Teaching Future Matters in the Medieval West. The Terms *propheta / prophetabant*, *tempora*, and *visio* in Peter the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹*

Anke Holdenried (Bristol)

I. Introduction

I.1. Preliminaries: Scope

In this paper I proceed by way of a case study, in which I undertake a close analysis of some of the terms set out in Peter the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹. The terms I have chosen are all related broadly to the future (see below, II.2.). The ›Distinctiones‹ connects these words to others in a lexical chain intended to evoke some of their intellectual associations. This paper brings out these connections and their implications and casts light on Peter's work as well as, by contrast, on other similar texts in the same genre.

To be clear, I have chosen the terms discussed. They are only a sample. The text is far too long for a complete analysis (or anything close) since, as I will show, even unpacking connections for just a handful of terms is a lengthy exercise. My approach is methodologically valid because in effect I have used the text in the same way medieval readers would have done. I have had to make this selection not only for reasons of space but because Peter the Chanter was not especially concerned with the future per se. I will describe the nature of the text in detail later, but for now note only that the ›Distinctiones‹ is essentially an alphabetized – and hence easily searchable – Bible study tool intended to explain the content of Scripture to students. Thus, references to the future appear in it only as part of the work's broader exegetical purpose. For the purposes of this article, therefore, I have focussed on a handful of such references to illuminate the intellectual connections Peter suggested for these terms. This will show what can be gleaned about twelfth-century discourses concerning the future even from such seemingly intractable

*) My title is inspired by the work of the sociologist Barbara Adam and her co-author Chris Groves, Future Matters. Action, Knowledge, Ethics (Supplements to the Study of Time 3), Leiden 2007. I am grateful to the organisers of the »Herbsttagung 2018« for providing me with this opportunity for discussion and exchange. I would also like to express my gratitude for having had the opportunity to think further about aspects of my paper at the 2019 IMC Leeds-session organised by our colleague and fellow Reichenau-discussant the late Dr. Miriam Czock whose premature passing is a very great sadness and loss.

sources as the ›Distinctiones‹. Note that, had the topic of this conference been different, the same methodology could have been applied to a different set of terms connected to a different theme with, I suspect, comparably rich results.

I.2. Peter the Chanter, his »Circle«, and his ›Distinctiones‹

The Parisian university master Peter the Chanter (Petrus Cantor), who died in 1197, was one of the leading theologians of his time. Peter became the cantor of the cathedral of Notre Dame in 1183 but probably began teaching in Paris a good decade earlier, in 1173. While there is still much to discover about Peter's work he is already famous among modern scholars for two reasons: firstly, as a scholar in his own right; and, secondly, on account of a group of his students who became influential ecclesiastics and which the historiography refers to as »the circle of Peter the Chanter«. They were active principally in the decade after 1200.

Modern scholars have noted that in his Bible commentaries, his ›Summa de Sacramentis‹, and his ›Verbum Abbreviatum‹, Peter was consistently keen to adopt a moral reading of the Bible in order to resolve real-word ethical problems[1]. These are the Chanter's best-studied works and they have shaped the historiographical perception of him as the embodiment of a thinker who engaged with the social and political issues of his time – not only when ecclesiastical business brought him in contact with secular affairs, but particularly in his theological works[2]. His approach had a lasting impact especially through his »circle«[3], including Robert of Courson (d. 1219) and Fulk of Neuilly

1) See especially the pioneering study by John W. Baldwin, Masters, Princes, and Merchants. The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and his Circle, 2 vols., Princeton 1970, which draws mostly on these two works. For textual studies, see Monique Boutry, Petri Cantoris Parisiensis ›Verbum Abbreviatum‹. Textus Conflatus, Turnhout 2004; Peter the Chanter, ›Summa de Sacramentis et Animae Consiliis‹, 5 vols., ed. Jean-Albert Dugauquier (Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia 4/7/11/16/21), Paris, 1954–1967. On the impact of modern scholarly engagement with Peter's ›Summa de Sacramentis‹ and his ›Verbum Abbreviatum‹ see Emily Corran, Lying and Perjury in Medieval Practical Thought: A Study in the History of Casuistry, Oxford 2018, pp. 66–93 (c. 3: »Moral Dilemmas. Peter the Chanter's ›Summa de Sacramentis et Animae Consiliis‹«).

2) On Peter the Chanter's standing as a prolific commentator on the Bible who included in his commentaries thoughts on matters such as lay or ecclesiastical government, violence, and warfare, see Philippe Buc, L'Ambiguïté du livre. *Prince*, *pouvoir* et *peuple* dans les commentaires de la Bible au Moyen Age (Théologie historique 95), Paris 1994; id., Vox clamatis in deserto? Pierre le Chantre et la prédication laïque, in: Revue Mabillon 4 (1993), pp. 5–47, and Katherine Chambers, ›When We Do Nothing Wrong, We Are Peers‹. Peter the Chanter and Twelfth-Century Political Thought, in: Speculum 88/2 (2013), pp. 405–426.

3) Members of this circle are named, for instance in Jean Longère, Peter Cantor (d. 1197), in: Encyclopedia of the Middle Ages, 2 vols., ed. André Vauchez/Richard B. Dobson/Michael Lapidge, Chicago et al. 2000, vol. 2, p. 1121; John W. Baldwin, The language of sex. Five voices from northern France around 1200, Chicago/London 1994, pp. 1–2.

(d. 1202), for instance, that is, ecclesiastical figures who shaped the Church's response to current issues, from heresy to crusading and the laity[4]. That there is a growing international body of modern scholarship about the activities of »Peter the Chanter's circle« underlines his significance for understanding the socio-political contexts of medieval learning around the turn of the twelfth century. At the same time, mingling the Chanter's name with that of a later »circle« risks approaching him with hindsight and blurring the differences between him and later historical figures and their approaches. It also obscures the diversity of Peter's personal intellectual range which recent scholarship on the twelfth century increasingly has come to appreciate[5].

Too often hindsight also limits how the historiography approaches Peter's ›Distinctiones‹ as a text[6]. As a genre, *distinctiones* only became widespread in the period after 1200, when such texts gained popularity with medieval preachers[7]. However, even if the

4) See, for example, Andrew W. Jones, Fulk of Neuilly, Innocent III, and the Preaching of the Fourth Crusade, in: Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies 41 (2010), pp. 119–148; Jessalyn Bird, The Construction of Orthodoxy and the (De)construction of Heretical Attacks on the Eucharist in Pastoralia from Peter the Chanter's Circle in Paris, in: Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy, ed. Caterina Bruschi/Peter Biller, Woodbridge 2003, pp. 45–61; Lucy J. Sackville, Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century. The Textual Representations, Woodbridge 2011.

5) Suzanne LaVere, Out of the Cloister. Scholastic Exegesis of the Song of Songs 1100–1250, Leiden/Boston 2016, devotes a chapter to Peter the Chanter (ibid., pp. 72–96, c. 3); see also Marcia L. Colish, Scholastic Theology at Paris around 1200, in: Crossing Boundaries at Medieval Universities, ed. Spencer E. Young (Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance 36), Leiden 2011, pp. 29–50. Colish highlights in particular Valente's work on Peter the Chanter's ›De tropis loquendi‹, his contribution to teaching logic and semantics, see Luisa Valente, Phantasia contrarietatis: Contradizzioni scritturali, discorso teologico e arti del linguaggio nel ›De tropis loquendi‹ di Pietro Cantore († 1197), Florence 1997. See further Jack Watt, Parisian Theologians and the Jews: Peter Lombard and Peter Cantor, in: The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy, and the Religious Life: Essays in Honour of Gordon Leff, ed. Peter Biller/Barrie Dobson, Woodbridge 1999, pp. 55–76.

6) The ›Distinctiones‹ by Peter the Chanter, although frequently mentioned as part of his œuvre, have received very little specialist attention. To date, the key discussions are Stephen A. Barney, Visible Allegory. The ›Distinctiones Abel‹ of Peter the Chanter, in: Allegory, Myth, and Symbol, ed. Morton W. Bloomfield (Harvard English Studies 9), Cambridge MA 1981, pp. 87–107, and Richard H. Rouse/Mary A. Rouse, Biblical Distinctiones in the thirteenth-century, in: Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge 41 (1974), pp. 27–37.

7) Modern scholarship on theological *distinctiones* stretches across a number of fields, especially medieval sermon studies, pastoral care literature, and medieval reading culture more broadly. Theological *distinctiones* are also considered within the context of scholarship on canon law distinctions, see, for example, Christoph H. F. Meyer, Die Distinktionstechnik in der Kanonistik des 12. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte des Hochmittelalters (Mediaevalia Lovaniensia Series I: Studia 29), Leuven 2000; Louis-Jacques Bataillon, The Tradition of Nicolas of Biard's ›Distinctiones‹, in: Viator 25 (1994), pp. 245–88; id., Intérmediaires entre les traités de morale pratique et les sermons: les distinctiones bibliques alphabétiques, in: id., La Prédication au XIII^{e} siècle en France et Italie, Aldershot 1993, item IV, pp. 197–209; Silvia Serventi, Did Giordano da Pisa use the Distinctiones of Nicholas Gorra?, in: Con-

text was subsequently consulted in early mendicant circles, it would be a mistake to think that it was created for that context. Its composition predates by at least a couple of decades the Fourth Lateran Council and the so-called »homiletic revolution« that followed[8]. Indeed, Peter the Chanter's text may be the earliest surviving example of the genre[9]. As such it was produced in a very different environment from later *distinctiones.*

Unfortunately, modern scholarship has not always appreciated this point. For example, Pitra's ›Spicilegium‹ of 1855 places the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹ alongside that by Peter of Capua (d. 1214) without regarding this as problematic[10]. Even very recent scholarship has not questioned whether it is appropriate to treat together these two different examples of the *distinctiones* genre[11]. Peter of Capua wrote only a few years after the Chanter's death, but in a very different environment: although not connected with mendicant preachers, his ›Distinctiones‹ was nevertheless intended to help in the composition of sermons, specifically those preaching the crusade[12]. Consequently, Peter of

structing the Medieval Sermon, ed. Roger Andersson (Sermo: Studies on Patristic, Medieval, and Reformation Sermons and Preaching 6), Turnhout 2007, pp. 83–116.

8) Note that Peter the Chanter taught at Notre Dame from 1170/73 to 1196 and that his ›Distinctiones‹ is believed to have been aimed at the students there, see Barney, Visible Allegory (as n. 6), p. 60. On Lateran IV, preaching, and Peter the Chanter see Brian Fitzgerald, Inspiration and Authority in the Middle Ages. Prophets and their Critics from Scholasticism to Humanism (Oxford Historical Monographs), Oxford 2017, p. 94. On Lateran IV and its wide-ranging impact see: The Fourth Lateran Council. Institutional Reform and Spiritual Renewal, ed. Gert Melville/Johannes Helmrath, Affalterbach 2017.

9) See Barney, Visible Allegory (as n. 6), p. 100, on Peter's ›Distinctiones‹ as an experiment in innovation. Alan of Lille also produced a collection of alphabetized ›Distinctiones‹ at around the same time as Peter the Chanter, see Gillian R. Evans, Alan of Lille's ›Distinctiones‹ and the Problem of Theological Language, in: Sacris Erudiri 24 (1980), pp. 67–86, and Tuija Ainonen, Manuscripts, Editions and Textual Interpretation. Alan of Lille's Distinction Collection Summa ›Quot modis‹ and the Meaning of Words, in: Methods and the Medievalist. Current Approaches in Medieval Studies, ed. Marko Lamberg/Jesse Keskiaho/Olga Timofeeva/Leila Virtanen/Elina Räsänen, Newcastle upon Tyne 2008, pp. 12–37, and Meyer, Distinktionstechnik (as n. 7), p. 123, n. 282.

10) See Jean Baptiste Pitra, Spicilegium solesmense, vols. 2–3, Paris 1855. In the absence of a critical edition, the ›Spicilegium‹ is currently our chief printed source of the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹. It offers only parts of the text, presenting word entries out of their original alphabetical context. For a perceptive discussion of the problematic nature of Pitra's handling of the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹, see Ainonen, Manuscripts (as n. 9), p. 15.

11) Jessalyn Bird, Crusade and Reform. The Sermons of Bibliothèque Nationale, MS nouv. acq. lat. 999, in: The Fifth Crusade in Context. The Crusading Movement in the Early Thirteenth Century, ed. E. J. Mylod/Guy Perry/Thomas W. Smith/Jan Vandeburie, London/New York 2017, pp. 92–113, esp. p. 98.

12) Scholarship assigns the composition of Peter of Capua's ›Distinctiones‹ (called the ›Alphabetum in artem semonicandi‹) to the period 1193–1214, see Bird, Crusade (as n. 11), p. 98. For a detailed bibliography on Peter of Capua and his ›Distinctiones‹, see Werner Maleczek, Die Brüder des Papstes. Kardinäle und Schriftgut der Kardinäle, in: Das Papsttum und das vielgestaltige Italien. Hundert Jahre Italia Pontifica, ed. Klaus Herbers/Jochen Johrendt (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen N. F. 5), Berlin/New York 2009, pp. 331–372, at p. 344, n. 37.

Capua's text was indeed organised as a tool for preaching, with specific aids designed to assist the user in swiftly identifying options for sermon themes derived from the Bible[13].

By contrast, however, when, some years earlier, Peter the Chanter devised his own ›Distinctiones‹, it was not intended for preachers. Rather, it was innovative in a different context, that of the school room and the learning environment of the early University of Paris. Just because the genre eventually became a preaching aid does not mean we should interpret all *distinctiones* only in that light. This applies in particular to early examples, such as Peter the Chanter's. Moreover, contextualising this work very specifically as pre-1200 (in, roughly, the last couple of decades of the twelfth century) leads us to highlight a different aspect of it, namely the Chanter's well-attested emphasis on Bible study as a key subject in its own right and not merely as a tool to help with composing sermons. He sought to further such Bible study not only through his class room discussions, his university lectures, and his exegetical commentaries on all of the books in the Bible, but also in specialist works such as his ›De tropis loquendi‹. The Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹-text, too, shows the hallmarks of being a scholar's pedagogical response to the growing interest in analysis of scriptural vocabulary. This interest had arisen earlier in the schoolroom environment of the second half of the twelfth century in the context of theological study and debate[14]. Thus, even though both Peter the Chanter's and Peter of Capua's works belong to the genre of *distinctiones*, there are important differences between these two texts. As I shall now discuss, this is revealed by direct examination of surviving manuscript copies of these two different *distinctiones* texts.

II. Analysis of Manuscript Content

II.1. Manuscript Layout and Presentational Techniques

Any further discussion of Peter the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹ requires a description of what the work looks like in manuscript. This captures the distinctive and innovative communication strategies which Peter employed in the ›Distinctiones‹ and which involved both the work's textual content and visual layout.

Some 70 manuscript copies of Peter the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹ are thought to exist – yet, despite its medieval popularity, the work has remained unedited. Consequently,

13) See, for example, the word-indices placed at the start of each individual letter section; for manuscript details see below, n. 24.

14) On the method of logical and semantic *distinctio* as a method of enquiry and analysis used in medieval canon law as well as in medieval theology, see Meyer, Distinktionstechnik (as n. 7), p. 123, and Evans, Alan of Lille's ›Distinctiones‹ (as n. 9).

a systematic appraisal of the manuscript transmission is still lacking[15]. My description here is based on a sample of five manuscripts[16]. Several redactions of the work are thought to exist[17]. If there are any major differences between them in terms of layout, then the sample I have used here does not reflect this. The visual presentation of the text I describe below does not vary substantially across the manuscripts I have sampled[18]. A casual glance might suggest a fairly conventional layout, with a dense block of text, occupying roughly the right-hand two-thirds of the width of the page, while to its left a few words appear in what seems to be a rather wide margin suggesting they are, therefore, merely marginal annotations. This first impression is totally wrong.

In fact, the left-hand column is a list of words from the Bible selected by Peter the Chanter and arranged in alphabetical order. The detailed text on the right (occupying most of the page) gives short explanations of the words on the left[19]. In a key difference from other Bible study aids such as commentaries, the explanations in Peter's ›Distinctiones‹ do not provide references to chapter and verse of biblical passages. Peter opted for a less expansive critical apparatus, and an altogether more compact format[20].

Perhaps the most noteworthy feature of Peter's ›Distinctiones‹ – since the work derives its name from it – is that multiple explanations are given for the vast majority of Bible word(s), that is, each entry is subdivided to »distinguish« various levels of meaning of the Bible word(s). These levels of meaning are not limited to the standard four meanings of biblical exegesis but reflect Peter's inclinations, which could result in him dis-

15) Although Barney, Visible Allegory (as n. 6), p. 88, promised an edition of Peter's ›Distinctiones‹ in 1981, it has yet to appear. Complete texts are still available only in manuscript. On the manuscript tradition see Ricardo Quinto, Teologia dei maestri secolari e predicazione mendicante: Pietro Cantore e la ›Miscellania del Codice del Tesoro‹, in: Il Santo 46/3 (2006), pp. 335–384.

16) Examined in microfilm: London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, fols. 2–11 (s. XIII). Four manuscripts examined as digital copies: Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, 680 (743), fols. 1–132 (s. XIII); Beaune, Bibliothèque Municipale, 51 (50), fols. 1–179 (s. XIII); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 47, fols. 1–174 (s. XIII); Clermont-Ferrand, Bibliothèque Municipale, 50 (47), fols. 1–163.

17) Longère, Peter Cantor (as n. 3).

18) When considering distorted meanings in later copies of Alan of Lille's ›Distinctiones‹-text, Ainonen, Manuscripts (as n. 9), pp. 19–21, reports that the way it is presented changes in these later manuscripts, with scribes moving away from the original layout (which resembled Peter the Chanter's format) to a prose-style layout. This seems to represent the decisions of later scribes, not the original author. However, this is not the case in my sample of manuscripts of Peter the Chanter's work, which remain consistent in their presentation of the text on the page, which I describe below. While there are certainly instances where individual distinctions are conflated into a continuous text, the overall character of the page with its detailed separation of information remains essentially unchanged in my sample of five manuscripts.

19) The list is substantial: according to Longère, Peter Cantor (as n. 3), the work contains some 1250 distinctions.

20) This is in line with Peter's general preference for succinct exegesis of the Bible, see, for example, LaVere, Out of the Cloister (as n. 5), pp. 72–96.

tinguishing many more levels of meaning[21]. Such multiple distinctions reflect the growing twelfth-century interest in the analysis of scriptural language mentioned above using the skills of the *trivium* (grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric)[22]. This interest manifested itself in attempts to produce works to help students appreciate that words in the Bible could acquire different meanings depending on the context in which they were used. *Distinctiones* provided the textual genre for this pedagogical exercise[23].

Strikingly, the various levels of meaning are literally and visually connected to the relevant biblical word on the page by means of a wavy line. This makes the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹ look quite different to that of Peter of Capua, for example: the latter work adopts a standard two-column, continuous-text layout, relying on the standard method of coloured initials to help the reader pinpoint the start of a new thread in the discussion[24]. By contrast, in Peter the Chanter's format the across-the-page visual linking of Bible word and explanation sharply distinguishes scriptural terms from their interpretation. The Bible text stands out on the page. It is not subsumed as in Peter of Capua's format. This visual clarity facilitates the reader's easy, at-a-glance identification of separate levels of meaning attached to biblical vocabulary and hence offers a visual prompt encouraging them to make connections[25].

As noted, the Chanter's explanatory distinctions are generally sparse, but this is not to say that all of them are short, since sometimes Peter includes explanations derived from patristic or contemporary writers. In line with the nature of medieval literacy, they rely on the memory skills of readers to make connections across scripture. When Stephen Barney tried to elaborate on this particular feature of the ›Distinctiones‹, he ended up confessing that

> I cannot describe this except to speak of it as an intellectual play, a devout delight in the discovery and highly articulate presentation of multiple sense… it is […] to leap with the mind in a way that gives

21) Barney, Visible Allegory (as n. 6), esp. pp. 92, 98–99.

22) Frédéric Goubier/Irène Rosier-Catach, The *Trivium* in the 12th Century, in: A Companion to Twelfth-Century Schools, ed. Cédric Giraud, Leiden 2020, pp. 141–179.

23) Rouse/Rouse, Biblical Distinctiones (as n. 6), p. 28.

24) This is at least how Peter of Capua's ›Distinctiones‹ (the ›Alphabetum in artem sermonicandi‹) is formatted in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, ms. lat. 16895. I must confess that this is the only manuscript of Peter of Capua's work I have been able to consult in the original. On other manuscripts of Peter of Capua, see Ainonen, Manuscripts (as n. 9), pp. 19–21, especially p. 20, n. 21.

25) The use of visual clues and prompts (such as lines, schemata, diagrams, or »information-trees«) to convey information was on the rise in the twelfth-century, see Christoph H. F. Meyer, Spuren im Wald der Erinnerung. Zur Mnemotechnik in Theologie und Jurisprudenz des 12. Jahrhunderts, in: Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales 67 (2000), pp. 10–57, esp. pp. 25–30 (3: ›Schematische Distinktionen als Gedächtnisstütze‹), and Andrea Worm, Visualizing the Order of History. Hugh of Saint Victor's ›Chronicon‹ and Peter of Poitiers' ›*Compendium Historiae*‹, in: Romanesque and the Past. Retrospection in the Art and Architecture of Romanesque Europe, ed. John McNeill/Richard Plant, Leeds 2013, pp. 243–264.

> pleasure in itself […] it issues from a stroke of the imagination [and] it seems to glow with the possibility of further analogies[26].

Barney's helpful description of the text emphasises that Peter's work is a distinctive source, abundant in material which relies on allegory and allusion instead of on the careful weighing up of established authorities. As Barney explains, the over-arching purpose of Peter's approach is to identify how even seemingly distant ideas are related and then group them together accordingly – that is, ultimately, the ›Distinctiones‹ represents Peter's experiment in conceptual classification, categorization, and systematization.

This can sound narrow and rigid. I would add, however, that in the ›Distinctiones‹ Peter did not write a tightly-argued thesis on any particular subject; instead he laid out a mental landscape on individual topics but without giving a detailed account of that landscape. Keywords in the left-hand column define an approximate terrain, while the right-hand column provides more potential features in that terrain. Peter leaves open how the reader should connect the landmarks in this territory, and indeed whether to do so at all. There is no pretence that this presentation is complete[27], nor any expectation that the material in the right-hand column must be understood in a particular way, or even included at all. The ›Distinctiones‹ is a map, but it is for the reader to decide how to navigate its terrain.

In this sense, to offer a different comparison, Peter the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹ might be said to be a kind of Christian conceptual thesaurus, presenting biblical terms which are grouped and connected (by wavy lines) to other phrases and concepts. Peter seems to intend that these connections implicitly (and occasionally explicitly) explain the terms in question. Unlike a modern thesaurus, however, his ›Distinctiones‹ does not merely group together linguistic synonyms or near-synonyms. Instead, amongst other links, the text provides an open listing of terms which allows the reader to make moral, theological, analogical, and numerological connections.

II.2. Textual Analysis of »Tokens«

The theme of this volume is »Zukunft« (»the future«) which I render by the Latin term *futura.* Let us now analyse the content of the ›Distinctiones‹ as it relates to the semantic field of *futura*[28].

26) Barney, Visible Allegory (as n. 6), p. 91.

27) Ibid., Barney suggests that when citing Psalms, for example, »often he [Peter] omits the key word and assumes the reader will supply it from memory«.

28) Regarding the wording of the text (for tokens as well as distinctions), when I analyse it below, I rely on that given in London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, after having ascertained that a word, phrase, or passage can also be found in all of the other four manuscripts, even if it does not appear in all of them in

In my analysis of the medieval text I shall borrow terminology employed in modern linguistics[29]. Hence, below, I refer to the material in the left-hand column (that is, the words and short phrases from the Bible) as the »token«, while I refer to the material in the right-hand column (and which offers different levels of meaning) as »distinctions«. By the term »entry« I mean both the token and its distinctions considered together as a single unit.

I begin with a brief commentary on the tokens, that is, on the biblical words and short phrases in the left-hand column of Peter the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹ which concern both the semantic field and conceptual network of *futura.*

Here we immediately encounter a problem: the term *futura* does not appear amongst the tokens in Peter the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹[30]. In a more conventional reference work this would be the end of our enquiry. By thinking more as Peter intended, however, we can still extract a great deal from his ›Distinctiones‹ about *futura.* A moment's reflection, for example, reveals that concepts about the future were common in medieval thought, even where the word itself is absent.

Christian thought is built around the Incarnation and the promised Second Coming. The former was foretold or prefigured by Old Testament figures, while the latter is an event to occur at some time in the future. As such, terms to describe the future were very important to medieval Christian thinking. Concepts related to *futura* employ words such as those for knowing and proclaiming »things yet to come« (such as *prophetia*, *prophetare*, and *propheta*); words for time(s), periods, ages, or seasons (for example *aetas*, *aevum*, *tempus*, *tempora*, and *saeculum*); words denoting future states and conditions (for instance *in gloriam*); words for the endpoint of time such as the Apocalypse, the Second Coming, and the Last Judgement (for example *iudicium*), as well as for its binary opposite, creation (such as *in principio*). These are just some examples of *futura*'s wide conceptual remit and very considerable semantic scope. Consequently, they demonstrate the range of opportunity for considering matters to do with the future even where the word

exactly the same wording, or in the exact same position in the sequence of tokens and distinctions (on the last point see also above, n. 18). British Library, Royal 10 A XVI is an early witness dating from the thirteenth century. It bears the ownership mark of Rochester Cathedral Priory and is listed in the medieval library catalogue of this community, see Mary P. Richards, Texts and Their Traditions in the Medieval Library of Rochester Cathedral Priory (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 78/3), Philadelphia 1988, p. 20.

29) In this I follow the suggestion by Barney, Visible Allegory (as n. 6), p. 94. My Latin scriptural citations are from the ›Vulgate‹, see ›Biblia Sacra Vulgata‹ at www.biblegateway.com (25.08.2020), English translations from the ›Douay Rheims Bible‹, see www.gutenberg.org (25.08.2020).

30) On *futura* in the middle ages see Jean-Claude Schmitt, Appropriating the Future, in: Medieval Futures. Attitudes to the Future in the Middle Ages, ed. Ian P. Wei/John A. Burrow, Woodbridge 2000, pp. 3–18.

itself is not used. They provide an indirect way of approaching the issue that is in some senses more interesting because it reveals lateral connections[31].

Therefore, although the term *futura* itself is not amongst the tokens in the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹, nevertheless we can still approach the topic by studying other related terms. So, the question then is: which terms?

I have chosen three: *prophetia* (or rather related terms), *tempora*, and *visio.* The reason for taking *prophetia* as my starting point is historiographical. Fitzgerald's recent, much-needed study of twelfth-century approaches to prophecy only mentions Peter the Chanter in passing. This has prompted me to investigate the term *prophetia* in his ›Distinctiones‹.[32] I have broadened this investigation beyond the term *prophetia* to include connected terms such as *revelatio*, *inspiratio*, and *visio.* This is because prophecy was understood in a broader intellectual tradition since the power of prophecy derived from the

31) Of these particular terms, only three are included in the list of tokens in Peter's ›Distinctiones‹ (based on my sample of five manuscripts): *aetas* (in its plural form *etates*), *tempora*, and *iudicium.* Out of these three terms, *iudicium* is currently the only one to have received at least some indirect attention because of Jacques Le Goff: Le Goff mined Peter the Chanter's ›Summa de Sacramentis‹ for terms and phrases to do with purgation in the afterlife such as *poena purgatorii*, *in purgatoriis*, *passio purgatorii* et cetera. On this basis, Le Goff termed Peter (alongside Simon of Tournai) »the first theologian[s] of purgatory«, see Jacques Le Goff, The Birth of Purgatory, Aldershot 1984, pp. 165–167. Since Le Goff does not reference Peter the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹ in his study, nor the term *iudicium* specifically, I note here that *iudicium* is in the list of tokens of this work, together with these closely related tokens: *iudicii dies dicitur occultus*; *iudicii dies dicitur manifestus*; *iudicii dies dicitur magnus*; *iudicio erit quattuor ordines*; *iudicii dies haec signa precedent*, and *iudicii ut signa.* The distinctions for this group of tokens include the kinds of phrases concerning the concept of purgatory considered by Le Goff, as well as non-biblical traditions, such as the ›Fifteen signs of Judgement‹. Regarding the language concerning purgatory, note that the token *purgatur aliquis* appears in the Rochester manuscript. This token has three distinctions: (dist. 1) *per fidem* […]; (dist. 2) *per ordinem* […]; (dist. 3) *per bonam* […].

32) Fitzgerald, Inspiration (as n. 8), pp. 94–95. Historians still have only a fragmentary understanding of prophecy's intellectual history. For example, for the period in which Peter's ›Distinctiones‹ were written, academic interest has overwhelmingly focussed on prophecy concerning the End of the World (note Peter was a contemporary of Joachim of Fiore). For the thirteenth century, the topic which has attracted most attention is prophecy's place in the systematisations of the great scholastic theologians. Much more work is required in particular on the earlier world of twelfth-century school- and university-based theologians and educators, as has recently been demonstrated. Fitzgerald draws our attention to, for example, Gilbert of Poitiers' (d. 1154) new attitude to the ›Book of Psalms‹, which were attributed to David's prophetic inspiration in the Middle Ages. He also includes the careful discussion by Peter Lombard (d. 1160) of the nature of inspiration as delivered by the pagan *vates.* Both Gilbert of Poitiers and Peter Lombard were scholars at the nascent University of Paris and so it is valuable and illuminating to learn more about the diverse intellectual *loci* for discussing prophecy in this environment. However, Fitzgerald seeks to make a wider argument: he takes the twelfth-century intellectual world as his starting point in a longer process and argues that prophecy was gradually »normalized« in the period c. 1200–1400. By »normalized«, Fitzgerald means that prophecy's sacred authority (which was rooted in divine inspiration) was annexed over time to more ordinary tasks, such as the secular activity of writing poetry and the cleric's professional task of preaching. I am much more sceptical about the latter.

belief that a prophet was a divinely-inspired proclaimer of divine revelations (*revelatio*). This is often referred to more generically as »divine illumination«. In medieval culture, understanding the nature and purpose of such divine illumination (*inspiratio*) was an important intellectual tradition in its own right. Prophecy was not, however, the only such experience of an individual's direct communication with God that was recognised in the Middle Ages (and by scholars subsequently). Mystics and visionaries also claimed private encounters with the divine. There was also a related but distinct tradition of monastic contemplation, whereby monks actively sought a direct personal encounter with God. The prophetic experience therefore overlaps with the mystical and contemplative experience(s) and their associated Latin terms, such as *visio*[33].

A brief overview of the tokens, that is the biblical words and phrases in the left-hand column of the ›Distinctiones‹, which concern prophecy and its cognates gives an impression of the range and scale of Peter's engagement with the subject. The ›Vulgate‹ refers to *prophetia*, and, with varying frequency, its related terms *revelatio*, *inspiratio*, and *visio.* With 108 references in the ›Vulgate‹, the term *visio* is far more prominent in scripture than the term *revelatio* (18 counts) or *inspiratio* (4 mentions). Perhaps this is why *revelatio* and *inspiratio* are not among the alphabetical list of tokens, while the term *visio* is.

I have also decided to discuss a third term: *tempora* (»times«). Unlike *prophetia*, this word appears as a token in its own right. As such it offers perhaps the most direct approach to a »typical« reading of Peter the Chanter's work. The entry for *tempora* is an excellent example of how the text works by opening up wider intellectual connections for medieval readers. In this case, as we shall see, these connections also include links to the tokens for *etates* and a token on *tempus.*

Below, as I discuss each of my selected tokens, in conformity with medieval educational preferences and memory techniques I shall pay particular attention to the biblical events and people mentioned in the distinctions and explore the wider metaphors and allegories attached to them[34]. If we recall, rather than dictate a single authorial meaning, Peter designed the distinctions to allude to and to stimulate further connections in the reader's mind. In this context, as we shall see, the personal names of prominent biblical figures act as memory »prompts« because they each conjure up a multitude of further

33) For a detailed consideration how the categories »prophetic« and »mystical« elide, see Niels Christian Hvidt, Christian Prophecy. The Post Biblical Tradition, Oxford 2007.

34) Hugh of St Victor (d. 1141), for example, reminded his students in his ›Chronicon‹ that »there are three matters on which the knowledge of past actions especially depends, that is, the persons who performed the deeds, the places in which they were performed, and the time at which they occurred« [*Tria igitur sunt in quibus praecipue cognitio pendet rerum gestarum, id est, personae a quibus res gestae sunt, le* [sic] *loca in quibus gestae sunt, et tempora quando gestae sunt*], see William M. Green, Hugo of St Victor: ›De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum‹, in: Speculum 18/4 (1943), pp. 484–493, here p. 491, as cited in Worm, Visualizing the Order of History (as n. 25), p. 244.

events and associated biblical personages. For medieval users, the technique of naming individuals thus opened up »associative thinking-spaces«. Any specifics (such as names of people, places, events, etc.) provide helpful fixed points of orientation in the vast intellectual tradition which is the Bible, making it easier for medieval and modern users alike to discern the mental spaces set out by tokens and their distinctions. I do not solely focus on biblical specifics, however. Since Peter was a theologian and taught theology he would have understood his biblical material also in the context of broader religious discussions. Indeed, as a teacher, it was incumbent upon him to foster awareness of such discussions in the interest of promoting *recta eruditio*[35], that is, profound comprehension of the truths of the Bible, Christianity's foundational text. I explore these tokens in the following section, treating them alphabetically, that is, in the order in which they appear in the ›Distinctiones‹.

II.2.1. *Prophetia* and its Related Terms

I begin by considering prophecy in the ›Distinctiones‹. Prophecy, of course, is both an epistemological category (it is a specific mode of foreknowing characterized by being divinely inspired) and a temporal category (it points towards the future, the »not yet« and »still to come«). Temporal dimensions particularly will shape the readings I offer but not to the exclusion of exploring epistemological issues and other lateral connections, especially where they arise from theological discussions familiar to Peter the Chanter.

In order to consider prophecy, the obvious term to examine in the ›Distinctiones‹ would be *prophetia.* Again, however, as for *futura* above, *prophetia* does not appear as a token in the ›Distinctiones‹. Instead, therefore, in order to consider prophecy, I discuss two tokens which are related to *prophetia: propheta dicitur* and *prophetabant. Propheta dicitur* has two distinctions, as does *prophetabant*[36].

Modern scholarship often connects the terms for prophecy and preaching. For example, thirteenth-century scholars (including the Chanter's presumed pupil Thomas of Chobham) are known to have discussed terms such *praedicare*, *predicire*, and *prophetare* in an attempt to distinguish their overlapping meanings[37]. Modern scholarship interprets such discussions from a socio-institutional perspective by emphasizing that the mendi-

35) On *recta eruditio*, see Aurelius Augustinus, De civitate Dei libri I–X, ed. Bernhard Dombart/Alfons Kalb (CC 47), Turnhout 1955, X, 14.

36) These two tokens appear in all five manuscripts in my sample. In three of them (London, Arras, and Beaune, full manuscript references as n. 16), a third token appears in the ›Distinctiones‹, namely *prophete* with its single distinction: *Ideo vix intelliguntur quod et prophetas et numeros et tempora frequntur conmutant.*

37) Fitzgerald, Inspiration (as n. 8), p. 95.

cant preachers – a new social group – were keen to elevate their main professional activity, preaching, to make it akin to the biblical prophets[38].

This does not seem to be the case in the ›Distinctiones‹, though. Below, I discuss the two tokens *propheta dicitur* and *prophetabant*, focusing on the individuals whom Peter names in the accompanying distinctions. In the text, Peter expressed his thinking obliquely, eschewing lengthy explanations in favour of more allusive associations. In this case, these associations are attached to biblical figures.

The two distinctions for the token *propheta dicitur* provide four names, all from the Old Testament. The first distinction (which states that prophets predict the future) names David and Isaiah: *Praedicens futura unde david et ysia et alii prophetae.* In medieval culture David and Isaiah were revered as figures of the Old Dispensation who nevertheless were able to foretell the New Dispensation, that is, they knew about, and predicted Christ. The reader would make the connection that the future which these two prophets predicted is therefore the key period in salvation history, the period *sub gratia*, under Christ's grace. One meaning implicit in this distinction therefore is that there are different phases of salvation history, namely *ante gratiam* (before grace, in other words before the birth of Christ), which was the period in which David and Isaiah actually lived, and *sub gratia* (the age of grace, in other words after the birth of Christ, during the Christian dispensation) foretold by Isaiah and David.

The second distinction for the token *propheta dicitur* concerns prophets understood as those who speak on behalf of God. It is very short and reads: *Interpretarens unde dominus ad moysem aaron erit propheta tuus in interpretans et prolucutor.* It first names the Old Testament prophet and Israelite leader Moses, whose role in medieval Christian cultural memory was more prominent than almost any other biblical figure. He appears in numerous guises, for example as lawgiver or as the model contemplative who ascends the heights to achieve direct contact with God. In scripture Moses is an important figure both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament; indeed, in Act. 3:22 and Luc. 27:27, Moses is treated not only as someone who knew of and predicted Christ but as a prefiguration of Christ himself. But Peter goes further, beyond Moses' christological significance, by mentioning Moses alongside his brother Aaron, specifying explicitly that God gave Aaron to Moses as his *prolocutor.* Here the ›Distinctiones‹ highlight that Aaron was Moses' assistant, a role he was given by God because Moses felt unequal to the task of speaking eloquently. Here the Chanter's distinction alludes to Exod. 4:14–16, which states that:

> (14) Then the Lord's anger burned against Moses and he said, ›What about your brother, Aaron the Levite? I know he can speak well. He is already on his way to meet you, and he will be glad to see you.

38) For example, in 1255 the Franciscan preacher Gilbert of Tournai presented preaching as »broadly prophetic, that is, as an inspired activity of spiritual exposition and guidance«, when he stated that clerics have a duty to prophesy, see Fitzgerald, Inspiration (as n. 8), p. 96.

> (15) You shall speak to him and put words in his mouth; I will help both of you speak and will teach you what to do. (16) He will speak to the people for you, and it will be as if he were your mouth and as if you were God to him‹[39].

Aaron is Moses' mouthpiece, just as Moses is God's. Clearly the wording of the distinction is especially close to Exod. 4:16. This episode from Exodus emphasises the divine origins of prophetic speech and sets it in the context of God's omnipotence and the relationship between God's will and human will[40].

Our next token is *prophetabant.* In the two distinctions for this token Balaam and Caiaphas are named:

> (dist. 1) *Quidam ex necessitate ut baalam dicens non possum ad dicere qua quod posuit dominus in ore meo*

and

> (dist. 2) *Quidam ex ignorantia ut cayphas unde hic non a se christo dixit. Expedit et cetera. Timebat* […] *romani qui loco propter religionem pepercerant si nova sub introiret religio tollerent locum*[41].

Here Peter references prophetic speech (*dicens*, *dicere*, *dixit*) by two figures: one, Balaam, from the Old Testament, and the other, Caiaphas, from the New Testament. Again, both figures are well suited to convey the christological significance of the biblical prophets, for each name carried its own association with the life of Christ. Caiaphas's association with Christ was most obvious, because he was the Jewish high priest involved in the trial of Jesus. Balaam's christological significance, on the other hand, is more oblique, for it arises from centuries of accrued exegetical traditions attached to Num. 24:7 where Balaam predicts that a star would rise from Jacob. This was thought to allude to the star of Bethlehem. The association of Balaam with the star of Bethlehem was frequently represented in medieval art and appreciated also in the university environment in which Peter taught[42].

39) Exod. 4:14–16: (14) *Iratus Dominus in Moysen, ait: Aaron frater tuus Levites, scio quod eloquens sit: ecce ipse egreditur in occursum tuum, videnque te laetabitur corde.* (15) *Loquere ad eum, et pone verba mea in ore ejus: et ego ero in ore tuo, et in ore illius, et ostendam vobis quid agere debeatis.* (16) *Ipse loquetur pro te ad populum, et erit os tuum: tu autem eris ei in his quae ad Deum pertinent.*

40) The entire episode in Exod. 4 can be further connected with miracle-working and the dangers of false prophecy (see, for example, Peter Comestor, Historia Scholastica, in: Migne PL 198, cols. 1049–1722, here c. 13: *De mutatione virgarum in colubrum*, col. 1149 A–C) but this lies beyond the scope of this article.

41) London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 88r.

42) For instance, Peter's contemporary Alan of Lille (c. 1128 –1202/03) connected Balaam with the star present at Christ's birth in Bethlehem in the distinction for the token *stella* in his own ›Distinctiones‹, see Alan of Lille, Liber in Distinctionibus dictionum theologicalium, in: Migne PL 210, cols. 687–1012, here col. 955C: *»Stella«, proprie dicitur Christus, unde Joannes: »Et dabo eis stellam matutinam«. Et alibi, propheta Balaam: »Orietur stella ex Jacob«. Proprie Lucifer dicitur stella matutina, quæ est nuntia lucis et*

However, while we may reasonably assume that Peter's audience would have understood both Balaam and Caiaphas as bearers of messianic prophecies, it appears this was not Peter's key point here. In the Christian exegetical tradition Caiaphas was well-known as the cypher for a quite different observation, namely that just because someone delivers prophetic speech, this does not make them a prophet. Caiaphas's words about the death of Jesus[43], while recognising that Christ died to enable the resurrection of humankind, were delivered without the intention of prophesying (*ex ignorantia* in Peter's distinction). In Christian exegetical tradition Balaam also raises these questions because God put authentic prophetic words into his mouth which Balaam then delivered against his will, or, as Peter the Chanter puts it in his distinction, »out of necessity«. Peter's phrase pithily encapsulates the received view that, as Augustine put it, »if God can make an ass speak [cf. Num. 22:28–80], he can certainly make an ungodly man submit to the spirit of prophecy for a short time«[44]. Again, therefore, as in the case of Moses and Aaron, the figures of Caiaphas and Balaam embody points about the nature of prophetic communication and the respective roles which human will and divine will play within it. Peter the Chanter leaves it to the reader to make these connections.

One way our two tokens could be read is that they are about the subordination of the prophet's will to that of God. The question of how humans exercise agency when there is an omniscient and omnipotent God perpetually taxed Christian thinkers and was thus a staple of medieval education. One frequent strand in medieval efforts to explain the Bible to others invited students to engage with questions about how the divine will intermingles with that of humans[45]. In his own pedagogical contribution in the ›Distinctiones‹, Peter the Chanter did the same by giving a selection of imperfect, unwilling,

tenebras repellit. Translative vero Christus dicitur stella matutina, quia repellit infidelitatis nubila. Dicitur virgo Maria gloriosa, unde Hebraice dicitur Maria, quasi »stella maris«, unde in hymno: »Ave, maris stella«.

43) Ioh. 11:49–50: »But one of them, named Caiphas, being the high priest that year, said to them: You know nothing. Neither do you consider that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people and that the whole nation perish not« [*Unus autem ex ipsis, Caiphas nomine, cum esset pontifex anni illius, dixit eis: Vos nescitis quidquam, nec cogitatis quia expedit vobis ut unus moriatur homo pro populo, et non tota gens pereat*].

44) Moreover not only did Balaam proclaim God's word against his own will, there were also serious doubts about whether Balaam was worthy to function as God's mouthpiece on account of his misdeeds (including leading the Israelites into idolatry and making his supernatural powers available for money), see Johan Leemans, »To Bless with a Mouth Bent on Cursing«: Patristic Interpretations of Balaam (Num. 24:17), in: The Prestige of the Pagan Prophet Balaam in Judaism, Early Christianity and Islam, ed. George H. van Kooten/Jacques van Ruiten, Leiden/Boston 2008, pp. 287–299, and Judith R. Baskin, Pharaoh's Counselors: Job, Jethro, and Balaam in Rabbinic and Patristic Tradition, Chico CA 1983.

45) For example, Peter Lombard (d. 1160) in his influential ›Sentences‹, I, xlv, 7, 1: »That God does not will that men do all things which he commands, or not do all that he prohibits«, see Peter Lombard, The Sentences. Book 1: The Mystery of the Trinity, transl. Guido Silano (Medieval Sources in Translation), Toronto 2007, p. 246.

or downright wicked prophets such as Moses (unwilling), Caiaphas (imperfect) and Balaam (wicked): this also invited questions about the relationship between God's will and human will. In sum, the entry here emphasizes that prophecy requires special and unusual divine intervention.

II.2.2. *Tempora* and its Associated Terms

Most tokens in Peter's ›Distinctiones‹ are single words or very short phrases of at most two or three words, but the token for *tempora* is much longer: *Tempora quattuor que recolit ecclesia que considerantur secundum quattuor principales partes diei que sunt.* It is accompanied by four short distinctions:

> (dist. 1) *Nox pertinet ad tempus deviationis. Nox […] obscura est et ydolatriae ceci erant;* (dist. 2) *Mane pertinet at tempus revocationis vel regressionis;* (dist. 3) *Meridies ad tempus reconciliationis pertinet;* (dist. 4) *Vespera pertinet ad tempus peregrinationis*[46].

This passage (that is, the token plus its four distinctions) is very similar to a passage from a work by Johannes Beleth that circulated in Paris at the time and which, it is likely, was the source for Peter the Chanter here[47]. This notwithstanding, Peter, as we shall see, discussed the term *tempora* in an intellectually-fresh, educationally-current, and pedagogically-creative way capable of appealing to beginners and advanced students alike.

In order to enable the modern reader to better appreciate this, the interpretation requires some broader thematic context first. The term *tempora* occurs in the Bible 47 times[48]. Some of these references can be found in the ›Book of Daniel‹ and include the famous passage predicting the transfer across the ages of secular power between empires. Modern scholars refer to this as the *translatio imperii* motif[49]. It subsequently came to feature very prominently in medieval scenarios of the future, especially apocalyptic ones, since the motif was popular with twelfth-century monastic scholars with a special interest

46) London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 102v; see also below, Appendix I.

47) The passage is embedded in the liturgical work ›Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis‹ (written before 1165) by Johannes Beleth, c. 55: ›De diversitatibus ecclesiastici officii per anni circulum‹. In this chapter Johannes presents the various ways of dividing time into successive periods, such as days, seasons, ages of the world (measured by biblical generations etc.), and how these map onto liturgical practices of dividing time. In this chapter the *tempora quattor* are therefore not only linked to parts of the day (as they are in this passage in the ›Distinctiones‹), but also to the world ages (that is, that from Adam to Moses, and from Moses to the Christ's nativity, etc.), see Johannes Beleth, Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis, ed. Heribert Douteil (CC Cont. Med. 41 A), Turnhout 1976, c. 55, l. 77.

48) This count is based on my search of the ›Vulgate‹ on ›BibleGateway‹, see www.biblegateway.com (25.08.2020).

49) Dan. 2:21: *Et ipse mutat tempora, et aetates: transfert regna, atque constituit: dat sapientiam sapientibus, et scientiam intelligentibus disciplinam.* For an overview see Heinz Thomas, Translatio Imperii, in: Lex.MA 8, Munich 1997, cols. 944–946.

in commenting on the Bible's eschatological content (particularly the ›Book of Daniel‹ and the ›Book of Revelation‹)[50].

Peter the Chanter's approach to *tempora* can be tied into a quite different tradition. It concerns God's manner of knowing time, a mystery expressed thus in Iob 10:5: »Are thy days as the days of man, and are thy years as the times on man [*numquid sicut dies hominis dies tui, et anni tui sicut humana sunt tempora*]?« This mystery reverberates through the Christian tradition of scriptural commentary. It is reflected, for example, in Peter the Chanter's distinctions for the token *mane*, the Latin term for the opening part of the day: morning[51]. The first distinction does not start by teaching that *mane* is a part of a day but rather that it denotes time on the much grander scale of world history: *temporis sed seculi vel mundi.* Gregory the Great had already treated *mane* as one of the world ages in in his homily on the ›Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard‹ (Matth. 20:1–6): *mane etenim mundi fuit ab Adam usque ad Noe*[52]. The third distinction enlarges on this by explicitly linking human time (*mane*) to God's time (*eternitas*) and the events that unfold within it (*resurrectio*)[53]. Similarly, the first of two distinctions for the term »day« relates human time to God's grander temporal scale: here the token *dies dicitur* explicitly names the eighth age, »that is, eternal beatitude«[54].

This manner of approaching time shaped Peter's treatment of *tempora.* We can recognise it in the very phrasing of this token, for it is not merely the term *tempora* itself, but a longer phrase (discussed further below) which announces that *tempora* are »after a fashion, in some way« like the »parts of a day«. Ultimately, in what then follows, Peter's treatment of *tempora* allowed his students (if they made the connection) to go beyond a familiar category of human time (for example, a day or days of man) to an appreciation of

50) See Bernard McGinn, Visions of the End. Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages, New York 1979.

51) *Mane est:* (dist. 1) *Temporis. Sed seculi. vel mundi. de quo in evangelio pater familias qui exiit primo mane conducere operarios in vineam suam et de mane hominis. id est de puericia intelligentur hec secundam aliam expositionem de quo mane dicitur mane sic herba transferat mane* […]; (dist. 2) *Pectoris. Sed ortu* […] *gracie vel inicium gracie de quo ysaias. Justicia tua sicut mane orietur et david* […]; (dist. 3) *Eternitatis vel gloriae sed inicium eternitas vel gloriae quod et* […] *mane dicitur secunda resurrectio de quo dicitur. Mane astabo tibi et videbo. et cetera est mane diei. Unde. Et valde mane una* […] *et est mane culpe. sed primi motus qui reprimendi sunt ne fiat processus ad* […] *consensum et de consensu ad actum. De primo motu dicitur mulier infidiabitur calcaneo tuo. tu* […] *conteres caput eius id est primum motum* (cited from London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 59v).

52) See Gregory the Great, Homiliae XL in Evangelia, in: Migne PL 76, cols. 1075–1312, here Homilia XIX, col. 1154C, and the reference to the ›Parable in the Vineyard‹ in dist. 1 (see above, n. 51); see also below, n. 79.

53) See above, n. 51: dist. 3.

54) London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 28v: *Dies in sacro elequentio* [sic!]: (dist. 3 [of 5]) *Octava etas id est beatitude eterna. unde nexus iste haec est dies et cetera frequenter cantatur in paschali tempore ad representandum illud gaudium* […] *erit in octava pro qua sed octava omnis alie etates* […] *sunt.*

a category of time peculiar to God and to an appreciation of the transcendent future: eternity.

Peter accomplished this by uniting *tempora* with traditions pertaining to the sacrament of penance. This combination does make sense thematically because penance concerns the future in that it is a forward-looking sacrament: for the individual, penance anticipates (and seeks to ameliorate) future judgement at the end of a human life. Thus, penance prepares the individual sinner for »life eternal«, that is, for truly sharing God's time (i. e. eternity). Meanwhile, on a collective level, the Church is responsible for administering penance and hence participates in the individual's pre-emptive action relating to the future.

Since penance is linked to salvation in the future, it is natural for penance to lead to reflection on salvation's temporal dimension, that is, on how salvation history unfolds over time, as set out in the Bible and elsewhere. The Christian vision for the future anticipated redemption at the Second Coming, as Peter the Chanter himself acknowledged[55]. Christianity measured the unfolding of salvation history by distinguishing different *aetates* or (world) ages, which mapped onto biblical history, from creation through to the future return of Christ. Thus, knowledge of (and theorising about) these world ages was a standard component of studying the Bible. Indeed, while Peter the Chanter was active at the University of Paris none other than its chancellor, Peter of Poitiers (d. 1205), focused on visually mapping time and salvation history in his ›Compendium historiae in genealogia Christi‹, a work which subsequently enjoyed considerable popularity and which included visual representations of the six world ages[56]. Regarding the ›Compendium historiae‹'s distinctive presentation of its biblical material, it has been well observed that

> the way […] Peter of Poitiers structured, systematized and categorized information about the past relates to the numerous innovations in the formal presentation of knowledge in the twelfth century, such as innovations in page-layout, and the increasing use of tables and diagrams[57].

Peter the Chanter, like Peter of Poitiers, grappled with structuring, systematizing, and categorizing the content of the Bible in fresh ways, albeit within the rules of a different genre, that of the »distinction«. Against this background, let us note that, apart from the extended token concerning *tempora*, Peter the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹ contain two separate tokens on the subject of *aetates: etatum mundi* (concerning the world ages; see

55) See the distinctions for the tokens *redempti sumus* and *reformatur homines*, respectively. Regarding the token *redempti sumus:* there are four distinctions, beginning (1) *In nativitate*; (2) *In passione*; (3) *Et cotidie*; (4) *Et in futuro.* Distinction 4 continues: […] *unde salvatorem expectamus* […]. The token *reformatur homines* has three distinctions: (1) *In baptismo*; (2) *In spiritum*; (3) *In futuro.* Distinction 3 continues: […] *unde salvatorem expectamus* (cited from London, British Library Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 89v).

56) Worm, Visualizing the Order of History (as n. 25), p. 249.

57) Ibid., p. 243.

details below) and *etatis initia homines* (ages of man). This double-offering emulates Isidore's approach to the term *aetas* in his ›Etymologies‹, which states that the word *aetas* can be applied both in reference to the ages of the world and in reference to the ages of man[58]. The distinctions for *etatum mundi* concern the length and number of the different ages of the world[59]. In determining these matters medieval thinkers mostly followed Augustine of Hippo, who had proposed six such *aetates* measured by the number of biblical generations they contain, but occasionally this number was adapted. Bede, for example also articulated the notion of eight ages, but this was not as widely reproduced as the Augustinian scheme[60].

In this context, it is noteworthy that in his ›Distinctiones‹ Peter the Chanter, too, enumerates an eighth (and final) age for the token *aetates mundi*[61]. This final age is no

58) Isidore of Seville, Etymologies, ed. Stephen A. Barney/W. J. Lewis/J. A. Beach/Oliver Berghof, with the collab. of Muriel Hall, Cambridge 2006, V, 38. Paul Archambault, The Ages of Man and the Ages of the World. A Study of two Traditions, in: Revue d'Études Augustiniennes et Patristiques 12/3–4 (1966), pp. 193–228, at p. 209. Elizabeth Sears, The Ages of Man. Medieval Interpretations of the Life Cycle, Princeton 1986, p. 22.

59) London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 39r: *etatum mundi:* (dist. 1) *Prima* […] *ab adam usque ad noe.* […] *suam* […] *molestiam* […] *chaym fratrem suum interfecit;* (dist. 2) *Secunda a noe usque ad habraham.* […] *nota est molestia* […] *cathaclismus aquarum facies aperuit;* (dist. 3) *Tercia ab abraham usque ad david. In* […] *abraham cum fratrem suo aram a caldeis proiectus est* […] *ignem post* […] *ipsi traducebantur. Habraham quidam transductus est a domino sed aram expiravit;* (dist. 4) *Quarta a david usque ad transmigrationem babilonis. In hac quidam quam difficilia passus david sit a saule ab inimicis a filio paucos credimus ignorare;* (dist. 5) *Quinta a transmigratione babilonis usque ad christum. In hac populus dei captivatis est. Urbi sancta e<..>. templum d<..> lex combusta;* (dist. 6) *Sexta a Christo usque ad finem seculi.* […] *sex sunt viventium. In hac christe est flagellatus. irrisus. consputus. opprobriis saturatis morte turpissima condempnatus;* (dist. 7) *Septima est quiescentium que incepit a passione domini;* (dist. 8) *Octava erit resurgencium que incepit a die iudicii et durabit usque in sempiternum. Sed nota que non dicuntur etates propter numerum annorum sed millenarium ut quidam volunt sed propter quedam mirabilia que sancta sunt in quarum* […] *inicio. Nam in principio prime sancta est mundi constitucio. Secundum mundi per diluvium purgacio. Tertie instituta est originale peccatum circumscisio. Quarte regum inunctio. Quinte populi dei in babilonem transmigracio. Sexte filii dei incarnacio. Septime ianue celestis apertio. Octave erit corporum resurrectio et bonorum et malorum plena remuneracio.*

60) On Bede's extended ages-scheme see Peter Darby, Bede and the End of Time, Farnham/Burlington 2012, pp. 85–86.

61) See above, n. 54, where Peter links the eighth age to »eternal beatitude«, and above, n. 59, where Peter describes the eighth age thus: *Octava erit resurgencium que incepit a die iudicii et durabit usque in sempiternum* […]. *Octave erit corporum resurrectio et bonorum et malorum plena remuneracio.* Compare this to, for example, Bede, De templo Salomonis liber, in: Migne PL 91, cols. 735–808, at col. 743B: *Octoginta propter spem resurrectionis, quae octava die, id est, post sabbatum in Domino praecessit, et in nobis quoque octava die simul et octava aetate, futura speratur*; ibid., col. 806C: *Quod bene significatur et in hoc, quod templum septem annis aedificatum est, octavo autem perfectum ac dedicatum est. Septem namque diebus omne hoc tempus volvitur. Octava est dies judicii et resurrectionis futurae, de qua Psalmi sextus et undecimus attitulati sunt; cui videlicet tempori convenit apte quod sequitur.* Note that Bede incorporated the extended ages-scheme in more than one of his works, see n. 60.

longer of this world, though, but pertains to life eternal, post-resurrection. Peter adds to this some further specifics, including that this resurrection will be one of the body[62]. I shall return to this particular set of tokens on the subject of *aetates* in Peter's ›Distinctiones‹ below, when I discuss the nexus of ideas »*tempora* – penance – *aetates*«, which Peter develops in connection with his token on *tempora.*

First, we must note, though, that Peter's decision to consider matters of time through the lens of penance (and vice versa) was not only thematically apt, it was also pedagogically extremely shrewd. It is not unreasonable to assume that the ›Distinctiones‹ preserves vestiges of real classroom discussions based on student questions[63]. Recall that the *passing* of time (which is measurable) is, of course, one of the most fundamental experiences of humans (including Peter's students), whether on a micro- or macro-level. For instance, over the course of a day light changes to dark with the passing of the hours; over the course of a year the seasons change; and over the course of a life-time a human being grows, matures, and then declines with age[64]. Yet, while on one level an »everyday« experience, »time« itself is also one of the most perplexing phenomena and is very hard to explain, as Augustine had acknowledged with a chapter in his much-studied ›Confessions‹ dedicated specifically to the subject of »time«. On top of this, there was the difference between »human time« and »God's time« in the Bible, flagged up, for instance, in the aforementioned passage Iob 10:5. So classroom conversations about »time« (whether past, present, or future) must have been a challenging prospect for a teacher.

62) Regarding the matter of »resurrection«, Peter also considered it separately (and fairly extensively) in two other tokens, without, however, addressing the issue of where the resurrection belongs temporally. In London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 89v, token 1 (*resurrectio*) has one single distinction over ten lines (fol. 91r). Following the initial statement that resurrection will be in the body, this distinction rehearses many of the classic themes and Bible references (such as Ps. 1:5 and Dan. 12:2) connected with two key issues: the question whether the resurrection will be for all without exception and the question of the relationship between resurrection of the body and resurrection of the soul. Token 2 (*resurrexit Christus*), which considers especially Christ rising again (see 1. Cor. 15:4), also has one distinction and extends over three lines (also fol. 91r). For an introduction to twelfth- and thirteenth-century discussions of the resurrection see Caroline Walker Bynum, Material Continuity, Personal Survival, and the Resurrection of the Body: A Scholastic Discussion in its Medieval and Modern Contexts, in: History of Religions 30/1 (1990), pp. 51–85.

63) For discussions of teaching styles and curricula in the twelfth century see Mia Münster-Swendsen, Regimens of Schooling, in: The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Latin Literature, ed. Ralph Hexter/David Townsend, New York 2011, pp. 403–422, and Sita Steckel, Charisma and Expertise. Constructing Sacralised Mastership in Northern and Western Europe, c. 800–1150, in: Schüler und Meister, ed. Andreas Speer/Thomas Jeschke (Miscellanea Medieaevalia 39), Berlin/Boston 2016, pp. 641–679.

64) In addition, an audience of clerical students would also have been aware of the technical issues arising from the passing of time in the context of *computus*, that is, in the context of calculating the date of Easter Sunday (a moveable feast in the annual liturgical calendar), see Arno Borst, Computus. Zeit und Zahl in der Geschichte Europas, Berlin 1990.

It seems Peter tried to aid his students' comprehension by linking discussion of time to discussion of penance. This allowed him to harness material and patterns with which his students in Paris were already familiar from their training in two other fields: the liturgy and canon law. The latter had been enriched recently by the reception in the University of Paris of Gratian's ›Decretum‹, either directly or mediated via Peter Lombard[65]. We know that Peter the Chanter himself participated in this reception of Gratian in other teaching contexts[66].

More important for our purposes, though, is that Gratian's ›Decretum‹ stimulated academic discussion of penance. It provided a comprehensive treatment of the subject in a lengthy section known as ›De Poenitentia‹, which increased familiarity in the Parisian university environment with the nature of penance as a process in four stages: first, examination of conscience; second, contrition; third, confession to a priest, and fourth, performance of some act to repair the damage caused by sin[67].

As we shall see in more detail, such patterns of four were a prominent aspect of this part of the ›Distinctiones‹ about *tempora.* For now, let us just note that a tetradic pattern in connection with penance leads naturally into other areas which were likewise grouped into fours. For instance, the liturgical year was divided into four seasons, beginning with advent. Clerics were required to mark this season by fasting and – like Easter – it concluded in a feast (Christmas) that symbolised mankind's redemption. At the time Peter the Chanter was writing penitential practices were still observed in Paris during advent[68]. In liturgical terminology this advent period was named *tempus revocationis*; it was followed by *tempus deviationis* (from Septuagesima to Easter, i. e. Lent); *tempus reconciliationis* (from Easter to the Octave of Pentecost), and *tempus peregrinationis* (octave of Pentecost to advent)[69].

Given this background, let us now turn to the textual specifics as well as the allusions attached to the token *tempora.* In so doing we will in fact encounter not one, but three fields from which medieval readers could draw allusions: matters to do with the parcelling

65) Gratian completed the ›Decretum‹ c. 1140 in Bologna, from where it spread quickly across Europe. His tract on penance is a digression in ›causa 33‹ (on marriage). Treatment of penance in canonical collections (rather than by theologians) had long been common, see Joseph Goering, The Scholastic Turn (1100–1500). Penitential Theology and Law in the Schools, in: A New History of Penance, ed. Abigail Firey (Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 14), Leiden/Boston 2008, pp. 219–237, at p. 221.
66) Atria A. Larson, Master of Penance. Gratian and the Development of Penitential Thought and Law in the Twelfth Century (Studies in Medieval and Early Medieval and Early Modern Canon Law 11), Washington DC 2014, esp. pp. 382–410 (c. 2: ›De penitentia in the Classroom (2): Paris and Bologna at the End of the Twelfth Century‹).
67) See Goering, Scholastic Turn (as n. 65), pp. 221–225.
68) Mary C. Mansfield, The Humiliation of Sinners. Public Penance in Thirteenth-Century France, Ithaca NY 1995, pp. 134–135.
69) Ibid.

up of time (field 1), matters to do with penance (field 2, a very wide one), and patterns of four (field 3).

The first thing to note here is that these allusions cascade down the manuscript page. They do not stop with the initial token *tempora* but stretch out from it, across a further six tokens (see sequence 1–7, below)[70]. Before I draw out the implications of Peter's decision to include this material, let us recall that having text coming down the page imposes a linear structure, but the text's nature is not linear. Rather, to come back to one of my earlier metaphors, the ›Distinctiones‹ is more like a »conceptual thesaurus«. Peter presented his material in a way that allowed his students to draw lateral connections. I shall therefore take a section of Peter's text and pursue it until its associations have led us so far that we have in effect moved to another topic. No study of the ›Distinctiones‹ can ever be exhaustive because all that can be offered are some of the various interpretations.

In the first and seventh tokens all of our three fields of allusion occur. Token 2 (*tamquam notat*) is a note on token 1 concerning varieties of expressing similitude/equivocation, so I shall not discuss it here further[71]; likewise, I exclude tokens three to six, because they connect only to one of our three fields of allusion (see field 2 above):

1. *Tempora* […][72]
2. *Tamquam notat*
3. *Tempus dicitur malum*
4. *Temptacio multiplex*
5. *Temptacio multiplex*
6. [token for Eccles. 7][73]
7. *Temptacio*

The connections I begin with are those that foster an appreciation of the complexities of God's time as discussed above. In full the token for *tempora* reads: *Tempora quattuor que recolit ecclesia que considerantur secundum quattuor principalis partes diei que sunt*[74]. Thus, Peter starts not with a biblical phrase but with the statement that the four penitential seasons of the Church are like the main parts of the day. The four distinctions for

70) See below, Appendix I, for the text of the distinctions for these tokens. The sequence 1–7 comes from the Rochester manuscript: London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, fols. 102v–103r. Although the equivalent sections are broadly similar in the other four manuscripts I consulted and contain the same terms given here, they are not always arranged in exactly the same order and some distinctions appear under different tokens in this section.

71) Note, however, that this particular distinction reflects the kind of interest in semantics described above, see n. 14.

72) See below, n. 86 and 87.

73) One manuscript here has a second token for *tempus*, which reads *tempus est*; its two distinctions concern the interpretation of lines from Eccles. 7, see London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 103r, and Appendix I.

74) See London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 102v.

this token then supply the details, matching the four penitential seasons we considered above (*tempus deviationis*; *tempus revocationis*; *tempus regressionis*; *tempus peregrinationis*) to four specific parts of the day (*nox*; *mane*; *meridies*; *vespera*)[75]. This connection taps into a prominent exegetical tradition in which the hours of the day are read as signifying a world age. This tradition derived in large parts from Gregory the Great's (d. 604) interpretation of the ›Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard‹[76]. The parable concerns the kingdom of heaven and the tradition regarding time derived from how Gregory had interpreted it was well known, not least because it was one of the readings for Septuagesima Sunday which marks the beginning of Lent, the Church's chief penitential season[77]. For instance, earlier we noted Gregory's influence on the token *mane* in Peter's ›Distinctiones‹[78].

However, the parable Gregory interpreted named not four hours of the day (as Peter's distinction for *tempora* does), but five hours when different labourers joined a master in his vineyard[79]. In Gregory's influential homily these five hours become the five ages of man (*aetates homini*, as opposed to the *aetates mundi* already mentioned). In so doing, Gregory aligned the stages of a human life with the course of a day: for example, *mane* (morning) is *pueritia* (childhood), the sixth hour is *iuventus* (youth), and the eleventh hour is *aetas quae decrepita vel veterana* (old age)[80]. The pious point Gregory sought to make was that it was never too late for an individual to start a good life[81]. Peter's token *tempora* alludes to this overarching point but does not follow Gregory's five stage structure. Instead, the ›Distinctiones‹ transposes Gregory's point from the level of the individual to the level of the collective: the token for *tempora* expresses the idea that the four penitential seasons of the liturgical year are the seasons when the Church (as a community of the faithful) engages in being restored to Christ. Thus, our first token reads not merely *tempora*, but expands into the longer phrase *tempora quattuor que recolit ecclesia* […]. Implicit in this is a future dimension because the process of mankind's restoration to God will be completed in the future, with Christ's return at the Second Coming.

75) Note that three of these terms (*nox*, *mane*, *vespera*) appear as tokens in Peter the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹, as does the term for »day« (*dies*). On his tokens for *mane* and *dies*, see above, n. 51 and 54.

76) See above, n. 52.

77) Exegesis of the ›Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins‹ also contributed to traditions concerning the allegorical meaning of the hours of the day, see Sears, Ages of Man (as n. 58), pp. 82–90. These traditions, while popularising the links between hours and (world) ages, transmit patterns of threes and fives (rather than fours, like Peter).

78) See above, n. 52. Gregory's influence can also be detected among Peter the Chanter's distinctions for the multiple tokens devoted to *dies*, and among the distinctions for the token *vespera.*

79) See Matth. 20:3–6: (3) *Et egressus circa horam tertiam,* […]. *Iterum autem exiit circa sextam et nonam horam: et fecit similiter.* (6) *Circa undecimam vero exiit,* […].

80) See Gregory the Great, Homiliae (as n. 52), Homilia XIX, col. 1155B.

81) Sears, Ages of Man (as n. 58), pp. 83–84.

The seventh and final token in our sequence above concerns temptation (*temptacio*); it offers three patterns of four, as well as topics central to penitential thought: sin/temptations and their associated remedies. These patterns of four are (1) the four degrees of temptation's »weightiness« (*levis*, *gravis*, *gravior*, *gravissima*); (2) four ages of man (namely *pueritia*, *adolescentia*, *robusta*, and *decrepita*[82]; a medieval audience would have readily understood these ages also as signifiers of different ages of the world); (3) the four cardinal virtues as remedies against temptation (*justicia*, *prudentia*, *fortitudinis*, *temperancia*)[83].

If we recall, Peter began by presenting the Christian collective (the Church) and the temporal dimensions of its salvific processes by analogy with the Church's liturgical year and its penitential seasons. These seasons are the *tempora* that he seeks to explain at the very start of our sequence of tokens (see token 1, above). His thematic linking of this token *tempora* with the later token *temptacio* (including their respective distinctions), via a distinctive pattern of four, demonstrates not only the Chanter's penchant for »intellectual play« (as Stephen Barney put it[84]) but also Peter's capacity for intellectual innovation – not necessarily because he sought new answers, but in the way he sought to explain God's time and to venture into transcendent temporal categories such as the future.

A medieval classroom contained students at different levels of intellectual achievement[85]. As a way of starting to think about this material Peter offered them a range of safe familiar reference points such as Gregory the Great's well-known homily, Augustine's ›Confessions‹, the liturgy and much more recent authors, such as Gratian. At the same time, Peter also offered more advanced students the possibility of thinking about this topic in more complex ways by presenting material in such a manner that inventive students might vary or combine themes in innovative ways.

82) Note that earlier in the ›Distinctiones‹ the token concerning the six ages of man (*etatis initia homines*) deploys slightly different terminology in its distinctions and does not use either the term *robusta* or *decrepita* used here. Note further that there are echoes here of a very well-known medieval tetradic pattern mentioned in Martianus Capella's ›De Nuptiis Philologie et Mercurii‹, V (›De arithmetica‹): *quid quod quattuor anni tempora frontesque caeli elementorumque principia esse non dubium est? hominum etiam quattuor aetates quattuor vitia quattuorque virtutes* [my emphasis]: *Hic numerus quadratus ipsi Cyllenio, quod quadratus deus solus habeatur*; see Martianus Capella, De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii, ed. James Willis (Bibliotheca scriptorium graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), Leipzig 1983, p. 264. However, as is evident, the ›Distinctiones‹ go beyond Martianus by specifying the four ages of man, substituting the vices for their remedies, and also by introducing the temptations, an element not present in Martianus's text. On this passage see also Sears, Ages of Man (as n. 58), p. 22.

83) For the Latin text see below, Appendix, I.3.

84) See above, n. 6.

85) See Münster-Swendsen, Regimens of Schooling (as n. 63).

Before turning to the term *visio*, as an illuminating aside I would draw attention to another word: *tempus*[86]. Of the five manuscripts I consulted, *tempus* is present only in the Rochester manuscript (London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI) where, superficially, it looks like a token, being accompanied by four other phrases which are presented in a form similar to other distinctions. Note that the fourth distinction for *tempus* includes the phrase *in futuro.* However, I believe it is an unusual entry. I must caveat my next observations by noting that they are based on a very limited sample. Nonetheless, given that this entry appears only in this manuscript, I draw the tentative conclusion that it is not part of Peter the Chanter's original text but an addition by the copyist[87]. In one sense, it is a pity that *tempus* and its distinctions (including *in futuro*) may well not have been part of Peter the Chanter's original text since those terms would have been ideal for the purposes of this paper. I have chosen to include *tempus* and its distinctions here because together they reveal something valuable if we consider the reception of Peter's work: the presence in the Rochester manuscript of a scribal addition connecting *tempus* with *in futuro* and placing them in close proximity to the term *tempora* confirms that for the readers of the ›Distinctiones‹ *futura* could be part of the nexus of medieval thinking about »the future«. Thus, Peter the Chanter did indeed inspire at least one reader to continue making connections in the manner intended in the ›Distinctiones‹.

II.2.3. *Visio*

Having looked at the terms for »prophecy« and for »times«, we now turn to the ›Distinctiones‹' handling of the word for »vision« in the sense of prophetic vision. The Vulgate refers to *visio* fairly frequently (108 references), whereas terms thematically related to it, such as *revelatio* (18 references) and *inspiratio* (4 references), are far less common[88]. Indeed, the latter two words are not among the tokens, whereas there are two entries for

86) The whole entry for *tempus* is as follows (see London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 102v): (dist. 1) *Ante legem* […] *representat primus nocturnus*, (dist. 2) *Sub lege* […] *representat secundus*; (dist. 3) *Gratiae* […] *representat tercius*, (dist. 4) *Quartum erit in futuro.*

87) This tentative conclusion is perhaps supported by the fact that the term *tempus* appears on the page in a rather unusual position. It is not copied below and in line with the other tokens. Rather, it is positioned on the right, roughly horizontally in line with the word *tempora* (but further to the right even than its distinctions). *Tempus* can appear in that position on the page because in the Rochester manuscript the three lines of distinctions for *tempora* are all short, thus leaving free space towards the right-hand margin. Thus, the word *tempus* and its four distinctions appear to have been squeezed into that space and are not integrated into the regular presentation of the text. It seems reasonable therefore to conclude that the addition of *tempus* should be considered a reader reaction.

88) My counts here are based on an electronic search of the ›Vulgate‹ on ›BibleGateway‹, see www.biblegateway.com (25.08.2020).

visio in the ›Distinctiones‹. Limitations of space mean I shall only discuss the first and unpack some of the connections in its distinctions[89].

The first time it occurs the token *visio* is linked to three distinctions. As was the case with the token for *tempora*, this entry for *visio* is derived from another source, a much more substantial text by Hildebert of Le Mans, which considers the topic of *visio* while reflecting on Daniel's vision of the Son on Man (Dan. 7:13–14)[90]. To give a sense of scale, in the ›Distinctiones‹ in the Rochester manuscript these three distinctions taken together run to only five (admittedly dense) lines. The first distinction begins *noctis*, the second begins *diei*, and the third begins *lucis.* Each of these three words is accompanied by material which references visions of God mentioned in the Bible.

The first distinction for *visio*, starting with the word *noctis*, mentions »prophets [and] patriarchs« whose nocturnal visions are expressly described as occurring in the period *ante gratiam.* The whole entry is just one line, and no specific individuals are named to provide illustrative examples: *Noctis visio nocturna fuit ante gratiam. In haec videbant partriarchae et prophetae unde David. Locutus es in visio sanctis*[91].

The second distinction is essentially a quote with a source. It begins with the word *diei* and talks about visions of God as a feature of the period *sub gratia*; the Apostle Paul's name then appears ahead of a brief extract from his own testimony regarding the topic of the vision of God from 2. Cor. 3:18 that »we all, beholding the glory of the Lord with open face, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord«. Again, this is only a short, one-line explanation: *Diei. visio dei sub gratia. De hac dicit Paulus. »Speculatores Gloria domini in eandem ymaginem transformamur a Gloria* [<…>; illegible]«[92].

89) The second entry takes a more encyclopaedic form because it draws on Augustine's commentary on ›Genesis‹, see Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram, ed. Jospeh Zycha (Corpus Sriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 28/1), Vienna 1894, XII, 7, esp. p. 387; I shall discuss it separately in a forthcoming article.
90) Hildebert of Le Mans, Sermones de tempore. VII. In adventu domini sermo septimus. De mysterio incarnationis, in: Migne PL 171, cols. 370D–376B, esp. cols. 371D–374 A. Peter may have obtained this material on *visio* directly from Hildebert (who was an occasional source for another of Peter the Chanter's texts, the ›Verbum Abbreviatum‹) or it may have reached Peter the Chanter via Peter of Blois, Sermo II. De eodem adventu, in: Migne PL 207, cols. 565 A–568B. Peter of Blois (c. 1130–1211) was a student in Paris c. 1155–1166. Note that, given the very close textual similarities between the works of Peter of Blois and Peter the Chanter on this point, it is also possible that the opposite is true and Peter of Blois actually drew this material from Peter the Chanter. We cannot say definitively who derived the passage from whom. On all three figures (Peter the Chanter, Peter of Blois, and Hildebert of Le Mans) see John D. Cotts, The Clerical Dilemma. Peter of Blois and Literate Culture in the Twelfth Century, Washington DC 2009, esp. p. 75.
91) London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 113v.
92) 2. Cor. 3:18: *Nos vero omnes, revelata facie gloriam Domini speculantes, in eamdem imaginem transformamur a claritate in claritatem, tamquam a Domini Spiritu.*

The third distinction begins with the word *lucis*, which it associates with the vision of God *in gloriam* (stating simply *visio lucis in gloria*). What then follows concerns *visio* as a mode of vision yet to come, different (that is, superior) to both physical sight and to spiritual vision in this life in which God can only be seen through a glass darkly, that is in a limited way:

> *Lucis. visio lucis in gloria. Et de hac tamen dicitur. nunc spiritualiter. Videmus nunc, quasi per speculum in enigmate. sed cum venerit visio lucis. fulgebunt iusti sicut sol in regno Dei. et tunc videbunt lumen in lumine et purificatis oculis videbunt lucem quam non posset mortalis oculus videre*[93].

This is the most detailed of the three distinctions in this entry, comprising three of its five lines.

At first sight, all of this is quite traditional: authoritative patristic thinkers had already noted the limits of the physical body and even of the ability in this life to truly »see« (that is, to comprehend) God. In the words of Augustine, for example:

> […] no man beholds Him while living this mortal life in the senses of the body. This vision is granted only to him who in some way dies to this life, whether he quits the body entirely or is turned away and carried out of the bodily senses[94].

The nature of *visio dei* therefore had long been a contentious issue in Christian thought, but in Peter the Chanter's time it became the focus of fresh debate[95]. More, perhaps, than any other period in the history of Christianity, the turn of the twelfth century witnessed numerous debates over the issues surrounding Christ's promise that the »pure of heart« shall *see* God (Matth. 5:8) – even Pope Innocent III composed a sermon on the topic in 1202[96]. Christ had given this promise in his ›Sermon on the Mount‹, so it is one of the so-called beatitudes. The issues discussed in the period included questions like: What kind of vision of God was promised in this beatitude? If there is some vision of God both here and in heaven, how are the two related? How could it be reconciled with the numerous scriptural passages that affirm that God cannot be seen?

Given its prominence in learned circles during the period when Peter the Chanter was teaching, for contemporaries the intellectual debate about *visio dei* would have been an

93) Text as in Rochester manuscript: London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI, fol. 113v.

94) Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram (as n. 89), p. 422, ll. 6–11): *ubi eum nemo vivens videt vita ista, qua mortaliter vivitur in istis sensibus corporis, sed nisi ab hac vita quisque quodammodo moriatur sive omnio exiens de corpore sive ita aversus et alienatus a carnalibus sensibus, ut merito nesciat, sicut apostolus ait, utrum in corpore an extra corpus sit, cum in illam rapitur et subvehitur visionem.* For the English translation see Augustine, The Literal Meaning of Genesis, transl. John Hammond Taylor (Ancient Christian Writers 42), New York 1982, pp. 218–219.

95) See Bernard McGinn, Visio Dei. Seeing God in Medieval Theology and Mysticism, in: Envisaging Heaven in the Middle Ages, ed. Carolyn Muessig/Ad Putter, Abingdon 2006, pp. 15–33.

96) Ibid., pp. 15–16.

obvious frame of reference for this distinction. Indeed, perhaps this was one reason Peter included it as a token in the ›Distinctiones‹ (although not the only reason)[97]. This means what is presented here would have been readily understood by Peter's audience, a group of people well-versed in contemporary theological discussions as well as the vast frame of biblical references evoked[98].

Precisely because of his readers' high degree of Bible literacy, we can infer some subtle points about Peter's presentation of this material and its potential interpretation. For example, looked at as a whole, the entry on *visio* goes from »dark« (in the first distinction) to »light« (»clarity«) (in the third distinction). Another point of note is the New Testament passage Peter the Chanter chooses to cite in the third distinction: Paul was granted *visio dei* in *this* life and he describes the experience in 2. Cor. 12:1–6[99]. However, this is not the Bible passage Peter references in the third distinction: as noted above, there he cited 2. Cor. 3:18 instead, which promises a vision of God to come in heaven, not the experience of seeing him on earth. By this selection Peter the Chanter thus emphasises the eschatological character of *visio dei*[100].

This personal eschatological association can be seen as only a part of the meta-historical context we can infer from the ›Distinctiones‹. The text places *visio* in the context of the universal history of salvation, too: returning to scripture, the 18 verses of 2. Cor. 3 articulate the idea that the revelation of God's truth in the Christian dispensation had already superseded that of the Old Covenant[101].

97) The topic of *visio dei* had attracted Peter's attention elsewhere in his teaching, see LaVere, Out of the Cloister (as n. 5), p. 90.

98) Peter of Blois may be among this group of people, for this distinction appears among his works according to the attribution in the Sanctorum Patrum Bibliotheca Maxima Lugdunensis: XXVII. Voluminibus comprehensa, in Epitomen Redacta, Id est: Omnes illustriores sententiae, ac selectiora dicta eorum Sanctorum Patrum, & Ecclesiasticarum Scriptorum, qui Bibliotheca Maxima Lugdunensi, […] continentur, in duas partes collecta & ordine Alphabetico, seu secundum locos communes collocata, ed. Philippus a Sancto Jacobo, Augustae Vindelicorum 1719, p. 798.

99) 2. Cor. 12:2–4 (Paul's Visions): (2) *Scio hominem in Christo ante annos quatuordecim, sive in corpore nescio, sive extra corpus nescio, Deus scit, raptum hujusmodi usque ad tertium caelum.* (3) *Et scio hujusmodi hominem sive in corpore, sive extra corpus nescio, Deus scit:* (4) *quoniam raptus est in paradisum: et audivit arcana verba, quae non licet homini loqui* [»(2) I know a man in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven – whether in the body or out of the body I do not know, God knows. (3) And I know that this man was caught up into paradise – whether in the body or out of the body I do not know, God knows – (4) and he heard things that cannot be told, which man may not utter«].

100) On seeing God in heaven, see McGinn, Visio Dei (as n. 95), p. 24.

101) See esp. 2. Cor. 3:6 and 13–14: »Who also hath made us fit ministers of the new testament, not in the letter but in the spirit. For the letter killeth: but the spirit quickeneth […]. And not as Moses put a veil upon his face, that the children of Israel might not steadfastly look on the face of that which is made void. But their senses were made dull. For, until this present day, the selfsame veil, in the reading of the old testament, remaineth not taken away (because in Christ it is made void)« [*qui et idoneos nos fecit ministros novi testamenti: non littera, sed Spiritu: littera enim occidit, Spiritus autem vivificat.* […] *et non sicut*

Implicitly, one way of considering this entry on *visio* is to regard it as categorising visionary experience along historical lines. In each of his three distinctions Peter uses a traditional label to designate a period. Each label distinguishes a different phase of salvation history: thus in the first distinction *ante gratiam* (»before grace«, that is, before the birth of Christ); in the second distinction *sub gratiam* (»in the age of grace«, that is, after the birth of Christ, and so in the Christian dispensation) in the second distinction; and in the third distinction *in gloriam* (in the future, outside human time, in heaven). Thus, although the entry concerns visions, embedded within the distinctions is an implicit understanding of the structure of history and its relation to the future[102].

This is not to claim that this was peculiar to Peter's ›Distinctiones‹, or to his sources, whatever they were. Peter's famous contemporary Joachim of Fiore (d. 1202), for example, had a similar tripartite notion of history, perhaps also derived from this passage in ›Corinthians‹ (2. Cor. 3). Joachim cites it when setting out his distinctive – if not necessarily unique – understanding of the underlying structure of history and eschatology in the ›Liber Introductorius‹ of his ›Commentary on Revelation‹. As background, Joachim applied a trinitarian framework to history's underlying structures. In short, he posited a progressive revelation, that is, one that became more fully realised over the course of three successive main stages. Indeed, his picture is even more complex in detail, for he divides the third stage into three sub-stages (secretly, openly, most clearly). In terms of language and images used to express these ideas of progressive revelation, Joachim contrasts what he terms the »freedom« of the Spirit granted by the Christian dispensation with the »obscurity« of the Old Testament. Here Joachim relies on the image of the veil of the letter, which he inserts when he describes the third and final stage as:

> near the end of the world, not any more under the veil of the letter, but in full freedom of the Spirit, when after the destruction of the Pseudo-Gospel [Evangel] of the Son of Perdition and his prophets those, who educated many people to justice, will be like splendour of heaven, and like stars in all eternity[103].

Moyses ponebat velamen super faciem suam, ut non intenderent filii Israel in faciem ejus, quod evacuatur, sed obtusi sunt sensus eorum. Usque in hodiernum enim diem, idipsum velamen in lectione veteris testamenti manet non revelatum (quoniam in Christo evacuatur)].

102) See also the token *tempus* discussed above, n. 86, which shows the use of several of these labels for the purpose of structuring world-historical time.

103) Julia Eva Wannenmacher, The Spiny Path of Salvation. Linear and Cyclical Structures of History in Joachim of Fiore, in: Von Platon bis Fukuyama. Biologistische und zyklische Konzepte in der Geschichtsphilosophie der Antike und des Abendlandes, ed. David Engels (Collection Latomus 349), Brussels 2015, pp. 136–159, here p. 152 and p. 153, n. 40, for the Latin text of this passage from the ›Liber introductorius‹: *Tertius ergo status erit circa finem seculi, non iam sub velamine littere, sed in plena Spiritus libertate, quando evacuato et destructo pseudoevangelio Filii perdictionis et prophetarum eius hii, qui »ad iustitiam« erudient »multos«, erunt »sicut splendor firmamenti et quasi stelle in perpetuas eternitates«.*

The line »not any more under the veil of the letter« is reminiscent of (and may even have been inspired by) 2. Cor. 3:4–6 and 12–14, which we considered earlier[104]. So, Peter the Chanter and Joachim might each have derived their understanding of history's tripartite division as a progressive phenomenon from 2. Cor. 3[105]. Peter and Joachim both offer a similar historical pattern, although Peter presents it in an extraordinarily compressed form. This is typical of his ›Distinctiones‹: he expects the reader to do much of the work of making connections. Here I have tried to show how this might be done.

Rather than seeing Peter's distinction on *visio* as unexciting, therefore, we should note the wide range of thematic coverage it achieved simply by drawing two readings from the same New Testament passage (2. Cor. 3:18): one »mystical« and one »temporal«.

III. Final Comments

Peter the Chanter's ›Distinctiones‹ is a lengthy, currently unedited work covering a vast amount of material on a huge variety of topics. In this paper I have been able to consider only a tiny sample concerning a single subject – the future – approached by examining the text's treatment of three related terms: prophecy, vision, and periods/eras of time. This involved analysing seven tokens in detail while noting several others alongside them[106]. This has revealed that the ›Distinctiones‹ incorporated a range of discourses in relation to the future. This material is not always obvious because of the way the ›Distinctiones‹ is set out. Rather than a closely-argued presentation, it offers a series of intellectual landmarks drawn from Christian thought and leaves the reader to decide if, and how, to connect them. Hence this paper shows how a twelfth-century student in Paris might have constructed sometimes oblique links and associations between distinctions concerning the semantic field of the future.

With regard to the material discussed in this paper I conclude with two final observations. Firstly, one can find embedded within Peter the Chanter's work unusual cultural fragments, such as a reference to Bede's seldom-adopted proposition that time should be split into eight ages. The ›Distinctiones‹ may prove to be a treasure trove of such cultural oddities. Secondly, to the extent that Peter the Chanter can be said to be guiding his readers at all, he does not necessarily point them in the direction modern

104) See above, n. 101.

105) Peter the Chanter and Joachim of Fiore were contemporaries. However, Joachim was not a university man but an abbot in Calabria. As general background, I very much doubt that Joachim could have influenced Peter the Chanter on this point; on Joachim's reception among twelfth- and thirteenth-century scholars at the University of Paris see the overview by Frances Andrews, The Influence of Joachim in the Thirteenth Century, in: A Companion to Joachim of Fiore, ed. Matthias Riedl (Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 75), Leiden/Boston 2018, pp. 190–266.

106) See Appendix.

scholarship might expect. Twelfth-century authors are often assumed to be interested in speculating on the meaning of contemporary crises and on the imminence of the end of the world[107]. Indeed, I set out on this exploration anticipating to find apocalyptic undertones in the ›Distinctiones‹, but Peter does not speculate in this manner. Peter does not steer his students to an apocalyptic view of a troubled present which signals an imminent end of history. Instead, they are guided to a conception of »the future« which is oriented towards the other world: it anticipates mankind's return towards God and the prospect of eternal beatitude in heaven. The text perhaps considers prophets such as Balaam more in the context of the primacy of God's will rather than for their ability to foretell the future. As such, in the elements of his ›Distinctiones‹ which I have considered here, Peter does not imply a political or apocalyptic future but a spiritual one.

APPENDIX: Tokens

Appendix I. Main tokens

I.1.1. *propheta dicitur*

(dist. 1) *Praedicens futura. unde. david. et ysia. et alii prophetae.*
(dist. 2) *Interpretarens unde dominus ad moysem. aaron erit propheta tuus id est interpretans et prolucutor.*

I.1.2. *prophetabant*

(dist. 1) *Quidam ex necessitate ut baalam dicens non possum ad dicere qua quod posuit dominus in ore meo.*
(dist. 2) *Quidam ex ignorantia ut cayphas unde hic non a se christo dixit. Expedit et cetera. Timebat* […] *romani qui loco propter religionem pepercerant si nova sub introiret religio tollerent locum.*

I.2. *visio*

(dist. 1) *Noctis visio nocturna fuit ante gratiam. In haec videbant partriarchae et prophetae unde David. Locutus es in visio sanctis.*

107) For further literature and a comprehensive overview of the revival of apocalypticism in the twelfth century, see Brett Edward Whalen, Joachim of Fiore and the Apocalyptic Revival of the Twelfth Century, in: The Cambridge Companion to Apocalyptic Literature, ed. Colin McAllister (Cambridge Companions to Religion), Cambridge 2020, pp. 190–211, at pp. 195–196.

(dist. 2) *Diei. visio dei sub gratia. De hac dicit Paulus. Speculatores gratia domini in eandem ymaginem transformamur a Gloria* […; illegible].
(dist. 3) *Lucis. visio lucis in gloria. Et de hac tamen dicitur. nunc spiritualiter. Videmus nunc, quasi per speculum in enigmate. sed cum venerit visio lucis. fulgebunt iusti sicut sol in regno Dei. et tunc videbunt lumen in lumine et purificatis oculis videbunt lucem quam non posset mortalis oculus videre.*

I.3. *tempora*

(plus: *tempus dicitur malum*; *temptacio* [and *quattuor temptationibus quattuor sunt assignate etates*])

London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI[108]

Folio	Token	Distinctions	Material copied alongside main token & distinctions
102v	*Tempora quattuor que recolit ecclesia que considerantur secundum quattuor principales partes diei que sunt*	(dist. 1) *Nox pertinet ad tempus deviationis. Nox* […] *obscura est et ydolatriae ceci erant*; (dist. 2) *Mane pertinet at tempus revocationis vel regressionis*; (dist. 3) *Meridies ad tempus reconciliationis pertinet*; (dist. 4) *Vespera pertinet ad tempus peregrinationis*	*Tempus* (dist. 1) *Ante legem* […] *representat primus nocturnus;* (dist. 2) *Sub lege* […] *representat secundus;* (dist. 3) *Gratiae* […] *representat tercius;* (dist. 4) *Quartum erit in futuro*
103r	*Tamquam notat*	(dist. 1) *Quandoque similitudinem tantum;* (dist. 2) *Aliquam veritatis expressionum tantum* (dist. 3) *Aliquam utrum ut ibi. Et erant tamqum lignum*	*Tempus dicitur malum* (dist. 1) *propter culpam. Unde. Redunentes tempus quam dies mali sunt;* (dist. 2) *propter temporalem penam;* (dist. 3) *propter eternam penam. Unde. Beatus qui intellegit super* […] *et cetera*
103r	*Temptacio multiplex est*	(dist. 1) *Ab inferiori id est a carne propria que blando nobis susurrat* […; 6 lines in total]; (dist. 2) *A superiori id est a ratione* […; 4 lines in total]; (dist. 3) *Ab anteriori id est a suggestione demonum qui in via quam ambulamus* […] *facilius est camelum per foramen acus et cetera* […; 7 lines in total]	

108) With the exception of the addition of »(dist. 1)« etc., my transcriptions below present the text as it appears on the manuscript page, that is, without corrections, emendations, etc.

Folio	Token	Distinctions	Material copied alongside main token & distinctions
103r	*Temptacio multiplex est*	(dist. 1) *A posteriori* […] *est memoria* […; 4 lines in total]; (dist. 2) *A dextris id est asperitate* […; 3 lines in total]; (dist. 3) *A sinistris est. Sexta* […; 3 lines in total]	
103r	*Tempus est* (Eccles. 7)	(dist. 1) *Tacendi. Unde. Dum medium silentium tenerent omnia et cetera;* (dist. 2) *Loquendi. Unde. Clamat iohannis in deserto* […] *se dei nostril*	
103r-103v	*Temptacio*	(dist. 1) *Levis vel lenis quam generat pusillaris miseria;* (dist. 2) *Gravis. quam imitator manis gloria;* (dist. 3) *Gravior quam fovet avaricia;* (dist. 4) *Gravissima quam comitatur fratrum discordia. hiis quattuor temptationibus quattuor sunt assignate etates. Prima est puericia que et incipientium cui lenis temptacio suberit ne incipiat. Secunda est. adolescencia. et est proficientium quam assequitur inanis gloria. Tercia est robusta etas et est eorum qui perfecerunt quam persequitur avaricia. Quarta est etas decrepita quam destruit fratrum discordia. hec quattuor temptationes notate sunt in psalmo ut dicitur. Non timebis a timore* [fol. 103v] *nocturno prima* […] *temptacio dicitur nocturnus timor. Item a sagitta volante. in die per quam notatur. Secunda temptacio a negocio per ambulante in tenebris notatur tercia temptacio. ab incursu et demono meridiano natur. Quarta temptacio. Contra has temptaciones dominus appoint. quarta. remedia. Contra primam dat iusticiam. Contra secundam apponit prudentiam. contra terciam fortitudinem. contra quartam temperanciam.*	

Appendix II. Further Tokens Mentioned/Cited

As included in the list of tokens in ›Distinctiones‹

aetas (etates mundi/homini)
dies
iudicium
mane
resurrectio
resurrectio christi
redempti sumus
reformatur homines
tempus[109)]
vespera

109) Only in London, British Library, Royal 10 A XVI; see above, n. 86.

As absent from the list of tokens

aevum
in gloriam
in principio
inspiratio
futura
prophetia
revelatio
saeculum

Summary

This paper is a case study in the potential interpretations of terms related to the future as they appear in the ›Distinctiones‹ of Peter the Chanter (d. 1197). This method is used because of the ›Distinctiones‹' particular intellectual approach. The text is one of the earliest examples (indeed perhaps the very first) of a new type of work in the genre of *distinctiones* that enjoyed considerable popularity in the thirteenth century. Peter's work is a very substantial source which relies on allegory and allusion rather than on reasoned arguments. The ›Distinctiones‹ is a map, but it is for the reader to decide how to navigate its terrain. In this sense, the text was intended as a kind of conceptual thesaurus of Christian thought.

Thus, Peter's work was an innovative teaching tool produced for students in the late twelfth-century schools in Paris which was a training ground for the next generation of theologians, ecclesiastics, and secular office holders. As an early example of the genre Peter's work displays some peculiarities, which the paper also discusses.

The text is unedited so the paper is based on a sample of material drawn from five of the 70 known manuscripts. It describes the layout of Peter's ›Distinctiones‹ on the page, which was important because the visual presentation of the material in the text was integral to the reader response it sought to prompt. The paper also shows how Peter connected concepts relating to the future to material familiar to his audience from the liturgy and canon law traditions, and includes an example of a reader's reaction from the Rochester manuscript which shows that at least one reader absorbed Peter's methods.