

1978

## Richard Fishacre's Quaestio on the Ascension of Christ: An Edition

R. James Long

Fairfield University, rjlong@fairfield.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.fairfield.edu/philosophy-facultypubs>

Copyright 1978 Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies

Peer Reviewed

---

### Repository Citation

Long, R. James, "Richard Fishacre's Quaestio on the Ascension of Christ: An Edition" (1978). *Philosophy Faculty Publications*. 16.

<https://digitalcommons.fairfield.edu/philosophy-facultypubs/16>

### Published Citation

Long, R. James (1978). "Richard Fishacre's Quaestio on the Ascension of Christ: An Edition," *Mediaeval Studies* 40 (1978) 30 55.

This item has been accepted for inclusion in DigitalCommons@Fairfield by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Fairfield. It is brought to you by DigitalCommons@Fairfield with permission from the rights-holder(s) and is protected by copyright and/or related rights. **You are free to use this item in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses, you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.** For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@fairfield.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@fairfield.edu).

# MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

*Volume XL*

1978

---

OFFPRINT

---



PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES  
TORONTO, CANADA

## CONTENTS

### TEXTS

- Deux remaniements anonymes des *Collationes in decem preceptis* de  
saint Thomas d'Aquin *Jean-Pierre Torrell* 1
- Richard Fishacre's *Quaestio* on the Ascension of Christ: An Edition  
*R. James Long* 30
- Robert Fland's *Insolubilia*: An Edition, with Comments on the Dating  
of Fland's Works *Paul Vincent Spade* 56
- A New *Passio beati Edmundi regis [et] martyris* *Judith Grant* 81
- Graduation Speeches of Gentile da Foligno *Carl C. Schlam* 96

### ARTICLES

- Chrestien and the Latin *comediae* *Tony Hunt* 120
- Russian Princes and Their Identities in the First Half of the Thirteenth  
Century *Martin Dimnik* 157
- Rome under Attack: An Estimation of King Aistulf's Motives for the  
Lombard Siege of 756 *Jan T. Hallenbeck* 190
- William of Saint-Amour and the Apostolic Tradition  
*James Doyne Dawson* 223
- A Second New List of Beneventan Manuscripts (I) *Virginia Brown* 239
- The *Summa* of Master Serfo and Thirteenth-Century Penitential  
Literature *Joseph Goering* 290
- Ranulf de Glanville's Formative Years c. 1120-79: The Family Back-  
ground and His Ascent to the Justiciarship *J. S. Falls* 312
- The Scriptorium of Bury St. Edmunds in the Third and Fourth Decades  
of the Twelfth Century: Books in Three Related Hands and Their  
Decoration *Elizabeth Parker McLachlan* 328
- Richard Fishacre's Use of Averroes with Respect to Motion and the  
Human Soul of Christ *Walter H. Principe* 349

RICHARD FISHACRE'S *QUAESTIO*  
ON THE ASCENSION OF CHRIST: AN EDITION

*R. James Long*

THAT the studium at Oxford from the beginning exhibited a distinctly scientific orientation is a fact well established by historians of medieval thought.<sup>1</sup> This interest in the positive sciences, moreover, was true both of the seculars (like Alfred of Sareshel, Daniel of Morley, John Blund, and Robert Grosseteste) and also the Franciscans (like Adam Marsh, Richard Rufus, and Roger Bacon), the latter group owing their interest at least in part to the tutelage of Grosseteste.

What is not so well established is the intellectual identity of the early Dominicans at Oxford. Did they share the scientific interests of their colleagues or did they incline more toward the speculative interests of the Paris theologians? Here the sources are scanty. Aside from a commentary on the Psalms and a few sermons by his mentor Robert Bacon,<sup>2</sup> the works of Richard Fishacre provide the sole surviving witness for the teaching activities of the early English Dominicans.<sup>3</sup>

In the Prologue to his Sentence-Commentary, which was probably the first composed at Oxford,<sup>4</sup> Fishacre articulates the commonplace rationale for the

1 See especially D. A. Callus, 'Introduction of Aristotelian Learning to Oxford', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 29 (1943) 3-55.

2 MS. Bodley 745 (2764), fols. 193-497; and British Library MS. Royal 7.A.ix, fol. 70v. See B. Smalley, 'Robert Bacon and the Early Dominican School at Oxford', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 30 (1948) 3-16.

3 Fishacre's extant works include a Sentence-Commentary (which survives in eleven MSS.), a treatise on heresies, the *quaestio* on the Ascension of Christ edited here, a collection of seventy-two *questiones* excerpted from the Sentence-Commentary (in Cambridge, Trinity Coll. MS. O.I.30), a number of sermons (see e.g. Cambridge, Trinity Coll. MS. B.15.38, fols. 24r-33r), and a treatise entitled *De fide, spe, et caritate* (which is possibly the anonymous piece by the same title in Oxford, Corpus Christi Coll. MS. 32, fols. 59r-63v; see L. E. Boyle, 'Three English Pastoral *Summae* and a "Magister Galienus"', *Studia Gratiana* 11 [1967] 140 n. 15).

4 Callus, 'Aristotelian Learning', 32; and R. J. Long, 'The Science of Theology according to Richard Fishacre: Edition of the Prologue to His *Commentary on the Sentences*', *Mediaeval Studies* 34 (1972) 71 n. 1.

study of the sciences, namely as a propaedeutic to the study of Sacred Scripture.<sup>5</sup> He finds a figure for this ancillary relationship in the Old Testament tale of Abraham, who had first to sleep with the maidservant Agar before his wife Sarah could conceive, the former representing the sciences, the latter theology.<sup>6</sup> Although he endorses such a relationship, Fishacre warns of the risks involved. There were those in his day, he admits with astonishment ('fateor mirabile'), who delighted solely in the embraces of a common handmaid and cared nothing for the lady of the house, though possessed of incomparable beauty. When they finally tore themselves away from the bosom of the secular sciences, moreover, they found themselves to be impotent with the queen of the sciences owing to their advanced age, just as David in his declining years bedded the beautiful Abisag for her warmth but did not know her carnally.<sup>7</sup>

This approach to theology via the secular sciences is admirably illustrated in an untitled and anonymous *quaestio* on the Ascension of Christ which occurs at the end of Vatican MS. Ottob. lat. 294. On the evidence both external and internal, which I will review below, I feel confident in ascribing the piece to Fishacre. If his Sentence-Commentary can be dated *circa* 1241-45,<sup>8</sup> I would tentatively place the *De ascensione* between 1245 and 1248, the year of Fishacre's death. The style, the rather unfinished nature of the text, and especially the character of the rather frequent errors, moreover, all suggest strongly that the original was in the form of a *reportatio*.<sup>9</sup>

The first and most obvious argument for the authorship of the work is its physical location, namely, appended to a copy of Fishacre's Sentence-Commentary.<sup>10</sup> The scribe of the *De ascensione*, furthermore, was one of several who labored over the latter. More significantly, the style of the piece, principally its cautious tone, is unmistakably Fishacre's. Like many an untenured faculty member he tends to abstain on issues that reflect a division of opinion. In the Sentence-Commentary this hesitancy saves him from committing himself on such sensitive and complex questions as the plurality of forms.<sup>11</sup> In the *De ascensione*

5 'Hinc insuper patet quod accedentem ad hanc <theologiam> oportet alias <scientias> praecognoscere vel universaliter omnes vel pro magna parte; alioquin ignorabit exempla huius scientiae' (Long, *ibid.*, 85).

6 *ibid.*, 85-86.

7 *ibid.*, 86-87.

8 *ibid.*, 74.

9 There are a number of stylistic clues that would indicate that the piece resulted from the reciprocity of live debate and the reporting thereof: e.g. *dicebat* (p. 46), *ad hoc quod dicitis* (p. 47), *cuius des subtilitatem* (p. 50), *responde* (p. 54). The textual corruptions, moreover, that are likely to have resulted from oral transmission are noted in the apparatus.

10 The codex contains as well *adnotationes* on Augustine's *De haeresibus* (fols. 287r-294v), which I would argue on similar grounds are from the pen of Richard Fishacre.

11 R. J. Long, 'Richard Fishacre and the Problem of the Soul', *The Modern Schoolman* 52 (1975) 265-66.

we read the same distinctive phrases: 'sic dico, non tamen asserendo, sed magis mihi uidetur'; 'cui concedenti mihi uidentur, non tamen assero'; 'dici tamen pōsset, nisi aliquid melius uideatur'; 'nec certum inuenio et ideo non dico', and so on.

Most telling, of course, are the close doctrinal similarities of the piece, amounting at times to literal parallelisms, to at least three distinctions (2.14, 4.44, and 4.47) in his Sentence-Commentary.<sup>12</sup> Although Fishacre nowhere in his Commentary addresses himself explicitly to the doctrine of the Ascension,<sup>13</sup> it is abundantly clear from these passages that not only was the author raising the same physical and cosmological issues and reading the same sources (notably Aristotle) but he was in most instances also reaching precisely the same conclusions as in the *De ascensione*.<sup>14</sup>

As to the content of the *quaestio* it must be said at the outset that Fishacre approaches this doctrine with both originality and daring. The usual manner of treating the issue employed by his predecessors and contemporaries at Paris was by way either of a literal gloss on the Scripture text or a meditation on the metaphorical content of the doctrine.<sup>15</sup> Although there are several allusions to Aristotelian science in an anonymous *quaestio* on the Ascension, which the Quaracchi editors have tentatively attributed to Alexander of Hales, the author's analysis takes a different tack and relies far less than Fishacre's on the Stagirite.<sup>16</sup>

12 See Cambridge, Gonville and Caius Coll. MS. 329/410, fols. 188ra-b, 515ra-518vb, and 530va-531ra. See also Cambridge, Trinity Coll. MS. O.I.30, qq. 49-50, fols. 20v-21v.

13 Notice should be taken of a sermon on the Ascension ('Ascendit Deus in jubilacione') in Cambridge, Trinity Coll. MS. B.15.38, fols. 35r-37r, which J. B. Schneyer has attributed to Fishacre (*Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters für die Zeit von 1150-1350* [Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters 43. 5; Mühster, 1974], p. 148, no. 17). The only reason given by Schneyer for his assigning the sermon to Fishacre, however, is that it follows a sermon on fol. 24r ('Ego autem sicut oliua') which bears Fishacre's name in the rubricator's hand. There are, moreover, arguments against Fishacre's authorship: (1) the marginal note (in a modern hand) on fol. 35r reading 'Dictum Lincolnensis 50'; (2) a note in the same hand in the fly-leaf following the item 'Ser: in Ascensione Domini' reading 'Lincolnensis'; (3) most importantly, the fact that the sermon has nothing in common with the treatment of the subject in both the Sentence-Commentary and the *De ascensione*. The 'Ascendit Deus' sermon, in fact, stands in sharp contrast to the 'Ego autem sicut oliua' sermon, which makes extensive use of Aristotelian science (in this case the pseudo-Aristotelian *De plantis*) and clearly bears the impress of Fishacre's style and interests.

14 The parallel passages will be noted as they occur in the text. Though by no means do I claim to have found every relevant text, enough have been cited, I believe, to demonstrate quite clearly Fishacre's authorship of the present *quaestio*.

15 See e.g. William of Auvergne, Sermon for the Fourth Sunday after Easter, in *Opera omnia* 2.2 (Rouen, 1674), p. 265.

16 Alexander of Hales, *Quaestiones disputatae 'Antequam esset frater'*, vol. 3 (Quaracchi, 1960), appendix 2, q. 3, pp. 1469-78. See the note on this question *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 23\*. In addition, the compilation that circulated under the title *Summa fratris Alexandri* devotes seven chap-

Since the Lombard did not include the doctrine in his *Sentences*, it was not incumbent on his commentators to raise the issue. Neither Alexander's Glosses on the *Sentences*, a prototype of such works at Paris, nor Fishacre's Commentary, as mentioned, contain any specific treatment of Christ's ascension. However, when Peter Lombard asks about the nature and location of Christ during the three days between his crucifixion and resurrection (3.22), Thomas Aquinas finds occasion also to ask several questions about his ascension: namely 'whether Christ ought to have ascended?'; 'whether the motion of the Ascension was forced (*violentus*)?'; and finally, 'whether Christ ascended above the heavens?'<sup>17</sup>

Until Aquinas' careful and thorough discussion of the question, however, Fishacre's opusculum stands virtually alone with respect to the extent to which he makes use of the new science.<sup>18</sup> Invoking the Aristotelian concepts of natural place, natural motion, gravity and levity, vacuum, and time, Fishacre asks by what power Christ's ascension took place, that is, was it by virtue of his divinity, his soul, or his body? That it was possible that Christ ascended by virtue of his divinity, Fishacre establishes by citing the authority of Scripture. The possibility of the Ascension taking place by the power of Christ's soul, however, merits a lengthier discussion. Four arguments are advanced, all to the effect that the rational soul is deserving of the highest place in the universe because it is the noblest of creatures; furthermore, it will naturally be conveyed to that place unless impeded.<sup>19</sup>

Does not the glorified body impede the soul, asks Fishacre? Decidedly not, is his response, and he formulates no less than nine arguments to prove it. Most of these arguments are *a fortiori* and offer little difficulty of interpretation. The third, for example, runs as follows: a sound albeit heavy body is more mobile

ters to the Ascension (Alexander of Hales, *Summa theologica* III, tr. 7, q. 1; vol. 4 [Quaracchi, 1948], pp. 278-92). Despite the occasional reference to Aristotle and two citations of St. Augustine in common with Fishacre, there is no evidence to suggest that the one work influenced the other. Since, moreover, a version of the *Summa* was in circulation about 1250, the dates of composition/compilation for the two works are roughly contemporaneous.

<sup>17</sup> 3 *Sent.* 22.3.1-3 (Parma, 7.232-35).

<sup>18</sup> My examination of the works of Fishacre's contemporaries has admittedly not been exhaustive. Mention should be made, for example, of two anonymous questions (one possibly Alexandrine) on the Ascension in Prague, Univ. MS. IV.D.13, fols. 211vb-213va (described by B.-G. Guyot, 'Quaestiones Guerrici, Alexandri et aliorum magistrorum Parisiensium', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 32 [1962] 86). The second was printed by the Quaracchi editors as Alexandrine material (see n. 16 above), but the first (listed as no. 216) seems to contain, according to Guyot's summary description, a scientific analysis not unlike Fishacre's. Also Guerric of Saint-Quentin has a question on the Ascension in Todi, Biblioteca Comunale MS. 71, fols. 59c-60b, which I have not had the opportunity to examine.

<sup>19</sup> See below, pp. 43-44. A version of this commentary was read at the Eleventh Annual Conference on Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, Michigan, May 1976.

than a light and infirm body (according to the authority of St. Augustine); but since Christ's soul is most robust, his body is perfectly sound; therefore, most mobile. In the seventh argument he asks rhetorically why, if by virtue of a heavenly body water is suspended in clouds (above its natural sphere), cannot the glorified body, which is lighter than water, be raised on high by the power of the spirit, which is heavenly by nature; or similarly (in the ninth argument), if the spirits of birds can keep their non-glorified bodies in the airy sphere, why cannot the soul of Christ bear his lighter body (because glorified) into the empyrean, the highest sphere of heaven?<sup>20</sup>

To the thesis that the soul by its very nature ascends Fishacre presents two objections. First, it would seem that the souls of the damned *descend* into hell. Do they do so willingly, forcedly, or naturally? Eliminating the first two alternatives, it remains that certain souls descend of their own nature. Secondly, if the natural appetite of the angel is to be in heaven, its beatitude is diminished whenever it is sent thence on a divine mission; the implication is that this is unseemly.<sup>21</sup>

Fishacre resolves the difficulty by drawing a distinction; a place is said to be natural to a thing in two ways: (1) because the substance in question has a natural form by which it is inclined toward and desires that place (such being the case with the elements), and (2) because it has a natural form by which it desires that which is suitable to its nature (for example, the bird that is drawn to its nest but leaves it temporarily in search of food). The latter is the case with the rational spirit, which by its specific form desires naturally whatever it sees as being in harmony with its nature, including the highest place, the empyrean heaven.<sup>22</sup>

Replying to the first objection regarding the souls of the damned, the Dominican distinguishes four ways in which a substance can be in a place: naturally and not voluntarily (for example, heavy bodies), voluntarily and not naturally (for example, angels when they are here below), naturally and voluntarily (for example, the blessed spirits in heaven), and lastly, neither naturally nor voluntarily. It is to this last category that the souls of the damned belong. However, by what power they are retained there (since they are there only by force), Fishacre does not know, suggesting only that it may be the same power that suspends water in clouds, that is, above their natural place. Alternatively — Fishacre also hesitates to assert this — there may be a bonding between the damned spirits and the fires of hell, which is yet not altogether like the composition of body and soul in man. Thus it would be divine power that effects the bond and by the latter would they be forcibly detained.<sup>23</sup>

20 pp. 44-45.

21 pp. 45-46.

22 p. 46.

23 pp. 46-47.



Responding to the second objection, that the beatitude of the angels is diminished when they are apart from their natural place, Fishacre posits a distinction between grace and nature. In the angels the latter is ennobled and as it were absorbed in its entirety by the former. Therefore, they delight more in the works of grace (for example, coming here below in response to the divine will) than in remaining in heaven in accordance with their nature. Nor is this contrary to their nature. There are indeed in the angels not contrary appetites but appetites for two things that are not compossible (that is, to be in heaven and here below at the same time). But the one appetite belongs to nature, the other to the informed will.<sup>24</sup>

Resuming his original division of the text, Fishacre raises the third possibility, namely, that it is solely by virtue of his glorified body that Christ could have ascended. In support of this option the Oxonian marshals thirteen arguments, punctuated occasionally by objections to which he then immediately replies. To the nobler body, runs the first argument, belongs the higher place; but the body of Christ is noblest; therefore, and so on.<sup>25</sup>

According to this line of reasoning, one objects, the sun would be higher than all the stars (on the Aristotelian supposition that the sun is nobler). As a consequence of this absurd situation, the empyrean, that sphere of the heavens above the stellar sphere, would be occupied by a body, namely, the sun, and there would then be no room there for the body of Christ.<sup>26</sup>

He answers the objection by affirming the truth of his original proposition with respect to those heavenly bodies whose sole function is ornamental; it may be the case, however, that the proper working of the universe as a whole should dictate a different arrangement. Perhaps, he suggests, the sun is endowed by nature with a greater appetite for a *locus medius* than for the supreme position to which its nobility entitles it. The objection in any case is clearly not relevant to the body of Christ.<sup>27</sup>

His second argument is that the heavens were made for man, including his body, and according to Sacred Scripture are in his service. But this servitude

24 To illustrate this distinction he cites the example of Christ's agony before his death. The meaning seems to be that the two appetites are not divided against themselves, just as Christ's flesh, which willed not to die, did not in fact desire anything in opposition to the spirit (which willed the death of the body), 'because the spirit willed that the flesh should so will'. Or, Fishacre continues, it could be said that just as the deity, which has power over the humanity in Christ, permits it sometimes to sleep, to suffer, and in general to perform human acts, so also the informed will enjoys such sovereignty over the nature joined to it that it can temporarily disallow the functioning of its proper act (e.g. that it actually desire, rather than avoid, the wood of the cross). Such an act is not contrary to nature, but above it (pp. 47-48).

25 p. 48.

26 *ibid.*

27 *ibid.*

should extend even to physical location. Therefore, man's natural position is above the heavenly bodies.<sup>28</sup>

His third argument is particularly obtuse: Heaven is the natural dwelling place of the soul. Some souls, however, are brought there by violent means,<sup>29</sup> since man is capable of killing himself. Is it not reasonable to suppose, Fishacre asks, that the earthly substance can dwell in heaven naturally (in opposition to 'violently') and also move there naturally?<sup>30</sup>

Fourthly, there is a greater difference between spirit and body than between one body and another. But the spirit dwells in the body naturally. Therefore, *a fortiori* a body should be able to inhabit another body — specifically the glorified body should be capable of dwelling in the celestial body.<sup>31</sup>

To these last arguments the following objection is raised. If the natural place of the entire earth is the same as for that of a single clod, and if the clod of earth which is the body of Christ is naturally on high, so too will be the entire earth — at least when it will have been glorified.<sup>32</sup>

Fishacre responds by stating that the proposition (which is, in fact, Aristotle's) is true only of a clod or atom of earth not united to another and especially to a nobler nature (as is the case with earth in the body of Christ). Also in the glorified human body the weight of the earthly element will be removed, which may not be true of the entire glorified earth — in which case their place will not be the same.<sup>33</sup>

The following eight arguments proceed in similar fashion and cause no particular difficulty. The thirteenth argument (in support of the Ascension taking place by virtue of the body) is, however, somewhat convoluted. Fishacre establishes first that the universe consists of four concentric spheres: earth, air, the stellar heaven, and the empyrean. The phrase 'heaven and earth' is frequently used by the sacred writers to signify every creature,<sup>34</sup> for 'heaven' is three-tiered (air, stars, and the empyrean). There is, moreover, a hierarchy among the bodies that adorn the universe, the opaque being the less noble, the luminous the more

<sup>28</sup> pp. 48-49.

<sup>29</sup> Literally 'this violence someone inflicts on it (i.e. the soul)'; I suspect the text is corrupt here, the original positing the opposition between *anima/infernum/violencia* and *corpus/celum/natura*. Thus, 'if the soul can be borne to hell by violent means (i.e. suicide), *a fortiori* the body can be borne to heaven by natural means'. This is merely a conjecture, and I have found no parallel text in the Sentence-Commentary to support it.

<sup>30</sup> p. 49.

<sup>31</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> In the Pentateuch alone see e.g. Gen 1:1, 2:1, 2:4, 14:19, 14:22, 24:3; Ex 20:11, 31:17; Deut 4:26, 30:19, 31:28.

noble; within these categories, furthermore, the inanimate is less noble than the animate, such that the following classification results: opaque inanimate substances ornament the earthly sphere, opaque animate the air, luminous inanimate the stellar heaven, and therefore, by extrapolation, luminous animate substances (including especially the glorified body of Christ) adorn the empyrean heaven.<sup>35</sup>

In addition, just as the star is borne upward naturally, so also is the glorified body, because, as Augustine has it, 'God removes gravity from the elements composing such a body. Remembering, however, that fire is one of those elements, and that fire by nature is light, Fishacre adds that though Augustine is silent on this point, if the glorified body retains its fiery element, it will ascend naturally at least as far as the outer limit of the fiery sphere (i.e. the stellar heaven). Because fire in the glorified body has been ennobled above the nature of the stellar heaven; moreover, it will ascend still higher ('just as if God were to make a nobler heaven above the stellar heaven, and each were to be light because made of fire, thus the nobler heaven would naturally ascend still higher if it were below').<sup>36</sup>

Even if both lightness and heaviness are removed from the glorified body, Fishacre continues, it still retains a natural appetite for that which is in keeping with its nobility, namely, the highest position and one which contains the noblest being, and barring any impediment will be carried thence by its natural appetite. To illustrate this latter he chooses the example of fire, which here below has no natural figure, but only a 'pineal' figure. In its proper sphere fire derives its round or spherical configuration from the heaven which contains it; or, if fire is itself a heaven, it naturally has a spherical figure. But because it has a natural form which seeks that which is in keeping with its nature, it gathers itself together now into a penetrative figure (that is, the cone-shaped figure in which fire now appears), by which it seeks to penetrate to a higher place.<sup>37</sup>

The conclusion Fishacre draws from all of this is that Christ could have ascended either by virtue of his divinity by itself, or by virtue of his soul by itself, or by virtue of his body by itself. Granting the possibility of any of the above options, the Dominican now asks by what power Christ did in fact ascend. The objection is posed that it could not have been by all three powers simultaneously, for no action is common to God and creature. He answers by reminding his putative interlocutor that the action of ascending could have been an *actum* (that

35 p. 51.

36 pp. 51-52. Cf. idem: 'Dicit Aristoteles in libro celo et mundo, loquens de loco super celum stellatum quem ibi frequenter uocat locum spirituum sic' (2 *Sent.* 2; Cambridge, Gonville and Caius Coll. MS. 329/410, fol. 128vb and Oxford, Balliol Coll. MS. 57, fol. 82rb).

37 p. 52.

is, something done) on the part of God and an *actio* on the part of the creature (that is, Christ's soul and body) simultaneously; hence possible.<sup>38</sup>

In typical scholastic fashion Fishacre argues in the first place that Christ did not in fact ascend by virtue of his body alone. Presenting arguments for the opposition, he says that it could be demonstrated that Christ ascended by virtue of his body, if he were borne on high instantaneously — which seems to be the case. First, if a stone were on high and the medium were a vacuum, it would fall instantaneously owing to the total lack of resistance; but nothing between earth and the empyrean could offer any resistance to the rarefied nature of Christ's glorified body; therefore, and so on. Secondly, light travels instantaneously owing to its subtlety; but the glorified body of Christ is subtler than light, which is evident because light finds resistance in doors and walls (whereas the risen Christ penetrated these<sup>39</sup>); therefore, and so on.<sup>40</sup>

Arguing the contrary position, Fishacre formulates the following syllogism: Christ did not ascend by virtue of his body unless he did so instantaneously; but he did not ascend instantaneously; therefore, he did not ascend by virtue of his body. In support of the minor premise the Oxonian argues that in instantaneous motion there is 'prior and posterior' with respect to nature, but not to time; the senses, however, cannot perceive prior and posterior with respect to nature, but only with respect to time. But Scripture clearly attests that the disciples 'watched' him ascend.<sup>41</sup> Therefore, he did not ascend instantaneously and therefore, not by the power of his body alone.<sup>42</sup>

Was Christ's divinity then in fact responsible for his ascension? Fishacre finds three arguments against such a thesis. First, Christ's ascension ought to arouse our own hopes of ascending to our eternal reward; however, we will not ascend by virtue of the Godhead conjoined with our nature, but by virtue of our soul; therefore, Christ ascends by the same power. Secondly, every motion takes place only with some resistance of the *mobile* to the *motor* or of the medium to the *mobile* or from both of these; but no finite power can offer any resistance to an infinite, indivisible *motor*. Therefore, just as in the case of the instantaneous fall of the stone through a vacuum, if Christ ascended by virtue of his divinity, such ascension would be instantaneous (the possibility of which has already been discounted). Lastly, local motion can be predicated only univocally; but if God moved a body locally, he would share a category in common with a creature, which is impossible; therefore, and so on.<sup>43</sup>

38 p. 52.

39 See Jn 20:19.

40 pp. 52-53.

41 'Cumque intuerentur in caelum euntem illum ...' (Ac 1:10).

42 p. 53.

43 *ibid.*

To the second and third objections Fishacre has a response. The need of resistance for motion to take place obtains only for natural motion, not voluntary motion (which would be the case with a divinely caused ascension). Univocal predication, moreover, is avoided by once again positing the distinction between, *actus* (predicated of God) and *actio* (predicated of the creature); only the latter is an accident, the former being identical with God's very being.<sup>44</sup>

Fishacre thus seems most inclined to the third option, namely, Christ's ascending by virtue of his soul. Motion, he asserts, is either natural, voluntary or forced; but voluntary procession is solely from the soul. Since the Ascension, however, was gradual (again the authority is the text from Acts<sup>45</sup>), it evidently took place by virtue of the soul.<sup>46</sup>

Opposing arguments are presented as follows: gradual motion requires resistance; must we suppose, therefore, that Christ increased the density of air, fire, and heaven itself (as he once did that of the sea<sup>47</sup>) so that he could ascend gradually? Such does not seem to be necessary, replies Fishacre, since no resistance (in howsoever solid a body) can be found to the glorified body.<sup>48</sup>

Tentatively (and characteristically) Fishacre offers his conclusion that Christ's gradual ascension took place either by virtue of the soul alone or by virtue of the composite of soul and body, such that the soul or the divinity would have retarded the instantaneousness (*subitatio*) with respect to the body.<sup>49</sup>

In the final analysis, however, the matter exceeds the capacities of human knowledge, as the Lombard says in his gloss on the Psalm text 'Et ascendit super cherubim'.<sup>50</sup> In fact, according to Peter Lombard's gloss on another Psalm, it would seem that it was by virtue of Christ's divinity that he ascended. Neither can Fishacre find anything conclusive to say about the gradual nature of the Ascension.<sup>51</sup>

Finally, posing a new question, the Dominican asks in what direction Christ ascended. Scripture seems to offer contrary views, that is, toward the east and toward the west. After considering several alternate views offered by the Lombard, Fishacre concludes the *quaestio* by suggesting a literal interpretation based on one of the suppositions of contemporary geography: namely, that Jerusalem (the site of the Ascension) occupies the midpoint between east and west in the belt or climate of the earth which we inhabit. When the sun makes its daily cir-

44 p. 54.

45 Ac 1:10.

46 p. 54.

47 See Mt 14:25; Mk 6:48; and Jn 6:19.

48 p. 54.

49 *ibid.*

50 Ps 17:11.

51 p. 54.

cuit, it is setting for those living in the east at the same time as it is rising for those in the west. If, therefore, Christ ascended straight upward from the midpoint (Jerusalem), he would be ascending toward the west for those living in the east and ascending toward the east for those living in the west.<sup>52</sup>

Curiously, Fishacre never cites Aristotle or his works by name in spite of his frequent and often unassimilated borrowings from the *Physics* and the *De caelo*. Since, moreover, he is generally conscientious about citing his sources — and, in fact, refers *nominatim* to Aristotle and his works with some frequency in the Sentence-Commentary — we must assume that the omissions were by design. Possibly, to suggest an explanation, Fishacre felt that the Aristotelian propositions that were being appealed to were so familiar to his audience that there was no need to mention their author and no advantage in so doing, since in these matters Aristotle did not possess the authority of an Augustine (who, incidentally, is cited a dozen times).

What in conclusion can be said of the present question? To be sure, Fishacre only imperfectly understood a scientific analysis that even at best remained the weakest and least developed branch of Aristotelian science. Indeed, at times his incomplete assimilation of the new science led the Oxonian into quite wrong-headed conclusions: his contention, for example, that on the Last Day human bodies will ascend of their own accord, the original quantum of matter (Adam's seed) having been expanded to such a volume (the entire human race) that the inversely proportioned density will have become rarer than air or even fire.<sup>53</sup>

To the Dominican theologian reading the *Physics* and the *De caelo*, however, the doctrine of the Ascension must have naturally suggested itself as a test case for the viability of the new science, as the doctrine of the angels was destined to play a like role in the hylemorphic debates a few years later. Conversely, the Aristotelian categories of natural place and natural motion, gravity, levity, and velocity apparently struck Fishacre as a novel and fruitful means of explicating a central tenet of the Creed. At any rate the question on the Ascension provides further evidence of Fishacre's involvement with the physical sciences,<sup>54</sup> ~~an involvement which earned Matthew Paris commendation of him as pre-eminent in theology and in other sciences.~~<sup>55</sup>

52. pp. 54-55.

53. p. 50.

54. For Fishacre's use of the new science to explicate a theological question see also W. H. Principe, 'Richard Fishacre's Use of Averroes with Respect to Motion and the Human Soul of Christ', pp. 349-60 below. I had not seen this study by the time my article went to press, but the author assured me that his conclusions reinforce my own.

55. *Chronica majora*, ed. H. R. Luard (RS 57.5; London, 1880), p. 16. One should, however, be wary of pushing Fishacre's Aristotelianism too far; see F. Pelster, 'Das Leben und die Schriften des

That Fishacre answered the problems posed by Aristotle by appealing to St. Augustine, moreover, is not in the least surprising. His vision was still informed by traditional Christian Platonism and in that tradition Augustine remained the authority par excellence. Fishacre, to borrow his own imagery, was willing to entertain a dalliance with the handmaiden, science, but was loath to tarry in her chambers. The queen was waiting, and it was by her that Fishacre desired to bear fruit.

#### THE MANUSCRIPT AND EDITION

Only one copy of Fishacre's *quaestio* on the Ascension is extant: Vatican MS. Ottob. lat. 294, fols. 294vb-296rb.<sup>56</sup> The same codex also contains a copy of Fishacre's *Commentarium in libros Sententiarum* (fols. 1r-286v), ending with book 4, distinction 8, and also an untitled and anonymous work containing *adnotationes* on Augustine's *De haeresibus* (fols. 287r-294v). The latter is probably also from the pen of Fishacre.

The manuscript is of English origin, in a small hand and more than usually abbreviated. It has page, column, and line numberings in fives — the latter a peculiarity of a mid-thirteenth-century Oxford scriptorium which serves to identify the earliest Fishacre manuscripts.<sup>57</sup> Judging from its script, its line numberings, and especially its affinity with Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS. lat. 16389, thought to be copied during Fishacre's lifetime,<sup>58</sup> I would date the manuscript to the third quarter of the thirteenth century.<sup>59</sup>

Oxford Dominikanerlehrers Richard Fishacre (d. 1248), *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 54 (1930) 538. In discussing Fishacre's philosophical position Gilson remarks: '... the question arises whether Aristotle himself would have been able to understand the meaning of his main positions' (*History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* [New York, 1955], p. 354).

<sup>56</sup> The verso side of fol. 296 is free of text, suggesting that the question is complete. The manuscript is described in *Inventarium codicum MSS latinorum Bibliothecae Ottobonianae* 1.294; F. Ehrle, 'L'agostinismo e l'aristotelismo nella scolastica del secolo XIII', *Xenia Thomistica* 3 (1925) 553; Pelster, *ibid.*, 526-27; and Long, 'Science of Theology', 77. It was first identified by A. Landgraf in *Das Wesen der lässlichen Sünde in der Scholastik bis Thomas von Aquin* (Bamberg, 1923), p. 105.

<sup>57</sup> This unusual device is shared by five manuscripts containing Fishacre's *Sententiarum* Commentary. See Pelster, *ibid.*, 522.

<sup>58</sup> This Sorbonne manuscript, which ends with dist. 3 of book 2, contains the following petition, on fol. 90v: 'Rogo te, lector, quisque es, ut roges Deum pro fratre Richardo de Fishacre, qui hoc opus edidit, ut eum Dominus nunc et semper in anima custodiat et in corpore vires prebeat, ut residuum operis ad finem prospere perducat. Amen.' The writer of these lines apparently believed Fishacre to be still alive; hence we may affix a pre-1248 date to the codex. See Long, 'Science of Theology', 77.

<sup>59</sup> Ehrle without further explanation places the manuscript in the fourteenth century ('L'agostinismo', 553).

Since the manuscript is unique, I decided to preserve as faithfully as possible the orthography of the scribe, including the inconsistencies (e.g. *ignis* and *ingnis*). Whenever the spelling was so unusual or strange in appearance as possibly to engender confusion, I noted the more usual spelling in the apparatus (e.g. *opagum* for *opacum*). It will be noted that *tia/tio* becomes *cia/cio* following *i* or a liquid (e.g. *resistencia*). The punctuation and capitalization are mine.

I have emended with reluctance, and then only when I felt it necessary in order to preserve the sense. Obvious omissions and dittographies I have corrected in the text without further explanation by the use of pointed and square brackets, as follows:

- < > signifies letters or words to be added;
- [ ] signifies letters or words to be omitted.

I wish to acknowledge my gratitude to the Fulbright Commission for enabling me personally to study the manuscript at the Vatican Library and to Fairfield University for a grant covering the preparation of the article.



RICHARD FISHACRE,  
<DE ASCENSIONE CHRISTI>

6. (f. 294vb) Quesitum fuit de ascensione: qua uirtute Christus ascendit? Et primo utrum uirtute solius deitatis potuit ascendere. Et patet quod sic. Si enim illa manus Dei, scilicet Filius Dei, *tribus digitis appendit mo[bi]lem terre* (Is 40<sup>a</sup>), quanto magis corpusculum assumptum? Num 11: *Numquid manus Domini inualida est?*<sup>b</sup> Luc: *Non<sup>f</sup> erit impossibile apud Deum omne uerbum.*<sup>c</sup>
- 2 - Quod autem uirtute anime, probatio. Nobiliori creature debetur locus superior. Ergo omni anime rationali debetur naturaliter locus supremus.<sup>d</sup> Sed fertur unumquodque ad locum suum non prohibitum.<sup>e</sup> Ergo et cetera.
- 3 - Item angelus<sup>2</sup> et anima natura sunt pares.<sup>f</sup> Ergo et locus naturalis eis par aut idem. Sed angelorum locus est celum. Ergo et animarum.<sup>g</sup>
4. Item quod omnibus inest, naturale est, ut dicit Augustinus.<sup>h</sup> Sed appetitus illius (f. 295ra) bone<sup>3</sup> habitationis omnibus inest. Ergo est naturalis. Ergo secundum

<sup>a</sup> Is 40:12.

<sup>b</sup> Num 11:23.

<sup>c</sup> Lc 1:37.

<sup>d</sup> -Cf. Fishacre: 'Item materia et sua per se forma proporcionantur ita ut nobilioris materie sit nobilior forma et e converso. Sed forma corporis humani est nobilissima, scilicet anima rationalis. Ergo ipsum est nobilissimum. Ergo naturaliter ei debetur locus supremus' (2 *Sent.* 14; Cambridge, Gonville and Caius Coll. MS. 329/410 (= C), fol. 188rb and Oxford, Balliol Coll. MS. 57 (= B), fol. 109ra).

<sup>e</sup> Cf. e.g. Aristotle, *De caelo* 1.8 (276a23-28).

<sup>f</sup> Cf. Augustine, *De libero arbitrio* 3.11 (CCL 29.294): 'Animae sunt enim rationales, et illis superioribus officio quidem impares sed natura pares'.

<sup>g</sup> Cf. Fishacre: 'Quorum est eadem natura, idem est locus naturalis. Sed anime rationalis et angeli est eadem natura, quia, ut dicit Augustinus, sunt natura pares et officio dispares. Ergo eorum est idem locus naturalis. Sed locus omnis compositi naturalis est locus naturalis predominantis in ipso. Ergo cum homo compositus sit, et in eo pars predominans sit anima, locus totius hominis naturalis est locus anime: sed locus anime, ut ostensum est, celum est. Igitur et locus totius hominis naturalis celum est' (2 *Sent.* 14; C, fol. 188ra and B, fol. 109ra).

<sup>h</sup> In his Sentence-Commentary (see i below) Fishacre gives as his source the *Unde malum*, the title under which the first book of the *De libero arbitrio* was known in the Middle Ages; I was unable, however, to locate the source of this quotation.

1 bene MS.

2 augustinus MS.

3 bene MS.

illum appetitum motus ad illum locum naturalis erit et illuc feretur nisi prohibeatur.<sup>1</sup>

7 Item que tantum corpora sunt, ut mineralia, habent naturalem positionem in infima<sup>4</sup>; que coniuncta<sup>5</sup> ex corpore et spiritu, in media, ut in superficie terre; in aqua, in aere, et in celo. Stelle animate secundum ethnicos angelique in medium uenientes induunt corpora. Ergo naturalis positio spirituum nudorum erit in supremo. Ergo illuc naturaliter feruntur nisi prohibea<n> tur.

6 Sed numquid potest corpus glorificatum cui est colligatum impedire? Patet quod non. In<sup>6</sup> Christo glorificato corpus omnino subditur<sup>7</sup> spiritui.<sup>8</sup> Alioquin si haberet corpus inclusionem deorsum et anima sursum, iam non esset Christo plena quies uel habitudo, et fieret aliquando separatio corporis et spiritus. Quia nullum uiolentum<sup>9</sup> eternum, et nullus appetitus naturalis eternaliter [cum] frustra, ergo ubique<sup>10</sup> uolet spiritus, ibi statim erit corpus, quod et dicit Augustinus.<sup>k</sup>

2 Item spiritus glorificati Christi est in ultimitate sue potencie et uirtutis.<sup>11</sup> Et <uirtus> corporis glorificati in Domino ad deorsum est aut<sup>12</sup> minor quam fuit aut nulla. Ergo uincet super corpus nec impeditur ab eo.

8 Item anima corpus graue tam sanum et bene dispositum facilius mouet quam idem macilentum et leue et infirmum, ut dicit beatus Augustinus,<sup>1</sup> et patet. Sed

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Fishacre: 'Item cum absque hesitatione anime locus naturalis sit celum, habet naturalem celi appetitum, cuius indicium est manifestum, quod omnibus insitus est appetitus celi. Quod autem inest omnibus est naturale, ut dicit Augustinus in libro *Unde malum*. Igitur anima humana naturaliter appetit locum supremum, qui si non esset naturalis corpori nostro, accideret hominem numquam fore plene beatum, quia si corpus nostrum ibi non erit, non habet anima suum appetibile, scilicet locum suum naturalem' (2 *Sent.* 14; C, fol. 188rb and B, fol. 109ra).

<sup>j</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *De caelo* 1.4 (271a33). Cf. also Fishacre: 'Item locus naturalis corporis Christi est celum. Alioquin cum locus naturalis anime eius sit celum, concupiscet caro eius etiam contra spiritum, quia caro naturaliter appetet locum suum naturalem, et tunc Christus miser esset. Sed idem est locus naturalis eius corporis et nostri, quia de nobis carnem accepit, sicut idem est locus naturalis totius terre et unius glebe. Igitur corporis nostri naturalis locus est celum' (2 *Sent.* 14; C, fol. 188rb and B, fol. 109ra).

<sup>k</sup> 'Cerçe ubi uolet spiritus, ibi erit protinus corpus' (*De ciuitate Dei* 22.30; CCL 48.862).

<sup>l</sup> *ibid.* 13.18 (CCL 48.400). Cf. Fishacre: 'Item spiritus honera non sentit, ut probat Augustinus sic: corpus sanum et pingue, licet multo maioris ponderis sit quam corpus macilentum, et macrum, tamen ipsum animum supra modum facilius portat et ad nutum mouet anima hoc quam illud. Quomodo hoc esse posset si pondere spiritus grauaretur?' (4 *Sent.* 47; C, fol. 530vb and B, fol. 350rb).

<sup>4</sup> infona MS.

<sup>5</sup> coniuncta; this spelling occurs regularly.

<sup>6</sup> An MS.

<sup>7</sup> The scribe seems to have written *subdiuiditur*, then corrected it by expunction to *subditur*.

<sup>8</sup> spiritum MS.

<sup>9</sup> uiaticum MS.

<sup>10</sup> utique MS.

<sup>11</sup> ueritatis MS.

<sup>12</sup> ante MS.

- Christi anima glorificata est robustissima, et corpus gloriosum in fine sanitatis et bone dispositionis. Ergo facillime mouebit quo uult.
9. Item angeli assumunt corpora corruptibilia et hec mouent facillime; sed non est anima Christi glorificata quouis angelo inpotencior, immo omnibus potencior, et corpus eius glorificatum corpore ab angelo assumpto nobilius et mobilius.<sup>13</sup> Ergo multo forcius et, cetera.
10. Item Dan 14: tulit [tulit] angelus Abacuc facillime a Iudea in Babilonem cum panibus et pulmento que omnia erant graua.<sup>m</sup> Nec est anima Christi illo angelo inpotencior, et eius corpus illis leuius. Ergo et cetera.
11. Item nunc potest corpus animam<sup>14</sup> natura celestem deprimere inferius dum neutrum gloriosum. Quare non poterit tunc anima leuare corpus sursum cum utrumque erit gloriosum<sup>15</sup>?<sup>n</sup>
12. Item uirtute corporis celestis, que est uirtus corporis, aqua suspenditur in nubibus. Quare non uirtute spiritus naturaliter celestis corpus gloriosum aqua leuius eleuet<sup>ur</sup> sursum?<sup>o</sup>
13. Item ignis propter naturalem adherenciam cum graui combustibili fertur et manet deorsum. Quare non<sup>16</sup> corpus propter naturalem coherenciam<sup>17</sup> cum spiritu feratur et maneat sursum?<sup>p</sup>
14. Item si possunt spiritus auium sua corpora non gloriosa eleuare in celum aereum, quare non anima Christi corpus leuius in celum empireum?<sup>q</sup>
15. Contra. Uidetur quod anime male descendant in infernum. Hoc aut est propter culpe pondus, que nichil est, aut propter illatam uiolenciam. Sed cuius? Non demonum. Quis enim et demonibus hanc facit uiolenciam cum et ipsi descen-

<sup>m</sup> Dan 14: 32-35.

<sup>n</sup> Cf. Fishacre: 'Item si potest corpus terrestre animas deprimere deorsum, non poterit aliquando anima corpus leuare sursum?' (4 *Sent.* 47; C, fol. 530vb and B, fol. 350rb).

<sup>o</sup> Cf. idem: 'Item si opere nature aqua suspenditur in nubibus super aerem, quomodo opere creatoris nature non poterit corpus humanum habitare super celum?' (ibid).

<sup>p</sup> Cf. idem: 'Item secundum Platonem idem est spera ignis et celum. Si igitur potest corpus ignis, scilicet corpus celeste, esse in terra ut hic nobiscum per adherenciam cum sua materia, cuius ponderis uirtus uincit super ignis leuitatem, immo in profundissimo terre, ut in inferno, et non poterit corpus terrestre esse in celo propter adherenciam cum anima, cuius uirtus uincit supra pondus corporis?' (ibid).

<sup>q</sup> Cf. Augustine, *De ciuitate Dei* 22.11 (CCL 48.829). Cf. also Fishacre: 'Qui per pennarum leuitatem donauit auium terrenis corporibus ut portentur in aere (etc.)' (4 *Sent.* 47; C, fol. 530vb and B, fol. 350rb).

13 nobilius et mobilius: nobilior et mobilior MS.; an example of perseveration (see 'inpotencior ... potencior' above).

14 anima MS.

15 gloriosus MS.

16 quare non: qualiter omnino MS.

17 choerenciam MS.

dant? Nec bonorum angelorum; tunc enim eternaliter aliqui essent in inferno ad detinendum demones et animas ibi. Ergo per naturam aut propriam uoluntatem. Sed non hoc. Ergo propter naturam.

16. Item si naturalis appetitus angelorum est esse in celo, tunc cum angeli exeunt à celo, minus gaudent quia contra appetitum naturalem exeunt.

17. Solutio. Dupliciter dicitur locus alicui naturalis, scilicet uel quia istud locatum habet formam naturalem qua inclinatur et appetit illum (f. 295rb) locum — et sic elementa sunt naturaliter in suis locis et feruntur ad ea — uel quia habet formam naturalem qua appetit omne congruum sue nature ut decens et expediens. sue nature — et sic auis naturaliter fertur ad nidum suum et naturaliter a nido ad colligendum, cibum pro tempore.

18. Sic dico — non tamen asserendo, sed magis mihi uidetur — quod spiritus habet naturaliter sibi deputatum locum supremum, quia habet formam suam naturalem qua appetit omne congruum sue nature. Et locus supremus talis est et ratione positionis, quia nobilior est situs superior quam inferior, et ratione corporis ibi positi, scilicet substance celi empirei, que est corpus nobilissimum<sup>18</sup> inter corpora continencia. Non<sup>19</sup> tamen est uerum<sup>20</sup> quod habeat spiritus rationalis specialem formam qua feratur ad illum locum uel inhabitet sicut terra, sed qua appetit omne quod uidet sue nature congruere.

19. Cui concedenti<sup>21</sup> mihi uidentur (non tamen assero) supradicte rationes probantes quod est naturalis locus ille spiritibus rationalibus.

20. Item rationibus affirmantibus quod corpus glorificatum non impedit spiritum assencio. Augustinus, *De ciuitate Dei* lib. 22: 'Poterit Deus graue pondus auferre, ut in eodem elemento habitet uiuificatum corpus, in quo uoluerit uiuificans spiritus.'<sup>r</sup>

21. Ad obiectum contra dicebat quod eorum<sup>22</sup> que sunt in loco, quedam sunt naturaliter in loco et non uoluntarie, ut corpora graua;<sup>23</sup> quedam uoluntarie et non naturaliter, ut angeli boni aliquando sunt hic nobiscum; quedam naturaliter et uoluntarie, ut spiritus beati in celo; quedam non naturaliter nec uoluntarie, ut demones in inferno et dampnate anime, qui quia noluerunt tenere ordinem, ut dicit Augustinus, tenentur ab ordine.<sup>s</sup>

<sup>r</sup> Augustine, *ibid.* (830).

<sup>s</sup> *idem*, *De musica* 6.14 (PL 32.1187).

<sup>18</sup> nobilissimus MS.

<sup>19</sup> nam MS.

<sup>20</sup> uno MS.

<sup>21</sup> concedente MS.

<sup>22</sup> torum MS.

<sup>23</sup> glaria MS. (possibly an error of oral transmission)

21 Sed qua ui teneantur dampnati<sup>24</sup> spiritus in inferno, nescio. Dicit tamen posset, nisi aliquid melius uideatur, quod illa uirtus detinet uiolenter illos spiritus naturaliter celestes que detinet aquas uiolenter superius — dico aquas que super celos sunt. Sed aquas detinet sursum quia forte expedit et spiritus tales deorsum quia decet et congruit. Licet enim deformes sint, tamen ornare possunt illam uilem habitationem et penalem, sicut latro ornat carc<er>em, ut dicit Augustinus, *De libero arbitrio*,<sup>t</sup> et eadem ui possunt detineri in illis ignibus<sup>25</sup> qua ille ignis in loco infimo.<sup>26</sup> Uel aliter (quod nec assero) dicit Augustinus, *De ciuitate Dei* lib. 21: 'Adherebunt spiritus incorporei corporeis ignibus cruciandi meris et ineffabilibus modis, accipientes ex ignibus penam, non dantes ignibus uitam.'<sup>u</sup> Sic ergo uidetur quod aliqua sit colligatio spiritus dampnati cum illis ignibus, licet non talis omnino qualis est anime cum corpore. Et tunc, ut uidetur, posset dici quod ministerio demonum illuc ueniunt et ibi uirtus diuina colligationem hanc facit cum illis ignibus et ita uiolenter ibi per similem colligationem detinentur.

22 Ad hoc quod dicis quod naturaliter sunt angeli in celo, uiolencia fit eis et minuitur eorum gaudium cum huc ueniunt, respondeo: Duo sunt: gratia uel uirtus, et natura. Et opus gratie uel uirtutis non est uiolentum nec nature, sed secundum naturam et supra naturam<sup>27</sup> ad eius melior<itat>em. Dicit ergo potest quod in angelis est natura et gratia, et natura illa tota quasi absorpta<sup>28</sup> a gratia est. Et ideo potest gratia super naturam, et ideo plus delectantur<sup>29</sup> in operibus gratie ut atemperando diuine uoluntati huc ueniendo quam prout congruit sue nature (f. 295va) illic manendo. Et ita huc uenire et non est contra naturam sed potius secundum naturam sicut opus uirtutis. Qui<sup>30</sup> appetit illic manere quia congruit sue nature, appetit pro tempore huc uenire quia uidet Deum hoc uelle, et quia plus potest in eis amor Dei quam sui, mauult huc uenire cum uidet Deum hoc uelle quam illic manere. Et sicut non est uiolencia nec contra naturam quod amat Deum plus quam se, sic nec opus ab amore egrediens et per hoc essent in angelis huc ueniuntibus appetitus non contrarii sed duorum impossibilium,<sup>31</sup> scilicet

<sup>t</sup> idem, *De libero arbitrio* 3.9 (CCL 29.292).

<sup>u</sup> idem, *De ciuitate Dei* 21.10 (CCL 48.776).

24 dampnari MS.

25 ignibus; this spelling is by far the more common.

26 infimo MS.

27 secundum materiam et supra materiam MS.

28 absorpta

29 delectantur

30 cui MS. (an error of oral transmission)

31 impossibilem MS.

esse ibi <et esse hic>. Sed unus est nature et alter est uoluntatis informate.<sup>32</sup> Nec sunt hec diuisa contra se propter hoc quia uoluntas informata uult quod natura hoc uelit quod uult, sicut caro Christi, que noluit<sup>33</sup> mori, non tunc cupiscit<sup>34</sup> aduersus spiritum<sup>v</sup> qui uoluit carnem mori, quia spiritus uoluit carnem sic uelle.

*Jd* Uel posset dici, sicut uidetur dicere Damascenus<sup>w</sup> et Crisostomus<sup>x</sup> de Christo, quod deitas que potuit super Christi, humanitatem nunc permittit eam somni<a> re et pati, et agere humana, nunc autem non. Sic uoluntas informata si potest super naturam sibi iunctam intantum ut actum suum ad tempus non sinat agere, scilicet appetere illud lignum<sup>35</sup> tunc esse, hoc non est contra naturam sed supra naturam.

*do* Quod autem uirtute corporis solius glorificati potuit ascendere uidetur, quia nobilior<i> corpori debetur locus superior.<sup>y</sup> Sed corpus Christi nobilissimum. Ergo ei debetur locus supremus.

*db* Contra. Secundum hanc rationem esset sol superior omnibus stellis. Item cum locus supremus [sic], scilicet celum empireum, sic plenus corpore esset, sic corpus Christi et extra empireum.

*dj* Sed respondeo: prima est uera in corporibus ornantibus<sup>36</sup> ad inuicem, ut in speris, [et in corporibus ornantibus ad inuicem] nisi utilitas contrarietur uniuersi. Forte enim soli est inditus<sup>37</sup> naturaliter maior appetitus loci medii propter utilitatem uniuersi quam loci suppremi<sup>38</sup> propter suam nobilitatem — quorum nullum impedit rationem de corpore Christi.

*dK* Item nobilius non fit propter innobilius. Sed celum et stelle sunt propter hominem, etiam propter corpus. Deu 4: *Ne forte uideas solem et lunam et uniuersas stellas quas creauit Deus in ministerium cunctis gentibus.*<sup>z</sup> Igitur non seruiendum sideribus sed ipsa potius<sup>39</sup> seruiunt nobis. Ergo cum ministrorum sit<sup>40</sup> etiam

<sup>v</sup> Cf. Gal 5: 17.

<sup>w</sup> John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* 58.5, trans. Burgundio of Pisa, ed. E. M. Buytaert (St. Bonaventure, N.Y., 1955), p. 217.

<sup>x</sup> I was unable to find this reference in any of Chrysostom's authentic works; Fishacre is here most likely paraphrasing from a secondary source.

<sup>y</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *De caelo* 2.13 (293a30-32).

<sup>z</sup> Deut 4: 19.

32 informare MS.

33 uoluit MS.

34 cupit ac MS.

35 illud lignum: illum linum MS.

36 ornans MS.

37 indicas MS.

38 suppreum MS.

39 post MS.

40 sic MS.

localiter subesse, Dominus: *Nisi sicut paruuli*,<sup>a</sup> secundum illud Gal 4: *Quanto tempore heres paruulus est, non differt a seruo, cum sit dominus omnium; sed sub tutoribus*<sup>41</sup> et *a[u]ctoribus est usque ad prefinitum tempus a patre*.<sup>b</sup> Sed si nobilius, naturaliter superius.

¶ Item anima, cum sit quiddam celeste, detinetur naturaliter in celesti habitatione, non uiolenter. Quidam hanc ei infert uiolenciam, cum possit homo se ipsum occidere. Quare ergo non potest terrenum naturaliter habitare in celo, et sic mouere potest illud<sup>42</sup> naturaliter?

¶ Et maior est differentia corporis ad spiritum quam corporis ad quocumque corpus, et habitat spiritus in corpore naturaliter. Quare non potest naturaliter <habitare> corpus quocumque in quocumque?<sup>c</sup>

¶ Contra hec: Idem est locus naturalis totius terre et unius glebe.<sup>d</sup> Ergo si gleba (f. 295vb)ba corporis Christi naturaliter sursum est, et tota terra — saltem cum erit glorificata.

¶ Respondeo. Prima uera<sup>43</sup> est de gleba uel athomo<sup>44</sup> terre non unita alteri et nobiliori maxime qualis est terra in corpore Christi, et si non esset maior glorificatio terre in corpore Christi quam totius terre erit, tunc idem esset eorum locus. Item idem totius et partis [idem] est locus, quia in utroque eadem est inclinatio.<sup>e</sup> Sed ut uidetur sentire Augustinus in fine precedentis pagine in auctoritate premissa uel ultima[m], auferetur terre in corpore glorificato humano pondus et forte non auferetur hoc toti terre glorificate.<sup>f</sup> Et ita non idem locus.

¶ Item uniuersaliter coniuncta sunt grauitas et grossicies uel densitas, ut patet in elementis.<sup>g</sup> Et quod est grossissimum uel densissimum est grauissimum. Ergo

<sup>a</sup> Mt 18: 3.

<sup>b</sup> Gal 4: 1-2.

<sup>c</sup> Cf. Fishacre: 'Sed contra eos arguitur multipliciter ibidem ab Augustino (cf. *De civitate Dei* 22. 4 [CCL 48.809-10]): Si potuit Deo agente spiritus, qui est tamen celo nobilior, habitare in terra ut in terrestri corpore, quare non potuit eodem agente non uiolenter cogente corpus terrestre habitare supra celos? Maior enim supra modum est differentia spiritus ad corpus quam unius corporis ad quocumque aliud. Mirabilis est igitur spiritum habitare in corpore terreno quam corpus terrenum in corpore celesti' (4 *Sent.* 47; C, fol. 530va-b and B, fol. 350ra-b).

<sup>d</sup> Aristotle, *Physics* 3.5 (205a10-11).

<sup>e</sup> Cf. idem, *De caelo* 1.3 (270a3-5).

<sup>f</sup> See n. r above. In fact, this passage is cited on the preceding page of the manuscript (fol. 295r), approximately a third of the way down in the second column. While not precisely 'at the end of the preceding page', this method of cross-referencing suggests a unique copy.

<sup>g</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *De caelo* 1.6 (273b3-5).

41 autoribus MS.

42 fort. illuc legendum est.

43 natura MS.

44 achomo MS.

subtillissimum corpus, scilicet gloriosum, cuius des subtilitatem,<sup>45</sup> erit leuissimum.

~~34~~ Item quanto ex minori fit magus,<sup>46</sup> tanto factum est subtilius.<sup>h</sup> ut si ex pugillo terre fiant centum, factum erit subtilius quam si ex ea tantum X fierent. Igitur cum uera humana caro non fit nisi de semine Adam, illud modicum factum est uehementer magnum. Et erit in die iudicii, cum erunt corpora tot humana completa, nullo addito, illi materie seminis Ade, et subtiliora, si computes, quam si essent omnino ignis uel celum. Ergo cum subtilius sit naturaliter superius, erunt corpora superius et supra celum stellatum. Et sic corpus Christi.

~~35~~ Item quanto leuius tanto mobilius, et quanto ponderos<i>us tanto immobilis, ut patet in elementis. Et ideo spera terre omnino immobilis, cum cetera spera elementorum moueantur. Sed corpus Christi est summe agile propter dotem agilitatis. Ergo summe leue.

~~36~~ Item opacum<sup>47</sup> infimum, diafonum medium, et luminosa, ut ignis et stelle,<sup>48</sup> sursum sunt; naturaliter ergo et corpus gloriosum ratione dotis<sup>49</sup> que est claritas. Unde comparat Apostolus ea<sup>50</sup> stellis dicens Cor 15: *Alia claritas solis, alia lune, alia stellarum; stella[m] enim a stella <differt> in claritate. Sic et resurrectio mortuorum.*<sup>i</sup>

~~38~~ Item ut ponit Plato<sup>j</sup> et Basilius,<sup>k</sup> 'facit Deus',<sup>l</sup> id est aufert igni urendi qualitatem manente qualitate lucendi, quia lux ignis emicat per oculos. Sed quare non similiter in elementis potest separare grauitatem aliis qualitibus manentibus?<sup>m</sup> Augustinus, epistola 73: 'Ualet diuina potencia de ista uisibili atque tractabili materia corporum, quibuslibet manentibus, auferre quas uoluerit qualitates.'<sup>n</sup>

<sup>h</sup> Cf. ibid. 3.7 (305b13-16).

<sup>i</sup> 1 Cor 15: 41-42.

<sup>j</sup> *Timaeus* 45B; probably quoted from Augustine, *De ciuitate Dei* 13.18 (CCL 48:401).

<sup>k</sup> *Homilia in Hexaemeron* 6.3 (PG 29.122).

<sup>l</sup> Possibly a reference to Gen 1: 16, ('Fecitque Deus duo magna luminaria'), the text upon which Basil is here commenting.

<sup>m</sup> Cf. Fishacre: 'Item si, ut dicit Basilius, Verbo Dei separabitur in igne lux ab ustione et, ut dicit Plato, dii qui hominem fecerunt secundum eum potuerunt separare ab igne urendi qualitatem et lucem relinquere que per oculos emicaret, quare non poterit a resurgentium corporum terra auferre ponderositatem, natura terre remanente?' (4 *Sent.* 47; C, fols. 530vb-531ra and B, fol. 350rb).

<sup>n</sup> *Epist.* 205.1 (CSEL 57.326-27).

45 subtilitas MS. (possibly an error of perseveration)

46 maius

47 opacum

48 stellas MS.

49 docis MS.

50 ca MS.



38. Item uniuersaliter in sacramento altaris est accidens sine omni subiecto. Quare non potest fieri ut subiectum sit saltem sine aliquo accidente, scilicet grauitate?

39. Item non plus ponderat hostia consecrata quam prius cum fuit non consecrata et constat <quod> pondus in consecrata est non corporis Christi secundum <modum> accidencium; nec est in corpore Christi illud pondus magis quam illa albedo. Ergo cum pondus primum remaneat nec modicum additur ponderi post consecrationem, corpus Christi nullius ponderis est uel potest esse aliquando sine pondere. Quare non ergo in ascensione?

40. Contra. Eadem ratione uidetur quod non sit leue quia non est aucta leuitas post consecrationem.

41. Item nullum uiolentum eternum,<sup>o</sup> quia si sol eternaliter esset sursum uiolenter, motus contrarius esset ei possibilis et potencia respectu talis motus frustra. Igitur cum corpus Christi sit in celo — et hoc eternaliter — non erit uiolenter. (f. 296ra)

42. Item omnes spere integre sunt 4, scilicet terre, aeris, celi siderei, empirei. Hinc frequenter dicitur coniuncti <m> 'celum et terra'<sup>p</sup> ut comprehendat <ur> 'omnis creatura'. Solum<sup>51</sup> enim triplex est: aereum, sidereum, empireum. Aqua non habet speram, quia non undique tegit terram.<sup>q</sup> Unde apud phisicos una<sup>52</sup> spera reputatur.<sup>r</sup> Angelis spera secundum sanctos non est nisi celum. Sunt autem inter ornancia corpora innobilia<sup>53</sup> opaga et nobilia luminosa; et opacorum inanimata innobilia quam animata. Prima sunt ornatus terre. Secunda sunt naturalis ornatus aeris. Tercia, scilicet luminosa inanimata, sunt ornatus celi siderei. Ergo luminosa animata sunt ornatus celi empirei. Et sicut stella sursum feretur naturaliter, sic corpus gloriosum, quod, ut dicit Augustinus, auferet[ur] Deus grauitatem elementis componentibus corpus glorificatum.<sup>s</sup> Sed utrum leuitatem igni in eodem corpore non dicit. Si ergo manet in eis leuitas naturalis et nulla grauitas, ascendit sursum naturaliter saltem usque ad locum suppreum spere ignis, et si non est alia spera ignis nisi celum sidereum, usque ad celi siderei suppreum. Et quia ignis in illo corpore est nobilitatus supra<sup>54</sup> naturam celi siderei, adhuc ascendet hinc,<sup>55</sup> sicut si faceret Deus celum nobilius super hoc

<sup>o</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *De caelo* 2.14 (296a33-34).

<sup>p</sup> See n. 34 (p. 36 above).

<sup>q</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *De caelo* 2.4 (287b1-14).

<sup>r</sup> Cf. *ibid.* (287b15).

<sup>s</sup> *De ciuitate Dei* 13.18, 22.11 (CCL 48.401, 829-31).

51 i.e. 'the vault' (of the heavens); *fort.* celum legendum est.

52 *fort.* uniuersum legendum est.

53 in hora MS.

54 sic MS.

55 huic MS.

telum sideretm et esset utrum<que> leue quia. ingnis, pars celi nobilioris, si esset inferius, ascenderet<sup>56</sup> superius naturaliter.

43. Si autem aufert Deus leuitatem sicut et grauitatem, ut nec sit graue nec leue, corpus glorificatum, tamen licet non haberet formam qua moueretur sursum sicut nec qua deorsum, habet tamen naturaliter inditum sibi appetitum eorum que congruunt sue nobilitati, scilicet situm<sup>57</sup> suppreum et continens nobilissimum, et isto appetitu naturali, ex quo nullum impedimentum, feretur sursum; ut mihi uidetur — non assero tamen. Et si stella non est grauis uel leuis, si esset extra suum locum, consimili appetitu ferretur ad suum locum.

44. Exemplum est ignis: non habet figuram naturalem<sup>t</sup>, maxime<sup>58</sup> figuram pinealem.<sup>59</sup> Unde in sua spera non habet figuram sed uel a celo continente[m] rotundam uel, si est celum, naturaliter habet figuram speralem; nunc tamen hic figurat se figura pineali, quia non habet formam naturalem qua sic figuretur (tu<n>c enim sic figuraret ubique). Sed quia formam habet naturalem qua appetit congruencia sue nature, et ideo colligit se in figuram penetratiuam, qua penetret ad locum superiorem.

45. Sic ergo patet quod uirtute et deitatis per se et anime per se et corporis per se potuit ascendere.

46. Sed cum uirtute singulorum potuit ascendere. ille, queritur qua uirtute ascendit. Non uirtute omnium simul, quia nulla actio Deo et creature communis est. Augustinus, epistola 125: 'Nichil omnino<sup>60</sup> a duobus idem fieri<sup>61</sup> potest.'<sup>u</sup>

47. Solutio. Illa actio posset esse actio creature et actum Dei. Sermo autem Augustini intelligitur in coequeuis agentibus ex quibus non fiat unum.

48. Sed probatio quod uirtute corporis, si<sup>62</sup> ipsum fer<r>etur sursum subito, demonstraretur — quod sic uidetur. Lapis si esset sursum et medium uacuum, fieret lapis deorsum subito propter nullam medii resistenciam.<sup>v</sup> Sed nichil inter

<sup>t</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *De caelo* 3.8 (306b30-307b26).

<sup>u</sup> I was unable to find the source of this quotation. Cf. Fishacre: 'Item, ubi est diuersitas agentium, nisi ex eis fiat unus agens, et diuersitas actorum' (4 *Sent.* 44; C, fol. 515ra and B, fol. 338vb).

<sup>v</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *Physics* 4.8 (215b1-6) and *De caelo* 4.4 (313b17-22). Cf. also Fishacre: 'Item ad hoc quod sit motus exigitur necessario aliqua resistencia in moto respectu motoris' (4 *Sent.* 44; C, fol. 518rb and B, fol. 341ra).

56 ascendit MS.

57 sicum MS.

58 fort. magis legendum est.

59 literally 'pineal' or 'shaped like a pine cone'.

60 oratio MS.

61 fm (?) MS.

62 quia MS.

celum empireum et terram habet resistenciam ad subtilitatem corporis glorificati propter dotem subtilitatis. Ergo et cetera.<sup>w</sup>

48. Item lux pertransit inde huc subito ratione sue subtilitatis. Augustinus ad Deogratias sacerdotem: 'Radius oculi non cicius peruenit ad propinquiora, tardius ad longinquiora, sed utraque interualla parili celeritate pertingit.'<sup>x</sup> Sed corpus Christi gloriosum est hac luce subtilius, quod patet quia lux inuenit in hostio<sup>63</sup> uel in alio resistenciam.

49. Quod non est <uirtute corporis, nisi> corpus Christi subito ferretur de se. Sed Christus non ascendit subito; ergo non ascendit uirtute nature corporis gloriosi. Quod non ascendit (f. 296rb) subito patet, quia in subito non est nisi prius et posterius natura, non <temp> ore<sup>y</sup>; et sensus non discernit inter prius et posterius natura sed tempore tantum, ut patet quia non discernit transitum lucis. Nunc autem uisus intuencium apprehendit eius ascensum. Ac: *Cumque intuerentur in celum.*<sup>z</sup> Ergo non subito. Quod concedo.

50. Item non uirtute deitatis quia si eius ascensio in spem ascendendi<sup>64</sup> suscitare debet<sup>a</sup>, restat ut ascenderit eadem qua nos uirtute ascendemus. Sed nos non propter unitam nobis deitatem sed propter animam. Ergo et ipse.

51. Item omnis motus est ex resistencia aliqua mobilis ad motorem aut medii ad mobile[m] aut ex utroque. Sed uirtutis finite ad infinitum et inpartibilem nulla omnino potest esse resistencia. Quod probari potest per crementum uirtutis, quia quanto maior uirtus tanto minor resistencia medii, sicut patet in decensu<sup>65</sup> lapidis par uacuum.<sup>b</sup> Ergo si sursum ferretur uirtute diuina, subito sursum esset.

52. Item cum mouere secundum locum non sit nisi uniuocum, si moueret Deus aliquod corpus, haberet cum creatura predica<men>tum positum unicum et commune — quod est impossibile. Igitur non ascendit uirtute deitatis.

<sup>w</sup> Cf. Fishacre: 'Item demonstrat Aristoteles in Phisicis quod quantumcumque spatium uacuum pertransiret lapis in instanti ... et ex hoc concludit si uacui ad plenum est infinita proportio, in infinitum citius pertransibit uacuum quam plenum. Ergo subito. Et causa huius subiti transitus est nulla resistencia medii uacui. Sed cum maxima sit subtilitas in corpore glorificato, patet quod nec in pariete nec in quolibet alio corpore inuenit aliquam resistenciam. Ergo eadem ratione transibit subito' (ibid.).

<sup>x</sup> *Epist.* 102 (CSEL 34.548).

<sup>y</sup> Cf. Fishacre: 'Sed si corpus esse sic posset ubique in eodem instanti, hoc esset per prius et posterius natura, licet non tempore' (4 *Sent.* 44; C, fol. 518vb and B, fol. 341ra).

<sup>z</sup> Ac 1: 10.

<sup>a</sup> See Jn 14: 3; Mt 24: 28; and Mic 2: 13.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *De caelo* 4.6 (313b17-22).

63 ostio

64 ascendenti MS.

65 descensu

54. Responde: quod dicitur 'non est motus ubi non est resistencia' medii ad motorem<sup>c</sup>, uerum tantum<sup>66</sup> in motu naturali, non uoluntario.

55. Ad aliud 'mouere secundum locum': de Deo dictum est motum esse actum Dei. De creatura uero dictum est esse actionem creature, et ita non uniuoce.

56. Cui<sup>67</sup> 'ascendit uirtute anime', que habet uirtutem particularem, quod etiam uidetur. Cum enim sit motus naturalis, uoluntarius et uiolentus. Sed processus uoluntarius est solum ab anima. Cum ergo Christi ascensus fuerit processiuus, patet quod fuit ab anima. Ac 1: *Cumque[que] intuerentur in celum euntem illum.*<sup>d</sup>

57. Sed contra. Motus processiuus est super uiam habentem aliquam resistencia. Numquid ergo sicut mare solidauit<sup>e</sup>, sic nunc aerem, ignem, et celum? Sed non uidetur quia nulla ad corpus gloriosum in aliquo corpore resistencia.

58. Solutio. Non assero, sed mihi uidetur quod potuit sic successiue asce<n>disse uirtute anime solius uel coniuncti ex corpore et anima, scilicet ut anima subitationem illi corpori retardaret uel deitas. Sed cuius uirtute factum sit, nescio, quia *ascendit super cherubin*<sup>f</sup>, id est, ascensio eius 'omnem modum sciencie excedit', ut dicit ibi *Glossa*.<sup>g</sup> Uidetur tamen quod uirtute deitatis, sic *qui ascendit super celum celi ad orientem*<sup>h</sup>, *Glossa*: 'Oriens intelligitur Uerbum a Patre genitum, cuius uirtute ascendit.'<sup>i</sup> Sed an uirtute anime et grauis interdum est, nec certum inuenio et ideo non dico.

59. Utrum etiam ascendit motu processiuo, nescio nec de hoc aliquid fixum inuenio. Nec necesse fuit solidari aerem, cum Christi corpus non habeat grauitatem.

60. Sed qua ascendit? Uidetur quod per occidentem; Ps: *Qui super occasum*<sup>j</sup>

61. Item uidetur quod per orientem; Ps: *Qui ascendit super celum celi ad orientem*.<sup>k</sup>

62. Solutio. *Ascendit super occasum*<sup>l</sup>, id est, 'mortem corporis quam resurgendo uicit.'<sup>m</sup> Et ita fit hic mencio de resurrectione, non de ascensione. "Ad orientem"

<sup>c</sup> For the doctrine that the void has no independent existence and therefore that movement through it is impossible, see Aristotle, *Physics* 4.8 (214b12-216a24).

<sup>d</sup> Ac 1: 10.

<sup>e</sup> See n. 47 (p. 39 above).

<sup>f</sup> Ps 17: 11.

<sup>g</sup> Peter Lombard, *Commentarium in Psalmos* 17.12 (PL 191.190).

<sup>h</sup> Ps 67: 34.

<sup>i</sup> Lombard, *Comm.* 67.36 (PL 191.618).

<sup>j</sup> Ps 67: 5.

<sup>k</sup> Ps 67: 34.

<sup>l</sup> Ps 67: 5.

<sup>m</sup> Lombard, *Comm.* 67.4 (PL 191.603).

66 cñ (?) MS.

67 fort. quod legendum est.

uel "ab oriente"; alia littera locum exprimit ubi resurrexit et unde ascendit, quia Ierusalem, ubi hec facta sunt, est in oriente. Uel ad orientem, id est, ut lumen gratie nobis oriri faceret.<sup>n</sup> Uel quia ascendit uerso uultu ad orientem — quod nescio, licet uideatur Damascenus hoc dicere.<sup>o</sup> Uel ad litteram quia terra promissionis est media habitabilis <zone> nostre — maxime Ierusalem in medio quarti climatis sita tenet<sup>68</sup> caput.<sup>p</sup> Ibi est medius punctus inter orientem habitabilis <zone> nostre et occidentem. Et quando sol transit per meridionalem circulum illum, necessario occidit sol existentibus in puncto orientali et oritur existentibus in puncto occidentali. Et ita cum directe ad illud tendit<sup>69</sup> <et> ascendit, ascendit ad orientem et occidentem.

*Fairfield University.*

<sup>n</sup> *ibid.* (618).

<sup>o</sup> *De fide orthodoxa* 85.2, ed. Buytaert, pp. 305-306.

<sup>p</sup> For an example of the sort of geography which is framing Fishacre's thinking here, see Honorius of Autun, *De imagine mundi* 1.6 (PL 172.122-23).

68 tenit MS.

69 tenit MS.

- An Old French Source for the *Genesis* Section of *Cursor mundi*  
*Sarah M. Horrall* 361
- Pre-Carolingian Seigneurial Obligations in 'Lex Alamannorum' XXI-  
 XXII, 1 and Their Relationship to the St. Gall Charters (754-770  
 A.D.)  
*Theodore John Rivers* 374
- Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (II) *A. G. Rigg* 387
- Marriage, Theory and Practice in the Conciliar-Legislation and Diocesan  
 Statutes of Medieval England *Michael M. Sheehan* 408

MEDIAEVALIA

- The *Dream of the Rood* and Aldhelm on Sacred Prosopopoeia  
*Bruce Karl Braswell* 461
- The Text of Cicero's *Topica* in Codex Chartres 498  
*Chauncey E. Finch* 468
- Legatus* and *nuntius*, as Used to Denote Papal Envoys: 1245-1378  
*Clifford Ian Kyer* 473
- An Identification of John of Glastonbury and a New Dating of His  
 Chronicle *James P. Carley* 478
- The French Prayer for the Sick in the Hospital of the Knights of Saint  
 John of Jerusalem at Acre *K. V. Sinclair* 484