

INTERPRETING THE HEXAEMERON: HONORIUS AUGUSTODUNENSIS *DE* *NEOCOSMO*

Wanda Cizewski

Introduction

During his lifetime, Honorius Augustodunensis tried to conceal his identity, and he succeeded. Five hundred years of scholarship have not uncovered the secret of the enigmatic *presbyter* and *scholasticus*, nor yet identified with certainty the "imperial hill" from which his name derives. The work of V.I.J. Flint and M.-O. Garrigues over the past decade has, however, narrowed the field of inquiry and made possible a fairly precise identification of the intellectual and controversial milieu in which he wrote. From internal evidence in his writings and on the basis of manuscript distribution, it can be concluded that during the first decades of the twelfth century, he was active somewhere in the Danube valley, probably at or near Regensburg. Both authors agree that he may well have been a Benedictine monk. Indeed, Valerie Flint goes so far as to suggest that his involvement in the Benedictines' struggle to preserve their right to priestly service and the care of souls may be the key to the place and purpose of his works.¹

Both the Benedictines of south Germany and their rivals, the Augustinian canons, were advocates of the Gregorian reform. Both aimed at a regulated communal life, high standards of clerical morality, and the kind of education that would equip them for their chosen rôle as spiritual governors of humanity. The Augustinian canons were secure in the approval of the reformist papacy and in the venerable authority implied in their name. The monks of the old Benedictine order were, by contrast, increasingly hampered by a

tendency in the post-Gregorian church to exclude them from pastoral care of the laity,² and by the attractiveness to recruits of a new and different style of monasticism, exemplified in the Cistercian movement. In Germany, however, the Benedictines had a tradition of priestly service to defend and a particularly eloquent spokesman for their cause in Rupert of Deutz.

Since the publication in 1906 of Endres' edition of Rupert's *Questio utrum monachis liceat predicare* with Honorius' *Quod monachis liceat predicare*, scholars have been aware of close affinities between the works of Rupert and Honorius.³ Needless to say, both were zealous partisans of the reform, and both propounded Gregorian views on the relationship between ecclesiastical and secular powers. As commentators, both wrote voluminously on the liturgy and Scripture. Both found occasion to assert that their aim in writing was to instruct the simple and uneducated. In the context of the local struggle for pastoral and priestly rights, such instructive writing might well have been intended to serve as reference books and catechetical texts for those monks who, according to Rupert, were also clerics because they were ordained *literati* and, as such, qualified to teach and preach.⁴

There are, however, some notable differences between the careers and reception of the two authors. Honorius hints darkly in his prefaces at opposition and attack from envious minds, but his enemies are not readily identifiable. Moreover, the principal targets of his polemical writings are the targets of the reform in general: immoral clerics and presumptuous lay powers. By contrast, Rupert's enemies are not only identifiable but usually members of the same factions that opposed his Order: first, the secular clergy and Alger of Liège, then the *magistri* of the school at Laon, and finally Norbert of Xanthen, founder of the Premonstratensians.⁵ Honorius clearly upheld the right of monks to preach, but he could also conclude, in the *Libellus XII questionum*, that the order of canons regular was higher in dignity than monastic orders.⁶ Surviving manuscripts of each author's works suggest a similar pattern. Both were strongly represented in Benedictine houses, as might be expected. Out of a total 215 manuscripts of Rupert's works, 59 are from Benedictine libraries. Ninety-four of the altogether 265 twelfth-century manuscripts of Honorius' works can be traced to a Benedictine establishment. Only 11 manuscripts of Rupert's works were found in Augustinian libraries and four in Premonstratensian. By contrast, 37 of the twelfth-century manuscripts of Honorius' works can be traced to Augustinian houses and 18 to Premonstratensian.⁷ Some of Honorius' works -- notably the *Elucidarium* -- are found in miscellaneous compendia of exegetical, didactic, and spiritual works that Valerie Flint names "pastoral codices" and identifies

as handbooks of the kind that would be useful to those who were directly engaged in pastoral care.⁸ Often, Honorius' works are bound with *sententiae* of the sort that spread from Laon and sometimes with abbreviations of Hugh of St Victor's *De Arca Noe*. One looks in vain for a comparable treatment of Rupert's writings.

Never quite unambiguous in his allegiances or his readership, Honorius remains a problem figure in the intellectual history of the early twelfth century. As Valerie Flint concludes in her paper on the place and purpose of his works, he did his job so well that he provided material not only for the Benedictines but also for their rivals and critics.⁹ His stated aims and chosen topics are, indeed, as close to those of the Augustinian canon, Hugh of St Victor, as they are to the authorship of the Benedictine Rupert.¹⁰ Initially, modern scholars have treated Honorius as an egregious magpie, rather than as an original thinker, because of the variety of his sources and the apparently haphazard use he made of them. Recently, Valerie Flint has suggested that his use of sources in an encyclopedic work like the *Imago Mundi* was motivated by a "desire to introduce clarity into areas of extreme confusion," and that the simplicity of his style masks a complex method of composition.¹¹ In the present paper, I propose to extend the question of Honorius' method of composition to one of his exegetical pieces, the *Neocosmos*, or commentary on the hexaameron,¹² because it lends itself to comparison with hexaemeral works by several other authors of his generation, including Rupert of Deutz and Hugh of St Victor.

De Neocosmo

The *Neocosmos* consists of two distinct parts.¹³ In the first, Honorius proceeds from an introductory *accessus ad auctorem* through a verse-by-verse exegesis of Genesis 1 on the literal level. To this, he adds a summary interpretation of the six days as six ages of world history. The second part he describes as an abbreviation of Augustine's opinions on the six days, and presents in the form of another, self-contained hexaameron. Both sections of the work are written in rhyming prose.

In an introductory statement, Honorius indicates that his treatise is an *elucidarium* of the hexaameron, or six-day work, written for a group of people who have requested the most eminent interpretation *ad litteram* of that text.¹⁴ Characteristically, he aims to produce clarity, for the benefit of simple folk (*simplices*), where earlier a multiplicity of interpretations and diverse opinions are blamed for causing confusion. His *accessus* then begins with the abrupt question: "In the first place, it may be asked, why did Moses write

about the fall of man, but suppress the fall of the angels?"¹⁵ Honorius answers that every author structures his work with a view to harmonious presentation, so that the material may match the intention. Moses, too, should be understood to have tailored his material to fit his intention, omitting the creation and fall of the angels because these are extraneous to his plan of writing "a figural account of the restoration of humankind through Christ."¹⁶ Thus, although the literal sense of the text is a narrative of creation, it must be recognized to contain a second, typological meaning, since Moses "sets down nothing except what corresponds figurally to Christ or the Church."¹⁷ For example, the opening words of the text, *In principio . . .*, are seen as an assertion not only that all things were created in Christ as principle but also that in Christ all things are subsequently to be restored. Similarly, Honorius explains, the culmination of Moses' narrative in the liberation of Israel from Pharaoh and their entry into the promised land signify the liberation of believers by Christ and the eventual culmination of salvation history, when the Church will have entered its promised land.¹⁸

It is customary in the *accessus* to describe an author's *intentio*, *materia*, and *modus tractandi*.¹⁹ Having stated his views on the author's *intentio* -- and, by implication, narrative *modus tractandi* -- Honorius makes a brief but complex statement about *materia*:

. . . His material is this sensible world, into which humanity was thrust after the fall, and the advent of the Only-Begotten of God into this world, maker of the world and liberator of humankind.²⁰

The term *materia* is used here in a double sense, both to mean literary matter and as a punning reference to the matter from which the sensible world (*sensilis mundi*) was created. Initially, Honorius combines it with a neo-platonic notion of the soul's fall into corporeality, but proceeds, through a series of parallels, to show how Moses' narratives of a material creation and historical events contain and prefigure the spiritual liberation achieved by Christ. Thus, the passover lamb of the exodus prefigures the sacrifice of Christ, while the sacrifices prescribed by the Law prefigure his sacraments. Similarly, the New Testament is the continuation and completion of the Old, because it provides the solution to mysteries presented in the Old Testament narrative and laws. Arguing from the tradition that places John first in the New Testament canon,²¹ Honorius finds further evidence, in the opening verses of Genesis and John's Gospel, for a progressive unfolding of parallel meanings,

since the *In principio* . . . of each Testament may be taken to indicate that both bear witness to the consubstantiality and co-equality of the Son with the Father. Honorius, moreover, would have it that although the prophet Moses refers to the Son as the principle in which all things were created, John the apostle speaks more precisely of the Father as principle, the Son remaining eternally and co-equally in him, and all things made through the Son.²² From there, he goes smoothly on to quote the remainder of the first verse of Genesis (*Et Spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas*), which was traditionally understood to refer to the third person of the Trinity. With that, he has introduced the divine author of the work he is about to elucidate:

To God the Father is ascribed the creation of the world, to the Son, the disposition, and to the Spirit the vivification or ornamentation of all things.²³

Honorius' *accessus*, although brief, is remarkably complex. It introduces a human author, Moses, and prepares the reader to expect in the text a double sense, literal and figurative, corresponding to the double Testament, Old and New. At the same time, it leads up to recognition of the divine author, by whom, as we shall see, the reader will find that the world was doubly created, corporeally and spiritually, or in ways that correspond not only to sense perception but also to angelic or spiritual perception.

At this point, Honorius announces the beginning of his literal exposition of the text (*Simpliciter autem sic ad litteram exponitur* . . .) and turns to an interpretation of key words and phrases. He does not quote the text word by word, but proceeds in a manner which suggests that he could assume that his readers had the relevant passage at hand and would refer to it. Throughout, he remains on the literal and material level, as may be seen in his interpretation, once again, of *In principio* On the literal level, the creation of heaven and earth *in principio* signifies the simultaneous (*in momento*) creation of all things, both corporeal and incorporeal. "Heaven" is to be understood as the name for incorporeal creation, including angels "and all spiritual beings which are not visible to us."²⁴ "Earth" is the word for corporeal creation, including the corporeal heavens, and all things perceptible to the senses. Alternatively, Honorius adds, *In principio* . . . may indicate that the creation of heaven and earth was prior in time to the creation of other things, since it is described as happening first. The earth, or corporeal creature, is said to have been "empty and void" since it was empty of fruits and void of animals. By contrast, the upper heaven, or

spiritual realm, must be understood to have been fully populated with angels as soon as it was created. Following Bede, Honorius identifies the angels with the morning stars and sons of God in Job 38:7.²⁵ He then parallels their praise of God's created work in the beginning with praises sung by the "evening stars," or elect human beings glorified in the resurrection.²⁶ As we shall see, this interpretation of heaven and its inhabitants becomes the key to Honorius' second, or Augustinian, hexaemeron.

After these preliminaries, Honorius proceeds, from phrase to phrase of the text, into an account of the formation of earth, or the corporeal realm. In his exegesis of Genesis 1:2 (*Et tenebrae erant super faciem abyssi*), he identifies the shadowy mass described in the text as *chaos*, or the unformed matter from which the world was shaped. Nevertheless, he grants that the elements were not entirely indistinct or formless but confused and intermingled: darkness prevailed because "fire was hidden in stones and iron"; the surface of the earth itself was covered by water and had "the same appearance as it has now under the depths of the ocean."²⁷ The hexaemeron relates that to this confused mass of elements came the formative commands of the Creator. Honorius points out that where the text reads, *Dixit Deus . . .* it must be understood to speak "according to our manner," using effective commands as a way of expressing the creation of all things in the divine Word. Through this Word, the physical process of formation advanced in orderly stages. Thus, the first word of creation produced corporeal light by releasing the element of fire into the world. That element shone out with a kind of pre-dawn glow in the primordial waters, illumining them as the sun illumines air. It circled the earth, thereby producing the twenty-four hour day, with twelve hours of light on one side of the earth, followed by twelve hours of darkness, or the division between light and dark in the Genesis text. Like the Word of command, both the commendation and the naming of things on this and each successive day are interpreted as expressions used to guide the rational creature into understanding. Thus, the commendation of light is intended to teach him that "all things are good, that he perceives through light." Finally, Honorius urges his readers to note (*Notandum autem . . .*) that the primordial day has a special, figural sense, since it is to be identified with Christ, the "true light," source and end of all creation.²⁸

Honorius continues his exegesis of the hexaemeron with a series of physical interpretations for the creative command and effect of each successive day. He relies primarily on Bede, as Crouse has noted, but draws for his account of the second day on Josephus' interpretation of the firmament as a solidification of the upper waters into crystalline density.²⁹

Subsequent developments are treated as natural results produced when the elements were released and freely sought their proper places. Thus, the water cycle is described and explained as an effect of the positions and relationship among the four elements. As soon as the waters had receded from the earth, the earth produced vegetation according to the command of God and very much in the same manner that it renews itself each year in spring.

The Genesis text relates that the heavenly luminaries were made on the fourth day (Genesis 1:14-18). Honorius begins his interpretation of this passage with a brief account of the placement of sun, moon, and stars, but interrupts himself to draw the readers' attention (*Notandum autem . . .*) to the series of ternaries that appear in the creation narrative and serve to show that all things were brought to perfection through the Trinity: "For the elements were perfected in three days, and in three days the things that follow them were perfected."³⁰ He then offers a summary of the hexaemeral work understood as a series of transformations produced in the elements, before proceeding to give an account of the fourth, fifth, and sixth days. In this way, he takes his readers beyond the *littera* of the scriptural text to a theological interpretation of the sensible world itself. By treating air as an intermediate stage between the elements of fire and water, he reduces the number of principal elements to three. These, accordingly, mirror the triune nature of God and make up a kind of material trinity from which corporeal natures derive and on which they are founded.³¹

In the section that follows, each item is described in terms of its physical source, nature, and purpose, within the order of creation. When he comes to Genesis 1:20 (*Producant aquae reptilia et volatilia*), Honorius comments:

Here Scripture discloses, why the Spirit of God brooded over the waters; doubtless, because he wished to produce living things from that element first, and to make the whole mixture fruitful.³²

Fish and reptiles were given their ordained place in the waters, but birds were sent to inhabit the lower air, a region that Honorius identifies with the element water and distinguishes from the upper air, or aether, which is more akin to fire.

Once the two kinds of water animals and three kinds of land animals are in place, everything necessary for human existence is prepared, and the human creature itself is produced from earth to govern earthly creatures. Honorius

interprets the words "image and likeness" to indicate that the human being has a peculiarly double nature, since it is a "celestial animal" distinct from other living things through reason and intellect.³³ Moreover, the human being occupies a unique position and exists for a unique purpose in the universe, insofar as he participates in some aspect of every creature and is destined to participate, at the Incarnation, in the life of the Creator:

Because God decided to be joined to him at some time, he gave him participation in every creature: namely, to discern with the angels, to feel with the animals, to grow with grass and trees, to be with stones.³⁴

All creation, in Honorius' interpretation, co-existed in peaceful vegetarian harmony before the Fall. Man's fall, however, disrupted both the corporeal and the spiritual order, and, as Honorius describes it, produced something like a second, evil creation of poisonous herbs, sterile trees, and carnivorous habits among the animals.³⁵ By implication, therefore, the union of Creator with creature in the Incarnation of Christ marks the beginning of a process of restoration destined ultimately to include and reintegrate all of material creation.

Honorius concludes his exposition *ad litteram* with an explanation of the liturgical and figural significance of the seventh day in comparison to the first, or eighth, day:

God the Father decreed that the seventh day be celebrated by the ancient people; but God the Son made the eighth, which is the first, [a day] to be observed by the new people.³⁶

Figurally, the seventh day is interpreted to mean the rest of the just -- their bodies buried, their souls in heaven -- before the day of judgment, while the eighth day represents eternity beyond creation and time. Furthermore, the seven days are taken to parallel the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit (Isaiah 11:1-3), while the octave parallels the beatitudes (Matt. 5:3-10). Significantly, in view of Honorius' dualisms, the seven gifts are drawn from an Old Testament text and are associated with the condition of souls within time and the present order, while the Beatitudes, drawn from a New Testament passage, are associated with eternity and an utterly new dispensation.

These comparisons lead into a summary allegorical interpretation of each of the seven days as an age of world history, based on the version found in Bede's Genesis commentary.³⁷ The passage serves as a bridge between

Honorius' first and second hexaemeron and signals a transition from the material and temporal aspect of creation, to creation from the point of view of eternity.

Honorius announces the beginning of his second, or Augustinian, hexaemeron by advising the reader that he will state Augustine's teachings as briefly as he can, adapting them to his own style for ease of understanding. What he then presents, proves to be a fairly free adaptation of some of the principal thoughts in Augustine's *De Genesi ad litteram* and *Confessiones* 12 to 13, selectively combined.³⁸ Once again, he offers an interpretation of *In principio . . .*, this time explaining that the *principium* in which all things were created is to be identified as the Son, or divine Wisdom. In the Son, God the Father created both spiritual and corporeal beings simultaneously, as the texts of Ecclesiasticus 18:1 and John 1:3-4 would appear to indicate. These texts, Honorius continues, must be understood to mean that "all that was subsequently made, materially and formally, always existed in the Word of God, causally and by predestination."³⁹ The ostensibly Augustinian interpretation, therefore, is to be an interpretation of creation "causally and by predestination," or creation at the intelligible level of the pre-existent Word presented to angelic and spiritual cognition.

"Heaven" and "earth" remain the comprehensive names for all creatures, but Honorius' concern is now with the angelic nature. It should not be supposed, he continues, that any insensible nature was produced by God before the creation of the angels, since every sensible nature is said to be more worthy than the insensible. For this reason, the creation of angels is understood to be implied in the production of "heaven" at the beginning of creation, since this heaven is to be identified with the heaven of heavens that is the dwelling-place of God, rather than the corporeal heavens described later on in the text. "Earth," described in the Genesis text as "formless and void," is to be understood as the corporeal creature, causally posited in the Word of God, but as yet unformed. When the Spirit moves over the waters of this "earth," his action is to be understood as the distinction into forms of all things that God decided to create from the primordial mixture of the elements.⁴⁰

The Genesis text treats creation as a series of consecutive developments; the level on which Honorius now seeks to interpret it is, however, that of eternity and angelic cognition, scarcely comprehensible or expressible in human terms:

It should, indeed, be understood that God did not first make the matter, and then the form, but brought forth everything simultaneously formed, as the song proceeds together with the voice. Moreover, that this or that is said to have been made on such and such a day, is said in our manner -- by whom it is scarcely understood, that he is described as having made all things simultaneously.⁴¹

The problem is complicated by the differing relations to time of the celestial or angelic nature and the corporeal nature called "earth." The length of time that passed between the creation of the angels and the creation of this world cannot be humanly calculated, in Honorius' opinion, since time began with the material world and is measured by the alternation of seasons and other perceptible changes in material creatures. Honorius therefore rejects the notion that the immaterial, angelic nature began with the corporeal world. Instead, it pre-existed the earth and was present, according to Honorius' chosen interpretation of Job 38:7, at the founding of the world.⁴²

The creation of light, accordingly, receives a quite different interpretation from the one proposed in Honorius' first hexaemeron, where it was a physical effect in the ordering of the elements. Here, the light is identified as an aspect of angelic cognition, the intelligible light produced by God for illumination of the angelic intellect:

Therefore, God said "Let there be light" when he illumined the angels with the light of wisdom. For this is the brilliance of eternal light. But "there was light" when they recognized that God had already made all things in his Wisdom, which were as yet to come: in him, they were already seeing all the causes and reasons of things. "And God saw that it was good" -- namely, that they distinguished the Creator from the creature, and loved, praising the Creator, disdaining the creature.⁴³

Just as the light produced on the first day is now interpreted as a spiritual and not a corporeal effect, so also the division of light from darkness is not a physical alternation of corporeal light and shadow, but a division between the formed, intelligible creature and the unformed creature or material world. The angels, Honorius explains, are named "day" because their nature is the eternal day of the heavenly and post-resurrection realm. The corporeal creature, by contrast, is called "night," since "every corporeal creature, if compared to the spiritual, is rightly called shadows."⁴⁴

At this point, Honorius notes that the day is called "day one" in the text, rather than "the first day." The unusual term indicates the eternal nature of that day, understood as the angelic condition and the condition of the saints who will become equal with the angels after the resurrection.⁴⁵ This thought sends Honorius into a digression in which he poses and answers the question, "What is the kingdom of heaven, or what reward will be given there to the spirits of the blessed?"⁴⁶ His answer provides a key to understanding his order of presentation and juxtaposition of two apparently contradictory interpretations of the hexaemeral text. The reader is advised that the splendours of the kingdom of heaven are not to be imagined as corporeal delights, but must be understood as spiritual beatitude found in the contemplation of God. For this reason, the "day" enjoyed by the angels, and to be enjoyed by the saints, is the condition of those who experience the perpetual vision of God. According to the text, it has an evening and a morning, which Honorius explains as a distinction between the angelic nature or condition considered in itself, and the same nature or condition "when it bursts forth in praise of the Creator for the marvellous creation."⁴⁷

Honorius' first hexaemeron was an interpretation of the Genesis text from the point of view of human beings who are yet to be redeemed or liberated; following the example of the prophetic author, he omitted references to the angelic nature, condition, and cognition. Here, however, his commentary is concerned with creation as it is spiritually perceived by the angels, or from the point of view that redeemed human beings will share with the angels after the resurrection, after liberation, and after the history that Moses is said to relate figurally in the Pentateuch. His interpretation has, accordingly, proceeded through two stages, from the elementary -- in both senses of the word -- to the spiritual or advanced. In this arrangement, he follows a method corresponding to what he sees as the multiple senses of Scripture and the steps by which these become accessible to the reader:

Sacred Scripture conforms itself to the intellects of human beings as a mother does to the habits of children, or wax to the reversed impression of seals. For it moves at a mother's pace with the slow, flies to the heights with the capable, laughs from the summit at the proud, terrifies the attentive with profundity, feeds the great with truth, nourishes the small with gentleness.

This [text], therefore, tells the wise that God created all things simultaneously in one day, relates to slower [minds] that God completed his work in six days. By the capable it is, indeed,

scarcely understood, that God is said to have created everything simultaneously in one day -- or rather, in the wink of an eye. By the slower ones, however, it is easily grasped -- as an apple is eaten in sections by small children -- how everything is said to have been completely created in six days.⁴⁸

In effect, the meaning of a text expands in relation to the capacities of its readers, and Honorius' exposition of Genesis has been arranged accordingly, with an eye to the presumably expanding capacities of his own audience. First, he takes them through an elementary exposition at the simple, material level of nature and history, but then moves on to the advanced level of the intelligibles. Having equipped his readers for the task of understanding simultaneous creation in terms of a single day of intellectual illumination, he proceeds to explain the symbolic significance of the number of days recorded in the *littera* of the text. God is said to have completed his work in six days, because of the perfection implied in the number six. Since one plus two plus three make six, six may be broken down into unity, the binary, and the ternary, and then reconstituted from them. The significance of this arithmetical rule is understood to have motivated both the prophetic author and the philosopher Plato, whose *Timaeus* happens to begin with those numbers.⁴⁹ Using the symbolic values of unity, the binary, and the ternary, Honorius then launches into a complex account of the significance of the number six, linking it to a theory of emanation and return both in the cosmic order and in relations among the persons of the Trinity.⁵⁰ The passage roughly parallels his earlier digression on ternaries in the material world and a trinity of the elements, but has moved from the corporeal realm to the purely intelligible level of number.

After these lengthy, explanatory digressions, Honorius returns to his text, taking up the production of the firmament on the second day. When the text reads *Dixit Deus . . .*, it is to be interpreted as saying that he constituted, eternally in the Word, what the creature was to be. The phrase *Et factum est ita*, signifies, in turn, the angelic cognition, by which the angels perceived, subsisting in the Word of God, what was as yet to be created in material fact. Evening and morning are interpreted as two aspects of the angelic cognition, namely, in its contemplation of the creature according to its proper nature and in its praise of the Creator for his work. The same sequence of meanings applies to each of the subsequent days, except the seventh, which has no evening but consists in eternal rest with the Creator.⁵¹

Having equipped his readers with these general rules of interpretation, Honorius offers the last of his summaries of the hexaemeron. Earlier, he set out what may be called an elementary summary, describing the ternaries in material creation and the elements that are its foundation. After that, he ended the first section of his *elucidarium* by summing up the days of creation as allegories of the ages of history. In the "Augustinian" section, he again summarized on a theme of numbers in creation, although at an abstract level, removed from the perceptible data of nature and history. In this final summing up, he lists the sequence of days and creative works as a series of potentialities in divine Wisdom, disclosed to the angels before being posited in material reality.⁵² From this final reading of the days of creation, Honorius makes a concluding transition into the second creation story in the Genesis text. The day of Genesis 2:4 (*Istae sunt generationes caeli et terrae in die . . .*), is interpreted as the one, eternal day, hitherto described as six, on which God created all things simultaneously. To this eternal day, temporal days are related as the human being is related to the Creator:

Just as man is created to the likeness of God, so also these temporal days are said to be created to the likeness of those six, or rather seven, remaining eternally in the Word of God. And, indeed, everything created in this world is not absurdly said to be formed to the likeness of the forms existing in God.⁵³

After this, the Genesis text is understood to turn to the actual production of the corporeal creature, beginning with the spring that welled up from the earth to irrigate the land (Genesis 2:6), the formation of Adam, and the planting of paradise. Honorius professes ignorance of the actual process: "On what day of the week, or in what order, whether in one day or many, everything was formed into species, is unknown."⁵⁴ Nor does he venture to estimate the length of time spent by Adam in paradise. Instead, he concludes by briefly contrasting God's creative activity in the eternal and in the temporal days:

In those eternal six days, therefore, God created everything causally, and rested on the seventh day from his work. In these temporal days, however, he made all temporal and corporeal things in reality by species and forms, and gave them a law for growing, enduring, and reproducing themselves.⁵⁵

It is in this latter sense that both the Father and the Son are "at work until now" (John 5:17), and will continue to work until every corporeal creature has been transformed into its more perfect condition.⁵⁶

Conclusion

Honorius' little *elucidarium* on the hexaemeron is a complex fabric, woven from numerous and sometimes conflicting strands of Scripture and exegetical tradition. To list only scriptural material -- he considers and incorporates into his work not only the creation week of Genesis 1 but also texts in which God is said to have made heaven and earth in one day (Genesis 2:4), that God, who remains in eternity, created all things simultaneously (Ecclus. 18:1), and that the Father and the Son are at work until now (John 5:17).⁵⁷ The stated purpose of Honorius' undertaking is clarification, and his method for achieving it is to find and order the various cognitive perspectives that correspond to each of the varied accounts of creation. For the perspective of sense perception, for example, there is an explanation of material creation as stages of transformation in the elements, just as there is an explanation of simultaneous, intelligible creation that corresponds to spiritual perception. The hexaemeral text itself, together with the rest of the Pentateuch, is read on a figural level from the point of view of salvation history, but is also presented on a broader, allegorical level as a summary of the ages of world history. All these approaches are valid for Honorius, and he makes each one issue in its own distinctive interpretation of the text at hand. The reader, meanwhile, is taught, by progression from the elemental to the spiritual levels, gradually to distinguish and apply each point of view, until the confusion of conflicting opinions is resolved.

What sort of clarity is it that Honorius achieves? It seems at first to depend more on successful compartmentalization than on a single philosophical or theological principle. The compartments, however, are segments in a continuum, and stand for stages in education through the study of Scripture. They stand also for stages in the progress of salvation history, from corporeal existence in the present world to spiritual fulfilment in the next. In his *accessus*, Honorius ascribed to Moses the intention of making "a figural account of the restoration of humankind through Christ," and a similarly Christocentric intention may be traced through his own interpretations. The saving work of Christ incarnate is seen as figurally adumbrated in the Pentateuch, while, as the second person of the Trinity, he is the pre-existent Word in which creation is ordered. The production of man as *microcosmos* of corporeal and incorporeal creation prepares the way for

the Incarnation, but after the resurrection both angels and human beings enjoy spiritual beatitude in the light of divine Wisdom. If, therefore, there is a unifying principle in Honorius' exegesis, it is a Christocentrism around which all the assorted parts of the hexaemeral tradition are fitted into place.

Comparison with some of the contemporaries who also wrote on the hexaemeron discloses the distinctive character of Honorius' exegesis, in both its Christocentrism and its resolute salvaging of as much of the tradition as possible. In genre and sources, for example, his work seems akin to two slightly later (1130's to 1140's) hexaemeral treatises, those of Peter Abelard and Thierry of Chartres.⁵⁸

Like Honorius, Thierry begins his commentary with a statement of purpose and an *accessus* to the author and text:

I shall elucidate, according to physics and the letter, the first part of Genesis, concerning the distinctions among the six works Afterwards, I shall proceed to expound the historical sense of the letter, and so pass over both the moral and the allegorical readings⁵⁹

Thierry's intention distinguishes him sharply from Honorius. He announces that he will pass over all but the literal and physical reading of the text, while Honorius, by contrast, passes over nothing and makes his physical interpretation merely a first step on the way to full, multi-layered understanding. Although both authors draw on many of the same sources -- including Macrobius, and Calcidius' commentary on the *Timaeus* -- for their account of material creation, Thierry begins by declaring independence from both the figural and the spiritual levels of that same Augustinian interpretation toward which Honorius leads his readers. Instead, Thierry looks for knowledge of the Creator in the four causes of material creation and the order in which it comes into being. Moreover, his analysis of the corporeal world itself offers a subtler and more complex interpretation of the relationship between Creator and creature than does that of Honorius, for whom the elements are of less importance in themselves, than as an image of the divine Trinity or as components of the humanity to which the Son was joined.⁶⁰

A similar divergence of intention appears when we compare Honorius' *Neocosmos* with Abelard's *Expositio in Hexaemeron*. Both Abelard and Honorius wrote at the request of beginners, promising to pursue clarification of obscurities and to compose an interpretation of the text *ad litteram*. Both

include the allegorical and moral interpretations that Thierry rejects. Nevertheless, a glance at the arrangement of Abelard's commentary finds the allegorical and moral interpretations inserted in a brief, incongruous digression, while the focus of attention remains on the literal and historical sense of the text. Like Honorius, Abelard questions Moses' omission of the creation and fall of the angels, and concludes that it must reflect the author's intention to relate the history of human salvation. Unlike Honorius, however, he refuses to consider the creation of the world from any cognitive perspective other than that prescribed by the text and its prophetic author. His concern, in effect, is to interpret the *littera* of the text by questioning it with a view to understanding the intended historical and -- occasionally -- implied prophetic meaning.⁶¹

There is a third member of the 1130's to 1140 generation of theologians in France whose aims and methods seem more readily comparable to those of Honorius. In his *Didascalicon de studio legendi*, book six, Hugh of St Victor discusses at some length the order and method to be used in study and exposition of Scripture. The task is compared to the construction of a house, where first a foundation is laid, then the structure is raised, and finally the decoration of colour and ornament added.⁶² The historical, allegorical, and moral meanings of Scripture correspond to these stages of construction, and Hugh discusses each in detail. Further attention is devoted to problems of interpretation that may occur in the narrative form of a text and in the expositor's attempt to distinguish the significance of the *littera*, the sense of words, and the deeper meaning or *sententia*. Hugh then concludes with a brief definition of method:

The method of expounding a text consists of analysis. Analysis takes place through separation into parts or through examination. We analyse through separation into parts when we distinguish from one another things which are mingled together. We analyse by examination when we open up things that are hidden.⁶³

Hugh commented on the hexaemeron in his *adnotationes* on the Pentateuch, but the mature and representative product of his exegetical work, as he himself indicates, is the *De sacramentis Christianae fidei*, a *summa* of doctrine aimed at students who are ready for the allegorical reading of Scripture, after elementary study of the historical sense.⁶⁴ The *summa* is constructed according to Hugh's understanding of the subject matter of Scripture, in two volumes corresponding to the twofold works of creation and

restoration. Much of the first volume is, in fact, taken up with tractates on the creation of the world, the Trinity, and the creation of angels and human beings. The second volume treats of the work of restoration from the Incarnation to the judgment day and renewal of the world. The whole *summa* might, however, be seen as a single, massive hexaemeral treatise, in that its theme throughout is the work of the Creator on both the material and spiritual creation and perfection of his creature. If we look at the chapters describing the creation of the world, we find that Hugh puts his methodological principles into practice, analysing the text by distinguishing it into parts, distinguishing among the senses of each part, and examining the meaning of the text on the material, allegorical, and moral levels.⁶⁵

Honorius' brief *elucidarium* of the hexaemeron cannot be compared in scope, detail, and sophistication to the massive systematic presentation of doctrine that we find in Hugh's *De sacramentis Christianae fidei*. Nevertheless, there are remarkable affinities of method and intention, as well as thematic similarities. Both authors are concerned with distinguishing and ordering the multiple layers of meaning in Scripture. Both write around a central, Trinitarian, and Christological theme of regeneration through the knowledge of God, a regeneration that occurs progressively in the restorative work of the Word incarnate, but occurs also in the understanding that develops from the study of Scripture. What Honorius attempted in miniature in the *Neocosmos* reappears, in effect, as the organizational principle of Hugh's systematic theology.

Culturally and politically, Honorius' nearest neighbour was probably Rupert of Deutz. Although Rupert did not compose a self-contained treatise on the hexaemeron, the first part of his massive Bible commentary, *De Sancta Trinitate et operibus eius* (completed in 1117) is a complete exegesis in two books of the creation narrative.⁶⁶ Many of the themes found in Honorius' work appear also in Rupert's: like Honorius, he divides the work of creation and providence among Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, ascribing creation to the Father, restoration to the Son, and ornamentation or vivification to the Holy Spirit.⁶⁷ At the same time, the Word or Son is held to be the *dies ex die* of creation and the prime and efficient cause of all creatures.⁶⁸ Both authors draw on many of the same sources, including the neoplatonism of Calcidius and Macrobius, as well as the tradition derived from Augustine and Bede. In method, however, they follow divergent courses. There is, primarily and most obviously, a difference between the programs of writing in which their hexaemeral treatises occur. Honorius composed, among other works of varied genres, a tractate on the hexaemeron alone, while Rupert set out to

interpret the whole of Scripture in terms of the creative, providential, and regenerative work of the Trinity. Within Rupert's schema, therefore, the hexaemeron is treated only as a small part of the unfolding totality of salvation history. Furthermore, Rupert's order of presentation is determined by the text, which he interprets in detail and word for word. Conflicting interpretations are resolved with reference to the *littera* of the text, not by Honorius' method of distinguishing and compartmentalizing levels of interpretation. Thus, for example, Rupert rejects the notion that a corporeal light could have been created and divided on the first day, in favour of the Augustinian tradition that interprets the first light of creation as intellectual illumination or the angelic nature. The physical explanation is not, however, rejected because of a predilection for the spiritual sense, but because it implies an inexplicable redundancy in the text. Corporeal light, in Rupert's view, could not have been produced until the fourth day, when the text relates that God created the heavenly luminaries (Genesis 1:14-19). Commenting on that passage, Rupert reverts to a physical explanation and reports with approbation the opinion of the *physici*, or natural philosophers, that the sun is the "guardian of heaven" and "source of aethereal fire."⁶⁹ Rupert's method, therefore, might best be summarized as a process of selecting, rejecting, and juxtaposing items from the full available range of cosmological and hexaemeral traditions, with a view to explicating the scriptural narrative as it presents itself.

Honorius lived in a transitional generation, amid the pressures and conflicts produced by the post-Gregorian movement for ecclesiastical renewal. His originality is not one of ideas or controversy but of composition and purpose, since the aim of his work was consistently to make a clear and comprehensible presentation of traditional doctrine. His hexaemeral treatise is written with a didactic purpose and a neat brevity that make it an especially convenient text for pastoral teaching. Its composition in rhyming prose, moreover, makes it easy to read and memorize. At the same time, Honorius' organization of his material moves him away from the leisurely and detailed style of exposition favoured by Rupert of Deutz and toward the systematic analysis and explanation advocated by Hugh of St Victor. Nevertheless, his style of composition is no mere variant of theirs. Indeed, it seems impossible to place him in any school of thought or exegesis except his own, that of the *solitarius* whose desire to teach the many and to provide books for those who had none outweighed all threat of scorn or criticism.⁷⁰

NOTES

¹ M.-O. Garrigues, "Qui était Honorius Augustodunensis?" *Angelicum* 50 (1973) 20-49; "Honorius, était-il Bénédictin?" *Studia Monastica* 19 (1977) 27-46; "Honorius Augustodunensis: *De anima et de Deo, quaedam ex Augustino excerpta sub dialogo exarata*," *Recherches augustiniennes* 12 (1977) 212-78; "A la recherche de la *Refectio mentium*," *Studia monastica* 20 (1978) 65-70. V.I.J. Flint, "The Career of Honorius Augustodunensis: Some Fresh Evidence," *Revue bénédictine* 82 (1972) 63-86; "The Chronology of the Works of Honorius Augustodunensis," *Revue bénédictine* 82 (1972) 215-42; "The *Liber Hermetis Mercurii Triplicis de VI rerum principiis* and the *Imago Mundi* of Honorius Augustodunensis," *Scriptorium* 17 (1982) 148-58; "The Place and Purpose of the Works of Honorius Augustodunensis," *Revue bénédictine* 87 (1977) 97-127.

² Landmark decisions include: the rulings of Urban II that monks might acquire tithes only with the consent of bishops -- see G. Constable, *Monastic Tithes From Their Origins to the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge 1964) 92-93; the Lateran Council decision of 1123 forbidding monks to engage in pastoral care -- see J.D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Florence-Venice 1759-98) 21.285.

³ J.A. Endres, *Honorius Augustodunensis* (Kempten-München 1906) 145-50; M. Magrassi, *Teologia e storia nel pensiero di Ruperto di Deutz* (Rome 1959) 272-73, presents a series of striking parallels between Rupert's *In Joannem* 1: PL 169.210-12 and Honorius' *Libellus XII quaestionum* 1-4: PL 172.1178-80.

⁴ Rupert of Deutz, *Questio utrum monachis liceat predicare*, in Endres (at n. 3) 146.

⁵ John Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley 1983).

⁶ Honorius, *Libellus xii quaestionum* 6: PL 172.1181D-82A. The explanation offered by Garrigues in "Honorius, était-il Bénédictin?" (at n. 1) 35-37 does not adequately dispel the ambiguity of Honorius' conclusion within the context of his authorship.

⁷ The statistics are derived from: R. Haacke, "Die Überlieferung der Schriften Ruperts von Deutz," *MGH Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 16 (1960) 428; H. Silvestre, "La tradition manuscrite des oeuvres de Rupert de Deutz: à propos d'une étude recente de Rhaban Haacke," *Scriptorium* 16 (1962) 343; Flint, "Place and Purpose of the Works of Honorius Augustodunensis" (at n. 1) 118.

⁸ Flint, "Place and Purpose of the Works of Honorius Augustodunensis" (at n. 1) 117.

⁹ Flint, "Place and Purpose of the Works of Honorius Augustodunensis" (at n. 1) 118; Honorius may himself have been aware of the problem: see *Imago Mundi*, prolog., ed. V.I.J. Flint, *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 57 (1982) 49.

¹⁰ Compare, e.g., the material described in Endres, *Honorius Augustodunensis* (at n. 3) and R. Baron, *Science et sagesse chez Hugues de Saint Victor* (Paris 1957).

¹¹ Flint, ed., "Honorius Augustodunensis: *Imago Mundi*" (at n. 9) 14; the earlier opinion of Honorius is reflected in R.W. Southern, *St Anselm and his Biographer* (Cambridge 1963) 213.

¹² Printed in B. Pez, *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus* (Augsburg and Graz 1721) 2.71-88 (=PL 172.253-66). A critical edition of the text has been prepared by R.D. Crouse, "Honorius Augustodunensis: *De Neocosmo*," (Harvard Univ. diss. 1970) 175-232, but as it is not yet published, references below will be to the PL text. Some of Crouse's findings on Honorius' sources and the hexaemeral tradition are published in R.D. Crouse, "*Intentio Moysi*: Bede, Augustine, Eriugena and Plato in the *Hexaemeron* of Honorius Augustodunensis," *Dionysius* 2 (1978) 137-57.

¹³ In Pez (at n. 12) and some of the manuscripts, the *De Neocosmo* is prefaced and concluded with brief statements describing the numerological and chronological parallels between Adam and Christ. These are not integral to the hexaemeron, but may have been joined to it by Honorius or later copyists because of their relevance to his interpretation of the intention of Moses, "restorationem humani generis per Christum figuraliter narrare." See PL 172.253A and 265C-66C; discussion in Crouse, "*Intentio Moysi*" (at n. 12) 147.

¹⁴ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.253B; Crouse, ed. (at n. 12) 175, inserts "ad litteram" based on a consensus of the majority of manuscripts.

15 "In primis quaeritur, cur Moyses de lapsu hominis scripserit, casum vero angeli reticuerit?" Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.253B.

16 "Intentio quippe Moysis est restaurationem humani generis per Christum figuraliter narrare, quam intentionem omnimode satagit suae materiae adaptare." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.253C.

17 "In toto quoque textu suae narrationis nihil aliud ponitur, nisi quod Christo vel Ecclesiae figuraliter congruit." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.253C.

18 Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.254B.

19 For "accessus" see E.A. Quain, "The Medieval *Accessus ad auctores*," *Traditio* 3 (1945) 215-64.

20 "Materia autem sua est hic sensibilis mundus, in quem homo post lapsum est pulsus; et adventus Dei unigeniti in hunc mundum, mundi fabricatoris et humani generis liberatoris." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.254A; compare Macrobius, *Commentarii in somnium Scipionis* 1.11.9-12, ed. J. Willis (Leipzig 1963) 47; Calcidius, *Timaeus a Calcidio translatus commentarioque instructus*, CCLXVIII, 2nd ed. J.H. Waszink, *Plato Latinus* 4 (London 1975) 273, line 10; Eriugena, *Periphyseon* 4.12: PL 122.800B; Crouse, ed. (at n. 12) 176 emends "sensibilis" to "sensilis" on doubtful manuscript evidence.

21 "Joannis quippe Evangelium in canone primum ponitur." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.254B; his source may be Origen, *Commentaria in evangelium Joannis* 1.6: PG 14.30BC ("Arbitror vero ego, etiamsi quatuor sint Evangelia veluti elementa fidei Ecclesiae, ex quibus elementis totus constat hic mundus Deo per Christum reconciliatus, . . . Evangeliorum primitias Evangelium esse Joannis nobis propositum . . .").

22 Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.254B; for the distinctive anti-Judaist polemic in Honorius' interpretation, compare Rupert of Deutz, *Annulus* 3: PL 170.593-610.

23 "Deo Patri ascribitur mundi creatio, Filio rerum dispositio, Spiritui sancto omnium vivificatio vel ornatio." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.254C; compare Rupert of Deutz, *De gloria et honore Filii Homini super Mattheum* 12, ed. R. Haacke, CCCM 6 (Turnhout 1967) 375 ("Sicut Patris proprium est opus hominis conditio, et Filii proprium opus redemptio, sic proprium est opus Spiritus sancti eiusdem hominis illuminatio.").

24 "Coeli etenim appellatione, incorporea, ut sunt angeli, intelliguntur,

et cuncta spiritualia quae a nobis non conspiciuntur." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.254C; compare Calcidius CCLXXVIII: 282, lines 10-15.

²⁵ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.255A; compare Bede, *Hexaameron* 1. 1. 2, ed. C.W. Jones, in *Beda's Venerabilis opera*, CCSL 118A (Turnhout 1967) 4, lines 40-45.

²⁶ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.255A.

²⁷ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.255B; compare Bede, *Hexaameron* 1. 1. 2: CCSL 118A. 5-6.

²⁸ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.255C-56A.

²⁹ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.256B; compare Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 1, ed. and tr. H. Thackeray (London 1930) 26-31.

³⁰ "Tribus enim diebus elementa, et tribus quae infra ea sunt, sunt perfecta." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.257A.

³¹ Compare Rupert of Deutz, *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius* 1. 1, ed. R. Haacke, CCCM 21 (Turnhout 1971) 129.

³² "Hic Scriptura aperit, cur Spiritus Dei aquas foverit; quia nimirum primum de hoc elemento voluit animantia producere, et cuncta huius admistione fecundare." Honorius, *De Neocosmo*: PL 172.257D-58A; compare Eriugena, *Periphyseon* 2. 20: PL 122.555C.

³³ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.258C; compare Macrobius, *Commentarius* 1. 11. 9-12: 47.

³⁴ "Et quia ei Dominus quandoque couniri disposuit, ei participium cum omni creatura tribuit; scilicet discernere cum angelis, sentire cum animantibus, crescere cum herbis et arboribus, esse cum lapidibus." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.258C.

³⁵ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.258D.

³⁶ "Septimum diem Deus Pater antiquo populo celebrandum instituit; octavum vero, qui et primum est, Deus Filius novo populo observabilem fecit." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.259B; see Augustine, *Ennarationes in Psalmis* 6. 2, ed. D.E. Dekkers and J. Fraipont CCSL 38 (Turnhout 1956) 28; compare Hugh of St Victor, *De tribus diebus* 27: PL 178.838D, and Rupert of Deutz, *De divinis officiis* 7. 13, ed. R. Haacke, CCCM 7 (Turnhout 1967) 240-41.

³⁷ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.259CD-60A; compare Bede, *Hexaameron* 1. 2. 3: CCSL 118A. 35-39; for a discussion of variations on the seven days as

ages of human history, see G. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform* (Cambridge, Mass. 1959) 222-338.

³⁸ See Crouse, "*Intentio Moysi*" (at n. 12) 150-52.

³⁹ "Omne quod postmodum factum est, materialiter ac formabiliter, semper in Verbo Dei fuit causaliter ac praedestinaliter." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.260B.

⁴⁰ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.260D.

⁴¹ "Sciendum vero quod Deus non prius materiam, deinde formam fecit; sed simul omnia formata protulit, sicut cantus cum voce simul procedit. Porro quod hoc vel hoc, illa vel illa die fecisse legitur, hoc nostro more dicitur: a quibus minime intelligitur, quod omnia simul fecisse scribitur." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.260D.

⁴² Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.260D-61A.

⁴³ "Deus itaque dixit, 'fiat lux,' cum angelos luce sapientiae illustravit. Ipsa est enim candor lucis aeternae. Facta est autem lux, cum cognoverunt Deum omnia in sapientia jam fecisse, quae adhuc futura erant: In quo omnes causas et rationes rerum jam conspiciebant. 'Et vidit Deus quod esset bonum': scilicet quod Creatorem a creatura discernebant, et creaturam despicientes, Creatorem laudantes, diligebant." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.261B.

⁴⁴ "Omnis namque corpora creatura, si spirituali comparetur, jure tenebrae appellatur." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.261D.

⁴⁵ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.262AB; *Libellum octo quaestionum* 1: PL 172.1186D.

⁴⁶ "Quaeritur etiam quid sit regnum coelorum, vel quod praemium ibi tribuatur spiritibus beatorum?" Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.262B.

⁴⁷ "Quasi vero in mane exsurgit, cum in laudem Creatoris pro mirabili creatione erumpit." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.262C.

⁴⁸ "Sacra Scriptura se conformat hominum intellectibus, ut mater infantium moribus aut veluti cera reversis sigillorum impressionibus. Materno namque inessu cum tardis ambulat, cum capacibus ad alta volat, altitudine superbos irridet, profunditate attentos terret, veritate magnos pascit, affabilitate parvulos nutrit.

"Haec ergo una die Deum cuncta in simul creasse sapientibus narrat, haec tardioribus sex diebus Deum opera sua explevisse commemorat: a capacibus,

quippe, vix intelligitur, quod Deus una die, imo uno ictu oculi, omnia insimul creasse legitur. A tardioribus autem facile capitur, ut pomum fractum a parvulis manditur, quod sex diebus omnis factura absoluta traditur." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.262D-63A.

⁴⁹ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.263B; compare *Timaeus* 17A.

⁵⁰ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.263B.

⁵¹ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.263CD; see Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram* 4. 35, ed. J. Zucha, CSEL 28. 3. 2 (Vienna 1894) 136.

⁵² Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.264CD.

⁵³ "Ergo sicut homo ad similitudinem Dei conditur, ita etiam isti temporales dies ad similitudinem illorum sex, vel potius septem, in Verbo Dei aeternaliter manentium, creati dicuntur; et omnia etiam in hoc, in mundo, formata ad similitudinem formarum in Deo consistentium, creata non absurde dicuntur." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.264D.

⁵⁴ "Qua autem die hebdomadae, vel quo ordine, utrumne una die vel pluribus, cuncta in species formaverit, ignoratur." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.265A.

⁵⁵ "Igitur in his aeternis sex diebus Deus cuncta causaliter creavit, et ab omni opere in septimo requievit. In istis autem temporalibus omnia temporalia et corporalia realiter per species et formas fecit; legem crescendi, permanendi, alia ex se gignendi dedit." Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.265B.

⁵⁶ Honorius, *De neocosmo*: PL 172.265B.

⁵⁷ Compare *Imago Mundi* 1. 2: 49; his source is probably Bede, *De rerum natura* 1, ed. C.W. Jones, CCSL 123A (Turnhout 1975) 192, lines 1-15.

⁵⁸ Peter Abelard, *Expositio in hexaemeron*: PL 178.731-82; Thierry of Chartres, "The Creation and Creator of the World According to Thierry of Chartres and Clarenbald of Arras," ed. N. Häring, *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 22 (1955) 137-216.

⁵⁹ "De septem diebus et sex operum distinctionibus primam Geneseos partem secundum physicam et ad litteram ego expositurus . . . Postea vero ad sensum litterae historicae exponendum veniam, ut et allegoricam et moralem lectionem . . . ex toto praetermittam." Thierry of Chartres (at n. 58) 184.

⁶⁰ For detailed discussions, see Brian Stock, *Myth and Science in the Twelfth Century: A Study of Bernard Silvester* (Princeton 1972) 240-49;

J.M. Parent, *La doctrine de la création dans l'école de Chartres: études et textes* (Paris 1938).

⁶¹ For detailed discussion, see E. Kearney, "Peter Abelard as Biblical Commentator: A Study of the *Expositio in hexaemeron*," in *Petrus Abaelardus (1079-1142): Person, Werk, und Wirkung*, ed. R. Thomas et al., *Trierer Theologische Studien* 38 (Trier 1980) 199-210.

⁶² *Hugonis de Sancto Victore Didascalicon de studio legendi* 6. 2, ed. C.H. Buttner (Washington, D.C. 1939) 113.

⁶³ "Modus legendi in dividendo constat. Divisio fit et partitione et investigatione. Partiendo dividimus quando ea quae confusa sunt distinguimus. Investigando dividimus quando ea quae occulta sunt reseramus." Hugh of St Victor, *Didascalicon* 6. 12: 129-30; the translation is from J. Taylor, *The Didascalicon of Hugh of St. Victor: a Medieval Guide to the Arts* (New York and London 1961) 150.

⁶⁴ Hugh of St Victor, *De sacramentis christianae fidei*, praef.: PL 176.183-84A.

⁶⁵ See, e.g., his interpretation of the first day, *De sacramentis* 1. 1. 1-15: PL 176.187-99.

⁶⁶ Rupert of Deutz, *De sancta Trinitate* 1. 1-2: CCCM 12.129-234.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 1. 1. 1: CCCM 12.129; see also n. 23 above.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 1. 1. 3: CCCM 12.131.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 1. 1. 4: CCCM 12.168

⁷⁰ "Ad instructionem itaque multorum quibus deest copia librorum, hic libellus edatus." Honorius, *Imago mundi*, prol.: 49.