Lombard for lectures and then subsequently influenced by lectures? It is hard to say for sure one way or the other. The editors will have to sift through all available evidence (codicological, textual, etc.), before any such questions can be answered, even tentatively. For now, though, it suffices to point out the obvious: the language of the *Versio primitiva* leaves no doubt that it was connected in some essential fashion to lectures: through the Lombard's composing it for lectures, through his delivering lectures using its text, or through both.

It is also worth pointing out that, although Brady found many sources used by the Lombard in the *Sentences*, the *Versio primitiva* enables us to be even more precise in locating those sources, and even ones recognized by Brady. Thus, for this passage Brady specified not only the beginning of Hugh's *De sacramentis* but also resonances with certain passages in the biblical Gloss.¹⁵ The more concise language in the *Versio primitiva* confirms the Lombard's use of the Gloss as a source of first resort but helps us to locate what are likely to have been the very passages the Lombard drew upon in the first instance.¹⁶

¹⁵ Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, Dist. 12, cap. 5.3 (ed. Brady, 1971, p. 387): "Num. 3. Prima pars ex Hugone, *De sacram.*, I, 1, I (PL 176, 190 B); deinde de mole supra firmamentum, cf. *Glossa ordin.* in Gen. 1, 6 et 7 (apud Lyranum, I, 24d, 25a; v 4v–5r)."

¹⁶ See Biblical Glossa, Glossa marginalis Bedae attributa in Gen. 1.2 (Valenciennes 19, fol. 2v^a.2): "BEDA. *Et tenebrae erant super faciem abyssi* etc. Non sunt audiendi qui reprehendendo dicunt deum prius creasse tenebras quam lucem, quia nullas in aqua vel in aëre fecit tenebras sed distincto ordine providentiae prius aquas cum caelo creavit et terra, et has cum voluit lucis gratia venustavit. Et notandum quod cum caelo duo elementa mundi creata sunt, quibus alia duo inserta sunt aqua scilicet et terra, quibus insunt ignis et aër.

One more chapter from Book I should suffice for a large enough sample and basis for comparison with the version of the *Sentences* edited by Brady, at least to accomplish the very modest aims of this study. In the next chapter of the *Versio primitiva* the Lombard continues his investigation of standard questions arising from the hexameral narrative in Genesis, in this instance the fundamental question of whether creation took place over six days, as described in Genesis, or whether God created everything at the same instant.

Pet. Lomb., I *Sent.*, *Versio primitiva* (Lincoln MS 230, fol. 1v–2r):

De distinctione operum sex dierum et requiete septimae diei.

Sex diebus distinguens Deus cuncta quae materialiter creaverat in species proprias perfectoque opere die sexto die septimo requievit id est cessavit novam facere creaturam nihilque postea fecit quod non continetur in aliquo generum quae tunc distinxit. Operatur tamen cotidie non nova genera sed novas res faciendo ex seminibus iam rebus tunc insitis. Unde in Evangelio: *Pater meus usque modo operatur*. Qui tamen creavit omnia simul. Operatur enim Deus quattuor [L230, fol. 2r] modis, ut Alcuinus ait Super Genesim: primo disponendo in Verbo; secundo in informi materia quattuor elementorum de nihilo eam creando. Unde: *qui vivit in aeternum creavit omnia simul*; tertio per opera sex dierum distinguendo varias species; quarto ex primordialibus seminibus non novas sed notas naturas facit, ne pereant.

About the distinction of the works of the six days and the rest of the seventh day.

Distinguishing over six days all that he had created materially into proper species and, once the work of the sixth day had been completed, God rested on the seventh day, that is, he ceased to create any new creature and indeed afterwards he created nothing that is not contained in one of the genera that he then distinguished. Nevertheless, he continues to work daily, not new genera, but by creating new things from the seeds that had already at that time been sown into things. Whence in the Gospel: *my Father works right up to the present moment*. God the Father, however, created all things at once. For God works in four ways, as Alcuin says in *On Genesis*: first, by arranging in the Word; second, by creating it from nothing in the unformed matter of the four elements. Whence: *He who lives for ever created all things at once*; third by distinguishing

Aquae autem totam terrae superficiem tanta altitudine tegebant, ut ad illos usque locos pertingerent, ubi nunc usque super firmamentum partim resident. Ipsa autem terra et aqua informis dicuntur materia, quia omnia quae videmus vel ex ipsis sumpserunt exordium vel ex nihilo, et priusquam in lucem venirent, non erant unde formam haberent”; and also Biblical Glossa, Glossa marginalis Bedae attributa in Gen. 1.9 (Valenciennes 19, fol. 4v^b.2): “*Congregentur aquae quae sub caelo sunt* etc. Aquae quae inter caelum et terram universa compleverant in unum locum congregantur, ut lux quae praeterito biduo aquas clara lustrabat in puro aëre clarior fulgeat, et appareat terra quae latebat et quae aquis limosa erat fieret arida et germenibus apta. Si quaeratur ubi congregatae sunt aquae quae omnis partes terrae usque ad caelum texerant, potuit fieri, ut terra subsidens concavas partes praeberet, quibus fluentes aquas reciperet. **Potest etiam credi primarias aquas rariores fuisse quae sicut nebula tegerent terras, sed congregatione esse spissatas**” (emphasis supplied to facilitate comparison with the *Versio primitiva*).

through the works of the six days the various species; fourth, from the primordial seeds he creates, not new but already known natures, lest they perish.

The twofold organization of this brief chapter is plain to see. Peter Lombard addresses the question in a straightforward fashion, first explaining how the creation over six days in Genesis, and second how creation *simul*, should be understood.

The former exposition would become at some point the fourth and final section of chapter 5 of distinction 12 in the version of the *Sentences* edited by Brady, as the following juxtaposition of texts makes clear:

De distinctione operum sex dierum et requiete septimae diei.

Sex diebus distinguens Deus cuncta quae materialiter creaverat in species proprias perfecto opere die sexto die septimo requievit id est cessavit novam facere creaturam nihilque postea fecit quod non continetur in aliquo generum quae tunc distinxit. Operatur tamen cotidie non nova genera sed novas res faciendo ex seminibus iam rebus tunc insitis. Unde in Evangelio: *Pater meus usque modo operatur.*

Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, Dist. 12, cap. 5.4 (ed. Brady, 1971, p. 388, lines 15–24):

Ostenso qualis fuit mundi facies in ipso primordio, incipit prosequi operum sex dierum distinctionem. Nunc superest ut dispositionem illam, qualiter perfecta sit, ordine prosequamur. **Sex diebus**, sicut docet Scriptura Genesis, **distinxit Deus et in formas redegit proprias cuncta quae simul materialiter fecerat; perfecitque opus suum die sexto et sic deinde die septimo requievit ab omni opere id est cessavit novam creaturam facere.** Sex enim diebus sex rerum genera distinxit, nihilque postea fecit quod in aliquo illorum non contineatur. **Operatus est tamen postea, sicut Veritas in Evangelio ait: Pater meus operatur usque nunc, et ego operor illud.**

Apart from the substitution of different words with the same meaning in several places, such as the Latin “formas” for the Greek “species” and the more classical word for creation, “fecerat,” for the more common word in medieval Latin, “creaverat,” the wording is the same. The syntax too remains largely the same, although there are minor differences, such as the Lombard’s substitution of “distinxit Deus” for “distinguens Deus” and the change in verb tense in the final sentence from “Operatur” to “Operatus est.”

The main differences in this first half of this chapter consist in the Lombard’s making explicit reference to Genesis in the later version (“sicut docet Scriptura Genesis”) and in his one-sentence summary and repetition of the very points that he had just made: “For over six days he distinguished six kinds of things, and afterwards he created nothing that is not contained in one of those kinds of creations.” One could question whether the repetition was necessary, but in a classroom context repetition is frequently employed by the best teachers.

Brady looked once more to Hugh's *De sacramentis* for the Lombard's inspiration here.¹⁷ But in fact the biblical Gloss was obviously the proximate source, not only for the substance and framework of the discussion but also for its language:

Biblical Gloss, Glossa marginalis in Gen. 2.2 (Valenciennes 19, fol. 9v^b.1):

Potest autem intelligi Deum requievisse a faciendis generibus creaturae, quia ultra nova non condidit. Usque nunc tamen operatur administrationem eorundem generum, quae tunc instituta sunt. Creatoris enim virtus causa subsistendi est omnis creaturae. Quod enim dicitur, *Pater meus usque modo operatur*, universae creaturae continuam administrationem ostendit. *Die ergo septimo requievit*, ut novam creaturam ulterius non faceret, sed usque nunc operatur, ut quod condidit continere et gubernare non cesset.

Comparison of the second half of this chapter in the *Versio primitiva* with its counterpart in chapter 6 of distinction 12 in Brady's edition reveals that the Lombard changed very little of his account of God's creating all things at once:

Qui tamen creavit omnia simul. Operatur enim Deus quattuor [L230, fol. 2r] modis, ut Alcuinus ait *Super Genesim*: primo disponendo in Verbo; secundo in informi materia quattuor elementorum de nihilo eam creando. Unde: *qui vivit in aeternum creavit omnia simul*; tertio per opera sex dierum distinguendo varias species; quarto ex primordialibus seminibus non novas sed notas naturas facit, ne pereant.

Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, Dist. 12, cap. 6 (ed. Brady, 1971, p. 388, line 26–p. 389, line 6):

De quattuor modis divinae operationis. **Quattuor enim modis, ut ait Alcuinus *Super Genesim*, operatur Deus: «Primo in Verbo omnia disponendo; secundo in materia informi quattuor elementorum, de nihilo eam creando, unde: *Qui vivit in aeternum creavit omnia simul*, omnia scilicet elementa vel omnia corpora materialiter simul creavit; tertio per opera sex dierum varias distinxit creaturas; quarto ex primordialibus seminibus non incognitae oriuntur naturae, sed notae saepius reformantur ne pereant».**

Apart from the addition of the explanatory heading (“About the four modes of divine operation”) and the usual word changes (“creaturas” for “species” etc.) and minor changes in syntax, as from active to passive voice in the last line, these two versions differ minimally. Evidently, the Lombard was content to reproduce here in large part his original source, which Brady in this case correctly identified as one of the *glossae prothematicae* from the biblical Gloss.¹⁸

¹⁷ Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, Dist. 12, cap. 5.3 (ed. Brady, 1971, p. 387): “Num. 4. Partim ex Hugone, *De sacram.*, I, 1, 7 (PL 176, 193 A).”

¹⁸ Biblical Gloss, Glossa prothematica (Valenciennes 19, fol. 2r, col. c.2): “Alcuinus: Quattuor modis operatur Deus: primo in Verbo; secundo in materia informi (unde, *qui vivit in aeternum creavit omnia simul*); tertio per opere sex dierum distinxit creaturas; quarto ex primordialibus seminibus non incognitae oriuntur naturae sed notae saepius, ne pereant, reformantur.” See Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, Dist. 12, cap. 6 (ed. Brady, 1971, p. 388): “Cap. 6. Fere totum ex *Prothematibus Glossae*...”

At the risk of tedium I provide here one more chapter, but this time from the start of Book II of the *Versio primitiva*, to show that the chapters just seen are indeed representative of the relation between this proto-version of the *Sentences* and the version edited by Brady. Riccardo Saccenti, as noted above, sent this table and his transcriptions, which I have modified only to keep the orthography consistent with my own transcriptions. We do not here translate the passages, as the crucial point, rendered obvious at a glance in the table, is the dependence of the later version on the earlier preserved in Lincoln MS 230:

Ms. Lincoln 231, fol. 40r

Incipit liber secundus de Incarnatione Verbi.

Cum venisset plenitudo temporis misit Deus Filium suum, factum de muliere, factum sub Lege, ut eos qui sub Lege erant redimeret, ut adoptionem filiorum reciperemus. Tempus plenitudinis, tempus gratiae quod in adventu Christi incepit, tempus inferendi annus benignitatis, in quo gratia et veritas facta est, gratia impletio Legis per caritatem, veritas sponso antiquorum de adventu Domini.

Pet. Lomb., III *Sent.*, Dist. 1 (ed. Brady, 1981, p. 23, line 17–p. 24, line 8)

Cum venit igitur plenitudo temporis, ut ait Apostolus, misit Deus Filium suum, factum de muliere, factum sub Lege, ut eos qui sub Lege erant redimeret, in adoptionem filiorum Dei. Tempus autem plenitudinis dicitur tempus gratiae, quod ab adventu Salvatoris exordium sumpsit. Hoc est tempus miserendi et annus benignitatis, in quo gratia et veritas per Iesum Christum facta est: gratia, quia per caritatem impletur quod in Lege praecipiebatur; veritas, quia per Christi adventum exhibetur atque perficitur humanae redemptionis sponso facta ab antiquo. Filii ergo missio est ipsa incarnatio: eo enim missus est quod in forma hominis mundo visibilis apparuit. De quo supra sufficienter dictum est.

The texts juxtaposed in this table make plain that Book II of the *Versio primitiva* corresponds to Book III in the version of the *Sentences* edited by Brady and that the former is the primitive, the latter a later and related version. In this case, the first paragraph in the former is taken over in its entirety, although we encounter the usual alterations in wording and syntax.

The final phrase in Brady's edition ("De quo supra sufficienter dictum est") provides a fitting conclusion to this comparison of versions, early and late, for it reminds us once more that the universal notion among scholars that Peter Lombard composed the *Sentences* as a "book" must be nuanced. If one understands that view to mean that Peter Lombard sat down to write a book in the modern sense, which he began writing and then finished, then this view would be quite mistaken. If on the other hand, one means that he composed a text

that would be used for lectures and be modified by lectures over time, then it is correct. The evidence of lecturing is ubiquitous in the *Versio primitiva*, as it is in the every version of the Lombard's *Sentences*. The reason for this is that lecturing was the primary duty and activity for Peter Lombard, like virtually every theological master in the High Middle Ages from Abelard to Ockham, with the salient exception of Thomas Aquinas, who did write some actual books.

By contrast, one searches in vain for *scripsimus* or *scripsi* or *scribimus* or *scribo* or any word that could reasonably indicate that the Lombard "wrote" the *Sentences*. He did not. He lectured on theological sentences, as had predecessors such as Anselm of Laon.¹⁹ These texts, whether earlier or later versions, are in some fashion integrally connected with lecturing. Whether the Lombard first wrote a text for lectures, or whether the text was the result of lectures, is impossible to say at this point. And in one sense, the question is irrelevant, for the whole *raison d'être* of the text was the classroom. Modern scholars have anachronistically imputed to the Middle Ages the book culture of the Renaissance. There was no book culture during the High Middle Ages: its culture had more in common with Homer than with the Renaissance, at least in terms of orality as the ordinary means of transmitting learning.

The examples cited have already established the simple goals of this study, namely that Lincoln MS 230 preserves in fact a *Versio primitiva* of the *Sentences*, which the Lombard used in some fashion for lectures and which was subsequently developed into later versions of the *Sentences*. The risk of stopping at this point is to understate the extent of the difference between the *Versio primitiva* and the version edited by Brady. Indeed, there are very many instances where it is no simple matter to find correlative texts in Brady's edition, but the task of establishing the extent of the differences between the two versions, early and late, will have to wait for another study. This one aims merely at documenting the discovery of a proto-version of the *Sentences*, and that task is done. It is now time to pass to the historically significant question of the dates of the *Versio primitiva*. Fortunately, that is a question for which we have some helpful evidence.

A BRIEF DISCUSSION OF THE HISTORICAL CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING LINCOLN MS 230

This study is not the place to present all of the evidence of whatever kind (codicological, historical, textual, etc.) surrounding Lincoln MS 230 and its connection both to Peter Lombard and to Lincoln Cathedral Library, for even to gather

¹⁹ See Cédric Giraud, *Per verba magistri: Anselme de Laon et son école au XII^e siècle* (Turnhout, 2010). See also Alexander Andree's review essay, "Laon Revisited: Master Anselm and the Creation of a Theological School in the Twelfth Century," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 22 (2012): 257–81.

together such preliminary evidence as is now available would far exceed the limitations of an article.²⁰ What is, however, feasible is to present briefly the main outlines of such evidence and to note questions that are likely to be of great importance for understanding the *Versio primitiva* and its relation to later versions of the *Sentences*, including that edited by Brady. I shall address the question of the dates of the *Versio primitiva*, which of necessity introduces some discussion of the Anglo-Norman context.

The key factor in Brady's dating of the *Sentences*, as in all subsequent scholarly discussions of the matter (by Colish, Rosemann, et al.) has always been Burgundio of Pisa's translation into Latin of the *De fide orthodoxa* of John Damascene. Brady and all of the scholars following him assumed that the Lombard could not have obtained Burgundio of Pisa's translation of John of Damascus before the death of Pope Eugenius III on 8 July 1153, since in contrast to Burgundio's two prior works even the older manuscripts preserving his translation have Burgundio's letter of dedication to Pope Eugenius III: "of blessed memory."²¹ Brady thus assumed that Burgundio's translation became available sometime in 1154 and that Peter Lombard, who in Brady's view must have acquired it somehow on a trip to Italy in 1154, started writing the *Sentences* — like everyone else, Brady was thinking in terms of "books" in the ordinary sense — during the 1155–56 academic year, given the presence in Books I and III (of the final version edited by Brady) of Damascene's *De fide orthodoxa*.²²

Such an assumption is on several grounds a mistake. First, it is obvious that Burgundio could have begun and even have completed his translation long before the death of Pope Eugenius III in 1153. Just because the manuscripts now available to us refer to the pope as "beatae memoriae" does not make it certain that Burgundio did not initially dedicate the work to "Eugenius papa." Second, even the absence of dedicatory epistles in a later work is inconclusive at best, for Burgundio could have changed his practice or it may be that we do

²⁰ Thus, a good bit of it is assembled in the study of the Anglo-Norman context for the presence of so many early copies of the Lombard's works in England, already referred to above in note 13 ("Peter Lombard, Stephen Langton, and Twelfth-Century Cathedral Schools in England and Paris"), and that study already runs to 140 pages.

²¹ Brady, Prolegomena to *Sent.* 1, 124*: "Primo, quia, abstractione facta ab omni relatione ad Lombardum, monstrari potest quod versio Burgundionis libri Damasceni De fide orthodoxa solum post mortem beati Eugenii III (8 iulii 1153) absoluta fuerit: deest enim epistola dedicatoria, quae Burgundionis duobus operibus prioribus praefigitur, et in titulo istius novi operis, etiam in codicibus antiquioribus, Eugenius salutatur ut 'beatae memoriae.'"

²² *Ibid.*: "Proinde, concludere oportet quod haec versio lucem vidit solum circa finem 1153 vel anno sequenti. Ex alia parte, non sine influxu huius facti, ut libenter concedimus, iter italicum Magistri nostri mensibus septembri–decembri an. 1154 assignatur, quando ad limina apostolica socius fuit Theobaldi Parisiensis episcopi. Unde sequitur quod terminus post quem Sententiarum (vel saltem libri primi et dist. 1–22 libri tertii, ubi frequentius occurrit nomen et doctrina Damasceni) poni debet initium anni 1155."

not know from the extant manuscripts what his practice was during the twelfth century. Brady and the scholars who accepted his reasoning treated negative evidence as decisive, when such evidence could never compare with positive evidence.

Like everyone else, Riccardo Saccenti agreed with Brady that Burgundio of Pisa's translation was not available in the Latin West until 1154 at the earliest.²³ He changed his mind, however, and for two reasons: his discovery in a thirteenth-century copy of Burgundio's translation (Pisa, Biblioteca Cathariniana, MS 2) of a reference to a much older manuscript formerly in Pisa, which contained what Saccenti believes may have been Burgundio's original; and his contemporaneous study of the *Dialogi* of Anselm of Haverberg. Pope Eugenius III asked Anselm not only to attend a meeting of Greek and Latin theologians convened by the pope in Tusculum in 1146 but also to write down his experiences.²⁴

Saccenti now believes that Burgundio, who like Eugenius was from Pisa and who accompanied the papal court as *Iudex sacri palatii*, translated *De fide orthodoxa* at the request of the pope following the unsuccessful Greek-Latin dialogue in 1146, and that this translation went with the papal court to France shortly thereafter. Saccenti now dates the Pisa manuscript provisionally to between 1146 and 1148.²⁵ Whatever the ultimate outcome of what is sure to become a lively and interesting discussion of the dates of Burgundio's translation of the *De fide orthodoxa* restarted by Saccenti's finds, his revised estimate of those dates has the virtue of opening up what was long considered a settled question. The evidence that I shall now present would have opened up that discussion in any case, for in Book II of the *Versio primitiva*, which as we have seen became Book III in later versions, Peter Lombard discusses Burgundio of Pisa's translation of the *De fide orthodoxa*.

The first, and arguably most important, such evidence is the connection to Peter Lombard of Robert Chesney, whom Theobald of Bec, Archbishop of Canterbury, consecrated bishop of Lincoln on 19 December 1148, one day after Robert's

²³ See Riccardo Saccenti, *Un nuovo lessico morale medievale: Il contributo di Burgundio da Pisa* (Rome, 2016), 27–53, in which Saccenti reviews at length Burgundio's intellectual biography and concludes to the same dates as Brady (1154/1155) for the diffusion of the *De fide orthodoxa*.

²⁴ I am grateful to Saccenti for sharing this information as well as his revised thinking on the dating of Burgundio's translation. It may be helpful to point out that both of his grounds for changing his estimate of those dates predate my sharing with him (on 20 September 2018 in the British Library) my discovery (in Lincoln that same week) of the *Versio primitiva* in Lincoln MS 230.

²⁵ Saccenti now believes that Pope Eugenius III brought that translation with him to the Council of Reims in 1148 and that *De fide orthodoxa* became available in Latin sometime between 1146, at the earliest, and 1148, at the latest. If Saccenti is correct, John Damascene's *De fide orthodoxa* got to France no later than the Council of Reims, held in March of 1148. It is obvious that it could have gotten there earlier and would most likely have gotten to Paris as soon as it was available.

ordination to the priesthood and six days after his election.²⁶ Very little is known of Robert's earlier life, although from the fact that he was addressed as *magister* scholars have inferred a serious education, perhaps at Paris.²⁷ His possession of Lincoln MS 31, however, which he donated to Lincoln Library upon his death in 1166, is a fact of great relevance to our inquiry. As noted above, Lincoln MS 31 was possibly the second gift of a version of the *Sentences* given to Robert by Peter Lombard. The first may have been Lincoln MS 230, seemingly an exact replica of a copy that the Lombard used for lectures on the *Sentences*.²⁸ There is good reason, therefore, to suppose that before he was elected to the see of Lincoln, Robert of Chesney was a student of Peter Lombard's in Paris, for it would be very hard indeed to explain in any other fashion his possession of one (and perhaps two) versions of the *Sentences* almost certainly copied during the Lombard's lifetime.

Moreover, Lincoln Cathedral Library, which also contains early copies of the Lombard's lectures on the Pauline Epistles and on the Psalms, is at the center of a large network of English cathedral libraries that had extraordinarily rich collections of Peter Lombard's works during the twelfth century. In some cases, at Hereford for sure, whose Lombard collection is also early and quite obviously related to Lincoln's, local masters may have taught theology, lecturing on the Lombard's various theological works.²⁹ The story of the Lombard in English cathedrals during the twelfth century is likely to revise not only what scholars have long believed about twelfth-century cathedral schools in England — the longstanding consensus is that, in spite of ancient rumors of learning, they were no more than grammar schools — but also everything that is known about the schools in Paris after the death of Abelard and Hugh of St. Victor in 1141. The simple but compelling basis for this surprising and paradoxical statement of

²⁶ John Neve and Diana E. Greenway, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1066–1300*. 3. *Lincoln* (London, 1977), 2.

²⁷ See Dorothy M. Owen, "Chesney, Robert de (d. 1166), bishop of Lincoln," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

²⁸ The evidence for the claim that Lincoln MS 230 preserves a replica of the Lombard's own copy is substantial and various, but here it must suffice to note that the copyist preserved rubrication and decorative lettering even on a *schedula* that he added after skipping a section. We do not know when Lincoln MS 230 arrived in Lincoln — it is not listed in the early catalogues — but quite apart from questions related to the manuscript itself (when it was copied, where, etc.), the version of the *Sentences* preserved in Lincoln MS 230 is demonstrably very early. It is on this basis that I suggest the possibility of its connection to Bishop Robert, a conjecture that is at this point admittedly speculative.

²⁹ Thus Hereford MS O.VIII.9, which preserves an early version of the Lombard's *Sentences*, and Hereford MS P.V.13, which contains an early version of the Lombard's *Collectanea* on the Pauline Epistles, both contain rich evidence of the teaching of English masters on that of Parisian masters. Both manuscripts will have to be edited, especially the margins, which were manifestly preformatted to accommodate such teaching.

fact is that, whereas very little early manuscript evidence exists in Paris, the treasury of early manuscripts containing Parisian scholastic works in English cathedral schools is filled to overflowing.³⁰

A hypothesis, therefore, according to which Peter Lombard lectured on an early version of the *Sentences* in the years before Robert's election to the see of Lincoln in December 1148 is justifiable, given Robert's evident relationship with Peter Lombard himself. Such a hypothesis fits everything that is known about the works preserved in these manuscripts and about Robert's career. It also fits everything known about the career of Stephen Langton, who grew up in Lincolnshire not far from Lincoln cathedral, who may have spent time in bishop Robert's *familia*, and who was certainly sent to Peter Lombard and his circle around or before Peter Lombard's death in 1160.³¹ Finally, it accords with the reality of the sizeable discrepancy between the *Versio primitiva* and later versions of the *Sentences*, even within Peter Lombard's lifetime.

In this study, I have shown clearly the relation between the *Versio primitiva* and the version edited by Brady, but the fact is that there are many important differences, not least the absence in the *Versio primitiva* of what would be in later versions Book I. To get from the *Versio primitiva* to the version in Lincoln MS 31, especially given that we now know that Peter Lombard was lecturing on the *Sentences* during his Parisian teaching career, would take a long time, not a little.

I am inclined to think that Peter Lombard did so from early in his career. I am also persuaded that he did so in opposition to the theology of Abelard. A quick read through Brady's footnotes will suffice to show how often Peter Lombard had Abelard in mind in the *Sentences*, and there are many such instances that Brady did not catch. The well-known episode of Bernard of Clairvaux's introducing Peter Lombard to Hugh of St. Victor and assisting him with securing a teaching post in Paris will, I believe, be seen in an altogether new light following the discovery of the *Versio primitiva*, for one can readily imagine both Bernard and Hugh of St. Victor urging the brilliant young theologian from Lombardy to meet the challenge to Christian theology posed by Abelard. My hunch is that he started to do so right away, early in his teaching career.

³⁰ A telling sign of just how little scholars know about Parisian schools after 1141 is Ferruolo's monograph, which remains to this day the standard authority. After Chapter One ("Paris and the Expansion of Education") and Chapter Two ("The School of St. Victor"), Ferruolo turns to monastic and humanistic critiques of the scholastic project. He can say no more about the Parisian schools after 1141 owing to lack of any evidence. See Stephen Ferruolo, *The Origins of the University: The Schools of Paris and Their Critics, 1100–1215* (Stanford, 1985).

³¹ For a full discussion of the redating of Langton's Parisian career, which revised Powicke's 1933 estimate by at least ten years, see Mark J. Clark, *The Making of the *Historia scholastica*: 1150–1200* (Toronto, 2015), 164–72. The story in which Langton describes his experiences serving the tables of the rich is at p. 187.

There is one last little but persuasive bit of evidence to consider, but some preliminary background is needed to understand its importance. Brady's edition lists three places in Book IV where the rubric or heading that precedes a decretal is "Innocentius papa."³² There is, however, also a reference in Book IV of Brady's edition to "Innocentius secundus," which precedes the first portion of Canon 22 of the Second Lateran Council, convened by Pope Innocent II in 1139.³³ This decretal and this heading in the *Sentences* have been much discussed by scholars in connection with the second recension of Gratian's *Decretum*. The relevant texts are as follows:

Pet. Lomb., *IV Sent.*, (ed. Brady, 1981), Dist. 15, c. 7.6, p. 335, lines 9–13:

Innocentius secundus*. **Item Innocentius II:** «Admonemus fratres nostros, ne falsis poenitentis laicorum animas decipi et in infernum pertrahi patiantur. Falsam autem poenitentiam esse constat, cum spretis pluribus, de uno solo poenitentia agitur; vel cum sic agitur de uno, ut non discedatur ab alio.»

Gratian's *Decretum*, *Tractatus de poenitentia* (C. 33, Q. 3), *De pen.*, Dist. 5 c. 8:³⁴

Item Innocentius II. [in concilio Romano, c. 22] IV. Pars. Fratres nostros et presbiteros ammonemus, ne falsis penitentiis laicorum animas decipi et in infernum pertrahi patiantur. Falsam autem poenitentiam esse constat, cum spretis pluribus de uno solo penitencia agitur, aut cum sic de uno agitur, ut ab alio non discedatur.

Historians have assumed, given Brady's chronology (1155–56) for the initial appearance of the Lombard's *Sentences*, that the second recension of Gratian's *Decretum* was Peter Lombard's source for this papal decretal and rubric, since it is the last of a series of rubricated canons added to Distinction 5 of the Treatise on Penance.³⁵ Scholars date the second recension of Gratian's *Decretum* to sometime before 1150.³⁶

³² See Pet. Lomb., *IV Sent.* (ed. Brady, 1981): d. 35, c. 1.2 (p. 468); d. 38, c. 2.8 (p. 480); and d. 41, c. 3.6 (p. 498).

³³ The standard edition of c. 22 can be found at *Concilium Lateranense II* (1939), c. 22 (*Corpus Christianorum Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta* 2.1, 111–12).

³⁴ Emil Friedberg, ed., *Corpus iuris canonici*, 1, *Decretum magistri Gratiani* (Leipzig, 1879). For a recent edition of the Treatise on Penance, see Atria Larson, *Gratian's Tractatus de Penitentia: A New Latin Edition with English Translation* (Washington, DC, 2016); Dist. 5, c. 8 is at 258.

³⁵ On the posited reception by Peter Lombard of this papal decretal from Gratian, see Atria Larson, "The Reception of Gratian's *Tractatus de poenitentia* and the Relationship between Canon Law and Theology in the Second Half of the Twelfth Century," *Journal of Religious History* 37 (2013): 457–73. Larson also treats the subject in her monograph: Atria A. Larsen, *Master of Penance: Gratian and the Development of Penitential Thought and Law in the Twelfth Century* (Washington, DC, 2014).

³⁶ Anders Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's Decretum* (Cambridge, 2000), who discovered the existence of an earlier recension of the *Decretum*, dates the earlier to just after Lateran II in 1139 and the later recension to before 1150. Recent scholarship suggests that these dates are too late. For comprehensive discussion of all relevant historiography, see Atria Larson, "Papal

The key bit of evidence, internal to Lincoln MS 230, is the presence in Book III of the same first part of Canon 22 of II Lateran. This papal decretal, however, appears in the *Versio primitiva* under the different and older rubric (“Pope Innocent”):

Lincoln MS 230, fol. 123v:³⁷

Innocentius papa. Ammonemus fratres nostros, ne falsis poenitentiis laicorum animas decipi et in infernum pertrahi patiantur. Falsam autem poenitentiam esse constat cum spretis pluribus de uno solo poenitentia agitur vel cum sic agitur de uno, ut non discedatur ab alio.

Given that the later form of the rubric (“Innocent the Second”) dates to 1149 at the latest, and given that the rubric in the *Versio primitiva* (“Pope Innocent”) is manifestly earlier, we have additional support for our hypothesis of lectures delivered between 1146–48, since the later form found in Brady’s edition dates to sometime before 1149 at the latest.

All of this discussion is of course provisional, for we are just at the start of a new line of research, founded on manuscripts that have evidently never been studied, into Peter Lombard’s teaching career and the evolution of his thought. We have to edit not only Lincoln MS 230 but also Lincoln MS 31 and doubtless other early copies of the *Sentences* and of the Lombard’s works on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles, at Lincoln, Hereford, and elsewhere. Scholars have assumed for so long that Brady edited a version of the *Sentences* that was standardized early on, that an enormous treasury of manuscripts containing very early versions of the Lombard’s works, certainly in England and likely elsewhere too, was seemingly overlooked altogether. I am persuaded that the contents of Lincoln MS 230 and of other manuscripts still to be examined will almost certainly revise much, if not most, of what scholars have long assumed they knew about Peter Lombard, about his career, about the *Sentences* and his other works, and finally about the trajectory and importance of his thought, even within his own lifetime. To my knowledge no scholar has ever paid any attention to the diffusion of his thought apart

Councils and the Development of Lay Penance in the Long Twelfth Century,” *Cristianesimo nella storia* 39 (2018): 39–85 at 42: “The conciliar record then falls silent about this issue until the pontificate of Innocent II (1130–1143), who rescued Melfi’s decree on false penance at the Second Lateran Council (1139) and likely a few years earlier at Pisa (1135).” See also Atria Larson, “*De vera et falsa poenitentia* and Penitential Renunciation Canons in the Period from Gregory VII to Gratian and the *Collection of Nine Books*,” in *Proceedings of the XVth International Congress for Canon Law in Paris 2016*, forthcoming. I am very grateful to Atria Larson for sending me proofs of these studies before publication and for bringing these and other relevant studies to my attention. Larson herself relies upon an ongoing reappraisal of all of the councils convened by Innocent II. See in this connection Martin Brett and Robert Somerville, “The Transmission of the Councils from 1130 to 1139,” in *Pope Innocent II (1130–1143): The World vs the City*, ed. J. Doran and D. J. Smith (London, 2016), 226–71.

³⁷ We owe the discovery of this earlier form of the rubric preceding c. 22 to Joshua Benson, who is editing Book III of the *Versio primitiva*. We are grateful to him for sharing his discovery with us and permitting us to present it here.

from mentioning the fact. It is, however, certain that we have a great deal yet to learn not only about the evolution of Peter Lombard's own thought but about its reception as well. England with its vast treasury of manuscripts preserving early copies of all of the Lombard's extant works is a good place to start.

In this connection I would be remiss not to mention the importance of Stephen Langton, the brilliant young Englishman who was sent by his countrymen in Lincolnshire to Peter Lombard in Paris, with whom one of them at least had studied right around the time that Langton was born. The Lombard's ubiquity in twelfth-century England was no accident but was rather born of personal connections between the Lombard and Anglo-Normans who studied with him in Paris. Neither was Langton's decision to devote his career to the theological legacy of Peter Lombard accidental.

Thanks to six months spent in English libraries I have now moved far beyond my findings in the article cited at the start of this study, in which I announced the discovery that Stephen Langton lectured throughout his career not only on the Bible and the various prologues of Jerome attached to it but also on Peter Lombard's lectures on the Old Testament, long thought to be lost apart from the Psalms.³⁸ I can now trace with confidence the number, order and method of Langton's many and various lecture traditions on the Bible. I can also show with great precision the influence on Langton's corpus of the Lombard's lectures on the Bible, which formed the core and foundation of Langton's own. Langton's corpus too thus promises to shed much light on Peter Lombard's theological enterprise, even during the Lombard's own lifetime.

These twin discoveries, namely that, on the one hand, Robert of Chesney and his Anglo-Norman peers and associates brought back early versions of the *Sentences* (and other of the Lombard's works) to England from Paris, and on the other, that Stephen Langton lectured throughout his Parisian teaching career on the biblical lectures of Peter Lombard, open up altogether new avenues for research. Together they make it possible for the first time to understand the development of Peter Lombard's theological teaching during his lifetime and his enormous influence, both in Paris and in England, during the four decades following his death in 1160. This would take us right up to the cusp of the formal founding of the University of Paris. That opportunity now lies open to any scholar who can read and edit manuscripts. Let us, therefore, hasten to train those who would do so.

The Catholic University of America
clarkm@cua.edu

Keywords: Peter Lombard, the Lombard's *Sentences*, Bible, theology, English cathedral libraries, Lincoln Cathedral, Hereford Cathedral

³⁸ Mark J. Clark, "Peter Lombard, Stephen Langton, and The School of Paris" (n.1 above).