

## PETER COMESTOR AND PETER LOMBARD: BROTHERS IN DEED

By MARK CLARK

According to medieval legend, Gratian, Peter Lombard, and Peter Comestor were brothers.<sup>1</sup> What united these men in the medieval imagination were the three great works they produced, respectively, over the course of the twelfth century: the *Decretum*, the *Sentences*, and the *Historia scholastica*.<sup>2</sup> The two Peters, in particular, were connected. Stephen Langton, one of the most prominent teachers of Scripture and theology at Paris during the last decades of the twelfth century, praised both Peters for their mastery of Sacred Scripture.<sup>3</sup> The joint ascendancy of the reputations of Peter Lombard and Peter Comestor can also be seen in the tradition of medieval chroniclers such as Otto of St. Blaise, who wrote that “in those days Peter Lombard and Peter Comestor shone forth as distinguished masters at Paris.”<sup>4</sup>

In the twentieth century as well, historians of scholasticism found truth in the supposed kinship of these men. Joseph de Ghellinck, recalling the legend of the fraternity of the three men, emphasized the complementarity of their

---

<sup>1</sup> The following abbreviations are used throughout: GI = *Glossa interlinearis* and GO = *Glossa ordinaria*, Facsimile reprint of the *Editio princeps* by Adolph Rusch of Strassburg 1480/81, introduction by K. Froehlich and M. Gibson (Turnhout, 1992); Peter Lombard, *I and II. Sent.* = *Magistri Petri Lombardi Parisiensis Episcopi sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, ed. Ignatius Brady vol. 1, part 2, books 1–2 (Grottaferrata, 1971); RTAM = *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*.

<sup>2</sup> The chronicler Godfrey of Viterbo started the resilient medieval legend that Comestor was the brother of Peter Lombard and Gratian, the authors of the two most celebrated works in theology and canon law, respectively. See Joseph de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XIIe siècle*, 2nd ed., rev., Museum Lessianum, Section historique 10 (Bruges, 1948; repr. Brussels, 1969), 214 and 285. See also Marcia Colish, *Peter Lombard*, 2 vols., Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History 41 (Leiden, 1994), 1:16 and n. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Smalley wrote that “Langton puts their author on the same level as the author of the theological classic, the *Sentences*; both are of the fellowship of Wisdom,” citing (in her own translation) Langton: “Blessed is the man . . . that lodgeth near her house and fasteneth a pin in her walls [Eccles. 14:22–25] as they do who hand down some writing on Scripture, the Manducator who compiled the *Histories*, the Lombard who established [statuit] the *Sentences*” (Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3rd ed., rev. [Oxford, 1984], 214 and n. 1).

<sup>4</sup> “His diebus Petrus Lombardus et Petrus Manducator apud Parisensum magistri insignes claruerunt” ( *Continuatio Sanblasiana*, MGH, Scriptorum [Hannover, 1868], 20:308, cited by Colish, *Peter Lombard*, 1:31, n. 51).

three great works in the development of twelfth-century scholasticism.<sup>5</sup> Marie-Dominique Chenu viewed the link between the great works of the two Peters as especially keen: “the legend of the brotherhood in the flesh of Comestor and of Lombard is a symbol full of truth.”<sup>6</sup> The bond between the two Peters and their work, in particular, would seem to be especially well founded, for they were joined not only in legend but in life. Comestor was the Lombard’s student, and it is chiefly through him that we know about the Lombard’s oral teaching.<sup>7</sup>

It is, therefore, somewhat surprising to discover that the works that made the two Peters brothers in legend, namely the *Sentences* and the *History*, while products of the same distinctive historical stream, are nevertheless seen as wholly unrelated in substance, approach, and genre. Twentieth-century scholarship, while it established a close link between Comestor and the Lombard, nevertheless clearly separated the *Sentences* and the *History*. Martin Grabmann, in his classic study published in 1911, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, distinguished sharply between the works of the two Peters.<sup>8</sup> The Lombard, together with Hugh of Saint Victor, Peter Abelard, Robert of Melun, and Peter of Poitiers, whom Grabmann called “the truest student of the Lombard,” represented “the theoretical side of theology” in the twelfth century.<sup>9</sup> Grabmann grouped Comestor with Peter the Chanter into an alternative, “more positive-practical stream” of theology, whose dis-

<sup>5</sup> De Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique*, 213–14; and also idem, *L’Essor de la littérature latine au XIIe siècle*, 2 vols., Museum Lessianum Section historique 4–5 (Paris, 1946), 1:71, 95. For the origins and subsequent *fortuna* of the legend, see *Le mouvement théologique*, Appendix 3, 285.

<sup>6</sup> Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Introduction à l’étude de saint Thomas d’Aquin*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1954), 205. See also idem, *La théologie au douzième siècle*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1966), 69 n. 3, and 328. Henri de Lubac held a similar view of the *History*. See his *Exégèse médiévale: Les quatre sens de l’écriture*, 2 pts., each in 2 vols. (Paris, 1961–64), 2.1:379.

<sup>7</sup> Ignatius Brady established beyond doubt that Peter Comestor went to Paris prior to the end of Peter Lombard’s teaching career in 1158–59, that he witnessed and reported the Lombard’s teaching, and that he himself began teaching in the Paris schools after the Lombard’s death in 1160. Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, 39–44 and especially 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 Ignatius Brady, “Peter Manducator and the Oral Teachings of Peter Lombard,” *Antonianum* 41 (1966): 454–90.

<sup>8</sup> Martin Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, 2 vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1911), 2:393.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 476: “Die theoretische Seite der Theologie . . . ist im letzten Drittel des 12. Jahrhunderts vornehmlich von Petrus von Poitiers, dem treuesten Schüler des Lombarden.”

tinguishing feature was a shared interest in biblical study and practical moral concerns, but made only passing mention of the *History*.<sup>10</sup>

Grabmann's characterization of Comestor and his work was soon subjected to critical scrutiny. In three articles published in 1931, Artur Landgraf and Raymond Martin sought to identify the basis for Comestor's exalted reputation and authority as a theologian among his successors in the schools.<sup>11</sup> Landgraf puzzled over the fact that an impressive list of late-twelfth- and early-thirteenth-century theologians, many of them labeled by Grabmann as speculative theologians, cited Comestor's teaching as authoritative.<sup>12</sup> Both scholars set out to account for "the circumstance that, in the literature of the end of the twelfth and of the beginning of the thirteenth centuries, we find an astonishing number of citations of the Eater, which cannot be identified either in the *Historia scholastica* or in his sermons."<sup>13</sup> This circumstance led Martin to question whether Grabmann's characterization of Comestor's interests was too restrictive: "A professor of Sacred Scripture and a moralist, did Peter Comestor also treat theoretical or speculative theology?"<sup>14</sup>

The answer to this question proved ambiguous. Martin and Landgraf differed over whether Comestor had, in fact, glossed the *Sentences*.<sup>15</sup> Their

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 476–77. Grabmann, who acknowledged the extraordinary success of Comestor's *History* in the Middle Ages, hardly paused to consider what he characterized as a popular work: "Die Bedeutung dieses Werkes, welches im Mittelalter unzählige Male abgeschrieben und auch mehrfach übersetzt wurde und seinem Verfasser den Namen *Magister Historiarum* eintrug, liegt mehr auf populärtheologischem Gebiete" (ibid., 477). Although Grabmann devoted little attention to Comestor and the *History*, his descriptive label, "biblical-moral," proved influential in subsequent discussions of Comestor's work. See, for example, Chenu, *Thomas d'Aquin*, 201–2, and Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, 196–97.

<sup>11</sup> Artur Landgraf, "Recherches sur les écrits de Pierre le Mangeur," RTAM 3 (1931): 292–306. Landgraf's second article followed up on his first. Artur Landgraf, "Recherches sur les écrits de Pierre le Mangeur: le traité 'De Sacramentis,'" RTAM 3 (1931): 341–72. Martin's article was related to both. Raymond-M. Martin, "Notes sur l'oeuvre littéraire de Pierre le Mangeur," RTAM 3 (1931): 54–66.

<sup>12</sup> Landgraf referred to multiple citations of Comestor in the works of Praepositinus, Peter the Chanter, Peter of Capua, Guy of Orchelles, Stephen Langton, and Godfrey of Poitiers, as well as in such important theological works as the Bamberg *Summa* and the *Sentences* attributed to Peter of Poitiers ("Pierre le Mangeur," 294–305).

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 292. Both scholars, however, acknowledged the centrality of the *History* in Comestor's fame. Landgraf wrote: "Sa célébrité extraordinaire, il la doit à l'*Historia scholastica*, qui, dans la scolastique du XIIe et du XIIIe s., compte parmi les œuvres les plus souvent citées" (ibid.). According to Martin, "Pierre le Mangeur est un grand nom dans l'histoire littéraire de la seconde partie du XIIe siècle. . . . Ce *famosissimus doctor* . . . est surtout connu par son *Historia scholastica*" ("Pierre le Mangeur," 54–55).

<sup>14</sup> Martin, "Pierre le Mangeur," 55.

<sup>15</sup> Martin concluded: "Et c'est tout. Jusqu'à nouvel inventaire, il n'est plus permis de parler d'un commentaire de Pierre le Mangeur sur les *Sentences* de Pierre Lombard. Nous

research, however, established beyond question Peter Comestor's close ties to Peter Lombard: "We have been able to establish that the substance of these citations corresponds closely to that of the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard."<sup>16</sup> Subsequently, Ignatius Brady proved Comestor to be "our best informant on the Lombard's teaching."<sup>17</sup> Scholars have accepted Comestor's status as "a close follower of Peter Lombard" ever since.<sup>18</sup>

In one respect, then, Grabmann was overruled. In the 1940s, Landgraf and de Ghellinck put Comestor in the school of Peter Lombard.<sup>19</sup> Paradoxically, however, the essence of Grabmann's view prevailed. Although de Ghellinck put Comestor in the Lombard's school, he discussed the *History* in a separate section entitled, "L'activité biblico-théologique des écoles de Paris."<sup>20</sup> And while Landgraf also put Comestor in the Lombard's school, he too ignored the *History*, devoting one small paragraph to it in his *Introduction à l'histoire de la littérature théologique de la scolastique naissante* and passing over it entirely in his *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik*.<sup>21</sup>

---

en possédons une introduction, un prologue, rien de plus" (ibid., 62). Landgraf, however, wrote: "Il semble cependant que précisément ce court fragment attribué par un ms au Manducator nous fournisse un moyen de lui attribuer un Glose sur les Sentences" ("Pierre le Mangeur: le traité 'De Sacramentis,'" 351).

<sup>16</sup> Landgraf, "Pierre le Mangeur: le traité 'De Sacramentis,'" 372.

<sup>17</sup> The quotation is from Beryl Smalley, *The Gospels in the Schools, c. 1100-c. 1280* (London, 1985), 4 and n. 14. See also Brady, "Peter Manducator" (n. 7 above) 454-90, and idem, ed., *II Sent.*, 39-44.

<sup>18</sup> David Luscombe, "Peter Comestor," in *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in Honor of Beryl Smalley*, ed. Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood, 109-29 (Oxford, 1985), at 109. Luscombe reviews all of the evidence for Peter Comestor's relationship to Peter Lombard (ibid., 109-10).

<sup>19</sup> Artur Landgraf, *Introduction à l'histoire de la littérature théologique de la scolastique naissante*, trans. from *Einführung in die Geschichte der theologischen Literatur der Frühscholastik* (Regensburg, 1948), by Louis-B. Geiger, and revised and updated by Albert-M. Landry (Paris, 1973), 130-48 and especially 140-42. Joseph de Ghellinck, *L'essor* (n. 5 above), 1:70-73.

<sup>20</sup> Joseph de Ghellinck, *L'essor*, 1:93-95. De Ghellinck did mention Comestor on a number of occasions in *Le mouvement théologique* (n. 2 above) but discussed the *Historia Scholastica* only in connection with the legend of the fraternity of Comestor, Gratian, and Lombard (Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique*, 214).

<sup>21</sup> Landgraf, *Introduction à l'histoire de la littérature théologique de la scolastique naissante*, 140; idem, *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik*, 4 vols. (Regensburg, 1952-56). In Landgraf's case, at least, such an outcome is surprising, given that he had earlier taken note of passages in the *History* that paralleled explicitly theological discussion in other works, such as, for example, on the Eucharist (Landgraf, "Pierre le Mangeur," 303 and n. 45, and "Pierre le Mangeur: le traité 'De Sacramentis,'" 348) and on baptism: "Dans l'*Historia scholastica* nous lisons en effet une remarque qui semble légitimer la conclusion que, précisément dans la doctrine du baptême, le Comestor a eu sous les yeux les *Sentences* du Lombard" (ibid., 346). As I show below, Comestor did, in fact, have the *Sentences* under his eyes in composing the first twenty-five chapters of the *Historia Genesis*.

Subsequent research has not changed the essential view of the relationship between the two Peters and their greatest works.<sup>22</sup> The consensus is that Comestor knew the *Sentences* well, but that whatever works he may have composed in that tradition have been lost. As for the *History*, it has no substantive relationship to the *Sentences*. The latter work is speculative; the former is not. Notwithstanding Landgraf's tantalizing hints of a connection between the *Sentences* and the *History*, no scholar to my knowledge has looked for a connection between the work of the two Peters in the *History* itself.<sup>23</sup>

In this article, I show that Peter Comestor not only systematically mined the second book of the *Sentences* for hexaemeral material but also closely followed, and even incorporated into his own work, much of the Lombard's organizational framework. In fact, the *Sentences* lie just beneath the surface of this part of the *History*, hidden from view by Comestor's novel method.<sup>24</sup> I conclude by suggesting that our basic view of Comestor and his *History*, not only in relation to the *Sentences*, but also in relation to theological

---

<sup>22</sup> Beryl Smalley saw the *Historia scholastica* in the context of the biblical work of the Victorines and in particular the Victorine emphasis on the literal sense of Scripture (Smalley, *Study of the Bible* [n. 3 above] 178–80, 196–215; "The greatest triumph for the Victorine tradition was the success of the *Histories*" [214]). More recently, Joseph Goering has called into question Grabmann's original classification of twelfth-century theologians into speculative and non-speculative but still characterizes Comestor's work as practical. See Joseph Goering, *William de Montibus (c. 1140–1213): The Schools and the Literature of Pastoral Care*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies: Studies and Texts 108 (Toronto, 1992), 36–40.

<sup>23</sup> Thus, for example, Dahan, in his recent overview of biblical commentary from the twelfth through the fourteenth centuries, which includes a comprehensive review of relevant scholarship, accepts without question the conventional demarcation between the *Sentences* and the *History*: Gilbert Dahan, *L'Exégèse chrétienne de la Bible en occident médiéval, XIIe–XIVe siècle*, Patrimoines Christianisme (Paris, 1999), 102–9. In the fall of 2003, the editors of Corpus Christianorum, who were preparing to publish Agneta Sylwan's edition of Comestor's *Historia Genesis*, asked me to share my own dissertation research on that work. I sent them substantial portions both of my edition of the *Historia Genesis* and of my thesis, including material documenting my discovery of Peter Comestor's extensive use of the Lombard's *Sentences* in that portion of the *History*. Although the apparatus to Agneta Sylwan's just-published edition (CCM, April 2005) of the *Historia Genesis* records to some extent Comestor's use of the *Sentences*, I provide comprehensive documentation of Comestor's use of the Lombard in the *Historia Genesis* both in the Textual Appendix that follows the body of this article (for the first eight chapters of the *History*) and in my dissertation: Mark J. Clark, "A Study of Peter Comestor's Method in the *Historia Genesis*" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 2002), Textual Appendix A, 1–55. More importantly, I also provide in this article an in-depth account of the manner of Comestor's use of the *Sentences*. I give my other reasons for using my text and apparatus in spite of the appearance of Sylwan's edition (see Appendix 1, n. 3 below).

<sup>24</sup> For an argument that Comestor's method in the *History* was, in fact, novel in many respects, see Clark, "A Study of Peter Comestor's Method."

developments in the second half of the twelfth century, needs to be reexamined. In so doing I follow the counsel of Martin and Landgraf, who in 1931 ended their articles by urging the study of Comestor as a theologian. Landgraf held out hope of finding the works by which Comestor exercised “such a personal influence over scholastic thought” and “which could have preserved fresh the memory of his teaching.”<sup>25</sup> Martin hoped to stimulate critical research into Comestor’s theological work and placed the study of Comestor squarely within the ambit of historians of theology.<sup>26</sup> It turns out, however, that to understand Peter Comestor as theologian, we will have to take seriously the *History* itself. Comestor’s hidden yet extensive reliance upon Book Two of the *Sentences* in his own hexaemeral account, which is itself interesting, is also important as a sign that the *History* will likely repay serious scholarly attention to both its form and content.

#### COMESTOR’S HEXAEMERAL ACCOUNT AND BOOK TWO OF THE SENTENCES

The opening chapters of the *History*, which contain Comestor’s hexaemeral account, show his adoption of a structural compromise between conventional biblical commentaries and new theological works organized around theological topics.<sup>27</sup> Like traditional biblical commentators, Comestor proceeded systematically through a given scriptural text, in his case through much of the Bible.<sup>28</sup> Unlike traditional biblical commentators, Comestor took great freedom with Scripture to fashion a cogent historical narrative, organizing his *History* into discrete “episodes” treated in separate chapters.<sup>29</sup> The *History*’s first chapter is entitled: “On the initial creation of heaven and

<sup>25</sup> Landgraf, “Pierre le Mangeur,” 305–6.

<sup>26</sup> Martin, “Pierre le Mangeur” (n. 11 above), 65–66.

<sup>27</sup> For the discussion that follows, I provide at the end of this article a Textual Appendix (cited throughout as “TA”) that consists of a working edition of the first eight chapters of Comestor’s *Historia Genesis* preceded by a list of the manuscripts used.

<sup>28</sup> As Hugh of St. Cher puts it in his commentary on the *History*: “Materia quidem huius libri est eadem quae et totius Bibliæ” (Uppsala, University Library MS C 134 [Dominican Convent of Sigtuna, 1233–1248], fol. 3v<sup>a</sup>). Hugh exaggerated, but not much. For a description of the manuscripts containing Hugh’s commentary on the *Historia scholastica*, see Anja Inkeri Lehtinen, “The Apoeceiae of the Manuscripts of Hugh of St. Cher’s Works,” *Medioevo* 25 (1999–2000): 3–10.

<sup>29</sup> Christian biblical commentators had, of course, occasionally organized their works into chapters, which were themselves divided topically. For Genesis, see, for example, Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* (ed. Joseph Zycha, CSEL 28.1, 436–503), and Rabanus Maurus, *Commentarius in Genesim* (PL 107: 439–670). In many such commentaries, however, headings seem nominal and somewhat arbitrary. See, for example, Honorius Augustodunensis, *Hexaemeron* (PL 172: 253–66), and Pseudo-Bede, *Expositio in primum librum Mosi* (PL 91: 189–286). Nevertheless, what chiefly distinguishes Comestor’s *History* from these and other such works is the cogency of the narrative that he produced

earth.”<sup>30</sup> The second bears the rubric: “On the initial confusion of the universe.”<sup>31</sup> Chapter three of the *History*, entitled “On the work of the first day,” begins a series of six chapters (three through eight) dealing separately with the six days of creation. These chapters, which depend on the framework put in place by the first two chapters, form the core basis of this study.

In organizing the *History* by chapters, Comestor gave himself the freedom to proceed topically. He did not, however, organize the *History* according to broad theological divisions, as had Peter Lombard in the *Sentences* and Hugh of Saint Victor in the *De Sacramentis*. Rather, his material followed in rough outline the scriptural narrative, which starts with creation. In his first chapter, Comestor glossed Genesis 1:1: “In principio creavit Deus caelum et terram.”<sup>32</sup> In his second, Comestor brought to the fore the difficult problem of the confused state of the initial creation by glossing Genesis 1:2. In every successive chapter, Comestor treated a discrete topic organized either strictly or loosely around the text of Scripture. In short, Comestor constructed his *History* upon a solid but not slavish scriptural foundation.

In the first twenty-five chapters of the *History*, Comestor covered roughly the same ground as the first three chapters of Genesis, that is, from creation through the expulsion of Adam and Eve from paradise.<sup>33</sup> By contrast, Peter Lombard did not even take up the subject of creation and creatures before the start of Book Two of his *Sentences*.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, although the *Sentences*

---

in using a method that was at once faithful to and independent of Sacred Scripture. See Clark, “A Study of Comestor’s Method,” 34–300.

<sup>30</sup> “De prima creatione caeli et terrae” (TA 40).

<sup>31</sup> “De prima mundi confusione” (TA 82).

<sup>32</sup> As Langton says in his first commentary on the *History*: “In hoc autem capitulo nihil ultra hanc clausulam exponit Magister: *in principio creavit Deus caelum et terram*” (Paris, BNF MS Lat. 14417, fol. 129r<sup>a</sup>).

<sup>33</sup> It is beyond the scope of this paper to situate Comestor’s hexaemeral account within the broader context of the twelfth century as a whole. That Comestor was both aware and distrustful of the issues and controversies associated with Chartrian thinkers is patent from his numerous references to Plato and his errors. See, for example, TA 57–64, 99–101, 256–61, etc. Nevertheless, I restrict my efforts herein to establishing the connection of Comestor’s hexaemeral account with the Lombard’s. I do, however, provide, in the critical apparatus, extensive documentation of the sources Comestor used. For a recent and thorough overview of twelfth-century hexaemeral developments, from the various Chartrian theories of creation up to and including the Lombard’s account, as well as up-to-date scholarly bibliography, see Colish, *Peter Lombard* (n. 4 above), 1:303–97.

<sup>34</sup> The title and remarks preliminary to Book II make this plain: “**INCIPIT LIBER SECUNDUS: De rerum creatione et formatione corporalium et spiritualium et aliis pluribus eis pertinentibus.** Quae ad mysterium divinae unitatis atque trinitatis, licet *ex parte*, cognoscendum pertinere noscuntur, quantum valuimus, diligenter executi sumus. Nunc ad considerationem creaturarum transeamus” (Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*

were pregnant with Scripture, there was nothing of scriptural narrative in them. Nevertheless, Comestor was able to adapt them to the altogether different structure of the *History*. To show how he did so requires a bit of textual detective work, particularly with regard to how the two Peters used their hexaemeral sources.

In the first number of the first chapter of the first distinction in Book Two, the Lombard begins his discussion of creation with a chapter headed: “**He shows that there was one beginning of things, not several, as certain have thought. — Bede.**”<sup>35</sup> The attribution to Bede is correct for the first part of the passage that the Lombard provides, although he took it from the *Glossa ordinaria* and not directly from Bede’s commentary on Genesis.<sup>36</sup> The second part of this passage, however, is a reworking of several excerpts from related passages that introduced the biblical *Gloss*, as the following comparison of texts shows.

His et huiusmodi erroribus obvians Moyses in uno spiritu in uno principio temporis mundum a creatore deo factum . . . GO (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.6<sup>b</sup>.2).

*In principio creavit Deus caelum et terram.* Moyses in uno principio temporis a deo creatore mundum factum refert . . . GO (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.6<sup>b</sup>.3).

His etenim verbis Moyses, Spiritu Dei afflatus, in uno principio a Deo creatore mundum factum refert, elidens errorem quorundam plura sine principio fuisse principia opinantium. Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 1, chap. 1.1 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 330.1–3).<sup>37</sup>

This instance is typical of the Lombard’s adaptation of hexaemeral sources. Indeed, Brady tells us that the Lombard, in his treatment of Genesis 1–3, actually depended on the *Gloss*, and not on original sources, for the first twenty-four distinctions (as well as distinction 29) in Book Two.<sup>38</sup>

---

[Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 329.1–6]). In Book I, of course, the Lombard dealt only with God and the Trinity.

<sup>35</sup> Peter Lombard, *II. Sent.*, dist. 1, chap. 1.1 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 329.9–10).

<sup>36</sup> Brady notes this in his apparatus (*ibid.*). Compare Bede, *Libri quattuor in principium Genesis* 1:1 (CCL 118A, 3.1–6) with GO (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>.3).

<sup>37</sup> Brady notes this as well (“ex eius *Prothematibus* seu ex verbis Strabi”). Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 1, chap. 1.1 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 329, apparatus to chap. 1.1).

<sup>38</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.* (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 329, apparatus to dist. 1 and throughout for individual instances). Colish too takes note of this “one feature of Peter’s treatment of creation that is, for him, unusual.” Colish, *Peter Lombard*, 1:336. Indeed, noting Brady’s clear documentation of the Lombard’s “dependence on intermediary sources,” she observes that such dependence “is quite atypical of his methodology more generally” (*ibid.*). It must be admitted then that, in exploiting systematically his Master’s hexaemeral account, Comestor to some extent relied on the Lombard at his most atypical. This admission, however, has no bearing on my thesis in this paper. Indeed, it may be, as Landgraf’s observations (n. 21 above) suggest, that Comestor also made use of the Lombard at his



Like the Lombard, Comestor read and used the *Gloss* extensively in his account of creation.<sup>39</sup> His particular *accessus*, however, was the Lombard's *Sentences*. The first clue that points in this direction is the word *elidens*, which Comestor uses in his own version: "Cum vero dixit Moses CREAVIT trium errores elidit: Platonis, Aristotelis, Epicuri."<sup>40</sup> It provides a clue, taken from the opening lines of Book Two of the *Sentences*, to Comestor's approach to sources. The *Magister historiarum*, it turns out, looked first to the teaching of his own *magister*, namely the *Magister sententiarum*, in composing this part of the *History*.

The glosses immediately preceding and succeeding this line provide the first solid evidence in the *History* that, of all the sources available to him on the subject of creation, Comestor routinely started with the Lombard. Jerome was the ultimate source for the immediately preceding gloss: "The Hebrew has *eloim*, which is both singular and plural, that is, 'God' or 'gods,' since God is three persons in one creator."<sup>41</sup> Comestor, however, adapted a passage from Book One of the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard.<sup>42</sup>

The full passage from which the line including *elidens* was taken, and in which Comestor contrasted the erroneous notions of Plato, Aristotle, and Epicurus with the prophetically inspired testimony of Moses, is even more telling since it shows Comestor's reliance on other material from the first distinction in Book Two:

---

most typical. Nonetheless, my purpose is not to show Comestor as a faithful Lombardian — quite the contrary, the structure and substance of the *History* clearly show otherwise — but rather to document the fact, overlooked by scholars until now, that, in composing his *History*, Comestor made extensive use of the *Sentences*.

<sup>39</sup> In contrast to the Lombard, Comestor carefully consulted original sources in his hexaemeral account. See, for example, Clark, "A Study of Comestor's Method" (n. 23 above), 93–94.

<sup>40</sup> TA 57–58.

<sup>41</sup> TA 56–57. I have emended the text to accord with the obviously correct reading in Jerome's gloss of Genesis 6:2: "*Videntes autem filii dei filias hominum quia bonae sunt. Verbum hebraicum eloim communis est numeri: et deus quippe et di similiter appellantur*" (Jerome, *Hebraicae quaestiones in libro Genesis*, Gen. 6:2 [CCL 72, 9]). Cf. Sylwan, ed. (CCM 191, 7.22); this edition has the correct reading, but it is not clear from the apparatus which manuscript supports it.

<sup>42</sup> "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" (Peter Lombard, *I Sent.*, dist. 2, chap. 4.5 [Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 65.26–31]). One early manuscript of the *History*, BL Royal MS 4 D.VII (hereinafter "S" for St. Albans), adds *iudices*, additional evidence that the Lombard was Comestor's principal source for this passage. The Lombard's likely source was Peter Abelard, *Theologia scholasticum*, 1.69 (CCM 13, 345.765–346.775).

Moses, however, when he said “created,” smashed the errors of three [philosophers]: Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus. Plato said that there were three [first principles] from eternity: God, the ideas, and matter, and that in the beginning of time the universe was made from matter. Aristotle [held that there were] two: the universe and the demiurge, who from two principles, namely matter and form, worked without beginning and works without end. Epicurus [also held that there were] two: the vacuum and atoms, and in the beginning nature solidified certain atoms into earth, others into water, others into air, [and] others into fire. Moses, however, prophesied that God alone was eternal, and that the world was created [by God] without pre-existent matter.<sup>43</sup>

Comestor could have consulted a wide variety of sources, since refuting the errors of the philosophers about creation, and in particular the notion of pre-existent matter and other eternal first principles, had been a central concern of Christian commentators from the patristic era into the twelfth century.<sup>44</sup> Yet Comestor’s key sources were the *Sentences* first and then the biblical *Glossa ordinaria*. Juxtaposition of passages from these texts shows that Peter Lombard once again had recourse to the same introductory gloss in the *Gloss* that he had used to complete distinction one, chapter 1.1:

1.1.2. **Strabus: Plato tria dixit principia:** Plato namque tria initia existimavit, Deum scilicet, et exemplar, et materiam; et ipsa increata, sine principio, et Deum quasi artificem, non creatorem. Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 1, chap. 1.2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 330.4–6).

1.3.4. **Aristotiles tria. – Strabus:** Aristotiles vero duo principia dixit, scilicet materiam et speciem, et tertium “operatorium” dictum; mundum quoque semper esse et fuisse. *Ibid.*, 1.2 (331.21–23).

<sup>43</sup> TA 57–64.

<sup>44</sup> Basil, for example, devoted significant attention in the first homilies of his *Nine Homilies on the Hexaemeron* to refuting these and other heterodox views of the philosophers on creation (Basil, *Homiliae IX in Hexaemeron*, hom. 1.1–7, 2.1–3; E. Amand de Mendieta and S. Y. Rudberg, eds., *Eustathius: Ancienne version latine des neuf homélies sur l’Hexaéméron de Basile de Césarée*, 66 [Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1958], 4–13, 18–22). Ambrose, who followed Basil closely, began his *Exameron* with a passage similar to Comestor’s (Ambrose, *Exameron*, sermo 1, 1.1.1–3 [CSEL 32.1, 3.1–4.8]). In the twelfth century, renewed acquaintance with the *Timaeus* focused attention on Plato’s identification of three eternal first principles in that work: “Haec est meae quidem sententiae mens esse et ante mundi quoque sensilis exornationem fuisse tria haec: existens locum generationem” (*Timaeus* 52d; Plato, *Timaeus a Calcidio translatus commentarioque instructus*, ed. Jan Hendrik Waszink [London, 1962], 51.6–7). See also the commentary of Chalcidius: “Sunt igitur initia deus et silva et exemplum, et est deus quidem origo primaria moliens et posita in actu, silva vero ex qua prima fit quod gignitur” (*ibid.*, 308.14–309.2). John of Salisbury, introducing the Platonism of Bernard of Chartres, restated the position clearly in the *Metalogicon*: “Hanc autem veram existentiam partiebatur in tria quae rerum principia staeuebat, Deum scilicet, materiam, et ideam. Siquidem haec in sui natura immutabilia sunt” (John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon* 4.35 [CCM 98, 173.22–25]).

**Strabus.** *In principio creavit Deus caelum et terram.* Moyses in uno principio temporis . . . Plato enim tria initia vel principia estimabat: deum, exemplar, et materiam, et ipsa increata, sine principio, et deum quasi artificem non creatorem. Aristoteles duo: materiam et speciem, et tertium operatorium dictum. Mundus vero semper esse et fuisse. Contra haec ergo et huiusmodi dicitur . . . GO (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.6<sup>b</sup>.3).

Comestor varied the wording a bit and also introduced Epicurus, which shows that he consulted other sources as well.<sup>45</sup> The important point, however, is that he was using in the first chapter of the *History* the same materials that Peter Lombard had used to put together the first distinction in Book Two of the *Sentences*.<sup>46</sup> To understand how Comestor, while borrowing freely from the Lombard, produced a work so obviously different, I compare the way each man dealt with two hexaemeral difficulties that had proven difficult for Christian interpreters of the hexaemeron since the time of the Fathers: the role of angels in, and the form and timing of, creation.

#### ANGELS IN CREATION

Every twelfth-century thinker who discussed creation had to deal with difficulties arising from what the Scriptures did or did not say. There was, for example, the problem of angels. As Andrew of St. Victor pointed out, Moses said nothing about angels in his account of creation in the opening chapters of Genesis: “And since he meant to discuss only those matters that were created for the use of man and on account of man, therefore — in treating the creation of the universe — he omitted completely the creation of the angels and their confirmation [in sanctity] or fall from grace in the beginning of his work.”<sup>47</sup> Andrew’s view, however, departed radically from the norm. From the patristic era through the high Middle Ages, Christian commentators on the first line of Genesis saw in God’s creation of heaven a clear reference to the creation of angels. Basil the Great, for instance, asserted their creation by God before time and the rest of creation came into being, citing Colossians 1:16 as evidence of the reality of angels.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>45</sup> John of Salisbury gives a summary of the views of Epicurus similar to that presented by Comestor in his *Metalogicon* (ibid. 58.11–12): “sicuti Epicurus qui ex atomis et inani mundum sine auctore Deo constituit.”

<sup>46</sup> By contrast, Andrew of Saint Victor relied not on Peter Lombard but rather on the *Gloss*, from which he borrowed verbatim and extensively to explicate the same material. Cf. Andrew of Saint Victor, *Expositio super Heptateuchum, In Genesim 1:1* (CCM 53, 8.92–9.99).

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., Prologus (CCM 53, 4.20–23).

<sup>48</sup> Basil, *Homiliae IX in Hexaemeron*, hom. 1.5–7 (De Mendieta and Rudberg, eds., *Eustathius: Ancienne version latine des neuf homélies sur l’Hexaéméron de Basile de Césarée*, 9–13).

Ambrose followed Basil.<sup>49</sup> For Augustine, the role of angels in creation made possible a literal understanding of the hexaemeral account.<sup>50</sup> Following the Church Fathers, an unbroken line of Christian biblical commentators down through the twelfth century read angels into the hexaemeral text.<sup>51</sup>

The force of this tradition of interpretation was such that even Andrew of St. Victor could not resist it entirely. Twice in his discussion of Genesis 1:1 he presented the classic teaching on the subject of angels only to catch himself and recall his determination to omit discussing them. In glossing the words “heaven and earth,” Andrew set forth straightforward Augustinian teaching on the subject of angelic creation, before retreating with a restatement of Moses’s intentions:

*Heaven and earth.* According to certain thinkers, Moses understands [by *heaven and earth*] bodily and spiritual creation or the unformed matter of both. Spiritual life (that is spirit) in itself, which is not turned towards its creator, is unformed; turned towards him, it is formed. Bodily matter, however, is unformed through the privation of all corporeal quality that appears in formed matter. But since we have said that he [Moses] intentionally omitted the creation of angels, and concentrated on those things alone that pertained to the utility of men, we also pass over what others have thought was said about angels in this part of his work, what we ourselves also [would think], if there was such a something to be said on the subject of these words.<sup>52</sup>

When he came to discuss heaven as a place, he first presented his own understanding of the heaven referred to in Genesis 1:1 as the upper reaches of corporeal creation, above the moon, or alternatively, simply what can be seen above.<sup>53</sup> He then once again interjected angels into the discussion:

There are those who do not think that this text treats of this heaven known to us (since it is accounted for in Moses’ discussion of the second day), but rather of that heaven that they call *empyreum* or *intellectual* or *fiery*. This

<sup>49</sup> “Sed etiam angeli, dominationes et potestates etsi aliquando coeperunt, erant tamen iam, quando hic mundus est factus. omnia namque creata et condita sunt, visibilia et invisibilia, sive sedes sive dominationes sive principatus sive potestates . . .” (Ambrose, *Exam.*, sermo 1, 1.5.19 [CSEL 32.1, 15.23–27], also citing Col. 1:16).

<sup>50</sup> For the key passages in the theory, see Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim*, 4.21–22, 26 (CSEL 32.1, 120.8–122.25, 125.3–126.8), in which Augustine argues for understanding the days and nights spoken of in the hexaemeron as movements interior to the spiritual creation, namely the angels, first with respect to their own creation and subsequently with respect to the remainder of creation. I discuss Augustine’s theory below in connection with the retreat from, and adaptation of, his position on the part of other thinkers, the Lombard and Comestor included, down into the twelfth century.

<sup>51</sup> One can see this readily in such important sources as Bede’s commentary on Genesis and, in the twelfth century, the biblical *Glossa ordinaria*.

<sup>52</sup> Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.*, 1:1 (CCM 53, 6.15–25).

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.* (6.26–28, 7.36–38).

heaven, removed completely from the mutability of the universe, as soon as it was created, was filled with holy angels. The Lord himself bears witness that these were created in the beginning with heaven and earth when he says: "Where were you when the Morning Star and all the sons of God praised me and rejoiced?". . . But, as we said already, about angels and about this heaven of theirs, whether it exists or does not exist, we omit completely.<sup>54</sup>

Notwithstanding Andrew's exceptional independence of mind in pointing out the silence of Moses on the subject of angels, subsequent Christian commentators on the hexaemeron did not hesitate to interpret angels into the world that God had created.

Nevertheless, the twelfth century also saw the possibility of treating angels separately and, to a certain extent, independently of the biblical narrative. Andrew's Victorine predecessor, Hugh, devoted thirty-four chapters in the Fifth Part of Book One of his *De Sacramentis* to the creation and simultaneous salvation or damnation of the angels.<sup>55</sup> Peter Lombard made their role in creation a principal topic in his treatment of the first day of creation in Book Two of his *Sentences*.<sup>56</sup> Although Peter Comestor relied extensively on the Lombard's hexaemeral account, he nevertheless pursued a middle course in his own treatment of angels.

Comestor did not delay in taking account of angels in creation, discussing them in three of the *History's* first four chapters. In chapter one, following his opening paraphrase, he discussed four ways in which *mundus* ("world") was spoken of.<sup>57</sup> First was the angelic heaven (*caelum empyreum*), called *mundus* owing to its *munditia* ("cleanness" or "purity").<sup>58</sup> Again in the first chapter, in glossing the heaven spoken of in the first line of Genesis, Comestor referred to the creation and location of the angels: "*In the beginning God created heaven and earth, heaven, that is, that which contains and that which is contained, that is, the fiery heaven and angelic nature.*"<sup>59</sup>

Understanding the heaven mentioned in the first line of Genesis to refer to angels was wholly conventional.<sup>60</sup> So too was Comestor's use of the word

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.* (7.42–52).

<sup>55</sup> Hugh of Saint Victor, *Adnotationes elucidatoriae in Pentateuchon* 4 (PL 175: 245–64).

<sup>56</sup> The Lombard discusses angels in all thirteen distinctions dealing with the first day of creation. From distinctions two through thirteen, there is copious and detailed analysis of their role and destiny. See Peter Lombard, *II Sent.* (Grottaferrata, 1971, 336–90). See also Colish, *Peter Lombard* (n. 4 above), 1:347–53.

<sup>57</sup> By *mundus* he meant world in the broadest sense.

<sup>58</sup> TA 42–43.

<sup>59</sup> TA 51–53.

<sup>60</sup> The *Glossa interlinearis*, for example, has "spiritualem et corporalem creaturam" as the first interlinear gloss given for "heaven and earth" (GI, Gen 1:1 *ad loc.* [Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>]). Andrew of Saint Victor's gloss is identical (*In Gen.* 1:1 [CCM 53, 6.15]).

*mundus* to refer to the entire initial creation.<sup>61</sup> The substance, therefore, of Comestor's glosses on angels was typical. What distinguished Comestor's glosses from those of other commentators, however, was the way he structured his commentary on Genesis 1:1.<sup>62</sup> He was pouring old wine into new skins.

The organization Comestor imposed on the *History*, a cross between a typical biblical commentary and a topical *summa*, let him have it both ways. Three of the next four references to angels come where one would expect in a biblical commentary. In contrast to God, who is eternal, the angels are sempiternal like the world, since they came into existence at the beginning of time.<sup>63</sup> In chapter three of the *History*, glossing what Genesis 1:4 records as God's reaction to the light he had created on the first day, namely that it was good, Comestor had recourse to an oft-repeated Augustinian formula: "AND GOD SAW THAT THE LIGHT WAS GOOD, that is, what had pleased God in his foreknowledge that it should come to be, pleased God in his essence that it should remain in existence."<sup>64</sup> He then provided another Augustinian gloss, which he labeled as allegorical: "Or understood allegorically, *saw*, that is, caused to be seen."<sup>65</sup> As Langton made plain in his second commentary on the *History*, God caused it to be seen by the angels, who had already come into existence.<sup>66</sup> Again in chapter three, Comestor

---

The marginal *Gloss* reproduces an excerpt along the same lines from Remigius of Auxerre: "*Creavit enim coelum et teram [sic]. Coelum non istud visibile firmamentum accipere debemus, sed illud empyreum, id est igneum, vel intellectuale coelum quod non ab ardore, sed a splendore igneum dicitur.*" (Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:1 [PL 131: 54D–55A]). Cf. GO (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>.3).

<sup>61</sup> Christian commentators on Genesis as widely cited as Bede and as unconventional as Andrew of Saint Victor did so. See Bede, *In Gen.*, Gen. 1:1 (CCL 118A, 3.4), and Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* 1:1 (CCM 53, 6.1).

<sup>62</sup> Comestor actually inverted the standard approach to glossing Genesis 1:1. The word *mundus*, which prompted his initial comment on the angelic heaven, was not just part of his commentary but rather the final word of his opening paraphrase of the beginnings of Genesis and John's Gospel. It was, together with the remade scriptural text, a part of the lemma that had to be glossed. Moreover, as a result of his atypical approach, Comestor did not gloss heaven until he had fully explained the possible understandings of *mundus* and introduced the actual text of Genesis 1:1 as part of his commentary.

<sup>63</sup> TA 66–68.

<sup>64</sup> TA 109–11. Cf. Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1.1 (CSEL 28.1, 11.15–20). See also, for example, Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:1 (CCL 118A, 12.292–95); GI, Gen. 1:4 *ad loc.* (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup>) and GO (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup>.1).

<sup>65</sup> TA 111. According to Augustine, this was a literal reading of Scripture, since the hexaemeron refers not to actual days but rather to a succession of interior recognitions by angels of creation. See my discussion, below, of Augustine's literal understanding of the hexaemeron, where I show Comestor's hexaemeral account to be part of a long Christian retreat from Augustinian idealism.

<sup>66</sup> "VIDERI FECIT angelis, qui iam erant creati" (BNF MS Lat. 14414, fol. 115v<sup>a</sup>).

provided another classic gloss on part of Genesis 1:4: “*AND GOD DIVIDED THE LIGHT AND THE DARKNESS. . . .* Here it is also understood that the division of the angels was accomplished: those who remained in grace were called *light*, those who fell *darkness*.”<sup>67</sup>

The fourth reference to angels, however, was different. Comestor began chapter four with a statement of the ultimate disposition of the angels, unattached to any biblical lemma: “On the second day God arranged the higher portions of the sensible world. For the angelic heaven, as quickly as it was created, was immediately arranged and adorned, that is, filled with holy angels.”<sup>68</sup> Comestor was here using an answer already in the tradition but in a new way. Bede, for example, had used the same idea and similar language in glossing Genesis 1:2: “*The earth however was void and empty.*” Why, Bede asked, did the sacred writer who had mentioned both heaven and earth in the opening line of Genesis now omit mention of heaven? Was it not because that heaven above, which is cut off from this world by the glory of the divine presence, was not at all empty and devoid of living beings, as was earth and the heaven of our world, but rather was filled at once with blessed troops of angels as soon as they were created?<sup>69</sup>

Comestor must also have been familiar with other sources for the same idea. The *Gloss*, for example, reproduced a concise version of Bede’s gloss.<sup>70</sup> On the same page it also restated an unattributed excerpt making the same point about the instantaneous disposition of the angels but in connection with Genesis 1:1: “*In the beginning God created heaven and earth. The heaven spoken of is not the visible firmament but the angelic, that is, fiery, that is, intellectual heaven, which is so called not from its heat but from its brilliance. This heaven was immediately filled with angels.*”<sup>71</sup> Comestor’s source, however, was none of these but rather the *Sentences*, where the same idea was also detached from any scriptural context.

The rubric for the first part of the fourth chapter of the second distinction in Book Two reads: “**1. Ubi angeli mox creati fuerint: in empyreo scilicet, quod statim factum, angelis fuerit repletum.**”<sup>72</sup> The Lombard had taken a question and an answer from the narrative in the first chapter of Treatise Two in the *Summa Sententiarum* and turned them into a chapter heading comprised of a concise question — where were the angels as soon as they were created? — and an answer — in the empyreum that, as soon as it

<sup>67</sup> TA 111, 115–16.

<sup>68</sup> TA 128–29.

<sup>69</sup> Bede, *In Gen.*, Gen. 1:2 (CCL 118A, 4.34–47).

<sup>70</sup> GO (Turnhout, 1992, Gen. 1:2 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>.11).

<sup>71</sup> GO (Turnhout, 1992, Gen. 1:2 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>.3). The excerpt reproduced in the *Gloss* is a slightly modified version of the text of Remigius of Auxerre cited in n. 60 above.

<sup>72</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 2, chap. 4.1 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 339.11–12).

was created, was filled with angels.<sup>73</sup> In the next two parts, numbers two and three, of chapter four, distinction two, the Lombard cited the traditional answers, conveniently available in the *Gloss* and ultimately attributable to Bede and Remigius of Auxerre.<sup>74</sup>

Comestor's use of the Lombard in the present instance is noteworthy in several respects. Like the Lombard, Comestor used the summary information in a non-scriptural context, in this case as a sort of preface to the fourth chapter of the *History*. Unlike the Lombard, however, who was comprehensive, Comestor was concise. Peter Lombard included in the remaining parts of chapter four all readily available sources. Comestor left out the tradition, content simply to include his own pithy version of the Lombard's chapter heading.

This was, in fact, typical of Comestor's approach. In constructing his own hexaemeral account, he proceeded systematically through the Lombard's, taking what he could use and adapting it to his much more concise narrative structure. Comestor put *elidens* and the glosses about Plato and Aristotle from Book Two, distinction one into the *History's* first chapter. His use of the Lombard's chapter heading is a signpost pointing to more systematic usage, in this case of the second distinction in Book Two. Indeed, a close comparison of the other chapters in distinction two with the rest of the *History's* first chapter reveals more substantial borrowing. The language of Comestor's initial glosses on "heaven and earth" seems to come straight from the first chapter of distinction two.<sup>75</sup> Comestor's series of glosses concluding the *History's* first chapter, which tied together creation of the world and angels in time and reconciled apparently contradictory scriptural texts, was a concise adaptation of the Lombard's presentation of the same material in chapters one, two, and three of Book Two, distinction two.<sup>76</sup>

The *History's* first chapter, it turns out, is filled with material from the first two distinctions of Book Two of the *Sentences*. What makes Comestor's extensive reliance on the Lombard easy to overlook at first is the profound difference in structure between the two works. Comestor did not simply

---

<sup>73</sup> See Brady's note to chapter 4.1 at Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 2, chap. 4.1 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 339). The Lombard's source reads: "Ubi facti fuerunt quaeritur. . . . Nec appellamus hic coelum firmamentum quod secunda die factum est, sed coelum empyreum; id est, splendidum quod statim repletum est angelis" (*Summa sent.*, 2.1 [PL 176: 81C]).

<sup>74</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 2, chap. 4.2–3 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 339–40 and apparatus), where Brady provides the relevant citations.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. TA 51–55 with Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 2, chap. 1.2–4 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 336.20, 337.16–17, 22–23).

<sup>76</sup> Cf. TA 64–72 with Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 2, chap. 1.2–4, chap. 3–4 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 337.1–338.18).



transfer the Lombard's material into the *History*. Instead, he mined the *Sentences* systematically, borrowing some material directly but reworking most into a very condensed narrative account.

One final point about Comestor's incorporation of the Lombard's chapter heading on angels stands out, since it bears on the structure of Comestor's hexaemeral account as a whole. In Comestor's version, the creation of the angels, attested by the use of the word "heaven" in the opening line of Genesis, was accompanied by their instantaneous disposition or arrangement into the angelic heaven, which they adorn.<sup>77</sup> The Lombard, however, said nothing about arrangement and adornment.<sup>78</sup> What makes this change significant is that Comestor adapted the chapter heading to fit the tripartite division of the hexaemeral account into creation, arrangement, and adornment that he set forth at the end of the *History*'s first chapter. According to Comestor: "Scripture explains this creation of the universe, poured out as a first libation under the works of six days, introducing three [parts]: creation, arrangement, adornment. On the first day, creation and a certain arrangement; on the second and third [days], arrangement; on the remaining days, adornment."<sup>79</sup>

Given how much the first chapter of the *History* owes to Peter Lombard, it is not surprising to learn that Peter Comestor also borrowed this overall hexaemeral framework from his teacher. A key source was the second part of the ninth chapter of the Lombard's fourteenth distinction in Book Two:

**That on the preceding three days the arrangement of creation was accomplished and the separation of the four elements, and on the three following days the world was adorned.** On the preceding three days, the machine of this whole world was arranged and distributed according to its separate parts. For after the light that illumined the world had been formed on the first day, the following two days were allocated to the highest and lowest parts of the world, the firmament, namely, air, earth, and water. For on the second day, the firmament was unfolded from above; and on the third, when the huge mass of waters had been gathered into its own receptacles, the earth came into view and the air was made clear. The four elements of the world therefore were separated and set in order in their own places on those [first three] days. On the following three days, however, those four elements were adorned. For on the fourth day, the firmament was adorned with the sun and the moon and the stars. On the fifth day, the air in the birds and the waters in the fishes received their adornments. On the sixth, the earth received beasts of burden, reptiles, and wild animals [as its adornments]. After all this, mankind was made from the earth and on the

<sup>77</sup> TA 127–28.

<sup>78</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 2, chap. 4.1 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 339.11–12).

<sup>79</sup> TA 72–75.

earth, not, however, for the earth or on account of the earth, but rather for heaven and on account of heaven.<sup>80</sup>

Just as he furnished Comestor with a satisfactory account of *heaven*, that is, the angels, the Lombard here provided his student with a concise outline for how to deal with the ultimate disposition of the earth and the elements.<sup>81</sup> How Comestor reformed the Lombard's treatment of the form and timing of creation to suit his own purposes in the *History* is the subject of the next section. To understand the versions of both Peters, I first sketch the main outlines of the precedent tradition.

#### THE FORM AND TIMING OF CREATION

If there was confusion wrought by the silence of Scripture over what was meant by "heaven," there was even more over the meaning of "earth." According to the Old Latin translation of the Book of Wisdom, God made the universe "from unformed matter."<sup>82</sup> If this were true, however, how was one to account for the obvious differences in form of the various creations spoken of in the hexaemeron? About "earth," moreover, there was an even more basic question. No Christian thinker questioned Empedocles' thesis that four elements constituted the primal substances that made up the visible world: earth, water, air, and fire. The opening line of Genesis named the first, but, as Basil pointed out, Moses said nothing explicit about the last three.<sup>83</sup> Nevertheless, Christian commentators from antiquity onwards, including Basil, discussed the four elements in their exposition of the hexaemeron.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>80</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 14, chap. 9.2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 390.25–399.13). As Brady notes, the Lombard's principal source for this passage was Hugh of Saint Victor, *De sacramentis Christianae fidei*, 1.1.24–25 (PL 176: 202D–203A). Comestor too, of course, read Hugh carefully and would have recognized the Victorine as the Lombard's source.

<sup>81</sup> The Lombard's outline was thoroughly traditional. Bede, for example, provided a concise outline similar in all respects (Bede, *In Gen.*, Gen. 1:14 [CCL 118A, 15.398–413]). Moreover, one could argue that for this hexaemeral framework Hugh of Saint Victor was as much a source for Comestor as the Lombard. Let this be granted. The important point for my argument is that Comestor used the Lombard as a point of entry into the tradition and, more importantly, to frame the whole of his own treatment of creation.

<sup>82</sup> "Ex materia informi" (VL, *Wisd. of Sol.* 11:17). Augustine and other patristic authors cited this text. See, for example, Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* 2–3 (CSEL 28.1, 464.22–23). The reading of the Vulgate was different: "quae creavit orbem terrarum ex materia invisā" (*Wisd. of Sol.* 11:18).

<sup>83</sup> "Quamvis nihil de aëre vel igne vel aqua dictum sit" (Basil, *Homiliae IX in Hexaemeron*, hom. 1.7 [De Mendieta and Rudberg, eds., *Eustathius: Ancienne version latine des neuf homélies sur l'Hexaéméron de Basile de Césarée* (n. 44 above), 12.26–27]).

<sup>84</sup> "Non ergo quaeras de singulis rationem, sed illa quoque, quae silentio scriptura praeteriit, ex his quae relata sunt debetis advertere" (*ibid.*, 13.14–15).

The undoubted presence of these four elements, however, only exacerbated the problem of the initial form of matter. Basil's solution, which many of his successors adopted, shows the problem clearly. Water, air, and fire were, in his view, closely related to earth in ways readily apparent to the observant; their hiddenness was attributable to their having been mixed all together.<sup>85</sup> This explanation supported superficially the notion of God's creation "from unformed matter," but on a deeper level it was problematic. If these four elements were mixed together in an indistinguishable mass, how could they truly be different elements? Furthermore, their presence in the initial creation focused attention on the most troublesome of all hexaemeral questions: how and when did they take on the specific characteristics depicted in the opening chapters of Genesis?

Scripture was hopelessly contradictory about the timing of creation. According to Ecclesiasticus 18:1, God created all things simultaneously.<sup>86</sup> The hexaemeral narrative, however, seemed directly to contradict this supposition with its account of a creation that spanned six days, with a seventh day set aside for God's rest. A passage in the Book of Exodus supported the truth of this latter view: "Over six days God created heaven and earth and the seas and everything that is in them, and he rested on the seventh day."<sup>87</sup> Behind the latter two accounts lay the authority of Moses, first and greatest of the prophets and the presumed author of Genesis and Exodus. Nevertheless, the simultaneous creation proposed in Ecclesiasticus 18:1 had a powerful philosophical advantage. It preserved God's essential immutability and separateness from a creation that changed by definition when it came into being and that continued to change as it was formed over time. Augustine succinctly posed the difficulty when he asked: "And how can it be shown that God, without any change in himself, brings about changeable and temporal creation?"<sup>88</sup> In the twelfth century, Bernard Silvestris restated the unbridgeable gap between God and creation: "There were, therefore, two first principles of things: unity and diversity. Diversity was exceedingly ancient, going back very far. Unity had not begun: simple, untouched, solitary, enduring of itself and in itself, eternal and incapable of limitation. Unity is God, diversity none other than preexistent matter, lacking form."<sup>89</sup>

The point of departure for all Christian hexaemeral commentators in the West after the fourth century was the solution set forth by Augustine in his

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 12, 27–31.

<sup>86</sup> "Qui vivit in aeternum creavit omnia simul."

<sup>87</sup> "Sex enim diebus fecit Deus caelum et terram et mare et omnia quae in eis sunt et requievit in die septimo" (Exod. 20:11).

<sup>88</sup> Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1.1 (CSEL 28.1, 4.7–8).

<sup>89</sup> Bernard Silvestris, *Cosmographia, Microcosmus*, 13.1 (ed. Peter Dronke [Leiden, 1978], 146.1–5).

*De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim*. Augustine had argued in an earlier work for an initial material creation that was confused and formless, out of which all things subsequently took their known forms.<sup>90</sup> In this mature work, however, Augustine explained in what way the letter of the hexaemeral text could be interpreted to express a historical reality yet still preserve the inviolable unity of God. The spiritual light called day was the angelic creation, which received its proper form in turning towards its creator. The night of the first day indicated the self-reflection of this intellectual creation, turning inwards to behold and comprehend its own nature. Morning meant turning back towards the creator in praise for what he had wrought in creating them. The six subsequent days spoken of in Scripture signify a repetition of this threefold process, but with respect to the rest of creation. Day means the recognition in the Word by the angelic intellect, turned towards the Word, of the creature to be made, evening means angelic knowledge of its actual existence following creation, and morning means a movement of praise to the creator. On the seventh day, the angelic knowledge is fixed on God's rest. There is no question of actual days in time, but only of knowledge in spiritual creation of God's unified creative act.<sup>91</sup>

Peter Lombard was well aware of Augustine's approach to this question, but for his own discussion of the form and timing of creation he relied upon a modified Augustinian view. This he set forth succinctly in chapter two of distinction twelve in Book Two. Although he attributed the modified Augustinian position to Jerome, Gregory the Great, and Bede, the Lombard's source for most of this passage was the *De sacramentis* of Hugh of Saint Victor:<sup>92</sup>

**That the holy treatise-writers seem on this subject to have handed down, as it were, contradictory opinions, with some saying that all things were made simultaneously in matter and form, and others saying through an interval of time.** Certain of the holy Fathers, who admirably and thoroughly examined the words and the secret things of God, seem to have written contradictory things, as it were, on this matter. Some,

<sup>90</sup> See, for example, Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 1, 2, 3–4 (PL 34: 178): "Primo ergo materia facta est confusa et informis, unde omnia fierent quae distincta atque formata sunt, quod credo a Graecis chaos appellari."

<sup>91</sup> The best concise explanation, on which I have relied, and which provides references to the key passages, is found in Augustine, *La Genèse au sens littéral en douze livres*, trans. and comm. P. Agaësse and A. Solignac, *Oeuvres de saint Augustin* 48–49 (Paris, 1972), 48.646–47.

<sup>92</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 12, chap. 2, 1.2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, apparatus to 384–85), citing Hugh of Saint Victor, *De sacramentis*, 1.2–3 (PL 176: 187CD–188AB). Brady, who provides relevant citations, questions the inclusion of Jerome in the list and also notes that the Lombard was relying not on original sources but on excerpts from the *Gloss*.

indeed, have handed down that all things were created simultaneously in matter and form, which Augustine seems to have thought. Others, however, argued for and approved this position more, namely that matter was at first created in a rough and unformed state, holding a commingling and confusion of the four elements; afterwards, however, over an interval of six days the classes of corporeal things were formed out of that matter according to their own individual forms. Gregory the Great, Jerome, Bede, and a few others recommend and put forward this position. It also seems to accord more with Scripture, namely Genesis, whence a first knowledge of this subject came to us.<sup>93</sup>

The Lombard's own account of the form and timing of creation, which he set forth in a series of distinctions, accorded with the compromise position adopted by Gregory the Great and others, including Hugh of Saint Victor in the twelfth century. Peter Comestor's version closely followed the Lombard's, yet his wording was ambiguous in several respects.<sup>94</sup>

Discussion of Comestor's treatment of the creation of the material universe must start with the rubric of his first chapter: "On the initial creation of heaven and earth."<sup>95</sup> Of three variants that I have seen, two are significant.<sup>96</sup> In F and S, as well as in five other manuscripts (uvwyz), *caeli* is either preceded or followed by *empyreii*. Another significant variant is found in F, M, and S (as well as in uvwy), all of which substitute *quattuor elementorum* for *terrae*. What makes these two variant readings important is the fact that they are interpretations. If one incorporates these variant readings, the rubric for chapter one of the *History* is quite different: "On the [initial] creation of the angelic heaven and the four elements."

<sup>93</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 12, chap. 2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 384.17–385.20).

<sup>94</sup> It is important to note that neither the creation account of the Lombard nor that of Comestor can be regarded as embracing the whole spectrum of twelfth-century hexaemeral developments. For a good orientation to and overview of twelfth-century discussion of Augustinian doctrine of creation, see Charlotte Gross, "Twelfth-Century Concepts of Time: Three Reinterpretations of Augustine's Doctrine of Creation *Simul*," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 23 (1985): 325–38.

<sup>95</sup> TA 40. The rubric is omitted in one of the five early manuscripts upon which I base my working edition of the *Historia Genesis*, namely BL MS Royal 7 F.III (hereinafter "E"); I adopt the text in BNF, MS Lat. 16943 (hereinafter "C").

<sup>96</sup> The word *prima* is omitted in three early (before 1215) manuscripts: Vienna, NB, MS Lat. 363 (hereinafter "M"), Durham Cathedral MS B I 34 (hereinafter "F"), and BL MS Royal 4 D.VII (hereinafter "S"), and in six others that I have examined: Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 566 (hereinafter "u"), Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 567 (hereinafter "v"), Graz, Univ. MS 141 (hereinafter "w"), Linz, Bundesstaatliche Studienbibliothek 272 (neu 390) and 273 (neu 402) (hereinafter "x"), Linz, Bundesstaatliche Studienbibliothek 26 (neu 490) (hereinafter "y"), and Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS Lat. 1205 (hereinafter "z"). For full descriptions of these eleven manuscripts as well as catalog references, see Clark, "'A Study of Comestor's Method'" (n. 23 above), Introduction to the Textual Appendices, 10–21.

The rubrics, of course, serve to introduce each chapter. In the present instance, the reference to the angelic heaven presents no difficulty, since it accords with the substance of Comestor's discussion of angels, reviewed above. Incorporation of a reference to creation of the four elements, however, raises a question whether Comestor's remarks on simultaneous creation in the first chapter were in some sense decisive for the rest of his hexaemeral discussion, in which he outlined the arrangement and adornment of material creation.

Comestor mentions the four elements with his initial comment on "heaven and earth" towards the middle of the *History's* first chapter. After glossing *caelum* as the angelic heaven and the angels, he glosses *terram* as "the matter of all bodies, that is, the four elements, that is, the sensible world arising out of these."<sup>97</sup> The wording, however, of Comestor's tripartite hexaemeral framework, which he presents at the close of chapter one, suggests a difficulty in interpretation concerning his view of the timing of that initial creation. As Comestor puts it: "Scripture explains this creation of the world foretasted under the works of six days."<sup>98</sup>

Comestor's words make plain his intended framework for treating the hexaemeral text. What they do not make plain, however, is whether he meant to adopt an understanding of the hexaemeron according to which creation, arrangement, and adornment actually took place over six days. Alternatively, did he understand those six days, in which the universe was created, arranged, and adorned, simply as the means Moses chose to represent an instantaneous creation? The former would accord with the compromise position favored by Hugh of Saint Victor and Peter Lombard; the latter would be true to the mature Augustinian understanding of the hexaemeral narrative.

The textual evidence is ambiguous. Comestor's opening words, *hanc creationem mundi*, refer back, owing to his use of the demonstrative adjective *hanc*, to the immediately preceding sentences. These made up Comestor's third and final gloss of "in the beginning," in which he appeared to endorse a simultaneous view of creation: "Or 'in the beginning' of all created things *he created heaven and earth*, that is, he made those primordial creations and simultaneously, but what was created simultaneously could not be spoken of simultaneously. For although here *heaven* is named before *earth*, nevertheless

---

<sup>97</sup> "*Terram* materiam omnium corporum id est quattuor elementa in est mundum sensibilem ex his constantem" (TA 53–54). He follows this with another: "Quidam *caelum* superiores partes mundi sensilis intellegunt, *terram* inferiores et palpabiles" (TA 54–55). Both glosses are in the *Glossa ordinaria*: "*caelum et terram* id est spiritualement et corporalement creaturam; omnem scilicet creaturam corporalement superiora et inferiora" (GI, Gen. 1:1 *ad loc.* [Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>]).

<sup>98</sup> TA 72–73.

it was written: “*in the beginning you, Lord, founded the earth and the heavens are the works of your hands.*”<sup>99</sup> On the other hand, it is difficult to reconcile Comestor’s tripartite understanding of the hexaemeral depiction of creation with simultaneous creation. Did the simultaneous creation of all things also encompass the arrangement and adornment of earth as well as heaven, lending support to the idea that the works of six days are merely figurative? The variant reading, “of the four elements,” in the first chapter’s rubric would tend to support this interpretation, since the simultaneous creation of earth would presumably encompass the creation and ultimate disposition of those elements. In this view, therefore, the next few chapters of the *History*, in which Comestor addressed the separation of each element and the formation of the material world as we know it, would simply be descriptive of an instantaneous creation at the beginning of time. Alternatively, did Comestor’s separate gloss about the simultaneous creation, arrangement, and adornment of the angels and the angelic heaven at the beginning of chapter four imply that the process for bodily things and places was different and that those works of six days were to be understood literally? It is hard to tell for sure.

Nevertheless, in spite of the textual ambiguities, I am convinced that Comestor did not mean to dismiss a non-instantaneous understanding of the hexaemeral narrative by the phrase “foretasted under the works of six days,” even if it must be admitted that his wording was equivocal. Three reasons, one of which is crucial, underlie this conviction. First, Comestor did, in fact, address the creation, arrangement, and adornment of the angels separately and in the context of the tripartite framework he assigned to the hexaemeron. Second, he treated the arrangement and adornment of the material creation as distinct parts of that same tripartite process. Ultimately, however, what I find most persuasive is the Lombard’s influence on Comestor, which one can trace from problem to problem and solution to solution. Indeed, the Lombard cited the same scriptural passages in support of simultaneous creation as a gloss on “in the beginning.”<sup>100</sup> And both Peters made a smooth transition from the simultaneous creation of spiritual and material creation to the chaos of the primitive material world.

Each author, of course, made the transition differently. In the second distinction of Book Two, the Lombard argued for simultaneous creation of the angels and the physical world (chapters one through three), affirmed the simultaneous creation of the angels and occupation of the angelic heaven (chapter four), and focused on the unformed state of both creations: “For just as the confused and commingled matter of bodies, which according to

<sup>99</sup> TA 68–72, citing Ps. 101:26.

<sup>100</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 2, chap. 1.2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 337.1–5).

the Greek was called *chaos*, had a form of confusion in that beginning of the initial creation, so also the spiritual and angelic nature . . . had no form.”<sup>101</sup> He then included a long series of distinctions on angelic nature.<sup>102</sup> The Lombard did not turn his attention to corporeal creation until the first chapter of distinction twelve.<sup>103</sup> There he expressed succinctly his own preference for the modified position espoused by Hugh of Saint Victor and others: “*and earth*, namely the still confused and unformed matter of the four elements, which was called *chaos* by the Greeks; and this was before any day. Afterwards, he separated the elements and gave proper and distinct likenesses to individual things according to each one’s genus. God formed this not simultaneously, as seemed pleasing to certain of the holy Fathers, but over an interval of time, namely six days, as it seemed to others.”<sup>104</sup>

Comestor’s treatment of angels was cursory by comparison. The *History*’s second chapter, entitled “On the initial confusion of the universe,” although it did not clearly indicate his own views, nevertheless followed closely distinction twelve. Glossing Genesis 1:2, “*terra autem erat inanis et vacua*,” Comestor declared that “the earthly machine was still useless and fruitless and empty of its adornment.”<sup>105</sup> He immediately explained the various names Scripture gave to the just-created physical world: “*AND DARKNESS WAS OVER THE FACE OF THE ABYSS*. The same machine that he called *EARTH*, he calls an *ABYSS* on account of its confused state and darkness. Whence also the Greeks call it *chaos*.”<sup>106</sup> A few lines later in chapter two, Comestor

<sup>101</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 2, chap. 5 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 336–340 and, for the quotation, 340.19–25). To account for this formlessness of the spiritual creation, the Lombard cited Augustine’s theory that spiritual being remains unformed unless turned towards its creator for the temporarily unformed state of the initial spiritual creation (*ibid.*, 341.1–5), citing Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* (n. 50 above), 1.1, 5 (CSEL 28:1, 4.14–17, 8.22–9.11).

<sup>102</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, distinctions 3–11 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 341–84).

<sup>103</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 12, chap. 1.1 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 384.3–4).

<sup>104</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 12, chap. 1.2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 384.10–16).

<sup>105</sup> TA 83–84. Comestor used the word *machina* two more times in the *History*’s second chapter (TA 85, 95). His likely source was chapter nine, distinction fourteen, Book Two of the *Sentences* — “*disposita est universitatis huius mundi machina*” — the same chapter from which he took his tripartite hexaemeral framework (Peter Lombard, *II Sent.* [Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 399.1]). Christian commentators used the word *machina* frequently enough to stand for the newly created world that it was incorporated into the *Glossa interlinearis* for Genesis 1:2: “*aquas . . . id est totam corporalem machinam quia ex humida natura formantur quae videmus in species varias*” (GI, Gen. 1:2 *ad loc.* [Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.9<sup>b</sup>]).

<sup>106</sup> TA 84–86. In this passage Comestor put together a text from chapter five of distinction two with another from distinction twelve. Cf. Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 2, chap. 5 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 340.19–22) and dist. 12, chap. 1.2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 384.9–12). I translate *Graecus* as “the Greeks,” since the word *chaos* is a common term in



considered a fourth name for the initial material creation from the final line of Genesis 1:2: “*AND THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD . . . WAS BORNE OVER THE WATERS*. Just as the will of an artisan having before his eyes all the material he needs for making a house is borne over it, while he arranges that from which he is going to make it. He calls the aforesaid machine ‘waters’ as if a material ductile for the purpose of fashioning from it. Therefore, indeed, its names are thus varied lest if it should be called by the name of one element only, it might be thought more adapted to that element.”<sup>107</sup> The ultimate source for much of this discussion was Augustine, who came back repeatedly to the same images.<sup>108</sup> Comestor’s source, however, was the *Lombard*, who not only bequeathed the references to *chaos* in distinctions two and twelve but also provided in distinction twelve, chapter 3.2 — “**Why that confused matter is called earth, abyss, water**” — an outline for and much of the substance of Comestor’s second chapter.<sup>109</sup> Comestor rewrote the Lombard’s version, making it more concise, but he incorporated each idea and the same essential format.

Comestor’s systematic progression through Book Two of the *Sentences* continued with the particular problem he focused on in that primary confusion. He cited two false positions, which had arisen as a result of Scripture’s testimony about the presence of darkness over the abyss: “But since it was said, *THERE WAS DARKNESS*, certain thinkers declared dogmatically that the darkness was eternal, since it already was, namely when the world came to be. Others, mocking the God of the Old Testament, say that he created darkness before light.”<sup>110</sup> Comestor’s response to these criticisms, which was

---

Greek philosophy and since Christian commentators had long discussed it generally as a Greek term and position. See, for example, Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* 2–3 (CSEL 28.1, 466.11–12). Comestor elsewhere refers to Plato and Aristotle by name.

<sup>107</sup> TA 91–97.

<sup>108</sup> See Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 1, 2, 3–4 (PL 34: 177–79), idem, *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* 4 (CSEL 28.1, 467.1–16, 27–468.1–27), and idem, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1.13–15 (CSEL 28.1, 19.23–20.19, 20.22–21.6, 22.15–24).

<sup>109</sup> “**Quare illa confusa materies vocetur terra, abyssus, aqua**. . . . 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 *ferbatur spiritus Domini*, sicut superfertur fabricandis rebus voluntas artificis, quia subiacebat bonae voluntati Creatoris quod formandae. . . . Haec ideo dicta est *aqua*. . . . His omnibus vocabulis vocata est illa informis materia ut res ignota notis vocabulis insinuaretur imperitioribus; et non uno tantum, nam si uno tantum significaretur vocabulo, hoc esse putaretur quod consueverant homines in illo vocabulo intelligere. Sub his ergo nominibus significata est materia illa invisae et informis” (Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 12, chap. 3.2 [Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 385.18–386.13]).

<sup>110</sup> TA 86–89. The second originated with the Manichees (Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 1, 2, 3–4 [PL 34: 176]). Bede also discussed the position in his *In Gen.*, 1:1

based upon the Lombard's text, was twofold: "but *DARKNESS* is nothing other than the absence of light. A certain obscurity of air, however, was created by God and called *DARKNESS*. Whence also in the catalog of creatures it was said: *ye light and darkness, bless the Lord.*"<sup>111</sup> Comestor's solutions seem to contradict each other. If darkness was not really anything, then how was it that God created a certain obscurity of air and named it darkness?

We see why the apparent contradiction is there when we consider his source, Peter Lombard, who in two sections treated the problem of darkness in that initial confusion at much greater length. In the third part of chapter three and in chapter four of distinction twelve, the Lombard provided the same two alternative interpretations of darkness adopted by Comestor. In contrast to his successor, however, Peter Lombard added the explanation that these were two different senses of an equivocal word:

3. And then there was *darkness*, that is, the absence of light. — **Augustine\***: "For darkness is not anything but the absence itself of light. Just as silence is not anything, but where sound is not, there is said to be silence. And nakedness is not anything, but where clothing is not on the body, there is said to be nakedness. Just as a vacuum is not anything, but a vacuum is said to be a place where there is no body," and a vacuum the absence of any body.<sup>112</sup>

Chap. 4 – **In what sense darkness may be said not to be anything, and in what sense it may be said to be something.** Pay attention to what Augustine says here, that darkness is not anything, when elsewhere darkness is posited as something real between creatures which bless the Lord; whence Scripture says: *Bless the Lord ye light and darkness*. And for this reason it must be known that darkness is understood in two ways; namely either for the absence of light, such as Augustine, quoted above, understood it, according to which sense it is not anything; or it is understood as obscure air, or the obscure quality of air, and according to this sense something was created."<sup>113</sup>

Comestor condensed the first paragraph into a single sentence and the second into two. To a certain extent, however, he sacrificed clarity for brevity in failing to make explicit the consistency of a twofold understanding of darkness.

---

(CCL 118A, 5.76–84), and the compilers of the *Gloss* included his discussion in shortened form. See GO, Gen. 1:2 (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.9<sup>b</sup>.3).

<sup>111</sup> TA 89–91, citing Dan. 3:72.

<sup>112</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 12, chap. 3.3 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 386.16–21), quoting Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 1, 2, 3–4 (PL 34: 176–77). Brady also notes similar language in the *Confessiones* 12.3.3.

<sup>113</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 12, chap. 3.3 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 386.22–387.4).

Comestor's position seemed even less clear when he returned in the next chapter to the subject of light and darkness, situating God's division of the light from the darkness within the framework of his own tripartite hexaemeral framework: "AND HE DIVIDED THE LIGHT AND THE DARKNESS. This passage begins the arrangement, and yet it also says something about creation as if to say that, with the light, God created darkness, that is, a shadow from the interposition of bodies with light."<sup>114</sup> Comestor clearly implied that, in creating light, God made actual shadows that arose from the interposition of that light with bodies. This of course seems to contradict his earlier statement that darkness was nothing but the absence of light.

Just as with his treatment of darkness in the initial creation, it was Comestor's omission of key material from Book Two of the *Sentences* that resulted in ambiguity. The Lombard, following an account of darkness in chapters three and four of distinction twelve, had given a definitive answer in chapter 5.2 to the question he framed as part of the chapter heading of 5.1: "why was that confused matter called formless?"<sup>115</sup> It was not called formless because it had no form whatsoever, since no corporeal being can exist without form. Rather, it was called formless because, subsisting in its confused primordial state, it did not have the clear, distinct, and beautiful form that we behold at present. All material creation, which was created at the same time, was made in a form of confusion. Subsequently, over the works of six days, each material creation received its specific form.<sup>116</sup> Comestor left out this general but clear statement of position regarding the disposition of creation over six days.

He also omitted Peter Lombard's overview of that disposition of the elements in the next paragraph, chapter 5.3, of distinction twelve. According to the Lombard, that first formless mass of all created things occupied the same space it now takes up in its formed state. The earthly element was in the lowest position; above it, thoroughly mixed up in one cloudy and indistinguishable mass that reached up to the summit of the material world, were the other three elements.<sup>117</sup> Instead, Comestor's discussion of the ele-

<sup>114</sup> TA 111–13. Cf. Ambrose, *Exam.*, 1.2, 5 (CSEL 32.1, 33.13–34.6).

<sup>115</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 12, chap. 5.1 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 387.9–10). Brady notes that the Lombard's interrogative chapter heading simply rephrases the language of Hugh of Saint Victor, *De sacramentis* (PL 176: 190A).

<sup>116</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 12, chap. 5.2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 387.9–26). The Lombard repeated his position, citing Alcuin through the *Gloss*, in chapter 6 (*ibid.*, 1.2, 388.25–389.6). As Brady notes, all of chapter 5.2 is based upon Hugh of Saint Victor, *De sacramentis*, 1.1.4 (PL 176: 189C–D).

<sup>117</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 12, chap. 5.3 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 388.1–9). The Lombard added that certain thinkers — Brady names Augustine in the *De Genesi ad litteram* and Bede, and gives the relevant citations — thought that this formless mass

ments was cursory and specific, tied to the scriptural narrative where possible. He discussed earth and water several times, whenever Scripture mentioned them.<sup>118</sup> In chapter four, he took note of fire in connection with the firmament that made up the heaven of the material world.<sup>119</sup> He did not, however, discuss air until the close of chapter five of the *History* (“On the work of the third day”): “Nor should it move you that in the disposition of the elements air does not seem to have been arranged, since it has not been named, but it was arranged when, freed from the waters, it took on the form known to us. Or it is not said to be arranged for this reason, that it had in itself no adornment that had been made out of its own substance.”<sup>120</sup>

Like his treatment of the angels at the beginning of chapter four,<sup>121</sup> Comestor’s discussion of air points to his adoption of a middle way. Unlike his predecessors, Comestor did not attach his explanation of the disposition of air to a specific scriptural text.<sup>122</sup> Unlike his teacher, Comestor said less rather than more about the elements. Both Peters understood the arrangement of the first days as the receipt of form.<sup>123</sup> The Lombard tied this specifically to the hexaemeral narrative.<sup>124</sup> Comestor, by contrast, was content simply to frame his own narrative with the bare essentials of the Lombard’s account in Book Two of the *Sentences*.

---

extended above the firmament, but in a lighter and more rarified state (*ibid.*, 1.2, 388.9–13).

<sup>118</sup> In the fifth chapter, for example, the gathering of the waters into one place and the consequent appearance of dry land led Comestor to discuss the various names for earth. For one name, Comestor used the earth’s position relative to the other elements to supply the etymology (TA 171–76).

<sup>119</sup> TA 137–41.

<sup>120</sup> TA 192–95.

<sup>121</sup> TA 127–28.

<sup>122</sup> Bede, for example, in explicating Gen. 1:2 (“Terra autem erat inanis et vacua et tenebrae super faciem abyssi”) mentioned numerous other biblical passages (Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:1 [CCL 118A, 4.34–5.89–100], citing Ps. 148:4–5). A concise version of Bede’s text was reproduced in the *Gloss* (GO [Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.9<sup>b</sup>.3]). Comestor would also have seen reproduced in the *Gloss* an unattributed excerpt, actually the solution of Pseudo-Remigius of Auxerre, in which the problem of the four elements in creation was addressed in connection with the opening line of Genesis: “*In principio creavit Deus caelum et terram. . . . Et nota tria hic commemorari elementa. Nomine caeli aerem intelligimus [sic]. Nomine terrae ipsam et ignem qui in ea latet. Quarti id est aquae in sequentibus fit mentio*” (GO [Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>.3]). Cf. Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:1 (PL 131: 55A).

<sup>123</sup> “Talis fuit mundi facies in principio, priusquam reciperet formam vel dispositionem” (Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 12, chap. 5.3 [Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 388.13–14]).

<sup>124</sup> “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” (*ibid.*, 388.16–19).

He did so in chapters three through eight of the *History*, tracing the disposition and adornment of creation exactly as the Lombard had done. Chapter three recounted the work of the first day, the forming of the light that illumined the world. Comestor's opening gloss — "*GOD SAID LET THERE BE LIGHT AND THE LIGHT WAS MADE*, that is, he brought forth the Word in whom it was that the light should come into being" — is a transparent adaptation of distinction thirteen, chapter six: "**How should it be understood that *the Lord said: whether God said this by the sound of a voice or otherwise*. . . . Therefore God said, *let there be* etc. not temporally, not by the sound of a voice, but in the Word coeternal with himself, that is, he brought forth the Word atemporally in whom it was, and formed from eternity, that the light should come into being in time.**"<sup>125</sup> In response to the question of what this light, formed before the sun, was, the Lombard had presented two options. According to the first, based on Augustine through the *Glossa ordinaria*, it was spiritual light.<sup>126</sup> According to the second, which Comestor subsequently adopted, it was corporeal light, a luminous cloud.<sup>127</sup> Finally, like the Lombard, Comestor concluded that the first natural day ended with the morning that followed.<sup>128</sup>

For the next two days of creation, Peter Comestor also followed the Lombard's straightforward outline, addressing himself to the higher and lower parts of the material world: the firmament first, and subsequently air, earth, and the waters.<sup>129</sup> In chapter four of the *History* ("On the work of the second day"), following his summary presentation of the disposition of the angels, Comestor made use of the Lombard to set forth the well-known position of Bede that the firmament, which separated waters above from those below and in which were fixed the stars, was itself made of frozen water,

<sup>125</sup> Cf. TA 103–4 with Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 13, chap. 6 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 393.6–16). As Brady notes, the Lombard's source was the *Glossa* adaptation and excerpt from Augustine's *De Genesi ad litteram*: GO, Gen. 1:3 (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.10.1).

<sup>126</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 13, chap. 2.2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 389.21–390.9). As Brady notes, the Lombard's source was the GO, Gen. 1:3 (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup>.3).

<sup>127</sup> Cf. Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 13, chap. 2.3 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 390.10–14) and TA 104–8.

<sup>128</sup> TA 120–25. Dawn and morning in the strict sense never happened on the first day, so that a full natural day, i.e., twenty-four hours, was completed only with the coming of the dawn and morning that followed evening and the first night. In the words of the Vulgate (Gen 1:5): "factumque est vespere et mane dies unus." As Brady notes, the Lombard relied on excerpts in the *Glossa* attributed to Augustine but actually from Bede (Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 13, chap. 4.2, 5.2 [Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 391.12–26, 392.11–18]).

<sup>129</sup> "Duo sequentes dies attributi sunt supremae et infimae parti mundi, firmamento scilicet, aëri, terrae et aquae" (Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 14, chap. 9.2 [Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 399.2–4]).

translucent like a crystal.<sup>130</sup> The waters above the firmament were themselves either frozen solid, impervious to fire, or in a vaporous state.<sup>131</sup>

In chapter five (“On the work of the third day”), Comestor began by substituting words taken from the Lombard’s chapter heading in distinction fourteen, chapter seven of Book Two for the words of Sacred Scripture. The texts of the Vulgate, *Vetus Latina*, and *Glossa ordinaria* were all in agreement about what God said (recorded in Genesis 1:9), namely let the waters be gathered into one place (*in locum unum*). Comestor’s opening paraphrase of Scripture — “On the third day God gathered the waters under the firmament into one place (*“IN VNVM LOCVM”*)” — closely approximated the Lombard’s chapter heading — “**De opere tertii diei quando aquae congregatae sunt in unum locum**” — in spite of the fact that the latter immediately followed this inverted reading with the one that was standard: “*Sequitur: Dixit Deus: Congregentur aquae in locum unum.*”<sup>132</sup>

Another textual detail betrays Comestor’s primary reliance on the Lombard. Following his scriptural paraphrase, Comestor again made use of the Lombard’s text, in this case the rest of chapter seven and all of chapter eight of Book Two’s distinction fourteen, to set forth two standard positions attributable to Bede, namely that the waters made room for the appearance of earth either by taking on a denser form or by sliding into openings in the earth’s surface.<sup>133</sup> Indeed, Comestor’s use of the word “matrix,” which the Lombard but not his source, Bede through the *Gloss*, had used, provides another clue to his preference for his teacher’s language. Even his summary treatment of the element air, which concluded the *History*’s fifth chapter and that was based on an excerpt in the *Gloss* attributed to Augustine, owed its inspiration to the Lombard’s summary outline of the disposition of the elements in distinction fourteen, chapter nine.<sup>134</sup>

<sup>130</sup> TA 129–34. See Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 14, chap. 2–4 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 395.15–23–396.1–12), which was based on GO (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.11<sup>a</sup>.1), which was itself based on Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:6–8 (CCL 118A, 10.241–68), who, as Brady notes, was relying at least in part on Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 2.5 (CSEL 28.1, 38.18–39.17). See also: GI, Gen. 1:6 *ad loc.* (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.10<sup>b</sup>).

<sup>131</sup> TA 146–47. For relevant sources please see preceding note.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. TA 168 with Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 14, chap. 7 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 397.19–398.1). Immediately following his quotation of the standard scriptural wording, the Lombard reverted to his own: “*Tertii diei opus est congregatio aquarum in unum locum*” (*ibid.*).

<sup>133</sup> TA 168–73. Cf. Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 14, chap. 7–8.1 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 397.20–398.13), which is based on GO (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.11<sup>b</sup>.5), which was itself taken from Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:6–8 (CCL 118A.12.325–13.342).

<sup>134</sup> Cf. TA 192–95 with Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 14, chap. 9.2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 398.25–399.13).

Comestor opened chapter six of the *History* (“On the work of the fourth day”) with an idea — that the adornment of creation proceeds from the heavens downwards, as does its arrangement — going back from Peter Lombard through the *Glossa ordinaria* to St. Augustine.<sup>135</sup> Moreover, the scriptural paraphrase that followed<sup>136</sup> — “FECIT ENIM EADEM DIE *LVMINARIA: SOLEM ET LVNAM ET STELLAS*” — owed as much to Peter Lombard (“Quarta enim die ornatum est firmamentum sole et luna et stellis”) and perhaps also to Josephus (“Quarta autem die ornauit caelum sole et luna aliisque sideribus”) as it did to Genesis 1:16 (“fecitque Deus duo magna luminaria luminare maius ut praeesset diei et luminare minus ut praeesset nocti et stellas”).<sup>137</sup> Comestor proceeded to use solutions taken from the Lombard for a series of difficulties traditionally associated with the creation of the great lights on the fourth day: why was it necessary that the moon and the stars should illumine the night? Was the creation of the sun superfluous in that there already existed a luminous cloud serving the same purpose? What happened to that cloud after the sun’s creation?<sup>138</sup>

One gloss in particular from the sixth chapter of the *Historia Genesis* typified Comestor’s use of the *Sentences* as a bridge back into the tradition. Addressing himself to the line — “in signa et tempora et dies et annos” — of Genesis 1:14, Comestor reproduced a concise gloss from the *Glossa interlinearis*: “ut scilicet *SIGNA* sint serenitatis et tempestatis.”<sup>139</sup> His likely prox-

<sup>135</sup> “Quarto die quae disposerat coepit ornare rebus illis quae infra mundum uniuersum congruis motibus aggerentur. Plantae enim, quia terrae haerent, ad dispositionem terrae quasi magis spectant, et sicut dispositionem, sic et ornatum inchoavit a superioribus” (TA 197–200). Comestor’s most likely source was chapter 9.3 of distinction fourteen of Book Two (Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 14, chap. 9.3 [Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 399.14–16]), which was itself based on the *Gloss* (GO, Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.12<sup>b</sup>.1), which was itself based on Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 2.13 (CSEL 28.1, 53.1–14). The Lombard, however, also made the same point in *II Sent.*, dist. 13, chap. 1 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 389.9–15).

<sup>136</sup> TA 200–201.

<sup>137</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 14, chap. 9.2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 399.9); and Flavius Josephus, *The Latin Josephus I: Introduction and Text — The Antiquities: Books I–V*, ed. Franz Blatt, 1.31 (Copenhagen, 1958), 127.12–13.

<sup>138</sup> Cf. TA 205–9 with Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 14, chap. 10 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 399.17–25); TA 209–11 with Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 13, chap. 5.3 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 392.19–24), which was itself a reworking of the GO (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.12<sup>b</sup>.1), which originated with Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1.1 (CSEL 28.1, 16.8–23); and finally TA 211–14 with Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 13, chap. 5.4 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 393.1–4), which was taken both from Hugh of Saint Victor, *De sacramentis*, 1.1.15 (PL 176: 198D–199A) and the *Gloss* (GO, Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup>.3), which was itself based on Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1.1 (CSEL 28.1, 16.8–17.16).

<sup>139</sup> Cf. GI, Gen. 1:14 *ad loc.* (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.12<sup>b</sup>) with TA 215–16.

imate source, however, was the Lombard, whose own gloss — “Sunt enim *in signa serenitatis et tempestatis*” — in chapter eleven (the concluding chapter of distinction fourteen and the next link in Comestor’s systematic progression through the first half of Book Two) came straight from the *Glossa interlinearis*. Comestor used the glosses in the *Glossa interlinearis* repeatedly in his hexaemeral treatment. Wherever possible, however, he started with his teacher’s account.

Peter Lombard’s treatment of the fifth and sixth days of creation in Book Two of the *Sentences* was cursory. Nevertheless, Peter Comestor, moving onto distinction fifteen, continued to use the Lombard’s account as his point of departure in the *History*. In chapter seven, he again substituted the Lombard’s wording for that of Sacred Scripture, in this case paraphrasing Genesis 1:20 with key words from the heading to chapter one, distinction fifteen, of Book Two.<sup>140</sup> In chapter eight, he skipped over the Lombard’s chapter two of distinction fifteen, to the problems considered in chapters three and four. Comestor reversed the Lombard’s order, considering first whether the tiny creatures that arise from cadavers or from various moist substances were created before or after the Fall, and second whether harmful animals were created before or after the Fall.<sup>141</sup> For both chapters three and four of distinction fifteen, Book Two, Peter Lombard relied on the *Gloss*, which, as Brady notes, he edited to suit his purposes.<sup>142</sup> Here also Comestor still followed his mentor’s outline, although certain details show clearly that he went behind the Lombard to the *Gloss* and other sources.<sup>143</sup>

The examples I have selected show that Comestor based the *History*’s creation account in chapters three through eight on the Lombard’s hexaemeral outline in Book Two, distinctions thirteen through fifteen, chapter four. In chapters five and six of distinction fifteen, the Lombard brought to a close his own account of the form and timing of creation. In spite of the fact that he had already clearly set forth the split in the tradition over whether crea-

<sup>140</sup> Cf. TA 252 with Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 15, chap. 1 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 400.15–20).

<sup>141</sup> Cf. TA 284–92 with Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 15, chap. 4 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 401.16–27), and TA 292–304 with Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 15, chap. 3 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 401.6–15). For both Peters, and in particular the treatment of animals harming other animals, see GO (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.14<sup>b</sup>.4–5).

<sup>142</sup> Cf. Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 15, chapters 3–4 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 401.6–27, and the notes provided in the apparatus by Brady) with GO (Turnhout, 1992, vol. 1.14<sup>b</sup>.4–5).

<sup>143</sup> Comestor, for example, addressed the question for what purpose animals harm other animals, which, although it is part of the *Gloss* excerpt of Augustine, is nevertheless omitted in the Lombard’s treatment. Other details, such as, for example, Comestor’s discussion of the question why animals harm the corpses of dead men, which neither Augustine nor the *Gloss* nor the Lombard addresses, show that Comestor also consulted other sources.



tion was simultaneous or was rather a work of six days, the Lombard restated the debate.<sup>144</sup> After bringing up a new topic in the chapter heading of the first section of chapter five — “**Why was man made after all things?**” — he digressed, setting forth in the next and last section of the same chapter and in chapter six a comprehensive and accurate statement of the two traditional positions as well as his own marked preference:

Chapter 5.2: **Before he will treat of the making of man, he treats more fully of the manner of the first creation of things, which he touched on briefly above: where the Catholic men seem to disagree, with some saying that the world was thus created simultaneously in matter and form, while others through an interval of time and days.** . . . But before we will treat of the creation of man, let us make more clear, considering more deeply that which we touched on briefly above. For in this distinction of things, Catholic thinkers are found to disagree, as we said above: with some saying that things were created and rendered distinct according to their own species over an interval of six days; since the letter of Genesis seems more to support and the Church approves the opinions of these men, we have therefore to this point taught more zealously how out of that common matter first things were made unformed, afterwards the genera of corporeal things were formed distinctly over the book of six days.<sup>145</sup>

Chapter 6.1: **Here he considers the opinion of those who argue that all things were made simultaneously.** It seems, however, to others that all things were not formed over an interval of time, but came forth into existence simultaneously already formed. Which position Augustine, in his *On Genesis according to the Letter*, tries to show in many ways, saying that the four elements came into existence formed such as they now appear, and that heaven was adorned with the stars; certain things, however, were created then not formally but materially, which afterwards through the advance of time were rendered distinct in form, such as vegetation, trees, and perhaps animals. These say that everything, therefore, was created in the beginning itself of time, but certain things formally according to the likenesses we see that they have, such as the greater parts of the world; certain, however, materially only.<sup>146</sup>

In the second section of chapter six, the Lombard provided Augustine’s explanation, mediated through the *Summa sententiarum*, that what God accomplished simultaneously nevertheless had to be expressed in human lan-

<sup>144</sup> The first and main text, which I translate above, is at Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 12, chap. 2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 384–85).

<sup>145</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 15, chap. 5.2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 402.6–18).

<sup>146</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 15, chap. 6.1 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 402.19–403.8). Brady, who provides in the apparatus the series of relevant citations to Augustine’s *De Genesi ad litteram* and the *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber*, nevertheless also notes that the Lombard himself relied on the *Gloss* for his information.

guage as a succession of events.<sup>147</sup> The six days recounted in Sacred Scripture, therefore, did not indicate a creation over time but rather referred to necessary logical distinctions.<sup>148</sup>

Unlike his mentor, Peter Comestor ended his treatment of the form and timing of creation in chapter eight of the *History* without providing an explicit statement of his own position. He did, however, continue his systematic progression through Book Two of the *Sentences*, picking up the thread of the Lombard's argument in chapter nine of the *History*.<sup>149</sup> The important point is that, despite his thoroughness, Comestor adapted the Lombard's material to an entirely different type of work, reworking his mentor's text so thoroughly and effectively that scholars looking for a connection between the work of Peter Lombard and his most famous student overlooked the *History* entirely.<sup>150</sup>

---

<sup>147</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 15, chap. 6.2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 403.9–15) and accompanying references provided by Brady.

<sup>148</sup> Peter Lombard, *II Sent.*, dist. 15, chap. 6.2 (Grottaferrata, 1971, 1.2, 403.15–19).

<sup>149</sup> As always, Comestor rearranged the Lombard's material to suit his purposes. He started off chapter nine with a reworked version of Book Two, distinction sixteen, chapters 1, 2, and 3.1, 5, and 6. In chapter ten, he went back to distinction fifteen, chapter 9.1. In chapter eleven, he made use of chapter 9.2 of distinction fifteen as well as chapters 7, 8.1 and 2, and 10.1. He did the same through the twenty-fifth chapter of the *Historia Genesis*, where Comestor's systematic use of the Lombard ended with the twenty-third distinction of Book Two. Up to that point, Comestor's use of the *Sentences* was comprehensive in that the Lombard's work provided not only a principal point of entry but also raw material and a rough outline. Comestor did not use everything that was in the *Sentences*, but his treatment of the first three chapters of Genesis was pregnant with the Lombard's ideas and material. As with chapters three through eight, Comestor's work in subsequent chapters can be traced directly to particular distinctions and chapters in Book Two of the *Sentences*. For evidence of and precise references documenting Comestor's use of the *Sentences* in chapters nine through twenty-five of the *Historia Genesis*, consult the second level of the apparatus to Textual Appendix A, 26–54, in Clark, "A Study of Comestor's Method" (n. 23 above).

<sup>150</sup> It is beyond the scope of this paper not only to inquire into the details of Comestor's complex and novel method in composing the *History* but also to attempt to classify Comestor's work in the context of twelfth-century theology. It would, however, be worthwhile to point out what Comestor was not. He was not an abbreviator of the *Sentences*, as were, for example, Magister Bandinus, *Sententiae libri quatuor* (PL 192: 964–1111), and Gandulphus of Bologna, *Sententiarum libri quatuor* (ed. J. de Walter [Vienna, 1924]). For a good orientation to these men, as well as secondary literature on the works that they produced, see Marcia Colish, "From the Sentence Collection to the Sentence Commentary and the Summa: Parisian Scholastic Theology, 1130–1215," *Manuels, programmes de cours et techniques d'enseignement dans les universités médiévales*, ed. Jacqueline Hamesse (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1994), 9–29, and eadem, "The Development of Lombardian Theology, 1160–1215," *Centres of Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, ed. Jan Willem Drijvers and Alasdair A. MacDonald (Leiden, 1995), 210. Peter Lombard's abbreviators consciously imitated the *Sentences*, following his division of theology into four books, and retaining his structure of distinctions and questions as well. Their debt to the

By now it should be obvious that a salient feature of Comestor's adaptation of the *Sentences* to the narrative framework of the *History* was its economy of expression and explanation. Comestor's accounts of darkness and light in creation and of the timing of creation, though closely based on the Lombard's accounts, were nevertheless less explicit. Where the format of the *Sentences* gave Peter Lombard the freedom to repeat himself, sometimes repeatedly and at length, Peter Comestor always said less rather than more in the *History*. Like his use of the *Gloss* and the sources behind it, Comestor's handling of the Lombard was ordered to producing a seamless narrative. The fact that his extensive reliance on the *Sentences* in his account of the first part of Genesis has remained so effectively hidden from view is further proof of how artful his narrative technique was. Comestor took what he needed from the *Sentences* and recast it into the framework that he created for the *History*.

As I noted at the beginning of this paper, the two Peters were linked not only in legend but in life. My examination of Comestor's incorporation of traditional material from Book Two of the *Sentences* into the *Historia Genesis* establishes a solid connection between the work of the *Magister historiarum* and that of his teacher, the *Magister sententiarum*; the *History* and the *Sentences* are themselves linked not only in legend but in fact. Historians, of course, have long grouped the *History* with biblical commentaries, but Comestor's use of the *Sentences* in the *History* calls into question longstanding scholarly assumptions about the latter work. Comestor, after all, was a disciple of Peter Lombard and was part of the same historical movement in

---

Lombard's *Sentences* is both conscious and instantly recognizable. Comestor's, by contrast, has remained latent in all probability since the mid-thirteenth century, when the two greatest commentators on the *History*, Stephen Langton, who produced two complete commentaries on that work, and Hugh of St. Cher, both used the *Sentences* to revise and correct Comestor's use of the *Sentences*. For an up-to-date orientation to their commentaries on the *Sentences*, see Mark J. Clark, "The Commentaries on Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* of Stephen Langton, Pseudo-Langton, and Hugh of St. Cher," *Sacris erudiri* (forthcoming, 2005). Moreover, as Colish notes, Gandulph and the other abbreviators intentionally simplified the *Sentences*, dispensing with the Lombard's careful evaluation of sources, in order to render them "more accessible to beginners" (Colish, "Parisian Scholastic Theology," 17–19 [quoted text at 19]). Comestor, by contrast, even though he too simplified the material that he took from the *Sentences*, produced a work that bore no resemblance whatsoever either to that of the Lombard or to those of his abbreviators. Indeed, a cursory comparison of Comestor's hexaemeral account in his *Historia Genesis* with that of Magister Bandinus, for example, reveals the gulf between the aims and methods of the two men. There is, to be sure, common material, as one would expect from two authors relying heavily on the Lombard. Cf., for example, Bandinus, *II Sent.*, distinctions 11–14 (PL 192: 1040B–1043BC) with TA 40–313. Nevertheless, in stark contrast to the Lombard's abbreviators, Comestor's use of his master's work lies hidden beneath a carefully constructed historical narrative.

theology. At the very least, Comestor's *History* deserves careful study to determine exactly what type of work it was.<sup>151</sup>

In the course of this article, I have suggested that Comestor can be seen attempting a theological *via media* between the old way of theology, namely commenting on the Bible, and the new ways that had taken firm root in the fertile theological soil of the twelfth century. Indeed, what external evidence there is suggests that how Comestor's successors in the twelfth- and thirteenth-century schools viewed the *History* evolved in step with developments in theology. In the dedication, written in 1267, of his *Opus minus* to Pope Clement IV, the Oxford Franciscan Roger Bacon discussed the *History* in the context of his dismay that study of the *Sentences* had displaced study of the Bible in theology.<sup>152</sup> He could not understand how theological faculties had abandoned "this text, given to the world from the mouth of God and the saints."<sup>153</sup> The Bible, after all, had been until recently the only theo-

---

<sup>151</sup> In this regard, the words of George Lacombe about Comestor's *History*, written in 1930, remain apt today: "There was a time when the *Historia Scholastica* was one of the most widely used books in Christendom. Today it is almost a miracle to find any one who has read it" (George Lacombe, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton," pt. 1, *Archives d'histoire et littéraire du moyen âge* 5: 5–151, at 24). More recently, Jacques LeGoff lamented the fact that, in spite of Comestor's exalted medieval reputation, he remains "little studied and poorly known" (Jacques LeGoff, *La Naissance du Purgatoire* [Paris, 1981], 213; Engl. trans: *The Birth of Purgatory* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984]).

<sup>152</sup> A portion of the dedication is reprinted at H. Denifle and A. Chatelain, eds., *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* (Paris, 1889), 473–74. Bacon's complaint was passionate:

Quantum peccatum [studii theologie] est quod preferitur una Summa magistralis *textus* facultatis theologie, scilicet *liber Sententiarum*, nam ibi est tota gloria theologorum, que facit onus unius equi. Et postquam illum legerit quis, jam presumit se de magistro theologie, quamvis non audiat tricesimam partem sui textus. Et bacalarius qui legit textum succumbit lectori *Sententiarum Parisius* et ubique, et in omnibus honoratur et preferitur. Nam ille qui legit *Sententias*, habet principalem horam legendi secundum suam voluntatem, habet et socium et cameram apud religiosa. Sed qui legit *Bibliam*, caret his et mendicat horam legendi, secundum quod placet lectori *Sententiarum*. Et ille qui legit *Sententias*, disputat et pro magistro habetur; reliquus qui textum legit, non potest disputare, sicut fuit hoc anno Bononie et in multis aliis locis, quod est absurdum. Manifestum est igitur quod textus illius facultatis subjicitur uni Summe magistrali (ibid., 473).

Although Bacon uses the term *Biblia* once in this passage, he mainly refers to the Bible as "the Text" and emphasizes repeatedly that the Bible is the text *par excellence* of a theological faculty. Bacon's language shows his impatience with a situation in which those who read the *Sentences* rather than the Bible enjoyed all theological prerogatives.

<sup>153</sup> "Nam omnis alia facultas utitur textu suo, et legitur textus in scolis, quia statuto textu suo solum statuuntur omnia que pertinent ad facultatem, quia propter hoc sunt textus facti, [et] hic longe magis, quia textus hic de ore Dei et sanctorum allatus [est] mundo" (ibid.). Bacon's argument seems unanswerable, since unlike other faculties, which must pro-

logical text, and its scope was such that a lifetime of study would be insufficient to master it.<sup>154</sup>

Bemoaning theology's move away from the Bible in favor of the Lombard's *Sentences*, Bacon urged that the *History* be used instead:

Alexander was the first who read [the *Sentences*] and then it was read everywhere, just as the *Book of Histories* was accustomed to be read and is still read very rarely. And it is amazing that the *Book of Sentences* has been so exalted, since the *Book of Histories* is more properly of theology. For it follows closely the biblical text from its beginning to its end, explaining it. And the *Book of Sentences* does not stick to the biblical text, but wanders outside of that text along the way of inquiry. If therefore any *summa* should be preferred in the study of theology, it should be the *Book of Histories* that has already been produced, or another should be produced anew, in order that any [theological] treatise should be made certain of the history of the Sacred Text.<sup>155</sup>

Bacon was not, of course, advocating that the *History* replace the Bible, which he clearly considered to be the crucial text in theological studies. But given that the Bible had already been supplanted, he much preferred the *History* to the *Sentences*. The former was, in his view, far closer to the Bible and hence more theological than the *Sentences*. The *History* then would have suited Bacon principally as an alternative to the Lombard's text, since it struck a middle way between the biblical ideal and the contemporary way of studying theology.<sup>156</sup>

---

duce their own texts to establish the proper objects for study in their respective schools, a theological faculty is unlikely to improve on one given by God.

<sup>154</sup> "Et est ita magnus quod vix sufficeret aliquis lector ad perlegendum eum in tota vita sua. . . . Deinde sancti doctores non usi sunt nisi hoc textu, neque sapientes antiqui, quorum aliquos vidimus, ut fuit dominus Robertus episcopus Lincolniensis et frater Adam de Marisco, et alii maximi viri" (ibid.). The word *magnus* can be understood to refer to the size and extent of the Bible, as I have here rendered it, or it could instead be meant to convey that text's greatness. Either meaning makes sense in context. Bacon's eyewitness testimony — "some of whom we have seen" — underscores how recent the transition away from theology based solely upon the Bible had been.

<sup>155</sup> "Alexander fuit primus qui legit et tunc legebatur aliquando, sicut *liber Historiarum* solebat legi, et adhuc legitur rarissime. Et mirum est quod sic est exaltatus liber *Sententiarum*, quia *liber Historiarum* est magis proprie theologie. Nam prosequitur textum a principio usque in finem, exponendo ipsum. Et *liber Sententiarum* non adheret textui, sed vagatur extra textum per viam inquisitionis. Si igitur aliqua *Summa* deberet preferri in studio theologie, debet *liber Historiarum* factus vel de novo fiendus; ut scilicet aliquis tractatus certus fieret de historia sacri textus" (ibid., 473–74).

<sup>156</sup> Research into the *History's* place in developing theology would be interesting in this connection. See Marie-Dominique Chenu, *La théologie au douzième siècle* (n. 6 above) and idem, *La théologie comme science au XIIIe siècle*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1948), and more recently, G. R. Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford, 1980).

The *History*, however, had not always been seen as an antidote to the *Sentences*. Almost a half a century earlier, William of Auvergne complained that “some are satisfied to have heard the preliminaries to Holy Scripture, such as the *Histories* or some other works. The rest they neglect.”<sup>157</sup> Like Bacon, William of Auvergne wished to preserve the centrality of Sacred Scripture in theological education. Unlike the Oxford Franciscan, he viewed the *History* as a threat to that aim. Their different perceptions of the *History* reflect the altered circumstances of a half-century of developments in theology. The *History* was initially, like the *Sentences*, part of a movement in theology away from strict adherence to the biblical text. In that context, it complemented and paralleled the *Sentences* in theological education. As William of Auvergne’s complaint shows, however, the *History* was closely associated with the Scriptures from the first. By Bacon’s time, after a fissure had occurred in theology between the *Sentences* and the Bible, the *History* fell to the side of Scripture once and for all.

My study, however, of the link between the *Sentences* and the *History* suggests that Bacon’s view of the latter work as a compromise of sorts between two ways of doing theology may be accurate. Indeed, we cannot hope to understand the *History*, a work that may have been *sui generis*, without a thorough account of its structure and of Comestor’s method in producing it. Only in the light of such an account will we be able to ascertain with precision not only the *History*’s place in the developing theology of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but also Comestor’s achievement as a theologian. Unlike his theological successors in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, we may have underestimated both Comestor and the *History*.

---

<sup>157</sup> Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, 214 (n. 3 above), where she provides the translation and a citation.

APPENDIX:  
HISTORIA GENESIS, 1–8

*List of Manuscripts*

I reproduce below an eclectic, working edition of the first eight chapters of the *Historia Genesis*. I rely primarily on two early manuscripts. The first is C (BNF, MS Lat. 16943), which I have examined in person; internal evidence establishes the date of the manuscript's origin as 1183.<sup>1</sup> The second is M (Vienna, NB, MS Lat. 363); this manuscript is datable to between 1180 and 1183.<sup>2</sup> Both present excellent, legible texts. In general, I start with C but use M with confidence.<sup>3</sup> Together they form the twin pillars of my working edition of the *Historia Genesis*.<sup>4</sup> I make use of three other, early (before 1215) manuscripts: E (BL MS Royal 7 F.III), datable to 1191–92;<sup>5</sup> F (Durham Cathedral MS B I 34),

<sup>1</sup> At the close of the *History*, there is the following passage written in the hand of the copyist: “Anno Incarnati Verbi MCLXXXIII [scriptus est liber iste *marginis*] a Iohanne Monoculo, quo rex Francorum Ph[ilippus], filius Hludovici regis, passus est horribilem guerram a comite Flandrensi Ph[ilippo] et comite Theobaldo et cometissa Campaniensi et duce Burgundiensi et Stephano comite Blesensi. Liber Sancti Petri Corbeiensis. Qui furatus fuerit anathema sit.” There are two other manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale copied by this same scribe, John One-Eye: lat. 11576 and 11700. Philipp Augustus reigned as king of France from 1179 to 1223. He was the son of Louis VII, king of France from 1137 until 1180. They shared the throne from November of 1179, when Philipp Augustus was fourteen years of age, until the death of Louis in 1180. There is one more pertinent piece of evidence bearing on the date, a heading at the top of folio 2r<sup>a</sup> that introduces this copy of the *History* as follows: “Incipit prologus epistolaris ad Guillelmum tunc Senonensem postea vero Remensem archiepiscopum.” William, who was appointed archbishop of Sens in 1167, officially took up his duties in 1168 and remained there until 1176, when he was transferred in the same capacity to Rheims. Comestor's prologue, written either in 1167 or 1168, dedicates the work to William, archbishop of Sens. This manuscript's heading is therefore consistent with a dating to sometime after 1176, in this case to 1183.

<sup>2</sup> There is the following notice, at folio 222r<sup>b</sup>, establishing provenance and date: “Explicit liber Scholastice historie, descriptus sub obtentu domini Heinrici abbatis.” At the bottom of the folio is written: “Memento (spi eras.) scriptorum Heinrici Heinrici.” Heinrich was abbot of Mondsee from 1180–1183.

<sup>3</sup> In spite of the appearance of Agneta Sylwan's critical edition of the *Historia Genesis, Petri Comestoris scolastica historia liber Genesis* (CCM 191 [Turnhout, 2005]), I supply my own text and apparatus owing to the many discrepancies between our readings and records of these two crucial manuscripts: BNF, lat. 16943 and Vienna, ÖNB, lat. 363. For the reasons why one should use Sylwan's edition with caution, see my upcoming review in *Revue Benedictine* (2006).

<sup>4</sup> C's copy of the *History* was carefully corrected. Most of these corrections seem to be by the original scribe. Moreover, of the five early manuscripts that I used, M is the only one to get the chapter divisions right for chapters 67, 70, and 71. See Clark, “A Study of Comestor's Method” (n. 23 above), Textual Appendix A 136, 140–41. M also solves a textual corruption common to the other early manuscripts in chapter 58 (*ibid.*, 121.9).

<sup>5</sup> The colophon, beginning at folio 196, reads as follows: “Hunc librum scripsit Robertus filius Radulfi discipulus et scriptor ultimus Magistri Roberti Bonni de Bedeford quorum animae consocientur in caelis etc. . . . Scriptus est liber iste anno tertio coronationis Regis

which Mynors dates to the late twelfth century;<sup>6</sup> and S (BL MS Royal 4 D.VII), which is datable to before 1215.<sup>7</sup> I have examined these three in person. All five manuscripts are early witnesses to a text written sometime between 1169 and 1173.<sup>8</sup>

To make the structure of Comestor's *Historia Genesis* as clear as possible, I follow conventional editorial practice in setting off biblical text in italics. I highlight lemmata, however, in small caps owing to Comestor's extensive use of biblical paraphrase. Moreover, I also underline lemmata wherever Comestor substitutes for Scripture an extra-biblical source. Since I provide in the second level of the apparatus the relevant citations to biblical book, chapter, and verse for all of Comestor's biblical references, the reader can be confident of identifying the source even for those scriptural paraphrases that depart markedly from the original text.

There are three main levels to the critical apparatus provided in the Textual Appendix. The first provides textual variants. In the second level, I include references to Scripture. In the third, I identify extra-scriptural sources used by Comestor. In general, I follow the sentence structure and punctuation of C. I also adopt standardized, and largely classical, spelling. I also document certain notes appended to chapters of the *History* in some manuscripts, although they constitute a minimal part of my working edition.<sup>9</sup>

---

Ricardi, quem scribere [*sic*] fecit C. de Chanuill. bonae memoriae abbatissa beatae Mariae de Helenestow. [Elstow, co. Bedf.] in eruditionem et profectum conventus sui et ceterorum inspicientium." The reference to the third year of the kingship of Richard dates the manuscript to 1191 or 1192. The book belonged to the Benedictine Nunnery of Elstow in County Bedford.

<sup>6</sup> R. A. B. Mynors, *Durham Cathedral Manuscripts to the End of the Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1939), #133, 77. Ker and Watson, however, list this manuscript as originating at the Durham Cathedral in the late twelfth or early thirteenth centuries. Neil Ripley Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, Royal Historical Commission: Guides and Handbooks 3 (orig. publ. London, 1941, 2nd ed. London, 1964), 66. *Supplement to the Second Edition*, ed. Andrew G. Watson, Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 15 (London, 1987), 22.

<sup>7</sup> On folio 1 is the St. Albans pressmark, "B 8 gra[dus]," and the inscription: "Titulus istius libri in dorso Scolastica hystoria W. abbatis." William of Trumpington was abbot from 1214–1235. This manuscript is mentioned in the *Gesta abbatum* as caused to be written by prior Raymond under Abbot John, 1195–1214, deposed by William. This latter appropriated the books of Abbot John and gave them to the Abbey.

<sup>8</sup> See Clark, "A Study of Comestor's Method," 2 n. 3. For comprehensive descriptions of all five, together with catalogue references, see "The Commentaries on Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* of Stephen Langton, Pseudo-Langton, and Hugh of St. Cher," (n. 150 above), 50–54. See also Clark, "A Study of Comestor's Method," Introduction to the Textual Appendices, 10–14.

<sup>9</sup> For purposes of simplicity, I include in this Textual Appendix only those found in the main columns of text, whether as notes or as an integral part of the principal text, in both C and M.



*Historia Genesis*

Incipit prologus epistolaris ad Guillelmum tunc Senonensem postea uero Remensem archiepiscopum.

- Reuerendo patri et domino suo Guillelmo Dei gratia Senonensi archiepiscopo
- 5 Petrus seruus Christi presbyter Trecensis uitam bonam et exitum beatum. Causa suscepti laboris fuit instans petitio sociorum. Qui cum historiam Sacrae Scripturae in serie et glossis diffusam lectitarent breuem nimis et inexpositam opus aggredi me compulerunt, ad quod pro ueritate historiae consequenda recurrerent. In quo sic animus stilo imperauit ut a dictis patrum non recederem, licet nouitas
- 10 fauorabilis sit et mulcens aures. Porro a cosmographia Mosi inchoans riuulum historicum deduxi usque ad ascensionem Saluatoris, pelagus mysteriorum peritioribus relinquens in quibus et uetera prosequi et noua cudere licet. De historiis quoque ethnicorum quaedam incidentia pro ratione temporum inserui instar riuuli qui secus alueum diuerticula quae inuenerit replens praeterfluere tamen
- 15 non cessat. Verumtamen quia stilo rudi opus est lima uobis pater inclite limam reseruauit ut huic operi Deo uolente et correptio uestra splendorem et auctoritas praebeat perennitatem. Per omnia benedictus Deus amen.

Item praefatio Magistri Petri Manducatoris in Historia Veteris et Noui Testamenti.

- 20 Imperatoriae maiestatis est tres in palatio habere mansiones: auditorium uel consistorium in quo iura decernit; cenaculum in quo cibaria distribuit; thalamum in quo quiescit. Ad hunc modum Imperator noster, qui imperat uentis et mari, mundum habet pro auditorio, ubi ad nutum eius omnia disponuntur; unde illud:

---

**Prologus**, 2/3 Incipit . . . archiepiscopum] *om.* **EF** incipit praefatio epistolaris in Historiam scholasticam de Ueteri et Nouo Testamento **S** 4/17 Reuerendo . . . amen] *om.* **EF** 4 Reuerendo] reuerentissimo **S** 5 seruus . . . Trecensis] p. T. s. C. **M** 6 laboris] operis **S** 8 consequenda recurrerent] *tr.* **S** 9 recederem] recederet **S** 10 cosmographia] cosmographiam *et add.* mundi scriptura **M**<sup>a.m. sup. 1</sup>; Mosi] a Mose **M**; inchoans] incipiens **M** 11 ascensionem] Domini *add.* **M** 16 Deo] *om.* **M**; correptio] correctio **MS** **Proemium**, 18–19 Item . . . Testamenti] incipit Historia scholastica praefatio incipit **E** proemium est hic sequens prologum et cum differentia tali: in prologo nullam facit mentionem sequentis operis; in proemio praelibationem sequentium cum benivolentiae captione qua sic incipit: incipit liber scholasticae historiae; praelibatio operis sequentis **M** incipit Historia scholastica theologiae disciplinae **S** 20 est] *om.* **F**; tres . . . palatio] in palatio tres **EF** 23 nutum eius] *tr.* **M**; unde] secundum **S**; illud] *om.* **FM**

---

**Prologus**, 6/7 historiam – serie] Cfr. Hugh of Saint Victor, *Didascalicon* 5.2 (ed. Buttmer, 96.5–13).

8 ueritate historiae] Cfr. Hugh of Saint Victor, *Didascalicon* 4.6, 5.2 (ed. Buttmer, 76.18–19, 96.19).

10/15 Cfr. Greg. I, *Moralia in Iob* (CCL 143.4.96–105).

---

**Proemium**, 20 Cfr. Ioh. 14:2. 22 Cfr. Matth. 8:27; Marc. 4:40; Luc. 8:25.

*caelum et terram ego impleo.* Secundum hanc dicitur Dominus; unde: *Domini est*  
 25 *terra et plenitudo eius.* Animam iusti pro thalamo, quia *deliciae* sunt ei *esse cum*  
*filiis hominum.* Secundum hanc dicitur sponsus. Sacram Scripturam pro cena-  
 culo, in qua sic suos inebriat ut sobrios reddat; unde: *ambulauimus in domo Dei*  
*cum consensu* id est in Sacra Scriptura id ipsum sapientes. Secundum hanc dicitur  
 30 paterfamilias. Cenaculi huius tres sunt partes: fundamentum, paries, tectum.  
 Historia fundamentum est, cuius tres sunt species: annalis, kalendaria, ephemer-  
 a.\* Allegoria paries superinnitens, quae per factum aliud factum figurat. Tro-  
 pologia doma culminis superpositum, quae per factum quid a nobis sit faciendum  
 insinuat. Prima planior, secunda acutior, tertia suauior. A fundamento loquendi  
 sumemus principium immo ab ipsius fundamenti principio Deo iuuante, qui  
 35 omnium princeps est et principium.

\* Annalis historia est quae per annum facta est. Kalendaria est quae in uno  
 quoque mense facta est id est factum insigne aliquod quod in uno mense factum  
 est. Ephemera est quod repente factum est id est uno die uel in parte mensis;  
 hac similitudine ephemera est piscis qui uno die nascitur eodemque moritur.

40 Cap. I – De prima creatione caeli et terrae.

IN PRINCIPIO ERAT VERBUM ET VERBUM ERAT PRINCIPIVM, IN QVO ET PER

---

24 *impleo*] adimplebo **M**; hanc] hoc **F** 25 *et . . . eius*] etc. **F**; thalamo] habet *add. S*; ei] ibi requiescere et *add. F* ibi quiescere *add. ES* 26 dicitur sponsus] et anima cuiusque iusti *add. D* et anima cuiusque *add. E, tr. M* 27 sic suos] *tr. M*; *ambulauimus . . . Dei*] a. i. d. Domini **F** i. d. D. a. **M** 28 hanc] hoc **F** 29 Cenaculi huius] *tr. EF*; tres . . . partes] s. t. p. **F**; paries] et *add. S* 30 fundamentum est] *tr. F*; tres sunt] *tr. F* 31 superinnitens] superimminens (uel superinnitens *add. sup. l.*) **M**; per factum] aliquod *add. M*; factum<sup>2</sup>] *om. M* 32 doma] dogma **CEF**; factum] id quod factum est **EF**S; a] *om. M* 33 suauior] Historia annalis est factum quod per annum factum (est *sup. l.*). Kalendaria quae in uno mense facta (est *sup. l.*) id est factum aliquod insigne quod in uno mense factum (est *sup. l.*). Ephemera est quod repente factum est id est in uno die uel in parte mensis id est hac similitudine ephemera est piscis qui eo die quo nascitur moritur *pars textus principalis hoc loco, sed uide adnotationem infra M* 33/34 loquendi . . . principium] s. p. l. **D** l. sumamus p. **M** 34 Deo] eo **EFM** 36/39 Annalis . . . moritur] *adnotatio segregata in textu, manu textus principalis CS om. EF uide supra M* 36 Annalis historia] *tr. S*; quae<sup>1</sup>] factum quod **S**; facta] factum **S**; Kalendaria] historia *add. S* 37 insigne aliquod] *tr. S* 38 est quod] *tr. S*; est<sup>3</sup>] *om. S* 39 eodemque] eo die **S** **I**, 40 De . . . terrae] *om. E*; prima] *om. FMS*; caeli] empyrei *praem. FS*; terrae] quattuor elementorum **FMS** 41 **PRINCIPIVM**] principii principium **M**

---

**I**, 41/42 *IN*<sup>1</sup> – mundum] Cfr. Ambrose, *Exam.*, 1.2.5; 1.4.15; 1.5.19; 1.8.29 (CSEL 32.1.4.21–24, 13.4–15, 15.17–16.1, 28.10–13); Aug., *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 1.2.3–4 (PL 34: 174–75); Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* 2–3 (CSEL 28.1.459.12–17, 461.21–25); Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1:1 (CSEL 28.1.6.11–21, 7.10–17, 8.10–21, 10.7–17); Ps.-Bede, *De sex dierum creatione* (PL 93: 207–8); Ps.-Bede, *Expositio in primum librum Mosi* (PL 91: 190–91); Honorius Augustodunensis, *Hexaemeron* 1 (PL 172: 253–254).

---

24 Ier. 23:24. 24/25 Ps. 23:1. 25/26 Prou. 8:31. 27 sic – reddat] Cfr. Ps. 35:9; Ps. 64:10; Cant. 5:1. 27/28 Ps. 54:15. **I**, 41/42 Gen. 1:1; Ioh. 1:1–3; cfr. Col. 1:15–17 et Hebr. 1:2.

QVOD PATER *CREAVIT* MVNDVM. MVNDVS quattuor modis dicitur. Quandoque caelum empyreum mundus dicitur propter sui munditiam; quandoque sensilis mundus, qui a Graecis pan, a Latinis omne dictus est, quia philosophus empyreum non cognouit. Quandoquo sola regio sublunaris mundus dicitur, quia haec  
 45 sola animantia nobis nota habet, de qua: *princeps mundi huius eicitur foras*. Quandoque homo mundus dicitur, quia in se totius mundi imaginem repraesentat. Vnde a Domino omnis creatura dictus est, et Graecus ipsum microcosmum id est minorem mundum uocat. Empyreum autem et sensilem mundum et sub-  
 50 lunarem regionem *CREAVIT* Deus id est de nihilo fecit; hominem uero *CREAVIT* id est plasmavit. De creatione ergo illorum trium inquit legis lator: *In principio creauit Deus caelum et terram: caelum id est continens et contentum id est caelum empyreum et angelicam naturam, terram materiam omnium corporum id est quattuor elementa id est mundum sensilem ex his constantem*. Quidam *caelum*  
 55 superiores partes mundi sensilis intellegunt, *terram* inferiores et palpabiles. Hebraeus habet eloim, quod tam singulare quam plurale est id est Deus uel dii,

---

43 caelum . . . dicitur] e. c. m. d. **EM** m. d. e. c. **F** e. c. d. m. **S**; sensilis] sensibilis **M** 44 omne] *sup. l.* **M**; dictus] dictum **ES**; philosophus empyreum] quod empyreum est philosophus **S** 45 Quandoque] aliquando **M**; mundus dicitur] *tr.* **M** 46 habet] habent **M**; qua] dicitur *add.* **S**; *eicitur*] eicietur **EFMS** 47 Quandoque] etiam *add.* **FS** aliquando **M**; mundus dicitur] *tr.* **F** 48 et] *sup. l.* **C**; microcosmum] microcosmum **C** 49 sensilem] sensibilem **M** 51 ergo] uero **M** 52 *caelum*<sup>2</sup>] *om.* **D** 52/53 caelum empyreum] *tr.* **E** 53 naturam] uel creaturam *add.* **E**; *terram*] id est *add.* **E**; corporum] corporalium **M** 55 partes . . . sensilis] partes mundi sensibilis **M** partes sensilis mundi **S** 56 Hebraeus] autem *add.* **F** tantum *add.* **M**; eloim] ubi nos habemus Deus *add.* **S**; Deus uel dii] di uel dii **C** dii uel domini **EF** domini uel dii **M** dii uel domini uel iudices **S** *scripsi*

---

42 PATER] GI, Gen. 1:1 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>.

48/49 Graecus – vocat] Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesisim* 1:37 (PL 131: 57).

49/51 Empyreum – plasmavit] GO, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>, quod ex Ps-Bede, *Expositio in primum librum Mosi* (PL 91: 191); cfr. Basil, *Homiliae IX in Hexaemeron*, 1.7, 2.2–3, trans. Eust. (ed. J. Guarnier [Paris, 1839]), 9–10, 18–19; Ambrose, *Exam.*, 1.1.2; 1.2.5; 1.3.8–9, 11; 1.4.12; 1.5.18; 1.7.25–27 (CSEL 32.1.3.13–17, 4.24–5.3, 7.8–9, 8.5–9, 9.20–10.2, 15.3–12, 23.10–12, 19–24, 24.12–19, 25.22–23); Aug., *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 1.2.4, 1.6.10 (PL 34: 175, 178); Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* 1 (CSEL 28.1.459.18–460. 5); et Andrew of Saint Victor, *Expositio super Heptateuchum*, *In Genesisim* 1:1 (CCM 53.6.8–12), quod ex GO, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>.

51/55 De – palpabiles] GI, Gen. 1:1 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup> et GO, vol. 1.8<sup>b</sup>, quae ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1:1 (CSEL 28.1.4.8–5.9); Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* 2–3 (CSEL 28.1.464.4–17); cfr. Basil, *Hom. in Hex.*, 1:7, trans. Eust., (ed. J. Guarnier [Paris, 1839]), 10–11; Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesisim* 1:1 (PL 131: 54–55); Ps-Bede, *Expositio in primum librum Mosi* (PL 91: 191); Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* 1:1 (CCM 53.6.15–16–7.36–38, 42–45) et Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 2, cap. 1.2–4 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.336.20, 337.16–17, 22–23).

56/57 Hebraeus – est] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 2, cap. 1.2–4 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971]), 1.2.65.26–31; cfr. Hier., *Heb. quaest. in Gen.*, 6:2 (CCL 72.9); uide etiam: Peter

---

46 Ioh. 12:31. 48 Cfr. Marc. 16:15. 51/57 *in* – *CREAVIT*] Gen. 1:1.

quia tres personae unus Deus creator est. Cum uero dixit Moses *CREAVIT* trium errores elidit: Platonis, Aristotelis, Epicuri. Plato dixit tria fuisse ab aeterno: deum, ideas, ylem, et in principio de yle mundum factum. Aristoteles duo: mundum et opificem, qui de duobus principiis scilicet materia et forma operatus est sine principio et operatur sine fine. Epicurus duo: inane et atomos, et in principio natura quasdam atomos solidauit in terram, alias in aquam, alias in aera, alias in ignem. Moses uero solum Deum aeternum prophetauit et sine praeiacenti materia mundum creatum. Creatus est autem *IN PRINCIPIO* sic: *in principio fecit* 60 *Deus caelum et terram, IN PRINCIPIO* id est in Filio, et iterandum est *IN PRINCIPIO* temporis scilicet; coaeva enim sunt mundus et tempus. Sicut autem solus Deus aeternus, sic mundus sempiternus id est semper aeternus id est temporali-

---

57 Deus] *praem.* unus **E**; est] *om.* **ES** 58 fuisse] principia *add.* **ES** 59 de . . . mundum] mundum de yle **M**; factum] factum fuisse **FS** fuisse factum **M** 60 de] e **C**; scilicet materia] *tr.* **EF** 61 et<sup>3</sup>] *om.* **F** 62 quasdam] quosdam **CFMS** 62/63 alias . . . alias . . . alias] alios . . . alios . . . alios **CFMS**; in aera . . . in ignem] *tr.* **M** 63/64 sine . . . mundum] m. s. mat. **EF** 64 est autem] *tr.* **EF** 64/65 sic . . . est<sup>2</sup>] id est in Filio et iterandum est in principio sic in principio creauit deus caelum et terram **EFMS** 66 temporis scilicet] creatus autem est *praem.* **F** *tr.* **M**; enim sunt] *tr.* **M**; mundus et tempus] t. e. m. **E** 67 aeternus<sup>1</sup>] est *add.* **S**

---

Abelard, *Theologia scholarium* 1.69 (CCM 13.345.765–346.775), Peter Abelard, *Theologia summi boni* 1.6 (CCM 13.88.63–89.73), et Peter Abelard, *Theologia Christiana* 1.8 (CCM 13.75.100–16).

57/61 Cum – fine] GO, vol. 1.6<sup>b</sup>, quod ex Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:1 (PL 131: 53–54); cfr. Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* 1:1 (CCM 53.8–9, 92–99); Hugh of Saint Victor, *Adnot. in Pent.* (PL 175: 33); Hugh of Rouen, *Tractatus in Hexaemeron* 1.10 (PL 172: 1251); John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon* 4.35 (CCM 98.173.22–25); et Ambrose, *Exam.*, 1.2.5 (CSEL 32.1.3.1–4.8).

57/58 Cum – Epicuri] Cfr. Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 1, cap. 1 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.329.9–330.3).

58/59 Plato – factum] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 1, cap. 1.2 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.330.4–6), quod ex GO, vol. 1.6<sup>b</sup>.

59/61 Aristotelis – fine] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 1, cap. 3.4 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.331.21–23).

61/63 Epicurus – ignem] Cfr. John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon* 4.35 (CCM 98.58.11–12).

63/64 Moses – creatum] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 1, cap. 1 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.329.9–330.3); cfr. GO, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>, quod (partim) ex Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:1 (CCL 118A.3.1–8).

64/72 Creatus – caeli] Cfr. Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 2, cap. 1.2–4 et cap. 2–3 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.337.1–25–338.1–17).

64/66 Creatus – scilicet] GI, *Gen.* 1:1 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>, quod ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1:1 (CSEL 28.1.4.1–7).

---

64/69 *Gen.* 1:1. 64 fecit] VL, *Gen.* 1:1.

ter aeternus; angeli quoque sempiterni. Vel *IN PRINCIPIO* omnium creaturarum  
*creauit caelum et terram* id est has creaturas primordiales fecit et simul. Sed quod  
 70 simul factum est simul dici non potuit;\* licet enim hic prius nominetur *caelum*  
 quam *terra*, tamen scriptum est: *Initio tu Domine terram fundasti et opera*  
*manuum tuarum sunt caeli*. Hanc creationem mundi praelibatam sub operibus sex  
 dierum explicat Scriptura insinuans tria: creationem, dispositionem, ornatum. In  
 75 primo die creationem et quandam dispositionem; in secundo et tertio dispositio-  
 nem; in reliquis tribus ornatum.

\* Sicut quam cito oculos aperio statim acies mea solem icit in oriente, quod  
 non faceret nisi multa aeris spatia quae sunt inter me et solem transuolaret.  
 Quam momentaneam transuolutionem si uelim explicare, saepe addam “prius”  
 et “post” sic: prius transit acies mea aerem uicinum, post aerem qui est super  
 80 Alpes, post aerem qui est super alias terras usque ad oceanum, post aerem qui  
 est super oceanum, et tandem tangit solem.

#### Cap. II – De prima mundi confusione.

*TERRA AVTEM ERAT INANIS ET VACVA* id est machina mundialis adhuc erat  
 inutilis et infructuosa et uacua ornatu suo. *ET TENEBRAE ERANT SVPER FACIEM*  
 85 *ABYSSI*. Eandem machinam quam *TERRAM* dixerat, *ABYSSVM* uocat pro sui con-

---

68 sempiterni] sunt *add. S*; omnium creaturarum] *tr. S* 69 *caelum*] deus *E*; *et*] *om.*  
**E** 70 simul<sup>1</sup>. . . simul<sup>2</sup>] simile . . . simile **M**; potuit] sicut quam cito oculos aperio  
 statim acies mea solem icit in oriente quod non faceret nisi multa aeris spatia quae sunt  
 intra me et solem transuolaret quam momentaneam transuolutionem si uelim explicare  
 saepe addam prius et post sic prius transit acie mea aerem uicinum post aerem qui est  
 super alpes post aerem qui est super alias terras usque ad oceanum post aerem qui est  
 super oceanum et tandem tangit solem *pars textus principalis hoc loco, sed vide adnotatio-*  
*nem, infra M*; hic prius] *corr. ex sic prius C om. E corr. in prius M* 71 *Initio*] in initio  
**E** 73 explicat] explicauit **F**; Scriptura . . . tria] tria insinuans Scriptura **S** 74  
 in<sup>1</sup> . . . dispositionem] dispositionem secundo et tertio **F** 75 reliquis tribus] *tr. M*  
 76/81 Sicut – solem] *adnotatio CES pars textus principalis FM* **II**, 82 prima] primaria  
**EFMS** 83 *ET VACVA*] *sup. l. E om. F*; machina . . . erat] *m. mund. a. autem e. E*  
*mund. m. a. e. F mund. e. m. a. M* 85 dixerat] *corr. ex dixerant M*

---

68/72 Vel – *caeli*] GO, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>, quod (partim) ex Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:1 (CCL 118A.3.6–8, 16–20).

73/75 In – ornatum] Cfr. GI, Gen. 1:3 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>b</sup>.

**II**, 83/84 *TERRA* – suo] Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:1 (PL 131: 55).

83/86 *TERRA* – obscuritate] GI, Gen. 1:2 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>b</sup>.

85/86 Eandem – dixit] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 2, cap. 5 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.340.19–22) et dist. 12, cap. 1.2, 1.2.384.9–12, quod ex Aug., *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 1.5.9 (PL 34: 178), mediante *Summa sententiarum*, 3.1 (PL 176: 89); uide etiam: Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 12, cap. 3.2 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.385, 18–386.13).

---

71/72 Ps. 101:26. **II**, 83/97 Gen. 1:2. 84/87 *TENEBRAE ERANT*] VL, Gen. 1:2; GO, Gen. 1:2 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>.

fusione et obscuritate. Vnde et Graecus eam chaos dixit. Quia uero dictum est, *TENEBRAE ERANT*, quidam dogmatizauerunt tenebras fuisse aeternas, quae iam scilicet cum mundus fieret erant. Alii irridentes Deum Veteris Testamenti dicunt eum prius creasse tenebras quam lucem, sed *TENEBRAE* nihil aliud sunt nisi lucis  
 90 absentia. Obscuritas autem quaedam aeris a Deo creata est et dicta *TENEBRAE*; unde et in catalogo creaturarum dictum est: *Benedicite lux et tenebrae Domino. ET SPIRITVS DOMINI* id est Spiritus Sanctus Dominus uel Domini uoluntas *FEREBATVR SVPER AQVAS* sicut uoluntas artificis habentis prae oculis omnem materiam domus faciendae super illam fertur, dum quid de quo facturus est disponit.  
 95 Praedictam machinam *aquas* uocat quasi ductilem materiam ad operandum ex ea. Ideo uero sic uariantur eius nomina, ne si unius elementi nomine tantum censeretur illi magis putaretur accomoda. Hebraeus habet pro *SVPERFEREBATVR*

---

86 et] *om. E*; eam chaos] *tr. M*; dixit] uocat *corr. ex* uocant *M*; Quia] quod *FM* 89  
 aliud] *om. E*; nisi] quam *F* 89/90 lucis absentia] *tr. F* 90 autem] *om. E*; quaedam]  
*om. E* 91 dictum est] dicitur *M* 92 *DOMINI . . . Sanctus*] dei ferebatur super aquas  
 vel *M* dei id est spiritus sanctus *S*; Sanctus] scilicet *F*; uel . . . uoluntas] *dup. sed del. C* uel  
 dei uoluntas *M* 93 uoluntas] uoluntas *C* 94 quid de quo] quid de qua *F* de quo quid  
*M*; facturus est] facturus sit *M tr. S* 95 materiam] materiem *M* 96 uero] *om. F*;  
 eius nomina] *tr. M*; unius] *corr. ex* unus *C* 97 censeretur] censerentur *C*; *SVPERFERE-*  
*BATVR*] ferebatur *E*

---

88/89 Alii – lucem] Aug., *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 1.3.6 (PL 34: 176); uide etiam: GO, vol. 1.9<sup>p</sup>.3 quod ex Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:2 (CCL 118A.5.77–6.122); cfr. Basil, *Homiliae IX in Hexaemeron*, hom 2.5, (E. Amand de Mendieta and S. Y. Rudberg, Eustathius: Ancienne version latine des neuf homélies sur l’Hexaéméron de Basile de Césarée, 24–25); Ambrose, *Exam.*, 1.8.32 (CSEL 32.1.33.12–15); Aug., *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 1.4.7 (PL 34: 176–77); Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* 4 (CSEL 28.1466.11–12).

89/91 sed – *Domino*] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 12, cap. 3.3 et 4 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.386.16–387.7); cfr. Aug., *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 1.4.7 (PL 34: 176–77); et GO, vol. 1.9<sup>p</sup>, quod ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1:1 (CSEL 28.1.5.10–13).  
 91 *Benedicite – Domino*] Dan. 3:72.

91/97 *ET – accomoda*] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 12, cap. 3.2 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.385.18–386.13); cfr. Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:2 (PL 131: 55); uide etiam GI, *Gen.* 1:2 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>p</sup>.

91/94 *ET – disponit*] Cfr. Aug., *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 1.5.8 (PL 34: 177); Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* 4 (CSEL 28.1.468.27–469.107).

95/97 *Praedictam – accomoda*] Cfr. Aug., *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 1.7.12 (PL 34: 179); Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* 4 (CSEL 28.1.467.1–16); et Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1:5 (CSEL 28.1.9.19–24).

97/101 Hebraeus – *creabuntur*] Cfr. GO, vol. 1.9<sup>b</sup> et HIER., *Heb. quaest. in Gen.* 1:2 (CCL 72.3); uide etiam: Basil, *Homiliae IX in Hexaemeron*, hom 2.6, (E. Amand de Mendieta and S. Y. Rudberg, Eustathius: Ancienne version latine des neuf homélies sur l’Hexaéméron de Basile de Césarée, 25); Ambrose, *Exam.*, 1.8.29 (CSEL 32.1.28.20–29.5); et Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1:18 (CSEL 28.1.26.20–27.5).

97/98 Hebraeus – *o*] GI, *Gen.* 1:2 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>b</sup>.

---

91 Dan. 3:72. 92 *DOMINI*] GO, *Gen.* 1:2 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>. 97 VL, *Gen.* 1:2; GO, *Gen.* 1:2 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>.

incubabat uel Syra lingua fouebat sicut auis oua; in quo etiam cum regimine nascentis mundi notatur initium. Hunc locum male intellexit Plato esse dictum hoc putans de anima mundi, sed dictum est de Spiritu creante, de quo legitur: *Emitte spiritum tuum et creabuntur.*

Cap. III – De opere primae diei.

*DIXIT DEVS FIAT LVX ET FACTA EST LVX* id est Verbum genuit in quo erat ut fieret lux id est tam facile ut quis uerbo uocat lucem, tam facile fecit lucem, et itera sic quam lucem uocat: quandam nubem lucidam illuminantem superiores mundi partes, claritate tamen tenui ut diluculo fieri solet et haec ad modum solis circumagitata; praesentia sui superius hemisphaerium et inferius uicissim illuminabat. Per *FIAT* essentia lucis in Deo intellegitur priusquam fieret; per *FACTA EST* essentia eiusdem in actu scilicet cum prodiit ad esse. *ET VIDIT DEVS LVCEM QVOD ESSET BONA* id est quae placuerat in praesentia ut fieret placuit in essentia ut maneret. Vel tropice, *uidit*, id est uideri fecit. *ET DIVISIT LVCEM AC TENE-*

---

99 notatur] uocatur **F**; esse] *om.* **EFMS** 100 Spiritu] sancto *add.* **M**; legitur] dicitur **M** **III**, 102 primae] primi **MS** 103 *DIXIT*] dixitque **E** dixit autem **F** dixit quoque **MS** 104 id est] *om.* **F** uel **S** 104/5 uocat . . . quam] *om.* *per hom.* **CEF** diceret **S** 105 itera] ita **M** quandam . . . lucidam] *n. c. q.* **M** *q. l. n.* **S** 106 solis] *add.* **M**<sup>*marg., a.m.*</sup> 108 essentia . . . intellegitur] *int. e.* uel praesentia *l. in D.* **E** *int. e. l. in D.* **M** praesentia lucis intellegitur *ideo* **S**; per *FACTA*] perfecta **CEFM** 109 essentia eiusdem] *tr.* **S**; in] *om.* **E**; *DEVS*] *om.* **E** 110 quae] quod **E** 111 *AC*] *corr. ex a* **F**

---

**III**, 103/4 *DIXIT* – lucem<sup>2</sup>] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 13, cap. 6 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.393.13–16), ex GI, Gen. 1:3 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>b</sup> et GO, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup>.1, quae ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1.2–5, 9–10 (CSEL 28.1.5–9, 11–14). Vide etiam: Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:3 (CCL 118A.8.168–72), et Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* 1:3 (CCM 53.9.125).

104/7 et itera – circumagitata] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 13, cap. 2.3 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.390.10–14), ex Hugh of Saint Victor, *De sacramentis*, 1.1.9 (PL 176: 193D–94B) et *Summa sententiarum*, 3.1 (PL 176: 89A–B); et Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 13, cap. 3.1 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.390.15–19), ex GO, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup>.3 (quae uerba sunt Bedae, ut notat Brady, non obstante rubrica, qua Augustino attribuitur) et cap. 3.2, ex Hugh of Saint Victor, *De sacramentis*, 1.1.9 (PL 176: 194B).

107/8 GO, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup>.3, ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1:10–11 (CSEL 28.1.16.9–17.6); cfr. Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 13, cap. 3.1 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.390.16–19), quod (non obstante rubrica, qua Augustino attribuitur) ex GO, vol. 1.9<sup>b</sup>.10–10<sup>a</sup>, et Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:3 (CCL 118A.8.180–85).

109/11 *ET* – maneret] GI, Gen. 1:4 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup> et GO, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup>.1, ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1.6, 8 (CSEL 28.1.10.3–6, 11.15–20). Vide etiam: Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:6–8 (CCL 118A.12.292–95), et Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* (CCM 53.11.164–68).

111 Vel – fecit] Cfr. Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:1 (CCL 118A.3).

111/13 Vel – luci] Ambrose, *Exam.*, 1.8.32 (CSEL 32.1.33.13–34.6).

---

101 Ps. 103:30. **III**, 103/9 Gen. 1:3. 103 Cfr. VL, Gen. 1:3 et GO, Gen. 1:3 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>b</sup>. 109/12 *ET* – TENEBRAS] Gen. 1:4.

BRAS. Hic incipit dispositio, et tamen aliquid dicit de creatione quasi cum luce tenebras creauit id est umbram ex obiectione corporum luci. Et creatas diuisit locorum distantia et qualitate ut scilicet numquam simul, sed semper e regione  
 115 diuersa hemisphaeria uicissim sibi uendicarent. Intellegitur etiam hic angelorum facta diuisio: stantes *lux*, cadentes *tenebrae* dicti sunt. ET APPELLAVIT LVCEM DIEM a *dian* graeco, quod est claritas, sicut lux dicitur quia luit id est purgat tenebras. TENEBRAS DIXIT NOCTEM a nocendo, quia nocent oculis ne uideant, sicut tenebrae quia tenent oculos ne uideant. Sicut tamen dies exortum est a  
 120 *dian* graeco, ita nox a *nictim*. ET FACTVM EST VESPERE ET POST FACTVM EST MANE et sic completus est dies unus naturalis. Primo enim cum caelo et terra lux est creata, qua paulatim occidente FACTVM EST primum uespere diei usualis, et eadem migrante sub terras et ad ortum ueniente FACTVM EST MANE id est terminata est nox, et inchoauit dies secunda. Itaque praecedente luce diei et  
 125 sequente nocte terminata exstitit DIES VNVS.

Cap. IV – De opere secundae diei.

Secunda die disposuit Deus superiora mundi sensilis. Empyreum enim quam

---

112 incipit] incepit **E**; dicit] dicitur **M**; quasi] diceret *add.* **M** qui **S** 113 creatas] creata **ES**; diuisit] *dup.* **ES** 114 scilicet] *om.* **E** 115 uicissim sibi] *tr.* **E**; uendicarent] *corr. in* uendicaret **E**; Intellegitur . . . hic] hic etiam intellegitur **M** 118/19 TENEBRAS . . . uideant<sup>2</sup>] Sic tenebrae quia tenent oculos ne uideant sic tenebras dixit noctem a nocendo quia nocet oculis ne uideant **S** 118 TENEBRAS] *om.* **C**; nocent] nocet **C**; ne uideant<sup>1</sup>] *add.* **M**<sup>sup. l. a. m.</sup>; sicut . . . uideant] *om. per hom.* **M**; tamen dies] *tr.* **M** 119/20 exortum . . . graeco] a d. e. est g. **E** 120 *nictim*] nictin **S**; FACTVM EST] *om.* **S** 121 naturalis] non primo die sed primo tempore ut large tempus intellegas *add.* **S** 122 est creata] *tr.* **E**; primum uespere] uespere primae **M**; usualis] lux ipsa diuisas partes ostendebat sed non diuidebat *add.* **S** 123 et<sup>1</sup>] *om.* **E**; migrante . . . terras] e. m. super t. **E** e. s. t. m. **M**; ueniente] redeunte **M**

---

113/15 Et – uendicarent] GO, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup>.4, ex (non obstante rubrica, qua Augustino attribuitur) Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:4 (CCL 118A.9.203–7); cfr. Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* (CCM 53.11.174).

115/16 Intellegitur–sunt] GI, Gen. 1:4 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup>.

116/19 ET–uideant<sup>2</sup>] GI, Gen. 1:3 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.9<sup>b</sup>, GI, Gen. 1:5 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup>, et Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:4 (PL 131: 55C) (partim uerbatim); cfr. Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* 1:1 (CCM 53.9.129–30).

120/25 ET – VNVS] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 13, cap. 4.2, 5.2 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.391.12–26), ex GO, vol. 1.10<sup>b</sup>.3, quod (non obstante rubrica, qua Augustino attribuitur) ex Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:5, CCL 118A.9.219–10.240, et Hugh of Saint Victor, *De sacramentis*, 1.1.9, PL 176: 194B–C.

**IV**, 127/28 Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 2, cap. 4.1 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.339.11–12). Vide etiam: GO, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>.3, ex Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:1 (PL 131: 54D–55A), et GO, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>.11, ex Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:2 (CCL 118A.4.45–46); cfr. Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* (CCM 53.7.42–45).

---

116/25 Gen. 1:5. 118 TENEBRAS – NOCTEM] Cfr. VL, Gen. 1:5. 120 Cfr. VL-E, Gen. 1:5.



cito factum est, statim dispositum est et ornatum id est sanctis angelis repletum. *FEICIT ERGO EA DIE DEVS FIRMAMENTVM IN MEDIO AQVARVM* id est quendam  
 130 exteriorem mundi superficiem ex aquis congelatis ad instar crystalli consolida-  
 tam et perlucidam, intra se cetera sensibilia continentem ad imaginem testae  
 quae in ovo est, et in eo fixa sunt sidera; ET DICITVR *FIRMAMENTVM* non tan-  
 tum propter sui soliditatem, sed quia terminus est aquarum quae super ipsum  
 sunt, firmum et intransgressibile. DICITVR ETIAM *CAELVM*, quia celat id est tegit  
 135 omnia inuisibilia uel sensibilia, et cum *FIRMAMENTVM CAELI* endiadis est id est  
 firmamentum quod est caelum, ut cum dicitur creatura salis. Vnde et pro sui  
 concameratione graece dicitur *uranon* id est palatum uel palatus. Vel DICITVR  
*CAELVM* quasi *casa helios*, quia sol sub ipso positus ipsum illustrat. Hanc tamen  
 circumuolutam concamerationem philosophus summitatem ignis intellexit. Cum  
 140 *enim ignis non habet quo ascendat, circumuoluitur ut in clibano patet; ita et*  
*circa mundi exteriora ignis uoluitur, et hoc est sidereum uel aetherium caelum.*  
*Est etiam tertium caelum infra quod aerium dicitur, de quo: aues caeli comed-*  
*runt illud. Quidam suspicantur quartum esse caelum super empyreum, quia Luci-*  
*fer cum esset in empyreo legitur dixisse: Ascendam in caelum etc. Et in eo dicunt*

---

**IV**, 128 est<sup>1</sup>] *om. EFM*; est<sup>2</sup> . . . ornatum] et ornatum **E**; id est] *om. E*; angelis] est *add.*  
**E** cito *add. sed eras. M* 129 *EA DIE]* *corr. ex die ea C* 130 *ad]* *om. E*; consolidatam]  
 solidatam **EMS** 131 *se]* *om. E* 132 *eo]* *ea E*; *FIRMAMENTVM]* *corr. ex fundamen-*  
 tum **M** 134 *firmum . . . intransgressibile]* firmamentum e. i. **E**; firmus et intransgressi-  
 bilis **M**; *ETIAM CAELVM]* *tr. MS* 135 *inuisibilia uel]* *om. EM* 136 *cum . . . salis]*  
 dicitur creatura salis **E** est creatura salis **M**; et] *om. E* 137 *palatum . . . palatus]* pala-  
 tum **EF** palatum (uel palatium *add.*) **S**<sup>sup. l. a. m.</sup> 137/38 *DICITUR CAELUM]* *tr. S*  
 138 *ipsum]* illum **M** 139 *circumuolutam]* *corr. ex uolutam circum F*; ignis intellexit] *tr.*  
**M** 141 *sidereum . . . caelum]* aetherium caelum **E** a. u. s. c. **M** 142 *etiam]* *om.*  
**E** 143 *suspicantur . . . caelum]* q. s. e. c. **EF** q. s. c. e. **M** s. q. c. e. **S**; empyreum]  
 caelum *add. ES* 144 *empyre]* caelo *add. ES* 144/45 *eo . . . hominem]* eo m. d. e.  
**EM** eo d. e. m. **S**

---

128/32 id est – sidera] **GI**, Gen. 1:6 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.10<sup>b</sup>, et Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 14,  
 cap. 2–4.1 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.395.15–23–396.1–12), ex **GO**, vol. 1.11<sup>a</sup>.1,  
 quod ex Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:6–8 (CCL 118A.10.241–268); cfr. Ps.–Bede, *De sex dierum creati-*  
*one* (PL 93: 210D).

132/34 *ET – intransgressibile]* **GI**, Gen. 1:6 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.10<sup>b</sup>, et Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist.  
 14, cap. 5.2 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.397.9–10), ex **GO**, vol. 1.10<sup>b</sup>.8 et  
 1.11<sup>a</sup>.6–11<sup>b</sup>, quae ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 2.10 (CSEL 28.1.46–48 et  
 praesertim 48.12–15); cfr. Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* (CCM 53.12.223–227,  
 14.276–278).

134/35 Ps.–Bede, *Expositio in primum librum Mosi* (PL 91: 192A), et Andrew of Saint Vic-  
 tor, *In Gen.* (CCM 53.7.54–55).

137/38 Cfr. Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* (CCM 53.7.54–55).

142/43 *Est – illud]* Ps.–Bede, *Expositio in primum librum Mosi* (PL 91: 194D).

142/44 *Est – empyreo]* Cfr. **GO**, vol. 1.9<sup>a</sup>.9.

---

**IV**, 129/32 Gen. 1:6–7. 134/38 Gen. 1:8. 142/43 Matth. 13:4; Luc. 8:5; Marc.  
 4:4. 144 Is. 14:14.

- 145 modo esse Christum hominem super angelos qui sunt in empyreo. Sane firmamentum DIVIDIT AQVAS QVAE SVB IPSO SVNT AB AQVIS QVAE SVPER IPSVM SVNT, de quibus dicitur: *Qui tegis aquis superiora eius*; et sunt sicut et ipsum congelatae ut crystallus, ne igne solui possint, uel in modum nebulae uaporabiles. Cur uero ibi sint Deus nouit, nisi quod quidam autumant inde rorem descendere in
- 150 aestate. Quod autem dictum est, *FIAT FIRMAMENTVM*, et post, *FECIT DEVS FIRMAMENTVM*, et tertio, *FACTVM EST FIRMAMENTVM*, non superfluit, quia sicut in domo facienda primo domus fit in scientia artificis, fit etiam materialiter cum leuigantur ligna et lapides, fit etiam essentialiter cum leuigata in structuram domus disponuntur, ita cum dicitur, *FIAT*, ad praescientiam Dei refertur, *FECIT*, ad opus in materia, *FACTVM EST*, ad opus in essentia. Illud primo die, istud secundo factum est, et cum huius diei opus bonum fuerit ut ceterorum, tamen non legitur de eo: *uidit Deus quod esset bonum*. Tradunt enim Hebraei, quia hac die angelus factus est Diabolus,\* quibus consentire uidentur qui in secunda feria missam de angelis cantare consueuerunt quasi in laudem stantium angelorum.
- 160 Sed tradunt sancti quia in signum factum est hoc, quia binarius infamis numerus est in theologia, quia primus ab unitate recedit. Deus autem unitas est, et sectionem et discordiam detestatur. Possumus autem dicere quia opus tertiae diei quasi adhuc est de opera secundae diei, quod post patebit. Vnde non commendatur nisi in tertia die quasi post sui consummationem.

---

146 SVNT] *om.* **E** 147 ipsum] firmamentum *add.* **E** 148 ne] nec **M**; possint] pos-  
sunt **M**; uero] ergo **E** 149 sint] sunt **FS**; quod quidam] *corr. ex* quidam quod **C**  
149/50 rorem . . . aestate] rorem . . . aestatem **C** r. i. a. d. **M** 150 post] dicitur *add.*  
**M** 151 sicut] sic **E** 152 primo] prius **M**; domus fit] *tr.* **E**; fit<sup>2</sup>] *corr. ex* fiat **M**  
153/54 in . . . domus] d. i. s. **M** 154 dicitur *FIAT*] *tr.* **S**; praescientiam] *corr. ex* prae-  
sientiam **F**<sup>sup. l. a.m.</sup> 155 opus<sup>1</sup>] illud *add.* **S**; die] immo ante diem opus erat in materia  
et idcirco intellege primo die id est primo tempore *add.* **S** 156 secundo] die *add.* **S**;  
cum] omne *add.* **E**; fuerit] fuit **F** 157 quia] quod **M**; hac] hoc **MS** 158 angelus . .  
. est] a. e. f. **M** f. e. a. **S**; Diabolus] *post hoc uerbum magna textus pars in codice E deest,*  
*add. M*<sup>sup. l. a.m.</sup> 159 missam . . . angelis] missas d. a. **M** 160 quia<sup>1</sup>] quod **S**  
161 est<sup>1</sup>] *sup. l.* **M**; autem] tamen **FMS** 164 tertia] tertio **M**

---

145/56 Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 14, cap. 2–4.1 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.395.15–23–396.1–12), ex GO, vol. 1.11<sup>a</sup>.1, quod ex Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:6–8 (CCL 118A.10.241–77), qui ut notat Brady citat (partim) Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 2.5 (CSEL 28.1.38.18–39.17). Cfr. Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:2 (CCL 118A.6.103–6), et Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* (CCM 53.12.225–231), et Ps-Bede, *Expositio in primum librum Mosi* (PL 91: 194D) et *De sex dierum creatione* (PL 93: 210D).

150/55 Cfr. GO, vol. 1.11<sup>a</sup>. 2, 4.

155/64 GO, vol. 1.11<sup>a</sup>.5; uide etiam: Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 14, cap. 6 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.397.12–18); Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:6–8, CCL 118A.12.292–306; Hugh of Saint Victor, *De sacramentis* (PL 176: 201), et Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:6 (PL 131: 56B–C).

---

146 Gen. 1:7. 147 Ps. 103:3. 150/55 Quod – essentia] Gen. 1:6–7.

165 \* Id est *Sathanel, Lucifer: Sathan*, aduersarius; *El*, Deus, et inuenitur hoc nomen in epistula Clementis tantum.

Cap. V – De opere tertiae diei.

Tertia die AQVAS SVB FIRMAMENTO CONGREGAVIT DEVS IN VNVM LOCVM. Quae licet plura obtineant loca, tamen quia omnes continuantur in uisceribus terrae,  
 170 IN VNVM LOCVM CONGREGATAE dictae sunt. Et potuit esse ut aquae, quae totum aeris spatium occupabant uaporabiles, solidatae modicum obtineant locum. Vel terra paululum subsedit, ut eas tamquam in matrice concluderet, et sic APPARVIT ARIDA, quasi latens sub aquis, proprie humus dicta est. Sed cum APPARVIT ARIDA, EADEM DICITVR TERRA, quia teritur pedibus animantium. Vel tribus circumpositis elementis dicitur solum, quia solida. Dicitur tellus, quia tolerat labores hominum. CONGREGATIONES AQVARVM VOCAVIT MARE hebraeo idiomate quod  
 175 quaslibet aquarum congregationes uocat maria. Completo ergo aquarum opere, subditur: ET VIDIT DEVS QVOD ESSET BONVM, et addidit aliud opus illi cum DIXIT, GERMINET TERRA, nec de opere germinandi tantum intellegendum est sed  
 180 de potentia quasi potens sit germinare. PRODVXIT ENIM DE TERRA HERBAM VIRENTEM ET FACIENTEM SEMEN ET LIGNVM POMIFERVM FACIENS FRVCTVM

---

165/66 Id . . . tantum] *om.* **CFMS** haec pars textus deest **E** scripsi ut in prima glossa Stephani de lingua tonante **V**, 168 AQVAS . . . DEVS] s. f. D. c. a. **M** 169 plura] plurima **M** 170 CONGREGATAE . . . sunt] d. s. c. **M** 171 aeris spatium] *tr.* **M** 172 paululum subsedit] *tr.* **M** 173 quasi] quia **M** quae **S** 174 Vel] a *add.* **M** 176 CONGREGATIONES] congregationesque **S**; VOCAVIT MARE] appellantur maria **M** u. maria **F**; quod] quos **C** 176/77 hebraeo . . . maria] *om. per hom.* **S** 178 aliud . . . illi] i. o. a. **M** 179 tantum . . . est] i. e. t. **M** 180 quasi] dicens *add.* **M**; germinare] postea *add.* **S**; PRODVXIT . . . de] produxit enim **F** eduxitque **M** produxit enim Deus de **S**; TERRA] etiam *add. sed eras.* **F**

---

**V**, 168/71 Tertia – locum] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 14, cap. 7–8.1 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.397.20–398.13), quae ex GO, vol. 1.11<sup>b</sup>.5, quod ex Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:6–8 (CCL 118A.12.325–13.342); cfr. GI, Gen. 1:9 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.11<sup>b</sup>, et Hugh of Saint Victor, *Adnot. in Pent.* (PL 175: 35).

168/70 IN – LOCVM] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 14, cap. 7 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.397.20, 398.1, sed cfr. 1.2.397.21).

173/74 GO, vol. 1.11<sup>b</sup>.6, ex (non obstante rubrica, qua Augustino attribuitur) Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:10 (CCL 118A.13.351–60); cfr. Isid., *Etyim.*, 14.1.1.5, Ps.–Bede, *De sex dierum creatione* (PL 93: 211D), et Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* (CCM 53.14.292).

176 CONGREGATIONES – MARE] GO, vol. 1.11<sup>b</sup>.6, ex (non obstante rubrica, qua Augustino attribuitur) Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:10 (CCL 118A.13.351–14.369); uide etiam: Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 14, cap. 8.2 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.398.14–21), quod ex GO, vol. 1.11<sup>b</sup>.6–7 et Hier., *Heb. Quaest. in Gen.*, Gen. 1:10 (CCL 72.3).

176 VOCAVIT] Hier., *Heb. Quaest. in Gen.*, Gen. 1:10 (CCL 72.3–4).

178/80 addidit – germinare] GI, Gen. 1:10 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.11<sup>b</sup>.

---

**V**, 168/74 Gen. 1:9. 176/78 Gen. 1:10. 176 VOCAVIT] VL-CE, Gen. 1:10. 179/89 Gen. 1:11–12. 179 VL, Gen. 1:11. 180 PRODVXIT] VL-E, Gen. 1:12.

*SECUNDVM GENERA SVA*. Patet quia non per moras temporum ut modo produxit plantas suas terra sed statim in maturitate uiridi, in qua et herbae seminibus et arbores pomis onustae sunt. Notandum est quod dictum est *VIRENTEM*. Quidam  
 185 dicunt mundum in uere factum, quia uiror illius temporis est et fructificatio. Alii quia legunt, *LIGNVM . . . FACIENS FRVCTVM*, et additum, *HERBVM HABENTEM SEMEN*, factum dicunt in augusto sub leone, sed in martio factum dogmatizat ecclesia. Nota cum primo ait, *FACIENTEM SEMEN*, et addit, *HABENS VNVM- QVODQVE SEMENTEM*, quia sementis proprie dicitur dum adhuc est in sementiuo;  
 190 semen uero cum seminatur; seminium uero uel sementum cum seminatum est. Distinguuntur tamen aliter: sementis, frugum et arborum; semen, animalium; seminium, cuiusque rei exordium. Nec uos moueat quia in dispositione elementorum uidetur aer non dispositus, quia non est nominatus sed dispositus est cum, liber ab aquis, notam nobis formam accepit. Vel ideo non dicitur dispositus, quia  
 195 nullum ornatum ex substantia sui factum in se habuit.

Cap. VI – De opere quartae diei.

Quarto die quae disposuerat coepit ornare rebus illis quae infra mundum uniuersum congruis motibus aggerentur. Plantae enim, quia terrae haerent, ad

---

183 plantas . . . terra] t. p. s. **M**; sed] *corr. ex et F*; uiridi] uirili **S** 184 Notandum] notandumque **M**; est quod] cum **M** quia **S** 185 in . . . factum] f. i. u. **M**; Alii] scilicet caldei *add. S* 186 additum] est *add. M* 187 factum dicunt] f. esse d. **M**; in . . . leone] s. l. i. a. **S** 188 addit] addidit **FS**; *HABENS UNUMQUODQUE*] *tr. M* 189 sementiuo] uel sementum *add. M* 190 uero<sup>1</sup>] uel sementum *add. FS*; uel . . . est] cum seminatum est **FMS** 191 Distinguuntur] distinguitur **FMS** 192 seminium] seminum **C**; cuiusque] cuiuslibet **M**; quia] quod **S**; dispositione] *corr. ex* dispotione **F** 193/94 quia . . . dispositus<sup>2</sup>] *om. per hom. sed add. infra S* 194 formam accepit] *tr. M* 194/95 Vel . . . habuit] *om. FM* aer non dispositus quia non est nominatus sed dispositus est cum liber ab aquis notam nobis formam accepit *add. S* **VI**, 198 Plantae] planetae **M**; haerent] adhaerent **FS**

---

182/85 Patet – fructificatio] GO, vol. 1.12<sup>a</sup>.1, 3, ex Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:11–13 (CCL 118A.14.378–15.397).

184/85 Quidam – fructificatio] Ambrose, *Exam.*, 1.4.13 (CSEL 32.1.11.23–12.3).

188/92 Nota – exordium] GO, vol. 1.12<sup>a</sup>.6, et Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:11 (PL 131: 56C).

192/95 Nec – habuit] GO, vol. 1.11<sup>b</sup>.4, ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 2.11 (CSEL 28.1.49.5–50.14).

**VI**, 197/201 Quarto – *STELLAS*] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 14, cap. 9.3 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.399.14–16), ex GO, vol. 1.12<sup>b</sup>.1, quod ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 2.13 (CSEL 28.1.53.1–14); uide etiam Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:14 (CCL 118A.15.413–15); cfr. Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 13, cap. 1 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.389.9–15); uide etiam: Ps-Bede, *Expositio in primum librum Mosi*, 1 (PL 91: 196D–197A), Ps.-Bede, *De sex dierum creatione* (PL 93: 212D), et Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* (CCM 53.15.315).

197/98 Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 2.13 (CSEL 28.1.53.1–14), et Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:14 (CCL 118A.1.413–15); uide etiam Ps-Bede, *Expositio in primum librum Mosi* (PL 91: 196D–197A).

---

182 VL-C, Gen. 1:11–12. 186 VL-C, Gen. 1:11; VL-E, Gen. 1:12. 188 Gen. 1:11. 188/89 Gen. 1:12.

dispositionem terrae quasi magis spectant, et sicut dispositionem, sic et ornatum  
 200 inchoauit a superioribus. FECIT ENIM EADEM DIE LVMINARIA: SOLEM ET LVNAM ET  
STELLAS. Et dicitur sol, quia solus lucet id est nullum cum eo, luna luminum  
 una id est prima, ut una dierum uel una sabbatorum dicitur. Sol et luna dicuntur  
 MAGNA LVMINARIA in duobus et ex duobus, id est non solum pro quantitate  
 205 se, quia sol dicitur octies maior terra, et luna etiam maior terra dicitur. LVNAM  
 ET STELLAS VOLVIT ILLVMINARE NOCTEM, ne nox sine lumine nimis esset inde-  
 cora, et ut operantes in nocte ut nautae et uiatores solatium luminis haberent.\*  
 Sunt etiam quaedam auiculae quae lucem solis fere non possunt et fere nocte  
 pascuntur. Nec superfluit sol, licet nubes lucida uicem eius ageret, quia illa  
 210 tenuem et insufficientem lucem habebat, et forte non nisi superiora illuminabat,  
 sicut nec stellae modo. De illa autem nube traditur quod uel redierit in materiam  
 unde facta fuerat, ut stella quae apparuit magis, et columba in qua uisus est

---

197/99 rebus . . . spectant] *adnotatio* **M** 199 magis spectant] quam ad ornatum *add.*  
**S**<sup>sup. l. a.m.</sup> 200 inchoauit . . . superioribus] a s. i. **FMS**; EADEM] in eo **M**; ET<sup>1</sup>] *om.*  
**S** 201 quia] quasi **M**; lucet] lucens **M**; luna] autem quae de nocte lucet *add.* **S** 203  
 pro quantitate] uel qualitate *add.* **M** 204 et<sup>1</sup>] etiam **M** 205 maior<sup>2</sup> . . . dicitur] d.  
 m. t. **M** 206 lumine] lucis *add.* **S** 207 luminis haberent] *tr.* **MS** et *add. hic*: maxime  
 in desertis aethiopiae harenosis ubi modicus impulsus uenti inuenta itinerantium uestigia  
 complanat *pars textus principalis* **FMS** 208 Sunt] sed **F**; fere] quaedam *add.* **M** quae-  
 dam sunt quae *add.* **S** 209 nubes] *corr. in nube* **M** 209/10 illa . . . insufficientem] t.  
 e. i. l. **S** 210 lucem habebat] *tr.* **M** 212 ut] sicut **M** 212/13 uisus . . . Sanctus]  
 sp. s. u. e. **M**

---

200/201 SOLEM - STELLAS] Cfr. Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 14, cap. 9.2 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.399.9); Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:14 (PL 131: 56C); et Josephus, *Ant. Iud.*, 1.31 (ed. Blatt [Copenhagen, 1958], 127.12–13).  
 202/5 GO, vol. 1.13<sup>a</sup>.1–2, ex Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:16–17 (CCL 118A.17.468–483).  
 207 operantes – luminis] Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:14 (PL 131: 56D).  
 205/9 LUNAM – pascuntur] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 14, cap. 10 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.399.17–25), ex GO, vol. 1.12<sup>b</sup>.1, quod ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 2.13 (CSEL 28.1.53.14–23); uide etiam Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:3 (CCL 118A.8.185–88), et Ps.-Bede, *De sex dierum creatione* (PL 93: 212D).  
 209/11 Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 13, cap. 5.3 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.392.19–24), ex GO, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup>.3, quod ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1.10 (CSEL 28.1.16.8–23).  
 211/14 De – solare] Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 13, cap. 5.4 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.393.1–4), ex (id est quaestio et prima pars responsionis, ut notat Brady) Hugh of Saint Victor, *De sacramentis*, 1.1.15 (PL 176: 198D–199A), et GO, vol. 1.10<sup>a</sup>.3, quod ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 1.10–11 (CSEL 28.1.16.8–17.16).

---

**VI**, 200/206 Gen. 1:16. 212 stella – magis] Matth. 2:2. 212/13 columba – Sanctus] Matth. 3:16–17; Marc. 1:10–11; Luc. 3:22; Ioh. 1:32.

Spiritus Sanctus, uel quod semper solem comitatur, uel quod de ea factum est  
 215 etiam VT ESSENT *IN SIGNA ET TEMPORA ET DIES ET ANNOS*, ut scilicet *SIGNA* sint  
 serenitatis et tempestatis, uel ut ex ipsis fierent *SIGNA* duodecim maiora et quaedam  
 signa minora plura his quae dicuntur signa uel sidera, tum quia magna dili-  
 gentia signauit uel considerauit ea antiquitas, tum quia adhuc signant et consi-  
 220 derant ea homines ad designationem temporum. Nec dicendum est, ut geneatici  
 somniant, quod haec posita sint in signa orientium et operum nostrorum aut  
 quod status uitae nostrae signent et moderentur, quod docent experimentis quae  
*apotelesmata* uocant. Non enim credendum est de caelo his qui alieni sunt a  
 Patre qui est in caelis. Quod autem sequitur, *IN TEMPORA*, non est putandum  
 225 quod tunc per ea inciperent esse tempora, quae coeperunt cum mundo, sed quia  
 per ea sunt quattuor temporum distinctiones. Sol enim descendens ad Capricor-  
 num solstitium hiemale facit, ascendens ad Cancrum aestiuale; inter utrumque  
 pari ab utroque distantia aequinoctia facit. Vel est ibi endiadis scilicet *IN SIGNA*  
*ET TEMPORA* id est in signa temporum. *IN DIES* dicitur pluraliter, quia dies mul-  
 tipliciter dicitur: de die scilicet naturali scilicet spatio uiginti quattuor horarum,  
 230 et de die usuali. Ponitur etiam *DIES* pro tempore non determinato et ignoto  
 nobis, ut ibi: *In die illa stillabunt montes dulcedinem*. *IN ANNOS* etiam pluraliter  
 dictum est, quia etiam annus multipliciter dicitur. Nec hoc dico quod apud  
 diuersas nationes sunt utique annorum diuersae distinctiones maiorum et minorum,  
 sed et planetae annos suos habent, sed secundum etiam usum ecclesiae dici-

---

213 comitatur] comitetur **M** 214 et ad] uel **M** 215 etiam] et **CS**; ESSENT] ut  
 mathematici *add.* **C**<sup>sup. l.</sup> *om.* **M** 218 tum] dum **M** 219 geneatici] genealici  
**S** 220 haec . . . sint] posita sint **FM**; in] *om.* **M**; orientium] euentuum **MS** 221  
 et] *sup. l.* **M**; docent] *corr. in* docet **M** 222 *apotelesmata*] *apolesmata* **M** 225 ea]  
 eam **M**; sunt] fit **FS** fiunt **M**; temporum distinctiones] temporum distinctio **FS**; enim]  
 quoque **FS** quippe **M**; descendens . . . Capricornum] a. c. d. **M** 226 ascendens] et  
*praem.* **M** 227 scilicet] sint **S** 229 scilicet<sup>2</sup>] *om.* **M** id est **S** 230 usuali] duode-  
 cim horarum *add.* **S** 230 etiam] *om.* **M** 231 ibi] illic **M**; *die illa*] *tr.* **M** 232  
 etiam] et **FS**; apud] *om.* **C** 233 annorum diuersae] *tr.* **FMS** 234 sed<sup>1</sup>] *om.* **MS**;  
 secundum etiam] *tr.* **M** 234–35 dicimus hoc] *tr.* **M**

---

214/16 GI, Gen. 1:14 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.12<sup>b</sup>, et Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 14, cap. 11 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.400.1–3, 9), ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 2.14 (CSEL 28.1.53–56); uide etiam Andrew of Saint Victor, *In Gen.* (CCM 53.15.332–333). 216/19 cfr. GO, vol. 1.12<sup>b</sup>.4, ex Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:14, CCL 118A.15.431–16.443.

219/23 Nec – caelis] Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 2.16–17 (CSEL 28.1.59.11–60.16).

223/25 Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 14, cap. 11 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.400.1–8) et GO, vol. 1.12<sup>b</sup>.1, quod ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 2.14 (CSEL 28.1.53–56). Vide etiam: Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:14 (CCL 118A.16.437–41).

227/38 *IN* – lunationes] GO, vol. 1.12<sup>b</sup>.1, ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 2.14 (CSEL 28.1.55.4–56.2); uide etiam: Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:17–18 (CCL 118A.19.537–548).

---

215/31 Gen. 1:14. 231 Am. 9:13.

235 mus hoc. Est etiam annus lunaris habens trecentos quinquaginta quattuor dies;  
 est solaris constans ex diebus trecentis sexaginta quinque et quadrante id est sex  
 horis; est bisextilis ex trecentis sexaginta sex; est embolismalis qui trecentos  
 octaginta dies excedit habens tredecim lunationes. Dicitur etiam annus ab an  
 quod est circum, quia in se reuoluitur. Vnde et antiquiores ante usum litterarum  
 240 annum figurabant sub specie serpentis, cuius cauda in os eius reuoluebatur.  
 FACTA ERGO *LVMINARIA POSVIT DEVS VT LVCEANT IN FIRMAMENTO CAELI ET  
 ILLVMINENT TERRAM*, sed non semper, ET *DIVIDANT LVCEM AC TENEBRAS*.  
 Quod autem luna in plenilunio facta sit, ex alia perpenditur translatione quae  
 habet: *et luminare minus in inchoatione noctis*. In principio enim noctis non oritur  
 245 luna nisi pansilenos id est rotunda. Inde perpenditur quia sol factus est mane in  
 oriente et facto uespere luna in initio noctis, similiter in oriente. Volunt tamen  
 quidam quod simul facti sint, sol in oriente, luna in occidente; et sole occidente  
 luna sub terra rediit ad orientem in inchoatione noctis.  
 \*maxime in desertis Aethiopiae harenosis, ubi modicus impulsus uenti inuenta  
 250 itinerantium uestigia complanat.

Cap. VII – De opere quintae diei.

QVINTO DIE DEVS ORNAVIT AEREM ET AQVAM, *VOLATILIA* DANS AERI, *NATATILIA*  
 AQVIS, ET VTRAQVE EX AQVIS ORTA SVNT. Facilis enim transitus est aquae in aera  
 tenuando et aeris in aquam spissando. Pisces uocauit Moses *REPTILIA*, quia  
 255 impetu quodam totos se rapiunt ut serpentes, quia non feruntur pedibus ut ferae.

---

235 etiam] enim **FMS**; habens] *om. C*; trecentos . . . dies] d. t. quin. q. **M** 236 quin-  
 que] *corr. ex* quinquaginta **F**; quadrante] die *add. M* 238 etiam] autem **FS** 241  
*CAELI*] semper *add. S* 243 luna] *in marg. M*; perpenditur translatione] *tr. M*; quae] sic  
*add. M* 244 enim] autem **M** 245 quia] quod **S** 246 luna] facta est *add. S*;  
 similiter] facta est *add. M* 246/47 Volunt . . . occidente<sup>1</sup>] *om. M* 247 quod] mane  
*add. S* 248 ad] in **M** 249/50 maxime . . . complanat] *adnotatio in textu CS pars*  
*textus principalis FM VII, 252 DEVS ORNAVIT] corr. ex* deus hornauit **C** *corr. ex* ornavit  
 deus **F** *tr. M*; *NATATILIA*] natalicia **C** 253 aera] aerem **M** 254 Pisces] *corr. ex*  
 pisses **C**; quia] quae **C** *corr. ex* quasi **M** 255 quia] *om. FM, add. S<sup>sup. l. a.m.</sup>*

---

243/45 GO, vol. 1.12<sup>b</sup>.1 et 1.13<sup>a</sup>.4, quae ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 2.15  
 (CSEL 28.1.56.3–58.4).

249/50 Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:14 (PL 131: 56D); Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:14 (CCL  
 118A.16.451–54).

**VII**, 252 Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 15, cap. 1 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971],  
 1.2.400.17–21); *cfr. Josephus, Ant. Jud.*, 1.32 (ed. Blatt [Copenhagen, 1958], 127.14–15).

253/54 Facilis–spissando] *Cfr. GO*, vol. 1.13<sup>b</sup>.2, quod ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri  
 duodecim* 3.2–3 (CSEL 28.1.64–66).

254/55 Pisces – ferae] Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:20–21 (PL 131: 56D); *cfr.*  
 GI, *Gen.* 1:20 *ad loc.*, vol. 1.14<sup>a</sup>, ex Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:20 (CCL 118A.21.605–11).

---

242 VL, *Gen.* 1:18. 241/42 *Gen.* 1:14–18. 244 VL-E, *Gen.* 1:16. **VII**, 252/56  
*Gen.* 1:20. 254 VL, *Gen.* 1:20.

Nota quod ex hoc quod dictum est, *uolatile super terram*, errauit Plato; qui descendens in Aegyptum libros Mosi legit et putauit Mosen sensisse uolatilia esse ornatum aeris tantum circa terram, ornatum uero aeris superioris calodaemones et cacodaemones; sed non ita est. Boni enim daemones, ut dictum est, sunt in empyreo; mali uero in hunc aerem caliginosum detrusi sunt ad suam poenam, non ad eius ornatum. *CREAVITQVE DEVS* id est plasmavit *CETE GRANDIA* — *ce* neutri generis est indeclinabile; declinatur hic cetus, huius ceti — *ET OMNEM ANIMAM VIVENTEM ATQVE MOTABILEM QVAM PRODVXERVNT AQVAE*. Motabiles autem dicuntur animae piscium et auium respectu hominis. Illae enim mouentur de esse ad non esse; ista non, quia perpetua est, uel quia forsitan animas non habent, sed ipsum animal uocauerit *ANIMAM* id est uiuens. Vnde et Graeci diuidunt animalia per *zoa* et *psychea*, *zoa* id est uiuentia bruta, sed *psychea*, animata, a *psyche* quod est anima, rationalia scilicet. Et dicitur creatum *MOTABILE*, quia creatum est sic ut moueretur de uita ad mortem, quod non homo qui sic creatus est ut non moreretur, si uellet. Illa uero creata sunt ut uel in esum cedant aliis uel senio deficient.\* *HIS BENEDIXIT DEVS: CRESCITE ET MVLTIPPLICAMINI*.

\*Augustinus uidetur uelle quod pisces animas habent. Dicit enim eos habere memoriam. Ait enim fontem esse in Bullensi regione plenum piscibus. Qui cum hominibus supergradientibus gregatim natando eunt et redeunt, et stant cum stantibus exspectantes ut aliquid eis iaciant, quia sic assueuerunt.

---

256 quod<sup>1</sup>] quia **S** 258 ornatum aeris<sup>1</sup>] *tr.* **M**; superioris] *corr. ex superiores* **M**  
 260 empyreo] caelo *add.* **M**; suam] *om.* **FM** 261 ornatum] *corr. ex adornatum* **C**; *CREAVITQVE*] auctoritate Augustini probat pisces animas habent *praem.* **M** 262 neutri generis] *tr.* **FS**; est] *et add.* **M**; indeclinabile] est *add.* **M**; declinatur] tamen *add.* **FMS**; hic] *corr. ex hoc* **C om.** **F**; huius ceti] *ti* **FS** 264 hominis] animae *praem.* **FM** 265 non quia] *tr.* **M**; quia forsant] forsitan quia **M** 266 sed] *om.* **FMS**; uocauerit] uocauit **FM**; et] *om.* **M**; diuidunt] ea id est *add.* **M** 267 sed] scilicet **FMS**; animata] animantia **M** 268 rationalia scilicet] animalia scilicet rationalia **S**; Et] *om.* **F**; quia] quod **MS** 269 sic ut] *tr.* **M**; non] est *add.* **MS**; sic] *om.* **FMS** 270 ut uel] *tr.* **GF**; esum] usum **M** 271 Deus] sic *add.* **M** 272/75 Augustinus . . . assueuerunt] *adnotatio* **C**<sup>*in marg.*</sup>, *pars textus principalis sed scriptum est alia manu in marg.: "haec est glosa"* **F** *pars textus principalis* **M** *adnotatio in textu* **S** 272 Augustinus] Beda vel Augustinus **M**; uidetur] videntur **M**; animas habent] habeant animas **M**; enim] ipse Augustinus *add.* **M** 273 Bullensi] Bulliensis **C** 274 gregatim] gradatim **M**; natando] *corr. ex notando* **F** 275 aliquid eis] *tr.* **M**; assueuerunt] consueuerunt **M**

---

256/61 cfr. GO, vol. 1.14<sup>a</sup>.2–3, ex Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 3.9–10 (CSEL 28.1.71–74).

263/71 Rem. Aux., *Commentarius in Genesim* 1:20–21 (PL 131: 56D), et Hugh of Saint Victor, *Adnot. in Pent.* (PL 175: 37A); uide etiam: GO, vol. 1.14<sup>a</sup>.4, ex Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:21 (CCL 118A.22.642–49).

272/75 Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 3.8 (CSEL 28.1.71.12–24).

---

261/68 Gen. 1:21. 271 Gen. 1:22.



## Cap. VIII – De opere sextae Diei.

SEXTA DIE ORNAVIT DEVS TERRAM. PRODVXIT ENIM TERRA TRIA GENERA ANIMALIVM: IVMENTA, REPTILIA, BESTIAS. Sciens enim Deus hominem per peccatum casurum in poenam, ad remedium laboris dedit ei iumenta quasi iuamenta  
 280 ad opus uel ad esum. Reptilia uero et bestiae sunt ei in exercitium. Reptilium uero sunt tria genera: trahentia ut uermes, qui se ore trahunt; serpentia ut colubri, qui ui costarum se rapiunt; repentia pedibus scilicet ut lacerate et botracae. Dicuntur autem bestiae quasi uastiae a uastando id est laedendo et saeuendo. Quaeritur de quibusdam minutis animantibus, quae uel ex cadaueribus uel ex  
 285 humoribus nasci solent, si tunc orta fuerint; quorum sex sunt genera. Quaedam enim exhalationibus habent esse, ut bibiones ex uino, papiliones ex aqua; quaedam ex corruptionibus umorum ut uermes in cisternis; quaedam ex cadaueribus ut apes ex iumentis, ut scarabei et scarabones ex equis; quaedam ex corruptione lignorum ut teredines; quaedam ex herbarum corruptione ut tineae ex oleribus;  
 290 quaedam ex corruptione fructuum ut gurguliones ex fabis. De his dicitur quia quae sine corruptione nascuntur, ut illa quae exhalationibus, tunc facta sunt; quae uero ex corruptionibus post peccatum ex rebus corruptis orta sunt. Quaeritur quoque de nociuis animantibus, si creata sunt nociua uel primo mitia post facta sunt homini nociua. Dicitur quia post facta fuerunt nociua tribus de causis:  
 295 propter hominis punitionem, correptionem, instructionem. Punitur enim homo cum laeditur ab his uel cum timet laedi, quia timor maxima poena est. Corrigi-

---

**VIII**, 277 **TRIA**] omnia **M** 278/79 hominem . . . peccatum] per peccatum hominem **M** 279 poenam] laboris *add.* **S**; remedium] *corr. ex* redmedium **C** 280 uel] et **S**; Reptilia . . . exercitium] r. u. s. e. i. ex. et b. **M**; bestiae] quasi uastiae *add.* **C**<sup>sup. l.</sup> *a.m.* 281 uero] autem **M**; sunt tria] *tr.* **M**; ore] *corr. ex* hore **C** 282 rapiunt] *corr. ex* trahunt **C**; scilicet] *om.* **C**; et] *om.* **S**; botracae] genus serpentis *add.* **S** 283 laedendo] delendo *add.* **S**; et saeuendo] uel saeuendo *sup. l.* **M** 284 minutis animantibus] *tr.* **M** 286 bibiones] scilicet paruae muscae *add.* **C**<sup>sup. l.</sup>, (id est *sup. l.*) paruae muscae *add.* **S**; uino] humo **F** 287/88 ex<sup>2</sup> . . . equis] *om.* **S** 288 iumentis] iuencis **FM**; ut] *om.* **FM**; et] uel **M** 289 teredines] teredones **F**; herbarum corruptione] *tr.* **MS**; tineae] *corr. ex* fruct **F** 293 sunt] sint **FMS** 294 sunt] sint **FMS**; post] homini *add.* **M**; fuerunt] sunt **DM** sint homini **S** 295 correptionem] correctionem **S**; Punitur] *corr. ex* ponitur **F**; enim] *add.* **C**<sup>sup. l.</sup> *a.m.*, *om.* **F** 296 ab his] his **FS**, *om.* **M**

---

**VIII**, 277/78 Cfr. Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 14, cap. 9.2 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.398.26, 399.7–8, 10–11), et dist. 15, cap. 2 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.401.1–5).

280/82 Hugh of Saint Victor, *Adnot. in Pent.* (PL 175: 37B).

284/92 Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 3.14 (CSEL 28.1.79–80); cfr. Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 15, cap. 4 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.401.16–27), ex GO, vol. 1.14<sup>b</sup>.4.

292/304 GO, vol. 1.14<sup>b</sup>.5–6, et 1.15<sup>a</sup>.1; cfr. Pet. Lomb., *II Sent.*, dist. 15, cap. 3 (ed. Brady [Grottaferrata, 1971], 1.2.401.6–15), ex GO, vol. 1.14<sup>b</sup>.5, et Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 3.15–17 (CSEL 28.1.80–83).

---

VIII, 277/78 Gen. 1:24–25.

tur his cum scit ista sibi accidisse pro peccato suo. Instruitur admirando opera Dei, magis admirans opera formicarum quam onera camelorum, uel cum uidens haec minima posse sibi nocere, recordatur fragilitatis suae et humiliatur. Sed dicunt quia quaedam animalia laedunt alia, quae nec inde puniuntur nec corriguntur nec instruuntur. Sed et in his instruitur homo. Per exemplum etiam ad hoc creata sunt, ut aliis sint in sum. Sed iterum dicunt quod etiam in mortuos homines saeuunt, sed et in his instruitur homo, ne aliquod genus mortis horrescat, quia per quoscumque transeat meatus *nec capillus de capita eius peribit*. Ad hunc modum solet quaeri de herbis et arboribus infructuosis, si et in illis diebus orta sunt, cum Scriptura non memoret nisi herbas seminales et arbores fructiferas. Potest dici quia quae modo infructuosa sunt, ante peccatum fecerunt fructum aliquem, post peccatum uero nascuntur homini magis ad laborem quam ad utilitatem; uel post peccatum orta sunt, quia post dictum est homini: *Spinis et tribulos germinabit tibi terra*. Vel quaecumque terris haerent faciunt fructum id est utilitatem manifestam uel occultam. Quod uero piscibus et auibus dictum est, *CRESCITE ET MVLTIPPLICAMINI*, etiam de his intellegendum est, licet non sit dictum. Haec est enim communis causa creationis eorum.

*Thomas Aquinas College*

---

297 scit] scilicet **M**; accidisse . . . suo] p. pe. s. a. **M** 297/98 admirando . . . uel] *om.* hic sed *add. infra* **S** 298/99 uidens . . . minima] h. m. u. **S** 300 nec<sup>2</sup>] uel **FS** 301 nec] uel **FS**; et] *om.* **M**, etiam **S**; homo] admirando opera dei magis admirans opera formicarum quam onera camelorum uel instruitur *add. hoc loco sed uide supra* **S**; exemplum] possunt enim similiter nocere *add.* **S**; etiam] haec *praepos.* **S** 302 hoc] haec **G**; etiam] et **FMS** 303 et] *add. F<sup>sup. l.</sup>, om.* **M** 304 transeat meatus] *tr.* **M** 305 si et] *corr. in et si* **F** 306 orta] creatae **M**; sunt] sint **FMS**; memoret] commemoret **M** 307 quia] quod **M**; fecerunt] fecerint **M** 308 uero] *om.* **FMS**; nascuntur . . . magis] n. h. potius **M** potius n. h. **S** 309 post<sup>2</sup>] peccatum *add.* **M** 310 terra] *om.* **S**; terris haerent] haerent terrae **M** 313 Haec] hoc **M**

---

304/11 Ad – occultam] Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* 3.18 (CSEL 28.1.83–84).  
 311/13 Cfr. GO, vol. 1.15<sup>b</sup>.2, ex (non obstante rubrica, qua Augustino attribuitur) Bede, *In Gen.*, 1:25 (CCL 118A.24.706–19).

---

304 Luc. 21:18. 309/10 Gen. 3:18. 312 Cfr. Gen. 1:20–22.