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Abstract

This thesis traces the twelfth-century origins and development of the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis from the evidence of sixteen early manuscripts, focusing on the creation narrative (Genesis 1–3). The Glossa ordinaria on the Bible, a product of the twelfth-century School of Laon, was one of the most influential texts of the High Middle Ages. The Glossa on the creation narrative compiled excerpts from Genesis commentaries and Hexameral literature, explaining the scriptural basis for doctrines such as the creation of the world ex nihilo and Original Sin, and exploring the relationship between the Genesis account, Plato’s Timaeus, and Aristotelian natural philosophy.

The first chapter observes the manuscripts for themselves: it describes their physical characteristics and argues that the textual development of the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis depended upon mid-twelfth-century innovations in formatting and layout. The second and third chapters study the history of the two distinct versions of the text. The second chapter compares the earlier version—the Glossa primitiva— to an anonymous Genesis commentary found in London, Lambeth Palace Library, 349, and argues that the two commentaries are built on a shared source, likely a lecture aid used in a classroom. The third chapter studies the relationship between the Glossa primitiva and the later Glossa ordinaria, arguing that they represent two
stages in a process by which classroom notes were transformed into an encyclopedic reference. The fourth chapter focuses on the content of the texts: it looks at the exegetical principles and theological questions treated in the *Glossa ordinaria* to show that its compilers read the creation account with a hermeneutic that challenges a simplistic division between literal and allegorical readings. It concludes by observing that this, combined with the narrative structure of the gloss format, gave twelfth-century exegetes more scope for cosmological inquiry than did other contemporary genres, such as sentence collections. The thesis is supported by two appendices: one containing manuscript descriptions, the second a transcription of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1-3.
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Introduction

The twelfth-century schools of Northern Europe saw a resurgence of interest in the structure and creation of the universe, whether expressed in neoplatonic allegory as in the Cosmographia of Bernardus Silvestris (c.1085–c.1178), as a study of the relationship between the classical elements as in the Hexameron of Thierry of Chartres (d. ante 1155), or as the foundation of a systematic approach to Christian theology as seen in the Sentences of Peter Lombard (c. 1096 – 1164). Scholars of such disparate backgrounds and personalities as Hugh of St. Victor (c. 1096–1141), Peter Abelard (1079–1142), and Rupert of Deutz (c. 1075–c. 1129) appropriated the patristic and Carolingian tradition of Genesis commentaries, incorporating cosmological questions about the creation account into the broader study of theology.

This trend coincided with the compilation of the Glossa ordinaria on the Bible, commentaries composed of marginal and interlinear glosses gleaned from authoritative works of patristic and medieval exegesis. This collection of commentaries is a characteristic product of an era in which scholars dedicated themselves to sorting through inherited doctrinal texts from past eras in the service of teaching their students doctrine with an intellectually rigorous approach to the faith. Composed in the first decades of the twelfth century, the Glossa ordinaria on the Bible was the foremost doctrinal resource of the French universities of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries and provided a foundation of excerpts from patristic authorities on which the later scholastic tradition was built.

Given these two aspects of twelfth-century intellectual history, the origin of the Glossa ordinaria on the creation account is of great importance to the history of medieval theology, both academic and—thanks to the young men who took their books with them when they joined religious communities—monastic. The first three chapters of Genesis were central not only to medieval beliefs about the origins of the universe, but also to ideas about the nature of man, the meaning and origin of sin, the roles of men and women in relation to the natural world and one another, and the Devil’s action in the world. Genesis 1–3 is the source for many doctrines of Western Christian theology: creation ex nihilo, humans as images of God with a unique position in the order of creation, the Fall, and Original Sin.
Scholars have used medieval glosses on classical literature, the Bible, and canon law as sources for what was taught in the medieval classroom and how it was transmitted. However, despite the frequency with which the *Glossa ordinaria* has been used as a source for the study of twelfth-century intellectual life, there have been few attempts to study the work as it was transmitted in the decades immediately after it was compiled. Between the edition found in the *Patrologia Latina* (from which any glosses that postdate Walafred Strabo were removed) and the folio edition of the *editio princeps* (which presents the *Glossa ordinaria* in its fifteenth-century form) the available resources skirt the twelfth-century text on both sides.¹

This dissertation fills this gap by presenting the history of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3 as seen through the surviving twelfth-century manuscript evidence. The manuscripts used for this study are found in collections in France, England, Germany, and Austria. Unlike studies which focus on resources found in major libraries and urban centers, this project includes many manuscripts now held in more remote collections—primarily the French municipal libraries, whose holdings were gathered from monasteries closed during the Revolution. This geographic breadth in source material allows for a more detailed portrayal of the development of both the codicological features and the text of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3 than is found in studies with a more limited geographic scope. None of the manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* cited in this thesis were copied later than the early thirteenth century. Their dates are established through reference to contemporary catalogues, as well as paleographic and codicological features, which include ruling methods and the use (or, properly, the lack) of running headers and other organizational features that, although developed in the twelfth century, only began to be used in the *Glossa* manuscripts in the thirteenth.² Another characteristic that serves as an aid to dating the codices is whether or not the text of Genesis was bound with other books of the Pentateuch, as is characteristic of later manuscripts.

---

¹ Karlfried Froehlich, “Walahfrid Strabo and the *Glossa Ordinaria*: The Making of a Myth,” in *Studia* 2
The first chapter surveys the codicological features of the cited manuscripts. Clear assessment and description of their physical characteristics aid our understanding of how the distinctive three-column layout of the *Glossa ordinaria* developed, and show that the text of the *Glossa* on the first chapters of Genesis depended on innovations in formatting and ruling methods made in the early twelfth century. As many of these manuscripts were last described in nineteenth-century catalogues, full descriptions are included in Appendix A.

One cannot work for long on the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis without noticing that there are two distinct stages to the text, a phenomenon which the text on Genesis shares with the *glossae* on other books of scripture.³ Chronologically, the earlier text appears to correspond to what Lesley Smith has described as the early period of the development of the *Glossa ordinaria*, before 1140, when its use was primarily confined to Laon.⁴ Following Philippe Buc, I refer to this text as the *Glossa primitiva*. It is extant in two manuscripts: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398 (*Pn*) and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 64 (*Pf*). (From this point on, I shall distinguish between the two stages of the *Glossae* on Genesis by calling them the *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria*: when referring to both, I will use the Latin plural, *Glossae*, without an adjective.) The text of the *Glossa primitiva* is composed of extended passages compiled from the Genesis commentaries of Augustine and Bede, as well as glosses from a lost medieval intermediary, which I refer to as the proto-*Glossa*. The interlinear glosses, for the most part, refer back to the themes discussed in the marginal commentary. The second chapter of this dissertation is a study of the history of the *Glossa primitiva*, in which I analyze how it appropriates its patristic sources and argue for the existence of a lost proto-*Glossa* on which the text is based.

The third chapter turns to the development of the commentary that would become the *Glossa ordinaria* from the *Glossa primitiva*. This slightly later form of the text corresponds to Smith’s second period of the history of the *Glossa ordinaria*—from 1140–1200—after it came to be

---


used and copied in Paris.\footnote{Smith, The Glossa ordinaria, 145.} Chapter Three presents evidence for the relationship between the two versions of the text and describes three stages of the *Glossa ordinaria*’s development in the twelfth century, as defined by the addition of new glosses to the text as well as a recurring return to the original patristic sources. In this chapter, I argue that Buc’s political interpretation of the differences between the *Glossa primitiva* and *Glossa ordinaria* overlooks a general increase in interest in the mystical and moral interpretations of scripture in the later text.

Chapter Four moves to the content of the *Glossae*, describing how the use of the text and its exegetical program changed in the transition from the *Glossa primitiva* to the *Glossa ordinaria*, with a particular focus on the discussion of the text’s presentation of rules for biblical exegesis.

I have not produced a critical edition of either the *Glossa primitiva* or the *Glossa ordinaria*, as the fluid nature of the *Glossae* is resistant to the procedures used when producing a Lachmannian edition. As Chapters Two and Three will show, the end product would obscure the *Glossa ordinaria*’s multiple stages of development, rather than bring them to light. Using such a text to discuss the history of the *Glossae* and their influence on medieval theology and exegesis would be inaccurate, if not misleading. Nevertheless, a transcription of the text brings clarity to the arguments made in this dissertation and may be a useful resource for future studies. Thus, Appendix B of this dissertation presents a transcription of Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19 (*Va*), a manuscript of the *Glossa ordinaria* copied some time before 1168.\footnote{See my description of *Va* in Appendix B (pp. 268–269), as well as Léopold Delisle, *Le Cabinet des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Imperiale* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1868) 1:318. The complete catalog of donated books can be found in Delisle, *Le Cabinet des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Imperiale* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1874) 2:455–458.} *Va* preserves an early stage of the *Glossa ordinaria*, which is also found in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 3746 (*M*). In this transcription, none of the interpolations or corrections are my own: contemporary additions have been noted in angle brackets, while deletions are noted in square brackets. For ease of reference, the text has been (somewhat anachronistically) arranged according to biblical verse. The location of the interlinear glosses is denoted by letters placed above biblical text, marking where the glosses begin in the manuscript, while the marginal glosses are been placed below the verse to which
they refer. Marginal glosses that include multiple lemmata can be found below the verse referred to in the first lemma.

In Appendix B, as well as in the glosses cited throughout this dissertation, I have restrained my emendation of the texts’ medieval orthography to standardizing the use of u and V throughout, and the capitalization of proper names. I have retained the medieval “e” for “ae.”

1 Previous Research on the Glossa ordinaria

The old myth that the Glossa ordinaria was the work of Walahfrid Strabo (c. 808–849) has been thoroughly rejected, although it remains enshrined in Migne’s Patrologia Latina. Rather, Beryl Smalley showed that the original impetus behind the creation of the Glossa ordinaria was that of Anselm of Laon (d. 1117), a master of the twelfth-century cathedral school in that same city. It was he, Smalley argued, who compiled the earliest books of the Glossa ordinaria on the Bible, including the glosses on the Psalms (in their first recension), the Pauline Epistles, and the Gospel of John.

There have been two recent surges of interest in the Glossa ordinaria, building on Beryl Smalley’s foundational work; the first in the 1980’s, and the second over the past decade. The growth in scholarship on the text in the 1980’s may be attributed in many ways to the influence of Margaret Gibson, who spearheaded the printing of the Glossa ordinaria editio princeps to ameliorate the deficiencies of the edition found in the Patrologia Latina. Gibson also produced several studies on the history of the three-column gloss format, through research on

---


glossed manuscripts from the Carolingian era. In the same period, Karlfried Froehlich contributed much to our knowledge of how the *Glossa ordinaria* was used in the early modern period. It was also at this time that Christopher de Hamel first presented his system of classification for the three developmental phases of the three-column gloss layout, with reference to the economic conditions under which it was produced and copied.

Other researchers who have contributed to the study of the manuscripts of the *Glossae* include Patricia Stirnemann, who has done invaluable research into the early manuscripts; Mark Zier, who surveyed the textual variations in the manuscripts held in the Bibliothèque nationale de France with reference to Froehlich and Gibson’s 1992 reprint of the 1480/1481 *Editio princeps* by Adolph Rusch of Strassbourg; Constance Bouchard, who has called attention to the importance of monastic scriptoria—in particular, those of the Cistercians—in the dissemination of the manuscripts; and Mary Dove, who produced an edition of the *Glossa ordinaria* to the Song of Songs for the *Corpus christianorum continuatio mediaevalis*.

---


Among those who have written about the *Glossa ordinaria* from the perspective of its Late Antique sources are René Wasselynck and E. Ann Matter.\(^14\) Other treatments of the text as a source for intellectual history include Guy Lobrichon’s work on the *Glossa ordinaria* on the book of Revelation, Michael Signer’s study of anti-Jewish sentiment in the *Glossa ordinaria* and Philippe Buc’s work on the theology of royal power in the *Glossa ordinaria*.\(^15\) Cédric Giraud’s research encompasses not only the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Song of Songs, but also other evidence of Anselm’s teaching, most notably his collections of *Sententiae*.\(^16\) Theresa Gross-Diaz has produced a thorough study on the interplay of form, text, and function in Gilbert of Poitiers’s commentary on the Psalms, in which she has tried to show that the text is more than a mere expansion of the *Glossa ordinaria*.\(^17\) Meanwhile, surveys of medieval biblical exegesis such as Gilbert Dahan’s *L’exégèse chrétienne de la Bible en Occident médiéval XIIe–*


XIVe siècle have contributed by providing basic introductions to the field and standard definitions for key terms.18

In Lesley Smith’s recent book, The Glossa Ordinaria: The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary, she has attempted to consolidate the scattered opinions on the development of the Glossa ordinaria into a cohesive narrative, and offers an updated and clarified version of de Hamel’s classification system, in which she describes the format in detail. However, although she outlines the general characteristics of the text itself, she does not demarcate any stages of its development. Admittedly, this task is overwhelming, if not impossible, in a work that covers the Glossa ordinaria to all the books of the Bible, which is why studies on the Glossae to individual books of the Bible are so important to the field.19 The publication of Smith’s volume as part of a new Brill series, Commentaria: Sacred Texts and their Commentaries shows that interest in the medieval reading of the Bible remains vibrant in academic circles. Similarly, volumes such as The Multiple Meaning of Scripture: The Role of Exegesis in Early Christian and Medieval Culture, edited by Ineke van’t Spijker, and The Practice of the Bible in the Middle Ages, edited by Susan Boynton and Diane J. Reilly, have gathered essays describing the many ways in which the Bible and its exegesis inspired the intellectual and cultural life of the Middle Ages.20

Another important figure in recent scholarship on the Glossa ordinaria is Alexander Andrée, whose doctoral dissertation consisted of a critical edition of the prologue and first chapter of the Glossa ordinaria on Lamentations. In this study, Andrée identified two recensions of the text, similar to the Glossa primitiva and the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis.21 He has since turned his attention to the history of the Glossa ordinaria on the Gospel of John. In pursuing this research,

he has identified a continuous commentary on John, attributed to Anselm of Laon, which he argues is the ultimate source of the *Glossa ordinaria* on that text.\(^{22}\)

The work most closely related to this dissertation is found in Philippe Buc’s research on the portrayal of political power in the *Glossa ordinaria*, found in his book, *L’ambiguïté du livre*. In this study, Buc compared the text of *Pn* to Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 63 (*Pb*), which he considered an “intermediary” text in the development of the *Glossa ordinaria*. Buc’s study, however, skips directly from what he considered an intermediary stage to the Parisian masters, with no discussion of later twelfth-century masters. This is an omission that this dissertation has sought to correct. Buc argues that glosses added to the *Glossa ordinaria* in the course of its transformation represent the glossator’s desire to give scriptural support to a hierarchical view of human society—a view which, he claims, was expressly rejected by the compiler of the *Glossa primitiva*.\(^{23}\) In Chapter Three, however, I argue that the hierarchies portrayed in these glosses are the result of increasing interest in spiritual and moral exegesis, rather than a political agenda.

The study of the *Glossa ordinaria* and its component volumes, as is made evident by the above survey, is a rich and growing field of research. As the *Glossa* to each book of the Bible developed separately, out of a distinct exegetical tradition, much work remains to be done. The goal of this thesis is to write the history of the *Glossae* on the first three chapters of Genesis, with the hope of contributing not only to our knowledge of the development and use of the *Glossa ordinaria*, but also to increase our understanding of the role of the Cathedral schools in the development of scholastic theology by studying the way in which the schoolmen who compiled and used the *Glossae* read, appropriated, and participated in the Latin exegetical tradition.

---


The Context of the *Glossa ordinaria*: The Twelfth-Century Schools

While it is uncertain to what extent the *Glossae* on Genesis preserve the teaching of any one school master, as iconic products of the twelfth-century schools, the texts and manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* should be among our most important witnesses for how theology and exegesis were taught in the growing urban schools of that era.

The cathedral schools were attended by young men who, having received the basics of the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, pursued advanced study in order to make themselves eligible for employment in the expanding bureaucracies of the Church and State. As their name implies, the schools were run by Cathedral chapters, which had the responsibility of finding, training, and, with the Bishop, licensing masters to teach theological topics. Several historical factors contributed to their growth: besides the growing demand for educated and ambitious young men to work in court and curia, increases in European prosperity and stability made long-distance travel for the sake of study possible, while the financial growth of cities supported the influx of new students as well as the rising social status of the masters, who were economic equals to the new urban bourgeoisie.

The cathedral schools are known by the cities in which they were located: Rouen, Chartres, Rheims, Auxerre, and Laon, the naturally-fortified center of Carolingian power under Charles the Bald (823–877). However, until they were eclipsed by the geographic and economic advantages found in Paris, their renown depended not on their location or the cathedral chapter that supported them, but on the masters who taught at them. These men competed with one another to attract paying students who were willing to travel in order to study with famed masters.

---


teachers. There were some notable disadvantages to this system. For example, students might arrive at a famous cathedral school, only to find that the teacher they sought had moved or died—a fact, Richard Southern suggested, that may have played a role in the growth of Paris as an academic center. Paris had appeal as a city with abundant resources of food and housing, where students would be sure of finding a teacher, and the masters sure of finding paying students.  

Indeed, just as capitalism was growing in the urban centers, so a kind of academic “free market” encouraged competition among the Parisian teachers. While the masters of the cathedral schools were licensed by the bishop or the cathedral chapter, independent masters could acquire the authority to teach through a non-episcopal license, through their known expertise in a given area, or—as was the case for many a Parisian school—through the simple expediency of setting up shop across the river from Paris, out of episcopal jurisdiction.

As our knowledge of the *Glossa ordinaria* has deepened, so has our understanding of the environment from which it grew: the cathedral school of Laon in the time of master Anselm. The foundations for these studies were laid in the first decades of the twentieth century by Joseph de Ghellinck, Franz Bliemetzrieder, and Odon Lottin, who saw Laon as the center for innovation in scholastic theology, and attributed the first flowering of the scholastic tradition to its masters. Laon’s association with early scholasticism was founded on the Laonnoise connections of several twelfth-century sentence collections, notably the *Liber Pancrisis*. However, while Chartres can boast a half dozen medieval Platonists, the defining personalities of the School of Laon were only two: Anselm, who died in 1117, and his brother Ralph, who died in 1134 or 1136. Anselm was highly praised in his own day and after his death for his

---


28 Southern, “The Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres,” 120.

learnedness and teaching. The *Actuarium Affligemense* notes, “Anselmus Laudunensis, doctor doctorum, preclarus habetur; qui non soli sibi laboravit, sed in vita sua multos erudiens, post mortem posteros beatos fecit, quos scriptis suis ditavit”. An anonymous epitaph cites Anselm’s exposition of scripture, reading,

Hic iacet Anselmus nunc in cinerem resolutus,
Cuius doctrina climat a cuncta Latina
Exponendo sacras scripturas atque docendo
[In] Domini nomen preciosum fudit odorem.

This renown, famously, drew the young Peter Abelard to Laon, although—as he reported in the *Historia Calamitatum*—he was sorely disappointed. Of Anselm, he wrote, “verborum usum habebat mirabilem, sed sensum contemptibilem et ratione vacuum. Cum ignem accenderet, domum suam fumo implebat, non luce illustrabat.

It is in the many praises of Anselm’s teaching that one finds him described as a compiler of glosses. One of the most often cited is from the appendix to the Affligem chronicle. It dates to the last quarter of the twelfth century, and reads, “Anselmus Laudunensis scolasticus nouo expositionis genere utriusque testamenti scripturas glosa interlineari et marginali de patrum scriptis elucidauit”. However, very few texts can be definitively attributed to Anselm. Andrée believes that he has found Anselm’s commentary on the Gospel of John, and one letter of
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30 “Anselm of Laon, doctor of doctors, was held in high esteem, who did not work for himself alone, but, in his life teaching many, after death he made happy those successors to whom he bequeathed his writings.” Sigebert of Gembloux, *Actuarium Affligemense*, ed. D. L. C. Bethmann, *Monumenta Germaniae Historiae, Scriptores* 6 (Hanover, 1844) 400.


32 “He had a marvelous use of words, but contemptible sense and devoid of reason. When he lit a fire, he filled his house with smoke, and did not illuminate it with light.” Peter Abelard, *Historia calamitatum* 164–179 [ed. J. Monfrin (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1959) 68].

Anselm’s survives, written to Abbot Heribrand of Saint-Laurent (abbot 1115–1128) in late 1116 or early 1117 in response to challenges Rupert of Deutz had made concerning Anselm’s orthodoxy. Fortunately, in the course of this letter Anselm explains his perspective on teaching and the inherited opinions of authorities: “Sententie quidem omnium catholicorum diuere, sed non aduerse, in unam concurrunt conuenientiam, in uerbis uero sonant quedam quasi contrarietates...”. It is this view that informed his teaching and drove the development of both the Laonnoise sentence collections and the Glossa ordinaria, the two projects for which he was known.

The challenge of defining specific methods and techniques from the School of Laon under Anselm and Ralph led Valerie Flint to question whether there had actually been a unified intellectual movement that one could refer to as the “School of Laon”. Focusing on the claim that Anselm’s school was responsible for the many collections of theological sententiae that were copied in the twelfth century, Flint argued against the idea of Laon as the birthplace of systematically organized theological treatises, as she found no shared principle of organization in the sentence collections attributed to the School of Laon. The recent work of Cédric Giraud has demonstrated, however, that the sentence commentaries from Laon were not the project of a single author, but of a group of students who sought to preserve Anselm’s teaching, and we may understand the “School of Laon” to comprise these students.

---

34 On the dating and other matters of this text, see Hubert Silvestre, “À propos de la lettre d’Anselme de Laon à Héribrand de Saint-Laurent,” RTAM 28 (1961) 5–25.

35 “Indeed, the sentences of all the fathers are diverse, but they are not adverse, and they come together into one harmony, although in words certain of them sound as if they are contradictory...” While Anselm is certainly not referring to Metropolitans of the Eastern churches in this sentence, his use of “catholicorum” for doctrinal authorities is reminiscent of the Greek title catholicos. cf. Du Cange, “catholicus” (3). Odon Lottin, Psychologie et morale aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles, Tome 5 (Gembloux, Belg.: J. Duculot, 1959) 175–176.


2.1 Gilbert the Universal and the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis

The *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis has long been attributed to Gilbert the Universal, Bishop of London from 1128–1134, whose remarkable title refers to his expertise in both theology and canon law. Little is known about his life, nor is it clear how he was associated with Laon. He is supposed to have been born some time around 1055–1065, and was likely in Laon around the turn of the twelfth century.\(^{38}\) There is evidence from charters that he was in Auxerre from 1110–1120, and Smalley suggested that his contribution to the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Bible may have been influenced by that school’s tradition of biblical scholarship.\(^{39}\) From 1125–1126 he was at the Roman curia, and he was the Bishop of London from 1128 to his death in 1134.\(^{40}\)

Literary evidence for Gilbert’s friends and associates include Peter Abelard’s *Introductio ad theologiam*, in which Gilbert is listed as one of Abelard’s opponents, among the friends of Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153).\(^{41}\) John of Salisbury (c. 1120–1180) associates him with Laon when he records that Gilbert the Universal was cited, in connection to Anselm and Ralph, in defense of Gilbert de la Porrée (c. 1075–1154) at the Council of Reims in 1148.\(^{42}\) John writes:

> audierat enim, ut dicebat, in scolis clarissimorum doctorum fratrum Anselmi et Radulfi Laudunensium hoc fuisse quesitum, sed ab eis minime receptum est, quia uerebantur transgredi terminos quos posuerant patres. Sed nec Gislebertus Universalis qui post fuit episcopus Lundoniensis, nec Albericus


\(^{40}\) Smalley, “Gilbertus Universalis, Bishop of London” 238.


Evidence of Gilbert’s activity as a biblical scholar is found in the Auxerre obituary, which lists the day of his death as August 12 and names him “venerabilis memorie magister Gislebertus, veteris et novi Testamenti glosator eximius, qui universalis merito est appellatus, huius ecclesie canonicus”. Bernard of Clairvaux wrote of him, “in cunctis huius mundi sapientium litteris et studiis ludens, omnem quoque studuit et potuit divinam quodammodo revocare et renovare scripturam”.

External contemporary evidence about which books of the Bible Gilbert glossed, however, is lacking. A chronicle from St. Victor composed around 1190 attributes most of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Bible to Gilbert, giving credit to Anselm for only the Glosses to the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles. More tempered, perhaps, is the description found in an English miracle collection composed by a cleric of St. Paul’s Cathedral, which credits Gilbert with the *Glossa* on the Old Testament, saying, “nempe litteris et sapientia, necnon auctoritate et frugalitate media cumulatus ante episcopatum uetus instrumentum ad liquidum exposuerat”.

---

43 “for he heard, as he said, that this had been asked in the lectures of the most renowned doctors, brothers Anselm and Ralph of Laon, but it was scarcely accepted by them, because they feared to pass the boundaries which the fathers placed. But neither Gilbert the Universal, who afterwards was the Bishop of London, nor Alberic of Reims, who afterwards was raised to the archepiscopate of Bourges, wished to accept this, for the same reason.” *Ioannis Saresberiensis Historiae Pontificalis*, ed. R. L. Poole (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1927) 19–20.


45 “...playing in all the letters and studies of the wise men of this world, he studied and could, in a way, revive and renew all sacred Scripture.” Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola 24*, *S. Bernardi opera*, vol. 7: *Epistolae I Corpus epistolarum 1–180*, ed. by Jean Leclercq, (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1974) 77


47 “truly abounding in letters and wisdom, and also wisdom and measured temperance, before the episcopate he clearly expounded the old document [i.e., Old Testament]” *The Saint of London: The Life and
Internal evidence found in the glosses themselves offer little help in clarifying Gilbert’s role. The exception is the *Glossa ordinaria* on Lamentations, which bears a colophon that attributes the entirety of the commentary to Gilbert. Several individual glosses are attributed to him in the text. Smalley suggested that signing glosses is a custom Gilbert acquired in his legal studies, where it was common. 48 Thus, the presence of glosses attributed to Gilbert in the *Glossa ordinaria* on Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy formed the foundation of Smalley’s argument that he was the compiler of those books of the *Glossa ordinaria*—an argument she supported by comparing the style and sources used in the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Pentateuch to those found in Lamentations. 49 However, the only manuscript that attributes any glosses of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis to Gilbert is found in Eton College Manuscript 48, copied in a hand characteristic of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. 50 As will be shown in Chapter Two, these attributions to Gilbert appear to have been added after the fact, and the glosses to which they are attached entered the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis at different stages, making them unreliable witnesses to the text’s authorship. It should also be noted that the earliest manuscripts of the *Glossae* on Genesis significantly predate those of the rest of the Pentateuch. This makes it likely that Genesis was glossed separately, by a different glossator than the rest of the Pentateuch, and suggests that Gilbert, who died in 1134, is unlikely to be responsible for the *Glossa ordinaria* on the other four books of the Pentateuch, as their earliest manuscripts all date to after 1140. 51 While the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis may well have been completed before his death, there is no internal evidence to confirm that he is responsible for the text.

---


In the second part of her study on Gilbert’s role in the compilation of the *Glossa ordinaria*, Smalley wrote, “Obviously, no theory could be accepted as conclusive unless it were based on a systematic investigation of the manuscripts, supplemented by research into the sources of commentators from the ninth to the twelfth centuries”.\(^{52}\) This dissertation, although it does not make a conclusive argument about Gilbert’s authorship of the *Glossa ordinaria*, may be seen as a step towards the comprehensive study that Smalley envisioned.

### 3 Genesis in the Christian Tradition

The compiler of the *Glossae* on Genesis worked from an exegetical tradition that originated in controversies current in the first centuries of the Christian faith, as the interpretation of scripture was integral to the development of Christian philosophy in the early centuries of the faith. Adapting classical methods of interpretation to their purpose without wholly embracing the tenets of Greek philosophy, the early exegetes rejected traditional beliefs about the nature of the universe—for example, its eternity—and in so doing laid the foundation for future centuries of intellectual inquiry. The rest of this chapter will trace this process from the earliest Christian exegesis and the challenges of classical philosophy, through the methods of the Late Antique and Carolingian expositors of Genesis. It will close with a summary of how Genesis 1–3 was interpreted in the Cathedral schools and fledgling universities, by near-contemporaries of the compiler of the *Glossa ordinaria*.

Genesis 1 begins, “In the beginning, God created heaven and earth”, from which the Judeo-Christian tradition took the belief that God created the universe out of nothing: *ex nihilo*. The newly created world is described as inchoate and empty (1:2). The spirit of God hovers over the unformed matter, represented as waters, and the known world takes shape at God’s command over a period of six days. Light, the firmament of heaven, dry land and plants, the lights of the heavens, birds and fish, and the animals—including man—are created, and God proclaims them each good (1:3–28). God then gives humanity dominion over creation (1:29) and institutes the Sabbath when he rests on the seventh day (2:1–3).

---

A second account of creation begins at Genesis 2:4. This narrative is centered on the making of the first man, Adam, who is fashioned out of dust and filled with the breath of life (2:4–7). He is placed in the garden of paradise, where he is given the right to enjoy all its produce, except that of a tree at its center, described as the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (2:8–17). God then declares that man should not be alone, and brings Adam the newly-formed animals to be named (2:18–20). When the man cannot find an appropriate companion among the other animals, God imposes a sleep upon him and creates the first woman from a rib taken from his side. Adam takes the woman as his wife, and they live together in unashamed nakedness (2:21–25).

Genesis 3 introduces the serpent, callidior (“more subtle”) than the other animals, who tempts the woman to eat from the forbidden tree with the promise that it will make them like gods (3:1–5). Medieval tradition understood the serpent to have been a dumb animal possessed by the Devil, rather than the Devil himself. Having yielded to temptation, the woman gives her husband a fruit from the tree, with the result that they become aware of their nakedness and attempt to clothe themselves (3:6–7). They try to hide from God, explaining, when asked, that they are embarrassed to be naked. (3:8–10). God asks Adam what he has done, and Adam blames his wife, who in turn blames the serpent (3:11–13). God punishes the serpent, the woman, and the man with curses, in turn. They are banished from the Garden, and Adam names his wife ‘Eve’ (3:14–24).

Christianity proposed a new way of understanding the Jewish scriptures—including the Genesis account—as applicable not only to a distinct group, but to all humanity.\(^53\) Observation of the Law as found in the Pentateuch was no longer thought to be necessary, but the entirety of the Jewish scriptures were retained, and were believed to be both unified and authoritative.\(^54\) Thus, working under the Hellenistic cultural assumption that—as Frances Young has put it—“nothing could be both new and true”, the first Christians relied on the Jewish scriptures in their

---


\(^54\) Young argues that the development of Christian creeds demonstrates that proving the unity and continuity of the Jewish tradition was crucial to Christian self-understanding from the earliest years. Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 19.
apologetics, with a particular focus on certain prophecies, notably those treating the *eschaton* depictiions of the Suffering Servant. These texts, in particular, were believed to demonstrate that the prophets had foreseen the life, death, and resurrection of Christ.\(^55\) The search for literary types and correspondences that characterizes early Christian exegesis was a common way of reading scripture in the Jewish community, evident in the text of the Jewish scriptures as well as in exegetical works.\(^56\) Similarly, the idea that the scriptures held a prophetic or messianic meaning which exegesis could uncover was not a new development. What Christianity changed was the subject of the hidden meaning—namely, a new covenant with God, applicable to all.\(^57\)

As Greek idealism moved to the center of Christian apologetics, holding the new faith up as unlike paganism or Judaism in its freedom from cult and superstition, some came to challenge the unity of scripture. How could the Law of the Jewish scriptures be revelation, when it was cultic, and therefore flawed? The Christian retention of the Jewish texts while rejecting the practice enjoined therein was a particular problem given the adoption of the Platonic definition of God as one, true, good, and unchanging.\(^58\) There were two responses to this challenge: either one could reinterpret the Law, a choice which encouraged further development in Christian exegesis, or one could reject the Creator God of the Jewish scriptures—that is, the God of Genesis—as an inferior being whose revelation was likewise flawed and incomplete. This idea was put forward by Marcion (fl. c. 140 AD), whose rejection of the authority of the Jewish scriptures forced Christian apologetics to turn to the defense of the canon.\(^59\)

---


\(^{56}\) Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 198.

\(^{57}\) Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 128.


If the scriptures provided the substance of apologetics, the Christian adoption of Greek philosophy gave the new sect language for talking about the nature of God, Christ, the sacraments, and salvation. This appropriation of Platonic thought was not without precedent among Jewish thinkers. Philo Judaeus (c. 20 BC – c. 50 AD), a mystic and philosopher as well as the scion of a politically powerful Alexandrian family, produced a vast body of works in which he sought concord between Jewish and Greek conceptions of religion. These included commentaries on the Greek texts of the Jewish scriptures in which Philo applied allegorical interpretations to expose the inspired texts’ hidden, scholarly meanings, albeit without abrogating legal observance. The most important of these works, in the context of the current discussion, is his treatise On the Creation of the World, in which he demonstrated the authority of Moses by bringing forth those aspects of the Genesis creation account which are in accord with Greek cosmology, with particular reference to the creation account described in Plato’s Timaeus. This method is in keeping with Philo’s proposed translatio sapientiae: Plato, he argued, took his ideas from Moses.

Thus, by the second century AD, the emphasis of Christian apologetics was fully reversed, and the Old Testament was defended through the New. This can be seen in the apologetics of Justin Martyr (d. 162/168 AD), a teacher and philosopher who defended the validity of the Jewish canon through the fulfillment of its prophetic claims in Christ. Justin Martyr followed Philo in accusing Plato of having copied Moses, and did so specifically in the context of the Timaeus,
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62 Goodenough, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, 9; Ibid., 20; Ibid., 76.
64 Goodenough, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, 10. This theory, rooted in the importance Greek culture placed on antiquity, originated with the Greek scholar Hecataeus (born c. 550 BC). Young, Biblical Exegesis, 52.
writing to the Roman Emperor, “And so that you might learn that when he said, ‘God made the world by changing formless matter,’ Plato took this from our teachings—we mean the words from the prophets—listen to what was said in so many words by Moses, whom we have already shown was the first of the prophets and earlier than the Greek writers...”

This claim was also adopted by Clement of Alexandria, who was heavily influenced by Philo’s Platonism.

The teachings of Justin and Clement, like Marcion, show the treatment of the Canon and the scriptures in intellectual communities made up of a philosopher speaking to a small circle of students—indeed, the central focus of Clement’s writing was his belief in the importance of a Christian gnosia understood only by select members of the community. The first claims about the canon that may be considered doctrinal—that is, which rejected philosophical speculations found in such philosophical communities while asserting a common tradition—are found in the Against Heresies of Irenaeus (d. c. 202 AD), in which he asserted the continuity of the newer Christian writings with the Jewish scriptures.

Acceptance of this continuity became the primary rule for the interpretation of scripture. The great proponent of this method was Origen (185–254). Origen’s exegetical practice reflected neoplatonic approaches to the interpretation of Plato’s dialogues, which required that the text be understood as having a coherent, overarching intent: the skopos.

---


68 Young, Biblical Exegesis, 290.

69 Young, Biblical Exegesis, 25–26; Ibid., 21; Ibid., 64.
Genesis is lost and survives only in fragments transmitted through other authors. Of Origen’s surviving texts, sixteen are homilies on Genesis, which were translated into Latin by Rufinus of Alexandria and thus entered into the Latin tradition. He also wrote about the Genesis narrative in his treatise Contra Celsum and De Principiis. Origen’s approach to the text shows the influence of Philo of Alexandria’s work on Genesis, and his use of the creation narrative as grounds for cosmological speculation appears to have been influenced by neoplatonic use of the Timaeus.

Origin’s use of classical literary theory was the foundation of what is known as his allegorical approach to scripture. In his Periarchôn, Origen developed the idea that a scriptural text could provide three lessons for the reader: the historical meaning of the text, a moral interpretation, and a mystical or metaphysical interpretation. Other texts, including his sermons, present a different order: from the literal sense he developed a mystical, Christological interpretation, out of which one pulls the moral lesson. Theologian Henri De Lubac used these two paradigms to argue that Origen’s work was the foundation of the medieval understanding of the four-fold sense of scripture: literal, allegorical, moral, and anagogical. However, De Lubac, with his role in the Catholic Ressourcement movement, had theological reasons to find a Late Antique parallel for a medieval trend. As Frances Young has shown, imposing the medieval senses on Late Antique exegesis does not do justice to its complexities or classical foundation, nor do they
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73 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 82–85.


suffice as a study of how the text was analyzed in order to uncover its multiple meanings.\footnote{Young, 201. Ibid., 202.} Young has also challenged the belief that the Antiochene school of exegesis—the proponents of which opposed the allegorizing found in Origen’s Alexandrian school—was engaged in any recognizably literal or historical commentary.\footnote{Smalley, \textit{Study of the Bible}, 15. Young, \textit{Biblical Exegesis}, 182–185.} The Antiochenes, too, applied classical methods to biblical scholarship, but disagreed with Origen in amount of freedom given the exegete in regard to assigning an allegorical meaning. Their literal exegesis was not literal in the sense that a modern reader would understand the word, but a study of how the words and style lead the reader to the text’s deeper meaning.\footnote{Young, 171; Ibid., 184. This definition of Antiochene exegesis may also be seen as a useful way of describing Augustine’s use of the phrase \textit{ad litteram} when describing his commentary on Genesis.}

While readers of later centuries were suspicious of his theology, Origen laid the groundwork for Christian exegesis. Theological controversies challenged the predominant Christian exegetical tradition and encouraged further development of exegetical methods, as well as the creation of definite boundaries between orthodoxy and heresy. Marcianism and its heir, Manicheism, which rejected the validity of the Old Testament, threatened Christian orthodoxy by invalidating the proof-texts on which the Church’s messianic claims were traditionally founded, while the heterodox Christological system of Arianism demonstrated that sole dependence on the literal meaning of the text could lead to exegesis that was at odds with accepted, orthodox belief.\footnote{G. W. H. Lampe, “The Exposition and Exegesis of Scripture: To Gregory the Great,” in \textit{The Cambridge History of the Bible}, vol. 2, 1st ed., ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1969) 170; R. P. C. Hanson, “Biblical Exegesis in the Early Church,” in \textit{The Cambridge History of the Bible}, vol. 1, 1st ed., ed. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1970) 440. It is in this context that one can best understand Augustine’s rule, as given in the \textit{De doctrina Christiana}, that an interpretation of the Biblical text must be rejected when it disagrees with the received Christian faith. \textit{De doctrina Christiana} I, 36 [ed. K. D. Daur and J. Martin, CCSL 32 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1962) 26–27] A similar argument is found in the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} on Genesis by way of Augustine’s \textit{DGAL} I, 21 [ed. Joseph Zycha, \textit{CSEL} 28 III 1 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1894) 31]. See Appendix B, p. 276.} The creation account in Genesis was a particular point of debate and controversy, as its depiction of the creation of the physical world was rejected by dualist philosophies like Manicheism, as were the allegorical inferences that were necessary to find Christ in the text. By the twelfth century, the challenges of these heresies were no longer current, but the tension they
brought to the exegesis of the text was preserved in the text of the Glossae in occasional references to heretics, primarily by way of Augustine’s De Genesi contra Manichaeos.

Plato and the Manicheans were not the only challenges to the creation account as it is found in Genesis 1–3: the text itself contained problems which were live concerns for twelfth-century commentators. The two creation accounts of Genesis—the first of which takes place over the course of seven days, and the second of which takes place in only one—were problematic. This was only underscored by the reference found in the Vulgate translation of the second-century BC Book of Sirach, which claims that God created all things simul. These internal disagreements were accompanied by concerns about the natural philosophy put forth by the Hexameron account: how could there be waters above the firmament, for example, and how could a single spring provide water for the nascent world? These questions, and others of their kind, are found throughout the history of the exegetical tradition.

Origen may have been the earliest of the commentators on Genesis, but Basil the Great’s homilies on the Hexameron would provide the model for a combined allegorical and structural approach towards the account of creation that would be followed by later generations, whether they accessed his text by means of Eustathius Afer’s fifth-century Latin translation or through the homilies of Ambrose of Milan, which borrowed heavily from those of Basil. Although less influential in the Latin tradition, Basil’s contemporary Gregory of Nyssa built up a structural system to explain the Hexameron account, in much the same way that Augustine would in later centuries.

Ambrose’s homilies depicted an essential dichotomy between the Pagan philosophers and revelation, offering the claim of creation ex nihilo put forward in Genesis as a respite from philosophical disagreement about the nature and origin of the universe. While he occasionally tried to offer solutions to structural problems in the Genesis account, such as the impossibility
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81 Sirach 18:1
82 O’Loughlan, Teachers and Code-Breakers, 79.
83 Köckert, Christliche Kosmologie, 528.
84 Ambrose, In Hexameron 1, 1–2 [ed. C. Schenkel. CSEL 32:1 (Vienna: F. Tempskey, 1897) 4–5].
of there being waters above the heavens, Ambrose’s focus was always on exhorting his listener to reject philosophical follies and believe in the inspired word of God.85

One of the most intriguing cosmological works of the early Christian period appears to have been a product of the intellectual circle of Ambrose of Milan—namely, the translation and commentary on Plato’s *Timaeus* by Calcidius. As was noted above, the *Timaeus* appears to have provided its neoplatonic readers with grounds for cosmological inquiry in much the same way that Genesis was used by Christian readers, and it was a key source for Christian interaction with the philosophical tradition.86 Calcidius, a mysterious figure, was likely—but not certainly—a native Greek speaker working in Milan around 400.87 His translation of the *Timaeus* into Latin was one of the primary texts through which medieval scholars had access to Platonic thought, and his commentary explains the *Timaeus* with reference to the text of Genesis, as well as competing Greek philosophical systems.88 It was used as an aid to interpreting Plato’s work into the eleventh century, when it was replaced by newer commentaries.89 The fact that the *Timaeus* was one of the few Platonic texts available to medieval readers, and its importance to Late Antique philosophy, meant that for the medievals, Plato was not the political theorist of the *Republic* as he was later centuries, but rather a philosopher who speculated upon the first principles of creation. While Calcidius’s text was likely known by Ambrose and Paulinus of Nola, however, Augustine’s neoplatonism (itself

85 Ambrose, *In Hexameron* II, 3; *In Hexameron* II, 9 [CSEL 32:1, 47].
86 Köckert, Christliche Kosmologie, 307.
88 One may note, for example, his discussion of the Stoics. Calcidius, *Commentarium*, Par. 294 [*Timaeus a Calcidio translatus commentarioque instructus*, ed. J. H. Waszink (Leiden: Brill, 1962) 296].
likely rooted in the writings of Plotinus) had a more far-reaching influence on the reading of Genesis in the medieval period.  

Jerome’s (c. 347–420) linguistic interest in the text of the Old Testament made him a model exegete for later generations, particularly in the Carolingian period. His work, *Hebraicae quaestiones in Genesim*, was composed of opinions on translation problems in the *Vetus latina* edition of the text and provided later commentators with linguistic commentary on the text. Jerome’s own translation would eventually replace the *Vetus latina*, but the wording of the older Latin translation was preserved in the exegetical tradition by means of commentaries that used the *Vetus latina*, including the *Hebraicae quaestiones* and Augustine’s commentaries. In the *Glossa primitiva* and *Glossa ordinaria*, the lemmata often refer to both translations of the text interchangeably.

None of the Latin fathers was as concerned with the exegetical problems of Genesis—or wrote as much on the subject—as Augustine, who brought Christian neoplatonism to the Latin exegetical tradition. Augustine defined the Latin exegetical tradition in many ways, not least through the program of biblical study laid out in *De doctrina Christiana*, in which he presented the challenges of interpreting the imagery of scripture. He compared the study of these symbols to learning a language, in the hope of encouraging scriptural study and strengthening the methods of teaching the faith. He gave guidelines for identifying interpretations as incorrect when they disagreed with their context or the received faith, and provided a list of rules for defining and interpreting allegories, adapted from a list composed by the fourth-century Donatist Tyconius. In this text, Augustine also reclaimed the study of rhetoric—frequently a

---


94 Augustine, *De doctrina Christiana* Prologue 5 [CCSL 32, 3–4].
subject suspected of having little purpose other than manipulation—as a key to explaining the text of the Bible.  

Augustine’s earliest work on the Hexameron was the *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, in which he attempted to prove the goodness of a creator God against dualist claims that matter was inherently evil. Augustine twice tried to show that the problems of Genesis could be resolved by readings “ad litteram”, that is, through careful attention to the words and grammar of the Latin text, once in his *De Genesi ad litteram opus imperfectum*, and once in the complete *De Genesi ad litteram*. This latter text provided the majority of the extracts in the *Glossa primitiva*. In this work, he developed a theory according to which the repetitive way in which each day’s creation is described represents a series of emanations, by which God’s ideas of what will be created move from his mind through the angelic consciousness that was created on the first day, and thus into existence.

Other treatments of Genesis in Augustine’s works include a collection of questions on the Heptateuch, the *Quaestionum in Heptateuchum libri VII*. The final three chapters of the *Confessiones* treat the interpretation of the Hexameron, and books 11–16 of *De civitate Dei* contain a discussion of society as portrayed in the later chapters of Genesis. The scope of

---


97 *DGAL* II, 8 [CSEL 28 III 1, 45].


Augustine’s work on Genesis, and the range of problems to which he applied it, made him the primary resource for subsequent generations of exegetes.  

Augustine’s *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* emphasized symbol and allegory in interpreting a challenging text, but it was Gregory the Great (540–604) who developed a three-fold sense of scripture (historical, allegorical, and moral) that would influence the later tradition. As an exegete, Gregory was considered the great master of the allegorical and moral senses, for which his work was mined by later commentators. His most influential work, the *Moralia in Job*, contained spiritual interpretations of many biblical passages, including some from Genesis. These passages, along with extracts from his other works, were excerpted by Gregory’s secretary, Paterius, who organized them according to the order of biblical history. This florilegium, known as the *Liber de expositione ueteris et noui testamenti*, was a key source for later compilers—all the entries on Genesis 1–3 in Paterius’ text were included in the *Glossa ordinaria*, occasionally in a form closer to that found in the *Liber de expositione ueteris et noui testamenti* than in Gregory’s original.

These exegetes and their concerns are chronologically and culturally distant from the compilation of the *Glossae* on Genesis 1–3. However, understanding the interests and motivations behind its sources is crucial to the history of the *Glossa ordinaria*. The patristic exegetes, in working through the problems set for them by the confluence of the received scriptures and philosophical tradition, laid the ground-rules for biblical exegesis and produced the bulk of the text that would go into the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis. In excerpting and
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103 Paterius, *LEVNT, PL* 79:687A.

104 Wasselynk notes that only the first part of the text attributed to Paterius in the *Patrologia Latina* is authentic. “L’influence de l’exégese de St. Grégoire le Grand,” 186.

combining patristic works, the compilers of the later commentaries—including the Glossae—sorted through these received texts. In choosing the passages which remained of interest or which could be applied to new problems, medieval exegetes went beyond the preservation of received tradition to the creation of new resources and approaches to doctrinal problems.

Insofar as it is made up of extracts from older texts, the Glossa ordinaria is, to a certain extent, an heir to the tradition of Isidore of Seville (c. 560–636), who worked in an era in which Latin exegesis depended primarily on compilations. Isidore’s commentary In Genesim is a strictly allegorical commentary in which he avoided questions of natural philosophy—for example, the waters above the heavens are allegorized as angels. Other works retained the same method while treating Genesis in less detail. Thus, the Allegoriae quaedam sacrae scripturae are limited to allegorical equivalences: Adam is Christ, Eve is the Church, and Abel is the good shepherd.

Bede (672–735) bridged the gap between the Late Antique period and the Carolingians by condensing the contents of his extensive library into commentaries. He had a marked interest in the natural world, the physical sciences, and computation, which is revealed in his commentary on Genesis. In this text, he carefully rejected the allegorizing popularized by Gregory the Great and turned, instead, to Augustine, particularly the De Genesi ad litteram. Nevertheless, he did provide some interpretations of the text which treat spiritual matters, particularly those raised by the disciplines of the monastic life.

The late-eighth-century circulation of Charlemagne’s educational reform letters, the Epistola de litteris colendis (c. 790) and the more sweeping Admonitio generalis (794), sparked a return to arts and letters across the Carolingian regions so profound that intellectual historians have
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crowned it with the name “renaissance”. The Carolingian educational program had a sustained influence on medieval biblical studies, both through work done in the correction of the biblical text and in the transmission of patristic sources. As will be discussed in Chapter One, the Carolingian era likely saw the beginnings of the three-column gloss layout, under the influence of Insular teachers.

Many factors contributed to the health of the Carolingian schools. The growth of Frankish power in the Carolingian period led scholars from Anglo-Saxon territories, Ireland, Spain, and Italy to what is now France and Germany, where they became teachers and royal advisers. The development and spread of Caroline minuscule led to the end of the idiosyncratic house scripts associated with the Merovingians, and made it easier for smaller institutions that lacked the resources to produce their own books to purchase them from the scriptoria of larger monasteries. The Carolingian program encompassed far more than biblical studies in their call for educational and liturgical reforms, but these renovations were inseparable from, and justified by, an intellectual culture that was centered on the scriptures.

Most of the exegetical work done in the academic centers of the Carolingian period was dependent on the patristic sources. The biblical exegesis of the Carolingian period has long

---


hung under the shadow of accusations of a lack of originality and derivative nature.\textsuperscript{116} Recent scholarship, however, has reconsidered the Carolingian contribution to the Latin exegetical tradition, with a greater respect for the scholars’ originality in method, their role in defining—rather than merely transmitting—the patristic canon, and the control they exerted over their commentaries through the choices made about who and what to include.\textsuperscript{117}

Carolingian exegesis often focused on linguistic and textual concerns. Charlemagne enjoined correction of the Vulgate text in the \textit{Admonitio generalis}, and the non-Latin speakers of the Frankish kingdom keenly appreciated their relationship to the Bible as a translated text.\textsuperscript{118} Under the influence of these trends, Carolingian exegetes undertook the task of editing and comparing the translations with care. This was accompanied by a renewed respect for the linguistic interests of Jerome, translator of the \textit{Vulgata}, whose commentaries, alongside Isidore of Seville’s emphasis on the importance of Greek and Hebrew, were the foundation for Carolingian philological endeavors.\textsuperscript{119}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Kaczynski, “Edition, Translation, and Exegesis,” 173–174. Kaczynski’s argument is similar to the point made by L. D. Reynolds and N. G Wilson, in regard to the transmission of classical texts. in which they write, “Texts perished, not because pagan authors were under attack, but because no one was interested in reading them, and parchment was too precious to carry an obsolete text.” \textit{Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the transmission of Greek and Latin Literature}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974) 85.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Carolingian interest in Jerome is an example of another contribution early medieval scholars made to the Latin intellectual tradition: cementing a canon, as it were, of the Latin Church fathers. From the seventh to the ninth centuries, commentators and copyists sifted through the Late Antique texts available to them, deciding what was worth saving. With limited resources, the decision to copy a given text had to be a conscious and active one, as it meant that other texts would have to remain uncopied.\textsuperscript{120}

Carolingian exegesis can be divided into three periods, demarcated by developing priorities and the changing use of patristic authority. The earliest commentaries that may be called Carolingian were composed in the late eighth and early ninth centuries.\textsuperscript{121} Genesis commentaries from this period include the works of Wigbod on the Octateuch and Alcuin’s \textit{Quaestiones in Genesim} (both composed between 775 and 800).\textsuperscript{122} These commentaries reflect limited scholarly resources when compared to those used by later exegetes: Wigbod’s text depends upon three \textit{florilegia} of \textit{De Genesi ad litteram}, but also contains citations from Augustine’s \textit{De Genesi contra Manichaeos}, Paterius’s florilegia of Gregory the Great’s work, Isidore, Junilius Africanus’ \textit{De partibus divinae legis libri II} (d. c. 552), and the works of Jerome.\textsuperscript{123} Alcuin’s text depends on Bede’s \textit{In Genesim}, the \textit{De Genesi ad litteram} (via Bede), \textit{De Genesi contra Manichaeos}, and \textit{De civitate Dei} of Augustine, as well as Eucherius’ (c. 380–c. 449) \textit{Instructiones ad Salonium}. It cites both Paterius and Ambrose, each only once. It also contains a surprising number of questions with no clear source, and which probably originate with Alcuin himself.\textsuperscript{124} Of the two exegetes, Alcuin, whose goal was to produce an introductory handbook to the study of Genesis, exerted more effort to produce a unified text.\textsuperscript{125} The period of these texts’ production corresponds with the period of greatest interest in Jerome and the

\textsuperscript{120} Kaczynski, “The Authority of the Fathers,” 6.


\textsuperscript{122} Fox, “Alcuin the Exegete,” 40.


\textsuperscript{124} Fox, “Alcuin the Exegete,” 47–48.

\textsuperscript{125} Fox, “Alcuin the Exegete,” 42.
correction of the biblical text. It is interesting to note that these early texts use far more sources than the Glossa primitiva, but that, unlike what is seen in later Carolingian texts, their access to the sources was mediated through previous florilegia.

In the second period, beginning around 810, improvements in education and the growth of libraries allowed exegetes access to more sources, which they were likely to identify more accurately and combine more ably than their predecessors. Three of the most renowned exegetes of this period, Rabanus Maurus (d. 856), Claudius of Turin (d. 827) and Angelomus of Luxeuil (d. 855), produced commentaries on the work of Genesis. Claudius, unlike his predecessor Wigbod, had access to the original patristic sources, and his commentary reflects the first careful use of Ambrose in the Carolingian period. Rabanus Maurus’s expansive commentary relies entirely upon faithful citations of the authorities, which he quoted with a system of abbreviations. While his commentaries may not have been original, they were crucial sources for the Glossa ordinaria, and his inclusion of Augustine’s rules for exegesis in his De clericorum institutione III promoted patristic concepts of biblical study.

We know almost nothing about Angelomus of Luxeuil, who appears to have worked independently, without access to the work of his contemporaries, Claudius and Rabanus. Michael Gorman considers Angelomus’s commentary the beginning of the third stage of Carolingian exegesis, in which the commentator became an active author of the text, rather than a compiler working from florilegia or previous commentaries. Angelomus is also notable for his system of cross-references and citation. Angelomus’ sources include Augustine’s De Genesi

126 Kaczynski, “The Authority of the Fathers,” 123.
130 Spicq, Esquisse d’ une histoire, 40–41.
ad litteram and De Genesi contra Manichaeos, Jerome’s Hebraicae quaestiones, Paterius’ florilegia of Gregory the Great, Isidore, Bede, and Alcuin.\footnote{132}

Other important contributions to the third period of Carolingian biblical exegesis include the commentaries of Haimo of Auxerre (d. ca. 855), whose fifteen known works of exegesis commented on concerns current in the ninth century, including theology, liturgy, and doctrine.\footnote{133} Often confused with Haimo in the textual tradition is Remigius of Auxerre (c. 840–908), who attempted to write a completely literal commentary on Genesis, turning to Augustine where his primary source, Rabanus, did not provide a literal interpretation.\footnote{134} This third period of Carolingian commentary was also the era of Walafrid Strabo, once considered the talent behind the Glossa ordinaria. Strabo was thought to be the author of a commentary on Genesis abbreviated from the work of Rabanus Maurus, as the text is attributed to him in several manuscripts, but Burton Van Name Edwards has demonstrated that this text is almost certainly a second commentary by Rabanus Maurus himself, in agreement with the attributions in the earliest manuscripts.\footnote{135}

It was in the Carolingian period, claimed Smalley, that the well-known medieval paradigm of the four senses of scripture was codified.\footnote{136} The first sense of scripture is the literal or historical


The commentaries (really homilies) that have been shown to be by Haimo cover Genesis, Deuteronomy, the Song of Songs, Isaiah, Ezechiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, the Minor Prophets, Matthew, Mark, John, the Pauline letters, and the Apocalypse. For a complete list of works attributed to Haimo, see Sumi Shimahara, editor, Études d’exégèse carolingienne: autour d’Haymon d’Auxerre, Atelier de recherches, Centre d’études médiévales d’Auxerre, 25–26 avril 2005 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007) 275–277. Chazelle and Edwards, “Introduction: The Study of the Bible and Carolingian Culture,” 12.


Smalley, The Study of the Bible, 41. Henri de Lubac notes that the mnemonic lists of the four senses date to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which may suggest a later date for a systematic approach. de Lubac, Medieval Exegesis, 1:1. It will be argued in Chapter Four that, while the Glossa ordinaria contained multiple
sense, which read the text as describing events that were believed to have occurred in history. God created heaven and earth: the commentators took this as literally true. Although Brian Stock has suggested separating the literary works on creation into two groups, named the “historical” and “structural” accounts of Genesis—that is, those that describe the action of God, and those that describe how that action proceeded—these two kinds of work are inextricably bound in the tradition of Genesis commentaries. Having accepted the historical account that the universe was made by God, the biblical commentators of the literal sense sought to explain how the act of creation had occurred.\textsuperscript{137}

The creation account of Genesis was understood as historically true, but it was not thought to be literally true in the manner of modern biblical literalism: structural commentaries on Genesis 1–3 wanted to explain how the historical events had occurred, and tried to understand the account in the light of contemporary cosmology, which was primarily metaphysical. One may also include under the historical sense attempts to harmonize the first and second creation accounts, as well as explanations of the metaphysics of the Fall. Thus, when Augustine suggested that the six days describe six successive illuminations of God’s creative will, or struggled with the origin of the soul and the implications of Original Sin, he was not interpreting the text literally, as the word is now understood, but he was nevertheless trying to explain the historical, structural account of creation.\textsuperscript{138}

While metaphysics tended to predominate in commentaries on the first chapters of Genesis, it was not the only component of the literal sense, which also encompassed analysis of grammar, language, and rhetoric, as well as any historical questions that may have been raised by the text.\textsuperscript{139} Discussions of the translation from the Hebrew were part of the literal sense, as were means of interpreting scripture from the beginning of its textual history, discussion of the four senses within the text was a later addition. See Chapter Four, pp. 186–187.


\textsuperscript{138} Augustine, \textit{De Genesi ad litteram} IV, 22 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 121].

\textsuperscript{139} Gilbert Dahan, \textit{L’ exégèse chrétienne de la Bible en Occident médiéval}, 242; Ibid., 276.
concerns about the wording. For example, concerns about why God created food for animals before the food for humans, when humans are properly superior to animals and should have precedence, were in accordance with the literal sense, as were concerns about why God is not said to have declared the works of the second day “good”, as he does for the others.¹⁴⁰

Augustine’s work showed how grammatical inquiry could serve the metaphysical interpretations of the historical sense, and that it was broad and flexible. It was, however, insufficient in itself to show the unity of the two testaments, and commentators turned to the spiritual senses to supply its deficiencies. The earliest Christians read the Jewish scriptures as looking forward to the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. For example, the opening of Adam’s side to create Eve was interpreted allegorically as prefiguring the opening of Christ’s side on the cross, from which the Church (Christ’s bride) was formed.¹⁴¹ The adoption of this sense, following Origen, allowed the exegete to interpret the biblical text as describing either Christ, or his Church.¹⁴² Caution is necessary when describing the allegorical sense, as the theological allegory of Origen is often conflated with Philo’s approach to allegorical interpretation, which was unconstrained by a specific hermeneutic and doctrinal agenda.¹⁴³ The Genesis tradition reflects this second form of allegory in the many commentaries that associated the six days of creation with six periods of human history, an interpretation that originated in Augustine’s De Genesi contra Manichaeos.¹⁴⁴

The moral, or tropological, sense instructed the reader in Christian living. This also came to be understood as a means of finding instruction for the monastic life.¹⁴⁵ Bede’s commentary on Genesis is filled with questions raised by a monastic lifestyle. (For example, does God’s

¹⁴⁰ “Remigius of Auxerre” (Haimo of Auxerre), Commentarius in Genesim, PL 131:56.
¹⁴¹ Isidore of Seville, Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum: In Genesim, PL 83:217.
¹⁴² de Lubac, Medieval Exegesis, 2:93.
¹⁴³ de Lubac, Medieval Exegesis, 1:148.
¹⁴⁵ de Lubac, Medieval Exegesis 2:127.
blessing of marriage and procreation constitute a challenge to the discipline of celibacy?)\textsuperscript{146} The moral sense is frequently seen in homilies—Ambrose found the gathering of the waters an apt time in his homilies on the Hexameron to complain of how difficult it is to gather the faithful into services.\textsuperscript{147}

The final sense, known as the anagogical sense, looked forward to the eschaton. This sense appeared with less frequency in the interpretation of the first chapters of Genesis. One example, however, was the interpretation of God’s curse on the serpent, “he shall crush your head”, which was interpreted with an eye towards revelation and man’s eventual triumph over Satan.\textsuperscript{148}

4 Genesis in the Twelfth Century

The twelfth-century environment in which the Glossae were first produced had its origin in the Ottonian empire of the tenth and eleventh centuries, in which the cathedral schools came into their own as institutions offering a program of study directed towards the formation of men for public life, distinct from that found in the monastic schools.\textsuperscript{149} Both monastic and cathedral schools educated their students in the foundational trivium of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, all subjects prescribed in Isidore’s Etymologies.\textsuperscript{150} The cathedral schools added to this program with instruction in mores or, as one eleventh-century poem has it, recte vivendi et dogma loquendi: the customs, manners, eloquence, and morals that were necessary to men seeking advancement in the imperial or ecclesiastical courts.\textsuperscript{151} These customs spread from German

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{146} Bede, \textit{In Genesim} I i, 27 [CCCL 118A, 27–29].
\item \textsuperscript{147} Ambrose, \textit{In Hexameron} III 1, 1 [CSEL 32, 59].
\item \textsuperscript{148} Isidore of Seville, \textit{Quaestiones in vetus testamentum: In Genesim}, PL 83:221.
\item \textsuperscript{150} Reynolds and Wilson, \textit{Scribes and Scholars}, 84.
\end{itemize}
regions (where they had begun to dissolve by the second half of the eleventh century) to the French schools, and so one finds French masters of the early twelfth century—including Anselm of Laon—attracting students through their personal charisma as well as their learning. This reliance on older methods of education may be one reason for the harsh criticisms Anselm received from young scholars like Peter Abelard.\footnote{Jaeger, “Cathedral Schools and Humanist Learning,” 571; Ibid., 589; C. Stephen Jaeger, The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideas in Medieval Europe, 950–1200 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994) 81–82; Ibid., 230. As Jaeger points out (“Cathedral Schools and Humanist Learning,” 571), it is unusual for modern historical works to claim that new developments originated in Germany and thus moved to France; one may therefore compare, with some interest, Margaret Gibson’s claims to have found the earliest manuscripts produced in the format of the Glossa. “The Twelfth-Century Glossed Bible,” 232–244.}

While some contested the role of manners in the cathedral schools, the structures and methods for studying letters were also changing. The study of rhetoric grew, driven by the development of the \textit{ars dictaminis}. Curricular reformers like Hugh of St. Victor moved away from the use of \textit{florilegia} and recommended the reading of complete works, and logic grew in importance as a discipline with the continued interest in dialectical methods.\footnote{Colish, Medieval Foundations, 176–177; Smalley, The Study of the Bible, 45.} Posing questions about the text was a tradition of exegesis that went back to the patristic era, but twelfth-century exegetes began to do so systematically, in accordance with dialectical practice: a step towards the techniques of the scholastic method.\footnote{Smalley, The Study of the Bible, 72–73; Chenu, “The Masters of the Theological ‘Science’,” 291–292.}

These developments in the teaching of the \textit{trivium} made the late eleventh and early twelfth century a time of growth in biblical scholarship. Other factors may also have contributed to the renewal of interest in the biblical text: Smalley suggested that the return to biblical studies—particularly the return to the subject that interested her most, the study of the literal meaning—may have been spurred by Pope Gregory VII’s (r. 1073–1085) use of scriptural proof-texts in defense of his position during the investiture conflict. Scholars who give a greater weight to the importance of the spiritual meaning of the text have suggested that the monastic reforms of the
tenth and eleventh centuries fostered developments in biblical exegesis. While it is impossible to isolate any one cause for such a dramatic cultural change, it is clear that the early twelfth century was a time of new developments in biblical studies, including a renewed interest in the literal and historical meaning of the texts and a trend towards consulting Rabbis and Hebrew sources on problematic passages.

One of the people behind these changes was Hugh, master of the School of St. Victor, a community of canons founded by William of Champeaux (c. 1070–1121) at the beginning of the twelfth century. As the head of the school, Hugh turned his attention to outlining the proper course of study for his students, and it was in this that he made his greatest contributions to biblical studies. He followed the De doctrina Christiana in asserting the importance of the secular sciences as a preparation for biblical exegesis, defended the importance of the historical meaning of the text, and made reference to the original Hebrew.

Hugh did not deny that the historical events outlined in scripture had a tropological significance, but insisted that the


spiritual meaning depended upon their having actually happened, as they were directed by
divine providence. Hugh’s methods were crucial in forming the biblical scholarship of his
disciples at St. Victor, Richard and Andrew of St. Victor, who each produced his own
independent exegetical works with very different interests. Richard turned to the spiritual sense,
Andrew to the literal.

Hugh produced two commentaries on Genesis. The Notulae, a continuous commentary, is now
published in the Patrologia Latina as the Adnotationes elucidatoriae in Pentateuchon. A later
discussion of some challenging questions about the creation account—including how to read
scripture and philosophical problems concerning unformed matter—is found in his theological
treatise De sacramentis. Both works demonstrate the ready availability of many sources,
including Augustine and Bede. The Notulae is composed of four parts: a gloss on Jerome’s
introductory letter to Desiderius, a series of responses to challenging questions about the nature
of creation, a summary of the Hexameron, and a lemmatized commentary explaining specific
phrases and words. The treatment of the Hexameron in the De sacramentis applied Hugh’s
exegetical principles, which emphasized the importance of the historical or literal sense, to the
Hexameron, thus incorporating this text into his larger theological work.

Peter Abelard, a former student of William of Champeaux, is well known for his theological
treatises, the dialectical program of Sic et non, and his autobiographical account of his studies
and troubles, the Historia calamitatum. Abelard is known as the last master of the “old logic”,
before the reappearance of Aristotle, and his works critiquing the use of the received
authorities—namely, the disagreement among those authorities—were crucial to the
development of theology as science. Abelard’s Hexameron, written for Heloise’s community

\[159\] Hugh of St. Victor, Adnotationes elucidatoriae in Pentateuchon II, PL 175:32D–33A; De
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\[162\] Charles M. Radding, A World Made By Men: Cognition and Society, 400–1200 (Chapel Hill:
University of North Carolina Press, 1985) 201; D. E. Luscombe, The School of Peter Abelard: The Influence of
at the Paraclete, is characterized by frequent references to the Hebrew—a tendency that may reflect Heloise’s own interest in the language—and cited Boethius (c. 480–524/525) and Calcidius as references for the problems of matter and cosmology.\(^\text{163}\) Abelard defended the study of natural causes against those, like William of Conches, who claimed that a too-great interest in them derogated from the honor due to God. Despite this innovation, his text is in many ways a standard continuous commentary with a heavy reliance on Late Antique and early medieval sources.\(^\text{164}\)

One commentary that reflects twelfth-century interest in cosmology while differing from the received tradition is that of Thierry, chancellor of the School of Chartres from 1142 to 1150.\(^\text{165}\) Thierry assumed that the *caelum et terra* created in Genesis 1:1 refers to the four elements, and believed that they were layered by weight: fire, air, water, and earth. He interpreted the days as a full circle of the heavens, and explained that on the first “day”, the element of fire warmed the air and caused it to become light: the first day. This heat then passed to the water, which began to evaporate, creating the waters above the heavens. Creation continued as heat was transmitted to the lower elements.\(^\text{166}\) After explaining the Hexameron in this manner, Thierry proceeded to a literal exposition in which he analyses the letter of the text in support of his theory.\(^\text{167}\) He cited Hermes Trismegistus, Plato’s *Timaeus*, and Virgil for evidence of his identification of the *spiritus Domini* with the “world soul”.\(^\text{168}\) The text concludes with a
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\(^{166}\) Thierry of Chartres, *Tractatus de sex dierum operibus*, 7 [Häring, 186].

\(^{167}\) Thierry of Chartres, *Tractatus de sex dierum operibus*, 18–29 [Häring, 190–194].

\(^{168}\) Thierry of Chartres, *Tractatus de sex dierum operibus*, 26–27 [Häring, 193].
discussion of unity, division, mutability, and the Trinity, which may have been inspired by Boethius’ De Trinitate, on which Thierry is believed to have written a commentary.169

As this survey has shown, the text of Genesis was the subject of sustained interest from the first centuries of the Christian faith. The Glossae on Genesis were built upon these received texts, going beyond the transmission and preservation of patristic works that characterized Carolingian scholarship to present a unified and comprehensive approach to scripture. If it was less original than the commentaries of Hugh of St. Victor, Peter Abelard, and Thierry of Chartres, the Glossa ordinaria was also more flexible. This was one reason for its near-ubiquity as a reference text; another may have been its characteristic and practical three-column format. It is to the history and development of this format—and the way in which the format proscribed and defined the text of the Glossae on Genesis—that this study will now turn.

Chapter One
The Manuscript Witnesses

The history of a text’s development cannot be told in isolation from the physical medium in which it was transmitted. There has been a growing consensus in this matter in the field of medieval textual studies, supported by such influential teachers as R. B. C. Huygens and Leonard Boyle, who argued that observing the physical characteristics of manuscripts was an essential part of the editor’s task due to their influence on copying and textual transmission.\(^\text{170}\) The physical aspects of the medieval manuscript determined how readers experienced the text—as shown, to give a dramatic example, in Paul Saenger’s research on word-spacing.\(^\text{171}\) This is particularly true of the *Glossa ordinaria*, which is defined by its distinctive *mise-en-page*, the popularity of which reflects the growth of new systems of thought and the organization of information with the twelfth-century growth of theology.\(^\text{172}\) The discipline of codicology is as indispensible to the historian as it is to the textual editor: the study of manuscripts reveals not only the intentions of the copyist, but also how the text was used and altered in the years that followed its initial production.

This chapter will begin with a review of the historical development of the medieval glossed Bible, from Carolingian prototypes to the changes seen in the early glossed manuscripts of *Genesis*, including the early *Glossa primitiva* and the later *Glossa ordinaria*, as well as the manuscripts of the related English commentary, the *Glossa Salomonis*, as well as the Lambeth glossed Genesis. The latest of these manuscripts date to the early decades of the thirteenth century, while the earliest, the *Glossa primitiva* manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398 (*Pn*) and the Lambeth glossed Genesis, London, Lambeth Palace Library, ...


\(^{172}\) Teresa Gross-Diaz has made this argument about the *mise-en-page* of Gilbert of Poitiers’ commentary on the Psalms. Teresa Gross-Diaz, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers*, 25.
349 (L) are from the first decades of the twelfth. Certain manuscripts can be more precisely dated: catalog evidence suggests that Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47 (C) was copied at Bury St Edmund’s in the 1150s, making it the earliest datable manuscript of the Glossa ordinaria, while Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19 must have entered the library of the monastery St. Amand-en-Pévèle before 1168.

After a brief history of the gloss format, this chapter will survey the codicological features found in the early manuscripts of the Glossae on Genesis, including their binding, script, layout, and decoration. In studying the manuscripts of the Glossa ordinaria, one of the fundamental questions is how the text and gloss were organized on the page, as the proportions of the text columns could not be copied from one manuscript to another, but had to be reorganized for each individual page, with consideration for the efficient use of available space, in order to fit the gloss around the text that it was meant to explain. The manuscripts of the Glossa ordinaria from before the 1130s were copied in an inefficient format in two stages. First, the biblical text was copied from beginning to end in the central columns, which were of a static size. The scribe then returned to the beginning of the manuscript to copy the glosses in the adjacent columns. This left a considerable amount of blank space, but new glosses could be added by later readers, allowing the text of the gloss to develop organically. L, a manuscript of a gloss-format commentary related to the Glossa primitiva, is copied in this early format.

From the 1130s on, scribes began to copy books of the Glossa ordinaria in an intermediate or transitional format, in which the width of the biblical column was changed to accommodate variations in the density of the Glossed text, leading to reductions in the amount of blank space left on the page. In the later decades of the twelfth century, the drive to develop more efficient means of laying out the page lead to the development of several new methods for

efficient ruling and formatting of the page. Eventually, transmission of the *Glossa ordinaria* came to be inseparable from the transmission of the resulting, advanced-format *mise-en-page* in the later decades of the twelfth century.\(^\text{177}\)

The central thesis of this chapter is that the text of the *Glossae* on Genesis 1–3, as found in both the *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria*, could not have come into existence organically, as a simple-format manuscript. Rather, the *Glossa primitiva* and *Glossa ordinaria* on the creation account depended on the development of intermediate formats, which permitted the first chapters of Genesis to be far more heavily glossed than the following forty-seven. The intellectual history of the contents of the *Glossae* on the first chapters of Genesis is thus shown to depend on the material history revealed by codicological study. This chapter will also argue, as will be shown in greater detail by means of the textual evidence in Chapter Two, that the formatting of the two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* show that it was composed through the combination of a continuous commentary and an early, simple-format gloss on Genesis, which was also a source for *L*.

After reviewing the codicological evidence, this chapter will proceed to a detailed discussion of four early manuscripts and the evidence they provide for the dual development of the text and its *mise-en-page*: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398 (*Pn*) and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 64 (*Pf*)—both manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis—and Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47 (*C*) and Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19 (*Va*), two early and precisely datable manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis. The chapter will close with a summary of the evidence for the manuscripts’ use and adaptation by contemporary and later readers.\(^\text{178}\) As will be shown, the survival of two related *Glossae* on Genesis, and the exceptional challenges they brought to scribes, provides evidence of more variation and complexity than is usually portrayed in studies of the gloss format.


\(^{178}\) Complete descriptions of the manuscripts discussed in this thesis can be found in Appendix A.
5 The Development of the *Mise-en-Page*

Both Christopher de Hamel and Lesley Smith have divided the development of the format of the *Glossa ordinaria* into three stages, characterized by methods of ruling and aesthetic choices about the placement of the glosses, with movement towards greater flexibility in the formatting of the gloss and greater efficiency in the use of the available parchment. The first stage, known as the simple format, is commonly seen in manuscripts of school texts and the less-popular glosses that preceded the *Glossa ordinaria*, which Smalley called the *gloses périmées*. It was used for manuscripts of books of the *Glossa ordinaria* in the first decades of the twelfth century, and is particularly associated with manuscripts copied in the schools. In this stage, the lines of the biblical text were ruled, and the text was then written continuously in a central column, leaving space for the glosses in the margins and between the lines. After the text of the Bible was copied in full in a large, clear book hand, the scribe returned to the beginning of the manuscript and began to copy the glosses in a smaller—and often less formal—text, ruling the margins and interlinear spaces as the gloss required. This was particularly useful for texts that would be glossed by several readers, or in several stages. Its primary limitation is that it allocates the same amount of space to the gloss for all parts of the manuscript, limiting amount of gloss one can copy next to passages of interest and leaving large areas of the parchment blank next to passages for which there was little or no commentary tradition. Both “L”- and “C”-shaped marginal glosses, formed by the use of the upper and lower margins, were common. This is the format of the manuscripts of the *Glossa Salomonis* (*La, Lr, and L*), an English gloss likely related to the *Glossa primitiva*.

The second, intermediate stage, which Lesley Smith has termed the “transitional” format, first appears in manuscripts copied around 1130. It is characterized by an improved efficiency in the use of parchment, achieved by pricking several sets of holes along the upper and lower edges of the folio. This allowed the scribe to vary the width of the three columns of the text, making the central column narrower for passages of the Bible that were more heavily glossed, and wider for those passages that were less glossed. “L”-shaped glosses began to disappear, as scribes

preferred to use a tie-mark to direct the reader to a continuation of the gloss onto the next folio, rather than use the upper and lower margins. The marginal columns were occasionally split, allowing two glosses to stand side-by-side, thus increasing the number of glosses that could begin near a given passage. Variation in script and in the size of the page meant that no scribe could blindly copy the format of his exemplar, whether he was working in the simple or the intermediate gloss format. However, the transition to the intermediate stage reflects an important development in which the scribe began to see and copy each page as an individual, discrete unit. The individual page, rather than the complete text, became the focus of the scribe’s attention.

The advanced format—also referred to as the alternate-line format—was made possible by a change in ruling techniques, and first appears in manuscripts dated to around 1160. Christopher de Hamel attributes the change in ruling techniques to a layout he attributes to Peter Lombard’s expansion of the Glossa on the Psalms and Pauline letters. Peter Lombard’s text, de Hamel claims, was originally copied as a continuous commentary on narrow lines ruled across the page. Lemmata—brief excerpts from the biblical text—indicated the passage under discussion. For ease of reference, however, scribes began to return the biblical text to the pages of the commentary, inserting it before the passages in which it was discussed. The page was ruled for the Gloss, but the biblical text was copied on every other line in order to produce two sizes of text, distinguishing the text of the Gloss from that of scripture. This formatting was referred to as textus intercisus. This changed the emphasis of the manuscript: the gloss became the focus, while the biblical text became a reference aid. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, 64 (Pf) is an important example of an application of this experimental format to a gloss not associated with Peter Lombard. All that remained for the invention of the advanced format was to combine the three-column layout with the alternate-line copying of the biblical text.

---

182 de Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible, 17.
183 de Hamel, Glossed Books of the Bible, 21.
184 Gross-Diaz, “From Lectio Divina to the Lecture Room,” 94.
This change to ruling the page for the gloss—rather than the biblical text—and of copying the biblical text on every other line, when it was combined with the practice of pricking several sets of column guides at the top and bottom of the page to allow for varying column width and split columns, introduced a new freedom and efficiency to the layout of the gloss.¹⁸⁵ The scribe could easily change the width of the text column, not only from page to page, but on a single page. The central column could be interrupted by a gloss, or, by splitting one or both of the marginal columns, several glosses could be copied in a nested format, the longer wrapping around the shorter in the shape of an “L”. This advanced stage is the classic format of the Glossa ordinaria, as copied in the commercial scriptoria of Paris.

This narrative has come under some deserved criticism due to de Hamel’s too-keen willingness to impose a chronology on these different formats, many of which existed simultaneously and, as will be shown, with greater variety than he portrays.¹⁸⁶ He underplays the spread of ruling methods and layout techniques throughout Europe in order to focus on the Parisian context, and Stirnemann critiqued his heavy use of manuscripts preserved in English, rather than French, collections. He also frequently describes techniques which had already been known in previous centuries and which were seen in other—frequently secular—glosses as new innovations, when what was new was their adoption for the Glossa ordinaria.¹⁸⁷ It should also be noted that de Hamel’s argument that innovations in the layout of the Glossa ordinaria were driven by the formatting requirements of Peter Lombard’s alteration of the text lead his research to be centered on manuscripts of the Psalms and the Pauline Letters, and he thus ignored many of the challenges faced by the scribes of other glossed books of the Bible. Many of these problems have been corrected by Lesley Smith’s reworking of de Hamel’s system. Furthermore, while it is important to remember that not all of the techniques were first developed for the Glossa ordinaria, as de Hamel suggests, his work has provided a useful chronology of their use in

certain books of the *Glossa ordinaria*. To avoid the dangerous temptation to over-state the originality of the techniques seen in the *mise-en-page* of the *Glossa ordinaria*, it is appropriate to briefly survey the history of the *Glossa* format before the twelfth century.

## 6 The Glossed Bible in the Early Middle Ages

As is true of many other scribal innovations, the medieval adoption and spread of glossed manuscripts of the Bible may be the result of the influence exerted by Irish and Anglo-Saxon scribes on Carolingian monasteries in the eighth and ninth centuries. Margaret Gibson was the first to identify the importance of several manuscripts that support this thesis. One of the earliest and most important glossed books of a biblical text is an eighth-century manuscript now in Frankfurt, Universitätsbibliothek Johann Christian Senkenberg Frankfurt am Main, Barth. 32, a glossed Psalter laid out in a three-column format, in which the majority of the text is written in insular hands. The manuscript was produced with considerable skill, and comes from one of the monasteries associated with Fulda and Fritzlar, if not from Fulda itself. The text of the marginal gloss is patristic, and most of it consists of extracts from Cassiodorus, while selections from Bede were included at the beginning of each Psalm, copied in a different hand. Close inspection shows that it is ruled in dry-point, across the page, with two lines of the gloss to every line of biblical text, although the stylus was lifted every other line when crossing the central column, to avoid creating extraneous lines—a method de Hamel claims is not seen in the manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* until after 1160. Gibson notes that the skill with which

---


190 Gibson, “The Place of the *Glossa ordinaria*,” 7.

191 Gibson, “The Place of the *Glossa ordinaria*,” 6; Ibid., 8.

the manuscript was executed implies that “it is the chance survivor of a vanished genre” from
the Insular scriptoria.  

This manuscript contains only marginal glosses, but there is evidence for a manuscript that is
more similar to the Glossa ordinaria, insofar as it contains both interlinear and marginal
glosses, and which is formatted in a way similar to the intermediate stage of the Glossa format.
This manuscript, not listed in Gibson’s study, is attested to by fragments from the library of St
Gall, cataloged as Zurich, Staatsarchiv, W 3.19.XII (previously AG19, number 12). These
consist of two folios of an eighth- or ninth-century manuscript containing a glossed text of the
visions of Ezekiel. Like the Fulda manuscript, they show a definite Irish influence. They may be
taken from the manuscript listed as “Ezechiel propheta in volumine uno” in a ninth-century
catalog of insular manuscripts owned by St Gall’s, but it is impossible to decide this
conclusively based on such meager evidence. A Carolingian probatio penae demonstrates
that the manuscript was on the continent in the Middle Ages, and suggests that it had already
been cut up for scraps in the early eleventh century.

Like the Fulda manuscript, the Ezekiel fragments show a degree of skill in formatting that de
Hamel claims is not seen in the manuscripts of the Glossa ordinaria until the middle of the
twelfth century. Notably, the width of the central column on the second folio is significantly
larger than that of the first folio. The text of this commentary, which relies on Gregory the
Great’s Homiliae in Ezechielem, glosses some passages more heavily than others, and the
varied width of the central column of biblical text allowed the scribe to use parchment
efficiently while copying glosses on the same page as the text that they address. The Fulda

---

194 This manuscript is number 1008 in E. A. Lowe, Codices Latin Antiquiores 7 (Oxford, 1959). For
discussion, see Lobrichon, “Les gloses de la Bible,” 98–99 and M. C. Ferrari, “Before the Glossa Ordinaria. The
Ezekiel Fragment in Irish Minuscule Zürich, Staatsarchiv W 3.19.XII, and Other Experiments towards a Bible
Commentée in the Early Middle Ages,” in Biblical Studies in the Early Middle Ages: Proceedings of the
Conference on Biblical Studies in the Early Middle Ages, ed. Claudio Leonardi and Giovanni Orlandi (Florence:
SISME/Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2005) 285. The St Gall list of “Libri scotice scripti” is found in St. Gall,
Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 728 (884 x 888) p. 4.
manuscript and the St Gall fragments show that the techniques for the characteristic Gloss layout had been developed by the ninth century, although they had not yet been combined to create the mise-en-page for which the Glossa ordinaria is known.

Gibson’s study provides several more examples of early medieval glossed biblical texts. These include two volumes of the Psalter with Cassiodorian glosses, both from St Gall: Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek, 30, and St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 27. She listed four ninth-century volumes from Weissenburg, including glossed manuscripts of the Prophets (Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Weissenburg 33, 32, and 6) and a volume containing Acts, the Catholic Epistles, and Revelation (Weissenburg 59), as well as Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, bibl. 25 and 76, which are glossed manuscripts of the Song of Songs and the Psalms copied for Otto III (980–1002). As the recipient of the last two volumes suggests, these are all deluxe manuscripts. Unlike the St. Gall Ezekiel fragments, which contain planned marginal and interlinear glosses, in these manuscripts the glosses that were copied with the biblical texts were only marginal. Interlinear glosses may have been added, but they did not form a part of the original glossing ‘program’.

It is not only the three-column manuscripts which have Carolingian antecedents. Merlette noted the survival of Autun, Bibliothèque Municipale, S. 2 (Libri 3), a Carolingian Gospel with commentary that interrupts the text of scripture, similar to the textus intercisus format de Hamel associates with the works of Peter Lombard. Despite the importance of Laon in the history of the Glossa ordinaria, however, the Autun manuscript does not appear to reflect a Laonnoise origin for the Carolingian glossed Bible, as the other manuscripts listed attest.

Who was reading these deluxe volumes, and how? Gibson cites the mid-ninth-century will of Everard of Friuli, who leaves to his fourth son “the glossed Psalter which Gisla [his wife] has had for her own use”. The use to which Gisla may have put the glosses when praying her

---

197 Gibson, “The Place of the Glossa ordinaria,” 8–11.
Psalter—whether the glosses demonstrate an intellectual interest, were part of a hitherto unstudied method of devotion, a status symbol, or ignored—remains unknown. Our ignorance of how these volumes were read by their wealthy lay owners is one of the challenges to comparing them to the glossed books of the Bible that were developed in the twelfth-century schools. There may, however, be some basis for comparison with glossed secular manuscripts. Mariken Teeuwen has argued that these are not the products of a classroom but of a group of scholars supported by the court, who debated theological topics, corrected classical texts, and organized information crucial for the understanding of such texts into commentaries and glosses.²⁰¹

Teeuwen’s opinion that the earliest medieval glosses on manuscripts of classical texts are witnesses of court-sponsored intellectual interests may support the opinion of Ferrari, who, noting the wide margins and broad lines of early medieval manuscripts, as well as the frequency with which a different hand has added commentary in the empty space, suggests that glosses were seen as an essential feature to a complete text and claims that the wide margins were left in order to accommodate the marginal additions of a later reader. Thus, he argues, a researcher should be surprised to find an early medieval manuscript that is not glossed, rather than one that is. If this were true, the biblical manuscripts listed above would only be remarkable as early examples of complete commented editions, copied from manuscripts that accumulated glosses through years of use.²⁰²

The suggestion that an early medieval reader would have expected a text to include a commentary in order to be “complete” gives a greater audience to these texts than is often assumed, and removes them from a purely teaching context, asserting a general interest among the literate. This theory is closely related to Teeuwen’s, which suggests that the tenth, eleventh,


and twelfth-century custom of “re-marginalizing” continuous commentaries by inserting them as glosses in the margins of the texts they discussed reflects the expectations of readers, who wanted texts that had the authoritative power granted to the commented texts of the eighth and ninth century. The glossed books of the Bible described by Gibson may be seen as the products of this trend.

Comparatively few Carolingian glossed books of the Bible survive, however, in comparison to those of classical texts traditionally associated with schools like Virgil, Ovid, Prudentius, and Martianus Capella. These secular texts outstrip the biblical manuscripts in popularity, with a continuous tradition apparent in the surviving manuscripts from the ninth century on. While the glossed texts may have originated among court intellectuals, as Teewen suggests, many show signs of classroom use, unlike the deluxe biblical manuscripts. Gibson attributes this to the Carolingian curriculum, which, she claims, was not founded on the Bible, but on classical authors through whose texts grammar and eloquence were taught.

The importance of the secular glossed manuscripts does not mean that the reading of the Bible in the Carolingian era was fully removed from the culture of the classroom, which was in that period a primarily monastic institution. Nor, as discussed above, were glossed manuscripts necessarily teaching texts. Carolingian commentators on the Bible—from the earliest, insular influences—were very concerned with the grammatical and rhetorical principles demonstrated by the text, as well as the other opportunities the biblical text provided for education in topics as wide-ranging as medicine and arithmetic. Nevertheless, it was not until the middle of the


205 Gibson, “The Place of the Glossa ordinaria,” 12

eleventh century (concurrent with the adoption of “glosatus” as an adjective in library catalogs) that glossed biblical texts clearly produced for classroom use appeared, namely, the glossed Pauline Epistles from Metz and Tegernsee, now found in Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Phillips, 1650 and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm., 18530A.\footnote{Gibson, “The Place of the Glossa ordinaria,” 14.}

E. Ann Matter has argued that the lack of new exegetical texts before the middle of the eleventh century can be attributed to the dominance of Carolingian commentators. Their successors, she claims, simply adopted older commentaries rather than composing their own, until they were forced to re-open their inquiries with the new culture found in the developing cathedral schools. Beryl Smalley, for her part, placed the blame at the feet of the bloated liturgy of Cluny, which took scripture from the schoolroom to the choir.\footnote{E. Ann Matter, “Exegesis and Christian Tradition: The Carolingian Model,” in Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition, ed. Patrick Henry (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) 90–105; Smalley, The Study of the Bible, 44–45.} Gibson argued that the religious reforms of the mid-eleventh century brought a growth in the teaching of the Bible in the classroom that encouraged the copying of new glossed manuscripts.\footnote{Gibson, “The Place of the Glossa ordinaria,” 13.} Whether one can truly argue a tenth-century turn away from biblical studies from the absence of manuscripts, particularly considering the fate of the St. Gall Ezekiel, is an open question.\footnote{C. Stephen Jaeger is particularly keen to disabuse the scholarly community of the notion that the absence of textual evidence demonstrates, necessarily, an absence of scholarly interest. See Jaeger, The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideas in Medieval Europe, 950 – 1200 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994).} In any case, by the mid-eleventh century the stage was set for a proliferation of classroom glosses —referred to by Smalley as the glosses perimées, which would be eclipsed by the Glossa ordinaria that would emerge within the School of Laon.\footnote{Smalley, “Les commentaires bibliques de l’époque romane,” 16.} While these glosses were grounded in the same authorities that had been used and copied by monastic readers of the Bible, John Van Engen has emphasized the novelty of the methods of the schools, which brought problems of scriptural...
exegesis into public discussion among scholars who did not necessarily have any expectation of taking religious vows, in a manner like that used for teaching classical texts.\footnote{John Van Engen, “Studying Scripture in the Early University,” in Neue Richtungen in der hoch-und-spätmittelalterlichen Bibellexegese, ed. Robert E. Lerner and Elizabeth Müller-Luckner (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1996) 20–22.}

As the discussion of school glosses implies, accounts of the development of eleventh- and twelfth-century glossed Bibles have tended to assume that the manuscripts that survive are fair copies of teacher’s texts, in which glosses were added as they were discovered, as one might mark up the margins of a modern book. However, as I will demonstrate, the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3 was not built up from glosses that accumulated in the margins of a copy of Genesis, but rather contains an adaptation of a preexisting continuous commentary to the gloss format—similar to what Zetzer would call a “re-marginalized” commentary—via an extended, intermediary gloss known as the *Glossa primitiva* (*Pn* and *Pf*).\footnote{Zetzel, *Marginal scholarship and textual deviance*, 6. Alexander Andrée has observed a similar phenomenon in the case of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Gospel of John. Alexander Andrée, “The *Glossa ordinaria* on the Gospel of John,” 304.} The first pieces of evidence for this argument can be found in the manuscripts themselves. Thus, it is necessary to discuss the form in which they survive.

### 7 The Manuscripts of the Twelfth-Century *Glossae* on Genesis

#### 7.1 Binding

It is unusual for a manuscript of the *Glossae* to retain a medieval binding, and extremely rare to find a binding that can be identified as the original. The fragility of bindings, as well as changes in use, ownership, and fashion, meant that most manuscripts were rebound at some point in their history, with varied degrees of concern for conservation. All the manuscripts in this thesis that are currently held in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (lat. 14398 [*Pn*], lat. 63 [*Pf*], lat. 64 [*Pb*], and lat. 14399 [*Ps*]) were rebound in the early modern period with bindings that brought them up to date with current aesthetics and marked them as the property of important (and powerful) collectors. The boards of *Pn* are covered in white leather stamped with the crest
of the Abbey of St. Victor, in Paris, while those of \( Pf \) and \( Pb \), which were in the Bibliothèque royale, are covered in leather stamped with the arms of the French king. The boards of \( Ps \) are covered in mottled paper, with red leather at the spine. The situation is similar with manuscripts in the Royal collection of the British Library, like London, British Library, Royal 4 A X (\( Lr \)), most of which are bound in white and red stamped leather.

It can be challenging to give the date at which a manuscript was rebound, as records were rarely kept. An exception is Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (\( olim \) Bibliothèque Municipale), 34 (\( Am \)), which was rebound in 1825 in boards covered in textured red leather by one “Paul LePrince, Amateur” who signed and dated his work on the spine. Some manuscripts were rebound yet more recently: the binding of Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 251 (\( Ad \)) was restored in 1969. This project included the re-creation of the previous cover with new boards, stitching, cords, leather, and straps. In the process, the pastedowns and flyleaves from the previous binding, which had been taken from a Psalter and a manuscript of the Letter to the Hebrews, and were marked with various pen-trials, were removed and re-cataloged.\(^{214}\) Fortunately, these were recorded on microfilm before the restoration was begun. It may also be noted that the edges of the folios had been cut at some point in the past, removing the portions of some marginal notes, which suggests that the binding replaced in 1969 was not the original.

However, several manuscripts retain medieval bindings, some of which are likely original, and these provide evidence for how the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} on the Bible was bound in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. These bindings are in a plain style consisting of wooden boards covered in white leather, with raised bands along the spine. The quires are stitched to white leather thongs, which are woven through holes in the boards and fixed with pegs. (These pegs are now visible on the outside of the boards of Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47 (\( C \)), which now has no leather on the front and back boards. End-bands were knotted in white or colored thread (green appears frequently), and some manuscripts, like Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19 (\( Va \)), have leather tongues at the head of the spine. In the Valenciennes manuscript, the edge of this tongue was stitched with yellow thread. Another manuscript in a medieval binding,

\(^{214}\) The date of this restoration is given on the back pastedown of the current binding. The previous front pastedowns are now cataloged as Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, Fragmenten-Sammlung, Fragm. C-251/1 (the front) and Fragm. C-251/2 (the back).
Arras, Médiathèque de l’Abbaye Saint-Vaast (*olim* Bibliothèque municipale), 1004 (188) (*Ar*), was bound in wooden boards covered in parchment, rather than leather. This manuscript is also notable for its curved spine, a feature not shared by other medieval bindings.

Clasps and straps rarely survive. Many manuscripts, like *C*, retain only the end of a strap or straps on the front board, in the form of a small piece of white leather that was inserted into a carved-out section on the edge of the board and fastened with small nails. Some manuscripts—*Va* is an example—show no evidence of having had clasps, despite the important function they had in checking parchment’s natural tendency to warp and curl.

Wooden covers with white leather are found on manuscripts of all sizes, and are not limited to particular versions of the text or to the quality of the manuscript. Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 21 is a manuscript of the marginal glosses of the *Glossa ordinaria* copied as a continuous commentary. It measures only 205 x 120 mm, contains only 77 folios, and is bound in wooden boards covered in white leather. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. E inf. 7, a manuscript of the complete Pentateuch with *Glossa ordinaria*, contains 236 folios and has the same binding, with boards that measure 470 x 310 mm.

*Va* is on the larger side for a manuscript of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis, measuring 340 x 240 mm, with a writing space of about 225 x 210 mm. Alençon, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (*olim* Bibliothèque municipale), 60 (*Al*), with a heavily damaged original binding (the leather has been removed and the back board is broken), is of a similar size at 345 x 250 mm, with a writing area of 225 x 145 mm.

It can be hard to ascertain the original size of a rebound manuscript like *Ad* or *Am*, which are currently in boards measuring 295 x 195 mm and 280 x 187 mm, respectively, with folios of 282 x 190 mm and 270 x 185 mm. Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 46 (*Pa*), also rebound in the early modern period, is currently of a similar size and measures 286 x 196 mm. However, as the writing space in *Ad* measures up to 200 mm high, and about 145 mm in width, while that of *Al* is around 180 x 140 mm and that of *Pa* up to 225 mm x 150 mm, it is unlikely that they were ever as large as Valenciennes, even before they were rebound.

These codices are of an average size for early manuscripts of the gloss. The two manuscripts of the *Glossa Primitiva*, *Pn* and *Pf*, measure 260 x 166 mm and 250 x 165 mm, with writing
spaces of 240 x 140 ($Pn$) and about 200 x 130 mm ($Pf$). It is important to note, however, that a larger size, like that of $Va$, is not an indication of a later date: $C$ is one of the oldest datable manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis and is in a well-preserved medieval binding. It measures 345 x 250 mm, with a writing space of 310 x 220 mm.

Simple medieval bindings are found on codices of all levels of quality and decoration, although it is possible that some bindings were at one time more deluxe than their current condition would suggest. One remarkable manuscript that retains its complete twelfth-century chemise binding is London, British Library, Additional Manuscript 63077 (*La*), a manuscript of the English *Glossa Salomonis*. The wooden boards are covered in white leather, to which a hide cover—on which some dark hair still remains—was then stitched, forming the “chemise”. Stitching on the end bands is in green and white, and there are tongues of white leather, with the edges stitched in green at white, at both the head and tail. The quires were tied to sets of doubled cords. There are medieval bosses on the front and back: three fluted bosses remain on the front, identified by the British library catalog as medieval replacements, and two original bosses—in the shape of knobs atop large flat circles—on the back. The front board shows evidence of a missing clasp, and in the center of the back board there is a flat, cast brass boss bearing the title of the work, “Genesis Glo”. This manuscript belonged to the monastery of Rievaulx, and the pen-trials on the pastedowns and flyleaves give the names of several monastic readers. The internal decoration, however, is simple: there are some red initials, including an initial ‘I’ on folio 1r measuring 115 mm high, which is followed by “n principio” in red display capitals. Chapter numbers were added in red, in the margins, at a later date. The Rievaulx *Glossa Salomonis* is a monastic text owned by a well-established and prosperous monastery, and is so extraordinarily well preserved that it would be irresponsible to draw any conclusions from it about the binding of glossed manuscripts in general. It is nevertheless an important witness to twelfth-century English binding techniques and what a glossed manuscript of the Bible could look like as it sat on the shelf (or perhaps, in the chest, considering the placement of the title plate) of a monastic library.

Christopher de Hamel argued the close relationship between blind-stamped “romanesque” bindings of the twelfth century and the manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria*.\(^{216}\) The only manuscript discussed in this study which might be characterized as having such a binding is Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 3746 (*M*), a late-twelfth-century manuscript bound in wooden boards covered in white leather, blind-stamped with a border made up of leaf-patterned rectangular stamps. Around this border are stamped triple lines, which were also used to divide the open space within the border into a series of diamonds. In the middle of each diamond was stamped one of the leaf-patterned rectangles.\(^{217}\) Oxford, Corpus Christi College 15 (*O*) is bound in a seventeenth-century imitation romanesque binding of polished dark mottled leather stretched over pasteboard. However, neither of these bindings is as ornate as those discussed by de Hamel.

What, if anything, can we conclude about the history of the *Glossae* on Genesis 1–3 from the manuscripts that retain their medieval binding? While the origins of the text are inextricably tied to the history and development of the Parisian universities, the bindings discussed above do not differ from those of contemporary manuscripts in an identifiably “scholastic” or “proto-scholastic” way. This is, in part, a question of size: some school texts are known to have circulated in simple parchment covers, which are occasionally preserved as blank folios in codices made up of several scholastic booklets. A glossed Genesis is too large a text to have circulated as a booklet, and a codex with over a hundred folios would have required wooden boards to prevent the parchment from curling, which would have made the manuscript unwieldy. A glossed Hexameron could have traveled alone, but there is no codicological evidence for this in the early manuscripts. These manuscripts of the *Glossae* also antedate the famed *pecia* system of the University of Paris, used for the copying of scholastic texts. It should be noted, however, that so few bindings survive from the early period of the universities that there has been no attempt to identify features that would classify a manuscript as having a “school” binding. The medieval bindings of the glosses on Genesis are, as far as one can tell,
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\(^{216}\) de Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible*, 70.

\(^{217}\) *M* also lacks its planned ornate initial, another frequent characteristic in Romanesque bindings. de Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible*, 79.
not school-specific, and reflect the general state of manuscript production in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

7.2 Script

The scripts seen in the manuscripts represent various stages of protogothic. The two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva*, *Pn* and *Pf*, are both copied in a small, tidy *Parisiensis* in brown ink. Both ampersands and the uncrossed tironean *et* appear, as do both single and double-compartment ‘a’s. Ascenders are slightly wedged, with a tendency towards forks, but these are not consistent. Similar hands are found in two manuscripts of the *Glossa Salomonis*, *Lr* and *La*.

Some other manuscripts, including *Am* and *C*, are copied in a hand with a less compact aspect. The hand of *C* is very round, while the aspect of the script found in *Am* is more square. *C* has characteristically English high upper compartments in the minuscule “a” and several old-fashioned ligatures, including both NT and N-long “S”. A similar hand is represented in later English manuscripts, like *O* and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. E inf. 7 (a glossed Pentateuch), although without the older abbreviations.

*Ad* is copied in a small, upright Germanic hand with wedged ascenders, a very compact upper lobe to the minuscule “a”, and consistent use of the “ct” ligature. Both straight-backed and uncial “d”s appear, and the latter is turned so that its ascender is a horizontal, rather than diagonal, line. Tabs on the minuscule “e” and up-turned bottoms of letters give the hand a spiky and untidy aspect. A similarly upright hand, albeit French, is that found in *Va*, which has a rectangular aspect that can cause some confusion of minims and gives the text a far more gothic feel, although it lacks the ‘biting’ characteristic of gothic scripts. One of the most distinctive abbreviations in this hand is the –*orum* abbreviation, which is finished with an s-shape with a diagonal line drawn through it. This hand is also notable for the narrow, elongated *litterae notabiliores* used to begin sentences both at the beginning of and within the glosses.

In some manuscripts, the letters of the top line of the gloss text were stretched vertically into the upper margins. This occurs in manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* (in *Pb*, *Ps*, and *Ad*), as well as in manuscripts of the *Glossa Salomonis* (*La* and *Lr*). In *Pb*, this decorative technique was used not only at the top of the page but also, where space allowed, at the beginnings of glosses.
In all manuscripts surveyed in this thesis, the biblical text is written in a hand that differs from that of the gloss in size, but not in aspect or style.

7.3 Decoration and Readers’ Aids

The twelfth- and early-thirteenth-century manuscripts of the Glossae on Genesis tend to be minimally, if at all, decorated. Pf, one of the two manuscripts of the primitive gloss, has no decoration besides the words “In principio creauit Deus” in brown display uncial. The relative simplicity or complexity of the decorative scheme, however, is once again no indication of relative age: the other manuscript of the primitive gloss, Pn, has a large initial ‘I’ decorated in red, green, yellow, and blue knot-work pattern, alternating display unitals in red and blue for “n principio creauit Deus celum et”, and red display capitals for “terram”. There are two distinct decorative styles for the litterae notabiliores in the biblical text, the first found in Genesis 1–3, in which the higher-level capitals appear in green or red (and several are missing), and lower-level capitals are inconsistently highlighted with red ink. From Genesis 4 (folio 23r) on, litterae notabiliores are consistently painted in red, and the lower-level capitals are highlighted in red. An initial “I” similar to that of Pn in both style and quality is seen in Ad, although that initial is further ornamented with a picture of a bird biting the letter’s trailing descender. In Ad, the litterae notabiliores of the biblical text are painted in red uncial. C has a simple initial “I”, decorated with foliage, measuring 90 mm high. The litterae notabiliores of the prefatory glosses are in red, blue, and green—as are the names of the tribes of Israel in Genesis 49—but all others are left uncolored.

Historiated initials are common in manuscripts of the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis, and they frequently depict the events of the creation account in Genesis 1–3. The initial “I” in Am is in the shape of Adam taking the fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil— the

218 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 64, fol. 3r.
219 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.
220 See Appendix A, pp. 245–248.
221 Admont, Stifterbiblothek, 251, fol. 4r.
222 Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47, fol. 3v. See also Appendix A, pp. 256–259.
subsequent letters “n principio” are written in red display capitals with blue penwork flourishes, and *litterae notabiliores* are denoted only by their size.\(^\text{223}\) *Am* is also one of the few early manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria*—*O* is the other—to contain glosses copied in decorative shapes. The decorative glosses in *Am* are triangles, while in *O* they are diamonds, arrows, and triangles.

The historiated initial of *Am*, in which the image forms the shape of the letter, is unique among the manuscripts surveyed. It is more common to find an initial “I” that is decorated with circles, in which scenes from the creation narrative have been painted.\(^\text{224}\) This is seen in *Pb*, in which the initial “I” measures about 177 mm high and contains seven circles, which frame (from top to bottom) images of Christ creating heaven and earth, separating the waters, making plants, placing the sun and moon in the heavens, making the birds, making Adam, and resting with the world—represented by a TO map—in his hand. The borders of these circles are painted in grey and gold and decorated with white dots, while the entire *I* is edged with an inner green border and an outer, yellow, wave-shaped border decorated with yellow and white dots. The borders of the letter have been painted over some of the gloss. The rest of the manuscript, however, is undecorated.\(^\text{225}\)

*Ps* has an initial “I” decorated with floral patterns, gold leaf, and a border of blue, red, and green, measuring about 172 mm high. In it are drawn three circles, framing images of the Creation of Adam, the Creation of Eve, and Adam and Eve eating from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. The letters “n principio” are in red display capitals.\(^\text{226}\) This text has one of the most complex decorative schemes of the manuscripts surveyed. In the biblical text, *litterae notabiliores* are written in alternating red and blue with flourishes of the opposite color, while lower-level capitals are written in alternating red and blue. Some of these have
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\(^\text{223}\) Amiens, Médiathèque Aveline (*olim* Bibliothèque municipale), 34, fol. 3r. See also Appendix A, pp. 251–254.

\(^\text{224}\) An example related to this motif is seen on folio 4r of *Ar* in which a circle at the top of the initial ‘I’ is filled by an author portrait of Moses, easily identified by his horns. Arras, Médiathèque de l’Abbaye Saint-Vaast (*olim* Bibliothèque municipale), 1004 (188).

\(^\text{225}\) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 63, fol. 2r. See also Appendix A, pp. 264–266.

\(^\text{226}\) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14399, fol. 5v.
been decorated with pen-work in black or another contrasting color: for example, a profile of a face has been drawn in an “O” on folio 33r.227

A simpler initial “I” is found in Va, painted in green with white dots and bordered in red and gold and measuring 155 mm high. The only other initial in the text is a small red “I” at the beginning of the prefatory glosses.228 As Va is an example of a fairly advanced layout, this simple decoration shows the complexity of the decorative scheme is not necessarily tied to the complexity or skill of the mise-en-page. The display initial “I” and subsequent ‘n’ were never added to M, although space was left for them, and all other litterae notabiliores are distinguished only by size.229

In Al, the initial “I” is drawn in red and blue with penwork flourishes, and measures 225 mm high. The following display capitals “in principio” alternate red and blue.230 Space was left on 51v for an initial to mark the beginning of the Abraham narrative, but it was not completed. Litterae notabiliores, found in the biblical text and—unusually— also in the gloss, are in alternating red and blue; paragraph marks in the gloss text are painted in the opposite color. Initials and paragraph marks are decorated with flourishes. This manuscript retains evidence of having been copied in a workshop, as small letters can be seen in the margins to direct the rubricator as to which letters were to be painted in the empty spaces.

The missing initial to the Abraham narrative in Al points to a function of the litterae notabiliores, beyond their aesthetic appeal: as orientation aids for the reader of the text. While the manuscripts surveyed in this study do not, for reasons of their age and genre, show evidence of many of the reader’s aids that developed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries—like running titles and indexes—one can still see the interplay of beauty and function on the page. One example can be found in the paragraph marks and paraphs that mark the beginning of each

227 See Appendix A, pp. 264–266.
228 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 1v; 2v.
229 Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 3746, fol. 2r. See also Appendix A, pp. 259–260.
230 Alençon, Médiathèque Aveline (olim Bibliothèque municipale), 60, fol. 2v. See also Appendix A, pp. 250–251.
gloss. These are frequently quite plain, in the shape of gibbets, “P”s, or intertwined “s” shapes (paragraphs), or majuscule “C” shapes with a vertical line drawn through the form (paraphs). In *Am*, the scribe reserved paraphs for the marginal glosses and used gibbet-shaped paragraphs for the interlinear glosses; the same scheme is used, with less consistency, in *C*. The scribes of *Ad* and *Va* used only paragraph marks. A stylized gibbet with a thick s-shaped curve crossed by a vertical line is the most common form.

However, scribes and rubricators sometimes used these functional symbols as an opportunity to decorate the text. The paraphs in *Al* are in red and blue ink, with complex, intertwining penwork flourishes in a contrasting color extending from the paraph into the margins of the page. *Al* is a late manuscript when compared to others discussed in this study, but the paragraph marks for the marginal gloss in *C*—an early manuscript—vary from extremely simple gibbets of two perpendicular lines to curved foliage motifs. On one folio, two of the paragraphs take the form of human heads in profile, while one is shaped like a cheerful dog. A less friendly canine is seen in *O*, in which a scribe drew a wolf gnawing on the base of the paragraph mark that introduces a gloss on the creation of animals dangerous to humans. Other paragraph marks in this manuscript bloom into bundles of foliage.

The function of paragraph marks and paraphs is to denote the beginnings of glosses. Another layout feature, identified by de Hamel as an aesthetic technique for filling the end of a line, may also have served to mark the end of a gloss and separate it, visually, from the one that followed: spacing out the letters of the final word or words of the gloss so that they fill the width of the column. This occurs frequently in manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria*, such as *Am* and *Ad*, as well as in *Lr*. It does not appear in *C*, which (with *Ad*) is one of the earliest datable manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria*. The appearance of this technique in the thirteenth-century manuscript

---


232 Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47, fol. 6v.

233 Oxford, Corpus Christi College Library, 15, fol. 10r.
\textit{Pb}, in which the letters of the biblical (rather than the gloss) text are stretched to fill the available space, is an example of a purely aesthetic application of this feature.

One feature meant to help the reader that did not attract much attention from decorators was the tie-mark, a small symbol placed at the end of an incomplete gloss, which usually occurred when the scribe came to the end of the column. The symbol was then repeated at the beginning of the continuation of the gloss, to allow the reader to pick up the text where it left off. The simplicity of these marks is necessary in order for them to remain useful: should a mark become so complicated that it was difficult to reproduce or to distinguish from another on the page, its function would be negated. However, as will be discussed in the section on layout, scribes demonstrate marked preferences for where to continue the text of an interrupted gloss—on the next folio, the verso of the next folio, or at the bottom of the next column.\footnote{See “Layout”, pp. 71–75.} It is unusual, however, to find a manuscript that contains \textit{signes-de-renvoi} except where the gloss was added at a later date. In order to identify the subject of the gloss, a reader would have had to rely on the lemmata. This may be due to the fact that the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} on Genesis 1–3 can contain many different glosses addressing one brief—but important—section of the text.

\section*{7.4 Ownership and Later Use}

The previous section discussed decorative features and aids to the reader that were part of the original plan of a manuscript’s design: this section will survey codicological features that provide evidence for its later ownership and continued use. One common feature of this kind is the addition of chapter numbers, which were frequently added in the margins in Roman numerals. These are seen in both manuscripts of the \textit{Glossa primitiva}, in red ink in \textit{Pf} and in \textit{Pn} in brown ink, beginning at Genesis 4.\footnote{Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 64, fol. 3r; fol. 10v; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 23r.} Among the manuscripts of the \textit{Glossa ordinaria}, they appear in \textit{Am}, \textit{Ar}, and \textit{M} (in brown) and in \textit{C} (in black). They are also seen in \textit{La}, in red ink. These chapter numbers show the continued use and adaptation of the manuscripts as custom of dividing the books of the Bible into standard chapters spread around Europe in the thirteenth century, and how the manuscripts were updated to provide readers with assistance in finding a
specific passage for reading or teaching.\textsuperscript{236} It is far more unusual to find a manuscript in which the chapter numbers have not been added—two examples are \textit{Pa} and \textit{Va}. Some manuscripts, like \textit{Pf} and \textit{L}, were updated with related marks, in pencil, which denote the beginnings of \textit{lectiones}, demonstrating that the manuscript was almost certainly, at one time, read liturgically.\textsuperscript{237}

Lesley Smith has argued that the inclusion of source attributions in the manuscripts of the \textit{Glossa ordinaria}, like “Aug”, “B”, and “Strab”, reflects a later adaptation of a text which began with some attributions—for the aid of a teacher—which were allowed to drop out in the process of transmission. Christopher de Hamel, similarly, claimed that the citations of authorities are absent from the early manuscripts.\textsuperscript{238} Citations are not found in the \textit{Glossa primitiva} on Genesis 1–3. However, attributions are found in the earliest surviving manuscripts of the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} on these chapters, and their use remains fairly consistent. In \textit{C}, for example, only the attributions for the glosses that make up the prefatory material appear to have been an afterthought, as they float in the margins beside the text to which they refer. In the gloss, they are neatly contained within the text column.\textsuperscript{239} Even the marginal placement of some attributions is not a clear sign that they were added to the manuscript at a later date. All the attributions in \textit{O} are copied in the margins, in red. Also visible in the margins are notes from the scribe to the rubricator indicating what should be written, demonstrating that they are part of the original design of the page. It is clear that attributions were added to manuscripts of the \textit{Glossa Salomonis}—for example, in \textit{Lr} they are written in red, in the margins, in a later hand—but that appears to be part of a sustained effort to update the manuscript in keeping with the contents of

\textsuperscript{236} The division of the books of the Bible into chapters can be traced to Stephen Langton’s work on the text. See Riccardo Quinto, \textit{Stefano Langton (d. 1228) e la tradizione delle sue opere: “Doctor Nominatissimus”}, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters Neue Folge 39 (Münster: Druckhaus Aschendorff, 1994) 33; Jean Châtillon, “La Bible dans les écoles du XIIe siècle” in \textit{Le Moyen Âge et la Bible}, Bible de tous les temps 4, (Paris: Beauchesne, 1984) 197; Smalley, \textit{The Study of the Bible}, 222.


\textsuperscript{238} Smith, \textit{The Glossa Ordinaria}, 72; de Hamel, \textit{Glossed Books of the Bible}, 31; Smith, \textit{The Glossa Ordinaria}, 58

\textsuperscript{239} Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47, fol. 2r; fol. 3r.
the *Glossa ordinaria*, as several characteristic interlinear glosses from the *Glossa ordinaria* were also added to this manuscript by a later annotator.\(^{240}\)

Other marginal signs that can indicate changes to how the text was read are small letters placed next to the beginnings of glosses, giving an order in which the glosses were meant to be read. These are seen with greater frequency in manuscripts with a complicated *mise-en-page*, such as *Ar* and *Ps*, although they can also appear in less complex manuscripts, such as *Am*.\(^{241}\) The prefatory material to *Ad* provides an interesting example of two such systems: the earlier system consists of letters a–i, k–u, and x in brown ink, and the later system of small red Arabic numerals, 1–6.\(^{242}\) As these are found only with the prefatory glosses, they suggest that someone wished to change the order in which the gloss was read, perhaps after consultation with another manuscript. (This is particularly likely as an explanation for the small letters, as the Admont manuscript was heavily corrected against another soon after it was copied).

It is not always clear who added these letters, whether they were part of a concerted effort on the part of a scribe or the addition of a dedicated reader or teacher. Some marks, however, were clearly made by readers. These include the *nota* monograms frequently found in the margins of manuscripts, as well as the frequently-seen marginal notes written in pencil or with a dry stylus. These can be challenging to read, but some manuscripts include less haphazard and more permanent additions in ink. One such example is *Pa*, which belonged to the College de Navarre in Paris. It contains several glosses added in a later, albeit also protogothic, hand and in a darker ink. These include not only glosses attributed to Isidore and Ambrose but one excerpted from the Hexameron commentary in Hugh of St. Victor’s *De sacramentis* and one attributed to Origen, on the gathering of the waters.\(^{243}\)
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\(^{240}\) London, British Library Royal 4 A X, fol. 3r. Attributions only appear in the *Glossa primitiva* from Genesis 4:1; see p. 90.

\(^{241}\) Arras, Médiathèque de l’Abbaye Saint-Vaast (*olum* Bibliothèque municipale), 1004 (188), fol. 4r (see Appendix A, 254–256); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14399, fol. 7r (See Appendix A, 266-268); Amiens, Médiathèque Aveline (*olum* Bibliothèque municipale), 34, fol. 5v.

\(^{242}\) Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 251, fol. 2r–3v.

\(^{243}\) Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 46, p. 3 (Isidore and ‘Hugo’); p. 5 (Ambrose and Hugh of St. Victor’s *De Sacramentis*); p. 7 (Origen). On *Pa*, see also Appendix A, pp. 262–264.
Another set of marginal additions is found in $M$, a French manuscript that belonged to the Augsburg Cathedral. These brief additions, roughly contemporary to the main text, were copied in the lower margin of the text. Many are attributed to Augustine, but some are idiosyncratic and unattributed. For example, one addition states, “fatorum experimenta, que illi apotelesmata uocant, omnino respuamus”. 244 This was added to the lower margin of the folio on which is described the creation of the sun, moon, and stars as markers of the passage of time, a common place to find glosses condemning astrology. This repudiation of apotelesmata—superstitious recitation words on a specific day of the year—is not expressed in other gloss manuscripts. These glosses are not necessarily spontaneous additions by a teacher or reader, as they may have been copied (at the direction of a teacher or other reader) from another, now lost, manuscript. However, it is the lone (known) witness of this gloss, and a revealing insight into how a text might have been modified for specific concerns or circumstances.

The previous two manuscripts contain examples of the ways in which the gloss might be customized to a particular context, but they do not provide any evidence for how that text might have been used—that is, whether it was read in a library or aloud in a classroom. 245 Nor do these modifications in any way change the manner in which the gloss would be read. In contrast, $Am$ contains not only several added glosses, but a series of marginal additions which are best described as glosses on the gloss, and which clarify the language or theological content of the gloss at hand. For example, a gloss on the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil contains the line, “que sola uerissime uirtus est”, and the word “sola” is glossed, “id est, maxime et principaliter”. 246 A similar note was added in order to clarify the problem addressed by the marginal gloss, either as a reminder to a teacher or an aid to the reader. The problematic line of the gloss is “sed hoc scripture congruere non uidetur”, and it refers to the problem of the two accounts of the creation of man in Genesis chapters 1 and 2. The gloss on the gloss makes

---

244 Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 3746, fol. 5r.

245 The problem of how to determine whether a gloss was used in the classroom is a difficult one. A useful, if occasionally somewhat circular, overview can be found in Gernot R. Wieland, “The glossed manuscript: classbook or library book?” Anglo-Saxon England 14 (1985), 153–173.

246 Amiens, Médiathèque Aveline (olim Bibliothèque municipale), 34, fol. 20r.
This note may have been necessitated by the fact that the gloss to which it refers is found on a page of the manuscript that contains no text, but only the gloss, and so a reader or listener may have been thought to have lost track of the question at hand. Notes of this kind are not necessarily evidence of classroom use of the manuscript, but they do provide evidence of the continued effort to explain and teach the text, even if only through the practice of private reading. Similar notes are found in Ar, which is textually closely related to the Amiens manuscript, and—albeit with less frequency—in Va.

Some of the most important additions for tracing the history of a manuscript are the *ex libris* marks, which record the name of the person or library to which the codex belonged. These are quite common, particularly in manuscripts that belonged to religious houses, and usually appear on the front paste-down, flyleaf, or the first folio, although they can occasionally be found the end of a manuscript, as in Pf, which belonged to the monastery of Fontenay. Institutional *ex libris* marks are also seen in Pn and Ps (both from St. Victor, Paris), in C (Bury St. Edmunds), in La (Rievaulx), and in Lr (St. Augustine’s, Canterbury). Some manuscripts contain the names of an individual: before it came to the College of Navarre, Pa belonged to a Guielmo Chirout, otherwise unknown, while Ar belonged to one “H. Presbyter”, who listed the contents of his library on the first fly-leaf.

The names of readers or scribes are occasionally found in pen-trials on the pastedowns or flyleaves of a manuscript. This is the case for La, in which one finds many names, including
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247 Amiens, Médiathèque Aveline (*olum Bibliothèque municipale*), 34, fol. 18r.

248 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale 19, fol. 12v. Above the word “secundum” in the of the marginal gloss, “quem tamen nudam fecit secundum causalem rationem,” the note was added, “id est, non contra”.

249 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 64, fol. 108v.

250 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 1r, 6r, and 132r; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14399, fol. 1r; Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47, front paste-down; London, British Library, Additional Manuscript 63077, fol. 1r; London, British Library, Royal Manuscript 4 A X, recto first fly-leaf. On La, see also Appendix A, pp. 238–240; on Lr, see also Appendix A, pp. 240–242.

251 Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, p. 256; Arras, Médiathèque de l’Abbaye Saint-Vaast (*olum Bibliothèque municipale*), 188 (1004), fol. 1r.
“Ricardus”, “Thomas Dawson”, “Wyghtman”, and “Dodson” (twice). Other pen-trials are notes of unclear purpose, if any. In La, at the bottom of the back paste-down, three different hands have left the following: “Hec nomina trium regium.../ “hec nomina trium regium sunt qui domino nato....”/ “Hec nomina trium regum sunt qui domino nato munera optulerauit: Gespar, Batizar, Melchior”. A pen-trial on the back pastedown of C reads, “prolensis, eprasim, stropha” and “esto id est concordatur”. Ar includes a pen-trial citing Gregory the Great’s opinion of sodomy. 252 Folio 105v of Ad contains a pen-trial with the beginning of Lamentations, “quomodo sedet sola ciuitas plena populo facta est”, while the back flyleaf, now removed, contains a note crucial for the dating of the manuscript. This pen-trial is a calculation of the age of the world and the number of years until Judgment Day, which gives the current year as 1140. (Six hundred and sixty years are said to remain, predicting the year 1800 as the date of the end of the world). 253

Flyleaves and pastedowns can also retain the medieval pressmarks. Va has the old pressmark “k 129” on the front paste-down, and C was listed as “B. 40” in the same location. The Glossa Salomonis manuscript Lr has the pressmark “D[istinctio] I Gra[dus] II” on the first flyleaf in a gothic cursive, while L reads “de tercio gra[du] pri[ma] armaria”. Pressmarks can indicate not only where a manuscript was stored, but how: the pressmarks described above indicate that the manuscripts were stored upright, on the named shelves. This is also clear in the case of Al, which has the old pressmark ‘k ii’ written on the bare spine of the manuscript. Other manuscripts have their pressmarks and titles on the front cover, which may indicate that they were stored flat. M, which has a red pressmark “A” on a piece of parchment attached to the front cover, is one such manuscript; Ad, which appears to have had its title on a similar piece of parchment attached to the front cover before restoration in 1969, is likely another.

These pressmarks are occasionally supported by medieval catalogs, which can also provide evidence for at what date a given manuscript is known to have been in a library. Va, for example, is the first item in a long list of manuscripts donated to the monastery of St. Amand-

252 Arras, Médiathèque de l’Abbaye Saint-Vaast, 1004 (188), back pastedown.

253 This flyleaf, which was taken from a twelfth-century psalter, is now cataloged as Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, Fragmenten-Sammlung Fragmen. C-251/2.
en-Pévèle, which Delisle argued was composed under Abbot Hugh, head of the monastery from 1150 to 1168.\textsuperscript{254} C itself contains the catalog in which it is listed as item 130, grouped with two other manuscripts, “Evangelia Iohannis et Luce Glosatus” (number 131) and “Liber Hugonis de Sacramentis (number 132).\textsuperscript{255} These three manuscripts, copied at the monastery, were likely part of the same program of acquisition—perhaps their exemplars were borrowed at the same time.\textsuperscript{256} The section of the catalog in which this manuscript appears was likely completed not long after 1150.\textsuperscript{257} La may be the “Genesis glosatus, in uno volumine” listed in a late-twelfth-century catalog of the library of Rievaulx, now Cambridge, Jesus College Library, 35, under press “P”, which is titled “libri glosati”.\textsuperscript{258}

7.5 Layout

The narrative of development provided by de Hamel and Smith is based primarily on manuscripts of texts glossed at a relatively early date: the Psalms, the Pauline Epistles, and the Gospels. Manuscripts of Genesis, which was glossed somewhat later, show the erratic spread of developments in technique and layout. There are, in the first place, no simple-format manuscripts of the \textit{Glossa primitiva} or \textit{Glossa ordinaria} on Genesis. Indeed, to copy the text in such a manner would be impossible. Genesis 1-3 is so densely glossed in both the \textit{Glossa primitiva} and the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} that the manuscripts include whole folios of gloss, copied in two columns without any biblical text at all (these are most commonly placed at the beginning of Genesis 2, when the gloss discusses the nature of God’s rest on the seventh day and the presence of a second creation account, and at the beginning of Genesis 3, when the gloss discusses the nature of the devil and his possession of the serpent). These folios could not have

\textsuperscript{254} Delisle, \textit{Le Cabinet des Manuscrits}, 1:318 and 2:455.

\textsuperscript{255} See Appendix A, pp. 256–259.

\textsuperscript{256} McLachlan, \textit{The Scriptorium of Bury St. Edmunds in the Twelfth Century}, 262–263; Ibid., 293.


\textsuperscript{258} An edition of this catalog is found in David N. Bell, ed., \textit{The Libraries of the Cistercians, Gilbertines and Premonstratensians}, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 3 (London: The British Library, 1992) 89–121. The glossed Genesis is listed on 117.
been included in a simple-format manuscript, in which the biblical text was copied as a continuous central column, but require the scribe to lay out the text page-by-page.

Similarly, all the manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* and *Glossa ordinaria* show some variation in the width of the central column. The central column is usually quite narrow for Genesis 1—as well as quite short, with the glosses wrapping around the top and bottom—while towards the end of the book, as the marginal glosses become more rare, the biblical text might take over the width of two columns, with only one column of gloss. *Pa* has several pages on which the biblical text was copied in two columns, with only marginal gloss. The central column can also be quite short for the earlier chapters of Genesis, and the “C” and “L” shapes of the gloss columns are created when the gloss fills the space left above and below the central column within the writing frame, not the upper and lower margins (as in the simple format). As with the pages that contain only the gloss, these manuscripts could not have been formatted as they are before the page—rather than the biblical text—came to be seen as the unit to be copied.

The reverse is also true: the text of the *Glossa primitiva* and *Glossa ordinaria*, as it is transmitted, could not have come into being without the so-called intermediate format, without which the extended passages on the creation and fall could not have been included. This is further demonstrated by comparison to manuscripts of the sparsely-glossed *Glossa Salomonis*, all of which are copied in the simple format, even those manuscripts which were copied in the thirteenth century. The format of the *Glossa primitiva* and *Glossa ordinaria* appear to have been reserved for those texts alone.

As noted above, the first and most obvious characteristic of the manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* and *Glossa primitiva* is the presence of entire pages of the gloss, ruled in two (and sometimes three) columns. In the two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva*, the all-gloss pages occur only after the beginning of the biblical text, while the scribes of the *Glossa ordinaria* copied many of the earliest passages on the folio—or folios—before the text began. This created a kind of introduction to the book of Genesis, particularly as glosses on biblical
interpretation were added over the twelfth century. The length of this prefatory material can vary widely: in C it requires only the recto and verso of one folio, while in Ps, these glosses begin on folio 2r, and the text does not start until 5v.

The all-gloss pages were necessitated by the length of the Glossae on Genesis, but by separating the gloss from the text, they remove one of the most useful and distinguishing features of the commentary, namely, the order and organization imposed upon the gloss by the presence of the text. This is likely why one occasionally finds small letters used to denote the order of the text on those pages, as well as why scribes tried to avoid the use of intervening pages in copying the Glossa ordinaria. With the movement of glosses to before the beginning of the biblical text, the abbreviated passages found in the Glossa ordinaria, and the increasing efficiency of the format as layout techniques improved, fewer all-gloss pages were required in the Glossa ordinaria than in the primitiva, and some manuscripts have none but the prefatory all-gloss pages. However, their presence is in no way an indicator of an early date for the manuscript: both Al and O, thirteenth-century manuscripts with advanced formats, have intervening all-gloss pages.

Because the glosses on the book of Genesis vary so greatly in number and density as the text progresses, scribes were forced to vary the width (and the height) of the text column in order to copy glosses on the same page as the text to which they referred—or, at the least, as close to the text as possible. Several of the manuscripts surveyed demonstrate how complex a layout the scribes could achieve, even without the alternate-line ruling characteristic of the advanced format. Pb, for example, was copied with a complex mise-en-page with split columns and

259 More will be said about this prologue in Chapters Three and Four.
260 Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47, fol. 2r–v; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14399, fol. 2r–5v.
261 For the use of these small letters on and around all-gloss pages, see Amiens, Médiathèque Aveline (olim Bibliothèque municipale), 34, 18r–v.
262 For example, Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 251 and Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47. On Ad, see also Appendix A, pp. 248–250.
varied column widths. Occasionally the central column is shortened, and a third column of gloss is copied below the biblical text, or the gloss column is wrapped around the shortened text column in a “C” or “L” shape. The biblical text can also be interrupted by the gloss, which was then continued into the central column. Providing evidence of an intermediate ruling technique, the folios of Pa were pricked twice, once for the biblical text and once for the gloss.

The folios that remain in Ar provide an example of a manuscript that was ruled for the gloss, according to the techniques associated with the advanced format. However, the columns were organized with less skill and precision than usually seen in manuscripts of that type. On the first folio of biblical text, six columns have been ruled: most of the first (counting from left to right) has been taken up by the initial ‘I’, while the second is of the biblical text. The third and fourth columns are of the gloss, the fifth is of the biblical text, and the sixth is, once again, the gloss. In essence, two three-column pages have been forced into one. Subsequent folios are characterized by extremely narrow central columns, with copious white space to the left and right. This distinctive format was achieved by ruling each page with multiple column guidelines, which—from the evidence of folio 6v, on which one finds a split gloss column—appear to have been drawn to allow the scribe flexibility for the width and organization of the gloss columns.

Scribes also differed in where they began the continuation of a long gloss that had to be divided across two pages. While most scribes copied the ends of the gloss from the top of the next page, the scribes of C and Va both preferred to copy the ends of marginal glosses on the same page, if at all possible, beginning in the middle of the next column (thus allowing the top of the column to be occupied by another gloss). These manuscripts also contain examples of marginal

---

264 Paris, Bibliothèque municipale de France, lat. 63, fol. 3v; 3r.
265 Paris, Bibliothèque municipale de France, lat. 63, fol. 5r.
266 Arras, Médiathèque de l’Abbaye Saint-Vaast (olim Bibliothèque municipale), 1004 (188), fol. 4r.
267 Arras, Médiathèque de l’Abbaye Saint-Vaast (olim Bibliothèque municipale), 1004 (188), fol. 4v–5v.
268 For example, Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 3v and 8v; Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, fol. 4v.
glosses that begin interlineally, flowing out from the central column to fill the margin. Some marginal glosses in the Pembroke manuscript not only begin between the lines of the text, but continue to wrap around the lines of the text in order to fill the available space, creating an appearance of interlocking teeth. This is an innovation that does not appear in later manuscripts of the gloss.

The layout of these manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria*, held in collections across Europe and throughout Northern France, shows the diversity of techniques with which scribes approached the problem of copying the gloss and biblical text in a way that maximized the efficient use of parchment while preserving the function of the manuscript. A study of specific manuscripts will further demonstrate the interdependent history of the text and layout of the *Glossae* on Genesis. Thus, having surveyed the common features of the described manuscripts, it remains to discuss the most important in greater detail. The next section will describe the ruling, collation, and *mise-en-page* of the two known manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva*, *Pn* and *Pf*. The subsequent section will summarize the evidence provided by the two earliest datable manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria*, *C* and *Va*.

### 8 Manucripts of the Glossa primitiva: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398 and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 64

There are two known manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva*, *Pn* and *Pf*, both now held by the Bibliothèque nationale de France. *Pn* is the only known complete witness to the text, and was used by Buc as the foundation for his study of how power and hierarchy was depicted in the *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria* (which he refers to as the “Glose remaniée”). Patricia Stirnemann has dated *Pn* to before 1140, and identified its style as that characteristic of manuscripts copied in Laon, although it subsequently passed into the library of the community

---

269 Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47, fol. 19v; Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 15r.

270 Cambridge, Pembroke College Library 47, fol. 11v, 12r, 13v, 15r, and 16r.

of St. Victor in Paris.\footnote{Stirnemann, “Où ont été fabriqués les livres,” 260.} It is laid out in the intermediate gloss format, with a central text column of varying width and height, frequent use of the upper and lower margins, and several folios which contain only the gloss, copied in two columns. It measures 260 x 166 mm and contains 133 folios.

The biblical text was copied in two stages, as shown by the presence of two protogothic text hands, two styles of decoration, and two groups of quires.\footnote{See Appendix A, pp. 245–250.} The gloss hand, however, is indistinguishable across this division. The first section runs from folio 5r to 22v, and is comprised of the first two quires. Both are quires of ten folios, with two folios removed from the second. These first two quires are unnumbered, and include the text of what are now Genesis 1–3. The second section of the manuscript runs from folio 23r to 133v and contains Genesis 4–50 in sixteen quires of eight (the last lacking one folio), each numbered 1 through 16 in the bottom margin of the verso of the last folio. The second text hand is distinguished from the first by its thicker lines, a forked top to the letter “a”, and the style of the majuscule ‘D,’ which is pinched at the top. In the first section of the manuscript, both the width and height of the biblical text column vary; in the second, the width of the central column varies, but the height is consistent at 22 lines throughout the manuscript. The second section contains no gloss-only pages.

The first section of the manuscript contains a variety of methods for decorating the litterae notabiliiores of the biblical text. As noted above in the discussion of manuscript decoration, the text begins with an initial “I” decorated with knot-work in red, green, blue, and yellow. The following words, “n principio creavit deus celum et” are written in blue and red display uncials, while “terram” is in red half-uncials. The text from the beginning of folio 6v (“Terra autem...”) to the end of folio 8r (“et uidit deus quod esset bonum et ait...”) is in display uncials with red highlights and red capitals. From folio 8v to 9r, higher-level litterae notabiliiores are in red, while those of the lower level have red highlights. Folios 9v and 10r have green litterae notabiliiores (with one straight-backed ‘D’ and one uncial ‘D’), and there are no highlighted capitals. There is likewise no highlighting from folio 10v to 22v (with the exception of 13v),
and space was left for capitals that were never added on folios 11v, 16r, and 17r. In short, there is no consistent scheme for decoration or capitals in the first part of the manuscript. However, in the second part of the manuscript, from folio 23r on, higher-level *litterae notabiliores* are consistently painted in red, and lower-level capitals are highlighted. This stylistic change is further evidence that the manuscript was copied in two stages.

One might wonder if the two stages represent two distinct manuscripts joined together when binding, or if the second stage is evidence that the *Glossa primitiva* was first a commentary on Genesis 1–3, and only later compiled for the rest of the text. As will be shown in Chapter Two, however, the textual evidence suggests that the *Glossa primitiva* was formed through the combination of two preexisting commentaries, one in the *Glossa* format and one continuous. It appears that the *Glossa* format commentary covered Genesis in its entirety, although the additional sources may have been taken from a continuous commentary that covered only the Hexameron.

As will be shown below, the formatting of *Pf* likely shows how these two sources were combined, and while there may be no significance to the two stages of *Pn* other than the challenge of formatting the page for the heavily-glossed early chapters of Genesis, this very problem was caused by the need to accommodate the continuous commentary. The early section may have been assigned to a more experienced scribe, who was more practiced with organizing the layout, as was common practice for the final quire of a manuscript, in order to ensure an efficient use of parchment.  

274 *Al*, a manuscript of the *Glos*sa *ordinaria*, provides evidence of a similar situation, in which two different scribes were responsible for different sections of the text, as seen in their two techniques for numbering quires. In this manuscript, the first eight quires are numbered—with no catchwords—and the folios are pricked across the page (rather than across the fold). The next eight quires, however, are marked with catchwords and are pricked across the fold. The final set of catchwords, on folio 136v, do not match the text of the following folio (the catchwords read ‘illi uero putabant’ while the text reads ‘illi uero parabant’), suggesting an error made when the manuscript production switched from one scribe to the other. The final five quires are once again pricked across the page. This manuscript is

otherwise coherent in style, but the change in the use of catchwords and the two methods of pricking suggest that there was a desire for more flexibility for the ruling of the early and late folios, when there was copious glossing and a need to use parchment efficiently. It appears that these folios were assigned to a more experienced scribe, who was not in the habit of using catchwords, for formatting, while a less experienced scribe, who did, copied the central folios. It is therefore likely that the two styles of Pn provide a similar example of the division of labor according to their abilities of the scribes.

It was argued above that the text of the Glossa primitiva as found in Pn could not have developed through the slow accretion of marginal glosses in a simple-format manuscript, but as a combination of two preexisting commentaries. Further evidence into how it was combined may be found in Pf, an incomplete witness to the Glossa primitiva from the middle of the twelfth century. This manuscript belonged to the library of the monastery of Fontenay, whence it entered the collection of Colbert. From there, it was added to the Bibliothèque royale. It has been described in detail in the second volume of Dominique Stutzmann’s 2002 doctoral thesis for the Ecole Nationale de Chartes, La Bibliothèque de l’Abbaye Cistercienne de Fontenay (Côte-d’Or).275 It is 250 x 165 mm and has 110 folios. The text is more corrupt than that of Pn, and it was heavily corrected in a hand contemporary to that of the scribe. As will be discussed in Chapter Two, Pn and Pf are witnesses to two branches of the transmission of the Glossa primitiva, with some significant differences in the division of interlinear glosses.

While Pf belonged to the monastery of Fontenay, Stutzmann does not identify it as a product of the Fontenay scriptorium, and it was likely copied in Paris. Its construction is somewhat ad hoc, and it appears to have been cobbled together from parchment meant for another project; however, as it retains flyleaves that can be shown to have been added at Fontenay (as another manuscript from the same monastery contains flyleaves taken from the same manuscript of Gratian’s Decretum), we can be reasonably certain that the several sections have come to us in the grouping in which they were found in the later medieval period.276 There is no available


276 Stutzmann, La Bibliothèque de l’Abbaye Cistercienne de Fontenay, 2:213.
evidence as to whether the two sections were first joined at Fontenay, or whether they entered the library together.

Stutzmann’s description, which is excellent in its discussion of the evidence for the manuscript’s provenance, lacks a careful study of the several styles of ruling and formatting found within. These can be divided into three stages. The first two stages are distinguished by a change in style, but do not line up with any change in quires. The third stage is a separate booklet. The folios for the first stage, from 3r–23r, are ruled across the page for the gloss, which is then copied in one column (on folios 3r–6v) or two columns (on folios 7r–23r), with the biblical text—written every other line—occasionally interrupting what would be the marginal gloss. Folio 23r is mostly blank, with only one of the two columns partially filled with gloss, and three folios remain in the quire.

The second stage begins at folio 23v and continues to 97r, and the text is written in the customary three-column format, using the upper and lower margins. The text covered by this section is Genesis 3:20 to 31:43. The third stage (and second booklet) runs from folio 98r to folio 109v and contains Genesis 47:7–50:25 copied in a central column of unchanging width, with no gloss. The fact that the gloss is incomplete was noted by a medieval reader in pencilled comments in the margins.

It is the first booklet of the manuscript that is of particular interest for this study, because, as noted above, the folios were ruled in dry-point across the page for two columns through folio 26, the end of the third quire. The text of the single-column pages was written across the central boundary. The text of the two-column pages usually follows the dry-point guidelines, but occasionally, new boundaries were drawn in crayon in order to create wider columns. The three-column layout begins before the end of the quire on folio 23v, and through 26v, the three-column layout of folios was copied over the previous dry-point ruling, with new column boundaries ruled in crayon. This suggests that the first folios of the manuscript were copied on parchment left over from another project.

This first section of the manuscript is the most interesting for the history of the Glossa primitiva on Genesis, as the continuous-gloss-with-inserted-text format is that which de Hamel claimed was characteristic of Peter Lombard’s glosses, a style referred to in a twelfth-century book list.
Peter Lombard’s glosses were originally written as continuous commentaries. In later manuscripts, the biblical text was returned to the page, copied on alternate lines, as a reference. It is important to distinguish this from the alternate-line ruling of glossed manuscripts, in which the same lines are used but the biblical text remains in a separate column. In the *intercisus* layout, the gloss and the biblical text are copied in the same column, such that the gloss is divided into sections in which the biblical text acts as a kind of heading.

*Pf* is an important witness to the use of the *textus intercisus* for commentaries not traditionally associated with Peter Lombard. Whether or not de Hamel was right to attribute the *textus intercisus* to the scribes of Lombard’s commentaries—I suspect that *Pf* shows that the technique was known before—the format of the manuscript suggests that the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3 originated as a continuous commentary, to which the text was reintroduced for reasons similar to those attributed (by de Hamel) to the scribes of Peter Lombard’s texts and (by Gross-Diaz) to Gilbert of Poitiers. A comparison of the text of the *Glossa primitiva* to that found the simple-format Lambeth glossed Genesis, however, shows a shared core in the *Glossa* format, with interlinear glosses. A combination of the two commentaries could be easily achieved in the *intercisus* format, as one could simply copy all the pertinent commentary from both texts below the biblical passage to which it referred, rather than struggling to find space for new glosses in a three-column format. The commentary could then have been re-copied in the *Glossa* format. This would explain how the text came to exist in the form in which it was found in the *Glossa primitiva*, which has too many glosses to have evolved, organically, from glosses that accumulated over time in the margins of a simple-format Genesis manuscript. The fact that there is a stylistic change in both manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* at the end of Genesis 3 further shows the association of these formatting challenges with the creation narrative.

---


279 This is discussed in detail in Chapter Two.

280 As noted above, this is similar to James Zetzel’s argument about the “remarginalization” of secular glosses, although he does not posit the intermediate *intercisus* stage. Zetzel, *Marginal scholarship*, 6. Alexander Andréé’s argument that Anselm of Laon’s gloss on the Gospel of John was a continuous commentary later adapted to the gloss format will be discussed in Chapter Two. Andréé, “The *Glossa ordinaria* on the Gospel of John,” 304.
In _Pf_, the change in the layout at 23v is concurrent with a change in the script and ink. However, this is clearly not a new booklet, as the change occurs before the end of the quire, and thus before the end of the dry-point ruled parchment. The change in format may be the result of a change in scribe, but it may also reflect the fact that the three-column format was a more efficient way to copy a text less glossed than the early chapters of Genesis. (It also suggests—as the text had not yet been divided into chapters—that the natural break in the narrative was understood to occur at Genesis 3:20, not the beginning of what is now Genesis 4.) The cobbled-together quality of this manuscript likely means that it was a cheap copy collected by a student, taken to Fontenay after he completed his studies.

_Pn_ dates to before 1140, but _Pf_ is from the middle of the twelfth century, making it a contemporary of the earliest manuscripts of the _Glossa ordinaria_, and it is likely that the two versions of the text were circulated and used simultaneously for some years. Both _Pf_ and _Pn_ are associated with the Parisian schools, the former by its likely origin and the latter by the fact that it belonged to the Abbey of St. Victor. The reason for their preservation may not be as much a question of what the _Glossa ordinaria_ adds—as Buc argues—but of what the _Glossa primitiva_ retains. What is clear from these two manuscripts, however, is the relationship between the heavily-glossed first chapters of the _Glossa primitiva_ on Genesis and the layout innovations that resulted in the advanced gloss format. While the _Glossa primitiva_ was not the first text to appear in these intermediate formats, it could not have been copied without them. The next section will continue to pursue the intimate relationship of gloss text and format, with a discussion of two datable manuscripts of the _Glossa ordinaria_ on Genesis.

9 Manuscripts of the _Glossa ordinaria_: _Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47_ and _Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19_

Both _C_, a manuscript copied at Bury St. Edmunds, and _Va_, a French manuscript donated to the library of the monastery St. Amand-en-Pévèle, are examples of how the _Glossa ordinaria_ on Genesis was copied in the intermediate stage of the gloss format. Both manuscripts can be dated with a fair degree of precision, in comparison to other manuscripts of the _Glossa ordinaria_. _C_ is the earliest datable manuscript of the _Glossa ordinaria_ on Genesis. Based on the evidence found in the library catalog inserted at the end of the codex, it can be dated to some time
around—likely soon after—1150. The contents are reflective of a school context, although it is copied and decorated in a style characteristic of the scriptorium of Bury St. Edmunds. It is the only manuscript discussed in this thesis that is bound with other texts, which provides crucial information about how it was read and studied. *Va* is known to have entered the library of St. Amand-en-Pévèle when it was lead by Hugh, abbot of the community from 1150–1168; it is the basis for the transcription found in Appendix B.

*C* is a manuscript of 119 folios, measuring 345 mm x 250 mm in a medieval binding of wooden boards. The first flyleaf is covered, recto and verso, with a selection of prescholastic extracts and sentences, copied in two columns. This is followed by Genesis with the *Glossa ordinaria*, a treatise on penitence by Jerome, and the Song of Songs with the *Glossa ordinaria*. Although there is a change in the hand of the scribe between the treatise on penitence and the Song of Songs, the quires indicate a coherent manuscript. The final three folios are an inserted booklet containing a catalog of the library of Bury St. Edmunds, copied in two columns. This catalog is organized in order of acquisition, and this manuscript is grouped with two others, a manuscript of the gospels of John and Luke, with gloss, and a copy of Hugh of St. Victor’s *De Sacramentis*. The grouping of the titles of these three manuscripts on the page, written in the same hand, suggests that they entered the library at the same time, and may have been part of the same program of copying and acquisition.

The presence of two glossed texts in the same codex allows us to compare their format. The glossed Song of Songs is ruled in pencil and copied in a simple format, with columns that vary in width by no more than 5 mm, while Genesis is ruled in pencil, and the width of the central column varies from 55 to 105 mm wide. Once again, there is a strong association between

283 The association between penitence and Genesis is common: Cambridge, University Library, Dd VIII 14 includes a booklet (iii recto – v recto) which originally contained only an unattributed continuous commentary on Genesis 1–3 and a treatise on penitence.
284 Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 74 is a glossed manuscript of Luke and John in a hand similar to *C* (McLachlan, *The Scriptorium of Bury St. Edmunds in the Twelfth Century*, 305); Cambridge, Gonville and Caius Library, 145 (195) is a mid-twelfth-century manuscript of Hugh of St. Victor’s *De Sacramentis* copied at Bury St. Edmunds (McLachlan, *The Scriptorium of Bury St. Edmunds in the Twelfth Century*, 285).
Genesis and the intermediate format. In both texts, the margins are ruled for the gloss as needed, and the space above and below the central column is used for the gloss. The height of the central column of the Genesis text is occasionally changed in order to permit more of the gloss to be written around it, but it is never as short as it can be in other manuscripts, including *Pn*. Despite this, the scribe of the glossed Genesis in *C* was able to fit the gloss around the text of Genesis with no all-gloss pages other than the recto and verso of the second folio, which contain the prefatory material. An unusual space-saving measure is that of wrapping the text of the marginal gloss around and between the lines of the biblical text, such that the gloss column on some heavily-glossed pages can look like interlocking teeth. There are other manuscripts in which the distinction between marginal and interlinear glosses is not strictly maintained, like *Va*, but they do not use this technique as a regular feature of the *mise-en-page*.

*Va* is a manuscript of 103 folios measuring 340 mm x 240 mm. Like *C*, it retains its medieval binding of plain wooden boards.\(^{285}\) The hand is a small, precise protogothic, and the formatting and layout of the manuscript is tight and compact. There are two facing folios of introductory glosses, but no all-gloss folios interrupt the text. One way in which this manuscript is distinctive is that the prefatory glosses were copied in three columns, rather than two, demonstrating an adoption of the three-column gloss format to the introductory material. The folios were ruled for the marginal text, which, when combined with the *terminus ante quem* for the manuscript, allows us to date the adoption of this ruling technique for the *Glossae* on Genesis. However, the use of this advanced technique is not apparent without a careful study of the ruling. In other matters, the manuscript is copied quite simply—the central column is never broken, is the length of the central column changed in order to accommodate the glosses, and the gloss columns are never split.

*C*’s status as the earliest datable witness of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis supports the argument, made above, that the intermediate layout was a necessary prerequisite for the existence of the *Glossae* on Genesis, and shows that scribes were able to work around its shortcomings to produce functional manuscripts with a skillfully executed—if imperfect—*mise-en-page*. This level of skill, and the flexibility the scribes were able to coax from it, may

\(^{285}\) See Appendix A, pp. 268–269.
also explain why many of the early manuscripts for which the advanced format gloss ruling was adopted, like \( V_a \), do not differ much in their appearance from those copied in the intermediate format. (Another example is \( A_r \), a manuscript that technically qualifies as an example of the advanced format due to its ruling, which has some unusual formatting choices—namely, extremely narrow text columns—and contains a considerable amount of blank space in the margins.) It can be quite difficult to tell whether a manuscript was copied in the alternate-line format or ruled for the gloss as needed without a study of the space between the columns, to see whether the lines were indeed ruled across the page. Just as the density of the gloss on the first chapters of Genesis required the so-called intermediate format, so the varying density of the gloss across the length of the text, along with the need to preserve the function of the text through the proximity of text and gloss, may have limited scribes’ ability to adapt the layout for greater efficiency, even as ruling and layout techniques developed. With the \textit{Glossa primitiva}, it was shown that the format of the page permits a text to exist in a certain form, but in the manuscripts of the \textit{Glossa ordinaria}, the text lays constraints on the format.

10 Reference Texts, Continuous Reading, and the Manuscripts of the \textit{Glossa Ordinaria} on Genesis

Much has been made of the twelfth- and thirteenth-century transition from continuous, “monastic” reading of texts to a rapid, “scholastic” searching through a text for reference, and of the innovations in layout and organization of the text that were necessitated by the simultaneous rise of the latter method and the thematic organization of scholastic texts (such as Peter Lombard’s \textit{Sentences}).\textsuperscript{286} The \textit{Glossa ordinaria}, as a text that originated and was popularized in the setting of the schools, comes from this period of transition and is a contemporary of the earliest collections of sentences. These sentence collection have long been associated with Anselm of Laon, whose school was behind the development of the \textit{Glossae}. When looked at in this context, the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} is in many ways a transitional text. It is organized according to the narrative structure of the biblical account (rather than according to

dialectical principles), and is meant for continuous reading, although it must be said that the experience of reading the text and gloss, with the many interruptions required to move from text to gloss, must have been a far cry from the experience of the ruminative monastic \textit{lectio}.

As an early and transitional text, the manuscripts of the \textit{Glossae} are largely free from the innovations in text organization seen in this period. Some later manuscripts do contain chapter numbers, which were added in the upper corners of the pages.\textsuperscript{287} The work that would be done by indices or tables of contents was done by the order of the text itself.

Smith has claimed that the presence of attributions in the manuscripts of the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} does not reflect a transition from continuous to reference reading. Attributions are found throughout the tradition of the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} on Genesis, and do not appear to have served an organizational purpose as much as they did the citation of authority—although the degree to which they did that is questionable.\textsuperscript{288} They certainly could not have been a finding aid. The great many glosses from Augustine, for example, precludes there being much organizational assistance from the addition of ‘Aug’ before a gloss—the reader benefits much more from the lemma. As will be argued in the following chapters, however, the inclusion of attributions in the \textit{Glossa ordinaria}, when they are absent from the \textit{Glossa primitiva}, suggests a transition from use of the text as an aid to oral lecturing to a source for private work and study.

The continuous narrative of the text imposed an organizational principle upon the gloss such that, with the reintroduction of the biblical text to Peter Lombard’s continuously-written emendations of the commentary, what was once the primary narrative read with the accompaniment of the glosses came to be a means for orienting the reader as to where he was in the text. This method of organization was further improved by the addition of chapter numbers in the margins, as the currently-accepted divisions of the Bible came into common use.\textsuperscript{289} The change in ruling methods from ruling for the biblical text to ruling for the gloss may thus reflect

\textsuperscript{287} This is seen in London, British Library Royal 4 C X, a manuscript of the glossed Pentateuch.

\textsuperscript{288} Smith, \textit{The Glossa Ordinaria}, 60–62.

\textsuperscript{289} Quinto, \textit{Stefano Langton (d. 1228) e la tradizione delle sue opere}, 33; Châtillon, \textit{La Bible dans les écoles du XIIe siècle} in \textit{Le Moyen Âge et la Bible}, 197; Smalley, \textit{The Study of the Bible}, 222.
not only an increased efficiency, but also a change in priority—although it is also true that the *textus intercisus*, if first used as a means of organization for Peter Lombard’s *Glossa ordinaria*, may have been adapted for the other books of the Bible solely for the efficiency it brought to the *mise-en-page*. Whether or not the organization of the gloss was a primary force behind the adoption of the gloss layout, the manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis demonstrate the way in which some texts bridged the gap between the two ways of reading, and suggest that one reason for the popularity of the gloss format was the flexibility of not only the *mise-en-page*, but of its use.

The two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* differ from those of the *Glossa ordinaria* in that the all-gloss pages interrupt the text, rather than coming before Genesis 1:1, as well as in their composite styles and formats. The lack of a coherent style in either manuscript of the *Glossa primitiva* suggests that they were working texts, perhaps copied for a small inner circle of an intellectual community, while the diversity in styles between the different manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* indicates the rapid and wide-spread adoption of the later text. Aside from the location of the all-gloss pages, however, there are no particular features of the layout that define the break between the *Glossa ordinaria* from the *Glossa primitiva*: both *Pn* and *C* were copied in the same intermediate format, suggesting that the greater popularity of the *Glossa ordinaria* may be attributed to content and use, not to formatting. The *Glossa primitiva*, however, was never copied in the advanced format; this form of the *Glossa* layout was used only for the text in its final form, when the smaller pieces of text allow for greater flexibility in the organization of the page. The *Glossa primitiva* is, rather, intimately tied to the intermediate gloss format, which made its formation—particularly the commentary on Genesis 1–3—possible. This was likely achieved through the combination of two source texts, one a Gloss and one a continuous commentary. The next chapter will pursue this hypothesis at greater length by means of the textual evidence.
Chapter Two
The Origins of the *Glossa Primitiva* on Genesis 1–3

Chapter One argued that the early manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* and *Glossa ordinaria* provide crucial information about the history and development of the text in the twelfth century. This chapter turns to what can be said about the history of the *Glossae* on the creation account from a study of the text of the *Glossa primitiva*. Previous work on the *Glossae* on Genesis has focused on the relationship between these two texts. In contrast, this chapter will focus on the origins of the *Glossa primitiva* itself, presenting a study of its use of the patristic sources and arguing for the existence of a proto-*Glossa*, a lost medieval source text in the gloss format. This proto-*Glossa* was the source of both the text of the *Glossa primitiva* and the commentary found in London, Lambeth Palace 349, a manuscript of the same period whose text is frequently grouped with manuscripts of the *Glossa Salomonis*, a commentary on Genesis surviving in three Englishmanuscripts.

The earliest surviving manuscripts of the *Glossae* on Genesis significantly postdate the first decade of the twelfth century, when the earliest books of the *Glossa ordinaria* are thought to have been compiled. Any contribution by Anselm of Laon must have been completed before his death in 1117, although, as Alexander Andrée has shown, it seems likely that Anselm’s commentaries were first copied into the Gloss format by his students, not by the schoolman himself. The earliest concrete date that can be given to any gloss on Genesis is found in the books of Bishop Alexander of Lincoln (bp. 1123-1148), who studied in Laon as a young man, and left the town before 1113. After his death, he bequeathed a collection of glossed books to the Lincoln Cathedral library, which he almost certainly acquired during his education in Laon. In the list of books he donated, one volume is listed as “Genesis non integer glossata”. Unfortunately, it has not survived.

If Gilbert the Universal were to be accepted as the compiler of the *Glossae* on Genesis, as tradition has it, the text would have had to be completed before he became the Bishop of

---

London in 1128, and likely before he went to the Roman Curia in 1125. This is speculation, however, and the attribution of the *Glossa* on Genesis to Gilbert is questionable.\(^{292}\)

Furthermore, the multiple stages of the *Glossae* on Genesis raise the question of which version—if any—is to be attributed to Gilbert. The *Glossa ordinaria* is too late to be Gilbert’s; if he was the author of the *Glossa* on Genesis, was he responsible for the proto-*Glossa*, or did he adapt an older Gloss when forming the *Glossa primitiva*? However, while the nature of Gilbert’s connection to the *Glossae* on Genesis must remain unclear, Alexander of Lincoln’s book collection provides evidence that Genesis was glossed in Laon in the first decade of the twelfth century.

### 11 The text of the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3

As was discussed in Chapter One, there are two known manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva*: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398 (*Pn*), and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 64 (*Pf*), which is incomplete. It contains only the text of Genesis 1:1–31:43, glossed, and Genesis 47:7–50:25, unglossed. Patricia Stirnemann has identified *Pn* as the earliest surviving manuscript of the *Glossae* on Genesis, and believes that it was copied in Laon.\(^{293}\) The history of *Pf* is much less clear: before it belonged to the Royal Library, it was at the Cistercian Abbey of Fontenay, located in what is now the *département* of Côte-d’Or, about halfway between Auxerre and Dijon. The codicological features of the manuscript suggest that it was a student copy, but there is no indication of where it was copied.\(^{294}\)

Comparison of the texts of *Pn* and *Pf* suggests that the text of the *Glossa primitiva* was more stable than that of the *Glossa ordinaria*, which rapidly acquired new glosses and, due to the greater flexibility permitted by the abbreviated glosses, frequently changed the order in which they were copied in order to execute a particular format on the page. In contrast, the texts of the two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* present the same passages, in the same order—but with enough small differences between the texts to indicate that *Pf* is not copied from *Pn*, but a

---


\(^{293}\) Patricia Stirnemann, “Où ont été fabriqués les livres?,” 260.

\(^{294}\) See my description in Appendix A, pp. 242–245.
witness to a separate branch of the same tradition. In Chapter One, I argued that the intermediate format of the gloss layout is characterized, in part, by a change towards understanding the commentary as a series of coherent, one-page units made up of both biblical text and gloss, rather than two separate texts copied side-by-side in the same manuscript. This copying technique was used for manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva*. However, the text appears to have been treated more like a continuous commentary than a glosed text, and scribes do not seem to have felt any freedom to change the order of the glosses.

As the only complete manuscript of the *Glossa primitiva*, *Pn* is a crucial witness to the text and the basis of the research presented in this chapter. Patricia Stirnemann’s theory that it was copied in Laon has only added to its apparent importance for the study of the *Glossae* on Genesis. However, this stylistic link to the School of Laon and thus the origins of the *Glossa ordinaria* does not necessarily mean that *Pn* presents the best or most accurate text—or, for that matter, the text from which the *Glossa ordinaria* was compiled. This is made clear by a comparison of the interlinear glosses to the first verse of Genesis as they are seen in manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* to those found in *Pn* and *Pf*. In the interlinear gloss of the *Glossa ordinaria*, three potential meanings are given for the word “principio”: “temporis, uel ante cetera, uel in filio”. 295 If one were to look only at *Pn*, however, one would find no interlinear glosses to the first verse of Genesis at all. Is one to believe that the crucial word “principio” was left unglossed by the compiler of the *Glossa primitiva*?

This mystery can be solved by reference to *Pf*, in which the first words of Genesis are glossed “temporis, uel primo omnium, uel uerbo dei”. 296 As the first words of Genesis in *Pn* were added by an illuminator, it is likely that the scribe of *Pn*, having left the space blank, forgot—or chose not—to add the gloss that would accompany that text. Therefore, for the textual studies found in both this chapter and the following, it is important to remember that, while *Pn* is our only complete source for the *Glossa primitiva*, its early date and provenance do not ensure that it is a perfect record of either the text as it was first compiled, or of the manuscript that was later used as the basis for the *Glossa ordinaria*.

295 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 2v.

296 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 64, fol. 3r.
12 The Sources of the *Glossa primitiva*

The foundation of the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3 is Augustine’s *De Genesi ad litteram*, which provides the vast majority of the text. The second most frequently used source—albeit only for Genesis 1 and 2—is Bede’s *Hexameron*. Allegorical interpretations of the text are provided by extracts taken from Augustine’s *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, and the glosses on the first chapter include one passage from a Genesis commentary by Rabanus Maurus.297 There are also a number of glosses that cannot be traced to patristic sources, which suggest the use of a medieval intermediary, now lost.

Lesley Smith has argued that the attribution of sources at the beginning of glosses is a feature of the later stages of the development of the *Glossa ordinaria*, it is true that there are no attributions given in the *Glossa primitiva* for the first three chapters of Genesis.298 (Some appear, occasionally, in later chapters.) Throughout the text of Genesis 1–3, however, some passages are headed with titles that note that the gloss pertains to a “mystical” sense of scripture. These glosses are, for the most part, taken from Augustine’s *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*. Comparing these glosses to critical editions of the texts from which they were excerpted shows that some follow the source text with scrupulous accuracy, while others are highly abbreviated or reorganized. The appearance of both near-verbatim and reworked extracts from source texts in the *Glossa primitiva* on these chapters indicates that the compiler had recourse to both the immediate sources and an intermediary commentary, or perhaps two commentaries.299

The stability of the order of the individual glosses in the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3 gives the appearance that they were compiled and meant to be read in a given sequence. When the sources of the text are charted out, as in the tables included below, some patterns in their inclusion and use begin to emerge. The first gloss on a given verse, introduced by a lemma, is

297 See Edwards, “The commentary on Genesis attributed to Walahfrid Strabo,” 71–89; St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 283

298 Smith, *The Glossa Ordinaria*, 72

299 As will be shown in Chapter Three, the accumulation of new glosses through reference to the patristic texts is found throughout the history of the *Glossa ordinaria*. 
usually—but not always—taken from Augustine’s De Genesi ad litteram. This is followed by any other glosses from the same text that can be introduced by the same lemma. The next set of glosses is usually taken from Bede’s Hexameron commentary, and they progress through the next few lemmata. The section of the commentary ends with any glosses from De Genesi ad litteram that apply to the later portions of the text covered by Bede, and the final glosses, usually headed “Mystice”, are taken from De Genesi contra Manichaeos and address the spiritual sense of the text under discussion.

This pattern is seen in the glosses on Genesis 1, which address not only the text itself, but also provide an overview of matters that concern the understanding of the biblical text at hand (as does the gloss from Rabanus, on the theories of first principles found in Plato, Aristotle, and Genesis), as well as questions of biblical exegesis as a whole. The Glossa primitiva begins with three extracts taken from the first Book of De Genesi ad litteram on the interpretation of scripture. These are followed by three passages that, as they cannot be traced to a patristic source, are likely taken from a medieval commentary. They discuss the author, subject, and title of the book of Genesis. These are followed by two more passages that provide the reader with background information on the first chapters of Genesis: the gloss on first principles mentioned above, and a gloss from the beginning of Bede’s Hexameron commentary, on the same topic. This is followed by an Augustinian gloss on the wording of the first verse of Genesis, and the section ends with a mystical interpretation of the same passage, taken from an unknown source.

Table 2.1: Sources of the Glossa primitiva on Genesis 1:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss Incipit</th>
<th>Gloss Explicit</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cum diuinus libros legitim...</td>
<td>...non inutile est eruisse sententiam.</td>
<td>Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram, I, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In rebus obscuris atque a nostris oculis...</td>
<td>...nostram esse debeamus.</td>
<td>Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram I, 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

300 These glosses appear to be influenced by the academic accessus, an idea which will be discussed at greater length in Chapter Four. Edwin A. Quain, “The Medieval Accessus ad Auctores,” Traditio 3 (1945), 215; Alastair J. Minnis, Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages, 2nd ed (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009) 42.
In narratione rerum factarum...
...in principio fecit deus celum et terram.
Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram I, 1

Sicut enim Paulus apostolus...
...conditi mundi cognouit exordium.

Notandum quia Moyses in hoc libro...
...sequuntur distinctiones diuersorum operum.

Notandum quod hec historia a suo principio...
...uero manifestatio completorum.

Plato tria principia omnium...
...ipsum esse initium uniuersorum.
Rabanus Maurus, Adbreviatio commentariorum in Genesim

Creationem enim mundi insinuans...
...ab homine dici non possit.
Bede, In Genesim, I, i, 1

Ait igitur in principio creauit...
...et illuminatur ut non sit tenebre.
Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram I, 2–3

Mystice. In principio creauit Deus celum. Id est eos qui...
...hominis imaginem portantes se fecerunt.301

This selection of glosses, while it maintains the same essential pattern of those on the other verses of Genesis, is somewhat unusual, insofar as it is primarily composed of extracts that address the book of Genesis or the Hexameron as a whole, not a particular verse. The next table presents the incipits and explicits to the glosses on the fourth day of creation, which is more characteristic of the text. This series of glosses is notable for the extended discussion on the calendar with which it begins, which is made up of a long gloss built up of heavily rewritten extracts from Augustine’s De Genesi ad litteram. It is also unusual in that the final gloss is an extract on the spiritual sense of the passage taken from Bede’s commentary on the Hexameron, which is included in addition to the customary mystical gloss from De Genesi contra Manichaeos.

Table 2.2: Sources of the Glossa primitiva on Genesis 1:14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss incipit</th>
<th>Gloss explicit</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Et dixit Deus, fiant luminaria... Quia uisibili mundo duo...

...uel forsitan circa speciem rei...

Sic et reliqui planetae...

Luna etiam post equinoctium uernale...

Dixit autem Deus, fiant luminaria in firmamento celi....Ea uidelicit diuisione...

Et sint in signa et cetera. Quia nimirum priusquam sydera...

Et luceant in firmamento celi, et cetera. Semper quidem luminaria...

Fecit Deus duo magna luminaria. Luminaria magna possumus...

Luminare maius, et cetera. Luminare maius est sol...

Et luminare minus quia etsi lunam omni mense...

Vt lucerent super terram, et cetera. Hec et de luminaribus magnis...

Mistice. Deinde fit mane regnum David. Hec etas...

Factus est uespere. In hac uespera populus Dei in

...motibus sidereum...

...anni solaris.

...quatuor anni tempora determinat.

...temere credendum est.

...redduntur lucida fulgore.

...lumine primario adhuc generaliter omnia replente.

...stellis per diem terris fulgeat.

...maior refulgeret proderet exiguitatis indicium.

...posita solent breuiora uideri.

...afferre certissimum est.

...sed minime adhuc sol ortus refulget.

...rerum noticia fortior effectus.

...intraindi spem fidemque donaret.

Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram II, 13

Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram II, 14

Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram II, 15

Bede, In Genesim I, i, 14

Bede, In Genesim I, i, 14

Bede, In Genesim I, i, 15

Bede, In Genesim I, i, 16

Bede, In Genesim I, i, 16–17

Bede, In Genesim I, i, 16–17

Bede, In Genesim I, i, 17–18

Augustine, De Genesi contra Manichaeos I, 38; De Genesi contra Manichaeos I, 43

Bede, In Genesim I, i, 19

302 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 8v–9v.
It is not surprising that so much of this section of the *Glossa primitiva* comes from Bede, whose interest in the calculation of the calendar is well known. The pattern of citation seen in this section, in which substantial segments of the text appear to have been copied from one source before moving on to the next, is a common pattern, particularly for the glosses taken from Bede. The author of the *Glossa primitiva* thus appears to have adopted and maintained a reliable organizational principle when compiling the glosses from his various sources, which are presented in the same order in the two manuscripts.

The same cannot be said for the principles by which he abridged the texts, which differ from source to source—and, in the case of glosses from *De Genesi ad litteram*, even between glosses taken from the same source. This can be shown through comparison of the glosses to the source texts from which they were drawn.

Many of the glosses follow the source text with a fair degree of accuracy. Indeed, some glosses could have been taken, nearly verbatim, from a modern edition, while others have only small variations in the text. This may be attributed to textual differences in the manuscripts that were available to the compiler. For example, the very first gloss of *Glossa primitiva*—beginning, “Cum diuinos libros legimus in tanta multitudine uerorum” and ending “sane fidei congruam non inutile est eruisse sententiam” is an almost exact rendering of a passage found in *De Genesi ad litteram* Book One, Chapter 21. There is little need to discuss these passages in detail. It should suffice to note that there is no particular pattern for the sources of the unaltered extracts—all three of the patristic texts that are sources for the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3 provide extracts that were copied verbatim.

In contrast, the gloss below, taken from Bede’s discussion of the fifth day of creation, shows the way in which many of the extracts were adapted as they became a part of the Gloss tradition. Some of the differences in the texts are easily explained as textual errors—*item*, for example, as seen in the text of *Pn*, is an easy mistake for Bede’s *inter*. However, the abridgement of this extract required some substantial tampering with the text. The lemma given at the beginning of

---

303 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r; Augustine, *DGAL* 1, 21 [CSEL 28 III 1, 31].
the passage, as it is found in Bede, is Genesis 1:20, but the topic of the passage is, in fact, Genesis 1:21, which Bede says was included to prevent the previous verse from being misunderstood by someone well-informed in matters of zoology. The compiler of the *Glossa primitiva* replaces Bede’s original lemma with Genesis 1:21, which allowed him to excise the biblical citation from the middle of the passage and permits for the restatement of Bede’s argument in a direct fashion.

Table 2.3: Bede and the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1:21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bede, <em>In Genesim</em></th>
<th><em>Glossa primitiva</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Dixit ergo Deus, producunt aquae reptile animae uivuentis, et uolatilie super terram sub firmamento caeli. Et ne forte, quia sunt aquarum animantia quae non reptando sed natando uel pedibus ambulando incedunt, sunt inter uolatilia quae ita pennas habent ut omni usu uolandie careant, putaret quia quam aliquod genus uolatiliium siue aquatiliium animantium in hoc Domini uerbo esse praetermissum, uigilanter adiungitur:</em> Creauit Deus cete grandia et omnem animam uivuentem atque motabilem, quam produxerant aquae in species suas, et omne uolatili secundum genus suum. Nullum igitur genus exceptum est ubi cum cetis grandibus creati est omnis anima uiuens eorum quae produxerant aquae in species diversas, hoc est, et <em>reptilium, et natatiliium, et uolatiliium; sed eorum quae nullo aptae incessui fixa cautibus inhaerent, ut sunt plurima concharum genera.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>in his uerbis generaliter comprehendidt omne genus reptilium, natatilium, uolatiliium et eorum quae nullo apta incessui fixa cautibus inherent ut sunt plurima concharum genera.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following gloss on the creation of Eve, taken from Augustine’s *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, provides another example of a way in which the compiler reworked his patristic sources. As in the passages from Bede, some of the changes to Augustine’s text are small.

---


305 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 9v–10r.
alterations that are easily attributed to errors in transcription, whether in copying the manuscript from which the extracts were copied or the collection of extracts. *Enim* has become *ergo*, the superlative *remotissima* is exchanged for the positive *remota*, and the *ista* found in the edition of Augustine’s text is *ipsa* in the manuscript of the *Glossa primitiva*. There are minor changes in vocabulary: Augustine’s *interiora* is exchanged for *secreta*, *quasi* is given in place of *ueluti*, and *etiam* is replaced by *autem*. There are some small abridgements—*quia interior est et secretio* is rendered as *secretior est* (which once again avoids the adjective *interior* in favor of *secretus*) and the final clause which expands the Christological allegory, *qui sapientia est dei*, has been removed entirely. The most striking deletion is the removal of the central clauses on concupiscence. Where Augustine’s syntax has been changed, it has been done in a way that is frequently seen in the glosses taken from *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*. Thus, in the first sentence, the text reading “*ut enim hoc uideatur, non est opus oculis istis corporeis, sed quanto quiseque ab istis uisibilibus rebus in interiora intelligenitiae secesserit*” is changed to “*non possunt hec oculis corporeis uideri, sed quanto quiseque a uisibilibus ad secreta intelligenitiae secesserit*”. The subjunctive *uideatur* is changed to *uideri*, which has been forced into the infinitive by the change from *ut enim hoc* to *non possunt*, and the phrase *istis uisibilibus rebus* is abbreviated to the substantive *uisibilibus*. Another change of syntax, with an attendant change of meaning, is the alteration of Augustine’s *aliud esse quod ratione dominetur* to *aliud esse rationem quae imperet*.

Table 2.4: *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* and the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 2:20-23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Augustine, <em>De Genesi contra Manichaeos</em></th>
<th><em>Glossa primitiva</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ut <em>enim hoc uideatur, non est opus oculis</em> istis corporeis, <em>sed quanto quiseque ab istis uisibilibus</em> rebus in interiora <em>intelligenitiae secesserit</em>—hoc *est autem quasi obdormiscre—, tanto melius et sincerius illud uidet. <em>Ipsa</em> enim <em>cognitio, qua intelligitur</em> in nobis <em>aliud esse</em> quod ratione dominetur, <em>aliud quod rationi obtemperet; ipsa</em> ergo <em>cognitio</em> ueluti effectio mulieris est de costa uiri propter coniunctionem significandam. Deinde, ut quiseque huic suae parti recte dominetur, et <em>fiat quasi coniugalis in seipso</em>, ut caro</td>
<td>Mistice. Non possunt hoc <em>oculis</em> corporeis uideri, <em>sed quanto quiseque a uisibilibus</em> ad secreta <em>intelligenitiae secesserit</em> (quod <em>est quasi obdormiscre</em>), tanto melius et sincerius illud uidet. <em>Ipsa</em> ergo <em>cognitio qua intelligitur</em> <em>aliud esse</em> rationem quae imperet, <em>aliud esse quod rationi obtemperet</em>; <em>ipsa cognitio</em> quasi <em>effectio mulieris est de costa uiri propter coniunctionem significandam</em>. Deinde, ut huic suae parti quiseque dominetur, et <em>fiat quasi coniugalis in seipso</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
non concupiscat aduersus spiritum, sed
spiritui subiugetur, id est concupiscetia
carnalis non adueretur rationi, sed potius
obtemperando desinat esse carnalis, opus
habet perfecta sapientia. Cuius
contemplatio quia interior est et secretor
et ab omni sensu corporis remotissima,
conuenienter etiam ista soporis nomine
intelligi potest. Tunc enim ordinatissime
caput mulieris est uir, cum caput uiri est
Christus qui sapientia Dei est.  

This gloss is followed by another, also from De Genesi contra Manichaeos, which provides an
example of a common technique used by the compiler to abbreviate texts for the Glossa
primitiva: an apparent interpolation, created by amending the gloss with a clarifying phrase
taken from a later part of the patristic text. (While I have usually indicated shared text in bold,
in this table I have italicized the interpolation.)

Table 2.5: De Genesi contra Manichaeos and the Glossa primitiva on Genesis 2:21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Augustine, De Genesi contra Manichaeos</th>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sane in locum illius costae carnem adimpleuit, ut hoc nomine insinuaretur dilectionis affectus, quo diligit quisque animam suam, et non est durus ut eam contemnatur, quod diligit quiscue cui praest. Non enim sic nominata est caro isto loco, ut carnalem concupiscientiam significet; sed illo modo potius, quo propheta dicit auferri populo cor lapideum, et dari cor carneum.</td>
<td>Sane in loco illius costae carnem adimpleuit, non ut caro hoc loco carnalem concupiscientiam signet, sed ut affectum dilectionis insinuet, quo quisque diligit animam suam, et non est durus ut eam contemnatur, quod diligit quiscue cui praest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the compiler of the Glossa primitiva does not appear to have been concerned by the
differences in translation between the Vetus latina edition used by Augustine and the Vulgata he

306 Augustine, DGCM II, 16 [CSEL 91, 137–138].
307 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 18v.
308 Augustine, DGCM II, 17 [CSEL 91, 138–139].
309 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 18v.
had to hand—perhaps because both the Carolingian exegetical tradition and the patristic texts themselves addressed matters of translation. However, a gloss taken from the discussion of Genesis 3:22 in De Genesi Contra Manichaeos does provide an example of the way in which translation differences influenced the alteration of the text. First, the compiler exchanged the Vetus latina text found in Augustine’s lemma for that of the Vulgata, which then allowed for further changes to the text:

Table 2.6: De Genesi contra Manichaeos and the Glossa primitiva on Genesis 3:22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Augustine, De Genesi contra Manichaeos</th>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Et tunc ne porrigeret Adam manum suam ad arborem uitae et uiueret in aeternum, dimisit illum Deus de paradiso.* Bene dictum est: *dimisit,* non: exclusit, ut ipso peccatorum suorum pondere tamquam in locum sibi congruum uiuderetur urgeri. Quod patitur plerumque malus homo cum inter bonos uiuere coeperit, si se in melius commutare noluerit: ex illa bonorum congregacione pondere mala consuetudinis suae pellitur, et illi eum non excludunt reluctantem, sed dimittunt cupiditem. Quod autem dictum est: *ne porrigeret Adam manum suam ad arborem uitae,* etiam haec ambigua locutio est. Loquimur enim sic, cum dicimus: ‘ideo te moneo, ne iterum facias quod fecisti’, uolentes utique ut non faciat; et item sic: ‘ideo te moneo, ne forte sis bonus’, uolentes utique ut sit; id est, ‘moneo te non desperans quod bonus possis esse’; Sicut apostolus loquitur, *cum dicit: ne forte det illis Deus paenitentiam ad cognoscendam ueritatem.*
| Nam data sententia *ne forte mittat manum ad arborem uitae et uiuat in aeternum,* dimisit illum Deus de paradiso uoluptatis, id est in locum sibi congruum pondere peccatorum suorum destinauit. Quod patitur plerumque malus cum inter bonos uiuere ceperit, si se in melius mutare noluerit, ex illa bonorum congregatione pondere mala consuetudinis suae pellitur. |

Quod dicit, *Ne forte mittat manum*

Having changed the lemma, the compiler no longer needed to explain the passage through comparison to common speech. However, he retained the comparison to 2 Timothy 2:11—

310 Augustine, *DGCM* II, 34 [CSEL 91:156–157].

311 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 22v.
indeed, as the lemma itself reads _ne forte_, the two texts are much more similar in the text of the _Glossa primitiva_ than they are in Augustine’s original, provided that one only changes the Latin of the lemma, but leaves the quotation from 2 Timothy as it is found in the _Vetus latina_.

Thus far, only the use of Bede’s _Hexameron_ and Augustine’s _De Genesi contra Manichaeos_ has been discussed. This leaves the text which provided the majority of the glosses in the _Glossa primitiva: De Genesi ad litteram_. Some of the passages taken from this text closely follow Augustine’s argument, as seen in the first gloss, discussed above. However, most of the passages from _De Genesi ad litteram_ differ from those taken from Bede and the _De Genesi contra Manichaeos_ insofar as they are not made up of individual extracts abbreviated from distinct sections of the text, with the occasional interpolation, but are composed out of selections from different parts of the text gathered together in order to create a single, lengthy gloss. The difference between the source text and the text of the _Glossa primitiva_ in these glosses is demonstrated in the following example, taken from the treatment of the creation of the planets on the fourth day. Notable in this extract is the interpolation of the phrase “nimimur” into the earlier part of the text, as well as how it moves from citing Augustine almost directly to a passage that is more easily described as an echo or reference than as an extract.

**Table 2.7: De Genesi ad litteram and the Glossa primitiva on Genesis 1:14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Augustine, <em>De Genesi ad litteram</em></th>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vespera autem et mane non quasi per temporis praeteritionem et aduentum, sed per quendam terminum, quo intelligitur quousque sit naturae proprius modus, et unde sit naturae alterius consequenter exordium: an aliqua alia ratio sit horum uerborum diligentius uestiganda?</td>
<td>Vespere autem et mane non intelliguntur quasi per temporis partitionem et aduentum, sed per quendam terminum, quo intelligitur quousque sit naturae propriae modus et unde sit naturae exordium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quis in tantum secretum facile irrumpat, et quae signa dicat, cum dicit de sideribus, et sint in signa? Neque enim illa dicit quae observare uanitatis est; sed utique utilia, et huius uitae usibus necessaria, quae uel uel natuae observant in gubernando, uel omnes homines ad praecuidendas aeris qualitates per aestatem et hiemem, et autumnalem</td>
<td>Nimirum quod dicit de sideribus, et sint in signa, non illa dicit quae obseruare uanitatis est, sed utilitatis et huius uitae usibus necessaria, quae uel uel natuae observant in gubernando, uel omnes homines ad praecuidendas huius aeris qualitates per estatem, per hiemem, per autumnalem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another example of this can be seen when tracing the sources of the following extended passage on the elements, made up of extracts from Book Three of *De Genesi ad litteram*. Identifying the disparate extracts that were used in the compilation of this gloss illustrates the compiler’s sophistication and mastery of his source material. In the chart that follows, in the interest of space, I have only included a portion of this very long gloss. Similarly, space concerns prevent the presentation of Augustine’s text. This chart begins with the discussion of the role of the four elements in the senses, which was extracted from Book Three, Chapter Four, although the compiler has abbreviated Augustine’s text considerably. Here, once again, one sees the phenomenon in which an interpolation is added in order to allow for the deletion of a later section of the text. The two extracts that follow this are an almost exact rendering of part of Chapter Five, and a small piece taken from Chapter Six. The gloss then skips to the second half of Chapter Seven—the first half will be the final extract in this composite text.

Up to this point, the text of the gloss follows the order of Augustine’s argument, with some deletions. The next extract, however, skips back to the second half of Chapter Two, in order to

---

312 Augustine, *DGAL II*, 14 [CSEL 28 III 1, 54–55.]

313 This number is rendered in Roman numerals, and likely reflects an attempt to account for leap years.

314 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 8v.
cite the second half of the paragraph, removing a quote from Lucan referencing Olympus, and replacing it with an unnamed height. The compiler then looked further back to the beginning of Chapter Two, before skipping forward to the beginning of Chapter Three. The final three sections of the gloss were taken, nearly verbatim, from Chapters Four, Six, and Seven. While the text of this gloss has been divided for the purpose of the below chart, in the *Glossa primitiva*, it is presented as one continuous text.

Table 2.8: The sources to an Augustinian gloss from *De Genesi ad litteram*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
<th>Chapter in DGAL Book 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inde quidam ista elementa ita distinguunt ut oculos ad ignem, aures ad aerem dicant pertinere, olfactum uero et gustum humidae naturae attribuant, tactus autem terreno elemento magis congruit. Ignis tamen omnia penetrat ut motum in eis faciat.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchoat enim anima motum suum in omnibus sensibus a subtilitate ignis, sed non in omnibus ad idem peruenit: in uisu enim peruenit represso calore usque ad eius lucem; in auditu usque ad liquidiorem aerem calorem ignis penetrat; in olfactu transit aerem purum, et peruenit ad humidam exalationem, unde crassior haec aura subsistit; in gustu uero et hanc transit, et peruenit ad humorem corpulentiorem, quo traiecto, cum ad terrenam peruenit grauitatem, tangendi ultimum sensum agit.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunc ordinem non ignorabat qui conditionem eorum quae intra mundum sit introducens, prius caelestia luminaria, deinde aquarum animantia, terrarum autem postrema narravit. Nec aerem praetermisit, sed purissimam et quietissimam eius partem caelo, turbulentam uero aquae uel terrae deputavit.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vnde etiam psalmus omnia superiora caeli nomine dicendo <em>laudate Domino de caelis</em>; omnia uero inferiora terrae nomine comprehendit dicendo <em>laudate Domino de terra</em>. Vbi et spiritus tempestatis et omnis abyssi nominantur et ignis iste qui urit tangentem, qui de terrenis et humidis motibus ita existit ut subinde uertatur in aliud elementum, ac per hoc in superiorem tranquillitatem euadere non ualens, in ista pigriori parte turbulentis motibus agitatur ad temperandum eius rigorem, et ad usus terroresque mortalium.</td>
<td>7 (2nd half)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In summo autem aer tam tenuis esse perhibetur, ut neque nubibus obumbretur, nec uento turbetur, nec sustentare alites possit, nec ipsos qui forte ascenderint homines, crassioris aurae spiritu alere, sicut in isto aere consueuerunt. Et tamen et ipse aer est et in humidam naturam tempore diluuuii conuersus creditur.</td>
<td>2 (2nd half)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aerios etiam caelos quondam perisse diluuo in quadam canonica epistola legitur quod aliter intelligendum non est, nisi in aquirum naturam pinguioris huius aeris qualitate conuersa.

De conuersione uero elementorum non parua questio est. Alii enim dicunt omnia in omnia posse conuerti; aliui uero esse omnino aliiquid proprium singulis perhibent elementis quod in alterius elementi qualitatem nullomodo uertatur.

Dicitur etiam nec uideri sine aliiquid, nec tangi sine terra. Ac per hoc elementa omnia in omnibus inesse, sed unumquodque eorum ex eo quod amplius habet accepisse uocabulum. Ideo autem caloris priuatione, cum corpus nimie frigescit, obtundi sensum, quia motus pigrescit qui ex calore inest corpori, dum ignis aerem, et aer humida, et humor terrena quaeque afficit, subtilioribus scilicet crassiora penetrantibus.

Aer itaque ille superior, siue quod ad caelestem mundi pertinet partem, siue quod nullum habet visibilem habitatorem, de qualibet nunc sermo est, neque pretermissum est celo nominato, neque annumeratus in creandis animalibus iste uero inferior qui nonnisi ex aquis accipit animalia. Quod enim eius humidum est, hoc portat alitum corpora, que ita nituntur pennis uolantes, quemadmodum pisces quibusdam suiis alis natantes,

unde ex aquis dicitur producta uolatilia. Aquarum enim natura bipartitum locum sortita est: inferiorem scilicet in unda labili, superiorem uero in aura flabili, illum deputatum natantibus, istum uolantibus. Sicut huic elemento congruos duos etiam sensus animalibus datos uidemus: olfactum explorandis uaporibus, gustatum explorandis liquoribus. Quod enim et tactu aquas uentosque sentimus, hoc est quod terrae solidum omnibus admiscetur elementis, sed in his crassioribus sentitur amplius.

This completes the survey of the passages for which a patristic source can be identified. However, as shown in Table One, there are also a number of passages in the Glossa primitiva that cannot be traced to a patristic source, although they frequently contain echoes of patristic commentaries on the creation account. These appear to come from a medieval source. The most prominent passages of this type come early in the text, and explain the manner in which the book of Genesis was inspired, Moses’ purpose in writing the book, and its title, which suggests that the author of these glosses was inspired by the tradition of the accessus. They read:

---

315 Here, Augustine’s text reads, “dicunt etiam nec videri sine igne posse aliquid...” igne has been omitted from the text of Pn.

316 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 9v.
Sicut enim Paulus apostolus per revelationem didicit euangelium ita Moyses, docente Spiritu Sancto, conditi mundi cognouit exordium.


Notandum quod haec historia a suo principio more Hebreorum generatio caeli et terrae uocatur, sicut euangelica Mathei historia “liber geneationis Ihesu Christi” appellatur, cum utraque scriptura multa in sequentibus contineat in quibus nulla generationis mentio fiat. Introducit quippe haec historia primum hominem futuri formam utpote de terra uirgine conditum per quem generandi
erant terreni in uitam transitoriam, sicut euangelium novum hominem inducit de matre uirgine factum per quem caelestes homines regenerandi erant in uitam aeternam. In hac ergo scriptura figurae sunt futurorum, in euangelio uero manifestatio completorum.\textsuperscript{317}

The patristic authority who appears to have had the greatest influence on the author of these glosses is Augustine, which may explain the presence of heavily reworked and abbreviated Augustinian glosses, such as the following passage on God’s creation of the world through his word:

Dixitque Deus in uerbo coeternaliter sibi coherente, \textit{fiat lux} ea conditione qua cuncta subsistunt intemporaliter in aeterna Dei sapientia antequam in se ipsis subsistant. \textit{Et facta est lux}, id est, angelica et caelestis substantia ita in se ipsa temporaliter sicut erat in Dei sapientia quantum ad eius incommutabilitatem pertinet aeternaliter. Huius autem creaturae informitas erat imperfectio antequam solidaretur in amore conditoris; formatur autem cum convertitur ad incommutabile lumen uerbi Dei. \textit{Et uidit Deus quod esset bona} id est, placuit ei ea benignitate quod factum est qua placuit ei ut fieret. Sic enim diligit Deus creaturam suam ut sit et ut maneat.\textsuperscript{318}

Other glosses combine medieval text from an unidentifiable source with extracts from Augustine. One example, an extended discussion on the calculation of the calendar, was cited in Table 2.2. This gloss begins and ends with passages from \textit{De Genesi ad litteram}, while the middle section comes from a source that cannot be identified. This is also true for some extracts from \textit{De Genesi contra Manichaeos}, as cited below. I have marked the extract from Augustine in bold font:

\textsuperscript{317} Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.

\textsuperscript{318} Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6v.
Mistice. *Terra autem erat inanis* quae deposuerat formam bonam et uacua boni operis fructu. *Et tenebrae erant*, id est ueri luminis priuatio erat in corpore superbiorum. *Et spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas*, id est super corda superborum fluitantia quae tranquillitatem mentis amiserant quia spiritus sanctus eis non immittebatur sed superferebatur potens quando uellet naturam humanam a confusione reuocare et in melius reformare. **Deinde per totum textum huius scripturae sex quasdam operosas aetates uidemus quasi limitibus suis distinctas, ut in septima seperetur quies et easdem sex aetates habere similitudinem sex dierum in quibus ea facta sunt quae fecisse scriptura commemorat.**

The medieval glosses, therefore, appear to be part of a commentary that depended on Augustine’s commentaries for their understanding of the creation account.

Medieval glosses are not only found in the commentary on the first three chapters of Genesis. Given that there was a long history of commentaries on the creation alone, it is unsurprising to find that the sources of the marginal glosses on Genesis 4 differ from those of the previous three chapters. It is remarkable, however, how few of the glosses on Genesis 4 can be traced to a patristic source. Except for a few glosses from Bede and one attributed to the translator Aquila of Sinope (fl. second century AD), the sources of the marginal gloss on Genesis 4 are impenetrable. All the passages that can be attributed to a source, in a stylistic change from the glosses on the previous three chapters, have their *auctores* cited at the beginning of the gloss.

The Augustinian focus of the marginal commentary on Genesis 1–3 is echoed in the interlinear glosses of the *Glossa primitiva*. Many of these glosses appear to be meant as notes, summarizing the marginal text—a memory aid for one already familiar with the more extended

---

texts. For example, the interlinear glosses on the creation of light summarize Augustine’s interpretation of the light as the minds of the angels and read:

Dixitque Deus, fiat lux et facta est lux:

Dixitque. abhinc distinguic
Dixitque. Non temporaliter, nec uocis sono, sed in uerbo suo, id est per uerbum suum fecit.
fiat lux. angelica natura uel lux corporalis
facta est lux. angelica natura conversione ad Deum
formata

The same Augustinian emphasis is seen in repeated interlinear glosses, “causaliter” and “actualiter”, which explain the repetition of the Hexameron narrative according to Augustine’s neoplatonic system. Thus, the interlinear glosses on the third day of creation read:

Et uocauit Deus aridam terram. Congregationesque aquarum appelauit maria. Et uidit Deus quod esset bonum et ait,
Germinet terra herbam uirentem et facientem semen et lignum pomiferum faciens fructum iuxta genus suum cuius semen in semet ipso sit super terram. Et factum est ita.

uidit. quod placuit in uerbo placuit in facto
Germinet. accipiat potentiam germinandi
cuius semen. de quo similia propagentur
Et factum est ita. causaliter

Et protulit terra herbam uirentem et facientem semen iuxta genus suum lignumque faciens fructum et habens

---

320 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14398, fol. 6v–7r.
321 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 8r–8v.
unumquodque semen secundum speciem suam. Et uidit Deus quod esset bonum.

Et protulit. actualiter

iuxta genus. de tritico triticum, de legumine legumen

Similar glosses referring to the marginal text are found in the later passages of Genesis 1–3 as well. For example, the following gloss on Genesis 2:5 refers back to a spiritual interpretation made in the marginal text:

Et omnem uirgultum agri antequam oriretur in terra
omnemque herbam regionis priusquam germinaret: non enim
pluerat Dominus Deus super terram et homo non erat qui
operaretur terram.

antequam. antequam mens humana terrena
concupisceret.

The corresponding marginal gloss reads, “Quod uero dicit antequam oriretur in terra, hoc intelligitur antequam anima peccaret, id est terrenis cupiditatibus sordidaretur”.

Another interlinear gloss addresses the reader directly, instructing him on how the text is to be interpreted:

Iste sunt generationes caeli et terrae quando creatae sunt in
die quo fecit Deus caelum et terram.

Iste. conclusio superiorum, siue historice siue mistice
legas.
While the marginal glosses of the *Glossa primitiva* contain a substantial amount of text taken from Bede’s *Hexameron*, these extracts do not appear to have influenced the interlinear glosses. From the theology of the medieval glosses to the combination of extracts from the *De Genesi ad litteram* and the *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* with commentary of an unknown source and the focus of the interlinear glosses, the history of the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3 appears inescapably Augustinian.

13 London, Lambeth Palace Library, 349 and the History of the *Glossa primitiva*

The glosses of indeterminate source found in the *Glossa primitiva* on the first chapters of Genesis show up repeatedly in twelfth-century commentaries on Genesis, particularly the “Sicut Paulus...” gloss.\(^\text{326}\) Searching through the non-*Glossae* manuscripts in which this gloss is found leads one to London, Lambeth Palace 349 (*L*), a twelfth-century gloss on Genesis copied in the simple format. Before it entered the Lambeth Palace Library, this manuscript belonged to the monastic community at Lanthony, and its text has been described as an example of the *Glossa Salomonis*, a simple-format gloss which survives in three English manuscripts.\(^\text{327}\) While the manuscript is still in its medieval binding, there are no definitive clues as to its origin in the manuscript, although the hand in which it is copied—a standard protogothic similar to those of *Pn* and *Pf*—is Continental, not English. Containing the majority of the unidentified glosses, a substantial number of the Augustinian glosses, and an interlinear text almost identical to that of *Pn*, the Lambeth gloss is clearly closely related to the *Glossa primitiva*, albeit with fewer marginal glosses.

Returning to Tables 2.1 and 2.2, which present the sources to some sections of the *Glossa primitiva*, and marking those passages which appear in the Lambeth gloss, a relationship


\(^{327}\) The manuscripts containing the *Glossa Salomonis are* London, British Library, Royal MS 4 A X, Dublin, Trinity College Dublin, 45; and London, British Library, Additional 63077, which is described in the catalog as a manuscript of the *Glossa ordinaria*. 

between the two texts becomes clear. These tables are below, with the portions of the text that are shared with the Lambeth text in bold. In the commentary on Genesis 1:1, the Lambeth gloss shares all the glosses of indeterminate source:

Table 2.9: The glosses of the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1:1 compared to the Lambeth Gloss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss Incipit</th>
<th>Gloss Explicit</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cum diuinos libros legimus...</td>
<td>...non inutele est eruisse sententiam.</td>
<td>Augustine, <em>De Genesi ad litteram</em> I, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In rebus obscuris atque a nostris oculis...</td>
<td>...nostram esse debeamus.</td>
<td>Augustine, <em>De Genesi ad litteram</em> I, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In narratione rerum factarum...</td>
<td>...<em>in principio fecit deus celum et terram</em>.</td>
<td>Augustine, <em>De Genesi ad litteram</em> I, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicut enim Paulus apostolus...</td>
<td>...<em>conditi mundi cognouit exordium</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notandum quod Moyses in hoc libro...</td>
<td>...sequuntur distinctiones diuersorum operum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notandum quod hec historia a suo principio...</td>
<td>...<em>uero manifestatio completorum</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato tria principia omnium...</td>
<td>...ipsum esse initium uniuersorum.</td>
<td>Rabanus Maurus, <em>Abhreviatio commentariorum in Genesim</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creationem enim mundi insinuans...</td>
<td>...ab homine dici non possit.</td>
<td>Bede, <em>In Genesim</em> I, 1, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ait igitur <em>in principio creauit</em>...</td>
<td>...et illuminatur ut non sit tenebre.</td>
<td>Augustine, <em>De Genesi ad litteram</em> I, 2–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystice. <em>In principio creauit Deus celum. Id est eos qui</em>...</td>
<td>...<em>hominis imaginem portantes se fecerunt</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A study of Table 2.2 shows that the Lambeth gloss also shares the glosses from *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, including the heading “Mystice”, with the *Glossa primitiva*. Notably, in the Lambeth gloss, many of the glosses from *De Genesi ad litteram* are headed “Historice”, a

---

328 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r; London, Lambeth Palace, 349, fol. 1v.
practice which is not found in the *Glossa primitiva*. Comparing Table 2.2 to the Lambeth Gloss shows one reason for the latter text’s shorter length: unlike the *Glossa primitiva*, it contains no glosses from Bede’s *In Genesim*. However, the Lambeth gloss and the *Glossa primitiva* do share the most reworked glosses from Augustine, such as the one on the calculation of the calendar which was discussed in Table 2.7, and whose sources are charted here.

Table 2.10: The glosses of the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1:14 compared to the Lambeth Gloss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss incipit</th>
<th>Gloss explicit</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Et dixit Deus, fiant luminaria...</em> Quia uisibili mundo duo...</td>
<td><em>...motibus sidereum...</em></td>
<td>Augustine, <em>De Genesi ad litteram II, 13</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>uel forsitan circa speciem rei...</em></td>
<td><em>...anni solaris.</em></td>
<td>Augustine, <em>De Genesi ad litteram II, 14</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sic et reliqui planetae...</em></td>
<td><em>...quatuor anni temporae determinat.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Luna etiam post equinoctium uernale...</em></td>
<td><em>...temere credendum est.</em></td>
<td>Augustine, <em>De Genesi ad litteram II, 15</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dixit autem Deus, fiant luminaria in firmamento celi...</em></td>
<td><em>...redduntur lucida fulgore.</em></td>
<td>Bede, <em>In Genesim</em>, I, i, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Et sint in signa</em> et cetera. Quia nimirum priusquam sydera...*</td>
<td><em>...lumine primario adhuc generaliter omnia replente.</em></td>
<td>Bede, <em>In Genesim</em>, I, i, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Et luceant in firmamento celi,</em> et cetera. Semper quidem luminaria...*</td>
<td><em>...stellis per diem terris fulgeat.</em></td>
<td>Bede, <em>In Genesim</em> I, i, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fecit Deus duo magna luminaria.</em> Luminaria magna possumus...*</td>
<td><em>...maior refulgeret proderet exiguitatis indiciwm.</em></td>
<td>Bede, <em>In Genesim</em> I, i, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Luminare maius,</em> et cetera. Luminare maius est sol...*</td>
<td><em>...posita solent breuiora uideri.</em></td>
<td>Bede, <em>In Genesim</em>, I, i, 16–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Et luminare minus quia etsi lunam omni mense...</em></td>
<td><em>...afferre certissimum est.</em></td>
<td>Bede, <em>In Genesim</em>, I, i, 16–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vt lucerent super terram,</em> et cetera. Hec et de luminaribus...*</td>
<td><em>...sed minime adhuc sol ortus refulget.</em></td>
<td>Bede, <em>In Genesim</em> I, i, 17–18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These charts give a broad sense of which glosses are shared between the two manuscripts, a sense that is only confirmed and clarified by comparing the complete text of one of the glosses contained by both manuscripts. This can be seen in the following, heavily altered extract from the De Genesi Contra Manichaeos on the temptation of Adam and Eve:

Table 2.11: The Glossa primitiva and Lambeth Gloss on Genesis 3:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>De Genesi contra Manichaeos</th>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
<th>Lambeth Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serpens autem significat Diabolum, qui sane non erat simplex. Quod enim dicitur sapientior omnibus bestiis, figurate insinuat eius uersutia. Non autem dictum est quod in paradiso erat serpens, sed erat serpens inter bestias quas fecit deus. Paradisus namque beatam uiam, ut superius dixi, significat, in qua iam non erat serpens, quia iam Diabolus erat et de sua beatitudine ceciderat, quia in ueritate non stetit...</td>
<td>Serpens significat Diabolum qui non est simplex. Vnde sequitur, Serpens erat callidior cunctis animantibus quo figurate significatur eius uersutia.</td>
<td>Serpens significat Diabolum qui non est simplex. Vnde sequitur, serpens erat callidior cunctis animantibus quo figurate significatur eius uersutia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quomodo enim [Diabolus - ed] accessit ad Iudam, quando ei persuasit ut dominum traderet? Numquid in locis per hos locutio itaque ista intelligenda est occulta temptatio quomodo accessit ad Iudam quando ei</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paradisus uero supra beatam uiam signat in qua iam serpens non erat qui iam Diabolus erat et de sua beatitudine ceciderat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

329 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 8v–9v; London, Lambeth Palace, 349, fol. 2v.
oculos ei uisus est? Sed utique, ut dictum est, in cor eius intrauit. Repellit autem illum homo, si paradisum custodiat. Posuit enim Deus hominem in paradiso ut operaretur et custodiret, quia sic et ecclesia dicitur in Canticis canticorum: *hortus conclusus, fons signatus*; quo utique non admittitur peruersitis ille persuasor. Sed tamen per mulierem decipit: non enim etiam ratio nostra deduci ad consensionem peccati potest, nisi cum delectatio mota fuerit in illa parte animi, quae debet obtemperare rationi tamquam uiro rectori.  

While the Lambeth text appears at first glance to be a source for the *Glossa primitiva*, the relationship between the Lambeth text and the *primitiva* is not so simple. First, there is the question of why the Lambeth gloss contains only some of the Augustinian material. It includes all of the Hexameron glosses from *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* but leaves out many glosses from the *De Genesi ad litteram*. A further complication is seen insofar as, while many of the shared glosses are found in their entirety in both texts, there are some places in which the glosses in the Lambeth text are clearly missing sections of the text that are found in the glosses of the *Glossa primitiva*. For example, in the Lambeth gloss, a middle section of the gloss on the calculation of the calendar, described above, is missing.

A third complication is found in the glosses on the beginning of Genesis 2. While in the commentary on Genesis 1, 3, and 4, the glosses of the Lambeth text can be easily matched to glosses in the *Glossa primitiva*, in the glosses on Genesis 2, it is less clear whether or not the

330 Augustine, *DGCM* II, 20 [CSEL 91,141–142].

331 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 20r.

332 London, Lambeth Palace, 349, fol. 7v.
two texts are related. When individual glosses are compared, the texts appear to be treating the same questions and sourcing the same texts, but the Lambeth glosses are more abbreviated and further from the source text. This can be seen in the example given below:

Table 2.12: The *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth gloss on Genesis 2:2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>De Genesi ad litteram</th>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
<th>Lambeth Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potest etiam intelligi Deum requieuisse a condendis generibus creaturae, quia ultra iam non condidit aliqua genera noua, deinceps autem usque nunc et ultra operari eorumdem generum administrationem, quae tunc instituta sunt, non ut ipso saltem die septimo potentia eius a caeli et terrae omniumque rerum quas considerat gubernatione cessaret, alioquin continuo dilaberentur. Creatoris namque potentia et omnipotentis atque omnitenentis uirtus causa subsistendi est omni creaturae... Proinde et quod Dominus ait, <em>pater meus usque modo operatur</em>, continuationem quandam operis eius, qua universam creaturam continet atque administrat, ostendit. 333... Denique ipse nec, cum creauit, defessus nec, cum cessauit, refectus est, sed nos uoluit per scripturam suam ad quietis exhortari desiderium intimando nobis cum diem se sanctificasse, in quo quieuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potest etiam intelligi Deum requieuisse a condendis generibus creaturae, qui [sic] ultra iam non condidit aliqua opera noua, deinceps autem usque nunc operatur eorumdem generum administrationem quae tunc instituta sunt, non ut ipso saltem die septima potentia eius a caeli et terre omnemque rerum quas considerat gubernatione cessaret, alioquin continuo dilaberentur. Creatoris namque uirtus causa subsistendi est omni creature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sed intelligi potest Deum requieuisse a condendis generibus creature, quia iam ultra non condidit aliqua genera noua non ut ipso saltem die septimo potentia eius a celi et terre omniuque rerum &lt;conditarum&gt; gubernatione et administratione cessaret, aliquando continuo dilaberetur. Vnde uerum est quod et septimo die requieuit et quia nunc usque operatur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

333 Augustine, *DGAL IV*, 12 [CSEL 28 III 1, 108].
As will be argued below, these glosses provide crucial evidence that the Lambeth gloss is a witness to a shared source, and not an abbreviation of the *Glossa primitiva*.

The glosses on Genesis 3 return to the pattern seen in the glosses on Genesis 1. The Lambeth Gloss has fewer glosses, all of which can be found in the *Glossa primitiva*. Just as in the *primitiva*, the Lambeth glosses on Genesis 3 can all be traced to Augustine’s *De Genesi ad litteram* or *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*. The glosses on Genesis 4 are not Augustinian, and are likely medieval. Most of these are shared between the *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth gloss. The few glosses from Bede present in the *Glossa primitiva*’s commentary on Genesis 4 are not found in *L*. The interlinear glosses match throughout all four chapters.

The presence of glosses in the *Glossa primitiva* which are missing sentences in the Lambeth text, or which follow the source text more closely in the *Glossa primitiva* than they do in Lambeth, indicates that Lambeth is not the source of the *Glossa primitiva*. It appears, rather, that the Lambeth gloss and the *Glossa primitiva* are based upon the same lost source text, a proto-*Glossa*, which was itself made up of both marginal and interlinear glosses. This, in turn, suggests that the history of the *Glossa* on Genesis is yet older than the *Glossa primitiva*, and the indication that the proto-*Glossa* on Genesis was copied in a gloss format suggests that the history of the *Glossae* on Genesis differs from that seen in recent work on other books of the *Glossa ordinaria*, such as that by Alexanderandrée, who has found evidence that the text was built on continuous commentaries.  

The first argument in favor of this interpretation of the relationship between the two texts is one of probability, as well as of the psychology of medieval commentators. Given a text like the

336 London, Lambeth Palace 349, fol. 4v.
334 Augustine, *DGAL IV*, 13 [*CSEL* 28 III 1, 110].
335 Paris, Bibliothèque municipale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 12r.
Glossa primitiva and the medieval dependence upon the transmitted texts of the auctores in biblical exegesis, the decision to remove all citations from Bede and many from Augustine while including the glosses from an unknown source would have been radical. It also assumes that the scholar who was abbreviating the Glossa primitiva on Genesis 1–3 was able to accurately identify which glosses were from Bede in the first place, given that the Glossa primitiva on these chapters contain no attributions for their glosses. This is particularly true given the Lambeth glosses on Genesis 2, which abbreviates the text of the Glossa primitiva with far greater efficiency than those on Genesis 1, Genesis 3 (which includes no unidentifiable glosses), or Genesis 4. Could not an author who was able to rework Augustine with such skill manage to change the text such that some of the extracts from Bede might be included?

One may wonder if the stage of the gloss format found in the manuscripts of the Glossa primitiva and the Lambeth gloss can be brought to bear on this question. However, the fact that the Lambeth gloss is copied in a simple format, while the Glossa primitiva in intermediate formats, does not—strictly speaking—prove that the Lambeth gloss is the earlier text. While the general course of the development of the Glossae was in favor of more efficient use of parchment, it is not impossible for a scribe to have copied a gloss from the intermediate format into the simple format, particularly as the simple format is (as the name suggests) easier to achieve.

One might assume, based on a quick survey of the available evidence, that the Lambeth gloss is only an abbreviation of the Glossa primitiva, similar to a primitiva-based Glose perimée in a Troyes manuscript noted by Philippe Buc in his doctoral dissertation. It was noted above that there are some sections of shared glosses that are missing from the Lambeth gloss, making the Glossa primitiva a better witness to their contents. Similarly, the Glossa primitiva glosses on Genesis 2 follow the patristic sources more faithfully than the heavily reworked text of the Lambeth gloss. This could be used in support of the idea that the Lambeth gloss is an abbreviation of the Glossa primitiva. However, at other places in the text, the Lambeth gloss offers the more faithful reading of the source texts, and I will argue that these passages support

---

my theory that the Lambeth gloss and the *Glossa primitiva* are both witnesses to a prior, lost commentary on Genesis.

First, there is a passage from *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* in which the *Glossa primitiva* divides a sentence between two glosses in a strange manner. In both the *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth gloss (and thus, one presumes, in the proto-*Glossa*), most of the extracts from the *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* are taken from Augustine’s interpretation of the Hexameron in Book One, Chapter Twenty-Three, in which he discusses each day of creation as representative of an age of biblical history and of one of the ages of man. At the end of each of these extracts, a moral interpretation of the day is appended, taken from Chapter Twenty-Five. Thus, the mystical and moral interpretation of the second day of creation, as found in the *Glossa primitiva*, reads as follows:

Mystice. Incipit mane secundi diei a temporibus Noe tanquam pueritia, et tenditur hec aetas usque ad Abraham aliis generationibus decem. Et bene comparatur secundo diei, quo factum est firmamentum inter aquam et aquam, quia et archa in qua erat Noe cum filiis suis firmamentum erat inter aquas inferiores in quibus natabat et superiores quibus compluebatur. Haec aetas non diluuio deletur quia et pueritia nostra non obliuione tergitur de memoria.\(^{339}\) Meminimus enim nos pueros fuisse; infantes autem non meminimus. Huius uespera est confusio linguarum in eis qui turrim faciebant et sit mane ab Abraham. Sed nec ista aetas secunda generauit populum dei quia nec pueritia apta est ad generandum.\(^{340}\) Secundo die factum est tamquam firmamentum disciplinae quod discernit inter carnalia et spiritualia sicut inter inferiores aquas et superiores.\(^{341}\)

---

\(^{339}\) tergitur is an error for tegitur


\(^{341}\) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 8r; cf. Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* I, 43 [CSEL 91,112].
The text of the *Glossa primitiva* on the fourth day begins in a similar fashion, comparing the splendor of the sun to the reign of King David. However, when one compares the moral interpretation of the fourth day to the source text, one notes that it breaks off mid-sentence:

Table 2.13: The *Glossa primitiva* on the Fourth Day of Creation

Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*  

Quarto die, quo iam in illo firmamento disciplinae spirituales intelligentias operatur atque distinguitt, uidet quid sit incommutabilis ueritas quae tanquam sol fulget in anima, et quemadmodum anima ipsius ueritatis particeps fiat, et corpori ordinem et pulchritudinem praestet tamquam luna illuminans noctem, et quemadmodum stellae omnes, intelligentiae spirituales, in huius uitae obscuritate tamquam in nocte micent et fulgeant. *Quarum rerum notitia fortior effectus* incipiat quinto die in actionibus turbulentissimi saeculi, tamquam in aquis maris operari propter utilitatem fraternae societatis et de corporalibus actionibus...

When one compares Augustine’s text to that found in the *Glossa primitiva*, one notes that the final clause, “*quarum rerum notitia fortior effectus*”, is introducing the discussion of the fifth day. The text of the *Glossa primitiva* picks up the moral interpretation of the fifth day accordingly, beginning, “Incipit etiam proyecta mens quinto die in actionibus turbulentissimi seculi tanquam in aquis maris operari, propter utilitatem fraterne societatis et de corporalibus agnitionibus que ad ipsum mare pertinent...”. Reference to the Lambeth Gloss, which retains the sentence as it is found in the *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, makes clear how this type of error might have occurred. This particular gloss is one of the few in *L* that, due to a lack of space in the margins, is broken across two folios, with a tie-mark to mark the continuation of

---

342 Augustine, *DGCM* I, 43 [CSEL 91,112–113].
343 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 9r.
344 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 10r.
the text. This break in the text happens at precisely the place where the sentence breaks off in the *Glossa primitiva*.\textsuperscript{345} It thus seems likely that the placement of the text in \textit{L} coincides with the formatting in the proto-*Glossa*, and that the compiler of the *Glossa primitiva*, wanting to join the mystical and moral interpretations to match the other extracts from \textit{De Genesi contra Manichaeos}, either ignored or missed the tie-mark, thus preserving the inaccurate break in the sentence.

Further evidence that the Lambeth gloss is more than an abbreviation of the *Glossa primitiva* is found in the apparent interpolations in the glosses on the beginning of Genesis 2, where wording and phrases are used that do not appear in the *Glossa primitiva*, but which do appear in the source text. For example, the following discussion of the second creation account is taken from Augustine’s *De Genesi ad litteram*. Of the two ways of abbreviating Augustine’s text, the *Glossa primitiva* preserves more of Augustine’s wording. However, the extract from the Lambeth gloss is still identifiably drawn from Augustine’s text and retains the words, “\textit{iam dicit}”, not found in the *Glossa primitiva*.

Table 2.14: The *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth Gloss on Genesis 2:4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Augustine, <em>De Genesi ad litteram</em>,</th>
<th><em>Glossa primitiva</em></th>
<th>Lambeth Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quandoquidem apertius</td>
<td>quandoquidem sancta</td>
<td>quandoquidem sacra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sancta scriptura iam dicit,</td>
<td>scriptura concludens</td>
<td>scriptura iam dicit, breui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concludens quodammodo</td>
<td>cuncta quae ab initio</td>
<td>recapitulatione cuncta que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuncta, quae ab initio usque</td>
<td>usque ad hunc locum</td>
<td>ab initio usque ad hunc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad hunc locum dixerat...\textsuperscript{346}</td>
<td>dixerat...\textsuperscript{347}</td>
<td>locum dixerat...\textsuperscript{348}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar example is found in an Augustinian gloss discussing the description of the river flowing from Paradise. Here the Lambeth gloss differs significantly from the *Glossa primitiva*, and may reflect the text of the proto-*Glossa*. This is shown in the following table:

---

\textsuperscript{345} London, Lambeth Palace, 349, fol. 3r–3v.

\textsuperscript{346} Augustine, *DGAL* V,1 [CSEL 28 III 1, 137].

\textsuperscript{347} Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 13r.

\textsuperscript{348} London, Lambeth Palace, 349, fol. 5r.
Table 2.15: The *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth Gloss on Genesis 2:10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Augustine, <em>De Genesi ad litteram</em></th>
<th><em>Glossa primitiva</em></th>
<th>Lambeth Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ut sic intelligamus fontes multos per uniuersam terram loca uel regiones proprias irrigantes, sicut dicitur miles, et multi intelliguntur, sicut dicta est locusta et rana in plagis quibus Aegyptii percussi sunt, cum esset innumerabilis locustarum numerus et ranarum: iam non diutius laboremus.</td>
<td>ut sic per unum fontem intelligamus multos</td>
<td>ut sic intelligamus multis fontes per uniuersam terram, loca, uel regiones proprias irrigantes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sicut cum dicitur miles et intelliguntur multi.</strong></td>
<td><strong>sicut dicitur miles et multi sunt,</strong> <strong>sicut dicitur locusta et rana in plagis Egipti cum esset innumerabilis numerus locustarum et ranarum.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A third example of these interpolations is found in the Lambeth gloss on Genesis 2:8, where the Lambeth gloss has acquired an interpolation from elsewhere in Augustine’s text. This is a notable passage, as it is also a gloss in which the *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth gloss share an alteration to the text. Where Augustine’s exegesis reads, “*Plantauit ergo Deus paradisum in deliciis (hoc est enim in Eden)*”, both the *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth Gloss switch the position of “Eden” and “deliciis”, suggesting, at some point, a shared source for the two versions of the gloss. The Lambeth Gloss retains the phrase, “Sic scriptum est quia sic factum est” of the original, while the *Glossa primitiva*—which is, on the whole, less accurate to Augustine’s texts—has kept the adjective “breuiter”. The biblical passage cited at the end of the Lambeth version is closer to the *Vulgata* edition than it is to the *Glossa primitiva*, which retains the *Vetus latina* of Augustine’s text.

Table 2.16: The *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth Gloss on Genesis 2:8

---

349 Augustine, *DGAL* V, 10 [CSEL 28 III 1, 154].
351 London, Lambeth Palace, 349, fol. 5v.
352 “locum scilicet amoenissimum fructuosum nemoribus opacatum, eundemque magnum et magno fonte fecundum” Augustine, *DGAL* VIII, 1 [CSEL 28 III 1, 231].
Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram

Plantauit ergo Deus paradisum in deliciis—hoc est enim in Eden—ad orientem et posuit ibi hominem, quem finxerat. Sic enim scriptum est, quia sic factum est. Deinde recapitulat, ut hoc ipsum, quod breuiter posuit, ostendat quemadmodum factum sit, hoc est quemadmodum paradisum Deus plantauerit et illic hominem, quem finxerat, constituerit. Sic enim sequitur: Et eiecit adhuc Deus de terra omne lignum pulchrum ad aspectum, et cetera. 353

Glossa primitiva

Plantauerit autem Deus paradisum in Eden, hoc est in deliciis quod recapitulat ut breuiter ostendat quemadmodum paradisum Deus plantauerit dicens et eiecit Deus de terra omne lignum et cetera. 354

Lambeth Gloss

Plantauit ergo Deus paradisum in Eden, id est in delitiis locus scilicet amenissimum fructuosum nemoribus opacum magno fonte fecundum. Sic scriptum est, quia sic factum est. Deinde recapitulat et ostendit quomodo factum sit, et produxit Deus de terra omne lignum pulcrum ad aspectum et bonum ad escam. 355

Working from these examples, the most likely explanation for the differences between the Glossa primitiva and the Lambeth gloss on Genesis 1-3 is that the compiler of the Glossa primitiva was working from a preexisting gloss commentary on the whole of Genesis, expanding the Hexameron text with new extracts taken from both the De Genesi ad litteram and from Bede’s In Hexameron. It is not necessary to imagine that the compiler was emending the text from the source texts themselves. What is likely is that the Glossa primitiva is a combination of two commentaries: the proto-Glossa, and a continuous commentary composed of extracts from De Genesi ad litteram and Bede. The difference in the treatment of the Augustinian (and other) material in the glosses on Genesis 2 could thus be explained by the compiler, faced with the large amount of the source material—given that the Lambeth

353 Augustine, DGAL VIII, 3 [CSEL 28 III 1, 233–234].
354 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 15v.
355 London, Lambeth Palace, 349, fol. 6r.
manuscript is more heavily glossed at that point of the text than at others—choosing to copy only the second commentary, rather than a combination of the two.

This theory is further supported by the presence of duplicate glosses, in which Augustinian extracts that follow the original text closely, likely from the continuous commentary, appear to re-state claims that were already made in a more heavily altered gloss. For example, one may consider the two glosses on the phrase “fiat lux”. Above, a heavily reworked Augustinian passage on the creation of light was presented as an example of the Glossa primitiva’s apparent use of an intermediate commentary. This gloss is also found in the Lambeth gloss. However, a second gloss on the same topic, taken directly from Augustine, is found only in the Glossa primitiva:

Item dixit Deus, fiat lux. Lux ista quae primo die facta est spiritualis uel corporalis intelligitur. Si autem spiritualis lux facta est non illa Patri coeterna intelligenda est per quam facta sunt omnia sed illa de qua dicitur, prior omnium creatum est sapientia, et ipsa est intellectualis et angelica ut quae nisi ad creatorem conuersa fluitaret informiter. Quae uidelicet potest esse prima creatura primo caelum appellata cum dictum est, in principio fecit Deus caelum et terram, sed iam his uerbis perfecta et ad creatorem conuersa cum dicitur, dixit Deus fiat lux et fecit lux. In qua luce spirituali forsitan diuisio lucis a tenebris distinctio intelligitur iam rei formatae ab informe.

This composite-of-two-commentaries hypothesis explains several of the features of the Glossa primitiva that were noted at the beginning of this chapter. First, if the Glossa primitiva was formed through a combination of two commentaries, one of which provided new Augustinian glosses and the texts taken from Bede, it would explain why the extracts from Bede appear as

---


357 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6v–7r. cf. Augustine, DGAL I, 17 [CSEL 28 III 1, 23–24].
large blocks of text, rather than intermittently, interspersed between extracts from other sources. (Of course, this characteristic does not require a second commentary, and could have been produced through reference to the original sources.) The double-source theory also explains why the treatment of some Augustinian glosses differs radically from that of others in regard to the fidelity of the source text. The more heavily altered glosses, and those that combine Augustinian extracts with new material, are primarily those that also appear in the Lambeth gloss. This suggests that the reworking of the source material happened in the compilation of the proto-Glossa, not the Glossa primitiva.

Understanding the Glossa primitiva on Genesis 1–3 as a combination of two commentaries, one a continuous commentary and one a series of interlinear and marginal glosses, also explains why the Glossa primitiva on the hexameron contains more marginal material than the Lambeth gloss, while the interlinear glosses are almost identical: only one of the two commentaries that provided material for the Glossa primitiva contained an interlinear gloss. This is further supported by the fact that the interlinear glosses that refer to marginal glosses generally refer to marginal glosses found in both texts. A rare exception proves the connection between the Lambeth text and the interlinear gloss. The interlinear glosses on Genesis 2:1 read as follows:

\[
\text{igitur perfecti sunt caeli et terra et omnis ornatus eorum.}
\]

\textit{perfecti. in perfectione senarii}

\textit{celi et terra. causaliter quidem et potentialiter quorum numeros perfectus et defectus temporis postea uisibiliter explicaret}

However, in the Lambeth text, the second of these two glosses is not found in the interlinear commentary. It is found in the margins, where it provides the first sentence of a gloss, made up of both Augustinian and new material, not otherwise found in the Glossa primitiva:

\[
\text{HISTORICE. Igitur perfecti sunt caeli et terra et omnis ornatus eorum. Causaliter quidem et potentialiter quorum numeros perfectus et defectus temporis postea uisibiliter explicaret. Et requieuerit Deus die septimo. Considerandum est quomodo requieuerit Deus <ab omni opere> qui nunquam laboruit, cum}
\]
This gloss then proceeds to the shared material on God’s rest, which was presented in Table 2.11. It would therefore appear that the compiler of the *Glossa primitiva* chose to include only this segment from the proto-*Glossa*, using it as the basis for a rare addition of an interlinear note.

This also explains why the interlinear glosses of the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3 are so heavily Augustinian, with no references to the material taken from Bede: the interlinear glosses are notes on the marginal glosses of the proto-*Glossa*, and the compiler who combined the two commentaries did not bother to update the interlinear glosses to reflect the changes to the marginal text. As will be seen in Chapter Three, this is in contrast to the development of the *Glossa ordinaria*, in which the interlinear glosses were heavily emended, changing their function in the text.

What can be said about the proto-*Glossa*, given the evidence found in the Lambeth manuscript and the *Glossa primitiva*? It appears that its treatment of Genesis 1–3 was founded on Augustine’s *De Genesi ad litteram* and *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*. It also appears that, like the *Glossa primitiva* and *Glossa ordinaria*, the proto-*Glossa* contained not only marginal glosses but also interlinear glosses which, for the most part, referred back to the marginal text. This suggests a teaching context. There may also have been a second commentary, likely focused on the Hexameron. I suggest that this was a continuous commentary made up of extracts from Augustine and Bede, and that this second text may have been the vehicle through which the sole gloss from Rabanus Maurus entered the tradition.

While the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3 retains only the heading “mystice”, used for certain extracts from *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, the headings “historice”, “moraliter” and (in the gloss on Genesis 4) “allegorice” in the Lambeth Gloss suggests that these titles were part of the proto-*Glossa*. It is notable that similar headings are found in the *Glossa ordinaria* on Lamentations, known to have been compiled by Gilbert the Universal, long thought to have

---

358 London, Lambeth Palace, 349, fol. 4v.
been the compiler of the *Glossa* on Genesis. This similarity in style may suggest support for the attribution of the proto-*Glossa* to Gilbert. As has been noted, there is only one manuscript of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis which attributes glosses to Gilbert—Eton, Eton College Library, 48. This manuscript dates to the thirteenth or fourteenth century. When the incipits of the glosses attributed to Gilbert are compared to those that can be traced to the proto-*Glossa*, one finds that the first of the three, “Sicut Paulus...” is found in both the Lambeth text and the *Glossa primitiva*, but the other two are not. Thus, these attributions to Gilbert do not seem to have come from the proto-*Glossa*. As there are no attributions in either the Lambeth gloss or the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3, and the manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* show that scribes sometimes added erroneous attributions to glosses (as will be discussed in the next chapter), the Eton manuscript, in the end, adds little to our knowledge of the person behind the *Glossa* on Genesis. Whoever the first compiler of the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis was, the passages shared by the *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth Gloss suggest that he did so as part of lectures on the book of Genesis, for which the texts were used.

Comparison of the Lambeth Gloss to manuscripts of the *Glossa Salomonis* suggests that there may be a further prehistory to the text of the proto-*Glossa*. For example, in both the Lambeth text and the *Glossa primitiva*, the explanation of Moses’ inspiration by the Holy Spirit reads, “Sicut enim Paulus apostolus per revelationem didicit euangelium ita Moyses, docente Spiritu Sancto, conditi mundi cognouit exordium”. In London, British Library Additional 63077 and London, British Library Royal 4 A X, this gloss reads, “Sicut Paulus per revelationem didicit euangelium, ita Moyses Spiritu Sancto docente conditi muni nouit exordium, non securali sapientia Egiptiorum qua eruditus fuerat ad plenum”. It is not clear whether the proto-*Glossa* was working from another commentary, or whether it was inaccurately representing a gloss that is found in its complete form in the British Library manuscripts, but future research on the *Glossa Salomonis* may reveal further aspects of the history of the lost source of the *Glossa primitiva*.

---


360 London, British Library, Additional 63077, fol. 1r; London, British Library, Royal 2 A X, fol. 3r.
Some reasons for the expansion of the proto-*Glossa* have been suggested. Another may be indicated by the study of the manuscripts in Chapter One—namely, that the text was expanded because developments in how the page was ruled and laid out allowed more efficient use of space, which permitted the addition of new texts to the glosses on the Hexameron. The contents of the *Glossa primitiva* are defined by the intermediate layout. The physical characteristics of the manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* may also offer insight into some technical questions concerning the development of the *Glossa primitiva* from the proto-*Glossa*. Of particular interest is the *textus intercisus* format found in the first folios of *Pf*, in which the would-be marginal glosses are not found in the margins, but in the same column as the biblical text, below the verse on which they comment. The ease with which a scribe could insert new glosses into a Gloss copied in this format leads me to believe that the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3, at the very least, was first compiled in this format, as he would not have to estimate the amount of marginal space the new glosses would require, but could simply copy all applicable glosses below a given verse before moving on to the next. This would also explain the appearance of the new extracts as blocks of text.

To a certain extent, the proto-*Glossa* hypothesis raises as many questions as it answers. While it resolves certain questions of how the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3 was compiled, it leads us no closer to the first principles of the *Glossa*—that is, who compiled it, where, and why. It simply refers those questions back to an earlier stage of the text. However, the relationship between the text of the *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth gloss suggests that the number of shorter, less-popular glosses on the text of Genesis which survive from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries may reflect not only the usefulness of the gloss format, but a common, pre-*ordinaria*, gloss-format core. In any event, it appears clear that the *Glossa primitiva* was built upon a previous text that has close ties to the oral teaching of the schools. It is possible that this may have been the original form of the Laon gloss on Genesis. It is also possible that the proto-*Glossa* was based upon older, preexisting gloss-format commentaries. That would make it not, ultimately, the product of the School of Laon, but rather of an earlier intellectual program. One might then name the *Glossa primitiva* as Laon’s contribution to the tradition.

The existence of a lost proto-*Glossa* would make the *Glossa primitiva* an intermediate stage in the development of the *Glossa* tradition on Genesis, reflecting early movement away from use as a teaching text and towards use for private reading and study, which motivated the
incorporation of new extracts from a continuous commentary. This, in turn, indicates that the development of the *Glossa ordinaria* from the *Glossa primitiva* and its subsequent stages of development was not a dramatic break with the *Glossa* tradition, but rather a step in an ongoing process of compilation that responded to changing use and interest. This second stage, in which the text becomes recognizable as that of the *Glossa ordinaria*, is the topic of the next chapter.
Chapter Three
The Development of the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1–3

Chapter Two compared the text of the Glossa primitiva on Genesis 1–3 to that of a gloss-format commentary found in London, Lambeth Palace 349, arguing for the existence of a proto-Glossa that was the shared source of both texts. This chapter moves from the study of the Glossa primitiva to the Glossa ordinaria, demonstrating the existence of a relationship between the two texts and arguing that the differences between them reflect continued changes in how the text was used. As will be shown, comparing the manuscripts of the Glossa ordinaria and the Glossa primitiva reveals a sudden break in the inherited textual tradition, followed by a slow growth in the number of cited extracts over the last decades of the twelfth century.

A cursory comparison of the Glossa primitiva and the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1–3 reveals the differences between the two texts. The marginal glosses of the Glossa ordinaria are much shorter than their primitiva counterparts, as most of them are abbreviated. The number of individual glosses, however, is greater, having been expanded through the inclusion of passages taken from sources not used in compiling the Glossa primitiva. While the interlinear glosses of the Lambeth Gloss and the Glossa primitiva were almost identical, those of the Glossa ordinaria contain many new additions. The two texts of the Glossae on Genesis 1–3 differ far more from one another than do the two recensions of the Glossa ordinaria on some other books of the Bible. For example, the Glossa ordinaria on Lamentations exists in two recensions, defined by “the exchange and transpositions of words, and occasional addition and omission of interlinear glosses”.361

As noted in Chapter One, the text of the Glossa ordinaria is found in more, and later, manuscripts than is the Glossa primitiva. These ordinaria manuscripts are also copied in a more advanced gloss format than the two manuscripts that preserve the Glossa primitiva. This suggests—but does not prove—that it represents a somewhat later stage in the text’s development. Glosses are more frequently broken across the page than in the Glossa primitiva, and interrupted glosses often continue not in the column that follows immediately, but the next,

361 Andrée, ed. Gilbertus Universalis: Glossa ordinaria in Lamentationes, 93.
and the continuation is keyed by tie-marks. This is a characteristic of later gloss manuscripts.

Both the length and width of the biblical text column changes, allowing for the glosses to be fit around it with greater efficiency. The smaller sections of the gloss text, with more frequent paragraph breaks, are easier on the reading eye than the dense blocks of unbroken text found in the manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva*, particularly in the glosses on the Hexameron.

A distinctive feature of the *Glossa ordinaria*, when it is compared to the *primitiva*, is the movement of the two-column all-gloss folios to before the beginning of the biblical text, creating the appearance of an introduction which was built out of the glosses that are found in the *Glossa primitiva* around the text of Genesis 1:1. In the *Glossa primitiva*, the first three chapters of Genesis are so heavily glossed that *Pn*, which is otherwise copied in the intermediate three-column gloss format, contains several folios in which the gloss, copied in two columns recto and verso, interrupts the course of the biblical narrative. Pages of this kind are less common in the manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria*, as methods for laying out the glosses on the page became more advanced and the abridgement of individual glosses resulted in a less verbose text. The movement of the glosses to before the biblical text aided in the reduction in the number of all-gloss pages, as scribes moved passages that introduced the book of Genesis, methods of biblical interpretation, and questions about creation *ex nihilo* out of the margins around Genesis 1:1-2, making room for the addition of new glosses. Over the course of the late twelfth and early thirteenth century, these preliminary glosses continued to acquire new texts, particularly glosses which treat biblical exegesis or the book of Genesis as a whole. Thus, while it does not have the rhetorical structure of a prologue, the opening all-gloss pages were adapted to serve as an introduction to the text at hand.

When studying the surviving manuscripts, it is striking that the transition from the *primitiva* to the *ordinaria* appears to have occurred suddenly, with no intermediary witnesses. One could hypothesize a long-term process of alteration in response to changing use, in which the glosses of the *primitiva* were gradually abridged and new glosses were slowly added to the text, the twelfth-century manuscripts of the *ordinaria* appear fully formed—with both abridged *primitiva* glosses and new additions—on the stage of intellectual history. However, there are no surviving intermediaries between these manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis and the *Glossa primitiva*. Even Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 63 (*Pb*, c. 1160), which Philippe Buc described as an “intermediary” manuscript in the history of the *Glossae* on
Genesis, is a complete, early example of the *Glossa ordinaria* text, with no evidence of the transition between the two.\(^{362}\) There is no surviving manuscript in which the text of the *Glossa primitiva* is only partially abridged, or is unabridged with added glosses—nor are there divergent traditions of abridgement. Whoever first formed the *Glossa ordinaria* appears to have done so with a coherent, over-arching editorial method, rather than setting in motion a slow series of changes according to use and need. Accordingly, when this chapter discusses the “development” of the *Glossa ordinaria*, it refers to changes made to the text of the *Glossa ordinaria* after it had already been formed out of the *primitiva*.

The sudden break in the textual tradition between the *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria* raises the question of how the two forms of the commentary were seen in the twelfth century. Unlike the title *Glossa Salomonis*, which is found in the manuscripts of some related Genesis glosses, the name *Glossa primitiva* was given by Buc. Similarly, referring to the twelfth-century *Glossa ordinaria* means imposing a title that was only given to the text much later. How, then, did the texts’ readers understand the relationship between the two glosses? There is some evidence that the *Glossa primitiva* and the commentary that came to be known as the *Glossa ordinaria* were considered to be separate works, which reinforces the theory that there was a definite break in the textual tradition. At the very least, it seems that some scholars used one text to make up for defects in the other: for example, it appears that Andrew of St. Victor relied on both texts when compiling his own commentary on Genesis. Andrew’s use of the *Glossa ordinaria* also provides a date before which the *ordinaria* must have been completed, as he completed his commentary on the Octateuch before 1147.\(^{363}\) As with the *Glossa primitiva*, this is earlier than the earliest date that can be given to a surviving manuscript of the *Glossa ordinaria*—Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47, appears to have been copied at Bury St. Edmunds in the 1150s.\(^{364}\)
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\(^{362}\) Buc, *L’ambiguïté du livre*, 90.

\(^{363}\) Buc, *L’ambiguïté du Livre*, 97. As *Pn* was at St. Victor in Paris, it may be the very manuscript to which Andrew of St. Victor referred. On the date of Andrew’s commentaries, see Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, 112.

This chapter will begin with a study of how the marginal glosses of the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3 compare to their counterparts in the *Glossa ordinaria*, demonstrating the relationship between the two texts and showing the different ways in which the text of the *Glossa primitiva* appears to have been manipulated in the formation of the *Glossa ordinaria*. It will then treat the additions made to the interlinear and marginal glosses, with a discussion of Buc’s theories about the hierarchical political philosophy of the *Glossa ordinaria*. It will conclude with an outline of a preliminary system for organizing the twelfth-century manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* according to the presence—or absence—of new glosses. While it is not the earliest surviving manuscript of the *Glossa ordinaria*, I will be using Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19 (Va) as the basis for my comparisons between the *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria*. This manuscript also provides the text for Appendix B, which presents the entirety of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3. While the *Glossa ordinaria* was expanded with new glosses over time, the texts of individual glosses remain relatively stable from manuscript to manuscript, and so one manuscript may provide a useful look at the state of the text in the middle of the twelfth century. Compared to many manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria*, Va can be dated with a fair amount of accuracy, as it must have been copied some time before 1168, the date of the death of the abbot under whose tenure it entered the abbey of St. Amand-en-Pévèle. The glosses are the same as those found in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 63 (Pb), the foundation of Buc’s study. Like Pb, Va provides a useful picture of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the creation account at an early stage of its development and expansion, permitting the grouping of later manuscripts according to the glosses added to them.

14 From *primitiva* to *ordinaria*: Transforming the Text

As discussed in Chapter Two, the argument in favor of a lost proto-*Glossa* shows the complexity of the twelfth-century exegetical tradition on Genesis 1–3 and the care that must be taken in claims about the relationship between different versions of the text. It is commonly assumed, when approaching these texts, that the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis was built on the foundation of the *Glossa primitiva*. This section will first survey the differences between the presentation of shared glosses in the *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria* on the creation

---

account, and will then move to a discussion of some shared glosses that provide evidence for the relationship between the two texts. It will close with a survey of the sources used when adding new glosses to the text, as well as a discussion of how the two versions of the text may have come about.

A useful example of the differences between individual glosses in the *Glossa ordinaria* and the *Glossa primitiva* on the first chapters of Genesis may be seen in the following table, which compares the form of an extract from *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* as it is found in *Pn* and *Va*.

As was discussed in Chapter Two, in the *Glossa primitiva* this gloss is found with almost exactly the same wording as seen in Augustine’s text. The *Glossa ordinaria* abridges the text by removing excess words, so that the reader must supply repeated nouns, and both the “tres sequentes [generationes]” and the “sexta generatio” become subjects of the same verb. (In the process, the noun modified by “sexta” has changed from an era to a generation.) The later part of the extract was abridged by removing some concrete terms that clarify Augustine’s meaning, and so neither the five senses nor the two sexes are named. Augustine is frequently challenging, and this is one of his more obscure passages; while Augustinian glosses in the *Glossa ordinaria* often seem to have been changed in order to make the text more clear, this abridgement has only made Augustine’s point more obtuse.

Table 3.1: The *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Spiritual Meaning of the Hexameron

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
<th>Glossa ordinaria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si autem aliquid mouet quod in istis etatibus seculi duas etates primas denis generationibus aduertimus explicari, tres autem consequentes singule quatuordecim generationibus contexuntur, sexta uero ista nullo generationum numero definita est. Facile est uidere etiam in unoquoque homine duas primas aetates, infantiam et pueritiam, corporis sensibus inherere, qui sensus corporis quinque sunt: uisus, auditus, olfatus,</td>
<td>Si quem mouet quod in etatibus seculi due prime denis generationibus explicantur, tres sequentes singule quatuordecim, sexta uero ista generatio nullo numero definitur. Facile est uidere etiam in unoquoque homine infantiam et pueritiam quinque sensibus corporis inherere. Quinarius autem duplicatus, quia duplex est sexus humanus, unde tales generationes fiunt, denarium facit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

367 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, 9r.
In the previous chapter, I argued that the glosses taken from the De Genesi contra Manichaeos, as well as many of the glosses from the De Genesi ad litteram, are glosses found in the proto-Glossa, which was combined with extracts taken from a second, continuous commentary in order to form the Glossa primitiva on the creation account. The example above is one of the glosses which appears to originate in the proto-Glossa. While the text of the proto-Glossa can only be inferred by comparison between the Glossa primitiva and the glosses found in London, Lambeth Palace, 349, comparing the two texts makes clear that the passages found in the Glossa ordinaria differ from the source text far more than do their counterparts in the Glossa primitiva. These alterations include not only the abridgement of extracts, but also the breaking up of long glosses into smaller pieces. This is seen in the following table, which compares an extract from the De Genesi ad litteram as it is found in both the Glossa primitiva and the Lambeth Gloss, and as it is presented—in two parts—in the Glossa ordinaria. In this table, the differences between the texts are in bold, rather than the similarities:

Table 3.2: The Glossa source and the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1:3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossa Primitiva; Lambeth Gloss</th>
<th>Glossa ordinaria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixitque Deus in uerbo coeternaliter sibi coherentente, fiat lux: ea conditione qua cuncta subsistunt intemporaliter in aeterna</td>
<td>Istorice. Fiat lux. Ea conditione scilicet qua cuncta subsistunt intemporaliter in Dei sapientia priusquam in se ipsis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dei sapientia antequam in se ipsis subsistant. Et facta est lux, id est, angelica et caelestis substantia in se ipsa temporaliter sicut erat in Dei sapientia quantum ad eius incommutabilitatem pertinent aeternaliter. Huius autem creaturae informitas erat imperfectio antequam solidaretur in amore conditoris;</td>
<td>Et facta est lux, id est angelica et celestis substantia in se temporaliter, sicut in sapientia quantum ad eius incommutabilitatem eternaliter. Huius creature informitas, imperfectio antequam formaretur in amore conditoris, formatur enim cum conversetur ad incommutabile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

formatur autem cum convertitur ad incommutabile lumen uerbi Dei. Et uidit Deus quod esset bona id est, placuit ei ea benignitate quod factum est qua placuit ei ut fieret. Sic enim diliget Deus creaturam suam ut sit et ut maneat. Et diuisit Deus lucem a tenebris. Hoc factum est ex quo lux facta est. Non enim potuit ab homine ita simul dici sicut potuit a Deo simul fieri. Discretio autem lucis a tenebris distinctio est inter perfectum cuiusque rei statum et eiusdem rei quem ex se habet defectum. Diem quippe non incongrue in specie rei condite intelligimus, sed non potuit ab homine simul dici sicut a Deo fieri. Discretio autem lucis a tenebris distinctio est inter perfectum cuiusque rei statum et quem habet ex se defectum. Diem quippe non incongrue in specie rei condite intelligimus noctem uero in eiusdem rei priuacione uel defectu, qui rebus temporaliter conditis ex se inest etiam si desit effectus. Vespera uero in omnibus perfecte conditionis terminus est; mane autem incipientis exordium. Omnis enim natura certis initiis et terminis continetur. Nondum enim dies solares erant, ut ortus solis dies, occasus uespera diceretur, quod quarta die factum est cum luminaria primum in firmamento ordinata sunt.  

While the Augustinian extract cited in Table 3.1 was made more obtuse by abbreviation, the following extract, which discusses the nature of God’s creation through speaking, shows how the compiler of the Glossa ordinaria changed the wording in order to make Augustine’s point easier to understand, albeit not without changing his meaning:

Table 3.3: The Glossa primitiva and Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1:3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
<th>Glossa ordinaria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item dixit non temporaliter sed in uerbi</td>
<td>Non temporaliter scilicet si enim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

368 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6v; London, Lambeth Palace, 349, fol. 1v.
369 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 3r.
370 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale 19, fol. 3v.
aeternitatis. Si enim temporaliter, tunc mutabiliter. Si autem mutabiliter, tunc per creaturam, et si per creaturam, tunc non est prima creatura lux. Que forsitum ideo non esse prima creatura dicitur, quia iam dictum erat in principio fecit Deus celum et terram, et poterat per caelestem creaturam uox hic fieri temporaliter. Quod si ita est corporalis lux facta est dicente Deo fiat lux per creaturam spiritualis, eo modo quod

371 per talis creature interiorem et occultum modum diuinitus dici potuit. Non enim sonuit hic corporalis uox Dei sicut ibi tu es filius dilectus, nec lingua aliqua sonuit, quia nondum erat linguarum diuersitas, nec lingua erat aliqua qua Deus loqueretur. Nullus quippe adhuc erat quem oporteret audire aut intelligere. Bene igitur hic accipitur uox Dei id quod in sono uocis intelligitur et ad naturam uerbi per quod omnia facta sunt hoc ipsum pertinere dicitur.

Simplification is seen in the addition of the adjective “subiectam” to “creaturam”, in order to emphasize the created being’s inferiority to God. Meanwhile, the change from the Glossa primitiva’s “…quia nondum erat linguarum diuersitas, nec lingua erat aliqua una qua Deus loqueretur”, to the Glossa ordinaria’s rhetorical question, “Qua enim lingua sonaret, cum linguarum diuersitas nondum esset?” reflects a change in the understanding of Augustine’s argument. Where Augustine’s text emphasizes the lack of any language at this point of biblical history—not either the first language of humanity nor the plurality of languages after the toppling of the tower of Babel—the compiler of the Gloss appears to have understood multiple languages to be the necessary condition for God to have spoken at all.

371 quod. An error for “quo.”

372 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 7r. cf Augustine, DGAL I, 2 [CSEL 28 III 1, 5–7].

373 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 3r.
The medieval passages that came from the proto-Glossa underwent much the same editing process as the patristic sources. Thus, the first of them appears much the same in the Glossa primitiva and the Glossa ordinaria, although it has lost a verb:

Table 3.4: The Glossa primitiva and Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
<th>Glossa ordinaria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sicut enim Paulus apostolus per reuelationem didicit euangelium ita Moyses, docente Spiritu Sancto, conditi mundi cognouit exordium.</td>
<td>Sicut Paulus per reuelationem didicit euangelium ita Moyses, docente Spiritu Sancto, conditi mundi exordium.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second medieval passage, however, not only acquired an erroneous attribution to Bede, but was broken up, lemma by lemma, in order to allow for the incorporation of new glosses taken from other sources. The reference to the Gospel of John was also removed in the transition from primitiva to ordinaria, as shown in Table 3.5:

Table 3.5: The Glossa primitiva and Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
<th>Glossa ordinaria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notandum quia Moyses in hoc libro de inferiori mondo in quo homo factus est ad instructionem generis humani facere sermonem intendit. Et quia visibili mundo perficiendus erat homo, primo ei regnum paratum describitur, postremo rector inducitur cui creaturarum ceterarum opulentia obsequatur.</td>
<td>BEDA. Moyses in hoc libro de inferiori mondo ad instructionem hominis agit, et quia homo proponendus erat mundo visibili, primum regnum paratum describit, postea rectorem inducit, cui seruiat plenitudo regni. Dicit ergo, in principio creavit Deus celum et terram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potest intelligi caeli et terre nomine quicquid Deus fecit, siue spiritualem siue corporalem, simul esse factum materialiter sed tamen informiter. Deinde per partes scriptura</td>
<td>Celi et terre nomine quicquid Deus fecit simul esse factum materialiter potest intelligi sed informiter, siue spiritualem siue corporalem sit. Deinde persequitur quomodo Deus singulorum formas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

374 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.

375 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 1v.
persequitur quomodo Deus fecit ponendo per singulas formas singulorum distinctiones operum. Et quia nondum erant distinctae formae elementorum sequitur, terra autem erat inanis et uacua his quae de terra processura erant. Et tenebrae erant super faciem abyssi. Abyssi nomine possunt intelligi reliqua elementa quae adhuc erant confusa et incerta in quas formas essent distinguenda. Et spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas. Id est sicut dominus sicut conditor praerat illi adhuc fluitanti et confusae materiae ut eam distinguere quomodo uellet. Ecce in hoc opere tota Trinitas operata intelligitur: Deus, Pater; principium, Filius; spiritus Dei, Spiritus Sanctus. De hinc sequuntur distinctiones diuersorum operum.

The final of the three medieval passages is a clear example of the kind of simplification of the text—with the preservation of content—that is common in the glosses of the Glossa ordinaria:

Table 3.6: The Glossa primitiva and Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
<th>Glossa ordinaria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notandum quod haec historia a suo principio more Hebreorum generatio caeli et terre uocatur, sicut euangelica Mathei historia “liber generationis Ihesu Christi” appellatur, cum utraque scriptura multa in sequentibus contineat in quibus nulla generationis mentio fiat. Introducit quippe haec historia primum hominem futuri formam utpote de terra uirgine conditum per quem generandi erant terreni in uitam transitoriam, sicut euangelium nouum hominem inducit de matre uirgine.</td>
<td>Liber iste more Ebreorum a principio “Genesis” appellatur quia de celi et terre generatione agit, licet alia multa sequantur, sicut euangelium Mathei “liber generationis Ihesu Christi”. Inducit enim Moyses primum hominem formam futuri de terra uirgine conditum, qui generaret terrenos in uitam transitoriam, sicut euangelium secundum de matre uirgine genitum, qui regeneraret celestes in uitam eternam. Hic ergo figura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

376 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.
377 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 2r.
378 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 2v.
factum per quem caelestes homines regenerandi erant in uitam aeternam. In hac ergo scriptura figurae sunt futurorum, in euangelio uero manifestatio completorurn.\textsuperscript{379}

The examples given show that the Glossa ordinaria and the Glossa primitiva both contain cores that can be traced to the proto-Glossa. However, the Glossa primitiva and Glossa ordinaria share not only the glosses that appear to come from the proto-Glossa, but also the glosses that were added in the formation of the Glossa primitiva— in other words, the Glossa primitiva and Glossa ordinaria are closer to one another in their content than they are to the Lambeth Gloss or the proto-Glossa. For example, both Glossae contain a form of the following gloss, which is made up of extracts taken from both Augustine and Bede— who were, it was argued in the last chapter, the primary sources of the new glosses that distinguish the Glossa primitiva from its proto-Glossa source. In this gloss, once again, the differences are in bold type:

Table 3.7: The Glossa primitiva and the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
<th>Glossa ordinaria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong> dixit Deus, fiat lux. Lux ista quae primo die facta est spiritualis uel corporalis intelligitur. Si autem spiritualis lux facta est, non illa Patri coeterna intelligenda est per quam facta sunt omnia, sed illa de qua dicitur, prior omnium creatae est sapientia, et ipsa est intellectualis et angelica uita quae nisi ad creatorem conuersa fluctuaret informiter quae uidelicet potest esse prima creatura primo caelum appellata cum dictum est, in principio fecit Deus celum et terram, sed iam his uerbis perfecta et ad creatorem conuersa cum dictur, dixit Deus fiat lux et fecit lux, in qua luce spirituali Forsitan diuisio lucis a tenebris, distinctio intelligitur iam rei formatae ab informe. Appellatio uero diei et noctis insinuatio</td>
<td>Dixit Deus, fiat lux. Lux primo die facta spiritualis [sic] uel corporalis intelligitur. Si spiritualis, non illa Patri coeterna per quam facta sunt omnia, sed de qua dicitur, prior omnium creatae est sapientia, id est intellectualis et angelica uita quae ad creatorem conuersa que potest esse prima creatura et celum dicitur, in principio creauit Deus celum et terram. Sed ad creatorem conuersa cum dicitur, fiat lux, et facta est lux, in qua luce spirituali forte diuisio lucis a tenebris, distinctio intelligitur rei iam formate ab informi, appellatio diei et noctis significatio distributionis qua significatur nichil Deum inordinatum relinquere, nec perfectus creaturarum sine supplemento</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{379} Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.

\textsuperscript{380} Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 2r.
distributionis est qua significetur nichil Deum inordinatum relinquere, neque perfectus creaturarum sine supplemento esse decoris uniuersi. Vespera autem in toto illo triduo antequam fierent luminaria consummati operis terminus non absurde intelligitur, mane tanquam futurae operationis significatio. Si autem primo die lux corporalis facta est, congrue mundi ornatum a luce Deus inchoat ut esset unde cetera quae creaturae apparerent. Si autem queritur quibus in locis Deo iubende hec lux facta sit, cum adhuc abyssus omnem terrae altitudinem contegeret, patet perfecto quia in superioribus terrae partibus quas nunc diurna solis lux illustrat, tunc principalis illa lux emicuit. Nec mirandum lucem in aquis posse splendere, cum etiam nautarum operatione sepius lustrentur qui in profundo mersi, misso ex ore oleo aquas sibi illustrant, que multo rariores quam sint modo fuerint in principio quia nondum congregata in uno loco.\[382\]

These charts show the differences between shared glosses in the Glossa ordinaria, as well as the consistency with which the text of the Glossa primitiva is closer to critical editions of the patristic sources than that of the Glossa ordinaria is. While most of the glosses in the Glossa primitiva appear in the Glossa ordinaria in some form, not every gloss was included. For example, one of the more extended passages from Augustine discussing the two accounts of the creation of man has no counterparts in the Glossa ordinaria, as its arguments are largely duplicated in other glosses.

There are three possible ways in which the Glossa ordinaria and the Glossa primitiva may be related. The proto-Glossa may be the source for the Glossa primitiva, which was in turn used as

\[381\] Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat 14398, fol. 6v–7r.

\[382\] Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 3r.
the source for the *Glossa ordinaria*. This is the assumption of past scholars, including Philippe Buc.\(^{383}\). The two versions of the *Glossae* may also be two independent developments of the proto-*Glossa*, similar to the relationship between the *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth gloss. However, the *Glossa primitiva* and *Glossa ordinaria* share the core of material that appears to have been added to that of the proto-*Glossa* from a second, continuous commentary, which makes it unlikely that the *primitiva* and *ordinaria* were independently developed from the proto-*Glossa*. They may be two versions of the same project by one and the same compiler, about which more will be said below. One could also attempt to argue, from the above charts, that what is referred to as the *Glossa primitiva* was a later development from the *Glossa ordinaria*, on the principle that texts tend to accrue more mass over time, rather than reduce. If one accepts the theory that the similarities between the Lambeth Gloss and the *Glossa primitiva* are evidence of a shared source, however, then this final theory can hold no water, for based on comparison of the texts, one can definitively say that the text of the *Glossa ordinaria* is further from that of the proto-*Glossa* than is the *Glossa primitiva*. Furthermore, the *Glossa ordinaria* is far more than an abridgement of the *Glossa primitiva*. The contents of the text was greatly expanded through the addition of glosses from new sources to both the marginal and interlinear glosses, as will be discussed in the next section.

### 15 New Sources in the Margins: Expanding the *Glossa ordinaria*

As has been noted, the abbreviation of the glosses of the *Glossa primitiva* appears to have happened simultaneously with the addition of extracts taken from previously unused sources: Alcuin’s *Interrogationes in Genesim*, Rabanus Maurus’ *Commentariorum in Genesim libri quatuor*, and Paterius’ collection of extracts from Gregory the Great, *Liber de expositione veteris ac novi testamenti*. A number of glosses, as will be discussed below, are attributed to Walafrid Strabo, although only one of them can be found in a commentary on Genesis attributed to him. One of the principal new sources was Jerome’s *Hebraice quaestiones in liber Geneseos*, whose work, alongside that of the purported Strabo, was mined for glosses that treated the historical and linguistic exegesis of the text already prevalent in the *Glossa*

---

\(^{383}\) Buc, *L’ambiguïté du livre*, 74.
primitiva. Thus, in the prefatory material to Va, one finds the following extract, which, while it is significantly different from its source, is identifiably taken from Jerome’s text.

Table 3.8: A Gloss from Jerome on Genesis 1:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jerome, Hebraice quaestiones in liber Geneseos.</th>
<th>Glossa ordinaria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This, in turn, is followed, by an extract attributed to Strabo—but from an as yet unknown source—glossing the word *celum* and discussing the elements:

---

384 Jerome, *LHQG* 1, 1 [CCSL 72, 3].
385 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 2r.
In principio creauit Deus celum et terram. Celum non uisibile firmamentum sed empireum, id est igneum, uel intellectuale quod non ab ardore sed a splendore igneum dicitur. Quod statim repletum est angelis. Vnde, cum me laudarent simul astra matutina, et cetera. Et nota tria hic memorari elementa: nomine celi aerem colligimus, nomine terre ipsam et ignem qui in ea latet. Quarti, id est aque, in sequentibus fit mentio.386

The attribution of some glosses to a “Strabus” poses a challenge in the search for the sources of the Glossa ordinaria. The Glossa ordinaria was once thought to have been composed by Walafrid Strabo, thanks in part to glosses such as these. This theory has been thoroughly discredited.387 There is a commentary on Genesis—an abbreviation of Rabanus Maurus’ Commentariorum in Genesim—that is attributed in several manuscripts, as well as in Stegmüller’s Repertorium Biblicum, to Strabo.388 However, Burton Van Name Edwards has argued that this commentary is almost certainly a second commentary by Rabanus himself, which is in keeping with the attribution in the earliest manuscripts.389 This pseudo-Straban commentary does make an appearance in the Glossa tradition—in the Glossa primitiva, where one finds a citation taken, verbatim, from the beginning of this abbreviated commentary. As shown in the below table, another version of this gloss is carried over from the Glossa primitiva into the Glossa ordinaria, and given the fact that it is taken from a commentary frequently attributed to Strabo, it is not surprising that it is so sourced in the Glossa ordinaria. While this gloss can be identified, a challenge remains: the other glosses in the Glossa ordinaria that are attributed to him have no connection to this text, which is the only commentary on Genesis traditionally associated with Strabo.

Table 3.9: The Gloss attributed to Strabo on Genesis 1:1

386 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 2r. cf. Rabanus Maurus, CG I [PL 107:443A].
387 On the history of this idea, see Froehlich, “Walahfrid Strabo and the Glossa Ordinaria,” 192–196.
388 See Friedrich Stegmüller, Repertorium Biblicum 5, no. 8316.
Glossa primitiva

Plato tria principia omnium, deum et exemplar et materia, opinatur, et ea increata et sine initio, deumque non tanquam creatorem sed quasi artificem. Aristotiles duo principia putauit, materiam et speciem, et terciurn quod operatorium dicitur, mundumque semper fore et fuisse. His erroribus obuians, Moyses duiuino spiritu in uno principio temporis mundum a creator Deo narrat factum tanta uelocitate ut uoluntatis effectus sensum temporis prœueniret ut, uidelicet, Deum cognoscens esse ante initium mundi et ipsum esse initium uniuersorum.\(^{390}\)

Glossa ordinaria

In principio creauit Deus celum et terram. Moyses in uno principio temporis mundum a Deo creatore factum refert ut sensum temporis prœueniret effectu uoluntatis, ut Deum sciamus esse ante temporis initium et ipsum esse initium omnium. Plato enim tria principia estimabat, deum, exemplar, et materiam, et ipsa increata sine initio et deum quasi artificem non creatorem. Aristotiles duo: materiam, speciem, et tertium operatorium dictum, mundum uero semper esse et fuisse. Contra hec ergo et huiusmodi dicitur, in principio creauit Deus celum et terram.\(^{391}\)

The attribution of anonymous texts to recognized authorities was common in the medieval period, as the many documents pseudonymously attributed to Augustine and Jerome attest. Here, one is forced to admit that the resources currently available do not provide useful assistance in identifying whether or not these glosses are correctly attributed, or in finding the text from which they were likely taken. It is clear, however, that the attribution of these glosses to Strabo comes from a very early stage of the Glossa ordinaria. This is in contrast to the attributions found only in Eton, Eton College Library, 48, a thirteenth-century manuscript of the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis, which assign various glosses—one, “Sicut paulus”, from the proto-Glossa—to Gilbert the Universal. There is no evidence in the early manuscripts of attribution to Gilbert, thus undermining this portion of Smalley’s argument for his authorship of the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis.\(^{392}\)

---


\(^{391}\) Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 2r.

\(^{392}\) Smalley, “Gilbertus Universalis,” 256–258. Alexander Andrée has noted a similar problem, in which the attribution of individual glosses was confused with the attribution of the entire compilation, in the Glossa ordinaria on the Gospel of John, traditionally credited to Anselm of Laon. However, while Andrée has been able to identify the Anselmian glosses as having originated in another work, which he argues was Anselm’s original text, there is no such association with the glosses attributed to Gilbert in the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis. Andrée, “Anselm of Laon Unveiled,” 227.
More plentiful than the additions to the literal sense were those to the spiritual sense of scripture, which had their ultimate source in Gregory the Great’s *Moralia in Job* and Isidore’s allegorical interpretations of Genesis in his *Quaestiones in vetus testamentum*. The *Glossa ordinaria* also includes a number of new glosses attributed to Alcuin—taken from his *Interrogationes in Genesim*—which pertain to both the literal and the spiritual sense, as in the following example:

Alcuinus. Terre maledixit, non aquis, quia homo de fructu terre contra uetitum manducauit, non de aquis bibit, et in aquis erat peccatum abluendum, de fructu terre contractum. Animalia quoque terrestria plus maledictionis habent quam aquatilia, quia plus uiuunt de maledicta terra. Inde Christus post resurrectionem de pisce manducauit, non de terrestri animali.\(^{393}\)

While the challenge to identifying the sources of the Straban glosses was the lack of source texts, with the extracts from Gregory the Great and Isidore, the problem is one of too many sources. Wasselynck argued that the citations from Gregory the Great’s *Moralia* were copied into the *Glossa ordinaria* from Paterius’ florilegium, but the passages in Paterius are too close to those in the *Moralia* to be able to make a comparison between the two, as shown in the following table. This gloss is not one of the many glosses from Gregory describing the spiritual life, but is rather an explanation of how God could be said to have both created the world over the course of six days and at once, as is said in Sirach:

**Table 3.10: A Gregorian Gloss on Genesis 1:1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gregory the Great, <em>Moralia in Job</em></th>
<th>Paterius, <em>Liber de expositioni veteri et novi testamenti</em></th>
<th><em>Glossa ordinaria</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rursum quaerendum est, quomodo Deus simul cuncta condidit, dum Moyses sex dierum</td>
<td>Quaerendum nobis est, quomodo Deus simul cuncta condidit, dum isdem Moyses sex dierum</td>
<td>Querendum est quomodo Deus simul cuncta condidit, dum idem Moyses ex dierum mutatione variante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{393}\) Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 20v. Alcuin, *IIG* 10–11 [*PL* 100:518B].
mutatione uariante distincte creata describit. Quod tamen citius agnoscimus, si ipsas causas originum subtiliter indagamus. Rerum quippe substantia simul creata est, sed simul species formata non est; et quod simul exstitit per substantiam materiae non simul apparuit per speciem formae. Cum enim simul factum caelum terraque descriptur, simul spiritualia atque corporalia; simul quicquid de caelo oritur, simul factum quicquid de terra producit indicatur.  

A similar problem arises with the Isidorean glosses in the *Glossa ordinaria*, which appear in the prefatory material and in the interlinear glosses. Philippe Buc argued that the interlinear glosses were copied into the *Glossa ordinaria* by way of Rabanus Maurus’ commentary on Genesis, and it is possible that the prefatory glosses came from the same source. However, the similarity between Isidore’s text and that of Rabanus makes it difficult to judge which was the more likely source for the prefatory glosses, while the interlinear glosses are so heavily abbreviated, they preserve little evidence either way. The following table presents one of the prefatory glosses, and one small difference—the absence of the lemma “spiritus Deus ferebatur super aquas” from Rabanus’ text—provides a hint that the prefatory glosses may have been

---

394 Gregory, *MI* XXXII, 12, 16 [CCSL 143B, 1640]
396 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, 1v.
397 It should be noted that these prefatory glosses do not appear in Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47 (C), the earliest datable manuscript of the *Glossa ordinaria*. However, C is also missing segments of several glosses that are found in Pn, making it impossible to claim whether the absence of these glosses is an omission or evidence that they were not present in the earliest version of the *Glossa ordinaria*. The stages of development of the *Glossa ordinaria* in the later twelfth and early thirteenth centuries will be discussed at greater length in the next section.
copied into the *Glossa ordinaria* from another source. Ultimately, however, it is impossible to tell:

**Table 3.11: An Isidorean Gloss on Genesis 1:1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isidore, <em>Quaestiones in vetus testamentum</em></th>
<th>Rabanus Maurus, <em>Commentariorum in Genesim</em></th>
<th><em>Glossa ordinaria</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Spiritus autem Dei super cor nostrum tenebrosum et fluidum, quasi super aquas iam superferebatur, in quo subsistentes requiesceremus, cuisque utiificaremur flatu, et cuius unda ablueremur. *Dixit quoque Deus: Fiat lux,* id est, illuminatio credulitatis appareat. Prima enim die lucem fidei dedit, quia prima est in conversione fidei. Unde et istud primum in Dei praeceptis mandatum est: *Dominus Deus tuus*

Deus unus est.\textsuperscript{399} \quad Dominus Deus tuus, Deus unus est.\textsuperscript{401}

The similarity between this extract and the interlinear text, as well as their association with both Isidore and Rabanus, can be seen by a comparison to the interlinear glosses on Genesis 1:1 and 1:2, which read as follows (with the Isidorean glosses in bold text):

\textbf{In principio creauit Deus celum et terram.}

\begin{verbatim}
In principio. temporis, uel ante cetera, uel in Filio
In principio. filio quo humanato patuit qui essent celestes,
qui terreni
creauit. tanquam omnium creator
Deus. Pater
celum. Informem materiam spiritualis uite, sicut in se
potest existere, non conversa ad creatorem in quo
formatur.

celum. id est spirituales qui celestia meditantur
et terram. corporalem sine omni qualitate que apparat in
materia formata
et terram. carnales scilicet qui terrenum hominem
necdum deposuerunt.\textsuperscript{403}
\end{verbatim}

\textbf{Terra autem erat inanis et uacua, et tenebre erant super
faciem abyssi, et spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas.}

\textsuperscript{400} “uno.” \textit{sic Patrologia Latina.}

\textsuperscript{402} Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 1v.

\textsuperscript{399} Isidore, \textit{Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum. In Genesim 1} [\textit{PL} 83:209A–210A].

\textsuperscript{401} Rabanus Maurus, \textit{Commentariorum in Genesim 1}, 10 [\textit{PL} 107:467A].

\textsuperscript{403} Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 2v.
Terra. corporalis substantia

Terra. nostre carnis

erat. informis; imperfecta

inanes. priusquam doctrine formam acciperet

inanes. his que de ipsa erant formanda

tenebre. peccatorum

tenebre. spiritualem naturam informem significat, que

conuersa ad creatorem formatur et illuminatur

tenebre. quia non erat lux que superesset

faciem. humani cordis

et spiritus. bona uoluntas creatoris cui subiacebat quod

formandum erat

et spiritus. Spiritus Sanctus

ferebatur. tanquam Dominus

ferebatur. Syra lingua “fouebat”, sicut auis oua

ferebatur. in quo subsistentes requiesceremus, flatu eius

uiuificati et unda abluti

super. sicut sapientia artificis superfertur faciendo operi

aquas. totam corporalem materiam, quia ex humida natura

formantur que uidemus per species uarias, uel spiritualem

uitam quasi fluantem ante conversionis formam

aquas. cor tenebrosum et fluidum

aquas. informem sed ductilem materiam.404

These are, as can be seen, far from the only additions to the interlinear glosses, many of which come from sources other than Rabanus and Isidore. As the interlinear text shows the most significant growth in the Glossa ordinaria—particularly in regard to the spiritual sense—and provides the backbone of Philippe Buc’s discussion of the Glossae, it is necessary to discuss it in greater detail. This will be the topic of the next section.

404 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 2v.
16 The Interlinear Glosses and the *Glossa ordinaria*

In the previous chapter, it was shown that the interlinear glosses in the *Glossa primitiva* were copied into the text from the proto-*Glossa*, and that little was done to change them to reflect the new, marginal glosses. This is not the case in the *Glossa ordinaria*, in which the interlinear glosses were substantially changed through new additions, albeit while continuing to demonstrate their source in the *Glossa primitiva*. For example, in the *Glossa primitiva*, the interlinear glosses on Genesis 1:27 read:

*Et creauit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam, ad imaginem Dei creauit illum, masculum et feminam creauit eos,*

\[\textit{ad imaginem Dei}. \text{non enim ad imaginem unius persone}\]
\[\textit{masculum et feminam}. \text{Per prolensin hoc dicitur; nondum formata muliere de osse uiri.}\]

In *Va*, the interlinear glosses on the same passage read:

*et creauit. Qui non quelibet sanctorum imitando, sed ipsam ueritatem intuendo, operatur iustitiam ut ipsam ueritatem intelligat et sequitur. Hic accipit potestatem super omnia, quia spiritualis quisque effectus et Deo similis, iudicat omnia et a nemine iudicatur. ad imaginem suam. in ratione qua contemplande ueritati inheret ad imaginem Dei. repetit ut confirmet et quales facti simus diligentius inculcet ad imaginem Dei. id est, ad imaginem suam Dei. non Patris, non Fili, non enim ad imaginem unius persone masculum. spirituales doctores*

---

405 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 10v–11r.
This is a remarkable growth in the text, particularly considering that no marginal glosses were added to the *Glossa ordinaria* on this passage. As the interlinear glosses that were added to the *Glossa ordinaria* are the focus of Buc’s analysis of the two texts, it is important to consider the nature of their inclusion and expansion.

Buc’s study of the *Glossae* on Genesis focused on the ways in which the *Glossa ordinaria* reflected religious endorsement of social hierarchies. He argued that, for example, the glosses that allegorize *masculum* as “spirituales doctores” and *feminam* as “obedientes”, as seen above, are examples of theological justification for the constructs of social hierarchy and political control. Buc’s work is a monumental and fascinating study of the interplay of biblical exegesis and what we would now call political theory. However, while Buc did not claim that the inclusion of these hierarchical glosses was the driving force behind the development of the *Glossa ordinaria*, his interest in social structures led him to ignore the changing emphases in methods of biblical interpretation, which can be seen in a broader study of the development of the *Glossa primitiva* into the *Glossa ordinaria*. Indeed, while many of the glosses Buc uses as examples do imply that inequalities are inherent to society, when they are compared to the other added glosses, their presence can be explained by the *Glossa ordinaria*’s expanded discussion of spiritual and moral exegesis of the text, rather than a societal agenda.

Buc’s key example is from Genesis 1:25, in which the interlinear gloss interprets the three kinds of animals created on the sixth day as three kinds of men. A similar theme is found in the interlinear glosses of Genesis 1:14. In *Pn*, the text reads,
Dixit autem Deus: Fiant luminaria in firmamento caeli, et diuidant diem ac noctem, et sint in signa et tempora, et dies et annos.\(^\text{408}\)

\[\begin{align*}
&fiant \text{ luminaria.} \ hic \ ordinantur \ ornamenta \ superioris \ partis \ mundi. \\
&et \ sint. \ serenitatis \ et \ tempestatis \\
&et \ tempora. \ uer, \ estatem, \ autumnum, \ hiemem \\
&annos. \ cum \ suum \ compleuerint \ cursum. \\
\end{align*}\]

In the text of \(Va\), one finds the addition:

\[\begin{align*}
luminaria. \ doctores^409 \\
\end{align*}\]

This is precisely the sort of gloss that Buc uses as an example of the glossator (presumably a \emph{doctor}) drawing up a social hierarchy, with the implication that he is in the upper echelons. However, the other glosses that appear in \(Va\) demonstrate the overarching emphasis of the \emph{Glossa ordinaria} towards adding spiritual senses to the reading. Thus, they read:

\[\begin{align*}
firmamentum. \ scripture \\
firmamentum. \ quia \ uicina, \ non \ quia \ infixa \\
in \ signa. \ serenitatis \ et \ tempestatis \\
in \ signa. \ uer, \ estatem, \ autumnum, \ hiemem \\
et \ dies. \ Quia \ predicatores \ propriis \ temporibus \ uiuunt \ et \\
transeunt. \ Prius \ germinauit \ terra, \ deinde \ facta \ sunt \\
luminaria, \ quia \ post \ bona \ opera \ uenit \ illustratio \ lucis \ ad \\
contemplandum \ speciem \ superne \ uirtutis. \\
et \ annos. \ cum \ suum \ compleuerint \ cursum \\
\end{align*}\]

Another example is the interlinear gloss on Genesis 1:9. In \(Pn\), the text reads:

\[\begin{align*}
408 \text{ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 8v–9r.} \\
409 \text{ Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 5r.} \\
\end{align*}\]
Dixit uero Deus: Congregentur aquæ, quæ sub cælo sunt, in locum unum: et appareat arida. Factumque est ita.\(^{410}\)

\textit{dixit uero Deus. uerbo separauit}

\textit{congregentur. secedant in unam terre partem}

\textit{factumque. causaliter.}

In \textit{Va}, the first two interlinear glosses are the same. However, two glosses have been added, reading:

\textit{aque. Infideles qui cupiditatum tempestate et temptationibus fluminum quaciuntur}\(^{411}\)

\textit{arida. fontem fidei sitientes}.\(^{412}\)

Once again, the focus is on developing an allegory of the faith that can be represented by the creation narrative. A similar focus can be seen in later interlinear glosses. Thus, in \textit{Va}, the spring that rises in Eden is glossed as “fons sapientie diuisus in quatuor partes uirtutum”.

This is not to say that the interlinear glosses of the \textit{Glossa primitiva} are entirely free of the moral or spiritual sense. Indeed, at Genesis 2:7, \textit{Pn} has an interlinear gloss that, unusually, does not correspond to the marginal text. It reads:

\textbf{Formauit igitur Dominus Deus hominem de limo terræ, et inspirauit in faciem eius spiraculum uitae, et factus est homo in animam uiuentem.}\(^{413}\)

\textit{Inspirauit. dedit spiritum contemplatiue uirtutis.}

\textit{Va} contains almost exactly the same text:

\(^{410}\) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 8r.

\(^{411}\) In \textit{C}, this is the more likely “qui temptationum fluminum quaciuntur”.

\(^{412}\) Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 4v.

\(^{413}\) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 13v.
The frequency of marginal glosses described “mystice” demonstrates the importance of the spiritual sense of scripture in the *Glossa primitiva*, although its default approach to the text appears to be “*ad litteram*”. It is nevertheless significant that the interlinear glosses that were added to the *Glossa ordinaria* are almost entirely moral or spiritual. A dramatic example can be seen at Genesis 2:10, “et fluuius egrediebatur de loco uoluptatis ad irrigandum paradisum, qui inde diuiditur in quatuor capita”. This verse has no interlinear glosses in *Pn*. In *Va*, however, the text is copiously glossed, as follows:

- *fluuius*. affluentia interne iocunditatis
- *fluuius*. Christus
- *de loco*. paterno fonte
- *ad irrigandum*. uerbo et baptismo
- *paradisum*. ecclesiam
- *in quatuor*. uirtutes principales
- *in quatuor*. quatuor euangelia
- *capita*. flumina

Once again, the spiritual sense is emphasized in the interlinear text. Of these eight glosses, only one treats the language of the text—the others are all spiritual or moral interpretations.

17 The Compiler of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis

Having described the features of the *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3, noting both their similarities and their differences, what remains to be considered is what reasons or forces may lie behind the existence of the two distinct texts. First, however, is the question of the compiler. Buc’s work seems to assume two different compilers—one for the *Glossa ordinaria*, and the other for the *Glossa primitiva*. This is, indeed, possible. However, the

---

414 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 12r.
415 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 15v; Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale 19, fol. 13r.
two texts may also have been the work of the same person, in two different iterations, perhaps as a result of teaching the text more than once. This is particularly true given the fact that, as de Hamel notes the format that made the *Glossa primitiva* possible was developed in the mid-1130s, while the *Glossa ordinaria* was used by Andrew of St. Victor in the mid-1140s, giving only a decade, at the most, between the development of the two versions of the text.\(^{416}\)

While it is impossible to say for certain whether the same compiler composed both versions of the text, it is important to consider the possibility that the two texts were composed by a single glossator. It was quite common for one medieval author to produce more than one version of the same text—indeed, a similar situation was discussed above, in regard to the two Genesis commentaries of Rabanus Maurus. Thus, it would in no way be unusual or unheard of for two *Glossae* to have been produced by the same person.

One piece of evidence for a shared compiler is the compiler of the *Glossa ordinaria*’s apparent familiarity with and command over the theorized sources of the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3. For example, the sense heading “Istorice”, which is found in the Lambeth Gloss and likely comes from the proto-*Glossa*, disappears in the *Glossa primitiva*. It returns in the *Glossa ordinaria*, however, which suggests that its compiler had access not only to the *Glossa primitiva*, but to the proto-*Glossa* as well. (This is seen in Table 3.2). Furthermore, while the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3 contains no attributions to the sources of the excerpts, in the *Glossa ordinaria* they are present throughout the text. They are, for the most part, accurately cited. One notable error is the false attribution of the gloss “Notandum quod Moyses” to Bede—as shown in Chapter Two, this passage likely originated in the proto-*Glossa*. The attribution may have been a later addition, or it may reflect the compiler’s belief about this extract’s ultimate source.

Whether the *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria* were composed by the same compiler, the lack of any surviving intermediary manuscripts or a divergent tradition of emendation suggests that the *Glossa ordinaria* was the product of a single concerted effort to emend the text, although the intermediary manuscripts may have been lost. Perhaps the author of the

---

primitiva decided to alter his extant text into a new form, or a new compiler—or group thereof—took up the task of updating the older version.

The visual difference between the presentation of the two texts—in which the extracts in the Glossa ordinaria are more broken up than those of the Glossa primitiva—reflect the addition of new sources to the commentary on the creation narrative, which increased the number of extracts applied to each lemma and thus required new divisions in the old glosses. The addition of new extracts was not the only possible motivation behind the visual changes to the manuscripts: this division of the extracts into smaller pieces, whose order in the text could be more easily altered, brought with it the benefit of greater flexibility for the mise-en-page of the gloss text. Smaller segments of text, marked by paragraph marks, were also easier to read, and are in keeping with developments in the format of manuscripts used for reading and reference in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.  

This suggests that the changes to the Glossa were adaptations made in response to changing use of the text. This, in turn, encouraged movement towards a more advanced gloss format. As the gloss changed from a lecture aid to a reference work, those who were using it lost both the interpretive help of a teacher and the assistance of the spoken word for comprehension of the text. This was a particular challenge for theologically complex ideas, such as those found in Augustine’s works, and thus the accompanying simplification of the text may have been of assistance to readers, as well. The idea that the differences between the Glossa primitiva and the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1–3 reflect a change in the use of the text is further supported by the adoption of citations giving the names of the authorities from whose works the extracts were taken.

In the previous chapter, I argued that the confluence of interlinear and marginal glosses suggests that the hypothesized proto-Glossa was a teaching text, in which the interlinear text reminded the lecturer of the marginal commentary that provided the foundation of his teaching. I also suggested that the additions of excerpts from a continuous commentary might reflect a


movement towards using the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis 1–3 as a reference text, rather than a document for a lecturer. The addition of new sources and the simplification of the arguments in the *Glossa ordinaria* likely reflect further development towards use as a reference text, without the guidance of a teacher, showing a continuous process of change across the three versions of the text. If the two texts were the product of the same compiler, the *Glossa ordinaria* may have been a more successful second version.

The changes made to the interlinear glosses in the development of the *Glossa ordinaria* reflect not only a developing interest in the senses of scripture, but also a changed relationship between the interlinear gloss and the marginal glosses. While the interlinear glosses of the *Glossa primitiva*—and, likely, the proto-Glossa—functioned primarily as a key to the marginal text, the additions made in the *Glossa ordinaria* sever this connection, incorporating the interlinear glosses into the exegetical project as key parts of the text. The interpretation of the text offered by the interlinear glosses also gives them a kind of primacy on the page as they are more invasive than the marginal gloss, insofar as they are immediately present to the reader, providing concurrent interpretation as the biblical text was read and are thus less easily ignored. These additions cause a shift in the use of the interlinear text, which would no longer function as a memory aid for the contents of the marginal commentary, but would rather provide an immediate interpretation of the text as it was read, reflecting the text’s replacement of—rather than source for—the voice of a teacher.

18 The Development of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3 in the Later Twelfth Century

The manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* can be divided into three groups according to the glosses that they acquired over the course of the later twelfth and early thirteenth century, particularly in the preliminary all-gloss folios. As will be shown, the changes made in the text reflect a continuing interest in defining matters of biblical exegesis and a repeated cycle of returning to the patristic sources. This cyclical pattern resulted in the duplication of several glosses, found in both the preface and the marginal text.

Distinct from these three groups is the text found in Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47 (C). This is the earliest precisely datable manuscript of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis, as it can be dated to the 1150s. However, as with all the manuscripts of the *Glossae*, references to
the text in other works show that all surviving manuscripts postdate the composition of the text. This manuscript was copied at Bury St. Edmunds as part of a larger program of manuscript acquisition, particularly of volumes of the *Glossa ordinaria*. While it is in all other respects almost exactly like other manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis, *C* contains a substantially shorter section of preliminary material than that found in later manuscripts, copied in two columns on the recto of the folio and three columns on the verso. This may reflect copying from an incomplete manuscript, or that the missing glosses were somewhat later additions. The incipits of these first glosses are as follows:

[2r] Aug. In narratione rerum factarum non omnia secundum figuratum...
Beda. Moyses in hoc libro de inferiori mundo...
*In principio creavit Deus celum*. Moyses in uno principio temporis mundum...
Ambr. Cum in diuina scriptura de paucis uerbis...
Ambr. Si qua obscura legimus que possint sane uariis exponi...
Liber iste more Hebreorum a principio Genesis appellatur...
Sicut Paulus per reuelationem dicit Euangelium ita Moyses, docente...
*In principio fecit Deus celum*. Plerique autumant, sicut Tertullianus et Hilarius...
Strab. *In principio creavit Deus celum*. Celum non uisibile firmamentum...
Alcu. Quattuor modis operatur Deus. Primo in uerbo...
[2v] Gr. Querendum est quomodo Deus simul cuncta condidit...
*In principio creavit Deus celum*. Non dicit “in principio dixit Deus...”
Beda. *In principio creavit Deus celum et terram*, et cetera. Creationem mundi
insinuans...

At the bottom of the mostly empty third column, a note in the same hand reads, “Sceleratum est mala cogitata uelle perficere”.

---


420 Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47, fol. 2r–2v.
Comparing these incipits to the preliminary material and first glosses in *Va* reveals some interesting trends. With the exception of the note at the end of the preface, *C* contains no glosses on Genesis 1–3 that cannot be found in *Va*. However, there appears to have been some disagreement in where the preliminary glosses ended and the marginal glosses began—and there is a strong distinction between the two in the manuscript of *C*, as the two parts of the commentary are distinguished by an empty column and the blank recto side of folio 3. Where *Va* includes the gloss, “Non dicit, ‘in principio dixit Deus’” as the first of the marginal glosses, *C* makes it part of the preface, and the marginal glosses begin, “In principio fecit Deus celum et terram. Eos scilicet qui celestis imaginem...”.

The order of the glosses also differs, although some clusters of glosses remain in the same order within their group. From the gloss, “In narratione rerum factarum...” to “liber iste more Hebreorum”, the preliminary material is presented in the same order. *C* then inserts the gloss “Sicut Paulus...”, before “Plerique autumant”, which is followed by the gloss, attributed to Strabo, beginning “Celum non uisibile firmamentum” and that attributed to Ambrose, “Quattuor modis operatur Deus”.

There are also notable differences between the attributions of the gloss. *C* does not attribute “Plerique autumant” to Jerome, nor “Moyses in uno principio temporis mundum...” to Strabo, although it does retain the erroneous attribution of the medieval gloss, “Moyses in hoc libro de inferiori mundo...” to Bede. Notably, it also wrongly attributes the Augustinian glosses, “Cum in diuina scriptura de paucis uerbis...” and “Si qua obscura legimus que possint sane uariis exponi...” to Ambrose, an error not seen in other manuscripts.

The most prominent and substantial difference between the two texts, however, is the absence from *C* of the set of allegorical interpretations from Isidore, beginning, “In principio fecit Deus celum, spirituales scilicet qui celestiae meditatur et terram, id est carnales terrenum hominem imitantantes”, which, although very similar, is not to be confused with the gloss found in the marginal gloss of *C* and in other manuscripts, which reads, “Eos scilicet qui celestis imaginem portauerunt. Et terram, id est qui postea superbiendo terram, id est terreni hominis imaginem
portantes se fecerunt”.\textsuperscript{421} The absence of this Isidorean gloss, as well as the gloss from Strabo on “celum” may be seen as evidence that these were early interpolations into the \textit{Glossa ordinaria}, not found in the first manuscripts.

In the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} on Genesis 1–3, the marginal glosses are the most stable part of the text, with the fewest additions to the text. The preliminary material, in contrast, is the section of the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} with the greatest amount of change over time, and so it will form the primary basis by which I will develop a preliminary grouping of the manuscripts into developmental stages.

The interlinear glosses are another place where there was sufficient space and flexibility for change in the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} over time. \textit{C} has some ideosyncratic omissions here. For example, in the interlinear gloss on Genesis 1:1, \textit{Va} and other manuscripts contain an interlinear gloss on \textit{creavit Deus} which reads, “tanquam omnium creator”. This is missing from \textit{C}. Similarly, \textit{C} lacks the allegorical gloss on \textit{ferebatur super aquas}, “cor tenebrosum et fluidum”, and the etymology of \textit{lux}, “lux a luendo, id est, purgando tenebras”.\textsuperscript{422} However, there is clear evidence that not all of the omissions from the interlinear gloss in \textit{C} are signs of later additions to the text: in the interlinear gloss on Genesis 1:7, \textit{C} is missing the interlinear gloss “causaliter” on \textit{et fecit Deus}.\textsuperscript{423} As this gloss is present in the \textit{Glossa primitiva} and the Lambeth gloss, it shows that one cannot assume that missing glosses are evidence that a manuscript is representative of an earlier form of the \textit{Glossa ordinaria}, particularly, in this case, as \textit{C} is the only manuscript with these omissions. This uncertainty is one of the reasons I have chosen to use the slightly later \textit{Va}, rather than \textit{C}, as my basis for comparison. However, reference to later manuscripts’ codicological features shows that there was an increased number of prefatory glosses in later manuscripts. This coincides with more advanced techniques of organizing the

\textsuperscript{421} Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 1v; Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale 19, fol. 2v; Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47, fol. 3v.

\textsuperscript{422} Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 2v–3r; Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47, fol. 3v–4r.

\textsuperscript{423} Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47, fol. 5r.
page. This suggests that the prefatory glosses do represent a process of expansion in the late twelfth century.

With the exception of $C$, the twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* can be divided into the following groups, based on the commentary on Genesis 1–3. These groups may then serve, at a later point, as a basis for comparison to see if they remain set for the rest of the gloss text.

*The Valenciennes Group*: including $Va$, as well as Paris, Bibliothèque municipale de France, lat. 63 ($Pb$), and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 3746 ($M$), which are both dated to the second half of the twelfth century.

*The Amiens Group*: including Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon, 34 ($Am$), from the late twelfth or early thirteenth century and the fragmentary thirteenth-century manuscript Arras, Médiathèque de l’Abbaye Saint-Vaast, 1004 (188).

*The Admont Group*: including Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 251 ($Ad$), Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 15 ($O$), and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14399 ($Ps$). The first two manuscripts are from the thirteenth century, while $Ps$ dates from the later part of the twelfth.

These are not strictly chronological. However, there are no late manuscripts in the Valenciennes Group, suggesting that it is the earliest of the three. The manuscripts of the Admont group are mostly later, but the presence of the twelfth-century manuscript $Ps$ suggests that this version of the text, while more recent than that in the Valenciennes Group, is older than the other manuscripts in the Admont Group would suggest. The two manuscripts of the Amiens Group appear to be examples of an intermediary stage.

This section will close with a discussion of Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 46 ($Pa$), as an example of an ideosyncratic text formed in response to particular interests in the environment of the early Parisian universities.
18.1 The Valenciennes Group: \textit{Va, Pb, M}

\textit{C} and the manuscripts of the Valenciennes Group represent the earliest stages of the development of the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} on Genesis 1–3, and provide the foundation for further comparisons. The preliminary material of the Valenciennes Group is distinguished by the inclusion of moral interpretations of the Hexameron extracted from Isidore, who was also the source of many of the allegorical glosses that were added to the interlinear text. Coming at the beginning of the prefatory material, these Isidorean passages (headed “mystice”) present a model of scriptural interpretation and give priority to exegesis of the Hexameron, making the understanding of the creation account the central challenge of the text of Genesis.

As it provides the basis for comparison of the later manuscript groups, the Valenciennes Group is difficult to discuss without reference to later additions to the text. Many of its characteristic features have been described at earlier points in this chapter. However, it is important to note what, precisely, is being compared: while the manuscript groups are distinguished from one another by the inclusion and exclusion of different glosses, they do not depict any stages of development in the abridgement or re-working of the texts of the individual glosses, whether taken from the \textit{Glossa primitiva} or from another source. The changes made to the \textit{Glossa primitiva} text when compiling the \textit{ordinaria} appear, already completed, in the earliest manuscripts of the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} and are carried on, mostly unaltered, into the manuscripts of later centuries.

The existence of two French manuscripts of differing style and one German manuscript in the Valenciennes Group suggests that manuscripts carrying this text were fairly widely dispersed through the intellectual communities of the late twelfth century, perhaps by scholars who had completed their studies in Paris. Evidence for the spread of the text is further supported by the English manuscript \textit{C}, copied at Bury St. Edmunds, which is textually most closely related to the manuscripts in this group.

18.2 The Amiens Group: \textit{Am, Ar}

There are, at this point, only two manuscripts of the Amiens group, \textit{Am} and \textit{Ar}. \textit{Ar} has been heavily damaged, with many quires and folios removed, but the text that survives shows that it contains errors and commentary shared with \textit{Am}. As Amiens and Arras are so close to one
another, geographically, it is not difficult to suppose that Ar was copied from Am, or that they share a common exemplar.

As described in Chapter Two, the Lambeth gloss and the Glossa primitiva contain a series of extracts from De Genesi contra Manichaeos, interpreting the six days of creation as representing six eras of human history. These glosses also give a series of moral interpretations for the Hexameron. While the source text treats all six days at once, in the Glossa primitiva, they are broken up into segments by day and copied in the marginal gloss, near the end of the interpretation of the day in question. These glosses were transferred from the Glossa primitiva to the Glossa ordinaria, and are found in both C and the Valenciennes Group. In the process, the moral interpretations of the days of creation, which were extracted from a later passage of De Genesi Contra Manichaeos, were made into separate glosses.

In Am, however, these glosses appear twice: they do not only appear as marginal glosses, as they do in the other manuscripts, but also, as a group, in the prefatory material, attributed to “Isidorus et Beda”. As will be seen in the table below, both versions of the gloss are highly abbreviated when compared to the text of the De Genesi contra Manichaeos, and so it is likely that the glosses of the preface were gathered from the marginal commentary and from there inserted into the preface.

Table 3.12: A Duplicated Gloss from De Genesi contra Manichaeos on the Ages of Man

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>De Genesi Contra Manichaeos</th>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
<th>Am Marginal; Va</th>
<th>Am Preface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primordia enim generis humani, in quibus ista luce frui cepit, bene comparantur primo diei quo fecit Deus lucem. Haec aetas tanquam infantia deputanda est ipsius uniuersi seculi, quod tanquam unum hominem proportione magnitudinis suae</td>
<td>Primordia generis humani, in quibus ista luce frui cepit, bene comparatuir primo diei quo Deus fecit lucem. Hec etas tanquam infantia est totius seculi, quod tanquam unum hominem unum proportione magnitudinis sue cogitamus.</td>
<td>Primordium enim generis humani, quo ista luce frui cepit, comparatur primo diei quo lucem fecit Deus. Hec etas tanquam infantia est disputanda ipsius uniuersei seculi, quod tanquam unus hominem etatem agit infantiam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cogitare debemus; Quia et unusquisque homo cum primo nascitur, et exit ad lucem, primam aetatem agit infantiam. Haec tenditur ab Adam usque ad Noe generationibus decem. Quasi uespera huuis diei fit diluuium quia et infantia nostra tanquam obliuionis diluuiio deletur.  

Quia et unusquisque homo cum primo nascitur, et exit ad lucem, primam aetatem agit infantiam. Haec tenditur ab Adam usque ad Noe generationibus decem. Quasi uespera huuis diei sit in diluuiui quia et infantia nostra tanquam obliuionis diluuiio deletur.  

Homo enim cum primo nascitur in lucem infantiam agit primam etatem, que tenditur ab Adam usque ad Noe generationibus decem. Diluuium quasi uespera huuis diei quia infantia nostra obliuionis diluuiio deletur.  

Hec praetenditur ab Adam usque ad Noe generationibus decem, quasi uespera huuis diei fit in diluuiui quia et infantia nostra tanquam obliuionis diluuiio deletur.

A similar relationship between the duplicated marginal and prefatory glosses is seen in the allegorical interpretations of the other days. One of the greatest differences is seen when comparing the marginal and prefatory glosses on the third day of creation, in which the gloss in the preface—like the marginal gloss in the *Glossa primitiva*—contains a lengthy extract quoting God’s promise to Abraham in Genesis 17:

**Table 3.13: A Duplicated Gloss from *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* on the Third Day of Creation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Am preface</th>
<th>Am marginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incipit mane tertii diei ab Abraam et succedit tertia etas similis adolescentie, et bene comparatur diei tertia quo ab aquis terra separata est. Ab omnibus enim gentibus quarum error instabilis et uanis simulacrorum doctrinis quasi uentis omnibus mobilis, quod bene significatur</strong></td>
<td>Isidorus. Mistice. <em>Et factum est uesperae et mane</em>, et cetera. <strong>Mane terti diei incipit ab Abraam et sucedit tertia etas similis adolescentie, et bene comparatur diei tertia quo ab aquis terra separata est. Ab omnibus enim gentibus quarum error instabilis et uanis simulacrorum doctrinis</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

425 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 7v.  
427 Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (*olim* Bibliothèque municipale), 34, fol. 1r–1v.
As these examples show, the later marginal glosses—unlike the gloss on the first day—are, like the preliminary material, attributed to Isidore, which suggests that the compiler who inserted the glosses into the preliminary all-gloss folios was aware of the duplication. It also suggests a reason for the movement of these glosses to the beginning of the text: as was noted above, the manuscripts of the Valenciennes group contain a long preliminary gloss from Isidore giving an allegorical interpretation of the days of creation. If these Augustinian glosses were thought to have come from Isidore, the compiler may have thought that these glosses were a proper accompaniment to the actual Isidorean glosses, and that the glosses erroneously attributed to

\[\text{maris nomine, fidelis populus pulsatur. Ab ac ergo gentium uanitate et huius seculi fluctibus separatus est populus Dei per Abraam tanquam terra cum apparuit arida, id est, sitiens imbrem diuinorum mandatorum. Qui populus unum Deum colendo tanquam irrigata terra ut fructus utiles posset afferrer, sanctas scripturas et prophetas accepit. Hec enim etas iam potuit generare filium}^{428} \text{ Deo, quia et tertia etas, id est adolescentia, iam filios habere potest. Et ideo ad Abraam dictum est patrem multarum gentium posui te nimiru alde et ponam te in gentes, et reges ex te erit et ponam testamentum meum inter me et semen tuum post te generationes eorum in testamentum eternum ut sim tibi Deus et semini tuo post te, et dabo tibi et semini tuo post te terram in qua habitas omnem terram Chanaam in possensionem eternam et ero ille Deus. Hec etas porrigitur ab Abraham usque ad Dauid generationibus, huius uespera est in peccatis populi quibus diuina mandata preteribant usque ad malitiam.}}^{430}

\[\text{et hec etas porrigitur ab Abraham usque ad Dauid generationibus quatuordecim. Vespera in peccatis populi quibus diuina mandata preteribant usque ad Saulis malitiam.}}^{430}

\[\text{maris nomine, fidelis populus pulsatur. Ab ac ergo gentium uanitate et huius seculi fluctibus separatus est populus Dei per Abraam tanquam terra cum apparuit arida, id est, sitiens imbrem diuinorum mandatorum. Qui populus unum Deum colendo tanquam irrigata terra ut fructus utiles posset afferrer, sanctas scripturas et prophetas accepit. Hec enim etas iam potuit generare filium}^{428} \text{ Deo, quia et tertia etas, id est adolescentia, iam filios habere potest. Et ideo ad Abraam dictum est patrem multarum gentium posui te nimiru alde et ponam te in gentes, et reges ex te erit et ponam testamentum meum inter me et semen tuum post te generationes eorum in testamentum eternum ut sim tibi Deus et semini tuo post te, et dabo tibi et semini tuo post te terram in qua habitas omnem terram Chanaam in possensionem eternam et ero ille Deus. Hec etas porrigitur ab Abraham usque ad Dauid generationibus, huius uespera est in peccatis populi quibus diuina mandata preteribant usque ad malitiam.}}^{430}

\[\text{et hec etas porrigitur ab Abraham usque ad Dauid generationibus quatuordecim. Vespera in peccatis populi quibus diuina mandata preteribant usque ad Saulis malitiam.}}^{430}

---

428 *Ar populum*

429 Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (*olim* Bibliothèque municipale) 34, fol. 1v.

430 Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (*olim* Bibliothèque municipale) 34, fol. 8r. cf. Appendix B, p. 295.
Isidore were an expansion of the exegetical methods provided by the glosses in the Valenciennes group manuscripts.

The addition of these Augustinian texts to the preliminary material is not the only development in the Amiens group. Other additions to the first glosses include two glosses on the four senses of scripture, one of which is taken from Guibert of Nogent. These glosses read:

Diuitia scriptura aliquando eterna intimantur, ut est in principio erat uerbum, aliquando facta narrantur, ut in principio creauit Deus celum et terram, aliquando futura narrantur, ut cum uenerit filius hominis in sede magisterii sui.\(^{431}\) Aliquando quae agenda sunt precipiuntur, ut diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum, et est bipartita diuitia scriptura quia alia sunt que secundum figuram tamen dicuntur, ut est audiiit Adam uocem Dei deambulantis in paradiso. Alia secundum rerum gestarum fidem ut est quod populus exiens de Egypto per mare pedibus ambuluit, alia sunt quae utroque dicta modo, ut est transitus maris rubri et miracula que Dominus in Euangelio fecit.\(^{432}\)

Quattuor sunt regule scripture, id est historia, quae res gestas loquitur; allegoria, in qua alid ex alio intelligitur; tropologia, id est morale locutio in qua de moribus ordinandis tractatur; anagoge, id est spiritualis intellectus per quem de summis et celestibus tractaturi ad superiora ducimur. His quatuor quasi quibusdam rotis tota diuitia scriptura uoluitur. Verbi gratia Jerusalem secundum istoriam est ciuitas, allegoriam, ecclesiam significat, secundum tropologiam (id est moraliter) animam

---

\(^{431}\) ‘magisterii’ is surely an error: Matthew 19:28 in the Vulgate reads, “Iesus autem dixit illis amen dico vobis quod vos qui secuti estis me in regenerationem cum sederit Filii hominis in sede maiestatis suae sedebitis et vos super sedes duodecim iudicantes duodecim tribus Israel.”

\(^{432}\) Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (olim Bibliothèque municipale), 34, fol. 1r. cf. Bede (spur.), De sex dierum creatione liber sententiarum ex patribus collectarum. De prima die [PL 93: 207A–207B].
cuiuslibet fidelis que ad pacem eternam anelat, secundum anagogen omnium <cele>stium uitam que reuelata facie Deum uident.\textsuperscript{433}

On the same theme, one finds a new sentence added to one of the anonymous medieval glosses from the \textit{Glossa primitiva} (the new text is in bold font). This duplicates the abbreviation of the same gloss found in other \textit{Glossa ordinaria} manuscripts.

\textit{Notandum quod hoc scriptura ita allegoricis uerbis textur ut allegoricum sensum contineat, et historia fidem gestarum rerum non amittat.} Dicit autem Genesis a suo principio secundum morem Hebreorum qui ex principiis maxime nomina libris imponit. Sicut Matheus Euangelicam suam historiam librum generationis apellat, cum utraque scriptura multa in sequentibus contineat in quibus nulla generationis mentio fiat. Introducit quippe hoc hystoria primum hominem futuri formam utpote de terra uirgine conditum, per quem generandi terreni erant in uitam transitoriam, sicut Euangelium quia de matre uirgine genitum qui filios generaret in uitam eternam. In hac ergo scriptura figure sunt futurorum; in Euangelio uero manifestatio completorum.\textsuperscript{434}

These explanatory glosses, with their focus on the senses of scripture, underscore the emphasis on the spiritual sense that is seen in the text of the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} when it is compared with that of the \textit{Glossa primitiva}.

The interlinear glosses in \textit{Ad} are characterized by their inclusion of short marginal glosses that have been moved to the spaces between the lines of the biblical text. Thus, one of the interlinear glosses on Genesis 2:19, “Adduxit ea ad Adam ut uideret quid uocaret ea”, reads, “Jer. Videtur primam linguam humano generi fuisse Hebream, quia nomina que usque ad diuisionem

\textsuperscript{433} Guibert of Nogent, \textit{Moralia in Genesin. Prothemata.} [\textit{PL} 156:25D–26A].

\textsuperscript{434} Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (\textit{olim} Bibliothèque municipale), 34, fol. 1r. cf. Appendix B, p. 276.
linguarum in Genesi legimus constat esse illius”.

Similarly, an interlinear gloss on Genesis 1:3, “et uidit Deus lucem quod esset bona et diuisit lucem ac tenebras”, reads, “S. lucem et tenebras fecit Deus, unde ‘benedicite lux et tenebre domino’ cum omnis creatura ad benedicendum inuitatur”. Both of these interlinear glosses are found in the margins of other manuscripts, and it is likely that their interlinear placement reflects the awkward formatting of Am more than any change in their use or importance.

As was described in Chapter One, Am and Ar preserve important evidence of the continued connection between the written gloss and the oral teaching of the classroom in the form of marginal comments on the gloss itself. These are written in a later hand, and explain the meaning of glosses that were thought to be confusing. For example, a gloss discussing the differences between the two creation accounts reads “sed hoc scripture congrue non uidetur”, and is glossed “scilicet, quod simul facta sint que de homine dicuntur, uel quod sit recapitulatio”. Another example of these glosses on the gloss is found in the extract, transcribed above, explaining the name “Genesis”. Where it reads, “cum utraque scriptura...”, a note has been added, explaining, “Genesi et Mathei”. These notes were also used to change the meaning of the text in the Glossa ordinaria. Thus, for example, the preliminary gloss on the name “Genesis” which begins, “Liber iste more Hebreorum” is changed so that it is not named from the first words—“in the style of the Hebrews”—but from the first principles it discusses: “Non a principio, id est a prima littera uel oratione sicut Hebrei, sed a principio, hoc est a prima parte materie, sicut in principio primo elemento nomina libris imponebant”. These glosses show the continued role that oral teaching played in the development of the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1–3, even as it changed over time to become more and more distant from its origins in the lecture room. It also shows that, while the later title ordinaria implies an imposed standard,


436 Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (olim Bibliothèque municipale), 34, fol. 4v. cf. Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 3v (Appendix B, p. 286).

437 Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (olim Bibliothèque municipale), 34, fol. 18r.

438 Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (olim Bibliothèque municipale), 34, fol. 1r.

439 Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (olim Bibliothèque municipale), 34, fol. 1r.
there was potential for variation in the interpretation of the text and engagement with the inherited *auctores* whose writings provided the bulk of the gloss material, even as the text grew in importance and popularity.

The dating of *Am* and *Ar* raises some questions about the nature of the Amiens Group. *Ps*, the earliest member of the Admont group, is a manuscript from St. Victor in Paris. It is contemporary to *Am* and *Ar*, although its text matches that found in later manuscripts. The formatting of *Ps* is also more advanced than that of *Am*, which—as was noted in Chapter One—shows an unusually primitive format. Since only two manuscripts of limited geographic range are found in the Amiens group, it is possible that it was an experimental middle point between the Valenciennes Group and the Admont Group, or that it is an example of faulty copying of the text outside the Parisian schools.

**18.3 The Admont Group**

From the Isidorean attributions that are applied to both the marginal and prefatory versions of the glosses duplicated in the Amiens Group, it appears that the compiler of the text was aware that the extracts were repeated. It is less clear whether similar duplications, found in the manuscripts of the Admont Group, were errors or intentional additions. While the duplicated glosses of the Amiens Group were found in the prefatory glosses and the margins, both of the two sets of duplicates in the Admont Group are found in the preface, which makes it hard to imagine that their duplication was intentional. As the texts of the duplicate sets differ from one another far more than do the duplicated glosses in the Amiens Group, it is possible that the compiler was unaware of the repetition.

The glosses in question are two of the Augustinian extracts that make up the very beginning of the *Glossa primitiva*. I have argued that these were added to the *Glossa primitiva* from *De Genesi ad litteram* itself, or from another intermediary commentary. They were included in the *Glossa ordinaria*, but are some of the most highly abbreviated of the glosses taken from the *Glossa primitiva*, as will be shown in the tables below. As was noted in Chapter Two, the *Glossa primitiva* follows Augustine’s text almost exactly for these two extracts:

**Table 3.14: Augustinian Glosses on the Interpretation of Scripture in the Glossa primitiva and the Glossa ordinaria**
Glossa primitiva

Cum diuinios libros legimus in tanta multitutudine uerorum intellectuum qui de paucis eruuntur uerbis et sanitate catholice fidei muniuntur, id potissimum diligamus quod certum apparuerit cum sensisse quem legimus; si autem hoc latet, id certe quod circumstantia scripturae non impedit et cum sana fide concordat, si autem et scripturae circumstantia pertractari ac discuti non potest, saltem id solum quod fides sana prescribit. Aliud est enim, quid potissimum scriptor senserit, non dinoscer; aliud a regula pietatis errare. Si utrumque uitetur perfecte se habet fructus legentis. Si uero utrumque uitari non potest, etiam si uoluntas scriptoris incerta sit, sane fidei congruam non inutile est eruisse sententiam.  

Table 3.15: Augustinian Glosses on the Interpretation of Scripture in the Glossa primitiva and the Glossa ordinaria

Glossa primitiva

In rebus obscuris atque a nostris oculis remotissimis, si qua inde scripta etiam diuina legerimus quae possint salua fide aliiis atque aliis parere sententiiis, in nullam earum nos praecepit affirmatione ita proiciamus, ut si forte diligentius discussa ueritas eam labefactauerit, corrueamus non pro sententia diuinarum scripturarum sed pro nostra ita dimicantes ut eam uelimus scripturarum esse quae nostra est, cum potius eam quae scripturarum est nostram esse debeamus.  

440 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r. cf. Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram I, 21 [CSEL 28 III 1, 31].

441 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 2r. Appendix B, p. 276.

442 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r. cf. Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram I, 18 [CSEL 28 III 1, 27].
These abbreviated glosses also appear in the prefatory material of the manuscripts of the Admont Group, in the same form as they are found in *Va*. However, the Admont Group gloss, like the *Glossa primitiva*, also begins with these two glosses, in a format much closer to that of the *Glossa primitiva* than is found in the other manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria*. These tables show the similarity of the new glosses:

Table 3.16: Duplicated Augustinian Glosses on the Interpretation of Scripture in the Admont Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Glossa primitiva</em></th>
<th><em>Ad</em>, Preface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Cum diuinos libros legimus in tanta multitudine uerorum intellectuum qui de paucis eruuntur uerbis et sanitate catholice fidei muniuntur, id potissimum diligamus quod certum apparuerit eum sensisse quem legimus. Si autem hoc latet, id certe quod circumstantia scripturae non impedit et cum sana fide concordat, si autem et scripture circumstantia pertractari ac discuti non potest, saltem id solum quod fides sana prescribit. Aliud est enim quod potissimum scriptor senserit non dinoscere; aliud a regula pietatis errare. Si utrumque uitetur perfecte se habet fructus legentis. Si uero utrumque uitari non potest, etiam si voluntas scriptoris incerta sit, sane fidei congruum non inutile est eruisse sententiam.</em></td>
<td><em>Cum &lt;omnes&gt; diuinos libros legimus in tanta multitudine uerorum intellectuum qui de paucis uerbis eruuntur et sanitate catholice muniuntur, id potissimum diligamus quod certum apparuerit eum sensisse quem legimus. Si autem hoc latet, id certe quod circumstantia pertractari et discuti non potest, saltem id solum quod fides exigit sana uel prescribit. Aliud est enim quod potissimum scriptor senserit non dinoscere; aliud a pietatis regula errare. Si utrumque uitetur perfecte se habet fructus legentis. Si uero utrumque uitari non potest, etiam si voluntas scriptoris incerta fit, sane fidei congruum non inutile est eruisse sententiam.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

443 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale 19, fol. 2r. Appendix B, p. 276.

444 Admont, Stiftsbibliothek 251, fol. 2r.


446 Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 251, fol. 2r.
Table 3.17: Duplicated Augustinian Glosses on the Interpretation of Scripture in the Admont Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossa primitiva</th>
<th>Ad, Prefatory Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In rebus obscuris atque a nostris oculis remotissimis, si qua inde scripta etiam diuina legerimus, que possint salua fide alii atque alii parere sententiis, in nullam earum nos praecipiti affirmatione ita proiciamus, ut si forte diligentius discussa ueritas eam labefactauerit, corruamus non pro sententia diuinarum scripturarum sed pro nostra ita dimicantes ut eam uelimus scripturarum esse quae nostra est, cum potius eam quae scripturarum est nostram esse debeamus.⁴⁴⁷</td>
<td>In rebus obscuris atque a nostris oculis remotissimis, si qua in scriptura etiam diuina legerimus, que possint salua fide alii atque alii parere sententiis, in nullam earum nos precipiti affirmatione ita proiciamus, ut si forte diligentius excusata ueritas eam labefactauerit, corruamus non pro sententia diuinarum esse quae nostra est, cum potius eam que scripturarum est nostram esse uelle debeamus.⁴⁴⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is possible that the emendations to the texts as found in the Admont group were made by someone who made reference to the original source. However, it is also possible that the source for these new glosses was the *Glossa primitiva* itself, to which a compiler might have referred. While the texts of the duplicated Isidorean glosses first seen in the Amiens group are so similar that it seems that the glosses in the preface were copied from those in the margins, these Augustinian extracts differ so greatly from one another that the compiler who added the duplicate glosses to the Amiens group text—whether from another commentary, the original text, or the *Glossa primitiva*—may not have realized that they were duplicates, even though the abbreviated forms could be seen in the prefatory material, not below the added glosses.

It is possible, however, that the repetition of information was recognized. If it were, then the inclusion of new glosses with the preservation of the old—rather than replacing the abbreviated glosses with the fuller text—may perhaps reflect an understanding of the *Glossa ordinaria* as authoritative, and a resulting reluctance to remove glosses from the received text. Whether or not the compiler was aware of the duplication, the apparent supplementation of the text with the more accurate Augustinian extracts underscores the growing importance of defining and

---

⁴⁴⁷ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r. *cf.* Augustine, *DGAL* I, 18 [CSEL 28 III 1, 27].

⁴⁴⁸ Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 251, fol. 2r.
teaching methods of exegesis as the *Glossa ordinaria* changed over the course of the twelfth century.

These are not the only new glosses in the preface of the Admont Group. While the Augustinian extracts emphasize the importance of teaching methods of biblical exegesis in the *Glossa ordinaria*, the other additions focus on the intersection of doctrine and natural philosophy peculiar to the first chapters of Genesis. With no parallels in the *Glossa primitiva*, they must have been taken from other sources. The first, following directly upon the two Augustinian extracts, discusses the different categories of God’s action in the Hexameron account. This gloss is found in the works of Junilius Africanus (c. 160 – c. 240), and is included in Wigbod’s commentary on Genesis, as well as a commentary spuriously attributed to Bede:

> Tribus modis significat hec scriptura generationem seculi esse factam: aut enim sola Dei uoluntate aliquid dicitur factum, ut *in principio creavit Deus celum et terra*; aut uoluntate simul et uoce, siue preceptiua, ut *fiat lux*, siue deliberatiua, ut *faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*; aut uoluntate uoce et diffinione, ut *cescite [sic] et multiplicamini et replete terram* et *germinet terra herbam uirentem et facientem semen secundum genus suum*. Et ea que sola uoluntate, uel uoluntate et uoce facta dicuntur, nouerit facta sunt. Que uero per diffinitionem, hec sunt similia illis que nouerit facta sunt, et hec sunt que post septimum diem usque in finem seculi per partes operatur Deus, et ex illa diffinitione perueniunt. 449

Another addition gives names to the seven heavens:

> Beda. Septem sunt celi [quorum] haec sunt nomina: aer, ether, olympum, spacium, et igneum firmamentum, celum angelorum, et

---

449 Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 251, fol. 1r. cf Junilius Africanus, *De partibus divinae legis libri II II*, 2 [*PL* 68: 25A–B]; Bede (spur.), *Quaestionum super Genesim ex dictis patrum dialogus* [*PL* 93:235]; Wigbod, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* [*PL* 96:1006].
celum trinitatis. Iheronimus autem dicit primum celum Trinitatis, secundum angelorum, tercium firmamentum.450

A third seeks to resolve the disagreement between Genesis’ account of creation ex nihilo and the claim, in Wisdom 11:17, that God created the world out of formless matter:


Both of these were taken from Bede’s commentary on the Pentateuch. These additions to the Admont Group show the prominence of Bede’s thought in discussions of the natural world. They also serve as examples for how the development of the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1–3 in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century reflects a change in the understanding of its purpose, from a record of an oral lecture on the scripture to an encyclopedic collection addressing all matters related to the text. The glosses that were added also reflect the influence of the twelfth-century interest in matters of natural philosophy.

18.4 The Arsenal Manuscript

To this point, the discussion has focused on the addition of glosses that would remain a part of the Glossa ordinaria, and thus become a part of its authoritative tradition. There was minimal change in the text over time and the overall trajectory of the history of the Glossa ordinaria was towards the development of an authoritative, universal reference text. There are manuscripts, however, that contain versions of the text that were adapted and altered for the particular

450 Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 251, fol. 1r. cf Bede, In Pentateuchum commentarii I [PL 91:192B–192C].
interests or requirements of a particular intellectual community. One of these is Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 46 (Pa), a late twelfth- or early-thirteenth-century manuscript of the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis and an unusual example of a manuscript whose owner can be named: before it came into the library of the Parisian College de Navarre, it belonged to one Guillelmo Chirout, who is otherwise unattested.

The text of this manuscript is somewhere between the Amiens Group and the Admont Group, as it contains the gloss “Septem sunt celi”, but none of the other glosses added to Admont. It also contains a series of glosses, likely taken from a Genesis commentary spuriously attributed to Bede, which assign the different works of creation to different gifts of the Holy Spirit. The additions that most represent its school context, however, were added in a later hand and in a darker ink than the rest of the marginal commentary. These include extracts attributed to Isidore and Ambrose, as well as several that are attributed to a Hugh and to Origen, some of which can be identified in edited volumes. For example, the text of the following gloss is found in Hugo of St. Victor’s De sacramentis:

Hugo. Non dixit scriptura “factum est mane et uespere” sed

*factum est uespere et mane dies unus*, quia primus dies mane

precedens non habuit quoniam a luce plena atque perfecta inicium

sumpsit, propterea quod a perfecto opus Dei inchoari debuisset,

propterea omnis aurora precedentis diei et omnis dies ab ortu solis

inicium sumit. Estque dies naturalis illud spatium temporis quod

ab ortu solis usque ad ortum pertransiens noctem in se diemque

concludit. In qua nocte naturaliter dies noctem precedit et finem

diei uesperam dicimus, finem noctis auroram, constat indubitanter

quod aurora semper ad precedentem diem referenda sit.\(^{453}\)

\(^{452}\) Dicit vero per spiritum sapientiae fecisse Deum caelum et terram, et per spiritum intelligentiae fecisse

firmamentum, et separasse aquas ab aquis, per spiritum consili separasse aquas ab arida, et germinare terram

fecisse; per spiritum fortitudinis posuisse luminaria in firmamento caeli, ut dividerent inter diem et noctem; per

spiritum scientiae ornare aquas de reptilibus, et aerem de volatilibus; per spiritum pietatis vestire terram de

animalibus, et hominem creare, vel caetera quae sequuntur; per spiritum timoris Domini, die septimo, opus suum

sanctificasse. Bede (spur.), *De sex dierum creatione liber sententiarum ex patribus collectarum* [PL 93:221B].

Similarly, the following passage is attributed to Origen, and can be found in Rufinus’ translation of his homilies:

Origines [sic]. *Congregentur aque que sub ceło sunt in unum locum et appareat arida*. Nos ergo laboremus congregare aquam que sub ceło est, et abicere eam a nobis ut cum hoc factum fuerit appareat arida que sunt in carne gesta opera nostra, que uidentes homines glorificent patrem nostrum qui in celis est. Si enim aquas istas que sub ceło sunt non separauerimus a nobis, id est peccata et uicia corporis nostri, arida nostra non poterit apparere nec habere fiduciam procedendi ad lucem. Omnis enim qui male agit odit lucem et non uenit ad lucem ne manifestetur opera eius, quia non in Deo sunt facta. Que utique fiducia non aliter dabitur nisi uelut aquas abiciamus a nobis, id est uicia corporis nostri que sunt materia peccatorum. Quo facto iam arida sed iam terra nominatur, hoc modo etiam corpora nostra, si hec ab eis segregatio fiat, non permanebit arida ignis escas gerens secundum ea que ex se protulit; etiam ipse esca ignis efficitur. Si uero studio et diligentia separatis a se aquis abissi, qui sunt demonum sensus, exibuit se terra fructiferam debet sperare quod ipse introducatur in terram fluentem lac et mel.\(^{454}\)

Unsurprisingly, the text from Hugh of St. Victor is close to that of the edited text, while the extract from Origen differs significantly from the source, likely due to its having been compiled from an intermediary commentary. The addition of these passages to the marginal commentary of the *Glossa ordinaria* demonstrates an interest in including new or less frequently read texts in the study of Genesis, as well as the liberties that some readers took with the text in order to appropriate it for their own purposes. The Arsenal manuscript also shows the diversity and complexity of the transmission of the *Glossa ordinaria*. Although surviving early manuscripts

of the *Glossa ordinaria* can, it appears, be grouped into broad categories, there was always the possibility for omission, new additions, and cross-pollination in the development of the text, whether driven by the material concerns of format or the polemics of scriptural exegesis.

This chapter has traced the origins of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3 from its primitive form in *Pn* and *Pf* to the version used in the schools of the early thirteenth century, developed under the pressures of changing use, a new emphasis on the senses of scripture, and the desire to incorporate further sources into an encyclopedic reference commentary. Having moved in this dissertation, as it were, from the outside in, discussing the manuscript binding, format, and the development of the text, the final chapter will turn to the heart of the matter: how the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3 presents the tools of scriptural exegesis and addresses matters of faith and doctrine.
Chapter Four  
Exegetical Practice and Theological Methods in the *Glossae* on Genesis 1–3

The creation account found in Genesis 1–3 was a school for exegesis and a focal point for the interplay between the Hebrew scriptures and Greek philosophy from the earliest centuries of the Christian faith. This chapter presents the exegetical program of the *Glossae* on this text, giving it its place in the history of the Genesis tradition. Chapters Two and Three explored the textual history, sources, and development of the *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3, while Chapter One surveyed the physical characteristics of the early manuscripts in order to show how the organization and presentation of the text developed alongside the changes to the text and its use. This chapter will study the context for these changes to the *Glossae* on Genesis, discussing the hermeneutic assumptions that underlie the two versions of the text—particularly their approach to the senses of scripture—and what these suggest about how the text was used. It will also discuss the intellectual environment of the twelfth-century schools and compare the *Glossae*’s treatment of questions about cosmology to that of twelfth-century sentence collections associated with the School of Laon, in order to shed light on the intention behind the formation of the *Glossae* and how they were used.

The first question that must be asked is whether one can properly speak of the *Glossa ordinaria* as having an exegetical program, given that it was almost entirely composed of extracts taken from the inherited authorities. As was noted by Bernice Kaczynski in regard to the Carolingian exegetes, anthologizing extracts from inherited authorities was not a merely passive and receptive activity, but required active choices about what was to be preserved and was frequently driven by an underlying method and purpose. The compiling exegete came to his task with a coherent exegetical approach towards the text.\(^\text{455}\) If this was true of the Carolingian compilers of florilegia, it was yet more true of the twelfth-century exegetes who appropriated the texts preserved by the Carolingians and adapted them for use in new kinds of texts. The *Glossa ordinaria* is more than a collection of excerpts: the interplay between the interlinear and marginal glosses, the organization of the extracts under titles naming their source or their

approach to the scriptural text, and the format of the text itself all speak to its having been created with a defined purpose and a certain understanding of how the book of Genesis was to be read.

It is now a commonplace that medieval biblical exegesis was characterized by a system which attributed four potential “senses”, or readings, to the text: the literal, the allegorical, the moral, and the anagogical. Henri de Lubac cites a didactic verse with which these four senses were commended to students of scripture, attributed to the Dominican Augustine of Dacia (d. 1282):

The Literal teaches events, Allegory what you should believe,
Moral what you should do, Anagogy to what you should aspire.\textsuperscript{456}

The medievals took their understanding of allegory from Donatus, who described it as “a trope in which something other than what is said is signified”, with reference to the line, found in Vergil’s \textit{Georgics}, “and now it’s time to loosen the necks of our foaming horses”, ends the second book of the poem.\textsuperscript{457} As was explained in the Introduction, allegory allowed exegetes to resolve challenges found in the biblical text, and to apply it authoritatively to a variety of questions. In her pioneering work on medieval exegesis, Beryl Smalley emphasized medieval interest in the letter of the biblical text as a way of establishing it as a legitimate field of study. This was a necessary technique when medieval exegesis was stereotyped as nothing more than fantastic allegory, but the result has been a certain preference, among scholars, for seeking counterparts to modern historical critics of the Bible, rather than understanding the techniques, methods, and role of spiritual exegesis.\textsuperscript{458} In the interest of rehabilitating the spiritual sense of scripture, de Lubac sought out what he believed was the Late Antique origin of these senses in the works of Origen. Frances Young’s more recent study has brought more nuance and detail to de Lubac’s work, placing the origins of the scriptural senses in the rhetorical schools of the Late

\textsuperscript{456}“Littera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria,/ Moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia.” de Lubac, \textit{Medieval Exegesis}, 1:1, not. 1.


\textsuperscript{458}Beryl Smalley, \textit{The Study of the Bible}, 3.
Antique period. The result of these two bodies of research has been a tendency to associate the allegorical sense with earlier exegesis, and the literal sense with later works. However, the exegetical tradition on the Hexameron, due to the influence of Augustine, has always been historically oriented, and the development of the Glossae shows that it was the earlier text—the Glossa primitiva—that was primarily composed of explanations of the text ad litteram. It was only in the later Glossa ordinaria that the spiritual sense was fleshed out by means of added extracts from new sources.

This chapter will study how the Glossa primitiva and the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1–3 instructed their readers in biblical exegesis, with a particular focus on the addition of theoretical discussions of the senses of scripture. It will discuss the use of sense headings within the marginal glosses, and study the changing focus of the Glossae in the transition from the Glossae primitiva to the Glossa ordinaria, and will explore what is meant by the adverb “historice” when applied to the creation narrative. This will provide the foundation for the following section on the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1–3 in the context of the intellectual interests of the twelfth-century schools.

19 The Senses of Scripture in the Prefatory Glosses to the Glossa ordinaria

As was discussed in Chapter Three, one of the ways in which the Glossa ordinaria differed from the Glossa primitiva is in copying of glosses before the beginning of the text, which came to function as a kind of introduction to the creation account. Particularly in the later manuscripts, this material contains a number of passages that explain principles of biblical exegesis. These introductory passages, many of which were extracted from Augustine’s commentaries, reflect the influence of the creation narrative on the development of Christian exegesis. They also suggest one way in which the text changed with changed use. In Chapter Two, I argued that the development of the Glossa primitiva from a lost proto-Glossa commentary was the beginning of a process of successive changes made to the Glossa

---


*ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3 as it came to be by broader audiences—particularly as reference works—rather than as a lecture aid read by a solitary master or small group of teachers. The prefatory material to the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3 shows the compiler orienting readers in the exegetical tradition and providing a groundwork for understanding the remainder of the text, perhaps in order to make up for the absence of a teacher.

The history of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Hexameron shows that it steadily acquired more and more introductory glosses on biblical exegesis over time. The original set of introductory glosses may be identified through comparison to the gloss found in London, Lambeth Palace Library 349. By comparing this text to the *Glossa primitiva*, one can surmise that the proto-*Glossa* likely contained glosses composed on the model of an *accessus*, with three medieval passages explaining the text’s authorship and its divine revelation (a brief treatment of the *auctor*), the intention behind the work (the *intentio scribentis*) with a brief summary of the subject matter of the Hexameron (*materia operis*), and the name of the text (the *titulus operis*). As these appear in the *Glossa primitiva*, they read:

> For, just as Paul the Apostle learned the Gospel through revelation in the same way Moses, with the Holy Spirit teaching him, came to know the beginning of the created world.⁴⁶²

Note that Moses, in this book, intends to speak of the lower world in which man was made, for the instruction of the human race. And because man was to be made in the visible world, first he describes the kingdom prepared for him, and afterwards he introduces the ruler, to whom the wealth of other creatures yields. It says, thus, *in the beginning*, that is in the wisdom coeternal to Him, who said of himself, I am the Beginning, who speaks to you.

*God created heaven and earth: by the names of heaven and earth*

---

⁴⁶¹ The *accessus* traditionally consisted of a discussion of the *vita auctoris*, the *titulus operis*, the *intentio scribentis*, the *materia operis*, the *utilitas*, and *cui parti philosophiae supponitur*. Quain, “The Medieval Accessus ad Auctores,” 215.

⁴⁶² “Sicut enim Paulus Apostolus per revelationem didicit euangelium ita Moyses, docente Spiritu Sancto, conditi mundi cognouit exordium.” Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.
it can be understood that whatever God made, whether spiritual or
corporal, was made at once materially, but unformed. Then, part
by part, scripture follows how God made them, by setting the
distinctions of individual works by means of individual forms.
And because there were not yet distinct forms of the elements,
there follows, and the world was empty and void of those things
that would come from the earth. And shadows were over the face
of the abyss. By the name ‘abyss’ is meant the remaining
elements which were at that point mixed, so that it was not clear
into what forms they were to be divided. And the spirit of God
was carried over the waters, that is [the Spirit], just as the Lord,
just as the Creator, was in charge of the material, at that point
fluid and confused, so that he might divide it as he wished. Thus,
in the production of that work all of the Trinity may be seen: God
is the Father, the beginning is the Son, and the Spirit of God is the
Holy Spirit. From this point follow the division of the diverse
works [of creation].

Note that this history is named from its beginning, the Creation of
Heaven and Earth, according to the Hebrew custom, just as the
Gospel of Matthew is called the Book of the Genealogy
[generationis] of Jesus Christ, although both contain many other
written things in what follows, in which there is no discussion of

---

463 “Notandum quia Moyses in hoc libro de inferiori mundo in quo homo factus est ad instructionem
generis humani facere sermonem intendit. Et quia visibili mundo perﬁciendus erat homo, primo ei regnum paratum
descritur, postremo rector inducit, cui creaturarum ceterarum opulentia obsequatur. Dicitur ergo in principio, id
est, in coeterna sibi sapientia quae de se dicit, ego principium qui et loquor uobis. Creaut Deus celum et terram.
Potest intelligi caeli et terre nomine quicquid Deus fecit, siue spirituale siue corporale, simul esse factum
materialiter sed tamen informiter. Deinde per partes scriptura persequitur quomodo Deus fecit ponendo per
singulas formas singulorum distinctiones operum. Et quia nondum erant distinctae formae elementorum sequitur,
terra autem erat inanis et aequa his quae de terra praecessura erant. Et tenebrae erant super faciem abyssi. Abyssi
nomine possunt intelligi reliqua elementa quae adhuc erant confusa et incerta in quas formas essent distinguenda.
Et spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas. Id est sicut dominus sicut conditor praerat illi adhuc ﬂuanti et
confusae materiae ut eam distinguenter quomodo ullet. Ecce in hoc opere tota trinitas operata intelligitur: Deus,
Pater; principium, Filius; spiritus Dei, Spiritus Sanctus. De hinc sequuntur distinctiones diuersorum operum.”
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.
their origins [generationis]. As you see, this history introduces the first man, the form of the one to come, as built of virgin soil, through whom terrestrial men would be begotten [generandi] into passing life, just as the Gospel introduces the new man, made of a virgin mother, through whom heavenly men would be regenerated into eternal life. Thus in these scriptures there are the figures of future things, whereas in the Gospel there is the manifestation of completed things.464

These passages all correspond to parts of an accessus. Alastair Minnis has associated this kind of accessus with a focus on the author, in order to support the auctoritas of the text. The bulk of the texts’ authority, however, he claimed was rooted in allegorical interpretation. He notes its occasional use in the early twelfth century—which these glosses appear to confirm—but claims that it only came into prevalence in biblical scholarship in the thirteenth century.465 What is clear is that these items differ significantly from the three-fold introduction recommended by both Gregory and Bede for scriptural exegesis, which consisted of explanations of the persona, the locus, and the tempus—even though the text of the Glossa primitiva on Genesis 1–3 appears to reflect a Gregorian approach to the multiple meanings of scripture.466 These introductory passages suggest that the hypothesized proto-Glossa may have been composed in an environment heavily influenced by philosophical methods, particularly the Aristotelian interest

464 “Notandum quod haec historia a suo principio more Hebreorum generatio caeli et terre uocatur, sicut euangelica Mathei historia “liber generationis Ihesu Christi” appellatur, cum utraque scriptura multa in sequentibus contineat in quibus nulla generationis mentio fiat. Introducit quippe haec historia primum hominem futuri formam utpote de terra virgine conditum per quem generandi erant terreni in uitam transitoriam, sicut Euangelium nouum hominem inducit de matre virgine factum per quem caelestes homines regenerandi erant in uitam aeternam. In hac ergo scriptura figvae sunt futurorum, in euangelio uero manifestatio completorum.” Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.

465 Minnis’ ‘Type C’ accessus has one more heading than found in Quain’s system: the ordo libri. Minnis, Medieval Theory of Authorship, 20–23; On the use of this accessus as a support for authorial auctoritas, Medieval Theory of Authorship, 38–39; Minnis cites the commentaries of Peter Abelard and Gilbert of Poitiers (c. 1080 – 1154), Medieval Theory of Authorship, 41. He is quite aware of the presence of the ‘Type C’ accessus in the Glossa ordinaria, but thinks it is more recent than the textual work on Genesis 1–3 indicates. Medieval Theory of Authorship, 48.

466 Minnis, Medieval Theory of Authorship, 17. On the adoption of the accessus in theological works, see Alastair J. Minnis, “Prologues to Scriptural ‘Auctores,’” in Medieval Theory of Authorship, 40–72; Gregory the Great, MI, Epistola a Leandrum 3 [CSCSL 143, 4].
in the final purpose of the text (as seen in the second passage), likely by way of Boethius.\footnote{Quain, “The Medieval Accessus ad Auctores,” 263.}


As noted above, Minnis has argued that this type of *accessus* structure is directed towards the establishment of authorial *auctoritas*, while early medieval biblical scholarship supported the authority of scripture “through elaborate allegorical interpretation which tended to undervalue the literal sense of scripture and the literary forms, genres, styles, and structures believed to constitute part of it”.\footnote{Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, 38–39.} However, the appearance of these *accessus* glosses, as well as the centrality of Augustine’s structural analysis in *De Genesi ad litteram*, demonstrates a rejection of spiritual allegory as the foundation for the authority of the Genesis creation account, in favor of grammatical analysis that lead to a philosophical defense of the text. While this interpretation required the exegete to accept a hidden meaning, it is a far cry from a purely allegorical analysis, as the word “allegory” is commonly understood.

One of the most interesting features of this oldest set of introductory passages is that they introduce two different methods of interpretation. The passage that discusses the work’s intention leads directly into a summary of the exegesis on the Hexameron, offering explanations of the first creation narrative with a focus on understanding the literal meaning of the account and careful attention to how the words of the text point the reader to the presence of the Trinity. The discussion of the name of the text, meanwhile, leads the commentator into a spiritual, Christological interpretation by means of comparison with the Gospel of Matthew.

I have suggested that the *Glossa primitiva* represents an intermediary stage in which the text was both used as the basis for lectures and read as a reference text. It contains a number of passages on biblical interpretation that cannot at present be tied to the hypothesized proto-*Glossa*. In these, two readings of scripture are introduced and explained in greater detail by
means of three passages taken from Augustine’s *De Genesi ad litteram* in which Augustine explains the principles by which he determined the meaning of the text:

When we read divine books, which contain so great a multitude of true meanings, which are drawn from few words and fortified by the soundness of Catholic faith, let us pick out that one above all which appears certain to be what was meant by him whom we read. If, however, this is hidden, [let us choose] that meaning, certainly, which the surrounding scripture does not hamper, and which agrees with sound faith. If, moreover, it cannot be treated or explained through the context of scripture, then at least [let us choose] that alone which sound faith prescribes. For it is one thing not to discern what the author chiefly meant, but another to wander from the rule of piety. If both are avoided, [the reader] has the fruit of reading perfectly. If, however, both cannot be avoided, even if the will of the author is uncertain, it is not useless to pick out the meaning fitted to sound faith.⁴⁷⁰

In matters that are obscure and far from our understanding, if we read things on those matters, even in divine scripture, which may be brought forth in sound faith in some or another words, in none of them should we rush forth in headlong affirmation in such a way that if, perhaps, a more diligently argued truth makes it unsteady, we totter, not on behalf of the understanding of divine scripture, but on behalf of our own, so struggling that we wish

---

⁴⁷⁰ “Cum diuinos libros legimus in tanta multitudine uerorum intellectuum qui de paucis eruuntur uerbis et sanitate catholice fidei munuuntur, id potissimum diligamus quod certum apparuerit eum sensisse quem legimus; si autem hoc latet, id certe quod circumstantia scripture non impedit et cum sana fide concordat, si autem et scripture circumstantia pertractari ac discuti non potest, saltem id solum quod fides sana prescribit. Aliud est enim, quid potissimum scriptor sensori, non dinooscere; aliud a regula pietatis errare. Si utrumque uitetur perfecte se habet fructus legentis. Si uero utrumque utiari non potest, etiam si uoluntas scriptoris incerta sit, sane fidei congruem non inutilre est eruisse sententiam.” Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r. cf. Augustine, *DGAL* I, 21 [*CSEL 28* III 1, 31].
that to be of the scriptures which is ours, when we should rather wish for that to be ours which is of the scriptures.\textsuperscript{471}

In the recounting of historic events, not everything should be accepted only according to the understanding of figures, but some things should be asserted and defended according to the trustworthiness of historical events. Whence, that scripture, in which it is said by Moses, \textit{in the beginning God created heaven and earth}, should be investigated beyond the allegorical meaning.\textsuperscript{472}

One may note that these passages, in which the exegetical method of the text is clearly stated, focus on Augustine’s rule of reading the biblical text in the light of Christian tradition, and do not explicitly discuss the idea of a spiritual sense of scripture. This is in keeping with the exegetical program of the \textit{Glossa primitiva}, which is so dependent on the historical interpretation of Genesis 1–3 that the compiler felt no need to give those extracts headings. Thus, only the few extracts from \textit{De Genesi contra Manichaeos} are titled according to their sense, “mystice”.\textsuperscript{473} The use of extracts from Augustine roots the \textit{Glossa primitiva} in Augustine’s philosophical grammar, in which the practice of reading is an ongoing process of working out the complexities and enigmas presented by the text.\textsuperscript{474} Grammar and the proper

\textsuperscript{471} In rebus obscuris atque a nostris oculis remotissimis, si qua inde scripta etiam diuina legerimus que possint salua fide aliis atque aliis parere sententias, in nullam earum nos precipiti affirmatione ita proiciamus, ut si forte diligentius discussereris eam labefactauerit, corruamus non pro sententia diuinarum scripturarum sed pro nostra ita dimicantes ut eam uelimum scripturarum esse quae nostra est, cum potius eam que scripturarum est nostram esse debeamus. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r. cf. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} I, 18 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 27]

\textsuperscript{472} In narratione rerum factarum non omnia secundum figurarum intellectum tantummodo accipientia sint, sed secundum fidem rerum gestarum quedam sunt asserenda et defendenda. Vnde preter allegoricam significatationem illa scriptura rimanda est in qua a Moys dicitur, \textit{In principio fecit Deus celum et terram}. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r. cf. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} I, 1 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 3].

\textsuperscript{473} The heading “mystice” is also the sole sense heading in the \textit{Glosae super Iohannem}, suggesting a possible unanimity in how the senses were approached in the exegesis of Laon. Andrée, “Anselm of Laon Unveiled,” 240.

\textsuperscript{474} Irvine, \textit{The Making of Textual Culture}, 170–171.
understanding of what is signified by the text is the foundation of Augustine’s speculative theology— hence the name he gave to De Genesi ad litteram.\textsuperscript{475}

The central position of Augustine’s exegesis can be found in the manuscripts of what may be the earliest version of the Glossa ordinaria, namely, the Valenciennes Group of manuscripts. These manuscripts contain extensive prefatory material, made up of passages found in the Glossa primitiva as well as new text extracted from previously uncited patristic authorities. For the most part, however, the new passages address questions about first principles and creation \textit{ex nihilo}. Not one of the new glosses explicitly treats exegetical principles or the spiritual sense. This is not to say that the spiritual sense is absent—far from it, as shown by the addition of the Isidorean explanation of the Hexameron in moral and spiritual terms, as well as the new interlinear glosses discussed in Chapter Three. (The prefatory Isidorean glosses also constitute one of the few times in the Glossae in which the heading “mystice” is seen applied to an extract not taken from De Genesi contra Manichaeos.) As in the Glossa primitiva, allegorical interpretation is explained in the Augustinian extracts found in the marginal glosses to Genesis 2–3, but it remains largely absent from the preface, and is not explicitly prescribed as a method for understanding the Hexameron.

This changed in later manuscripts. The Amiens Group contains two new additions, one of which is the earliest example of an explicit listing of the four senses of scripture for Glossae on Genesis 1–3. The first comes from a commentary falsely attributed to Bede, and it lays out a twofold division of scripture. The second is from Guibert of Nogent’s commentary on Genesis, written before his death in 1125, and it contains the traditional four senses:

\begin{quote}
At times, sacred scripture suggests eternal things, as in, \textit{in the beginning was the word}. At others it narrates things done, as, \textit{in the beginning God created heaven and earth}. At others it tells of things to be, as in, \textit{when the Son of Man comes in his seat of majesty}, and at others it prescribes what ought to be done, as in \textit{love your neighbor as yourself}; and sacred scripture is twofold,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{475} Irvine, \textit{The Making of Textual Culture}, 187.
because there are some things which are only said as figures, as in, *Adam heard the voice of God walking in paradise*, others as a trustworthy record of historical events, as when the people leaving Egypt walked across the sea on foot, and there are others which are said in both ways, as is the crossing of the Red Sea and the miracles which the Lord performed in the Gospels.476

The rules of scripture are four: that is, history, which speaks of deeds; allegory, in which one thing is understood from another; tropology, that is a moral statement in which ordained morals are discussed; anagogy, that is the spiritual understanding through which we, who are to speak of high and celestial matters, are lead to higher things. These four, like wheels, turn all of sacred scripture. The meaning of the word Jerusalem according to history is a city; in allegory, it signifies the Church; according to tropology (that is, morally), the soul of one of the faithful which sighs after eternal peace; according to anagogy, the life of all those in heaven who see God face-to-face.477

Where the Augustinian extracts provided a patristic foundation for the multiple senses of scripture and explained the different approaches to the biblical text found in the *Glossae*, these

476 “Diuina scriptura aliquando eterna intimantur, ut est *in principio erat eternum*, aliquando facta narratur ut *in principio creavit Deus celum et terram*, aliquando futura narratur, ut *cum uenerit filius hominis in sede magisterii sui*. Aliquando quae agenda sunt precipiuntur, ut *diliges proximum tuum sicut teipsum*, et est bipartita diuina scriptura quia alia sunt que secundum figuram tamen dicuntur, ut est *audiuit Adam uocem Dei deambulantis in paradiso*. Alia secundum rerum gestarum fidem ut est quod populus exiens de Egypto per mare pedibus ambuluit, alia sunt quae utroque dicta modo, ut est transitus maris rubri et miracula que Dominus in Evangelio fecit.” Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (*olim* Bibliothèque municipale), 34, fol. 1r. cf. Bede (spur.) *De sex dierum creatione liber sententiarius ex patribus collectarum*, PL 93:207A–207B.

477 “Quattuor sunt regule scripture, id est historia, quae res gestas loquitur; allegoria, in qua alius ex alio intelligitur; tropologia, id est morale locutio in qua de moribus ordinandis tractatur; anagoge, id est spiritualis intellectus per quem de summis et celestibus tractaturi ad superiorem ducimur. His quatuor quasi quibusdam rotis tota diuina scriptura voluitur. Verbi gratia Jerusalem secundum istoriam est ciuitas, allegoriam, ecclesiis significat, secundum tropologiam (id est moraliter) animam cuiuslibet fidelis que ad pacem eternam anelat, secundum anagogen omnium <cele>stium utam que reuelata facie Deum uident”. Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (*olim* Bibliothèque municipale), 34, 1r. cf. Guibert of Nogent, *Moralia in Genesin*, PL 156:25D–26A. Ryan P. Freeburn, *Hugh of Amiens and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011). This is a paraphrase of Cassian; see Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, 34.
glosses bring the text’s hermeneutical system into line with the prescribed exegetical system of the high Middle Ages—the four-fold method of interpretation. It is important to note, however, that these explanations of exegetical method were only added to the *Glossa ordinaria* after its essential structure, contents, and approach to the text were in place, and it is therefore unsurprising that the exegetical practice seen in the text can differ—sometimes significantly—from theory.

20 The Four Senses in the proto-*Glossa* and *Glossa primitiva*

The *Glossa primitiva* on the Hexameron presents a two-fold interpretation of scripture seen in both the *accessus* excerpts and in the passages taken from the first chapters of *De Genesi ad litteram*: scripture was to be interpreted both according to the letter, in order to explain the historical events that the text describes, and as having spiritual significance. This was due in part to the fact that the *Glossa primitiva* is a firmly Augustinian text, and approached the text of Genesis 1–3 in the light of Augustine’s most important contributions to the exegetical tradition: the allegory of *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* and the figural, grammatical explanation of the creation narrative found in *De Genesi ad litteram*, rooted in Augustine’s neoplatonic philosophy. The two-fold interpretation of the text is represented by the headings given to extracts, which labelled them according to the sense to which they pertained. In the *Glossa primitiva*, the glosses that interpret the text spiritually—almost all of which appear to be taken from *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* by way of the proto-*Glossa*—are labelled “mystice”. In the Lambeth Gloss, a few are labeled “moraliter”, but in the *Glossa primitiva*, this heading is primarily subsumed under the heading “mystice”. It reappears as a separate sense in the *Glossa ordinaria*, restoring the full three senses prescribed by Gregory in the *Moralia in Job*.478

It seems likely that Gregory’s scheme was that found in the proto-*Glossa*. Although they are untitled in the *Glossa primitiva*, it appears that the compiler of the proto-*Glossa* titled the extracts taken from *De Genesi ad litteram* “historice”, as seen in the Lambeth Gloss. These headings are found in the *Glossa ordinaria* as well. In these titles, one sees the mystical, which

478 Gregory the Great, *Ml*, Epistola ad Leandrum 3 [CCSL 143, 4].
attributed hidden meanings to the events described, as when the six days of creation were interpreted as representative of periods of biblical history; the moral, which applied the text to the condition of the human soul; the explanation of the letter of the text, which is referred to as the “historical” in the Glossae. This last sense interpreted the text of scripture as describing real events, and thus authoritative, but in a hidden way which could be unveiled by careful attention to the grammar and recourse to a philosophical understanding of the universe.

These headings appear to have had special meanings when applied to the text of Genesis 1–3, as is seen when comparing the headings in the Glossa primitiva on the first three chapters of Genesis to those found in the glosses on Genesis 4. When commenting on the story of Cain and Abel and the listing of Cain’s descendants, the heading “historice” disappears, and “mystice” is replaced by “allegorice”. “Allegorice” occasionally appears as an alternative to “mystice” in the marginal commentaries on Genesis 1–3 of later manuscripts of the Glossa ordinaria, but in the Lambeth gloss and the Glossa primitiva, it appears only in Genesis 4 and on, suggesting that the compiler of the proto-Glossa did not consider allegory the correct term for the spiritual interpretation of the creation narrative. Rather, it seems that allegory was only thought to be appropriate when expressing the spiritual meaning of easily understood historical narrative, like the story of Cain and Abel. In contrast, the spiritual interpretation of the creation account is described as “mystical”. This may reflect that, when reading the creation account, the historical meaning of the words also required careful interpretation in order to understand how events occurred as described, making their spiritual significance doubly hidden.

The historical sense was thought to pertain in particular to the Old Testament, which stood as a figure for the new. However, the use of “historice” in the Glossae on Genesis suggests that it was meant in a different way when discussing the creation account. The marginal gloss on Genesis 4 contains no glosses bearing the heading “historice”, which lends further support to this theory. There was no need for a historical gloss on the story of Cain and Abel as there was for the creation account, because the historical meaning of Genesis 4 was thought to be evident to the reader. When reading the creation story, however, the words of the text were believed to

---

479 de Lubac, Medieval Exegesis, 1:3.
be true, but the truth they contained was not thought to be evident on the first reading, and required explanation in order to describe how they could have occurred. Hence, “historice”.

This understanding of the historical truth of the creation narrative may be attributed, like so much of the Genesis tradition, primarily to Augustine, who built De Genesi ad litteram on a careful reading of the words and grammar of the scriptural text—the littera—of scripture, understanding his work as a corrective against the too-allegorized interpretation he had provided in De Genesi contra Manichaeos. Indeed, Augustine expressly rejected the idea that his grammatical analysis of the creation account in De Genesi ad litteram might be understood as only allegory, rather than a description of the structures through which the universe was made.

The fact that only the mystical and (occasionally) the moral glosses are so titled in the Glossa primitiva suggests that the glossator saw no need to mark the historical sense, understanding it as the default approach to the interpretation of the text. However, medieval scholars did not understand the words of the creation account as simply and clearly narrating historical events, as they did the murder of Abel and the succession of Cain’s descendants. Nor were they willing to read the text as pure allegory, and it was for his over-indulgence in allegory that Origen was harshly critiqued, particularly in his assertion that some passages of the Bible were intentionally false in order to support the allegory. Even if the literal meaning of the creation account was clouded by apparent disagreement with other scriptural texts or the principles of natural philosophy, orthodox belief held that it was necessary to accept it as authoritative. Thus, as seen in the Augustinian passages, disagreements with natural philosophy had to be resolved. This is seen in the following passage, which provides a representative example of the use of “historical” as a title for an argument about the structure of the creation narrative:

Augustine. Historical. Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and so forth. Note that the firmament is not called such on

Augustine, DGAL I, 17 [CSEL 28 III 1, 25].

Augustine, DGAL IV, 28 [CSEL 28 III 1, 126–127].

Porphyry, among others, was not impressed by Origen’s methods. Irvine, The Making of Textual Culture, 167; Ibid., 255.
account of a lack of motion, but because it is a firm and impassible boundary between the upper and lower waters, whether we understand ‘heaven’ to be the air, or that heaven which is above the space of the cloudy air, which bears water vapors from the exhalation of earth, and hangs them as subtle drops, and after they are gathered together into greater masses, pours them back in the rain. If, indeed, water, as we see, can exist as such small drops that they are born as vapor above the air, which is naturally lighter than water, then why do we not believe that it fills the space above that lighter heaven with smaller drops and lighter vapors? But in whatever way they are, we do not doubt that they are.483

As expressed in the first of the accessus passages, the trustworthiness of the biblical creation account was attributed to the Holy Spirit, who was believed to have inspired Moses’ writing of the book of Genesis. A similar argument, contemporary to the Glossa ordinaria, is found in the writing of Hugh of St Victor, who explained the harmony of the literal and spiritual senses in the interpretation of the creation account by arguing that God caused the historical events to happen as they did in order to convey their spiritual meaning.484

This leaves the question of what was understood by the meaning of the word “historical”. Brian Stock has categorized twelfth-century discussions of creation into two groups: those that express theological truths—i.e., that God created the universe from nothing—and “structural”


exegesis, which explains how he did so. The historical glosses, for the most part, fall under the latter category. In seeking to further understand the Glossae’s approach to the historical sense, a fruitful comparison may be made to other exegetical works on Genesis with structural concerns. The composition of the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis was contemporary to the Hexameron of Thierry of Chartres (d. c. 1150), and the text was an important source for the Historia scholastica of Peter Comestor (d. c. 1178). The divergent approaches of these two authors reveal the diversity of speculative approaches to the creation account in the twelfth century.

21 Literal Commentaries in the Twelfth Century: Two Examples

While Thierry of Chartres is associated with the twelfth-century Platonism of Chartres, in his Hexameron commentary he rejected Augustine’s interpretation of creation, which held that God’s works came into existence by means of the angelic intelligences. Thierry retained the understanding that Genesis described the structure of creation in a hidden way, however, which he attempted to explain “ad physicam”. Interpreting the days of creation as periods of successive heat and cold caused by the movement of the light, Thierry understood the universe to have begun as a layer cake of three classical elements: air, water, earth. He then explained that the conduction of heat through the elements over the course of the six “days” was the force driving the creation of the universe—for example, the warming water evaporated into steam and formed the water above the heavens, while further evaporation lead to the exposure of dry land. Thierry’s work is far more creative than the Glossa primitiva and the Glossa ordinaria. What he shares with Augustine and the compiler of the Glossae is a commitment to demonstrating the truth of the inspired scriptures by explaining the structure of creation in a way that accorced with natural philosophy.

---

485 Stock, Myth and Science in the Twelfth Century, 8.
486 Jeaneau, Rethinking the School of Chartres, 69.
487 Thierry of Chartres, Tractatus de sex dierum operibus 7 [Häring, 186]; Ibid., 18–29 [Häring, 190–194].
Thierry’s *Hexameron* is an excellent example of a purely structural commentary on the creation narrative. Given the ways in which it differs methodologically from the *Glossae*, however, more can be said about the historical sense in the *Glossae* by looking at how the text was used as a source for the *Historia scholastica* of Peter Comestor. “Master of the Histories” and Chancellor of the University of Paris from 1169 until his death, Peter Comestor was a student of Peter Lombard who appears to have been strongly influenced by the School of Saint Victor’s interest in the historical meaning of scripture.\(^{488}\) Hugh of St. Victor’s educational program demanded a firm grounding in scriptural History, and Peter provided that by means of the *Historia*, a “compendium of biblical history”, for which he had recourse to the exegesis of Andrew of St. Victor.\(^{489}\) Much of his treatment of the Hexameron account is taken from the *Glossa ordinaria*, by means of the *Sententiae* of Peter Lombard.\(^{490}\)

In his preface, Peter explains a metaphor, originating with Hugh of St. Victor’s *Didascalicon*, comparing biblical exegesis to a house: History provides the foundation, Allegory the walls, and Tropology the roof. The goal of his text, therefore, is to provide his reader with the necessary foundation for further scriptural study.\(^{491}\) One would expect such a text to discuss the history of the Patriarchs and the doings of the kings of Israel and Judah. When one reads the creation account it becomes clear that Peter, like the compiler of the *Glossae*, understood his historical foundation to encompass a wide range of glosses: questions of language and translation (such as explaining that *pan* is the Greek equivalent of *omne*) as well as Latin grammar (cete is indeclinable). It includes comparisons of Moses’ first principles to those of the Greek philosophers and brief refutations of Jewish exegesis, with a rapid summary of the


\(^{490}\) Mark Clark, “Peter Comestor and Peter Lombard: Brothers in Deed,” *Traditio* 60 (2005), 89.

Augustinian tradition on the creation account. In Peter’s usage, the historical sense of the text is everything that pertains to the meaning of the letter. This is the natural counterpart of Augustine’s approach, in which the letter was the key to unlocking the historical, structural meaning.

The equation of the historical meaning of the text with interpretation ad litteram and the structural system it was thought to reveal indicates the difference between the exegetical tradition on Genesis and the common, teleological narrative of medieval biblical study, in which the study of the spiritual sense eventually passes away to make room for the literal. In the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis, and the reading of Genesis in general, the search for hidden meaning was not only driven by a desire for spiritual allegory, as one sees in readings of the Psalms and the Song of Solomon, but by the need to accept the text as making a true claim about the origins of the universe in the face of challenges from other epistemological systems—a need which, as was discussed in the Introduction, was rooted in the early centuries of Christian apologetics. This is not to say that works such as the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis and Thierry’s Hexameron—to say nothing of the other numerous commentaries on Genesis from the twelfth century—were engaged in shoring up the reliability of a questioned text in the face of widespread doubt. However, they represent the growing interest in the natural world in the twelfth century, and the fact that for any who wondered about its workings and origins, Genesis was the foundation of further inquiry. The resulting combination of theoretical principles and interests brought greater complexity and nuance to the senses of scripture, as applied to the Genesis tradition, than is customarily portrayed in surveys of medieval intellectual endeavors.

22 The Expansion of the Senses in the Glossa ordinaria

As was noted in Chapter Three, the Glossa ordinaria contains extracts from several sources new to the exegetical tradition of the Glossae on Genesis 1–3, which result in an proliferation of the number of approaches to the text, both the spiritual and the literal. These include an expansion of the spiritual sense beyond what was found in De Genesi contra Manichaeos to

---

492 Peter Comestor, Scholastica Historia Liber Genesis 1 [CCCM 191, 5]; Ibid., 7 [CCCM 191, 18]; Ibid., 1 [CCCM 191, 7]; Ibid., 18 [CCCM 191, 35–36].

493 For example, Minnis, Medieval Theory of Authorship, 38-39.
include extracts from the works of Isidore—likely through Rabanus Maurus—and glosses taken from the *Moralia in Job* of Gregory the Great, by way of Paterius.

The additions are not limited to the spiritual sense. The contents of the *Glossa ordinaria* were expanded through the addition of new glosses treating the letter of the text and the structure of creation, consisting of extracts from Jerome’s *Hebraicae quaestiones* and Alcuin’s *Interrogationes in Genesim*, as well as certain glosses attributed to Strabo, treating questions of first principles and natural philosophy. (As discussed in Chapter Three, it is not yet possible to identify the source of these glosses.) It is the additions to the spiritual sense which appear to have a certain dominance, however, in part due to the inclusion of the Isidorean allegories in the interlinear glosses. These make the interlinear glosses much more heavily spiritual than one would suspect based on the material in the margins. This uneven balance to the senses in the interlinear glosses is responsible for their central position in Buc’s research on the *Glossa ordinaria*.

Several new literal and historical glosses appear in the prefatory material, introducing the structural questions that will be treated in the text. The following excerpt from Alcuin, which addresses the disagreement between the seven-day Hexameron account and the description of God creating all things “at once” found in Sirach, is an example:

Alcuin. God works in four ways: first in word, second in unformed matter, whence, *who lives eternally created all things at once*. Third he distinguished creatures through the work of the six days. Fourth, creatures do not arise from the initial seeds of an unknown nature, but they are reshaped more often from those of a known nature, lest they perish.  

As shown in Chapter Three, there is also an extensive addition from Paterius’ florilegium of the work of Gregory the Great, which treats the same question in Augustinian terms:

Gregory. It is asked how God created all things at once, when Moses described all things as being created separately out of a fluctuating movement of days. But the substance of things was created at once, even if they were not formed into species at once, and what came to exist at once in regard to the substance of matter, did not simultaneously appear through the species of form. So, when heaven and earth are said to have been formed simultaneously, it indicates that spiritual and physical things were created at one time, and that whatever would be produced from the earth was made at one time. The sun, moon and stars were made in the heaven on the fourth day, but that which would come as a species on the fourth day, existed on the first day in the substance of heaven by means of creation. On the first day, it says that earth was made. On the third, the trees were established, and all the green things of the earth are described. But that which came into being in its species on the third day, was created on the first day in the very substance of the earth.”

Another new gloss found in the prefatory material, taken from Jerome, addresses the letter of the text, giving in its comparison of various Latin translations:

Jerome. *In the beginning God made heaven and earth.* Many assert, like Tertullian and Hilary, that in the Hebrew it says, “in the son, God made heaven and earth”. But the Septuagint, Symachus, and Theodotion translate it as “in the beginning”, and in Hebrew is written “Bresith”, which Aquila translates as “at the

495 “Gregorius. Querendum est quomodo Deus simul cuncta condidi, dum idem Moyses ex dierum mutatione variante distincte creato describit, sed rerum substantia simul creatae est, simul auro per species formata non est, et quod simul exitit per substantiam materie non simul apparuit per speciem forme. Cum enim simul factum celum terraque dicitur, simul spiritualia et corporalia et quicquid de terra producitur simul factum indicatur. Sol, luna, et sidera quarto die in celo facta perhibentur, sed que quarto die processit in specie, primo die in celi substantia exitit per conditionem. Primo die terra creatae dicitur, tertio arbusta condita et cuncta terre uirentia describuntur. Sed quod die tertio in speciem prodiit, prima die in ipsa terre substantia conditionum fuit.” Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 1v. cf. Paterius, *LEVNT* 1:10 [PL 79: 688B–689A].
head”. Rather, therefore, it can be accepted according to the
translation of the word to concern Christ, who is described as the
creator of heaven and earth in this beginning of Genesis, which is
at the head of all the books, and in the beginning of John.
Whence, *at the head of the book it is written of me*, that is, “In
the beginning of Genesis”. *And all things were made through him*, et
cetera. Among the Hebrews, also, who name their volumes after
the beginnings of the books, this book is called “Bresith”.

The inclusion of new extracts in the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3
required an expansion in the use of the sense headings from the simple
notation of “mystice” found in the *Glossa primitiva*. While the headings
were still almost exclusively used for extracts from *De Genesi ad litteram*
and *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* which can be attributed to the
proto-Glossa, the *Glossa ordinaria* returned to the use of “historice” and
occasionally gave headings to glosses from other sources, such as
the following gloss, likely influenced by Isidore:

Mystically. *In the beginning God created heaven*. Those, that is,
who bear the celestial image, and *earth*, that is, those who,
afterwards, make themselves earth through pride, that is, who
bear the image of terrestrial man. *Earth was void*, because it gave
up the good form and was empty of the fruit of good works, and
there were shadows, that is, the deprivation of the light of truth.
*Over the face of the earth*, that is, over the hearts of the proud.

---

496 “Ieronymus. *In principio fecit Deus celum et terram*. Plerique autumant, sicut Tertullianus et Hylarius,
in Hebreo habere “in filio fecit Deus celum et terram”. Septuaginta uero Symachus et Theodotio *in principio*
transstulerunt, et in Ebreo scriptum est “Bresith”, quod Aquila interpretatur “in capitulo”. Magis igitur secundum
uerbi translationem de Christo accipi potest, qui in ipsa fronte Geneseos que caput omnium est librorum et
in principio Iohannis celi et terre conditor approbatur. Vnde, *In capitulo libri scriptum est de me*, id est “in principio
Geneseos”. *Et omnia per ipsam facta sunt*, et cetera. Apud Ebreos quoque hic liber “Bresith” uocatur, qui
uoluminis ex principiis librorum nomina imponunt.” Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 2r. cf.
Jerome, *HQLG*, 1, 10 [CCSL 72, 3].

497 “Mistice. *In principio creavit Deus celum*, eos scilicet qui celestis imaginem portauerunt, *et terram*, id
est qui postea superbiendo terram, id est terreni hominis imaginem portantes se fecerunt. *Terra erat inanis*, quia
deposuerat formam bonam et uacua boni operis fructu, et tenebre erant ueri scilicet luminiis priuatiot. *Super faciem
abyssi*, corda scilicet superborum.” Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 2v. cf. *Glossa primitiva*, Paris,
Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.
The heading “historice” also appears at the beginning of a gloss, unique to Va, taken from Hugh of St. Victor’s Notulae. This particular gloss, which treats the nature of the signs given by the stars and planets, is addressed more to the proper interpretation of a word of the text than an understanding of the structure of creation. Thus, while its use suggests a glossator familiar with the importance Hugh granted to the historical truth of the text, it also reflects a change in the meaning of “historice” away from structural questions and towards use as a more general synonym for the literal meaning.

More consistently used than the sense headings are the attributions, new to the text, which credit individual glosses to their sources. To a reader familiar with the reputation of a given patristic source, these headings may have served a dual function of not only citing the source for the comment’s authority, but of alerting him to what type of exegesis one could expect to find in the gloss that followed. These headings and attributions served to orient the reader to the several senses of scripture at hand. They were also the direct result of the intellectual changes that drove the development of the Glossa ordinaria, and it is to these that this chapter will now turn.

23 “Diverse, but not Adverse”

One of the challenges to the study of the exegesis of the Glossa ordinaria, as with much medieval intellectual history, is the glossators’ apparent lack of interest in explaining their motivations or methods. The prefaces to Bede’s In Hexameron, Abelard’s Hexameron, and other exegetical works provide introductions explaining their authors’ principles and method, even if these prefaces are constrained by rhetorical practice. However, the same cannot be said for the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1–3. This is particularly true given that much of the introductory material is a later addition to the text, which imposes a systematic program on an already extant work.

---

498 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, 5v. See Appendix B, p. 298.

499 Henri de Lubac notes that several patristic authors acquired reputations of being identified with particular senses of scripture. de Lubac, Medieval Exegesis, 1:6. While the division of the senses is not so tidy in the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis, one can nevertheless see, in reading the gloss, that there appears to be an expectation that one or another sense will be found in the work of a given Patristic author.
Anselm of Laon, in whose school the books of the *Glossa ordinaria* had their origins, is a particularly shadowy figure. The only explanation he left of his methods is found in a letter written to Abbot Heribrand, in response to accusations about his orthodoxy and the prudence of his teaching techniques. In this letter, Anselm explained that in his view, the inherited opinions of the authorities are “diverse, but not adverse” and that they come together in a “harmony”, despite apparent disagreement. 500 This phrase may be best understood as referring not to his program of exegesis, but to his discussions of collected authoritative *sententiae*, although the weaving together of extracts from various patristic authorities that is seen in the early versions of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Bible is reminiscent of this description.

Anselm’s description of his teaching methods is in keeping with the characterization of twelfth-century school masters as primarily concerned with the collection of contrary authoritative opinions for use in the classroom, a practice which laid the foundation for later techniques that would come to define scholastic theology. 501 The practice of working out how the texts were in harmony, however, was an oral exercise, and is for the most part not represented in the texts. 502 Thus, when Anselm defended his teaching by saying that the authorities are “diverse, but not adverse” and that these contradictions are to be explained by differences of wording, rather than the matter of their thought, he described the work that went on in his classroom, rather than in his writings—although one should expect the latter to support the former. The idea that the school texts of the twelfth century were composed as an aid to oral teaching is further supported by evidence that students requested written versions of exegetical lectures they had heard in the classroom. 503

---


The *Glossa ordinaria* on the Bible, however, was not composed to furnish contradictory texts for classroom disputation. A consideration of the intellectual context in which the *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria* were shaped should assist our understanding of the history and use of the text. However, if the methods of the late-twelfth-century schools were driven by an interest in collecting contradictory opinions, whether in texts or in the classroom, what can we say about texts in which the collected authorities tend to agree? How do the *Glossae* on Genesis 1–3 fit into this view of the intellectual world of the twelfth century?

The exegetical tradition on the creation account in Genesis has a certain degree of coherence from the central role of Augustine, a man who had a prodigious output of writings and was adept at describing multiple solutions and choosing that which seemed the most logical. One may also wonder if this apparent coherence reflects the genre of the text. While biblical exegesis was the foundation of theology, the twelfth century saw the development of many independent theological texts, themselves made up of collections of authoritative opinions: “sentences,” and with the new texts came a new methods. The differences in how these two disciplines approached the creation account may be best explored by comparison to the discussion of creation found in contemporary sentence collections, particularly the *Liber pancrisis*, an important product of the School of Laon under the lasting influence of Anselm.

It should not surprise one to find that there is much less in-depth discussion of the structure of creation in the *Liber pancrisis* than there is in the *Glossae*, as the former is not a text devoted solely to the questions raised by Genesis 1–3 but to Christian theology as a whole. Excerpts from the exegetical tradition on the first three chapters of Genesis do appear, but when they do, it is because they pertain to central theological questions like the origin of the soul. The sources listed in the *Liber pancrisis* manuscript London, British Library, Harley 3098 are Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Gregory, Isidore, and Bede—all, except Ambrose, key contributors to the *Glossa ordinaria*—as well as William of Champeaux, Ivo of Chartres (c. 1040–1115), and Anselm and Ralph of Laon. Sundry other sources appear throughout the text.

---

504 Giraud, *Per verba magistri*, 530.

505 For example, the six sentences attributed to Amalarius. Giraud, *Per verba magistri*, 510–511.
While the patristic authorities of the Liber pancrisis may be the same as those of the Glossa ordinaria, it is notable that the sentence collection cites a greater variety of sources than does the Glossa ordinaria. First, of course, there is the greater prominence of the modern masters, who are represented in the Glossae on the creation account only in the medieval accessus glosses and—perhaps—the glosses attributed to Strabo. The first two sententiae in the Liber pancrisis, in contrast, come from William of Champeaux, and treat questions of the Trinity, the essence and substance of God, and the creation of man and the angels, thus addressing questions of creation in passing.\footnote{Giraud, \textit{Per verba magistri}, 503.} Other points at which the creation narrative is used are in the discussion of the creation of souls (citing Ambrose, William of Champeaux, and Augustine’s \textit{Epistola}), and the institution of marriage (in a sentence attributed to Augustine, but for which a source cannot be identified).\footnote{Giraud, \textit{Per verba magistri}, 521 and 522; Ibid., 537.}

There is also a brief section of the Liber pancrisis discussing the structure of creation as found in \textit{De Genesi ad litteram}, the interpretation of \textit{in principio} as treated in \textit{De Genesi contra Manichaeos}, and further questions about the creation of the angels. One may note that the sentence collection demonstrates a far greater interest in angels than is found in the Glossa ordinaria.\footnote{Giraud, \textit{Per verba magistri}, 513.}

Further comparison between the methods of the Glossa ordinaria and the sentence collections may be achieved through reference to the early, northern French sentence collection known as Deus non habet initium uel terminum, edited by John C. Wei, which may have been known to both Anselm and William of Champeaux.\footnote{John C. Wei, “The Sentence Collection Deus non habet initium uel terminum and its reworking, Deus itaque summe atque ineffabiliter bonus” \textit{Mediaeval Studies} 73 (2011) 6.} Once again, the patristic authors are similar to those found in the Glossae, but the questions to which the sentences are applied differ in their scope and interest.
The first section of *Deus non habet* is a discussion of the angels, and here one finds excerpts from Augustine’s *De Genesi ad litteram* which do not have a place in the *Glossa primitiva* or *Glossa ordinaria*, such as the following discussion of pride, in reference to the fall of Satan:

> Pride is love of one’s own excellence, while jealousy is hatred of another’s happiness. Indeed, envy follows pride, it does not precede it, for the cause of pride is not envy, but the cause of envy is pride. For, in loving his own excellence, one either envies one’s equal because he is equal, or one’s inferior, lest he be an equal, or one’s superior, because he is not an equal.⁵¹⁰

A later extract, which explains that Satan and his companions were exiled to the physical air, rather than the upper, celestial heaven, is also not found in the *Glossa ordinaria*.⁵¹¹ The reason for this omission is clear: there is no explicit discussion of Satan in the text of Genesis 1–3. The *Glossae* includes some discussion of his fall, but there was little scope for an extended discussion beyond that which was required to explain his hidden action through the serpent in the garden.⁵¹²

From the angels, *Deus non habet* turns its attention to the creation of man, where one finds somewhat more agreement with the *Glossa ordinaria*. Its primary interests, however, remain in theological questions like free will, which were foreign to the concerns of the exegetical tradition on Genesis 1–3.⁵¹³ One point of agreement is in the discussion of how old Adam was when he was created. Here, the sentence collection has broken the text in two, in keeping with its structure, which is oriented towards theological discussion in the classroom:

---


⁵¹¹ Wei, “The Sentence Collection *Deus non habet initium uel terminum*,” 43.


⁵¹³ Wei, “The Sentence Collection *Deus non habet initium uel terminum*,” 50.
Augustine on Genesis. It is asked whether God made man from the earth as an adult immediately, or whether, by increasing him through diverse times and ages, brought him to adulthood?

Solution. Augustine, the same. Adam was made as an adult at once without any incremental movement, as the staff was at once turned into a serpent from the hand of Moses.\(^{514}\)

The next section of *Deus non habet* treats the question of grace, and only then moves on to discuss questions creation, beginning with paradise. It then explains how one may accept both the Hexameron and the idea that God created all things at once, through a theory of primordial, unformed matter.\(^{515}\) However, there is no detailed discussion of the contents of the Hexameron. There are no questions about the meaning of the “signs” provided by the celestial lights, or about the existence of the waters above the heavens. In the next section, *Deus non habet* turns to the temptation and fall of man. Here, its contents are more in line with those found in the *Glossa ordinaria*, but once again certain theological questions—like that of free will, discussed through an extract from Augustine’s *Enchridion*—appear among the sentences when they are not primary concerns in the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3.\(^{516}\) The final two sections discuss the nature of God’s will and Original Sin.

The differences between the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3 and the treatment of theological questions of creation in these sentence collections may be explained by consideration of the purpose and positions of the two texts. The sentence collections were compiled as anthologies of Christian theology whose contents were to be applied to topics of theological interest. In contrast, commentaries on the Bible were written with the purpose of clarifying the meaning and supporting the veracity of the texts on which the theological systems depended, and properly identifying the position of the passages discussed in salvation history. One should

---

\(^{514}\) "*Augustinus supra Genesim*. Queritur utrum deus repente fecerit hominem de limo terre in uiril etate, an per diversa tempora et etates augendo eum, promouerit ad uirilem statum? *Solutio. Augustinus in eodem*. Adam continuo est factus sine ullo progressu incrementorum in etate uiril, ut urga de manu Moysi continuo conuersa est in draconem.” Wei, “The Sentence Collection *Deus non habet initium uel terminum*,” 55.

\(^{515}\) Wei, “The Sentence Collection *Deus non habet initium uel terminum*,” 66.

\(^{516}\) Wei, “The Sentence Collection *Deus non habet initium uel terminum*,” 79.
therefore note that discussions of the intellectual activity of the twelfth-century schools that characterize them as oriented towards harmonizing apparent disagreements among the authorities and the development of a systematic theology describe a different kind of intellectual project than that found in the *Glossa ordinaria*. For example, one may consider a frequently-discussed theological dispute: the nature of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist. When medieval academics argued over the definition and understanding of transubstantiation, the question was of how to define and explain the doctrinal belief, itself supported not only by tradition but by scriptural evidence as found in the Gospel of John. What had to be defined in the debate, then, was how humans could properly describe a doctrine of the faith, given the fallibility of human terms and language.

This is not the same kind of intellectual challenge raised by the first three chapters of Genesis. In reading Genesis, and scripture as a whole, any contradictions that students faced when they approached the text were not primarily contradictions between the explanations of received authorities, but contradictions and challenges found in the text itself, whether these were apparent disagreements within scripture, as with the two creation accounts, or the apparent contradiction between the word of scripture and traditional doctrine. Thus, the compilation of the *Glossae* on Genesis was not so much a project of collecting contradictory opinions that had to be explained, but in supporting the authoritative text of Genesis itself. Sentence collections provided the contradictions as exercises for theological and philosophical thought, but in the *Glossae* on Genesis, the challenges to understanding the biblical text are the reason for the existence of the text of the *Glossae*, and the received authorities provide the examples and explanations through which these are resolved.

This distinction explains the difference between how the *Glossae* treat the creation narrative, and how it appears in the contemporary sentence collections. In the sentence collections, discussions of the creation narrative are used to underpin other theological discussions, such as questions about the nature of the soul. God’s role in the creation of the universe is, itself, a significant feature of Christian doctrine, and so creation *ex nihilo* is not absent from the sentence collections, but there is less room or opportunity to explore the details of how it came about. In contrast, the purpose of explaining the text on Genesis is to explain the events that occur. In the case of the creation narrative, this required delving into problems of natural philosophy. Other theological questions that arise, like those about the soul, are discussed
because they are seen to be the logical response to the reading of the text (or, properly, because Augustine saw them to be the logical response to the reading of the text, and so they entered the exegetical tradition). Thus, the *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria*—like other commentaries on Genesis—became a work in which the glossator could engage the challenges of natural philosophy and the structure of creation with greater detail than is found in the theological treatises that use Genesis as a source, while supporting the scripture’s authority.

### 24 Exegetical Questions in the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis: Case Studies

The central role of Augustine lent a certain coherence to the exegetical tradition on Genesis, and many extracts on the creation account are truly “diverse, but not adverse”—they are only different ways of expressing Augustinian theories. The multiplication of the senses in the *Glossa ordinaria* increased the diversity of interpretations, but these were understood to be complementary to other explanations of the text. There were, nevertheless, a number of questions on which diverse interpretations were mutually exclusive, particularly in questions of the “historical” sense of creation, that is, natural philosophy. At these points, unfortunately, the *Glossae* give us no direction in how they were to be interpreted, and the notes that remain in the margins of manuscripts like *Am* do not seem to find these a challenge. Does this mean that a medieval reader would not have been bothered by a multiplicity of “historical” (in the case of Genesis, pertaining to natural philosophy) interpretations, even when they did not and could not cohere? Or was one expected to offer several interpretations, with the understanding that having a concrete answer to the problem was not the goal of historical analysis? How were these readings changed in the transition from the *Glossa primitiva* to the *Glossa ordinaria*? Were they compiled with the same intention as the sentence commentaries, and what do they suggest about how the text was read?

The development and change in the *Glossa ordinaria* and the *Glossa primitiva* is best illustrated by a study of some concrete examples of how the glossators approached exegetical questions on the book of Genesis. Thus, this chapter will close with a discussion of the approaches to the following questions in the *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria*: the waters above the heavens, as an example of a conflict with natural philosophy, the creation of the stars, as an example of a potential conflict with Christian morals, and the two accounts of the formation of
Adam and Eve, as an example of an internal textual conflict. (Glosses related to a similar problem, of whether creation happened at once or over six days, have been presented throughout the previous chapters.)

24.1 The Waters Above The Firmament

The separation of the waters into those above and below the firmament was a long-standing challenge for readers of the text of Genesis 1–3. As Ambrose and Augustine asked, how can water remain above the heavens, when the element of water is heavier than that of air? The Glossa primitiva is fundamentally Augustinian in this matter, citing both his treatment from De Genesi ad litteram and the allegorical interpretation of the work of that day from De Genesi contra Manichaeos, while the text of the Glossa ordinaria has expanded the interpretation with new sources. This can be seen in the expansion of the interlinear glosses. Where the interlinear text of the Glossa primitiva reads as follows:

And the Lord said, let there be a firmament between the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters;

said. the heavens are made firm by the word of the Lord

firmament. an impassible barrier

between. [the waters] which are suspended as a vapor, and those which lie lapping at the earth

waters from the waters. those above from those below.517

And the Lord made a firmament and divided the waters that were above the firmament from those which were below the firmament. And so it was done.

and. causally

made. in the angelic understanding

above the firmament. above the starry heaven, vaporally in

517 “dixit. uerbo Domini celi firmati sunt/ firmamentum. intransgressibilis terminus/ in medo aquarum. uaporaliter suspensarum et per terra labiliter iacentium/ aquas ab aquis. superiores ab inferioribus.” Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 7v.
small drops
from those. from the denser waters
below the firmament. below the starry heaven
and so it was done. in actuality
so. thus, in its kind. 518

In the *Glossa ordinaria*, the following glosses are added to those found in the *primitiva*:

*let there be.* divine scripture, about which it is said,
heaven will be rolled up like a scroll
*waters* (above) the population of the angels, who do not need the firmament of scripture
*waters* (below) the population of men, who do need it
*waters* above the firmament. angels
above. not below
*waters* below the firmament. men
below the firmament. So that through him, they might discern between carnal and spiritual things, as if between the superior and inferior waters. 519

Except for the “not below” note, all of these additions are taken from Rabanus Maurus’ commentary on Genesis, either directly—as is the case with most of the glosses—or in reference to other glosses, as with the glosses “angels” and “men” in Genesis 1:7, which refer back to the interlinear glosses in Genesis 1:6.

The two versions of the text share the same backbone of Augustinian material, although that found in the *Glossa ordinaria* is abbreviated from the form found in the *Glossa primitiva*. In the

518 “*Et. causaliter/ fecit. in cognitione angelorum/ super firmamentum. super sidereum celum uaporaliter immutatas/ ab his. a densioribus aquis/ sub firmamento. sub sidereo celo/ Et factum. actualiter/ ita. ita in genere suo.*” Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 7v.

519 “*fiat. diuine scripture de qua dicitur, celum sicut liber plicabitur/ aquas. populos angelorum qui non indigent firmamento scripture/ aquis. populis hominum qui indigent/ aquas. angelos/ super. non subter/ his. hominibus/ que. ut per ipsum inter carnalia et spiritualia quasi inter superiores et inferiores aquas discernant.*” Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 3v–4r.
marginal glosses of the *Glossa primitiva*, the discussion of the waters above the heavens begins with an Augustinian discussion of their creation in the word of God. This was removed in the *Glossa ordinaria*, likely because the same matters are repeated at other points in the gloss.\(^{520}\) The text then moves to a discussion of the meaning of the word “firmament”, which—as was keyed in the interlinear gloss—is so called because of the barrier it produces, not because it does not move, which would be a challenge to their understanding of the movement of the stars. The text explains the waters above the heavens as water vapors, and the numerological reason why the text does not call the second day “good”.\(^{521}\)

In the next paragraph, the *Glossa primitiva* turns to Bede, who explains that the firmament is that which holds the stars, refers his readers to another biblical citation that refers to the waters above the heavens (*Qui tegis aquis superiora eius*, Psalm 103:3), and discusses the problem—first found in the Latin tradition in Ambrose—of how flowing waters could remain above the heavens, when the heavens are curved. The *Glossa primitiva* then returns to Augustine’s *De Genesi ad litteram* in order to discuss the problem of the weight of the element of water, clarify Augustine’s theory of creation through the angelic intelligences, and—in the next paragraph—to explain the firmament as a symbol of the authorities “who have the truth” (likely the authors of scripture). It then returns to a discussion of the stability and movement of the firmament, likely a duplication attributable to the use of multiple Augustinian sources in compiling the *Glossa primitiva*. The section ends with the spiritual exposition of the text from *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, which explains that the second day of creation represents the second period of biblical history, which spans the time from Noah—whose ark, between the rain and the waves, represents the firmament—to the fall of the tower of Babel. The final piece of exposition, also from *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, explains that the firmament represents discipline, which discerns between carnal and spiritual things. In the *Glossa ordinaria*, this gloss is echoed in the interlinear glosses, in the form in which it is found in Rabanus Maurus.\(^{522}\)

---

\(^{520}\) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 7v. Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 4r.

\(^{521}\) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 7v.

\(^{522}\) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 7v–8r; Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 4r; Rabanus Maurus, *CG* I [PL107:467C].
In the Glossa ordinaria, there is a new gloss from Augustine on these verses, in which he discusses the temperature of the heavens as evidence for the water above the firmament—namely, he argued, the heavens are very cold, but their rotational movement should make them quite warm (due to friction). The explanation given for their cold temperature is the cooling nature of the waters above the heavens. Other new glosses on this text are from the purported Strabo, in a gloss that explains that the upper waters are congealed, like crystal, and from Gregory, who discusses the firmament as a symbol of the angelic powers.\footnote{Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 4r.}

One may note that the Glossa ordinaria, in its combination of multiple sources, feels no need to limit itself to a single physical explanation for the phenomenon described in the biblical text, but is content to gather multiple explanations (admittedly, mostly from Augustine). Some of these explanations are mutually exclusive: the waters above the heavens cannot be both a very fine vapor, as Augustine suggested, and like a crystalline stone, as did Strabo. While one may be willing to accept multiple explanations of the text when they are divided as examples of the four senses of scripture, it is harder to understand how the medieval readers of the Glossa ordinaria could have understood there to be multiple explanations of the historical sense of the text. It is best to understand the Glossa ordinaria’s approach to these problems as being lists of possibilities from which the reader could choose that which he found the most convincing; the compilers, like the authors of the sources they used, were offering possible resolutions to a mystery. One may, however, wonder whether there was a difference between the theories to which no alternative is given—like those taken from Augustine about the angelic intelligences as the intermediaries of creation—and those matters about which there was still some question. In those cases, readers of the text may have been expected to understand all the possibilities as possible, or to choose the explanation that seemed the most likely.

24.2 The Stars as Signs

The claim in Genesis 1 that the stars and planets were placed in the heavens to act as signs led to questions about astrology and other forms of fortunetelling, which most of the commentators were keen to distance from the Genesis account. This is merely implied in the interlinear glosses of the Glossa primitiva, which, as usual, are far fewer in number than those of the
Glossa ordinaria. They list the seasons as an example of the things that might be signified by the lights in heaven:

And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of heaven, and let them divide day and night, and let them be as signs, and seasons and days and years.

Let there be. Here are ordained the ornaments of the upper parts of the world.
day and night. calm weather and storms.
seasons. spring, summer, autumn, winter.
years. when they complete their course.524

All of these glosses are found in the Glossa ordinaria. In the Glossa ordinaria, however, there are several more interlinear glosses, most of which were taken from Isidore, likely via Rabanus Maurus. They read:

lights. learned men.
firmament. of scripture
firmament. because the lights are near, not because they are fixed.
as signs. of virtues
days. Because prophets [preachers?] live and die in their own times. First the earth gave forth plants, then the lights were made, because it is after good works that the illumination of light comes for contemplating the vision of supreme virtue.525


525 “luminaria. doctores/ firmamentum. scripture/ firmamentum. quia uicina, non quia infixa/ in signa. uirtutum/ dies. quia predictores propriis temporibus uiiunt et transeunt. Prius germinauit terra, deinde facta sunt luminaria quia post bona opera uenit illuminatio lucis ad contemplandam speciem superne uirtutis.” Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 5r–5v.
One sees in this gloss not only the addition of new, moral or spiritual glosses, but these glosses being used in response to a question of natural philosophy which could be a challenge to the Genesis text: how could things grow before the sun was created? In the understanding of the biblical text put forward by Isidore’s commentary, and thus by the compiler of the gloss, these unlikely or impossible events occurred in order to make this description, and the accompanying spiritual interpretation, possible.

In the exegetical tradition on Genesis 1–3, one frequently finds that the authors were concerned to show that the signs that were given by the stars were not references to astrology. This is found in the discussion of the fourth day of creation in Ambrose’s *Hexameron* commentary, as well as in Augustine’s commentaries on the text. Instead, these commentators gave examples of benign reasons why one might use the stars as signs— for calculating dates, or for navigating on the sea or in the desert. It is notable that the *Glossa ordinaria* (with the exception of an addition made in the margins of *M*, as noted in Chapter One) was much less concerned with the dangers of astrology, particularly when one considers the amount of space given to an Augustinian discussion of what phase the moon was in when it was created. Indeed, in *Va*, one finds an idiosyncratic gloss taken from Hugh of St. Victor’s *Notulae*, which is fairly positive about the power stars have on human actions while being sure to preserve the importance granted to free will, which, Hugh said, is not taken away by the movement of the stars, “as the fortunetellers say”.

### 24.3 The Two Creations of Man

One of the enduring challenges to the interpretation of Genesis 1–3 was the internal contradiction between the two accounts of creation found in Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. This included two accounts of the creation of humanity: the first in which man and woman are created together on the sixth day, and the second in which Eve is created from Adam’s side

---


527 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 5r–5v. cf. Augustine, *DGAL* II, 14–15 [CSEL 28 III 1, 53–56]. See Chapter One, p. 68; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm., 3746, fol. 5r.

when he has not found an appropriate companion among the other animals. Augustine thoroughly discredited the view that the two creation accounts were two versions of the same story, although that opinion continued to appear throughout the exegetical tradition, including in Bede’s commentary.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VI, 3 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 172–174].} Looking at how the \textit{Glossa ordinaria} on Genesis addresses this challenge provides a useful test-case for how the text uses the senses of scripture to provide multiple solutions to the problem.

There are two marginal explanations for this repetition: one, from Bede, explained Genesis 2 as a more detailed recounting of the events in Genesis 1, and then explained that the order to “be fruitful and multiply” is not a condemnation of monastic virginity. This is a movement from historical to moral interpretation, with a focus on the monastic life.\footnote{Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 7v. \textit{cf.} Bede, \textit{IG} I, i, 27 [\textit{CCCL} 118A, 27–29].} The other marginal gloss, taken from Augustine, depended on his theory that things were first created in their potential. He explained that it was necessary to say that God created them man and woman in order to make it clear that human bodies, and not only their souls, were created. However, he makes clear, this does not mean that woman was actually created yet, for she had not yet been divided from man. In a remarkable moment of concern that a reader will take the text too literally, he also explained that “male and female he created them” does not mean that humans were first created as hermaphrodites.\footnote{Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 7v–8r. \textit{cf.} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} III, 20–22 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 86–90].}

In the interlinear gloss on Genesis 1:27, the glossator turned to literary forms, explaining that the reference to the woman is said by means of “\textit{prolensis} [a common medieval spelling of \textit{prolepsis}], because woman was not yet formed”.\footnote{“prolensis. nondum enim mulier formata.” Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 8r.} There is also a spiritual interpretation given in the interlinear glosses, which interprets the men as spiritual leaders, and women as those under their authority. This is taken from Rabanus.\footnote{Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 8r. \textit{cf.} Rabanus Maurus, \textit{CG} I [\textit{PL} 107:468C].} It is broadly interesting that this is a point at which the second account is given precedence over the first, in contrast to the general
tendency of the Genesis tradition, in which the second creation account must be explained in the light of the Hexameron.

In the commentary on Genesis 2, the glossator’s concern largely turns to moral questions, namely, extracts from Augustine on whether or not Adam and Eve would have consummated their union in the garden, given more time before the fall. There is also a discussion of structural questions about how Eve was created, with consideration of the formation of her body and the origin of her soul (that is, whether it was created from Adam’s, as her body was, or whether it was made from nothing). There is also an extended consideration of the spiritual meaning of their union, using allegory to discuss theological questions about the nature of the church.

What one observes in surveying the treatment of these questions in the *Glossa ordinaria* and the *Glossa primitiva* is that when contradictory opinions appear, as in the discussion of the waters above the heavens, they do so as part of the expanded sources in the *Glossa ordinaria*. Lesley Smith has argued that one of the reasons for the popularity of the *Glossa ordinaria* was its flexibility, and this flexibility was provided by expanding the contents to cover the many questions and meanings of the scriptural text. Thus, it appears that the expansion in the contents and opinions coincides in the movement of the texts’ use from a teaching text to a reading text and a reference text, which benefited from the inclusion of as many possible senses and sources as possible, in order to give the greatest scope to those who referred to the text in making doctrinal and spiritual resources. One should think of the scriptural text, with the *Glossa ordinaria*, as the underpinning for later theological works—the more opinions and means of interpreting the text, the more later teachers had to work with, whether in their lectures or in writing their own commentaries.

---


535 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 16r–16v. cf. Augustine, *DGCM* II 38 [CSEL 91, 162–164].

Many of the new glosses discussed in the examples above were allegorical glosses added to the interlinear text. It has been argued that there was no distinction, other than that of space and format, in the interlinear and marginal glosses. I have shown that this is not true in the *Glossa primitiva*, in which the interlinear glosses largely serve as keys to the marginal glosses, as aids for teaching. There is more movement of short glosses from one location on the page to another in the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3, as some appear in the margins in one manuscript and between the lines of the scriptural text in another. However, there still appears to be a difference in function, judging by the emphatically allegorical approach of the interlinear glosses added to the *Glossa ordinaria*, when these are compared to the relatively few allegorical or spiritual glosses added to the margins. Similarly, while the spiritual or allegorical glosses that are added in the margins are, generally, taken from Gregory, the interlinear glosses are foremost from Isidore, by way of Rabanus Maurus.

What was it about the interlinear glosses that makes them more appropriate for the spiritual sense (or, perhaps, what is it about the spiritual sense that makes it appropriate for the interlinear gloss?)? These glosses are mostly equivalences, giving the spiritual meaning of certain words in the biblical text, and thus, it is most efficient to give them interlinearly. However, one may wonder if they also reflect a change in the audience of the text, away from a school interest in the philosophical and theological questions raised by the text, and towards a more general interest held by those who might want to use the text for preaching or spiritual study. The interlinear spacing also made these glosses far more invasive for a reader, giving them a certain prominence over the marginal glosses: perhaps they were meant as introductions to a first, spiritual and theological reading of the text, only after which a reader would delve into the structural questions in the margins.

Finally, one may note that the development of the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3 over time indicates a growing interest in arranging the multiplicity of opinions found in the text. As was discussed at the beginning of this chapter, manuscripts of the *Glossa ordinaria* that contain what appears to be a later version of the text have included glosses explaining the four senses of scripture, even though the *ordinaria* does not appear to have been composed with this four-fold system in mind. Of course, an understanding of multiple senses of scripture is one way in which a harmony is imposed on the multiple interpretations of the text—when scripture is, by its very nature, understood to have a multiplicity of meanings through which one seeks a comprehensive
exposition of the text, the resolution of multiple interpretations is no longer a challenge. A plurality of answers was not a sign of weakness, but the desired result.

The final case study, on the creation of humanity, is not without its own contribution to theories of exegesis. Man is made in the image of God in his rationality, explains the Glossa ordinaria, yet Moses could only approach a true account of creation by way of divine inspiration, which is contrasted to the lies of the philosophers. Human nature ponders the heavens, but the ultimate resolution of the questions eludes human reason. The equivocation of the Glossa ordinaria made it a practical reference, but it was also an accurate reflection of its anthropology.

The development of the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis out of the Glossa primitiva may be understood to have occurred in support of the theological inquiry of the growing twelfth-century schools, as well as in response to the intellectual concerns of those schools. While sentence commentaries gathered the received opinions of Christian doctrine, the Glossa on Genesis 1–3 supported the authority of scripture and provided its readers with an investigation of questions not discussed in other genres of theology. In the changes made to the physical layout as it came to be copied in the Parisian scriptoria, the Glossa was distanced from its origin as a lecture aid, and supported the twelfth-century growth of reference works and finding aids. Thirteenth-century manuscripts increased in size, acquired running headings along the tops of the folios, and were joined with the Glossa ordinaria on Exodus to create reference works for study, much less easy to hold or lecture from than the smaller, earlier manuscripts.

This was a codicological continuation of a process that began with the Glossa primitiva. In the expansion of the text seen in the development of the Glossa primitiva out of the proto-Glossa, and later in the transition from the Glossa primitiva to the Glossa ordinaria, the text became a more flexible tool, useful for students of varied experience and instructors with multiple interests and writing in more than one genre. Adopting the four senses of scripture as an interpretive framework, the Glossa ordinaria on Genesis 1–3 became a source for teaching and doing exegesis, as well as and a coherent encyclopedic collection summarizing the centuries of

537 Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 7v; Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19, fol. 1v; Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, fol. 2r.
Christian interpretation on the first book of the Bible, and first took the form that would support the heights of scholastic theology in the coming centuries.
Conclusion

Twelfth-century creation theology has for decades been defined by the School of Chartres, known for the diversity of approaches that its masters took towards questions of the structure of the universe. This thesis has attempted to balance this historiographical trend by studying the history and development of an important text on the creation narrative from the schools of Laon and Paris, looking at how they preserved the Augustinian tradition and gathered diverse explanations of the text in the service of theological and exegetical inquiry.

The *Glossa ordinaria* on the creation account provided twelfth-century scholars with a bridge between the inherited tradition of previous centuries and new approaches to academic theology, for which it was a crucial source. At the same time, the *Glossa ordinaria* changed the use of its patristic and Carolingian source texts, adapting them to fit both accepted ideas about the nature of scriptural exegesis and the diverse needs of a variety of readers. The creation account was a key text in Christian theology, providing scriptural support for claims about the creation of the universe, humanity’s relationship to God, and the nature of sin. Yet it was not without its challenges: its narrative contradicted other biblical claims about the creation of the world, as Sirach 18:1 said that all things were created *simul*, while Genesis 1 divided the process over six days. Its portrayal of the structure of the universe was disputed by those educated in natural philosophy, as with the problem of the waters above the heavens. It left many theological matters unexplained—for example, Augustine was troubled by the question of how new souls were created in the process of human reproduction. The *Glossa ordinaria* gathered all these traditions into an encyclopedic work of reference. From where did this text come?

Chapter One addressed this question by turning to the material remains of the early *Glossae* on Genesis, surveying the physical characteristics of sixteen twelfth-century manuscripts of gloss-format commentaries on Genesis: three of the *Glossa Salomonis*, two of the *Glossa primitiva*—the version of the text most closely associated with Laon—and eleven of the *Glossa*.

---

ordinaria.\textsuperscript{539} The two surviving manuscripts of the \textit{Glossa primitiva} were discussed in detail as representing mid-twelfth-century experimentation with the gloss format.\textsuperscript{540} The discussion of the development of the gloss layout argued that the \textit{Glossa primitiva} on Genesis 1–3 could not have come into existence as it now survives without the intermediate gloss format, which allowed for the efficient use of parchment when copying a commented text in which some parts (such as, for example, the first chapters of Genesis) were copied far more heavily than the others.\textsuperscript{541} This is a central problem of the material history of the \textit{Glossae} on Genesis: as it is near-impossible to add new extracts to a gloss text copied in the intermediate format—a problem that precludes an organic process in which new glosses accumulate over time—how was the text of the \textit{Glossa primitiva} on Genesis 1–3 first composed? I have argued that the earliest manuscripts suggest that the \textit{Glossa primitiva} was not a new compilation of extracts but rather a selection from preexisting commentaries, interwoven by means of the \textit{textus intercisus} format found in \textit{Pf} and associated with the emended \textit{Glossa ordinaria} on the Psalms composed by Peter Lombard.\textsuperscript{542}

Chapter Two presented the textual evidence for a preexisting proto-\textit{Glossa} commentary, composed primarily of extracts from Augustine, by comparing the text of the \textit{Glossa primitiva} on Genesis 1–3 with \textit{L}, a gloss-format commentary on Genesis dependent on the same source.\textsuperscript{543} The proto-\textit{Glossa} appears to have been the source for the interlinear glosses found in the \textit{Glossa primitiva}, as well as for the headings that give the interpretive sense at the beginning of some glosses. Moving from the question of how the \textit{Glossa primitiva} was composed to the impetus behind its creation, I argued that the glosses added to the \textit{Glossa primitiva} suggest that it was created as a text that was meant to be read privately as a reference work or as an aid to lectures, rather than in the classroom.\textsuperscript{544}
Chapter Three turned to the relationship between the *Glossa primitiva* and the *Glossa ordinaria*. After presenting the arguments in favor of viewing the *Glossa ordinaria* as a reworking of the *Glossa primitiva*, I noted that the lack of any surviving intermediary manuscripts suggests that the *Glossa ordinaria* was developed from the former as part of a concerted effort to update the text. The two texts may even have been two versions of the same project, put together by the same exegete. Through a study of the sources and extracts added to the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3 in its first form and through the course of the twelfth century, I argued that the driving motive behind the new version of the text was a greater flexibility for multiple uses, whether by exeges or teachers. The addition of extracts which explain methods of biblical exegesis suggest a particular interest in producing a self-contained and encyclopedic text on Genesis for general academic use. I also noted a trend towards the expansion of the interpretive senses—primarily the spiritual sense—in the *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3, and argued that this was ignored by Philippe Buc’s research on the same texts.

Chapter Four looked at the *Glossa ordinaria*’s position in the history of Christian exegesis to show how it functioned as both a means for preserving and a way of modifying received tradition. Looking at the use of the senses of scripture in the *Glossae* on Genesis 1–3, I argued that the sense-headings “mystice” and “historice” have specific meanings when applied to the creation account, and are not necessarily interchangeable with explanations of the four senses of scripture as they were applied to other sections of the Bible. I also showed that the glosses that lay out the paradigm of the four senses of scripture are later additions to the *Glossa ordinaria*, and that they impose a new and foreign interpretive schema onto the text. I then turned to two other twelfth-century attempts to explain the creation narrative, comparing the exegesis of the *Glossa ordinaria* to that found in the *Hexameron* of Thierry of Chartres and

---
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Historia scholastica of Peter Comestor and showing that while the creation narrative was understood to have been historically true, its truth was still thought to be expressed in a hidden way that could be laid open by the exegete, and which allowed for inquiry into questions about the structure of the universe.551

Following upon this discussion, I looked at the Glossa ordinaria on the Hexameron in the intellectual context of the twelfth century by comparing its treatment of creation to that found in contemporary sentence collections. I argued that the differences between the two genres can be seen in the doctrinal and interpretive questions they include, and that exegesis, rather than theology, was the primary mode of inquiry into the structure of creation in the twelfth-century schools.552 I concluded the chapter with a discussion of Anselm of Laon’s intellectual methods and his claim that the sentences of the fathers were “diverse, not adverse”, looking at what the compilation of diverse sources meant for the exegesis of the Glossae, and providing three case studies of exegetical problems: the water above the heavens, the creation of the lights of heaven, and the two accounts of the creation of humanity.553 By considering the text and its historical context, I argued that the compiler and readers of the Glossa ordinaria did not understand the text as a source in which they found resolution of the tensions and conflicts within the text, but rather as a support for further inquiry into questions of both the supernatural and cosmological structure of the universe.554 The Glossae on Genesis 1–3 are thus seen to have played a key part not only in the development of twelfth-century theology, but in encouraging contemporary interest in nature and the cosmos.
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Appendix A
Manuscript Descriptions

Genesis cum Glossa ‘Salomonis’

*L* = London, Lambeth Palace Library, 349
Parchment, 130 folios, 260 x 170 mm, s. XII, Lanthony Abbey
Genesis with *Glossa Salomonis*
2nd fol. inc. *aquas ab aquis*

This codex of ii + 128 folios measures 260 mm x 170 mm, with a writing area of variable size which never exceeds 225 mm x 170mm. The binding is medieval and may be original. The wooden boards are covered in white leather, although the spine was reinforced with brown leather at a later date. A strap, pin, and long rectangular clasps are missing. The cords were threaded through the boards through two sets of two v-shaped channels. The crease of the pastedown has been strengthened with paper. The back cover bears a medieval pressmark which reads, “de tercio gr[adu] pri[ma] armaria”. The quires, as well as the folios, have been numbered with pencil in a modern hand. The first flyleaf is blank, and the second bears the title “Genesis”. The first folio was ruled in dry-point but left blank, and the text begins on 2r.

The initial ‘I’ is painted in red and measures 45 mm high. Capitals are accented in red, and the first four lines of the biblical text have been struck through with a red line. Paragraphs are usually in the margins, but some have been added within the text. The biblical text was written in darker ink than that of the gloss, which has yellowed with age. Ruled in dry-point. Rulings for the biblical text were drawn across the width of the page, and rulings for the gloss were added between the previously extant rulings as necessary. This manuscript is an example of Smith’s “simple” gloss layout, or de Hamel’s first stage, in which the entirety of the biblical text was copied, with glosses added later. The width and height of the central column of biblical text is static, with a constant 17 lines per page. Two hands contributed to this manuscript. The primary gloss script, and that of the text, is a wide, early protogothic. Gibbet-shaped paragraph marks appear within the margins of the glosses. The upper compartments of the minuscule ‘a’ are very short, and ascenders are wedged or slightly slightly forked. The ‘i’s have small tags at the head and foot, giving them a z-like appearance. The second scribe added decorative titles in
a hand that is small, thin, and of a pointy aspect. The manuscript has been corrected in black ink, with increasing frequency towards the end. One hand—likely that of the second scribe—has added initials to identify the sources of the glosses, e.g. “A” for Augustine, “B” for Bede. Another, later hand has numbered the modern chapters and the days of the hexameron in the margins. Collation: \(2 + 1–16 + 17^2\)


The text of this manuscript is a gloss on Genesis clearly related to the *Glossa Salomonis*, but closer to that of the *Glossa primitiva*, with which it shares a source. Text incipit 2r, “In principio creavit...”, gloss incipit, “Sicut paulus per reuelationem”. Text explicit 126r, “in loculo in egypto”, gloss explicit, “…cum uulto tuo dilectationes in dextera tua usque infinem”.

**La** = London, British Library, Additional 63077

Parchment, i + 106 folios, 294 x 190 mm, s. XII\(^2\), Rievaulx Abbey

Genesis with Gloss

2\(^{nd}\) fol. text inc. *esset bona et* 2\(^{nd}\) fol. gloss inc. *Aug. Diuisit lucem a tenebris*...

This manuscript contains iii +106 folios and measures 294 mm x 190 mm, with a writing space of about 195 mm x 150 mm. The manuscript is bound in a rare intact chemise binding with original parchment paste-downs and flyleaves which bear multiple pen-trials and notes. The boards are covered in white leather to which was stitched a hide cover that retains some coarse brown fur. There were four bosses on each board; three fluted bosses remain on the upper board and two plain on the lower, identified by the British Library catalogue as medieval replacements. A clasp is missing. A cast brass boss in the center of the lower board gives the
title of the work, “Genesis Glo.”. The quires are stitched to five sets of doubled cords. There are green and white knots at head and tail. On the spine, there is a paper sticker with the number “696”.

The script is a late protogothic hand, very fine and small and leaning to the right. Letters in the first lines of glosses are occasionally stretched vertically into the upper margin. Brown ink, varied in shade from dark to medium. Some marginal corrections, occasionally in pencil. Paragraph marks are tall, with a thick curve and a thin straight line, and extend into the margins. On 1r, there is a red initial ‘I’ measuring 115 mm high, and red display capitals “N PRINCIPIO”. Some red litterae notabiliore through the text. Occasionally, blank spaces are left where they were missed. The manuscript is ruled in hard-point with occasional crayon, and the text begins above the top line. The sheets were ruled across the fold, and prickings are still visible on the sides and on the top and bottom edges. There are from 12 to 22 lines of text per page, and a maximum of 60 lines for the surrounding gloss. The text is copied in three columns, in a simple gloss layout, with some variation in the width of the column (between 20 – 60 mm). Quire numbers can be seen at the bottom verso of the last folio of the quires. Strips of parchment are visible where folios were cut away from the quires. Collation: 1–3⁸ + 4⁷ [lacking 8th] + 5⁸ + 6⁶ [lacking 4th–6th] + 7–13⁸ + 14⁷ [lacking 8th] + 15⁶ [lacking 1st–3rd and 5th–6th].

Provenance of the manuscript is established by a twelfth-century ex libris reading “Liber Sancte Marie Rievallalis”, at the top of 1r. The manuscript may be the one listed as “Genesis, glosatus, in uno volumine” under press “P” (under the heading ‘Libri Glosati’) in the longer of the two late twelfth-century catalogues of Rievaulx, and as “Genesis Glosatus” in the shorter.⁵⁵⁵ Numerous pen trials and inscriptions speak to the codex’s history before and after the dissolution of the monasteries. On the front pastedown is a pen-trial giving the year 1569 and the name of a monk named Richard. On the front flyleaf, recto, there is a bond for £40, endorsed on the recto. The British Library Catalog records that it is “between Sir William Pykering of Oswaldkirk (d. 1542, Knight-Marshall to King Henry VIII), William Priestman, William...”

---

⁵⁵⁵ Both catalogues are preserved in Cambridge, Jesus College Library, 35. An edition of the longer catalog, numbered Z19, is found in Bell, ed., The Libraries of the Cistercians, Gilbertines and Premonstratensians, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 3, 89–121. The shorter catalog, Z20, is in the same volume, 121–138. The entries for the glossed Genesis manuscript are on pages 117 and 135.
yeoman of Newtongrange, William Walker of Oswaldkirk, yeoman, and William, abbot of Rievaulx”. On the verso of the same flyleaf is a seventeenth-century inscription reading “John Dodesworth of Thornton Watlas ys the owner of this Boke”. On 106v are found the names “Richardus gyllyng monachus Rieuallys”, and “Thomas Dawson”, while on the back pastedown is written “Dodsun” (twice) and “Wyghtman”. At the bottom of the pastedown, three different hands have copied: “Hec nomina trium regium.../ “hec nomina trium regium sunt qui domino nato....”/ “Hec nomina trium regum sunt qui domino nato munera optulerauit: Gespar, Batizar, Melchior”. It was purchased by the British Library at Christie's on 30 May 1984, lot 207.


**Lr** = **London, British Library, Royal 4 A X**

Parchment, 162 folios, 165 x 250 mm, s. XIII, England

Genesis with Glossa Salomonis

2nd fol. inc. *factumque*. 2nd fol. gloss inc. *notandum quod operi*...

This codex of ii + 160 (numbered i–161) folios measures 250 x 170 mm, with a writing space of around 55 mm x 165 mm for the central column of biblical text and a writing space for the gloss that can measure up to 220 mm high and 150 mm wide. The manuscript was rebound in the white and red leather covers characteristic of the Royal collection, and blue marbled paper end-papers and flyleaves were added. Six raised bands, and green and yellow knots on the end bands at head and tail of spine. The first flyleaf bears the old pressmark “D[istinctio] I Gra[dus] II” in a gothic cursive hand, below which was written the note “Genesis glossata” with the addition,
in another hand, “Salomonis”. Below this, in the same hand as “Genesis glossata”, is written “Liber sancti Augustini Canterbergensis”. Folio 1 (actually a second flyleaf) is blank, and 2r has an incomplete beginning to the text of Genesis, with ruling in crayon. The text and glosses begin on 3r.

The hand is a round, upright protogothic with short upper compartments on ‘a.’ Both ampersands and un-crossed tironean *et* appear. Ascenders are wedged and occasionally faintly forked. Letters in the first line of a gloss are occasionally stretched into the upper margin. At the end of glosses they are sometimes spaced horizontally in order to fill the width of the column. Biblical text in dark brown, gloss text in a lighter brown. Corrections were made in a darker ink, in two hands: one a protogothic with a spikier aspect, another gothic. Copious pencil corrections and notes. Paragraph marks are in the margins, and occasionally decorated with lines and dots. The initial ‘I’ measures 180 mm high and descends into the lower margin of the page. It is painted in green and red and decorated with geometric and floral motifs. Occasional highlighting in red. Some attributions were added in red (eg, 7v). Prickings are no longer visible in the manuscript. Ruled in crayon, as needed. The biblical text is written with 16-18 lines per page, while the gloss can have a maximum of 72 lines—but is usually more around 50. Marginal notes in crayon have divided the biblical text into sections, presumably for lectionary or other liturgical use. Collation: ii + 208+ iii.

The manuscript belonged to St. Augustine’s, Canterbury, as indicated by the *ex libris* on the first flyleaf. See N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, 2nd ed. (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1964), 44. A late fifteenth-century catalog of St Augustine’s Canterbury (now Dublin, Trinity College Dublin, 360) is reproduced in M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1903), 201. This manuscript is item 98, with the title *Genesis glo. salomonis*, and the pressmark given is d. I. G. 2. The 2nd folio incipit of the biblical text is listed as *factumque*—the first word of what is now labeled folio 4.556

---

The text is that of Genesis, with *Glossa Salomonis*. Text incipit 3r, “In principio creavit...”,
gloss incipit, “Sicut paulus per revelationem”. The first interlinear gloss, “tempus, uel primo
omnium, uel uerbo dei” has been added in a later hand and is an interpolation from the *Glossa
ordinaria*. Text explicit 160r, “repositus est in loco in egipto”, gloss explicit, “…facile possibilit
cadere auctoritas intellecctiones”.

**Liber Genesis cum Glossa primitiva**

*Pf* = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 64

Parchment, 110 folios, 250 x 165 mm, s. XII\(^2\), Fontenay Abbey

Parts of Genesis with *Glossa primitiva*

2\(^{nd}\) fol. inc. *dixitque deus fiat lux*; 2\(^{nd}\) fol. gloss inc. //*tem poecius quam per habundantiam*

This codex of i + 110 + i folios (foliated 1–109 with 63\(^2\)) measures 250 mm x 165 mm. It
contains an incomplete text of Genesis with portions of the “primitive” gloss and comprises two
booklets, the first of which was copied in two stages. The first booklet (3r–98r) contains
Genesis 1:1–31:43, with primitive gloss. The second booklet (99r–109v) contains Genesis
47:7–50:25, unglossed.

The manuscript is currently bound in a red leather eighteenth-century binding stamped with the
arms of Louis XV. Parchment end-papers. The joint at the front has been strengthened with a
piece of paper cut from an early modern French printed book. End-bands of green red, and
white (possibly originally yellow) thread. Folios 1, 2, and 110 are flyleaves taken from a
manuscript of Gratian’s *Decretum*, containing D. 66 c. 4 to D. 67 c. 6 and D. 71 c 1–9. These

boasts volumes of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, each in three copies: glo. Radulphi, glo. Roberti, and glo.
Salomonis. See James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, 202. Unfortunately, the only two
manuscripts that James believed had survived are the codex at hand, and the volume of Leviticus with the “*Glossa
Salomonis*”.
are likely retained from the medieval binding, as it was not usual for Louis XV’s binder, Guillaume Mercier, to re-use portions of dismembered manuscripts.\(^{557}\)

Three protogothic hands: two in the first booklet and one in the second. The hands of the first booklet, which are quite similar, are distinguished by the latter’s forked ascenders, use of decorative capitals, and narrow lines. Abbreviations for –or and –tur are more stylized in the second hand, with extended horizontal lines and round curves at the end.

Decoration is minimal. “IN PRINCIPIO CREAVIT DEUS” is written in display uncial. Paragraph marks are flourished. In the first section, the letters of the biblical text are occasionally spaced in order to fill the width of the column. The first letters of glosses are written in the margin. In the second section, there are a few capitals about two lines high.

Brown ink throughout, with darker ink in the second booklet. Both the biblical text and the gloss have been corrected. Liturgical readings have been marked in the margins of the later chapters, and the modern chapter divisions have been added as Roman numerals in the margins, in red ink.

The manuscript appears to have been copied in three stages. The first stage is seen from 3r–23r, and contains two stylistic subsections, which likely reflect nothing more than the density of the gloss on the early verses of Genesis. In the first subsection, which spans 3r–6v, the gloss is written in single columns running the width of the page, interrupted by the biblical text. In the second subsection, from 7r to 23r, it is written in two columns, with the right column of 23r left blank. In both subsections, the biblical text and gloss are not written in distinct columns, but alternate as necessary. This is a format that de Hamel identifies as characteristic of the early layout of Peter Lombard’s version of the Glossa on the Psalms and Pauline letters.\(^{558}\) The writing space of this first stage measures about 200 mm x 134 mm on the single-column pages and about 205 mm x 130 mm on double-column pages.


The second stage, from 23v – 98r, is written in a traditional three-column gloss layout. The writing space measures about 210 mm x 145 mm. The third stage consists of the second booklet, comprising 98r–109v and containing the unglossed text of Genesis 47:7–50:25, which was written in a single central column with space on either side left for glosses.

The above can be schematized as follows:

BOOKLET I (Genesis 1:1 to 31:43)

3r–23r First stage:
   3r–6v Single-column format
   7r–23r Two-column format
23v–97r Second stage: Gloss format

BOOKLET II: 98r–109v unglossed text of Genesis 47:7–50:25

The pricking and ruling of this manuscript provide revealing evidence of how these multiple formats may have come to be. In the first stage, containing the one- and two-column folios, the folios were ruled for the gloss in dry point, and the biblical text was written on every other line. On some folios, such as 1r, it is evident that a central division of two lines was ruled down the middle in dry point to prepare the page for two columns, and the single column of text was written across the division. Occasionally, the width of the columns was changed by ruling a new line in crayon— for example, the columns on 8v were made wider by ruling a line along the side and then writing into the borders created by the dry-point column ruling. This likely means that the manuscript was copied on parchment ruled for a different project, which would be appropriate to the patched-together quality of the codex.

Similarly, the decision appears to have been made to switch to a three-column layout before the folios with the two-column dry-point ruling were used up, and thus the columns for the first folios of the second stage of copying (23v to 26v) were ruled in crayon over the previous dry-point ruling. This, too, suggests that the first four quires of the manuscript were ruled for a two-column layout, and that the changes in layout were ad hoc decisions. This transition to the three-column layout at 23v also coincides with a change in the hand, and the ink becomes
slightly darker. The second, un-glossed booklet was ruled in dry-point with double lines bounding the width of the three columns. Collation: i + 1²+ 2–14⁸ + 15³ + ii

The manuscript belonged to the monastery of Fontenay, and belonged to Colbert (no. 4415) before entering the Royal library, where it had the shelf mark 3940⁵.5. The several sections, hands, and booklets, as well as the apparent recycling of parchment, suggest a relatively cheap manuscript, possibly put together by or for a student who later went to Fontenay. The fifteenth-century ex libris from Fontenay has been partially rubbed out on folio 108v. Another former ex libris, on folio 105v, is now entirely illegible. Previous pressmarks found at the top of folio 3r read “Cod Colb. 4415, Regius 3940 55”. The current shelf-mark, 64, is found in the right margin of folio 3r as well as on paper stickers on the spine and inside of the front board.


The text is portions of Genesis, with portions of the primitive gloss. Text incipit 3r “In principio creavit...”, gloss incipit “[C]um diuinos libros legimus in tanta multitudine uerorum...”. Gloss explicit 96v “id est quasi muliebria se habere innotuit”, text explicit 109v “repositus est in loculo in egypto”.

**Pn** = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398

Parchment, 133 folios, 260 x 166 mm, s. XII¹/₂ (ante 1140), St. Victor, Origin: Laon

Genesis with Glossa primitiva

2nd fol. inc. et facta est lux; 2nd fol. gloss inc. per quam facta sunt omnia

This codex contains 133+iii folios and measures 260 mm x 166 mm. The biblical text appears to have been copied in two distinct stages, dividing the manuscript into two parts. The first part, which runs from 1r to 22v and contains Genesis 1–3, has a writing area of around 240 mm x 140 mm. The second part, which runs from 23r–133v and contains Genesis chapters 4–50, has a writing area of up to 210 mm x 140 mm. The manuscript has been rebound in a gold-stamped
white leather cover bearing the crest of St. Victor, Paris with end-bands of knotted green and yellow cord. A total of five paper flyleaves have been added to the manuscript (ff 2–3 and i–iii), and the back pastedown is paper.

In the biblical text, two protogothic hands: the hand in the second part is distinguished from that of the first by a forked top to the letter ‘a’, the style of the majuscule “D”, and thicker lines. The hand of the gloss appears consistent throughout the manuscript. Brown ink throughout. The text begins above the top line, while the gloss begins below the top line. Capitals and decoration differ in the two parts of the manuscript: the decoration scheme of the second part is consistent, while that of the first part is varied. On 6r, the biblical text begins with an initial ‘I’ measuring 143mm high decorated in red, green, blue, and yellow knot-work. “N PRINCIPIO CREAT DEUS CELUM ET” is written in alternating blue and red display uncials, and a half-uncial “TERRAM” in red completes the sentence. From “TERRA AUTEM” on 6v to “ET AIT” on 8r, the biblical text is written in display uncials accentuated in red, with red capitals. This text changes to protogothic on 8v. From 8v to 9r, higher-lever capitals are in red, while lower-level capitals are accentuated with red highlights. Folios 9v and 10r have green initials (one uncial D and one straight-backed D), and there are no highlighted capitals. Highlighting is missing from 10v to 22v (except on 13v), and capitals have been left off folios 11v [I], 16r [T], and 17r [D], although space was left to accommodate them. In the second part of the manuscript, that is, from 23r on, higher-level capitals are consistently painted in red with lower-level capitals accented in the same color. Attributions, which appear only in the second part of the manuscript, are never highlighted.

Folios were pricked across the fold and the lines were ruled in dry-point, with double bounds to mark the columns. While the dry-point column boundaries remain evident, the rulings are almost invisible. The number of columns varies throughout the text: in the first part, folios that contain only the gloss are copied in two columns, while folios that include the biblical text are copied in three, and the height of the central column is varied to accommodate the gloss. The number of gloss lines on the page ranges from 55–61, and the number of text lines per page varies. In the second part of the manuscript, the biblical text is consistently copied in a central column of 21 lines, the width of which varies to accommodate the layout of the gloss, and the gloss is written in up to 63 lines, although this is rarely necessary.
The gatherings of folios 1–22 are unnumbered. Folio 23 begins a group of thirteen gatherings numbered 1–13, while the final gathering of 8 is missing one folio. Collation: iv + 1^10 + 2^10 (lacking 2) + 3–15^8+16^8 (lacking 1) + iii. Modern foliation begins at the first flyleaf.

St. Victor’s ownership of this manuscript is attested by multiple ex libris notes, found on 1r, 6r, and 132r. Pressmarks written at the top of 6r read 434 (crossed out), 805 (underlined) I f 20.

Patricia Stirnemann has identified the origin of this manuscript as Laon by comparing the initial ‘I’ and other decorative features of the manuscript to manuscripts in the collections of the community of Saint Vincent in Laon, but it is important to note that these features are only found in the first half of the manuscript. On the other hand, the consistency of the gloss hand across both parts of the manuscript makes it hard to claim that the two parts of the manuscript were ever wholly separate: the inconsistency may reflect the fact that the first part was produced separately due to the challenge of arranging the copious gloss to Genesis 1–3 on the page.


The text is that of the book of Genesis with primitive gloss. Text incipit 6r, “In principio creauit...”; gloss incipit, “Cum divinos libros legimus...” Text explicit 131v “...repositus est in loculo in egipto. AMEN. Explicit liber Geneseos”, gloss explicit “...delectationes in dextera tua usque in finem”.

**Liber Genesis cum Glossa ordinaria**

*Ad* = *Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 251*

Parchment, i + 104 folios, 295 mm x 195 mm, XIII, Stift Admont

*Genesis with Glossa ordinaria*

2nd fol. inc. *eternam tamquam herbis uiuentibus*

This is a codex of i + 104 folios (partially foliated 1–105) which measure around 282 mm x 190 mm with a variable writing area measuring up to 200 mm in height (although it is more often around 175 mm) and 145-150 mm in width. The manuscript appears to have been rebound twice, as will be discussed below. The more recent rebinding was done in 1969, as noted on the current back pastedown. The boards, white leather with blind stamping, straps, cords, and paper pastedowns all date to that restoration.

The paste-downs in the penultimate binding, as attested by the microfilm made for the Monastic Microfilm Project and held at the Hill Museum and Monastic Library in Collegeville, Minnesota, were sheets from a tenth-century psalter in a Carolingian hand, with Psalms 33:7-23 and 42:4 – 43:13 on the front paste-down and Psalms 41:6 – 42:4 and 34:1–15 on the back
paste-down. The back flyleaf was taken from an eleventh-century manuscript of the Letter to the Hebrews, verses 9:1–6 and 8:1–5 (recto) and 8:7–9 and 8:10–13 (verso). The back flyleaf, to which the back paste-down was glued, was likely part of the original binding, while the paste-downs appear to be from a second, later binding, at which point the folios were re-cut along the vertical edge. These fragments are now cataloged in the Fragmenten-Sammlung of Stiftbibliothek Admont as Fragmenten-Sammlung, Fragm. C-251/1 (the front) and Fragm. C-251/2 (the back). These paste-downs contained several notes and pen-trials, including a calculation of the end of the world on the back flyleaf, which gives the current year as 1140—however, given the paleographical evidence of the manuscript, it seems likely that this note predates the binding. The current front paste-down has a rectangle of parchment with the title, “Genesis Glosatus” in gothic script; it is not seen in the microfilm and was presumably attached to the front of the manuscript, like the title plate seen on Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 3746 (described below). The front flyleaf (numbered as folio 1) bears the word “Genesis” in brown ink, in a hand similar to that of the text, and 105v reads “Genesis glosatus” in a gothic cursive. There are no previous pressmarks, ex libris, or ex dono notes visible in the manuscript.

The hand is a standard, narrow, late protogothic hand with forked ascenders, both two- and one-compartment ‘a’s (many of the one-compartment ‘a’s have forks at the top of the lobe), and uncrossed tironean et. Extended diagonal lines on ‘x’ and the close of the letter ‘e’ give the hand an angular aspect. Brown ink. The beginnings of the glosses are marked with small capitals, and the ends of glosses are frequently written in capitals spaced to fill the width of the column. The prefatory glosses begin with the title, in small display capitals, “AVGUSTINUS SUPRA GENESIM” and a capital letter “C”. In the text, capitals are in small red uncial. There is a painted initial “I” measuring 135mm high, decorated with knot-work and foliate patterns in red, blue, yellow, and green, with a bird biting the descender. Paragraph marks, formed out of two curved lines, are in the margins. The text has been heavily corrected by two contemporary hands. Two attempts were made to reorder the prefatory glosses: one labels the glosses with small brown letters from a–i, k–u, and x; the second labels six glosses with red Arabic numerals.

The manuscript was pricked across the fold, and is haphazardly ruled in pencil. The rulings do not always match up with the prickings, and can cross the page at a steep angle (as seen on folio 73r). Prickings at top and bottom have been cut off. While the biblical text has been copied at a
ratio of about one line of text to two lines of gloss, it is clear on many folios that the columns were not ruled simultaneously, as they do not meet in the space between the columns (as seen on folios 86r and 86v). The gloss columns were ruled as needed, and there is much blank space. Three columns of variable width; on some folios towards the end of the text, only two columns have been used. Some quire numbers in Roman numerals. Collation: $i + 1–13^{8} + i$ (the back flyleaf was removed during restoration).

Little has been written about this manuscript. It was briefly described on page 134 of Fr. Jacob Wichner’s handwritten library catalog of 1887 (available as Catalogue of manuscripts in Stift Admont, Austria [Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms]). It is listed by Buberl in Die Illuminierten Handschriften in Steirmark, vol. 1, Die Stiftsbibliotheken zu Admont und Vorau (Leipzig: Verlag von Karl W. Iersemann, 1911) 158.


\textit{Al} = Alençon, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (olim Bibliothèque municipale), 60

Parchment, 155 folios, 345 x 250 mm, s. XIII, Abbey of Saint-Évroult

Genesis with Glossa ordinaria

$2^{\text{nd}}$ fol. inc. \textit{materiam et ea increata et sine initio}

This manuscript of 155 folios measures 345 mm x 250 mm, with a writing area of around 225 mm x 145 mm. It is bound in wooden boards, although the back board was broken and now measures only 65 mm wide. The boards and spine are uncovered, leaving six cords visible. The title “glossa in genesim” was written on the spine, directly on the folded edges of the quires, as was the old pressmark, ‘k ii’. There are remains of a paper sticker on the spine, and on the bottom left of the front cover, a paper sticker has the modern shelf-mark “60” written twice. The ends of two leather straps with white running stitch remain attached to the front board with nails. On the upper right of the inside front board, a small section of white leather remains, which suggests that the boards were at one time covered. No paste-downs. A rectangle of white paper has been pasted to the inside front board, reading “t. Glossa in Genesim ij”.
The hand is a late, round, upright protogothic with high upper compartments on “a”, of varying size depending on the amount of gloss to be copied on the page. Dark to medium brown ink.
The initial “I” on 2v is drawn in red and blue with flourishes and measures 225 mm high. The decorative capitals “N PRINCIPIO” alternate in red and blue. Space was left on 51v for a decorated initial to begin the Abraham narrative, but it was not completed. Initials of both text and gloss are in alternating red and blue, while the paragraph marks of the gloss, drawn in the margins, are in the opposite color. Initials and paragraph marks are decorated with flourishes. Small letters are seen throughout the text to direct the rubricator as to which letters were to be painted.

Pages were ruled in pencil. Copious pricking at top and bottom allowed for flexibility in column layout. Quires 1–8 and 18–21 were ruled across the page, which allowed for flexibility in the number of lines per page (which varies from between 40–50 lines throughout the manuscript), presumably because the text and gloss in these quires required a more complicated format. Quires 1–8 and 16–17 are marked with quire numbers, while 11–16 and 18 have catchwords, although it is possible that quire marks were trimmed away. Two to three columns throughout, in the advanced format with copious use of split columns. Folios 13r–v are two-column folios of gloss. Collation: 1–19⁸+20¹+21².

There are no ex libris marks in the manuscript. The catalog notes that it came to the library from the Abbey of Saint-Évroult. It is listed in Henri Omont, Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publies de France. Départements, Vol. 2, (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1888) 510.

The text is that of Genesis with Glossa ordinaria. Preface incipit 1r “Sicut paulus per reuelationem didicit euangelium...”, text incipit 2v “In principio fecit deus...”, gloss incipit 2v “Mystice igitur perfecti sunt celi...”. Text explicit 155v, “…repositus est in loco in egypto”, gloss explicit, “unde adimplebis me leticia cum uulto tuo”.

*Am* = Amiens, Médiathèque Aveline (olem Bibliothèque municipale), 34
Parchment, 108 folios, 280 x 187 mm, s. XII⁴, Corbie, France
Genesis with Glossa ordinaria
2nd fol. inc. in populo iudeorum

This codex contains 108 parchment folios, with one paper flyleaf at the front and one at the
back. The folios measure around 270 mm x 185 mm, with a variable writing space of about 180 mm (range from 175 to 190 mm) by about 140 mm (range from 135 mm to 150 mm). Boards are covered in textured red leather with a darker shade along the spine. The spine is decorated with six raised bands, black ink, and gold stamps with floral patterns and a crest flanked by two unicorns. The bottom of the spine is stamped in gold, “13° Saeculo. Rel. Paul LePrince Amateur”, identifying the binder. Stamped at the bottom right corner of the front board, along the spine, is “1825”, likely the year in which it was bound. A paper label on the spine reads “Ms 34 C”, the current shelf mark. Paper paste-downs and flyleaves have been added. At the top of 1r, a seventeenth- or eighteenth-century hand has written, “Glossa in Genesim” and then, in another hand, “no. 168”. Below this, an eighteenth- or nineteenth-century hand has written, “Mon[aster]ji S. Petri Corbiensis Cathal. jusc[r]”. and “Monasterii S. Petri Corbiensis” along the left side of the page. The same hand has written, “13° saecul” in the upper left corner of 1r, which, as this is the same date and abbreviation stamped on the spine, suggests that this may be the handwriting of Paul le Prince, the nineteenth-century binder. A blue stamp on 1r reads “Bibliothèque Communale Ville d’Amiens”. Parchment is of a fine quality, such that it is difficult to distinguish hair and flesh sides, but is of a very inconsistent size.

The hand is a round, thick, upright protogothic with occasional forked ascenders and small feet added to some descenders. The upper compartment of the ‘a’ can be cramped. Both ‘d’s are used, but the uncial ‘m’ appears only in capitals. Corrections and comments on the gloss are found in ink, in two protogothic hands, as well as in faint pencil. Another hand has added roman numerals in the margins to denote the modern chapter divisions. Paragraph marks, found in the margins, are round and flourished. There is frequent use of signes-de-renvoi to connect glosses to the biblical text, as well as tie-marks to join glosses split over multiple folios, and small letters are occasionally used to indicate the order in which the glosses were to be read. Ink is a dark brown. On 3r, there is a historiated initial ‘I’ formed out of an image of Adam taking the fruit from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, painted in green, blue, white, brown, and red. The letters “N PRINCIPIO” are written in red display capitals with blue flourishes. Subsequent capitals are distinguished by their size. Red highlighting only appears on capitals and paragraph marks on 32r.

The crayon ruling lines rarely line up with the prickings along the side and top and bottom of the page. Columns are separated by double lines. The number of lines on the page varies. The
biblical text is often written on every other line, but sometimes skips every three lines—or more—in order to accommodate the interlinear gloss, which is written on the same ruled lines as the marginal gloss but in a slightly smaller size. The number of columns also changes throughout the text: the prefatory material is copied in a two-column format, and the gloss is primarily copied in three columns (two of the gloss, and one of the biblical text). Folios containing only the gloss are copied in two or three columns. The width of the central column varies throughout the manuscript to accommodate the variations in the amount of gloss. Some folios demonstrate the split-column format characteristic of later gloss manuscripts; here double-lines have been ruled down the center of the column for some distance, and the lines written over when the scribe wished to use the width of the whole column. Similarly, on 13v, where the width of the central column varies over the page, new, wider vertical rulings were drawn and the biblical text was written between them, across the previously established borders. Decorative glosses tapering to a point are found on 5r, 41r, 52r, and 54v. On the whole, however, the organization of the text in this manuscript may be described as a “rustic intermediate stage”, according to the system laid out by Lesley Smith. Quires are marked by Roman numerals, surrounded by dots and flourishes. Collation: i + 1–138 + 144 + i.

The manuscript belonged to the library of Corbie, as is indicated on f 1r. The manuscript is included in the 1621 catalog of the library of Corbie as item 286 “Item, in Genesim”. The word ‘item’ in this case refers to the title “Glossa brevior”, also given to glosses on the Psalms, the Gospels, Job (four volumes), Tobit, the Apocalypse, and the letter of James. This catalog is published in Ernest Coyecque, Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques de France, vol. 19, Amiens (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1893) xli. This manuscript is not, however, evident in the twelfth-century catalogue preserved in Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Phillips 1865, 1–3v, and published in both Léopold Delisle, Le Cabinet des Manuscrits, vol. 2 (Paris: 1874) 427–432, and Edward Edwards, Memoirs of Libraries, including a handbook of library economy (London: Trübner & Co, 1859) 239–249. It is also not found in the early-thirteenth-century catalog published in Le Cabinet des Manuscrits, vol. 2, 432–440, although both catalogs contain several other glosses on books of the Bible.560 The manuscript is described

560 On the dating of these catalogues, see Delisle, Le Cabinet des Manuscrits, 2:105–106.
briefly in *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques de France* 19, 19.

The text is Genesis with *Glossa ordinaria*. Preface incipit 1r “Sicut paulus per reuelationem didicit...”, text incipit 3v “In principio creavit”, gloss incipit, “Mistice. in principio creauit deus celum et terram”. Text explicit 108v “repositus est in loculo in egipto. Explicit”, gloss explicit, “In que conhenni uite reseruatur”.

*Ar = Arras, Médiathèque de l’Abbaye Saint-Vaast (olum Bibliothèque municipale, 1004 [188])*

Parchment, i + 43 + i folios, 285 x 195 mm, s. XIII, Cathedral of Arras, France

Fragmentary Genesis with *Glossa ordinaria*

2nd fol. inc. *Quod enim euidencius significat*

This manuscript, from which many folios and several quires have been removed, now comprises 1 + 43 + i folios (numbered 1–45) measuring 282 x 200 mm, with a writing area of 215 x 150 mm. Square-edged wooden boards are covered in parchment, and quires are stitched to five straps. The spine is rounded, and at the head of the spine some green thread is visible in the stitching. To the spine is stuck a piece of parchment with the title, in a Humanist hand, “Notae in Genes.”, below this two paper stickers give the two most recent shelf marks, 188 and 1004. Pastedowns are parchment, as are the flyleaves found at the front and back. All bear copious notes, one (on the verso of the back flyleaf) in Hebrew.

The manuscript is written in several early gothic hands which appear and reappear throughout the manuscript. The first is a square protogothic written between the ruled lines, rather off from the top or bottom line. The second hand is a square, narrow, early gothic written from the top line, and the third is an early gothic hand with wedges at the tops of the minims, giving it an aspect similar to the “breaking” of later gothic hands. The tironean *et* is crossed with a single line. The removal of much of the manuscript has made it difficult to determine whether the hands change according to any clear divisions. Dark brown ink. Paraphs are round and heavy, with an extended upper line. Tie-marks appear to associate glosses divided over a page.

---

Pricked across the page and ruled in pencil, 49 gloss lines to the page. Prickings for columns are visible as seven sets of double prickings across the bottom of the page. Biblical text was copied every other line. Advanced column layout, executed with varying skill. Letters are horizontally stretched—rather than spaced—to fill the end of a line, and ascenders of the top line of the gloss are frequently extended into the upper margin. The gloss has been heavily corrected, and there are copious marginal notes. Chapter numbers have been added in the margins, in black Roman numerals. One illuminated ‘I’ on 4r, measuring 185 mm high, with a portrait of Moses on a gold background, with horns and wearing a red robe. The ‘I’ is gold with a center of brown waves and is on a blue background decorated with white dots. Display capitals “N PRINCIPIO” are in red. *Litterae notabiliores* in the biblical text are in alternating red and blue or red and green. On 1v, there is a red I with blue flourishes in the space between the columns, introducing the prefatory text “Incipit mane tercii diei”.

Many folios have been excised from the manuscript, and quires 2, 6, 8, and 11 are missing. Quire numbers are visible at the bottom verso of the last folio of the quire, in small Roman numerals. Strips of the removed folios remain visible along the spine, and many of the remaining folios were cut when the adjacent folios were removed. Current collation: i + 1\(^8\) (lacking 7\(^{th}\)) + 3–4\(^{4}\) + 5\(^{4}\) (lacking 2\(^{nd}\)) + 7\(^{6}\) (lacking 2\(^{nd}\) and 5\(^{th}\)) + 9\(^{6}\) (lacking 2 and 5) + 10\(^{6}\) (lacking 1\(^{st}\) and 4\(^{th}\)) + 12\(^{6}\) (lacking 2\(^{nd}\) and 5\(^{th}\)) + 13\(^{6}\) (lacking 2\(^{nd}\) and 4\(^{th}\)) + 14\(^{6}\) (lacking 2\(^{nd}\) and 5\(^{th}\)) + 15\(^2\) + i.

The manuscript comes from the Cathedral of Arras, and its old shelf mark, N. art. 41, is visible on the front paste-down. Before then it belonged to one H. Presbyter, who copied a list of his books on the recto of the first folio, and to an Arnaldus of Narbonne, as attested on the first folio. The manuscript is listed as 188 in Caron, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque de la ville d’Arras* (Arras: A. Courtin, 1860) 85, and as 1004 in the catalog of Jules Quicherat, published in *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements*, Series 4 Volume 4, *Arras, Avranches, Boulogne* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1872) 396–398.

The text is that of parts of Genesis, with *Glossa ordinaria*. Preface incipit 2r, “Sicut paulus per reuelationem...” Biblical text incipit 4r, “IN principio creauit...”, gloss incipit 4r, “All. In filo quo humanato partu<i>r>it...”. Gloss text is related to that of Amiens, Bibliothèque municipale 34, including the shared error “Nam senex apud eos non senex sed geron dicitur”, which should
read “apud eos non presbiter sed geron...”. Explicit 43v, “repositus est in loculo in egypto”, gloss explicit, “...adimplebis me leticia cum uulto tuo”.

**C = Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47**

Parchment, 119 folios, 345 mm x 250 mm, c. 1150, Bury St. Edmunds

Extracts, Genesis with *Glossa ordinaria*, Jerome’s *De Penitentia ad Rusticum*, Song of Songs with *Glossa ordinaria*, Catalog of the library of Bury St. Edmunds

2nd folio is blank

This codex contains i + 119 folios measuring 345 mm x 250 mm. It is unfoliated. The writing space varies: on the flyleaf, the writing space for the extracts measures 250 mm x 190 mm. For the prefatory material, the writing space is 275 mm x 200 mm, and for the glossed Genesis it measures up to 310 mm high and 220 mm wide. Writing space for the Jerome text measures 283 mm x 185 mm, and the writing space for the Song of Songs is about 270 mm x 225 mm.

The manuscript is in a medieval binding of wooden boards with cushioned edges. This binding may be original, but the addition of the catalog booklet makes that unlikely. There is white leather along the spine. Quires are tied to five sets of leather thongs, woven through holes in the boards and fastened with pegs. A metal plate was nailed at the top of the upper board to repair a crack. A piece of the strap can be seen on the front board, attached by four nails. Running stitch is visible along the edge of the leather at head and tail of spine. The spine bears the shelf-mark G 6, while the paste-down of the inside front cover carries the late-medieval shelf-mark B. 40, along with a late-thirteenth- or fourteenth-century *ex libris* of Bury St Edmunds and a red, modern number “47”, as well as the title of the work, “Genesis glosatus et cantica canticorum glosata”. The *ex libris* is written in the same hand that added the title “Ieronimus de penitentia ad rusticum”. A pen trial on the front paste-down reads, “amen amen amen dico”, and on the back, “prolensis, eprasim, stropha/esto id est concordatur”.

Two protogothic hands: the first, which copied the text on the flyleaf, the glossed Genesis, and the Jerome text, has a round and upright aspect, with slight hooks on minims and high, characteristically English upper compartments on minuscule ‘a.’ There is frequent use of older

---

562 Arras, Médiathèque de l’Abbaye Saint-Vaast (*olim* Bibliothèque municipale), 1004 (188), fol. 3r; Amiens, Médiathèque Aveline (*olim* Bibliothèque municipale), 34, fol. 1v.
ligatures, like NT and N-long S. The hand of the Song of Songs commentary has a narrow, spiky aspect with pointed descenders. In the Genesis text, paragraph marks are copied in the margins and are occasionally decorated with abstract, floral, or animal designs. In the interlinear glosses, however, paragraph marks are a simple gibbet shape, which is the form in which they are found in the Song of Songs. Occasional use of *signes-de-renvoi*.

The extracts were copied in black ink, while the ink used for the glossed Genesis and Jerome varies from black to brown. The text of the Song of Songs was copied in a dark brown with medium-brown glosses. Many comments have been added to the gloss on the Song of Songs, also in brown ink. Prickings are occasionally visible, but were rarely adhered to. Genesis was ruled in crayon, while Jerome and Song of Songs were ruled in pencil. Margins were ruled for the glosses as needed. Chapter numbers were added to the margins in black ink. Extracts, prefatory glosses, and Jerome were copied in two columns, while glossed Genesis and Song of Songs were copied in three. The width of the central column in Genesis varies from 55 mm to 105 mm wide; that of the Song of Songs does not vary much, and measures 85-90 mm wide.

The initial ‘I’ of Genesis, on 3v, is in red and measures 90 mm high. Initial letters of the glosses in the preface are in red, blue and green, as are the names of the sons of Israel in Genesis 49, 96r–98r. There is a green and red initial ‘Q’ at the beginning of the Jerome text (95r). The text of the Songs of Songs contains rubrication denoting the speakers. Despite the differences in style, the collation indicates that these texts were part of a coherent manuscript. The last three folios are a small booklet containing a catalog of the library of Bury St. Edmunds’s dating to the period between 1150 and 1175. It is ruled in crayon and pencil for two columns and copied in multiple hands. Collation: ii + 1–14\(^8\) +15\(^4\) (lacking 4\(^{th}\)) + 16\(^4\) (lacking 4\(^{th}\)).

The manuscript belonged to the monastery of Bury St Edmunds, as attested by the *ex libris* on the front paste-down. According to N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books* 2\(^{nd}\) ed. (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1964) 16, books at Bury St Edmunds were classified according to the first letter of their contents. For example, Augustine and Anselm would be catalogued under A, and biblical texts under “B”. The paste-down also bears a modern bookplate for Pembroke College and the number 47. The last item in this manuscript (117–119v) is a catalogue of the Bury St. Edmund’s library, which lists this manuscript as item 130. The catalog is organized by date of acquisition, and Thomson dates this
volume’s entry into the library to some time soon after 1150; this agrees with McLachlan’s identification of the style of this volume as characteristic of the scriptorium of Bury St. Edmund’s in the middle of the twelfth century. The title of this manuscript is copied in a group with two other manuscripts, “Euangelia Iohannis et Luce Glosatus” (number 131) and “Liber Hugonis de Sacramentis” (number 132), and it is likely that they were copied at the same time.


---

“Bibliotheca in uno uolumine”, explicit 119v “Quintilanus de Institutionibus oratoriis”.

M = Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 3746
Parchment, 111 folios, 305 x 195 mm, Augsburg Cathedral, s. XIII

Genesis with Glossa ordinaria

2nd fol. inc., Aug. In principio fecit deus celum et terram. Non dixit in principio dixit...

This is a codex of 111 folios measuring 295 mm x 195 mm, with a writing area of 215 mm x 155 mm. The boards are covered with white leather decorated with blind stamping. Clasps and straps are missing, and there is a sizeable hole in the top center of the black board where it was once attached to a chain. Two pieces of parchment have been pasted to the front board, one with the title “Genesis cum glos.” and one with the old pressmark “A” in red. On the spine, the title “Genesis cum glossa” in brown ink; below that, there is a paper with “46” in black ink and a paper sticker reading “Aug. eccl. 46”, its shelfmark from the Augsburg cathedral. The last paper sticker on the spine gives the current shelfmark, “Cod. lat. 3746”. The front paste-down is missing, and traces of reversed letters in black and red ink on the front board suggest that it was a re-used folio from another manuscript. The back paste-down is the last folio of the final quire. The folios have been recut, which has resulted in the loss of some marginal notes.

The hand is a fine, consistent, upright protogothic with a closed lower compartment to the g, feet added to descenders, and uncrossed tironean et symbols. Both uncial and straight-backed ds are used, but the two-compartment ‘a’ is used consistently. Forked ascenders appear frequently on ‘l’ and the straight-backed ‘d,’ but the top of ‘i’ is often clubbed, not forked. Letters are spaced at the end of glosses to fill the width of the column and mark the beginning of a new gloss. Brown ink of varying shades. Corrections and additions to the gloss appear in a darker brown. Tie-marks were used, and “nota” signs appear in the margins. Paragraph signs, found in the margins, are shaped like two entwined ‘s’ shapes. The only decoration takes the form of small capitals in brown ink in the biblical text. Space was left on 2r for an initial “l” and decorative “n” to begin the biblical text, but they were never added. A monogram “AR” appears in the upper right hand corner of 108r. Brief, idiosyncratic additions to the gloss have been added in the lower margin in a hand contemporary to that of the text.

Sheets were pricked across the fold and ruled in pencil. The outer left and right borders of the writing frame are bounded by single lines, while columns are divided by double lines. Sheets
were pricked at top and bottom, but column ruling rarely matches these holes. The frame was ruled for the gloss, and the biblical text was copied every two or three lines to make room for the interlinear glosses. At the beginning of the manuscript, the pages were ruled with 46 lines, but this was reduced to 44 when the gloss required less space. The manuscript is primarily copied in three columns, including the preface. The width and height of the central column changes to accommodate the gloss, but there is a good deal of blank space. Some folios, like 80r and 80v, use only two columns, with a wide column of biblical text. Occasional quire numbers, in the form of Roman numerals surrounded by four dots. The text ends on 108r, and there are three blank folios. Collation: 1–13\textsuperscript{8} + 14\textsuperscript{8} (lacking 1, the back paste-down).


\textit{Ox} = Oxford, Corpus Christi College Library, 15

Parchment, ii + 120 + iii folios, 332 mm x 210 mm, s. XIII, England?

Genesis with \textit{Glossa ordinaria}

2\textsuperscript{nd} fol. inc. \textit{meruit captiuaer}

This codex contains ii + 120 + iii folios measuring 325 mm x 205 mm, with a writing area of about 210 mm x 160 mm. It has been rebound in a seventeenth-century binding of mottled
brown leather over pasteboard, decorated with blind tooling. Paper pastedowns and flyleaves. Five bands. The edges of the folios have been cut and speckled with red ink. On the spine, two stickers with shelf-marks: at top, “E. 3. 7”, at bottom, “M.S. C.C.C. C. 15” On the recto of the second flyleaf, there is a seventeenth- or eighteenth-century note reading “No. 1482. 15. E. 3. 7.”

The hand is a neat, upright, round protogothic with a tidy aspect and feet applied to the bottom of letters minims. Both the tironean et and ampersand appear. The et can be uncrossed, crossed once, or crossed twice. The minuscule ‘a’ has a large lower compartment. Ink is black or dark brown. Some corrections in brown ink or pencil. Paragraph signs are in the margins and are ornately decorated, mostly with floral motifs. Tie-marks are used to join glosses that are split over a page turn. Prickings along the right and left edges have been cut away, but prickings at the bottom remain, in two groups of two and two of five. Ruling in crayon or pencil. The manuscript was ruled for the gloss and the biblical text was written every other line or more, hanging off the upper line. This manuscript was used by Christopher de Hamel as an example of the use of the top—rather than the bottom—ruled line as the guide for the biblical text. Interlinear glosses were ruled as necessary. Occasionally the text column was re-ruled to allow more space for the interlinear glosses. The majority of folios are ruled in three columns, including the prefatory material. Some folios contain only the gloss, and are ruled for only two columns, and one (198r) is in two columns, one of the text and one of the gloss. Advanced layout with split columns, varied column width, and occasional decorative shaping of gloss columns (eg, 3v).

On 4r, a large initial ‘I’ 275 mm high drawn in brown ink and filled in brown, green, blue, and red with foliage patterns for decoration. Display capitals “N PRINCIPIO” in alternating red and blue. On 1r, there is a blue and red “CVM” with red and blue pen-work decoration; a red ‘I’ with blue flourishes, and a small blue ‘Q’ with red flourishes, only one line high. The only other initial occurs at the beginning of Genesis 4, on 32v, and is a red and blue initial ‘H’ with pen-work flourishes. Red and blue running titles. Most gloss attributions have been written in the margins in red. Collation: ii + 1–12\(^{10}\)+iii.

In his catalog description, Thomson says that this manuscript was at Corpus Christi College by 1600. No previous ex libris remain. It may have been made in England. The manuscript is described in Rodney M. Thomson, A Descriptive Catalog of the Medieval Manuscripts of Corpus Christi College, Oxford: Western Manuscripts (Cambridge, UK: D. S. Brewer for Corpus Christi College Oxford, 2011) 7. It is also listed in H.O. Coxe, Catalogus codicum mss. qui in collegiis aulisque oxoniensibus hodie adservantur, vol. 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1852) 4, and J. J. G. Alexander and E. Temple, Illuminated Manuscripts in Oxford College Libraries, the University Archives, and the Taylor Institution (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985) 15 n. 120. It is discussed by Christopher F. R. de Hamel in Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Book Trade (Woodbridge, Suffolk: D. S. Brewer, 1984) 36.

The text is that of Genesis with Glossa ordinaria. Preface incipit 1r “Cum [omnes] diuinos libros legimus...”, text incipit 4r “In principio...”, gloss incipit 4r “In principio creauit deus celum et terram. Celum non uisibile firmamentum...”. Text explicit 119v “et repositus est in loculo in egypto. Explicit Liber Genesis”, gloss explicit “...unde adimplebis me leticia cum uulto tuo”.

**Pa = Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 46**

Parchment, 256 pp, 286 x 196 mm, s. XII, College of Navarre, Paris

Genesis with Glossa ordinaria

2nd fol. inc. *<l>*n principio creauit 2nd fol. gloss inc. uel temporis uel primordium uel uerbo domini

This codex contains i + 128 + i folios (paginated 1–256, excluding the flyleaves, which have been pasted to modern end-papers) and measures 286 mm x 196 mm. The writing space varies in size, with a maximum measurement of 225 mm x 150 mm. It has been tightly rebound in boards covered with light brown leather decorated with four raised bands on the spine and a frame of straight double lines stamped around the front and back covers. On the spine, gold text stamped over a black background reads “Glosa in Genesim” and a paper sticker reads “MANUS H6”. The leather of the spine is dry and cracking. Marbled endpapers are pasted to the inside of the front and back covers. A note on the verso of the first flyleaf reads, “T. L. 48, 255 pages, Mars 1877”. “T. L.” presumably means “tome latin”. The edges of the parchment folios have been painted with red and green diamonds, visible when the codex is closed. All four corners of
the folios have been rounded, which has contributed to the fragility of the spine. Strips of parchment have been sewn in the front and back of the manuscript to strengthen the binding.

Several protogothic hands: the first, in brown ink, is that of the scribe, and two others, in darker ink, made corrections or additions to the text. The biblical text is copied in a slightly darker ink than that of the gloss. Some use of tie-marks. The initial ‘I’ has been cut out of page 3, leaving a hole 64 mm high. “N PRINCIPIO” is written in alternating blue and red, while subsequent capitals, paragraph signs, and some headings are highlighted with red. Small display capitals are used to label the glosses according to their source or interpretive sense.

The folios were pricked twice, once to rule the page for the biblical text, and once again for the gloss. The page is ruled in crayon and pencil. The number of columns varies throughout the text. It is generally copied in three columns (two of the gloss, one of the text of Genesis), but some pages contain only the gloss, copied in two columns. Some pages near the end of Genesis, for which there is less gloss, were copied in a two-column format in which one column is the gloss and one the biblical text. This manuscript also contains some pages copied in the less-common format of two columns of biblical text, with only interlinear glosses. Collation: i + 1–168 + i.


The text is that of Genesis with Glossa ordinaria. The text is notable for the glosses that have been added, excerpted from—among other works—Origen and Hugh of St Victor’s Hexameron in Opera Conditionis, which attest a continued academic use of the text. Preface
incipit page 1 “Primordia generis humani in quibus...”, text incipit page 3 “<I>n principio creavit...”. The first gloss on page 3 is a continuation of the preface, incipit, “uel temporis uel primordium uel uerbo domini”. Text explicit page 255 “…repositus est in loculo in egypto. Explicit. Liber. Geneseos”, gloss explicit page 255: ...delectationes in dextera tua usque ad infinem”.

Pb = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 63
Parchment, 122 folios, 295 x 200 mm, s. XII, Abbaye de Fécamp, Normandy, France
Genesis with Glossa ordinaria
2nd fol. inc. In principio creavit deus. 2nd fol. gloss inc. bresith uocatur qui uoluminibus...

This codex contains iv + 122 + iv folios measuring 295 mm x 200 mm. The writing space measures about 190 mm x 150 mm. The manuscript is in a seventeenth-century binding of boards covered in yellow suede decorated with double-lines stamped around the edges. Four thick, square raised bands. One parchment pastedown and four paper flyleaves at the front, one of which was once pasted to the front board but has become detached. At back, four paper flyleaves and a paper pastedown that remains attached to the board. Paper “Latin 63” sticker on what was the front pastedown. End-bands in green and white at top and bottom of spine.

A fine, consistent, protogothic hand in brown ink, characterized by leafy cedillae on “e”s, wedged ascenders tending towards forks, and consistent, careful application of feet to descenders. Minuscule ‘a’s have an open, tall upper compartment. Both uncial and straight-backed ‘d’s appear, but the straight-backed ‘d’ is more common. The ampersand and tironean et are both used. There are occasional display capitals in brown ink, and flourished paragraph marks. Tie-marks are used to link glosses that are broken up across the page. The only decoration in this manuscript is a historiated initial ‘I’ on 2r, with seven images framed in circles that depict Christ creating heaven and earth, separating the waters, making the plants, placing the sun and moon in the heavens, making the birds, making Adam, and resting with the world, represented by a TO map, in his hand. These scenes have grey and gold borders

---

decorated with white dots. The entire letter is edged with an inner green border and an outer, yellow, wave-shaped border decorated with yellow and red dots. It measures about 177 mm high and is 52 mm wide at the widest points. The edges of this initial have been painted over some of the gloss text.

Prickings along the sides of the folios are no longer visible. Rulings for the biblical text are difficult to see. Margins appear to have been ruled for the gloss in pencil or crayon as necessary, with these lines extending between the lines of the biblical text as was needed for the interlinear glosses. The number of columns varies throughout the text. The prefatory material is in two columns, while the rest of the manuscript is copied in the three-column gloss layout, with width and height of the central column varied to accommodate the changing space requirements of the glosses. There are some L- and C-shaped glosses, and the gloss sometimes interrupts the biblical text, running through the central column in the middle of the page for a few lines before the text resumes. Collation: iii + 1–158 + 162 + iii.


---


**Ps = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14399**

Parchment, 129 folios, 285 x 190 mm, s. XII, St. Victor, France

Genesis with *Glossa ordinaria*

2nd fol. inc. Aug. *Cum in diuina scriptura de paucis uerbis...*

This is a codex of i + 129 + i folios measuring 270 mm x 185 mm, with a consistent writing space of 185 mm x 142 mm throughout. It was been rebound in the modern period in boards covered with mottled brown paper and with red leather on the spine, stamped “Liber Genesis”, with six raised bands. Marbled end-papers. One paper flyleaf at front and one at back. Paper stickers on the spine and inside of front board give the current shelf mark, and 2r and 129v are stamped with a red Bibliothèque nationale stamp.

The hand is a French protogothic with wedged ascenders, some of which extend into the top margin. Feet have been consistently added to minims. Tironean *et* is uncrossed. Glosses begin with decorative capitals. Brown ink. Curved, double-lined paragraph marks are painted on the edge of the columns. Tie marks are used to join divided glosses, and glosses are labeled with small letters to show the order in which they were meant to be read. Corrections and additions have been made in the margins in brown ink. The gloss begins on 2r with a red initial “I” decorated with blue flourishes, about 20 mm high. Initial “I” of biblical text on 5v is historiated with three circles depicting the creation of Adam, the creation of Eve, and Adam and Eve eating from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. The “I” is decorated with floral patterns and surrounded by gold leaf and a border of blue, red, and green. It measures about 172 mm high and is about 34 mm at the widest point. The letters “N PRINCIPIO” are in red display capitals. In the biblical text, higher-level capitals are written in alternating red and blue with flourishes of the opposite color, while lower-level capitals are written in alternating red and blue. Some of these capitals have been decorated with penwork; for example, an ‘O’ on 33r has a face drawn
on the inside. Chapter numbers have been added in red Roman numerals in the margins.

The manuscript was pricked down the side and ruled across the fold in crayon or pencil. The biblical text was written on every other line between, double-lined borders that divide the columns. The codex is consistently ruled at 36 gloss lines per page, allowing for 18 biblical lines. A moderately advanced/late intermediate gloss layout. Biblical lines begin below the top line, to allow for interlinear gloss if necessary. There are two columns of gloss, without biblical text, from 2r–5r. One extra folio has been added at the beginning, and quires have been marked in a modern hand in pencil. Collation: i + 1 1 2–17 8 + i.


The text is that of Genesis with Glossa ordinaria. Preface incipit 2r: “In introitu tabernaculi
domini quod fuit in ueteri testamento...”, text incipit 5v “In principio creauit...”, gloss incipit 5v “Mistice. In principio creuit deus celum et terram. eos scilicet qui celestis...”. Text explicit, 145v “...repositus est in loculo in egipo”, gloss explicit, “Adimplebis me leticia cum uultu tuo domine”.

*Va* = Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19

Parchment, 103 folios, 340 x 240 mm, s. XII (ante 1168), St. Amand en Pévèle, France

Genesis with Glossa ordinaria

This is a codex of 103 folios measuring 340 mm x 240 mm, with a writing space of 255 mm x 210 mm. It is bound in a medieval binding of wooden boards covered in white leather, with three raised bands and a leather tab at the head of the spine. Parchment pastedowns, through which three straps are visible. On the spine, a paper sticker with the crest of Valenciennes reads “M. no. 13, no. 41 manuscrits”. Paper stickers on spine and lower left hand corner of the front board read “19”. On the front pastedown is written “K 129”, the pressmark from St. Amand en Pévèle, as well as a modern note (erroneously) reading “volume de 104 feuillets”. There are no flyleaves, but 1r is blank and the text of the prefatory glosses begins in three columns on 1v.

The hand is a small, precise protogothic with an upright aspect, uncrossed tironian *et*, and occasional appearance of the NT-ligature. Dark brown ink. Tie marks are rarely used, and there are few corrections. Paragraph marks are written in the margins, and occasionally lines are drawn along the right side of multi-line interlinear glosses. There is one ornamental initial ‘I’ on 2v, painted in green with white dots and bordered in red and gold, measuring 155 mm high. There is a small initial ‘I’ on 1v at the beginning of the prefatory material, in red and gold. Divisions in the biblical text are marked by simple capitals and paragraph marks, and this technique is also used for the prefatory material and marginal gloss. Occasional attributions of glosses are written in small capitals. The lines have been pricked after gathering, and ruled in pencil. The parchment was pricked across the page, and the folios were ruled for the marginal text, while the biblical text was written on every other line. There are about 44 lines of gloss per page. The height and width of the central column of biblical text varies according to the amount of marginal and interlineal glossing, but the layout of some of the later, less-glossed chapters of Genesis can be quite inefficient, with abundant white space. Quires are numbered with small
Roman numerals surrounded by four dots. Collation: 1–12\textsuperscript{8}+13\textsuperscript{7}

The codex comes from St. Amand en Pévèle (Dép. Nord, France), and is listed as “Genesis glosatus” in the twelfth-century catalog of the monastery library. It is the first item in a list of a hundred and ten books given to the library by the author of the catalog. Léopold Delisle argued that this catalog was composed under Abbot Hugh, who was head of St. Amand en Pévèle from 1150 to 1168.\textsuperscript{567} An old pressmark, K 129, can be found on the front pastedown. The manuscript is listed in Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques de France: Départements, vol. 25, Poitiers, Valenciennes (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1894) 199, and in Jacques Mangeart, Catalogue descriptif et raisonne des manuscrits de la bibliothèque de Valenciennes (Paris: Techener; Valenciennes: Lemaitre, 1860) 19, under the old catalog number 13.


\textsuperscript{567} Delisle, Le Cabinet des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Imperiale, 1:318. The complete catalog can be found in Delisle, Le Cabinet des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Imperiale, volume 2 (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1874) 2:455–458. Boutemy critiqued some of Delisle’s interpretations of the format of the catalog, but does not challenge his dating of the main body of the text—although he suggests the catalog may date to before 1160. Boutemy, “Le scriptorium et la bibliothèque de Saint-Amand d’apres les manuscrits et les anciens catalogues,” 13.
Appendix B
The *Glossa ordinaria* on Genesis 1–3 in Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19

About the Transcription

I have sought to preserve the text as it is found in Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19 as much as possible, while producing a transcription that is both readable and useful for future researchers. With these two goals, the text is presented according to the following practices:

Organization of the Text

For ease of reference, the text is organized—albeit anachronistically—according to the modern division of the text into chapters and verses. The verses are given in bold type, with the interlinear glosses, marked by lemmata, immediately following. These are then followed by the marginal glosses that pertain to the gloss at hand. Where a marginal gloss discusses multiple lemmata, it is placed after the first verse to which it applies. Occasionally, marginal glosses are broken up over multiple folios, in which case the new folio number is given in square brackets. The point at which the text returns to the original folio is similarly marked.

Orthography and Punctuation

I have restrained my emendation of the texts’ medieval orthography to standardizing the use of u (for minuscule) and V (for majuscule) throughout, and capitalizing proper names. I have not expanded the collapsed diphthong “e” for “ae”. The *Glossa* is inconsistent in the gender it assigns to *dies*, and I have not altered its use.

Textual Variants, Errors, and Insertions

Variants in the text are only noted when there is a problem in the sense of the Latin. These points are footnoted. I have made no emendations to the text: this transcription is to be understood as an accurate rendering of the text as found in *Va*. A medieval editor made some emendations to the text: his insertions in the text are marked with angle brackets, and medieval deletions by square brackets. The paragraph breaks reflect the paragraph marks.
Sources and Citations

Sources for each gloss, where available, are footnoted. Where there are multiple sources for one gloss, or where part of the gloss is not found in the source, I have noted the beginning and ending of the section taken from the gloss at the beginning of the footnote. Biblical passages within the text are italicized; biblical references to passages other than Genesis 1–3 are given in square brackets within the text.

Manuscripts Cited

Ad Mont, Stiftsbibliothek, 251 (Glossa ordinaria, s. XIII)

Am Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (olim Bibliothèque municipale), 60 (Glossa ordinaria, s. XII2)

C Cambridge, Pembroke College Library, 47 (Glossa ordinaria, circa 1150)

Pn Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398 (Glossa primitiva, ante 1140)

Va Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 19 (Glossa ordinaria, ante 1168)

SG St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang., 283 (Rabanus/“Strabo”, Adbreviatio commentariorum in Genesim, s. IX)

Glossa ordinaria super Genesim 1–3

Preface

primum mandatum, Dominus Deus tuus unus est, et cetera [Dt 6:4]. Propter hanc fidem Christus uisibiliter apparuit, presentie sue gratia diuidens lucem, id est filios Dei et lucis, a tenebris, id est a peccatoribus. Hos appellauit diem, illos noctem. Vnde, fuiistis aliquando tenebre nunc autem lux in Domino [Eph 5:8]. 568

Die secunda posuit firmamentum, sanctas scilicet scripturas in ecclesia, de quibus dicitur, Liber sicut celum plicabitur [Is 34:4]. Hoc firmamento discreuit aquas, id est populum angelorum, quibus non est necesse ut in lectione audiant Dei uerbum, sed illud firmamentum posuit super infirmitatem inferiorum populorum, ut suscipientes in eo cognoscant qualiter discernant inter carnalia et spiritualia quasi inter aquas superioriores et inferiores. 569

Die tercia congregauit aquas inferiores et salsas, infideles scilicet concupiscentiarum et temptationum fluctibus sese quatientes. Segregauit ab eis aridam, id est fideles fontem fidei sitientes. Infideles uero coercuit ne iniquitatis sue fluctibus aridam, id est animam Deum sitientem, conturbent, sed liceat ei germinare fructus bonorum operum et diligere proximum ut habeat in se semen secundum similitudinem suam, ut scilicet ex sua infirmitate compatiatur indigenti et producat lignum, forte scilicet et fructiferum id est beneficium eripiendo oppressum et prebendo protectionis umbraculum. 570

Quarta die micuerunt luminaria in firmamento legis, id est doctores scripture sancte inherentes et inferioribus lumen sapientie demonstrantes. Prodiit quoque siderum turba, id est uirorum numerositas qui in huius uite nocte fulgentes diuidant scripture sensibilia et intelligibilia, quasi inter lucem perfectorum et tenebras paruulorum, facientes signa uirtutum et miraculorum qui sunt in tempora et in annos, quia propriis temporibus uiuunt et transeunt, uerbum Domini manet in eternum [1 Ptrl 1:25]. Bene autem terra primo germinauit et post facta sunt luminaria, quia post bona opera uenit illuminatio, qua uidentur species superne uirtutis. 571

569 Isidore, QVT I, 6–7 [PL 83:210A–210B]; Rabanus Maurus, CG I [PL 107:467B–467C]
570 Isidore, QVT I, 8–9 [PL 83:210B–211A]; Rabanus Maurus, CG I [PL 107:467C–467D]
571 Isidore, QVT I, 10–11 [PL 83:211A–211B]; Rabanus Maurus, CG I [PL 107:467D–468A]
Die quinta facta sunt in aquis reptilia uiuarum animarum, id est homines in uitam reuocati per sacramentum baptismi. Facta sunt uolatilia, id est anime uolantes ad superna.\textsuperscript{572}

Sexta die producit terra \textit{animam uiuam} quando caro nostra ab operibus mortuis abstinens uiua uirtutem parit \textit{secundum genus suum}, id est uitam imitando sanctorum, unde \textit{imitatores mei estate}, et cetera \textsuperscript{[1 Cor 1:11]}. Secundum genus nostrum uiuimus quando sanctos quasi proximos imitamur. Produxit terra \textit{bestias}, id est homines ferociitate superbientes et \textit{pecora}, id est simpliciter uiuentes, et \textit{serpentes} astutos seculi et bonum a malo discernentes et quasi reptando scrutantes terrena per que intelligent celestia.\textsuperscript{573}

Post hec fecit Deus hominem \textit{ad imaginem suam}, uirum scilicet perfectum qui ipsam ueritatem contemplando operatur iustitiam. Hic accepit potestatem \textit{piscium maris et uolatilium celi}, pecorum ferarum atque repentium, quia spiritualis similis Deo factus omnia iudicat et a nemine iudicatur. \textit{Masculum et feminam creauit eos}, quia sicut uiro mulier, sic spirituali et perfecto uiro minus perfectus obediens est. Dicitur enim eis, \textit{Crescite et multiplicamini} in spiritualibus seculi donis ut ratio dominetur carnii quasi insensato animante et perturbationibus carnis. Herbam seminalem et lignum fructuosum in escam hominibus datum intelligimus oblationes sanctorum, unde Apostolus, \textit{Si seminauimus uobis spiritualia magnum est si carnalia uestra metamus} \textsuperscript{[1 Cor 9:11]}.\textsuperscript{574}

Sicut Paulus per reuelationem didicit Euangelium ita Moyses, docente Spiritu Sancto, conditi mundi exordium.\textsuperscript{575}

Gregorius. Querendum est quomodo Deus simul cuncta condidit \textsuperscript{[Sir 18:1]}, dum idem Moyses ex dierum mutatione variante distincte creata descriptit, sed rerum substantia simul creatae est, simul uero per species formata non est, et quod simul extitit per substantiam materie non simul apparuit per speciem forme. Cum enim simul factum celum terraque dicitur, simul spiritualia et

\textsuperscript{572} Isidore, \textit{QVT} I, 12 \textsuperscript{[PL 83:211B]}; Rabanus Maurus, \textit{CG} I \textsuperscript{[PL 107:468A]}

\textsuperscript{573} Isidore, \textit{QVT} I, 13 \textsuperscript{[PL 83:211B–211C]}; Rabanus Maurus, \textit{CG} I \textsuperscript{[PL 107:468A–468B]}

\textsuperscript{574} Isidore, \textit{QVT} I, 14–16 \textsuperscript{[PL 83:211C–212B]}; Rabanus Maurus, \textit{CG} I \textsuperscript{[PL 107:468B–468D]}

\textsuperscript{575} cf. \textit{Glossa primitiva}, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.
corporalia et quicquid de terra producitur simul factum indicatur. Sol, luna, et sidera quarto die in celo facta perhibentur, sed que quarto die processit in specie, primo die in celi substantia exitit per conditionem. Primo die terra creatas dicitur, tertio arbusta condita et cuncta terre uirentia describuntur. Sed quod die tertio in speciem prodiit, prima die in ipsa terre substantia conditum fuit. Hinc Moyses distincte per singulos dies omnia condita retulit, et tam similis omnia creatas subiuuxit dicens, *iste sunt generationes celi et terre quando create sunt, in die quo fecit Deus celum et terram et omnem uirgultum agri antequam oriretur in terra omnemque herbam regionis*. Qui enim diuersis diebus creatum celum, terram, uirgultum, herbamque narrauerat, hic uno die facta manifestat ut ostenderet quod omnis creatura simul per substantiam extitit, quamuis non simul per speciem processit. Vnde, *Creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam, ad imaginem Dei creavit illum, masculum et feminam fecit eos*. Nondum femina facta, iam homo masculus et femina perhibetur. Sed quia ex Ade latere erat processura, in illo iam computatur per substantiam a quo fuerat producenda per formam. In minimis quoque licet hec considerare. Herba enim cum creatur, nondum in illa fructus necdum fructus sui semen ostenditur. Inest ei tamen fructus et semen quia simul sunt in radice substantie que non simul prodeunt per temporis incrementa.  

Augustinus. In narratione rerum factarum non omnia secundum figuratum tantum intellectum accipiuntur; quedam secundum fidem rerum gestarum asserenda et defendenda sunt. Querendum ergo quomodo preter allegoricam significationem dictum sit, *In principio creavit Deum celum et terram*. In principio, scilicet temporis, uel quia primo facta sunt, uel in principio, id est Dei filio, qui ait, *Ego principium qui et loquor uobis* [Jn 8:25], *celum et terram* spiritualem corporalemque creaturam intelligit, uel corpoream tantum per celum superiorem per terram inferiorem, uel utriusque informis materia dicta est celum et terra. Spiritualis enim uita sicut in se est, non conuersa ad creatorem, informis est, conuersa uero ad eum formatur. Corporalis autem per priuuationem omnis corporee qualitatis que apparat in formata materia, uel celum est creatura spiritualis que ab exordio, quo facta est et beata semper est, terra uero corporalis materies adhuc imperfecta, quia terra, inquit, *erat invisibilis et incomposita* et cetera, ubi uidetur informitatem significare corporalis substantie. Vtriusque tamen informitas hic

---

576 Patertius, *LEVNT* 1:10 [PL 79:688B–689A].
significari potest. Corporalis in eo quod dictum est *terra erat inuisibilis et incomposita*, spiritualis autem in hoc, *tenebre erant super faciem abyssi*, ut abyssum tenebosam naturam uite informem intelligamus nisi ad creatorem convartur, in quo solo formatur et illuminatur, ne sit tenebre uel abyssus.\(^{577}\)


Strabus.\(^{579}\) *In principio creavit Deus celum et terram*. Moyses in uno principio temporis mundum a Deo creatore factum refert ut sensum temporis preueniret effectu uoluntatis, ut Deum sciamus esse ante temporis initium et ipsum esse initium omnium. Plato enim tria principia estimabat, deum, exemplar, et materiam, et ipsa increata sine initio et deum quasi artificem non creatorem. Aristotiles duo: materiam, speciem, et tertium operatorium dictum, mundum uero semper esse et fuisse. Contra hec ergo et huiusmodi dicitur, *in principio creavit Deus celum et terram*.\(^{580}\)

---

\(^{577}\) Augustine, *DGAL* I, 1 [CSEL 28 III 1, 3–5].

\(^{578}\) This gloss is falsely attributed to Bede here: *cf. Glossa primitiva*, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.

\(^{579}\) Modern readers may expect “Strabo,” but the gloss gives “Strabus”.

Augustinus. Cum in diuina scriptura de paucis plures intellectus ueri et catholici habentur, illum diligamus maxime quem constat scriptorem sensisse, uel quem non impedit circumstantia scripture, si conuenit cum sana fide aut saltem quem sana fides prescribit.\textsuperscript{581}

Augustinus. Si qua obscura legimus, que possint sane uariis exponi sententiis, nullem precipitanter afirmemus, ne forte eam uelimus esse scripture que nostra est, cum potius scripture sententiam debeamus facere nostram.\textsuperscript{582}

Liber iste more Ebreorum a principio “Genesis” appellatur quia de celi et terre generatione agit, licet alia multa sequantur, sicut euangelium Mathei “liber generationis Ihesu Christi”. Inducit enim Moyses primum hominem forum futuri de terra uirgine conditum, qui generaret terrenos in uitam transitoriam, sicut euangelium secundum de matre uirgine genitum, qui regeneraret celestes in uitam eternam. Hic ergo figura in euangelio ueritas.\textsuperscript{583}

Ieronymus. \textit{In principio fecit Deus celi et terram}. Plerique autamant, sicut Tertullianus et Hylarius, in Hebreo habere “in filio fecit Deus celi et terram”. Septuaginta uero Symachus et Theodotio \textit{in principio} transtulerunt, et in Ebreo scriptum est “Bresith”, quod Aquila interpretatur “in capitulo”. Magis igitur secundum uerbi translationem de Christo accipi potest, qui in ipsa fronte Geneseos que caput omnium est librorum et in principio Iohannis celi et terre conditor approbatur. Vnde, \textit{In capitulo libr scriptum est de me} [Ps 39:8; Heb 10:7], id est “in principio Geneseos”. \textit{Et omnia per ipsum facta sunt}, et cetera [Jn 1:3]. Apud Ebreos quoque hic liber “Bresith” uocatur, qui uoluminibus ex principiis librorum nomina imponunt.\textsuperscript{584}

Strabus. \textit{In principio creauit Deus celi et terram}. Celum non uisibile firmamentum sed empireum, id est igneum, uel intellectuare quod non ab ardore sed a splendore igneum dicitur. Quod statim repletum est angelis. Vnde, \textit{cum me laudarent simul astra matutina}, et cetera [Job

\textsuperscript{581} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} I, 21 \textit{[CSEL} 28 III 1, 31].

\textsuperscript{582} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} I, 18 \textit{[CSEL} 28 III 1, 27].

\textsuperscript{583} cf. \textit{Glossa primitiva}, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.

\textsuperscript{584} Jerome, \textit{HQLG} 1, 10 \textit{[CCSL} 72, 3].
38:7]. Et nota tria hic memorari elementa: nomine celi aerem colligimus, nomine terre ipsam et ignem qui in ea latet, quarti, id est aque, in sequentibus fit mentio.

Alcuinus. Quatuor modis operatur Deus, primo in uerbo, secundo in materia informi, unde, qui uiiuit in e ternum creaut omnia simul [Sir 18:1], tertio per opere sex dierum distinxit creaturas. Quarto ex primordialibus seminibus non incognite oriuntur nature sed note sepium ne pereant reformantur.


1:1

[2v] In principio creauit Deus celum et terram.

In principio. temporis, uel ante cetera, uel in filio

In principio. filio quo humanato patuit qui essent celestes, qui terreni creauit. tanquam omnium creator

Deus. Pater

celim. informem materiam spiritualis uite, sicut in se potest existere, non conuersa ad creatorem in quo formatur.

celim. id est spirituales qui celestia meditantur

et terram. corporalem sine omni qualitate que apparet in materia formatas

---

585 Ad Am C opera
586 Alcuin, IIG 19 [PL 100:519A].
587 Bede, IG I i, 1 [CCSL 118A, 3].
588 Rabanus Maurus, CG I [PL 107:467A].
et terram. carnales scilicet qui terrenum hominem necdum deposuerunt 589

Augustinus. In principio fecit Deus celum et terram. Non dicit “in principio dixit Deus, fiat celum et terra” sicut dixit, fiat lux et facta est lux, quoniam uniuersaliter nomine celi et terre comprehendendum erat quod fecit Deus, deinde per partes explicandum quomodo fecit. Vnde sequitur, dixit Deus fiat, id est per uerbum suum fecit, uel quia cum primum fiebat informis materia spiritualis uel corporalis, incongruum erat a Deo dici “fiat”, quia formam uerbi non imitatur imperfectio, nisi cum generis sui conversione ad creatorem fit perfecta creatura, ut cum dicitur, dixit Deus fiat, intelligamus eum ad se imperfectionem creature reuocare. Cum ergo dicitur, in principio fecit Deus celum et terram, commemoratio filii fit, quia principium est, sed cum dicitur, dixit Deus fiat, commemoratur quia uerbum est. Per “principium” notat exordium creature existentis ab illo, per “uerbum”, perfectionem creature ab ipso reuocate ut formetur imitando formam uerbi incommutabilem. 590 Non enim habet uitam informem uerbum Dei, cui est esse quod uiuere, immo idem uiuere quod beate uiuere. Creatura etiam spiritualis habet informem uitam cui non est hoc esse quod uiuere, quia auersa a sapientia Dei stulte et misere uiuit. 591

Mistice. In principio creauit Deus celum, eos scilicet qui celestis imaginem portauerunt, et terram, id est qui postea superbiendo terram, id est terreni hominis imaginem portantes se fecerunt. Terra erat inanis, quia deposuerat formam bonam et uacua boni operis fructu, et tenebre erant ueri scilicet luminis priuatio. Super faciem abyssi, corda scilicet superborum. 592

Celum et terram, omnem scilicet creaturam corpoream superiorem et inferiorem.

Celum creatura spiritualis ab exordio perfecta et beata, terra corporalis materies adhuc imperfecta.

1:2

589 Rabanus Maurus, CG I [PL 107:467A].
590 Augustine, DGAL I, 3–4 [CSEL 28 III 1, 7–8].
591 Augustine, DGAL I, 5 [CSEL 28 III 1, 8–9].
592 cf. Glossa primitiva, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 6r.

*Terra.* corporalis substantia

*Terra.* nostre carnis

*erat.* informis; imperfecta

*inanis.* priusquam doctrine formam acciperet

*inanis.* his que de ipsa erant formanda

*tenebre.* peccatorum

*tenebre.* spiritualem naturam informem significat, que conuersa ad creatorem formatur et illuminatur.

*tenebre.* quia non erat lux que superesset

*faciem.* humani cordis

*et spiritus.* bona voluntas creatoris cui subiacebat quod formandum erat.

*et spiritus.* Spiritus Sanctus

*ferebatur.* tanquam Dominus

*ferebatur.* Syra lingua “fouebat”, sicut ausis oua

*ferebatur.* in quo subsistentes requiesceremus, flatu eius uiuificati et unda abluti

*super.* sicut sapientia artificialis superfertur faciendo operi

*aquas.* totam corporalem materiam, quia ex humida natura formantur que uidemus per species uarias, uel spiritualem uitam quasi fluitantem ante conversionis formam

*aquas.* cor tenebrosum et fluidum

*aquas.* informem sed ductilem materiam

Strabu. *Terra autem erat inanis et uacua*, inutilis scilicet infructuosa et incomposita, omnia enim elementa commixta et confusa, et totum hoc aeris spatium aquis plenum, non quales nunc sunt sed sicut nebule tenues erant quales adhuc super celestes sunt.

---

593 Rabanus Maurus, *CG I* [PL 107:467A].

594 Rabanus Maurus, *CG I* [PL 107:467A].

595 Rabanus Maurus, *CG I* [PL 107:467A].

596 C Am scilicet Ad et
Beda. *Terra erat inanis et uacua*. Quod uel quale celum in principio cum terra factum est ostendit. Hoc enim de terra subdit quod de celo intelligi uoluit. Hoc enim superius celum quod a uolubilitate mundi secretum est, mox ut creatum est, sanctis angelis est impletum. Quos in principio cum celo et terra conditos testatur Dominus dicens, *Vbi eras cum me laudarent astra matutina et iubilarent omnis filii Dei?* [Job 38:4–7], *astra matutina* eosdem angelos et filios Dei uocat, de celo enim in quo posita sunt luminaria quomodo uel quando factum sit, postea dicit.\(^{597}\)

Beda. *Et tenebre erant super faciem abyssi*, et cetera. Non sunt audiendi qui reprehendendo dicunt Deum prius creasse tenebras quam lucem, quia nullas in aqua uel in aere fecit tenebras sed distincto ordine prouidentie prius aquas cum celo creauit et terra, et has cum uoluit lucis gratia uenustauit, et notandum quod cum celo duo elementa mundi creata sunt, quibus alia duo inserta sunt, aqua scilicet et terra, quibus insunt ignis et aer. Aque autem totam terre superficiem tanta altitudine tegebant ut ad illos usque locos pertingerent, ubi nunc usque super firmamentum partim resident. Ipsa autem terra et aqua informis dicuntur materia quia omnia que uidemus uel ex ipsis sumpserunt exordium, uel ex nichilo et priusquam in lucem uenirent, non erant unde formam habeant.\(^{598}\)


*Et spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas*. Sicut dominus et conditor preerat fluitanti et confuse materiei, ut distinguueret quando uellet. Tota igitur trinitas hic operata intelligitur: Deus, Pater; principium, Filius; spiritus Dei, Spiritus Sanctus.\(^{600}\)

---

\(^{597}\) Bede, *IG I i*, 2 [CCSL 118A, 4].

\(^{598}\) Bede, *IG I i*, 2 [CCSL 118A, 5–6].

\(^{599}\) Jerome, *HQLG 1*, 2 [CCSL 72, 3].

\(^{600}\) *Tota igitur... spiritus sanctus*. Augustine, *DGAL I*, 6 [CSEL 28 III 1, 10].
Augustinus. Historice. *Et spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas.* Siue totam corporalem materiam aquam appellauit, ut insinuaret unde facta et formata sint omnia que ex humida natura per species uarias in terra formari uidemus, siue spiritualem uitam ante conversionis formam quasi fluitantem. Spiritus Dei superferebatur [3r] quia subiacebat bone uoluntati creatoris quod formandum et perficiendum inchoauerat. 601 Dictum est etiam *spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas* ne facienda opera potius per necessitatem indigentie quam per abundantiam beneficentie Deus amare putaretur. Commode enim prius insinuatur aliquid inchoatum cui superferretur non loco sed omnia superante potentia. 602

1:3

[3r] **Dixitque Deus, fiat lux. Et facta est lux.**

*Dixitque.* non temporaliter, non sono uocis sed in uerbo sibi coeterno

*fiat.* incipit distinguere opere

*fiat.* angelica natura uel corporalis lux

*lux.* illuminatio fidei appareat 603

*lux.* lux a luendo, id est pergando tenebras

*facta.* bene ab eterna luce prius fit temporalis lux ut per eam cetera uiderentur

*lux.* angelica Dei uisione illustrata

Moraliter. Habet quisque in operibus et recta uita distinctos sex dies post quos requiem speret. Primo die lucem fidei, quando primo uisibilibus credit propter quam fidem Dominus apparere dignatus est. 604

Augustinus. Historice. **Dixitque Deus.** Non temporaliter scilicet si enim temporaliter, et mutabiliter, si mutabiliter, per subiectam creaturam, si per creaturam, non est lux prima creatura

601 *Et spiritus... inchoaverat.* Augustine, *DGAL* I, 5 [CSEL 28 III 1, 9–10].

602 *Dictum est... potentia.* Augustine, *DGAL* I, 7 [CSEL 28 III 1, 11].

603 Rabanus Maurus, *CG* I [PL 107:467A].

604 Augustine, *DGCM* I, 43 [CSEL 91, 112].

*Dixit Deus, fiat lux.* Lux primo die facta spiritualis uel corporalis intelligitur. Si spiritualis, non illa patri coeterna per quam facta sunt omnia, sed de qua dicitur, *prior omnium creatae est sapientia* [Sir 1:4], id est intellectualis et angelica uita que informiter fluctuat nisi ad creatorem conversa que potest esse prima creatura et celum dicta cum dicitur, *in principio creavit Deus celum et terram*. Sed ad creatorem conversa cum dicitur, *fiat lux, et facta est lux*, in qua luce spirituali forte diuisio lucis a tenebris, distinctio intelligitur rei iam formate ab informi, appellatio diei et noctis significatio distributionis qua significatur nichil Deum inordinatum relinquere, nec perfectus creaturarum sine supplemento uniueris decoris esse. Vespera in triduo antequam fierent luminaria consummati operis terminus. *Mane*, futuri

---

605 *Dixitque Deus... coeternum*. Augustine, *Dgal* I, 2 [CSEL 28 III 1, 5–7].

606 *Cum enim...ut fieret*. Augustine, *Dgal* II, 6 [CSEL 28 III 1, 42].

607 *Ideo enim... ut maneat*. Augustine, *Dgal* I, 8 [CSEL 28 III 1, 11].

608 *spiritalis sic*

609 *Dixit Deus... est sapientia*. Augustine, *Dgal* I, 17 [CSEL 28 III 1, 23–24].

610 *id est intellectualis...est lux*. Augustine, *Dgal* I, 9 [CSEL 28 III 1, 13].
significatio. 611 Si autem primo die corporalis lux facta est, congrue mundi ornatus a luce inchoatur, unde cetera que creanda erant uiderentur. Si autem queritur ubi facta est, cum abissus omnem terre altitudinem tegeret, patet quia in illis partibus quas nunc illustrant solis diurna lux. Nec mirum lucem in aquis posse splendere, cum etiam nautarum operatione sepius lustrentur qui in profundo mersi, misso ex ore oleo aquas sibi illustrant, que multo rariores quam sint modo fuere in principio quia nondum congregate in uno loco. 612

Mistice. *Et spiritus Deus ferebatur super aquas*, corda scilicet fluctuantia que mentis quietem amiserant, quia eis spiritus non innitebatur sed superferebatur, quasi potens naturam a confusione in melius reuocare. 613 Deinde per totum huius scripture textum, sex quasdam operosas etates uidemus quasi propriis distinctas limitibus, ut in septima quies speretur, et eas habere similitudinem sex dierum quibus ea facta sunt que Deum fecisse scriptura commemorat. Primordium enim generis humani quo ista luce frui cepit comparatur primo diei quo Deus lucem fecit. Hec etas tanquam infantia est totius seculi, quod tanquam unum hominem proportione magnitudinis sue cogitamus. Homo enim cum primo nascitur in lucem infantiam agit, primam etatem que tenditur ab Adam usque ad Noe generationibus decem. Diluuium quasi uespera diei huius, quia infantia nostra obliuionis diluuiuo deletur. 614

Alcuinus. Dixit, profecit, posuit, ut celeritatem vel facilitatem operis Dei ostenderet. 615

Istorice. *Fiat lux*. Ea conditione scilicet qua cuncta subsistunt intemporaliter in Dei sapientia priusquam in se ipsis. *Et facta est lux*, id est angelica et celestis substantia in se temporaliter, sicut in sapientia quantum ad eius incommutabilitatem eternaliter. Huius creature informitas,
inperfectio antequam formaretur in amore conditoris, formatur enim cum convertitur ad incommutabile lumen uerbi.  

Fiat lux. Si corporalis lux facta est, que nam est illa quam cum sol occiderit uideri non possumus, quia nec luna erat nec stelle, sed forsitan in ea parte celi est, in qua sol non solis lux sed sic iuncta ei ut discerni non possit, uel forte in ea parte lucem Deus fecerat in qua hominem facturus erat, et cum ab illa parte lux discessisset, uespera diceretur.  


1:4

[3v] *Et uidit Deus lucem quod esset bona, et diuisit lucem ac tenebras.*

*uidit.* id est uideri uoluit

*lucem.* id est placuit ei in sua essentia quod prius placuerat in sapientia

*diuisit lucem.* rem formatam

*diuisit lucem.* filios lucis

*diuisit lucem.* in qua operentur homines

*tenebras.* informitatem

*tenebras.* peccatores

*tenebras.* a tenendo dictas, *tenent enim oculos ne uideant*

*tenebras.* in quibus quiescant

[3v] *Et uidit Deus lucem quod esset bonum* et cetera. Non quasi incognitam lucem lauduit sed iam factam laude dignam declarauit. Sed quia non totas mundi tenebras luce expulit recte

---

616 Augustine, *DGAL* I, 1 [CSEL 28 III 1, 4–5].

617 *Fiat lux...diceretur.* Augustine, *DGAL* I, 10 [CSEL 28 III 1, 16].

618 *Sed quare...addito.* Augustine, *DGAL* I, 11 [CSEL 28 III 1, 16–17].

619 *Emissionem...exiberetur.* Augustine, *DGAL* I, 16 [CSEL 28 III 1, 23].
subditur, et diuisit lucem a tenebris, diuisit enim non solum qualitatis sed etiam locorum distantia, diffundendo lucem in superiori parte inferiori in tenebris remanente. Appellavitque lucem diem et cetera. Nulla lingua hec appellatio facta est quia apud Deum purus intellectus est sine strepitu lingue. Sed appellavit id est appellari fecit quia sic distinxit ut discerni possent et nominari. 620

Et diuisit lucem a tenebris. Hoc factum ex quo lux facta est, sed non potuit ab homine simul dici sicut a Deo fieri. Discretio autem lucis a tenebris distinctio est inter perfectum cuiusque rei statum et quem habet ex se defectum. Diem quippe in specie rei condite intelligimus, noctem uero in eiusdem rei priuatione uel defectu, qui rebus temporaliter conditis ex se inest, etiam si desit effectus. Vespera in omnibus perfecte conditionis terminus est, omnis enim natura certis initiis et terminis continentur. Nondum enim dies solares erant, ut ortus solis dies, occasus uespera dicetur, quod quarta die factum est cum luminaria primum in firmamento ordinata sunt. 621
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Appellavitque lucem diem et tenebras noctem. Factumque est uespere et mane dies unus.

uespere. perfecte rei terminus
uespere. perfectio boni operis
mane. exordium
mane. initium fidei
unus. prima diuinorum operum distinctio

Factumque est uespere et mane dies unus. Occidentem paulatim luce, et post spatium diurne longitudinis inferiores partes subeunte, factum est uespere sicut nunc usitato circuitu solis solet fieri. Factum est autem mane eadem super terras redeunte et alium diem inchoante, et dies expletus est unus, uiginti et quattuor horarum. Notandum uero quod nox illo triduo omnino tenebrosa fuit que post creata sidera aliqua luce claruit. Decebat etiam ut dies a luce inciperent,

620 Bede, IG I i, 4 [CCSL 118A, 9].
in mane sequentis diei tenderent, et opera Dei a luce inchoare et in lucem completa esse significaretur.⁶²²

Notandum quod cetere creature que infra lucem spiritualem fiunt sine eius cognitione non fiunt. Ideo idem dies ubique repetitur, ut eius repetitione fast dice quotiens distinguuntur genera rerum creatarum perfectione senarii terminanda, ita scilicet ut uespera primi diei sit sui cognitio non se scilicet esse quod Deus est. Mane autem post hanc uesperam, quo clauditur dies primus et incoatur secundus, conuersio eius, ut quod creata est ad laudem referat creatoris, et cognitionem creature precipiat de uerbo Dei que post ipsum fit, id est firmamenti, quod prius in eius cognitione fit, post in natura ipsius firmamenti. Deinde fit uespera huius lucis, cum firmamentum non in uerbo Dei sicut ante, sed in firmamenti natura cognoscit, que cognition, quia minor est, uespera uocatur. Post fit mane quo clauditur dies secundus, incipit tertius, in quo simuliter mane conuersio lucis est, id est huius diei ad laudandum Deum qui fecit firmamentum et precipiendam de uerbo eius cognitionem creature post firmamentum faciende et sic usque ad mane post uesperam sexti diei,⁶²³ multum enim mentem inter cognitionem cuiusque rei in uerbo Dei et cognitionem eius in natura ut illud scilicet ad diem pertineat, hoc ad uesperam.⁶²⁴


Strab. Lucem et tenebras fecit Deus. Vnde, Benedicite lux et tenebre Domino, cum omnis creature ad benedicendum inuitatur [Dn 3:72].

---

⁶²² Bede, IG I i, 5 [CCCL 118A, 9].
⁶²³ Augustine, DGAL IV, 22 [CSEL 28 III 1, 121–122].
⁶²⁴ Augustine, DGAL IV, 23 [CSEL 28 III 1, 122–123].
⁶²⁵ Paterius, LEVNT I, 3 [PL 79:686C–687A].
Dixit quoque Deus fiat firmamentum in medio aquarum et diuidat aquas ab aquis

*Dixit verbo Domini celi firmati sunt* [Ps 32:6]

*fiat.* intransgressibilis terminus

*fiat.* diuine scripture de qua dicitur, *celum sicut liber plicabitur* [Rev 6:14] 626

*in medio.* uaporaliter suspensarum et per terra labiliter iacentium

*aquas.* superiores

*aquas.* populos angelorum qui non indigent firmamento scripture 627

*aquis.* inferioribus

*aquis.* populis hominum qui indigent

Fiat firmamentum in medo aquarum, et cetera. Queritur utrum celum nunc fiat quod excedit aeris spatio, an ipse aer vocetur firmamentum. Asserunt enim aquas super celum sidereum esse non posse, cum earum pondus hoc exigat ut super terram fluant, uel in aere uaporaliter ferantur, nec quisquam dicat fieri hoc omnipotentia Dei. Quomodo enim Deus naturas rerum fecerit, queritur non quid ex eis ad miraculum potentie operetur. Qui uero negant aquas super celum posse esse non tamen locis sed et qualitatibus distinguunt elementa, pro quibus sorciantur propria loca, ut sit aqua super terram, aer super aquam, celum super aerem. 628 Vnde colligunt quod si quis aerem super celum poneret pondere suo caderet, et sic aquas super celum esse non posse. 629 Vnde quidam conatur demonstrare aquas super celos aerem hic celum [4r] et firmamentum accipiens, et propter hoc tantum quia interualllum eius diuidit, inter quosdam uapores aquarum et aquas que in terris sunt. 630

Augustinus. Istorice. Fiat firmamentum in medio aquarum, et cetera. Notandum quod firmamentum non propter stationem sed propter firmitatem et intransgressibilem terminum

---

626 Rabanus Maurus, *CG* I [PL 107:467B].


628 *Fiat firmamentum... super aerem.* Augustine, *DGAL* II, 1 [CSEL 28 III 1, 32–34].

629 *Vnde colligunt... non posse.* Augustine, *DGAL* II, 3 [CSEL 28 III 1, 36].

630 *Vnde quidam... in terris sunt.* Augustine, *DGAL* II, 4 [CSEL 28 III 1, 36–37].
superiorum et inferiorum aquarum appellantum est, \(631\) siue celum intelligamus aerium siue quod excedit spatia nubilosi aeris, qui exalatione terre aquas vaporaliter trahit, et per subtiles minutias suspendit, et post corpulentius conglobatas pluialiter refundit. Si uero potest aqua sicut uidemus ad tantas minutias preuenire, ut feratur vaporaliter super aerem aquis naturaliter leuiorem, cur non credamus et super illud leuius celum minutioribus guttis et leuioribus immanare vaporibus? Sed quoquomodo ibi sunt, ibi esse non dubitamus. \(632\) Notandum uero quod primo die cum facta est lux dictum est tantum, \(fiat\) \(lux\) et hoc in uerbo \(et\) \(facta\) \(est\) \(lux\) et hoc in opere statimque adhesit creanti luci lux creata ut uicinior et omni creatura capacior. In secundo die quedam mora est et uerborum multiplicatio, \(fiat\) \(et\) \(fecit\) \(Deus\) \(et\) \(factum\) \(est\) \(ita\) ut intelligatur istas naturas ad deficiendum pronas, ad obediendum minus aptas. Notandum etiam quod huius diei opera secundum Ebreos non dicuntur bona, cum bona sint sicut cetera, quod fit propter binarium principem alternitatis qui primus ab unitate descendit, et in figura bigamie ponitur et multorum reprehensibilium, unde que bina ingrediuntur in arcam, immunda sunt, impar numerus mundus. \(633\)

1:7–8

[4r] \(Et\) \(fecit\) \(Deus\) \(firmamentum\). \(Diuisitque\) \(aquas\) \(que\) \(erant\) \(super\) \(firmamentum\) \(ab\) \(his\) \(que\) \(erant\) \(sub\) \(firmamento\). \(Et\) \(factum\) \(est\) \(ita\).

\(Et\) \(fecit\). causaliter
\(Et\) \(fecit\). in cognitione angelorum
\(firmamentum\). scripture
\(aquas\). vaporaliter in minutias
\(aquas\). angelos
\(super\). non subter
\(firmamentum\). sidereum celum
\(his\). densioribus
\(his\). hominibus

---

\(631\) \(Fiat\) \(firmamentum\)...\(appellatum\) \(est\). Augustine, \(DGAL\) II, 10 [\(CSEL\) 28 \(III\) 1, 47–48].
\(632\) \(siue\) \(celum\)... \(non\) \(dubitamus\). Augustine, \(DGAL\) II, 4 [\(CSEL\) 28 \(III\) 1, 37–38].
\(633\) \(cf.\) \(Glossa\) \(primitiva\), Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 7v.
que. ut per ipsum inter carnalia et spiritualia quasi inter superiores et inferiores aquas discernant

firmamento. sidereo celo

factum. actualiter

**Vocauitque Deus firmamentum caelum et factum est uespere et mane dies secundus.**

Vocauitque. diuinorum operum secunda distinctio

Augustinus. Super aerem purus ignis dicitur celum esse, unde sidera et luminaria facta coniectant, illius scilicet ignee lucis conglobata dispositaque natura in eas formas quas in cero cernimus. Quidam etiam nostri aquas non esse super celum sidereum, sidereum qualitatibus et meatibus conuincere uolunt, asserentes tamen stellam saturam esse frigidissimam. Queritur ergo ab eis unde frigida sit, que tanto debet esse ardentior, quanto sublimiori celo uicinior. Cum enim rotunda moles circumagitur, interiora tardius et exteriora eius mouentur celerius et ideo seruentius. Debuit ergo magis esse calida quam frigida. Facit ergo frigidam aquarum super celestium uicinitas.

Moraliter. Secundo die factum est tanquam firmamentum discipline, quo discernit inter carnalia et spiritualia, sicut inter inferiories et superiores aquas.

Strabus. *In medo aquarum*, quarum superior pars in modum cristallim lapidis congelata, inferior in matricem redacta.


---

634 Rabanus Maurus, *CG* I [PL 107:467C].
635 Augustine, *DGAL* II, 5 [CSEL 28 III 1, 38–39].
636 Augustine, *DGCM* I 43 [CSEL 91, 112].
*Fiat firmamentum in medo aquarum.* Celi in quo fixa sunt sidera creatio describitur quod constat esse in medio aquarum. Nam supposite sunt ei aque in aere et in terra et superposite de quibus dicitur, *Qui tegis aquis superiora eius* [Ps 103:3]. In medio ergo firmamentum est sidereum celum quod de aquis factum esse potest credi. Cristallinus enim lapis cuius magna firmitas, magna perspicuitas de aquis factus est. Si quem mouet quomodo aque natura fluide et in ima labiles super celum possint consistere, cuius figura rotunda uidetur esse, de Deo scriptum esse meminerit *qui ligat aquas in nubibus suis* [Jb 26:8]. Qui enim infra celum ligat aquas ad tempus uaporibus nubium retentas potest super celi speram ne labantur non uaporali tenuitate sed glaciali soliditate aquas suspendere qui etiam terre molem appendit in nichilo. Quales autem et ad quid utiles ipse nouit qui condidit.\(^{638}\)

*Et fecit Deus firmamentum,* et cetera. Queritur quare cum dixisset, *fiat firmamentum et factum est ita,* postea addidit, *et fecit Deus firmamentum,* cum in creatione lucis additum non sit. In quo demonstratur primo die quo facta est lux conditionem spiritualis creature, id est sanctos angelos, per lucem significari. Ideo non repetunt post quam dixit *facta est lux* quia non primo nouit rationalis creatura formationem suam et post formata est, sed in ipsa sua formatione cognouit, conditio enim lucis prius est in Dei sapientia post in conditione sua. Illic genita hic facta, id est ex informi formata. Vnde *fiat lux et facta est lux* ut quod erat in uerbo esset in opere. Cetera prius fiunt in sapientia, post in angelorum cognitionem, tandem in propio genere. Cum ergo audimus *dixit Deus ‘fiat’,* intelligimus ad sapientiam Dei scripturam recurrere. Cum audimus *factum est* intelligimus in creatura spirituali factam cognitionem faciende creature. Cum additur *et fecit Deus,* fieri ipsam naturam in genere suo.\(^{639}\) Nec totiens *dixit Deus ‘fiat’* quotiens dicit scriptura, qui unum uerbum genuit in quo omnia dixit, per quod singula facta. Sed scriptura condescendens paruulis in quocumque [4v] genere creature respicit eternam in uerbo Dei rationem dicens, *Dixit Deus,* et cetera.\(^{640}\)

---

\(^{638}\) Bede, *IG* I i, 6–8 [CCCL 118A, 10–11].

\(^{639}\) *Et fecit Deus... in genere suo.* Augustine, *DGAL* II, 8 [CSEL 28 III 1, 43–45].

\(^{640}\) *cf. Glossa primitiva,* Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fol. 7v–8r.
Augustinus. Solet queri cuius figure celum sit. Sed spiritus sanctus, quamuis auctores nostri scierint, per eos dicere noluit nisi quod prosit saluti.  

Queritur etiam si stet an moueatur celum. Si mouetur, inquiunt, quomodo est firmamentum? Si stat, sidera in eo fixa quomodo circueunt? Sed firmamentum non propter stationem sed propter firmitatem aut terminum aquarum intransgressibilem dici potest. Si autem stat, nichil impedit moueri et circuire sidera.  

Mistice. Factum est uespere et mane et cetera. Incipit mane secundi diei a Noe tanquam pueritia et tenditur usque ad Abraham aliis generationibus decem. Et bene comparatur secundo diei quo factum est firmamentum inter aquas, sicut arca Noe inter aquas inferiores in quibus natabat et superiores, quibus compluebatur. Hec etas non diluuiio deletur, quia pueritia nostra obliuione de memoria non tegitur. Meminimus enim nos pueros fuisse, infantes non. Huius uespera est confusio linguarum in eis qui turrem faciebant, et sit mane ab Abraham. Sed nec etas secunda generauit populum Dei quia nec pueritia apta est generationi.  

1:9  

[Dixit uero Deus, congregentur aque que sub celo sunt in locum unum et appareat arida, factumque est ita.  

Dixit. verbo separauit  

congregentur. secedant in unam partem terre  
aque. infideles qui cupiditatum tempestate et temptationibus fluminum quaciuntur  
arida. fontem fidei sitientes]  

641 Augustine, *DGAL* II, 9 [CSEL 28 III 1, 45–46].  
642 Augustine, *DGAL* II, 10 [CSEL 28 III 1, 47–48].  
644 C *temptationum fluminibus* Ad *temptationibus fluminum*  
646 Rabanus Maurus, *CG* I [PL 107:467C].
Dixit uero Deus, Congregentur aque. In hoc die factum uidetur ut duo tantum inferiora elementa secernentur. De aeris tamen formatione intelligi potest, qui tune primum notam nobis formam accepit, cum aqua que aeris et terre spatium occupabat, in unam terre partem secessit. Ita secundo et tercio die quatuor elementa in proprias formas uidentur esse distincta. Et quoniam per enumerationem dierum ex informibus formata numerantur, et ex corporali materia iam factum celum Moyses dixerat, cuius multum a terrenis species distat, quod ex ea formandum in infima parte restabat, noluit solitis uerbis inserere ut diceret fiat, quia infirmiorem et informitati proximam susceptrum erat speciem. Vt his uerbis congregentur aque et appareat arida, intelligamus hec duo proprias formas accepisse nobis notas et tractabiles, aquam scilicet mobilem, terram inmobilem. Vnde aqua congregatur, terra apparet, aqua enim labilis et fluxa, terra stabilis et fixa.  

Beda. Congregentur aquae que sub celo sunt et cetera. Aquae que inter celum et terram uniuersa compleuerant, in unum locum congregantur, ut lux que preterito biduo aquas clara lustrabat in puro aere clarior fulgeat, et appareat terra que latebat, et que aquis limosa erat fieret arida et germinibus apta. Si queratur ubi congregate sunt aque que omnis partes terre usque ad celum tectem, potuit fieri ut terra subsidens concava partes preberet, quibus fluentes aquas recipere. Potest etiam credi primarias aquas rariores fuisse que sicut nebula tegerent terras, sed congregatione esse spissatas.

1:10

Et uocauit Deus aridam terram congregationesque aquarum appellauit maria. Et uidit Deus quod esset bonum uidit. Quod placuit in uerbo placuit in facto

Et uocauit Deus aridam terram et cetera. Prius ad distinctionem aquarum totam solidoirem mundi partem terram appelauit, dicens, In principio creauit Deus celum et terram, terra erat inanis et uacua. Postquam mundus iam formari incipit et terre facies appareat, recendentibus aquis ad distinctionem partis que adhuc premebatur aquis, portio quam aridam esse licebat terre

647 Augustine, DGAL II, 11 [CSEL 28 III 1, 49–50].
648 Bede, IG i, 9 [CCSL 118A, 12–13].
nomen accepit eo quod pedibus teratur. *Congregationes aquarum appellantur maria*, sic enim appellantur apud Ebreos omnis aquarum congregationes siue salse siue dulces, et quia propter continuationem omnium aquarum que in terris sunt dixit eas congregatas in unum locum, nunc uocat pluraliter congregationes aquarum propter multifidos sinus earum.\textsuperscript{649}

*Congregationes aquarum appellauit maria* et cetera. Cum multa constet maria, in unum tamen locum dicit aquas congregatas quia cuncta magno mari iunguntur. Si qui autem lacus in semetipsos stricti uidentur, occultis tamen meatibus in mare reuoluuntur. Fossores quoque puteor hoc probant, quod omnis tellus per inuisibiles uenas aquis repleta est, quibus ex mari principium est.\textsuperscript{650}

*Et uidit Deus quod esset et ait...* Nondum terra germinabat, nec aqua animantia uiua produxerat, et tamen dicitur Deus uidere quod esset bonum cedentibus aquis apparuisse aridam, quia estimator uniuersitatis preuidens que sunt futura, quasi iam perfecta, laudat que adhuc in primi operis exordio sunt, quia apud eum rerum perfectio non in consummatione est operis sed in predestinatione uoluntatis.\textsuperscript{651}

1:11

*et ait, germinet terra herbam uirentem et facientem semen et lignum pomiferum faciens fructum iuxta genus suum cuius semen in semetipso sit super terram, et factum est ita germinet. potens sit germinare*  
*terra. anima fructifera ab aquis liberata*  
*herbam. bonorum operum fructus*\textsuperscript{652}  
*lignum. omnia creata sunt perfecta et homo etate perfectus et arbores cum foliis et fructu unde hic dicitur lignum pomiferum*  
*iuxta. ut ex sua infirmitate compatiatur indigentibus*\textsuperscript{653}

\textsuperscript{649} Jerome, *HQLG* 1, 10 [CCSL 72, 3–4].  
\textsuperscript{650} Bede, *IG* I, i, 9 [CCSL 118A, 13].  
\textsuperscript{651} Bede, *IG* I, i, 10 [CCSL 118A, 13].  
\textsuperscript{652} Rabanus Maurus, *CG* I [PL 107:467D].  
\textsuperscript{653} Rabanus Maurus, *CG* I [PL 107:467D].
cuius. de quo similia propagentur
factum. causaliter

*Germinet terra.* Aduertendum est moderamen ordinatoris quamuis distincta est creatura herbarum atque lignorum a specie terrarum et aquarum ut in elementis numerari non possint, quia tamen fixa radicibus terre nectuntur ad eundem diem uoluit pertinere.⁶⁵⁴

[5r] *Germinet terra herbam uirentem* et cetera. Patet in his uerbis quia uerno tempore mundi perfectus est ornatus, in quo solent herbe uirentes apparere et ligna pomis onusta. Simulque notandum quod non prima herbarum germina uel arbor genera de semine prodierunt sed de terra, quia ad unam iussionem conditoris arida apparuit herbis compta, nemoribus uestita, que sui generis ex se poma prodixerit et semina. Oportet enim ut forma rerum Dei imperio primo perfecta prodiret, quomodo homo propter quem omnia iuuenili etate plasmatus est.⁶⁵⁵
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[5r] *Et protulit terra herbam uirentem et afferentem semen iuxta genus suum lignumque faciens fructum et habens unumquodque sementem secundum speciem suam.* Et uidit *Deus quod esset bonum.*

protulit. actualiter

*herbam.* pabulum uerbi, misericordie opera

*iuxta.* de tritico triticum; de legumine legumen

Gregorius. *Et protulit terra herbam uirentem,* et cetera. Quod testatur historia sic est ueraciter factum ut significaret aliiud faciendum, terra est enim ecclesia que uerbi pabulo nos reficit et patrocinii umbraculo custodit, loquendo pascit, opitulando protegit, ut non solum refectionis herbam proferat sed etiam arborem protectionis.⁶⁵⁶

Gregorius. Lignum secundum speciem suam semen producit cum mens nostra ex sui consideratione quid in alterum faciat colligit et recti operis germen parit. Hinc quidam sapiens

---

⁶⁵⁴ Augustine, *DGAL* II, 12 [CSEL 28 III 1, 50–51].
⁶⁵⁶ Paterius, *LEVNT* 1, 4 [PL 79:687A–687B].
ait, *Quid tibi nonuis fieri, alis ne feceris et alibi, Quecumque uultus ut faciant uobis homines, et uos eadem ille facite* [Mt 7:12]. Quasi speciem nostram alterutrum respicite et ex uobismet cognoscite quid oporteat aliis exhibere.657

Strabus. *Sementis*. Frugum et arborum semen, hominum et animalium seminium uel sementum cuiusque rei exordium.
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**Et factum est uespere et mane, dies tercius.**

*tercius*. tercia distinctio


Moraliter. Tercio die quo mentem suam ad ferendos bonorum operum fructus preparat homo, separata labe ac fluctibus carnalium temptationum tanquam aridam habet terram temptationibus separatis, ut dicere possit, *Mente servio legi Dei* [Rom 7:25].659

1:14–1:15

657 Paterius, *LEVNT* I, 4 [*PR 79:687B*].

658 Augustine, *DGCM* I, 37 [*CSEL 105–106*].

659 Augustine, *DGCM* 1 43 [*CSEL 91, 112*].
Dixit autem Deus, fiant luminaria in firmamentum celi ut diuidant diem ac noctem, [5v] et sint in signa et tempora et dies et annos,

_fiant._ hic ordinantur ornamenta superioris partis mundi

_luminaria._ doctores

_firmamentum._ scripture

_firmamentum._ quia uicina, non quia infixa

_in signa._ serenitatis et tempestate

_in signa._ uirtutum

_in signa._ ver, estatem, autumnum, hiemem

_dies._ quia predicatoris propriis temporibus uiuunt et transeunt. Prius germinavit terra, deinde facta sunt luminaria quia post bona opera uenit illuminatio lucis ad contemplandam speciem superne uirtutis

_dies._ cum suum compleuerint cursum

ut luceant in firmamento celi et illuminent terram. Et factum est ita.

_ut._ ne homo in tenebras inducatur habitationem

_et illuminent._ causaliter

Augustinus. _Fiant luminaria_, et cetera. Quia uisibili mundo duo dies sunt attributi, suppreme, scilicet, et infime parti mundi, uisibilitus et mobilitus partibus que intra mundum creantur tres reliqui sunt deputandi. Et quia celum prius factum, prius erat ordinandum. Quarto fiunt sidera quibus illustretur inferior pars, ne esset habitantibus tenebra. Infirmitati quoque hominum prouisum est, ut circumeunte sole diei noctisque uicissituidine propter uigilandi et dormiendi uicissitudinem potirentur, ne nox indecora reamaneret, sed luna ac sideribus consolarentur homines, quibus operandi nocturna necessitas incumberet et quia animalia sunt que lucem ferre non possit. Quod autem dictum est _et sint in signa et tempora et dies et annos_. Ita dictum

---

660 Rabanus Maurus, _CG_ I [ _PL_ 107:467D].
661 Rabanus Maurus, _CG_ I [ _PL_ 107:467D].
662 _Ad fixa_
663 Rabanus Maurus, _CG_ I [ _PL_ 107:468A].
664 _Fiant luminaria...non possit_. Augustine, _DGAL_ II, 13 [ _CSEL_ 28 III 1, 51–53].
uidetur quasi quarto die cepissent tempora cum prius triduum sine tempore non fuerit. Nam si aliquis motus uel corporalis uel spiritualis conditionem luminarium precessit, ut aliiquid a futura expectatione per presens in preteritum transierit, sine tempore esse non potuit. Ideo tempora que fiunt per sidera non spacia morarum sed uicissitudinem affectionum celi debemus accipere, quia dies et anni quos usitate nouimus, motibus tamen siderum fiunt. Vel forte circa speciem facte rei dies appellatus est et circa priuationem nox, ut materia nondum specie formata sit nox dicta, unde formanda erant cetera, uel potius in ipsa re facta atque formata mutabilitas, id est deficiendi possibilitas nox dicitur. Possit enim res mutari, etsi non mutentur. Vespere autem et mane non intelliguntur per temporis preteritionem et aduentum, sed per terminum quo intelligitur usque quo sit nature modus et unde exordium. Nimimum quod dicit *sint in signa et tempora*, non *signa* dicit que obseruare est uanitatis, sed utilitatis que naute obseruant uel quilibet homines ad preuidendas aeris qualitates. De sole quippe certum est quod circuiutum compleat trecentis sexaginta quinque diebus et quandrante, qui est annus solaris. Sic reliqui planete annos suos compleunt breuiiores uel prolixiores. Est etiam sol ad distinctionem temporum, quia ab equinoctiali circulo uernali ad solstittium brumale perueniens, et inde ad equinoctium uernale rediens, quatuor anni tempora determinat. Luna post equinoctium uernale uespere plena procedens paschalem terminum facit, que regula usque hodie uiget. De qua cum queratur utrum plena an prima facta fuerit, respondendum est, Deum quotacumque fuerit perfectam fecisse quia, ut aiunt, non decebat Deum illo die aliquid imperfectum facere.665

[5v] Alii dicunt: debuit prima luna dici, non quartadecima, quia nemo sic incipit numerare. Si tamen imperfectum aliquid Deum fecisse dicatur, reprehensibile non est: quod enim ab illo inchoatum est, ab ipso non ab alio perfectum est. Creditur etiam ideo plena facta, quia uerba sic habent lunam factam in inchoatione noctis, quod fit cum plena est.666

Beda. *Fiant luminaria in firmamentum celi et diuidant diem ac noctem*, ea scilicet diuisione ut sol diem, luna et stelle illuminent noctem. Hoc enim factis sideribus ad augmentum primarie lucis accessit, ut etiam nox prodiret luminosa, lune uel stellarum splendore radiata, que hactenus

665 *Quod autem... imperfectum facere.* Augustine, *DGAL* II, 14 [CSEL 28 III 1, 53–55].

666 Augustine, *DGAL* II, 15 [CSEL 28 III 1, 56].
tantum tenebras nouerat. Etsi enim nox tenebrosa uidetur, obscurato aere qui terris est
proximus, superiora tamen etheris spacia semper siderum fulgore sunt lucida.⁶⁶⁷

*Et sint in signa et cetera.* Quia priusquam sidera fieren ordo temporum nullis notabatur indiciis,
uel meridiana hora uel quelibet alia. Sunt ergo *luminaria in signa et tempora et dies et annos*,
on quod a conditione horum tempora ceperint, uel dies uel anni, sed quia per ortus eorum uel
transitus, temporum, dierum, annorumque ordo signatur.⁶⁶⁸

*Vt luceant in firmamento celi,* et cetera. Semper luminaria in firmamento lucent, sed oportunis
temporibus terram illuminant, aliquotiens enim nebulosus aer obsistit, ortus etiam sol maiori
lumine lunam stellasque ne terram illuminent impedit. Vnde et sic uocatur quia solus obtusa
luna stellisque ceteris per diem terris fulgeat.⁶⁶⁹

Historice. *Et sint in signa.* Scilicet quarundam nostrarum actionum, sicut seminandi et merendi
transfretandi et huiusmodi. Non enim important necessitatem aliquam animis nostris ut auferant
arbitrium, inclinando eos ad quaslibet actiones sicut fabulantur genethliaci. Verum est tamen
quia quodammodo corporibus dominantur. Tria enim mire uirtutis et efficacie fecit Deus in
creaturis: herbas, lapides, stellas. Herbe enim frigefaciunt et calefaciunt et totum statum
corporis permutant, quam potentiam a Domino in creatione susceperunt. Lapides similiter
statum corporum diuerso modo permutant. Stelle quidem omnis, et principaliter planete in
corporibus subiectis suos habent effectus permutandi mediante aere. Immutatis uero corporibus,
per affinitatem quam habent cum animalibus sibi adiunctis et ipse quoque anime mutaretur
gaudium uel tristitiam et consimiles affectiones sortientes ab extrinsecus. Iste tamen affectiones
non in tantum dominantur animis hominum ut actiones nostre magis sequantur eas quam
discretionem mentis et liberum arbitrium.⁶⁷⁰
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---

⁶⁶⁷ Bede, *IG* I i, 14 [*CCCL* 118A, 15]
⁶⁶⁸ Bede, *IG* I i, 14 [*CCCL* 118A, 15–16].
⁶⁶⁹ Bede, *IG* I i, 15 [*CCCL* 118A, 16].
⁶⁷⁰ Hugh of St. Victor, *Adnotationes elucidatoriae in Pentateuchon* VII [*PL* 175:36C–36D]. This extract
appears to be unique to *Va.*
Fecitque Deus duo magna luminaria luminare maius ut preesset diei et luminare minus ut preesset nocti et stellas.

Fecitque in manifesto et stellas. ad decorem noctis et stellas. uirorum numerositatem

Fecitque Deus duo magna luminaria. Luminaria magna possumus accipere non tam aliorum comparatione quam per se, ut celum dicitur magnum, et magnum mare. Sol enim magnus dicitur, quia complet orbem terre suo calore, sicut luna suo lumine que in quacumque parte fuerint celi, totam terram illuminant et a cunctis uidentur. Magnitudinis eorum magnum argumentum est, quod omnibus hominibus idem eorum orbis uidetur. Nam si longe positis minor et proprie maior fulgeret, exiguinitatis indicium esset.672

Et luminare maius ut preesset diei. Et si lunam et stellas maiores in die aliquando uideri contingat, non tamen diei sed nocti lucis solatium eas afferre constat.673

Augustinus. Solet queri utrum hec luminaria corpora sola sint an habeant rectores spiritus et ab eis uitaliter inspirentur, sicut per animas animalium carnes animantur. Sed de tam obscurare nichil temere credendum.674

Luminare maius, solem scilicet, non solum forma corporis sed magnitudine luminis quia luminare minus et stellas illustrant. Maior est etiam in caloris qua mundum calefacit, cum preteritis ante eius creationem diebus nichil caloris habuisset. Quod autem equalis uniusque magnitudinis luna cum sole cernitur, hinc esse aiunt quod multo longinquior a terris atque altior quam luna incedit. Ideoque magnitudo eius non possit a nobis dinosci. Omni enim longius posita uidentur breuiora.676

671 C Ad uirtutum
672 Bede, IG I i, 16 [CCCL 118A, 17].
673 Bede, IG I i, 16–17 [CCCL 118A, 17].
674 Augustine, DGAL II, 18 [CSEL 28 III 1, 62].
675 Am calore
676 Bede, IG I i, 16–17 [CCCL 118A, 17].
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Et posuit eas in firmamento celi ut lucerent super terram

\textit{lucent. luce sapientie}

\textit{Vt lucerent super terram et cetera. Hec de magnis luminaribus et stellis intelligi possint ut quod dictum est \textit{et preessent diei} ad solem specialiter, quod subjunctum est \textit{et nocti} ad lunam et stellas pertineat. Quod uero additur, \textit{et diuiderent lucem a tenebris} omnibus eque conueniat, que quocumque incedunt lucem circumferunt. Vnde, absunt tenebrosa que cuncta relinquunt. Si queratur quale potuit esse lumen diurnum ante creationem sidereum, respondemus quale uidemus quotidie solis ortu proximante necdum apparente, quando lucet obtusis radiis stellarum dies, sed minime sol ortus refulget.}\footnote{Bede, \textit{IG} I, i, 17–18 [\textit{CCCL} 118A, 17–18].}

1:18–1:19

[6r] \textit{et preessent diei ac nocti ut diuiderent lucem ac tenebras. Et uidit Deus quod esset bonum.}

\textit{lucem. perfectorum}

\textit{tenebras. paruulorum}

\textit{Et. quia que facienda placebant ut fierent facta placuerint ut manerent}

\textbf{Et factum est uespere et mane dies quartus.}

\textit{dies. quarta distinctio}

[6r] Beda. \textit{Et factum est uespere et mane dies quartus.} In hac uespera populus Dei in Egipto agnum optulit, et uerus agnus sacramenta sui corporis initiauit. In hoc mane populus Israel iugum seruitutis excusssit, et Christus nos suo sanguine redimens a diaboli seruitute liberaulit, que dies lune plenissime in creatione mundi quarta <decima> processit. At in tempore dominice passiones altioris gratia sacramenti in quintam sabbati incidit, ut Dominus sexta sabbati
crucifixus sabbato in sepulchro quiesceret, et prima sabbati resurgeret, in qua nobis resurgendi et lucem perpetuam intrandi spem atque fidem donaret.\textsuperscript{678}

Mistice. \textit{Factum est uespere et mane dies quartus}. Mane quarti diei regnum Dauid. Hec etas similis est iuuentuti, que inter omnis regnat etates, et est firmum ornamentum omnium etatum. Vnde bene comparatur quarto diei quo facta sunt sidera in firmamento celi. Splendorem siquidem regni significat solis excellentia, plebem obtemperantem regi, lune splendor ostendit, tanquam sinagogam. Stelle principes eius et omnia fundata in regni stabilitate tanquam in firmamento.\textsuperscript{679}

Moraliter. Quarto die quo in illo firmamento discipline mens spirituales intelligentias operatur atque distinguat, uidet que sit incommutabilis ueritas, que sicut sol fulget in anima, et quomodo anima ipsius particeps fiat, et corpori ordinem et pulchritudinem tribuat, tanquam luna illuminans noctem et quomodo stelle omnis, id est intelligentie spirituales in hiuis uite obscuritate tanquam in nocte fulgeant.\textsuperscript{680}

1:20

\textbf{Dixit etiam Deus, Producant aque reptile anime uiuentis et uolatilie super terram sub firmamento celi.}

\textit{Producant}. quia uicinior est aqua celo quam terra preordinantur aquatilia
\textit{aque}. aquarium dicitur reptilia quia paucia repunt in terra, pedibus gradiantur plura
\textit{reptile}. renatos in uitam per sacramentum baptismi\textsuperscript{681}
\textit{anime}. pisces
\textit{uolatilie}. productum ex aquis
\textit{uolatilie}. ad superna uolantes\textsuperscript{682}
\textit{sub firmamento}. non usque ad firmamentum

\textsuperscript{678} Bede, \textit{IG} I, i, 19 [\textit{CCCL} 118A, 19–20].

\textsuperscript{679} Augustine, \textit{DGCM} I 38 [\textit{CSEL} 91, 106–107].

\textsuperscript{680} Augustine, \textit{DGCM} I 43 [\textit{CSEL} 91, 112–113].

\textsuperscript{681} Rabanus Maurus, \textit{CG} I [\textit{PL} 107:468A].

\textsuperscript{682} Rabanus Maurus, \textit{CG} I [\textit{PL} 107:468A].
Producant aque reptile anime, et cetera. Post ornatum quarto die celi faciem luminaribus, ornantur suis animalibus die quinto inferiores mundi partes, aque scilicet et aer.\textsuperscript{683}

Anime uiuentis, id est que sunt in animabus uiuis, sicut dicitur ignobilia hominum, id est qui sunt in hominibus ignobiles, quod quidam propter tarditatem sensus putant dictum esse, uel quia pisces nullius sint memorie, sed certissimum est eos memoriam habere.\textsuperscript{684}

Sub firmamento celi et cetera. Et si immenso interiacente spatio uolant tamen aues sub sidereo celo que super terram uolant, sicut homines qui in terra sunt sub celo esse dicuntur. Alia translatio, “secus firmamentum celi”, quia uicina sunt etheri spatia huius aeris qui aues subuehit.\textsuperscript{685}

Augustinus. Dixit etiam Deus, Producant aque reptile anime uiuentis, et cetera. Oportebat in creandis habitatoribus inferioris partis que tota sepe terra uocatur, prius produci ex aquis animalia, postea de terra, quod ita sit aeri aqua similis, ut eius exalationibus pinguescat et spiritum procelle faciat, uentos et nubila contrahat, aues sustineat uolantes.\textsuperscript{686} Est ergo ordo seruatus ut prius memorentur animalia aquarum quam terrarum. Nec putandum est pretermissum esse aliquod elementum, quamuis de aere tacere uideatur, sed aer ad celum more scripture pertinere intelligitur. Si qua sunt in eius superioribus paccatissima spacia uel ad terram propter turbulentem et caliginosum locum qui humida exalatione pinguescit, quamuis et ipse aliquando celi nomine nuncupetur. Ideo non est dictum, “producant aque reptilia et aer uolatilia”, sed utrumque ex aquis productum esse narratur. Quicquid enim aquirum siue labiliter undosum, siue uaporaliter tenuatum, utrumque tamen humide nature deputatur.\textsuperscript{687} Vnde quidam elementa sic distingunt ut oculos ad ignem, aures ad aerem dicunt pertinere, olfactum et gustum tribuant humide nature. Tactus autem congruit terre. Ignis tamen omnia penetrat, ut motum in eis faciat. Inchoat enim anima motum suum in omnibus sensibus a subtilitate ignis,
sed non in omnibus ad idem peruenit. In uisu enim peruenit represso calore usque ad eius lucem. In auditu usque ad liquiorem aerem calorem ignis penetrat. In ollfactu transit aerem purum peruenit ad humidam exhalationem, unde crassior hec aura subsistit. In gustu uero etiam hanc transit, et peruenit ad humorem corpulentiorum, quo traiecto cum ad terrenam peruenit grauitatem, tangendi ultimum sensum agit.

Hunc ordinem non ignorabat qui conditionem eorum que intra mundum sunt inducens, prius celi lumina, post aquarum animantia, terrarum postrema narruit, nec aerem pretermisit, sed quietissimam partem eius celo, turbulentiam aque uel terre deputauit. Vnde et psalmista omnia superiora celum dicendo, laudate Dominum de celo, omnia inferiora terre nomine comprehendit, Laudate Dominum de terra [Ps 148:1, 148:7], et cetera ubi spiritus tempestatis et omnis abyssi nominantur, et ignis iste qui urit tangentem, qui de terrenis et humidis motibus ita existit ut uertatur in aliud elementum, ac per hoc in superiorem tranquillitatem euadere non ualens in ista pigriori parte tribulentis motibus agitatur ad temperandum eius rigorem, et ad usus terroresque mortalium. In summo autem aer tam tenuis esse dicitur, ut neque nubibus obumbretur, nec uento turbetur, nec aues sustineat, nec homines qui forte ascenderet crassiore spiritu alat, sicut aer iste. Aer tamen est et in humidam naturam tempore diluuii conuersus creditur. Aerios etiam perisse celos diluuiio, in quadam canonica epistola legi [2 Pet 3:6]. Quod intelligendum non est nisi in aquarum naturam pinguioris huius aeris qualitate conuersa.
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[6v] Creauitque Deus cete grandia et omnem animam uiuentem atque motabilem quam produxerant aque in species suas et omne volatile secundum genus suum. Et uidit Deus quod esset bonum

cete. a maximo usque ad minimum

688 *Vnde quidem... ad idem peruenit.* Augustine, *DGAL* III, 4 [CSEL 28 III 1, 66–67].

689 *In uisu... sensum agit.* Augustine, *DGAL* III, 5 [CSEL 28 III 1, 67–68].

690 *Hunc ordinem...deputauit.* Augustine, *DGAL* III, 6 [CSEL 28 III 1, 68].

691 *Vnde et...mortalium.* Augustine, *DGAL* III, 7 [CSEL 28 III 1, 69].

692 *In summo... conuersa.* Augustine, *DGAL* III, 2 [CSEL 28 III 1, 64–65].
motabilem. ad differentiam hominis qui faciendus ad imaginem Dei et si precepta seruaret perpetua inmutabilitate maneret. Cetera uero animantia sic facta sunt ut alia aliis in alimoniam cederent uel senio deficerent.

Creatuitque Deus cete grandia. Quia sunt aquarum animantia que non reptando, sed natando uel pedibus ambulando incedunt. Sunt et uolatilia que pennas habent, sed omnino uolatu carent, ne aliquid genus pretermissum uideretur, generaliter comprehendid omne genus reptilium, natatilium, uolatilium et que cautibus inherent fixa ut concarum prolima genera.

Beda. Demones aeria dicuntur animalia quam corporum aeriorum natura uigent, nec per mortem dissoluuuntur, quia preualet in eis elementum aptius ad faciendum quam ad patiensum. Ad patiensum enim humor et humus, ad faciendum aer et ignis. Transgressores uero angeli cum principie suo nunc diabolo tunc archangelo, si fuerint ante transgressionem suam in puriore aeris parte, quidam enim nostri non putant eos celestes, uel super celestes angelos fuisse, non mirum si post peccatum in hanc caliginem detrusi sunt, ubi tamen aer sit. Si autem ante peccatum celestia corpora gerebant, neque hoc mirum est si conversi sunt ex pena in aeriam qualitatem ab igne, id est, elemento superioris nature pati, caliginosa tamen aeris tenere tantum permissi, qui eis quasi carcer sit usque ad tempus iudicii.
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benedixitque eis dicens, crescite et multiplicamini et replete aquas maris auesque multiplicantur super terram.

crescite. hoc ad utrumque genus de aquis factum et ad pisces pertinet et ad aues

auesque. que uel de aquis uel de terra vuiuunt

Crescite et multiplicamini et cetera. Ad utrumque genus animantium de aquis factorum, id est pisces et aues pertinet, quia sicut omnes pisces non nisi in aquis uiuere possunt, ita prolima aues, que si in terris aliquando requiescunt, fetusque faciant, non tamen de terra sed de mari

---

693 Ad incommutabilitate
694 Bede, IG I i, 20–21 [CCCL 118A, 21].
695 Augustine, DGAL III, 10 [CSEL 28 III 1, 72–74].
uiuunt et libentius mari quam terra utuntur. Quod uero subiungitur, *avesque multiplicentur super terram* ad utrumque genus auium que scilicet de aquis uel de terra uiuunt, respicit quia etiam aues que sine aquis non uiuunt, que etiam in profundo se sicut pisces latent non numquam egredi super terras solent maxime cum fetus faciunt et nutriunt.##696

De conuersione elementorum questio est. Alii dicunt omnia posse conuerti in omnia, alii aliquid esse proprium singulis, quod in alterius qualitatem nequeat conuerti.##697 Dicitur etiam nichil sine igne uideri, nec sine terra tangi et sic omnia omnibus inesse, sed unumquodque ex eo quod plus habet uocabulum accepisse. Inde autem caloris priuatio, cum corpus nimium frigescit, sensus obtunditur, quia motus pigrescit qui ex calore inest corpori, dum ignis aerem, aer humorem, et humor terrena afficit, subtilioribus crassiora penetrantibus.##698 Aer ergo superior, quia ad celestem pertinet partem uel quia nullum habet uisibilem habitatorem neque pretermissus est celo nominato, nec adnumeratus increandis animalibus. Inferior uero nonnisi ex aquis accipit animalia. Quod enim humidum est aues sustinet, que nituntur pennis uolantes ut pisces quibusdam suis alis natantes.##699 Vnde ex aquis dicuntur producta uolatilia. Aquarum enim natura bipartitum locum sortita est, inferiorem in unda labili, superiorem in aura flabili, illum natantibus, hunc uolantibus. Ex hoc elemento duo sensus animalibus dantur, olfactus uaporibus, gustus explorandis liquoribus. Quod enim tactu aquas uentosque sentimus, hinc est quod solida terra omnibus elementis miscetur. Sed in his crassioribus sentitur amplius.##700

Notandum quosdam philosophos ita sua cuique elemento distribuisse animalia ut terrena dicerent non tantum que in terra reptant aut gradiantur sed etiam aues que in terra requiescunt, aeria animalia demones esse, celestia deos, quorum nos partem luminaria partem angelos

---


697 *De conuersione...conuerti.* Augustine, *DGAL* III, 3 [CSEL 28 III 1, 65–66].

698 *Dicitur...penetrantibus.* Augustine, *DGAL* III, 4 [CSEL 28 III 1, 66–67].

699 *Aer ergo... natantes.* Augustine, *DGAL* III, 6 [CSEL 28 III 1, 68].

700 *Vnde ex his...sentitur amplius.* Augustine, *DGAL* III, 7 [CSEL 28 III 1, 68–70].
dicimus. Idem tamen aquis pisces et generis sui bestias tribuunt ut animalibus suis nullum uacet elementum.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} III, 9 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 71–72].}
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[7r] \textbf{Et factum est uespere et mane dies quintus.}
\textit{dies}. quinta distinctio
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\textbf{Dixit quoque Deus, Producat terra animam uiuentem in genere suo, iumenta et reptilia et bestias terre secundum species suas. Factumque est ita.}
\textit{Dixit}. dehinc infime partis mundi ornamenta sequuntur

\textit{Producat}. caro abstinentis ab operibus mortuis\footnote{Rabanus Maurus, \textit{CG} I [\textit{PL} 107:468B].}

\textit{animam}. germina uiirtutum\footnote{Rabanus Maurus, \textit{CG} I [\textit{PL} 107:468B].}
in genere. uitam imitando sanctorum quasi proximorum

iumenta. humanos usus iuuantia

bestias. que ungue ledunt uel dente

bestias. ferocitate superbientes

Producat terra animam uiuentem in genere suo, et cetera. Post celum repletum sideribus, et aere uolatilibus qui propter uiciniam celum nominatur, post impletas animalibus suis aquas que aeri uicine sunt, consequens erat terram suis animalibus repleri, et ipsa enim cognitionem habet cum aquis sine quorum succo et irrigatione nec fructificare potest nec subisistere. Iubet ergo Deus producere terram iumenta et reptilia et bestias terre. In bestiis quicquid ore seuit uel unguibus preter serpentes comprehenditur, in reptilibus etiam serpentes, nomine iumentorumque in usu hominum sunt animalia designantur, conditionem uero ceterorum quadrupedum ut ceruorum et huiusmodi, pro indomita feritate inter bestias forsitan numeramus. Iuxta antiquam translationem in qua scriptum est quadrupedia et reptilia et bestias terre nomine quadrupedum omnia comprehensa sunt, preter bestias et reptilia siue domita siue fera et agrestia.

Moraliter. Incipit prouecta mens quinto die in actionibus turbulenti seculi tanquam in aquis maris operari propter utilitatem fraterne societatis, et de corporalibus agnitionibus que ad mare, id est hanc uitam pertinent, producere animarum uiuarum reptilia, id est opera que prosint animis uiuis, et cetos magnos, id est fortissimas agnitiones quibus fluctus seculi dirumpuntur, et uolatilia celi, id est uoces celestia predicantes.

Historice. Producat terra animam uiuentem et cetera. Consequens erat ut terram iam ornaret suis animalibus. Ter dicendo iuxta genus suum, tria quedam genera significat primo iuxta genus quadrupedia et reptilia, ubi potest intelligi que quadrupedia dixerit que sunt scilicet in genere reptilium ut lacerti et huiusmodi. Vnde et in repetitione quadrupedum nomina non iterauit, quia

---


707 Bede, *IG* I i, 24 [CCCL 118A, 23].

708 Augustine, *DGCM* I 43 [CSEL 91, 113].
reptilum vocabulo ea intellexit. Ideo non simpliciter dixit “reptilia”, sed *omnia reptilia terre*. Sunt enim et aquarum ideo omnia ut comprehenderet ea que quatuor pedibus gradiantur. Bestias de quibus item ait *iuxta genus suum* intellexit quicquid ore seuit aut unguibus preter serpentes. Pecora uero de quibus tercio dixit *iuxta genus* que neutro ledunt sed cornibus aut ne hoc quidem. Quam late pateat quadrupedum nomen, pedum numero potest facile dinosci et nomine pecorum et bestiarum omne irrationale animal solet comprehendi.\textsuperscript{709}

Augustinus. *In genere suo* et cetera. Hec forsitan secundum genus dicuntur, quia ita ceta ut ex eis nascantur alia et originis formam successione conseruent. De homine autem hoc dictum non est, quia unus fiebat, de quo et femma facta. Non enim multa genera hominum facta sunt sicut herbarum et lignorum ut dicatur secundum genus ac si diceretur generatim, ut inter se similia atque in unam originem seminis pertinentia distinguenterunt a ceteris.\textsuperscript{710}
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**Et fecit Deus bestias terre iuxta species suas et iumenta et omne reptile terre in genere suo. Et uidit Deus quod esset bonum**

*Et fecit.* ne homo uacuam domum intraret

*bestias.* ordinis mutatio. Nichil curandum in nostra loquela quid prius in creaturarum ordine nominemus, cum Deus creauerit omnia simul

*iumenta.* simplices\textsuperscript{711}

*Et uidit.* preparatis que hominibus famulantur

*bonum.* facta et ornata habitacione mundana, homo tanquam habitator et Dominus omnium erat creandus

De uenenosis et pernitionsis animalibus queritur utrum post peccatum hominis ad uindictam creata sint, an potius creata innoxia peccatoribus nocere ceperint. Potuerunt ergo creata nichil

\textsuperscript{709} Augustine, *DGAL* III, 11 [*CSEL* 28 III 1, 75–76].

\textsuperscript{710} Augustine, *DGAL* III, 12 [*CSEL* 28 III 1, 76–78].

\textsuperscript{711} Rabanus Maurus, *CG* I [*PL* 107:468B].
nocere si causa non fuisse terrendorum puniendorumque uiciorum uel probande et
proficiende uirtutis, quia et exempla patientie aliis danda et homo temptatus certius sibi
innotescit, et iure salus illa per uoluptatem turpiter amissa per dolorem est fortiter reciproenda.\textsuperscript{712}

Bestie tamen bestiis nocent que peccatum non habent, ut nec uindicta dicatur, nec tali exercitio
recipiant uirtutem. Sed alie sunt cibos aliarum, nec ideo recte non essent quibus alie uescuntur,
habent enim omnia, quandiu sunt mensuras numeros ordinesque suos que cuncta merito
considerata laudantur.\textsuperscript{713}

[7v] De quibusdam minutis animalibus questio est utrum in primis conditionibus creata sint an ex rebus corruptis. Pleraque enim de humidorum corporum uitiis uel exalationibus uel
cadaueribus gignuntur, quedam etiam de corruptione lignorum et herbarum et fructuum, et Deus
auctor omnium est. Potest autem dici minutissima que ex aqua uel terra oriuntur tunc esse creata
in quibus illa intelliguntur que nascuntur ex eis, que terra germinante orta sunt. Que uero de
corporibus animalium, maxime mortuorum, absurdum est dicere cum animalibus ipsis esse
creata, nisi quod potentialiter et materialiter in ipsis erant preseminta.\textsuperscript{714}

Queritur quare hic non sit additum quod dictum est de animalibus aquarum, \textit{Benedixitque eis
dicens, Crescite et multiplicamini et replete terra}. Forte quod de prima creatura anime uiuentis
dictum erat, de secunda subintelligendum reliquit, maxime quia in huius diei operibus alia plura
dicturus. Herbas autem atque ligna, quia non habent generandi affectum, huius benedictionis
forsitan indigna iudicauit. Quod necessario repetitum est in homine, ne quis putet in officio
gignendi filios esse peccatum sicut in fornicatione sine coniugio.\textsuperscript{715}

Queritur etiam de spinis et tribulis et quibusdam lignis infructuosis, cur uel quando creata sint
cum Deus dixerit, \textit{germinet terra herbam uirentem et facientem semen} et cetera. Sed fructus
nomine quedam utilitas signatur. Multae autem utilitates sunt manifeste uel occulte omnium que
terra radicitus alit. Possimus autem absolute respondere spinas et tribulos post peccatum terram

\textsuperscript{712} Augustine, \textit{DGAL III}, 15 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 80–81].
\textsuperscript{713} Augustine, \textit{DGAL III}, 16 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 81–82].
\textsuperscript{714} Augustine, \textit{DGAL III}, 14 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 79–80].
\textsuperscript{715} Augustine, \textit{DGAL III}, 13 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 78–79].
homini ad laborem peperisse, non quod antea alibi nascenrentur et post in agris quos homo
coleret, sed et prius et postea in eisdem locis, prius tamen non homini sed post, unde *pariet tibi*
id est ut tibi nasci incipient ad laborem, que ad pastum tantummodo aliis animalibus antea
nascebantur.\textsuperscript{716}

Illud etiam mouet, si animalia noxia uitios ledunt penaliter, exercet salubriter, aut ignoranter
docent, cur in escas mortuos lacerant quasi quicquam intersit, caro iam ex animis per quos
transitus eat, que mirabili omnipotentia est reformanda quamuis et hic doceatur propter manes
curas examinatorum nulla genero mortuum esse horrenda.\textsuperscript{717}
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\textsuperscript{7v} et ait, *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram et presit piscibus
maris et uolatilibus celi et bestiis uniuereque terre, omnique reptili quod mouetur in
terra.*

\textit{et ait.} trinitatem significat

\textit{ad imaginem.} unitatem

\textit{ad imaginem.} rationalem inmortalen

\textit{ad imaginem.} in eternitate

\textit{ad imaginem.} trinitatis

\textit{similitudinem.} innocentie et iusticie

\textit{similitudinem.} morum sanctitae et iustificatione

\textit{et presit.} ad imaginem Dei

\textit{piscibus.} irrationali\textsuperscript{718} scilicet creature Dominus omnium inferiorum

Notandum quod sicut in creanda luce dicitur *fiat lux* et statim sequitur *et facta est lux*, sic cum
dicitur *faciamus hominem* infertur *et fecit Deus hominem ad imaginem Dei* quia ista natura
intellectualis est sicut illa lux, et hoc est fieri quod agnoscer euerbum per quod fit. Si enim
diceretur, “et factum est ita”, et adderetur, “et fecit Deus”, quasi post intelligeretur factum in

\textsuperscript{716} Augustine, *DGAL* III, 18 [*CSEL* 28 III 1, 83–84].

\textsuperscript{717} Augustine, *DGAL* III, 17 [*CSEL* 28 III 1, 82–83].

\textsuperscript{718} *Ad irrationabili*
cognitione rationalis creature et tandem in creatura que rationalis non esset.\footnote{Notandum quod... non esset. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} III, 20 [CSEL 28 III 1, 86–87].} Quomodo autem homo immortalis factus sit et escam cum aliis animalibus acceperit \textit{herbam afferentem semen} et cetera, difficile est dicere. Si enim mortalis peccato effectus est autem non indigebat his cibis, quia non posset fame corrumpi. Quod enim dictum est, \textit{crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram}, quamuis nisi per concubitum fieri non posse uideatur, unde hinc quoque mortuam corporum exitit indicium, potuit alius modus esse in corporibus immortalibus, ut caritatis affectu nulla corruptionis concupiscentia filii nascerentur, nec mortuis parentibus successuri nec ipsi morituri, donec terra hominibus impleretur, et sic instituto sancto populo qualem post resurrectionem futurum credimus, nascendi etiam modus fieret.\footnote{Quomodo autem...modus fieret. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} III, 21 [CSEL 28 III 1, 88].} Quidam suspicati sunt nunc interiorem hominem factum, corpus autem cum ait \textit{et finxit Deus hominem de limo terre}. Nec attendunt masculum et feminam secundum corpus tantum fieri potuisse. Ne putaretur enim solum spiritum esse factum, quamuis secundum eum solum ad imaginem Dei sit factus. \footnote{Quidam suspicati... preseminata. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} III, 22 [CSEL 28 III 1, 88–90].}

\footnote{Faciamus hominem...predicatio deitatis. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} III, 19 [CSEL 28 III 1, 85–86].}

Deo non dicitur, *faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*. Dei enim et angelorum non est una et eadem imago uel similitudo. Non autem secundum corpus, sed secundum intellectum mentis ad imaginem Dei creatus est homo, quanquam et in corpore quandam proprietatem habeat qua hoc indicat, qua est erecta statura, secundum quam corpus anime rationali congruit, quia in celum erectum est.723

[8r] Notandum etiam quia cum dixisset *ad imaginem nostram* continuo subiunxit *et presit piscibus maris et uolatilibus celi* et cetera ut scilicet intelligamus in hoc factum hominem ad imaginem Dei, quo irrationalibus antecellit, id est ratio uel mens uel intelligentia, uel si alio nomine commodius uocetur, in quo scilicet contemplande ueritate inheret.724

*Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*. Insinuatur pluralitas personarum Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, et statim unitas deitatis cum dicitur, *et fecit Deus hominem ad imaginem Dei*, non “Pater ad imaginem Filii” non enim uere diceretur *ad imaginem nostram* sed ita dictum est, *fecit Deus ad imaginem Dei* ac si diceretur “ad imaginem suam”. Cum autem dicitur *ad imaginem Dei*, cum superius dictum sit *ad imaginem nostram*, significatur quod non agat pluralitas personarum ut plures deos credamus, sed Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum unum Deum accipamus.725
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*Et creauit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam*, [8r] *ad imaginem Dei creauit illum*,

*masculum et feminam creauit eos,*

*Et creauit*. qui non quemlibet sanctorum imitando, sed ipsam ueritatem intuendo, operatur iustitiam ut ipsam ueritatem intelligat et sequitur. hic accipit potestatem super omnia, quia spiritualis quisque effectus et Deo similis, iudicat omnia et a nemine iudicatur.726

*imaginem*. in ratione qua contemplande ueritate inheret

---

723 *Vbi creari...erectum est*. Bede, *IG* I, i, 26 [CCSL 118A, 25–26].

724 Augustine, *DGAL* III, 20 [CSEL 28 III 1, 86].


ad imaginem. repetit ut confirmet et quales facti simus\textsuperscript{727} diligentius inculcet

ad imaginem. id est, ad imaginem suam

\textit{Dei.} non patris, non filii, non enim ad imaginem unius persone

\textit{masculum.} spirituales doctores\textsuperscript{728}

\textit{feminam.} prolensis. nondum enim mulier formata

\textit{feminam.} obedientes\textsuperscript{729}

\textit{creauit.} non simul in tempore sed in prescientia
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\textit{benedixitque illis Deus et ait, Crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram et subiecte eam, et dominamini piscibus maris et uolatilibus celi et uniuersis animantibus que mouentur super terram.}

\textit{Crescite.} fecunditatem sexus accipite

\textit{Crescite.} spiritualis intelligentie\textsuperscript{730}

\textit{multiplicamini.} sic

\textit{replete.} nuptie repient terram

\textit{et subiecte.} necessariis usibus

\textit{dominamini.} quod prius quasi consulendo de eis dixerat, nunc ipsis dicit ut habeant scilicet dominum omnium creaturarum in inferiori parte mundi quod per singula exequitur.

\textit{piscibus.} ut ratio dominetur omni carnali preturbationi quasi insensibili animanti\textsuperscript{731}

\textit{Masculum et feminam creavit eos,} et cetera. Postea plenius unde et quomodo homines facti sunt exponitur. Sed nunc breuiter creati referuntur ut sexti diei operatio et septum dedicatio cum ceteris explicetur. Masculum unum et feminam unam in primis creauit Deus, non ut cetera animantia que in singulis generibus plura creauit, ut humanum generis firmiori copula caritatis constringeret, cum se ex uno ortu meminisset. Vnde cum subiungeret \textit{masculum et feminam}

\textsuperscript{727} C Ad sumus

\textsuperscript{728} Rabanus Maurus, \textit{CG} I [\textit{PL} 107:468C].

\textsuperscript{729} Rabanus Maurus, \textit{CG} I [\textit{PL} 107:468C].

\textsuperscript{730} C Ad spiritualis intelligentie gradibus

\textsuperscript{731} Rabanus Maurus, \textit{CG} I [\textit{PL} 107:468D].
...creauit, noluit addere “ad imaginem Dei” quod unitate coniunctionis etiam in femina intelligendum reliquit. Bene autem in hoc loco creati dicuntur, et si modus creationis non explicatur, ut congrue inducatur diuina benedictio, qua dicitur, Crescite et multiplicamini et cetera. Multiplicatio enim hominum coniunctione maris et femine perficitur. Non igitur damnande nuptie quas ad propagationem superna benedictio instituit, et si uirginitas preferatur.732

Beda. Et dominamini piscibus, et cetera. Queritur qua utilitate homo dominatum in cetera animantia precepit, ad quos usus queue solatia sint hec creata homini, si non peccaret. Non enim hec ad escam sed herbe tantum et arborum fructus primo concessa sunt, sed forte quia peccatum presciebat Deus hominem, et sic futurum mortalem quem creauerat inmortalem, ea primordialiter instituit quibus se iam mortalis posset tueri, habens scilicet ex his indumentum et alimentum et laboris adiumentum. Postquam autem conditori subditus esse noluit, iure dominum prodidit. In testimonium uero prime creationis legimus aues uiris sanctis seruisse et rictus bestiarum et serpentium uenenum cessisse.733

1:29

Dixitque Deus, Ecce dedi uobis omnem herbam afferentem semen super terram et uniuersa ligna que habent in semetipsis sementem generis sui ut sint uobis in escam herbam, ut de oblationibus subditorum uiuant prelati734

Ecce dedi uobis omnem herbam afferentem semen, et cetera. Patet quod ante peccatum hominis nichil noxium terra protulit, non herbam uenenatam, non arborem sterilem. Omnis enim herba et ligna data sunt hominibus et uolatilibus et animantibus terre in escam. Vnde patet quod tunc animalia animalium esu non uiuebant, sed concorditer herbis et fructibus uescebantur arborum.735

732 Bede, IG I i, 27 [CCCL 118A, 27–29].
733 Bede, IG I i, 28 [CCCL 118A, 29].
734 Rabanus Maurus, CG I [PL 107:468D].
735 Bede, IG I, i, 29 [CCCL 118A, 30].
Queritur quomodo immortalis sit factus homo pre aliis animantibus et cum illis communem acceperit alimoniam. Sed alia est immortaliatas carnis quam in adam accepirimus, alia quam in resurrectione per Christum speramus. Ille factus est homo immortalis ut posset non mori si non peccaret, moreretur autem si peccaret, filii uero resurrectionis equales angelis nec poterunt ultra peccare nec mori. Caro ergo nostra post resurrectionem non eget [del. non eget] ciborum refectione, quia nec fame nec lassitudine uel alia infirmitate adest defectio. Caro autem Ade ante peccatum ita immortalis est creada ut per alimoniam adiuta mortis esset expers et doloris donec corporalibus incrementis productus ad etatem que conditori placeret, multiplicata progenie iubente, ipso sumeret etiam de ligno uite quo perfecte immortalis factus cibi ulterius adiumenta [8v] non requireret. Sic ergo immortalis et incorruptibilis condita est caro hominum ut suam immortalitatem et incorruptionem per custodiam mandatorum Dei custodirent, in quibus et hoc erat ut de lignis concessis manducarent, ab interdicto temperarent, per horum edulium immortalitatis dona conseruarent, illius tactu mortem inuenirent. Sic uero incorruptibilis et immortalis erit in fine caro nostra, ut sicut angeli in eodem statu semper maneat et corporalibus cibis qui ibi non erunt egere non possit. Nam quod angeli cum patriarchis manduauerunt non indigentia sed benignitate actum est, ut familiaris hominibus congruerunt. Christus quoque post resurrectionem manduauit, sed ut ueram se post mortem carnem recepisse monstraret.736

1:30

et cunctis [8v] animantibus terre omnique uolucri celi et uniuersisque mouentur in terra, in quibus est anima uiuens ut habeant ad uescendum. Et factum est ita.

in quibus. id est ita sibi in esum concessa cognouit homo

1:31

Viditque Deus cuncta que fecerat et erant ualde bona. Et factum est uespere et mane dies sextus.

Viditque. non commendat hominem specialiter sicut cetera quem ab ordine recessurum presciebat.

dies. sexta distinctio

736 Bede, IG I, i, 29–30 [CCCL 118A, 29–30].
Mistice. Mane sexti diei predicatio euangeli per Christo. Finito quinto, incipit sextus, in quo ueteris hominis apparat senectus. Hac enim etate uehementer attritum illud regnum, quando templum deiectum et sacrificia cessauerunt, et nunc gens illa quantum ad uires regni quasi extremam uitam trahit. In hac tamen etate tanquam ueteris hominis senectute, nascitur homo nouus, qui spiritualiter uiuit. Sexto enim die dictum est, producat terra animam uiuuentem et cetera, quia in quinto dictum erat, producant aque non “animam uiuam” sed reptilia animarum uiuarum. Quomodo enim corpora sunt reptilia, sic corporali circumcisione et sacrificiis tanquam in mari gentium populus ille seruiebat. Istam uero animam uiuam dicit, qua uita iam incipiunt eterna desiderari. Serpentes ergo et pecora que terra producit gentes significuit euangelio stabiliter credituras, de quibus petro dicitur, macta et manduca, et cum ille immunda diceret, auduit, que Deus mundauit tu immunda ne dixeris. [Acts 10:13–15]. Tunc fit homo ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei sicut in sexta etate nascitur Christus. De quo dicitur, et homo est et quis agnoscket eum? Et sicut in illa die masculus et femina, sic in ista etate Christus et ecclesia. In illa die preponitur homo pecoribus serpentibus et uolatilibus celi et in hac etate Christus regit animas obtemperantes sibi, que partim de gentibus, partim de iudeis uenerunt, ut ab eo domite mansuescerent carnali, scilicet concupiscentie dediti, sicut pecora, uel tenebrosa curiositate tenebrati quasi serpentes, uel superfia elati quasi aues. In illa die pascitur homo et animalia que cum ipso sunt herbis seminalibus, lignis fructiferis et uiridibus herbis. In ista quoque etate spiritualis homo quicumque <bonus> minister est Christi, et cum pro posse imitatur cum ipso populo spiritualiter pascitur scripture alimentis et diuine legis partim ad concipiendam fecunditatem rationum atque sermonum tanquam herbis seminalibus, partim ad utilitatem morum et humane conversationis tanquam lignis fructiferis, partim ad uigorem fidei spei et caritatis in uitam eternam tanquam herbis uiridibus, id est ingentibus que nullo estu tribulationum arescant. Sed spiritualis sic pascitur, ut multa intelligat. Carnalis autem, id est paruulus, in Christo tanquam pecus Dei ut credat et si non intelligat. Eosdem tamen cibos omnes habent, huius etatis uespera est de qua Dominus dicit, Putas ueniens filius hominis

---

737 As Augustine attributes cites this quote “per prophetam” in De Genesi contra Manichaeos, it is likely a reference to Isaiah 53:3, “despectum, et novissimum virorum, virum dolorum, et scientem infirmitatem, et quasi absconditus vultus ejus et despectus, unde nec reputavimus eum” (Vulgata).

Notandum quod ubi datur potestas homini herbas et fructus edendi subinfertur et factum est ita, in quo significatur quia hoc dicente Deo hec sibi in esum concessa, nouit homo non quod statim ediderit. Si enim ad omnia supradicta referimus quod ait, et factum est ita, consequens erit ut dicamus eos iam multiplicatos sexto die quod post multis annos factum est.  

Queritur cum cetera singillatim bona dicantur, cur homo ad imaginem Dei factus tantum cum ceteris hoc dicatur. Sed forte presciebat Deus peccatum nec in perfectione imaginis mansurum. Qui enim singillatim bonus est magis cum omnibus sed non convertitur. Cautum ergo est ut dicetur quod in presenti uerum esset, et prescientiam futuri significaret. Deus autem sic omnia ordinat ut si qua fiunt delinquendo deformia, semper tamen cum eis uniuersitas fit formosa.  

Moraliter. Sexto die producit terra animam uiuam, id est de stabilitate sue mentis, ubi habet fructus spirituales, id est bonas cogitationes, omnis motus animi sui regit ut sit in illo anima uiua, id est rationi et iustitie seruiens non temeritati et peccato. Ita fit homo ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei, masculus et femina id est intellectus et agnitio quorum copulatione spiritualis fetus terram impleat, id est carnem subiciat et cetera, que iam in hominis perfectione dicta sunt. In istis tanquam diebus uespera est ipsa perfectio singulorum operum et mane inchoatio sequentium.  

2:1  

[9r] Igitur perfecti sunt celi et terra et omnis ornatus eorum.
Igitur. perfectione senarii
Igitur. causaliter quidem et potentialiter quorum numeros profectus\textsuperscript{742} et defectus tempus\textsuperscript{743} post uisibiliter explicaret.

[9r] Nullomodo dici potest quomodo fecit Deus celum et terram, sed hec expositio per ordinem rerum indicat tanquam historiam rerum factarum, sed maxime observerat\textsuperscript{744} predicationem futurorum.\textsuperscript{745} Si quem mouet quod in etatibus seculi due prime denis generationibus explicatur, tres sequentes singule quatuordecim, sexta uero ista generatio nullo numero definitur. Facile est uidere etiam in unoquoque homine infantiam et pueritiam quinque sensibus corporis inherere. Quinarius autem duplicatus, quia duplex est sexus humanus, unde tales generationes fiunt, denarium facit. Ab adolescentia uero ubi ratio incipit preualere in homine accedit quinque sensibus cognitio et actio quibus uita regitur et amministratur, ut sit iam septenarius, qui duplicatur propter duplicem sexum xiii generationibus eminet, quas habent tres etates: adolescentis, scilicet, iuuenis et senioris. Senectus uero nullo termino annorum finituri, sed post illas quinque etates quantum quisque uixerit senectuti deputatur. In hac quoque etate seculi non apparent generationes ut etiam occultus sit ultimus dies, quem Dominus utiliter latere monstrauit.\textsuperscript{746}

Igitur perfecti celi et terra, et cetera. Post sex dierum opera bona ualde, speret homo requiem perpetuam et intelligat quid sit, requieuit Deus die vii ab operibus suis, quia et ipse in nobis bona operatur qui iubet ut operemur et recte requiescere dicitur, quia post hec omnia opera nobis requiem prestabit. Quomodo Pater familias domum edificat cum seruientibus facere imperat et post ab operibus requiescere cum perfecta fabrica iubet requiescit.\textsuperscript{747}

\textsuperscript{742} C Ad profectus
\textsuperscript{743} Pn C Ad temporis
\textsuperscript{744} Ad observer et
\textsuperscript{745} Nullomodo dici... futurorum. Augustine, DGCM I 41 [CSEL 91, 110].
\textsuperscript{746} Si quem mouet...monstrauit. Augustine, DGCM I 42 [CSEL 91, 111–112].
\textsuperscript{747} Augustine, DGCM I 43 [CSEL 91, 113–114].
Compleuitque Deus die septimo opus suum quod fecerat et requieuit die septimo ab uniuerso opere quod patrarat.

Compleuitque. Ier. In Ebreo habet die septimo. Artabimus ergo Iudeos qui de ocio sabbati gloriandur quia iam tunc in principio sabbatum solutum dum Deus operatur in sabbato complens omnia opera sua in sabbato.\footnote{Jerome, \textit{HQLG} 2, 2 [\textit{CCCL} 72, 4].}

et requieuit. in se ipso uel quia post nichil nouum fecit.

Compleuitque Deus, et cetera. Alia translatio, “Consummavuit Deus die sexto opera que fecit”. Que nichil questionis affert quia manifesta sunt que in eo facta sunt. Sed secundum ebraicam ueritatem querendum quomodo dicatur die septimo compleuisse opus suum, in quo nichil nouum creasse dicitur, nisi forte ipsum tunc fecisse, et in eius factura opus compleuisse dicatur, quod eo facto mensuram numerumque perfecerit dierum, quorum circuitu omnia secula uoluentur. Nam in reuolutione idem octauus qui et primus. Compleuit igitur die septimo opus suum addito ipso septimo, quem sabbatum dici et esse uoluit, quia mistica pre ceteris benedictione et sanctificatione donauit. Vnde et dies iudicii quia post septimam sabbati uentura est, octaua in scripturis dicta est quasi septem tantum precesserint. Dies quoque resurrectionis Deum cum post tot dierum milia uentura esset, octaua dicta est. Potest dici compleuisse Deum die septimo opus suum quia ipsum benedixit et sanctificavit. Opus enim est benedictio et sanctificatio. Aliquid enim operis Salomon fecit, cum templum dedicauit.\footnote{Bede, \textit{IG} I ii, 2 [\textit{CCSL} 118A, 32–33].}

Et requieuit die septimo, et cetera. Non laborauit Deus in operando, qui solo uerbo fecit dicendo “fiat”, nec homo dicendo laborat. Sed forte dicatur laborasse cogitando quid fieret a qua cura perfectis rebus quieuerit. Sed hoc sapere desipere est. Deum ergo requieuisse est creature rationabili in se requiem prebuisse ut illuc scilicet desiderio feramur quo requiescamus, id est nichil amplius requiramus. Sicut enim facere dicitur quod ipso in nobis operante facimus et cognoscere cum cognoscimus, sic requiescere cum eius munere requiescimus.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} IV, 8–9 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 103–106].}
Augustinus. *Compleuitque Deus die septimo*, et cetera. Queritur utrum illi sex dies preterierint, et addito septimo nunc per volumina temporum non re sed nomine repetantur. In toto enim tempore multi ueniunt preteritis similes, Nullus idem. Vnde dubitatur utrum illi sex preterierunt, an istis usitatis cotidie transcurrentibus illi maneant in rerum conditionibus ut non solum in tribus ante luminaria, sed etiam in reliquis tribus intelligamus diem in specie rei que creata est noctem in defectu, in priuatione, cum scilicet amittitur species aliqua mutatione que inest omni creature siue possibilitate cum desit effectus, sicut in celestibus corporibus siue actu ut in terrenis et mortalibus. Vespera autem in omnibus perfecte conditionis terminus sit, mane incipientis exordium. Omnis enim creatura certis initiis et finibus continentur. Sed siue hoc siue illud siue aliud dicatur probabilius, perfecto numero dierum, id est senario perfecit Deus opera sua, que mensura et numero et pondere disposuit, id est in se qui est mensura omnique rei modum prefigens et numeros speciem prebens et pondus quia omnia ad quietem et stabilitatem trahit. Omnia enim terminat, format, et ordinat, uel sic disposit et omnia ut haberent mensuram, numerum, et pondus, sicut dicitur. Deus corpora in coloribus disposuat, non ut colores in se prius haberint, sed ut ipsa colores haberent. Nec senarius numerus ideo perfectus quia sex diebus opera perfecit Deus, sed ideo opera perfecit sex diebus quia senarius perfectus. Sine his ergo esset perfectus qui nisi esset perfectus, secundum eum perfecta non fient. 751

*Et requieuit Deus*, non quasi operando lassus sed ab uniuerso opere requieuit, quia nouam creaturam facere cessauit. Requiescere enim cessare dicitur, unde in Apocalipsi requiem non habebant dicentia sanctus sanctus sanctus sanctus, id est dicere non cessabant [Rev 4:8]. 752

Non est etiam mirum, si diem quo Christus erat in sepultura quieturus hoc modo pronuntians die septima requieuit deinceps operaturus ordinem seculorum. 753

[9v] Potest autem intelligi Deum requieuisse a faciendis generibus creature, quia ultra noua non condidit. Vseque nunc tamen operatur administrationem eorundem generum, que tunc instituta sunt. Creatoris enim uirtus causa subsistendi est omnis creature. Quod enim dicitur, *Pater meus*

---

751 Augustine, *DGAL IV*, 1–2 [CSEL 28 III 1, 93–98].
753 Augustine, *DGAL IV*, 11 [CSEL 28 III 1, 108].
usque modo operatur [Jn 5:17], uniuerse creature continuam administrationem ostendit. Die ergo septimo reqeuisit, ut nouam creaturam ulterius non faceret, sed usque nunc operatur, ut quod condidit continere et gubernare non cesseret.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} IV, 12 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 108–110].}

Opera eius uidemus bona, quietem uero eius post bona opera nostra uidebimus, ob quam significandam unam diem sabbati precepit obseruari, quod in tempore genere ablatum est, in qua perpetuum obseruat sabbatum qui spe futuri omnia bona operatur, nec in bonis operibus suis quasi non acceperit gloriatur.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} IV, 13 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 110–111].}

Deus autem nec creando defessus, nec cessando refectus est. Sed per scripturam suam ad quietis nos hortatur desiderium, dicendo se diem sanctificasse in quo quieuit. Ceteros enim non legitur sanctificasse, tanquam apud ipsum plus quies quam operatio ualeat.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} IV, 14 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 111].}

2:3

\textbf{[9v]} Et benedixit diei septimo et sanctificauit illum. \textbf{[10r]} quia in ipso cessauerat ab omni opere suo quod creauit Deus ut faceret.

\textit{creauit.} in uerbo

\textit{ut faceret.} in opere

Augustinus. Queritur quomodo dicatur in se ipso requieuisse Deus, cum scriptum sit \textit{et requieuit die septimo}, quasi non in se ipso. Quid est ergo dies septimus, creatura an temporis spatium? Quod est ipsum creature temporali concreaturum et sic creatura. Nulla enim tempora sunt que a Deo creatra non sunt. Sex autem dies cum quibus uel in quibus creaturis creati sunt, superius dictum est. Sed septimum quando creauit? In ipso enim nichil fecit, sed ab his que fecerat quieuit. Quomodo ergo requieuit in die quem non creauit? Aut quomodo eum post sex dies creauit, cum sexto die omnia consummauerit, nec alicuam in septimo creauerit? Forte unum tantum diem creauit Deus, ut eius repetitione multi preterirent, nec opus erat ut septimum

Sed quomodo circuire poterat lux ad exhibendam diurnam nocturnamque uicissitudinem non solum ante luminaria, sed ante factum firmamentum immo ante speciem terre uel maris que circuitum lucis admisit? Hac difficultate supra diximus lucem prius factam esse spiritualis creature consummationem, noctem uero adhuc formandam in ceteris materiam que fuerat instituta, cum primo fecit Deus celum et cetera.

Alioquin aut non creauit Deus diem septimum, aut septimum post illos sex. Falsumque erit eum sexto die consummasse omnia opera sua.

Sed facilius est ut nos ignorare fateamur, quomodo lux que dies dicitur, circuitu si corporalis uicem diei noctisque egerit, si spiritualis est condendis omnibus presentata sui presentia diem, absentia noctem, uesperam initio absentie et mane initio presentie sue fecerit, quam contra naturam diuine scripture conemur dicendo alium diem esse septimum quam illius diei quam fecit Deus septimam repetitionem.

Sed quoniam lux corporalis antequam fieret celum quo circuitu noctem diemque exhibuerit non inuenimus, sic questionem terminamus. Lux prius creata non corporalis sed spiritualis, sicut post tenebras factura id est a sua informitate ad creatorem conuersa, ita post uesperam mane, cum post cognitionem proprie nature qua non est quod Deus refert se ad laudandam lucem que est Deus, cuius iusione formatur. Et quia creature inferiores sine eius cognitione non fiunt, unus dies ubique repetitur, cuius repetitione dies fiant. Quotiens distinguuntur [cont.10r] rerum genera

757 Augustine, DGAL IV, 20 [CSEL 28 III 1, 118–120] .
758 Augustine, DGAL IV, 21 [CSEL 28 III 1, 120].
759 Augustine, DGAL IV, 21 [CSEL 28 III 1, 120].
760 Augustine, DGAL IV, 21 [CSEL 28 III 1, 120–121].
senarii perfectione terminanda, ut uespera primi diei fit sui cognitionio, quia scit se non esse quod Deus est, mane post uesperam quo clauditur dies unus et inchoatur secundus, conuersio eius ut quod creata est ad laudem referat creatoris et cognitionem creature precipiat de uerbo Dei, quia post ipsam fit, id est firmamenti. Quod in eius cognitione fit prius cum dicitur et factum est ita, post in natura firmamenti cum additur et fecit Deus firmamentum. Deinde uespera ipsius lucis, cum ipsum non in uerbo Dei sicut ante sed in ipsius natura cognoscit, que cognitionio tanquam minor uespera dicitur. Postea fit mane quo clauditur dies secundus, et incipit tercius in quo itidem mane est conuersio huius lucis ad laudem Dei quia fecit firmamentum, et ad percipiendam de uerbo cognitionem creature faciende post firmamentum. Et sic cetera usque ad mane post uesperam sexti diei. 761 Multum enim est inter cognitionem cuiusque rei in uerbo et in ipsius natura. Vnde hoc ad diem illud pertinet ad uesperam. Pre luce enim que in uerbo conspicitur cognitionio qua creaturam in ipsa nouimus, recte nox dicitur. 762

[9v] Viciu quoque est anime ita suis operibus delectari, ut potius in ipsis quam in se requiescat ab eis, cum in ipsa alicquid melius sit quo fecerit quam ipsa que fecit. Ideo ostenditur Deus cum dicitur requieuisse nullo opere sic delectatus, quasi faciendi eguerit, uel minor si non fecerit, uel beatior cum fecerit. Quod ex illo ita est, ut ei debeat quod est, ipse autem nulli, quia ex ipso est quod beatus est, se rebus quas fecit diligendo preposuit. Ideo non sanctificans diem quo ea facienda inchoauit, nec illum quo fecit ea, ne illis faciendis uel factis gaudium ei creuisse uideretur, sed eum quo ab ipsa in se ipso requieuit qui nunquam requie caruit, sed eam nobis per diem septimum ostendit, significans eam non dari nisi perfectis cui deputauit diem qui perfectionem rerum omnium sequebatur. Qui enim semper quietus est, tunc nobis requieuit, cum se requieuisse monstrauit et requiescit in nobis cum in se requiem tribuit. 763 Requies Dei igitur est, qua nullius indiget bono, et ideo certa est nobis in illo, quia beatificamur bono quod ipse est, et hec est eius requies ab omnibus operibus que fecit, quia bono quod fecit non eget, nec egeret si non fecisset. Nam sic potest dici, nullis eget bonis, non a factis requiescendo, sed nulla faciendo. Sed facere si non posset, nulla esset potentia. [cont. 10r] Si posset et non faceret,
magna esset inuidia. Sed omnipotens et bonus, omnia fecit bona ualde. Quia uero se ipso bono perfecte beatus est, a bonis que fecit in se ipso requieuit, ea requie a qua nunquam recessit.\textsuperscript{764}

[9v] \textit{Et benedixit die septimo}, et cetera. Vnde dicitur, \textit{Memento ut diem sabbati sacrificies} [Ex 20:8]. Hec autem benedictio et sanctificatio maiorem benedictionem et sanctificationem significat. Sicut enim crebris uictimis sanguis Christi semel fundendus signabatur, ita per requiem septimi diei post opera sex dierum semper celebratam signabatur ille dies sabbati, quo Christus semel in sepulchro quieturus perfectis die sexta omnibus operibus quibus mundum sexta die perfectum restauruit. In quo antiqui memori operis salvationem mundi se perfecissem declarauit. \textit{Dixit enim consummatum est et inclinato capite tradit spiritum} [Jn 19:30]. Hec sanctificatio et benedictio et requies post opera bona ualde, significat nos post opera bona que in nobis operatur ipse preuenturos ad requiem celestis uite fruituros eterna sanctificatione et benedictione. Ideo hec dies uesperam habere non scribitur.\textsuperscript{765}

[10r] Si autem diceretur, “requieuisse a faciendis”, intelligenter tantum non fecisse. Si “a factis”, forte ipsi factis egere uideretur. Nos autem non in nobis sed in illo requiescamus, ne ita uelimus similes esse Deo, ut in nobis requiescamus, sicut ipse in se. Sed sicut non requieuit nisi in se ipso, quia beatus est in se ipso, tantum in ipso nos requieturos speremus, qui non nostro bono sed ipso beati sumus.\textsuperscript{766}

Altius quoque intelligitur \textit{requieuisse ab operibus suis}, id est non opus habuisse illis operibus in quibus requiesceret, cuius requies in se ipso semper uera est, sine initio et fine, sed sola bonitatis causa fecisse opera que in ipso requiescerent, humana uero indigentia cotidie laborat, ut in operibus suis requiescat dicente Deo, \textit{in sudore uultus tui uesceris pane tuo}. Deus autem non habuit necesse in creaturis suis requiescere, sed creaturis rationalibus in se requiem dedit.\textsuperscript{767}

\textsuperscript{764} \textit{Requies Dei...nunquam recessit}. Augustine, \textit{DGAL IV}, 16 [CSEL 28 III 1, 112–113].

\textsuperscript{765} Bede, \textit{IG I ii}, 3 [CCSL 118A, 34–35].

\textsuperscript{766} Augustine, \textit{DGAL IV}, 16–17 [CSEL 28 III 1, 112–114].

\textsuperscript{767} Bede, \textit{IG I}, ii 2 [CCSL 118A, 34].
Apud illum quieti eius nec mane nec uespera est, quia nec aperitur initio, nec clauditur fine. Perfectis autem operibus mane et non uespera, quia perfecta creatura incipit conuerti ad quietem creatoris. Sed illa non habet finem sue perfectionis, et sic requies Dei non ipsi sed rerum perfectioni inchoatuir, et habet in eo mane quod ab ipso perficitur. Sed in suo genere tanquam uespera terminatur, quod in Deo uesperam non habet, quia nichil erit perfectus illa perfectione.

In illis autem diebus quibus omnia creabantur, uespera est terminus condite creature, mane initium alterius condende, et sic quinte diei uespera terminus est condite in eo creature. Mane post ipsam initium faciende sexto die, qua condita terminus est uespera, et quia nichil condendum restabat, ita post illam mane factum est, ut non esset initium alterius creature condende, sed quietis omnis creature in creatoris requie. Intelligitur enim completo sexto die post eius uesperam factum mane, quo significatur initium manendi et quiescendi, que dies Deo nec initium habet nec terminum, creature autem habet initium sed non finem. Ideo ei septimus dies cepit a mane, sed nullo terminatur uespere. Si autem in ceteris diebus uespere et mane uices temporum significant qualia cotidie peraguntur, nichil prohibet septimum diem uespera mane concludi, ut mane post uesperum septimi sit initium octaui. Vnde probabilius est hos septem dies sub illorum nominibus sibimet [cont. 10v] succedentes tempora peragere, illos autem primos inusitata nobis specie in ipsis rerum conditionibus explicatos, quod de tribus fateri cogimur, qui conditi ante luminaria memorantur.

[10r] Quia vero angeli creaturam in ipsa sic sciunt, ut proponant quod eam in ueritate sciunt per quem omnia facta sunt, per sex dies non nominatur nox, sed post uesperam et mane dies unus, et sic per cetera. Diei ergo cuius uespera et mane secundum predictam rationem accipi potest, senaria repetitione facta est omnis creatura. Factumque est mane quo finiretur dies sextus et inciperet septimus sine uespera, quia Dei requies non est creature que per ceteros dies aliter in Deo, aliter in se facta cognoscitur, cuius cognitionis quasi decolor species uesperam facit. Non ergo forma operis dies, terminus uespera et alterius operis initium mane debet intelligi, ne

---

768 Augustine, DGAL IV, 18 [CSEL 28 III 1, 114–115].
769 Augustine, DGAL IV, 18 [CSEL 28 III 1, 115–116].
770 Quia uero... per cetera. Augustine, DGAL IV, 25 [CSEL 28 III 1, 124].
cogamur dicere preter sex dies septimi conditam creaturam, aut ipsum non esse creatura. Sed dies idem per omnia opera repetitur non circuiutu corporali, sed cognitione spirituali cum angeli prius contemplantur creaturam in uerbo Dei, deinde in sua cognitione, et post in ea ipsa quod significatur facta uespera, et hanc cognitionem ad ipsius ueritatis laudem referunt quod mane significat.\textsuperscript{771}

Nec putet quis quod de luce spirituali dictum est, et die spirituali condito et angelica creatura, et contemplatione quam habet in uerbo Dei, et de cognitione qua in se creatura cognoscitum eiusque relatione ad laudem ueritatis non iam proprie, sed figurate et allegorice conuenire ad intelligendum diem uesperum et mane, sed aliter quam in consuetudine huius corporalis lucis non tamen hic tanquam proprie, ibi figurate, ubi enim certior lux, ibi uerior dies. Cur ergo non uerius uespera et uerius mane?\textsuperscript{772}

[10v] Intelligitur etiam ut non creature, sed sibi requies Dei septimi diei mane habuerit sine uespera, id est initium sine termino. Si enim diceretur “requieuit in die septima” nec adderetur “ab operibus suis” frustra initium quietis quereremus. Requies autem ab operibus ex eo cepta est, ex quo illa perfecit. Neque enim operibus suis non egendo requieuisit priusquam essent, quibus nec perfectis eguisset, et quia eis quamquam omnino eguit, nec beatitudo qua non eis eget tanquam perficiendo perficietur, ideo septima die nulla uespera accessit.\textsuperscript{773}
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[10v] \textbf{Iste generationes celi et terre quando create sunt in die quo fecit Dominus Deus celum et terram}

\textit{Iste.} conclusio superiorum uel historice uel mistice recapitulatio

\textit{in die.} tempore

\textit{celum.} omnium uisibilum materiam

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{771} \textit{Diei ergo... mane significat.} Augustine, \textit{DGAL IV}, 26 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 125–126].
\item \textsuperscript{772} Augustine, \textit{DGAL IV}, 28 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 126–127].
\item \textsuperscript{773} Augustine, \textit{DGAL IV}, 19 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 118].
\end{itemize}
Beda. *Iste sunt generationes celi et terre.* Eos tangit qui mundum sine initio dicunt semper fuisse, uel qui ab eo factum putant, sed ex materia quam non fecerit, sed coeterna ei. *In die quo fecit Dominus celum et terram* et cetera. Diem ponit pro omni tempore quo primordialis creatura formata est. Non enim in quolibet sex dierum celum factum, uel sideribus illustratum, et terra ab aquis separata, arborebus herbisque consita. Sic Apostolus dicens *ecce nunc dies salutis* [2 Cor 6:2], significat totum tempus quo hic uiuimus. Sed difficile est intelligere quomodo *in hoc die fecit Deus celum et terram et omnem uirgultum agri*, nisi dicamus quod in materia informi pariter omnis creatura formata est, iuxta illud, *Qui uiuit in eternum creauit omnia simul* [Sir 18:10]. Si igitur in hoc die tempus intelligimus quo ante omnem huius seculi diem facta sunt omnia simul, patet quod herba et omnis arbor in ipsius terre substantia causaliter facta sunt, prorsum usibiliter orientur et germinarent. Si vero hunc diem pro illo tempore accipimus, quo mundus per sex dies ornatus est, possumus intelligere quia protulit terra herbam uirentem, non sicut modo cum irrigatone pluuiarum uel industria hominum multa procreantur. Sed aliter prima herbarum et arborum facta est creatio nouo scilicet Dei imperio sine pluuiia et opere humano. Vnde sequitur, *Non enim pluerat Dominus Deus super terram.*


---

774 Bede, *IG I ii*, 4–5 [*CCCL 118A*, 39–41].
die factum est, plane appareat illum esse unum diem quem fecit Deus, quo repetito factus est secundus, tertius et ceteri usque ad septimum.\textsuperscript{775} Cum enim nomine celi et terre omnem creaturam uellet accipi, supposuit \textit{omnem uiride agri} ut hec diem apertius significaret. Cum enim conditorum ordinem recolimus, inuenimus uiride agri tercio die creatum antequam solis presentia dies cotidianus perageretur. Quando etiam audimus, \textquotedblleft cum factus est dies fecit Deus omnem uiride agri\textquotedblright, admonemur ipsi quem siue corporalem luce nobis incognita siue spiritualim in societate angelica intelligimus.\textsuperscript{776} Item cum dicitur fecisse Deum celum et terram \textit{cum factus est dies}, simul omnia fecisse signatur. Cum enim sex dierum ordine creatam memorantur et nunc ad unum reducantur, hunc septies repetitum et illam senariam uel septenariam repetitionem non interualllo temporis factam intelligimus. Scriptura enim altitudine superbos irridet, profunditate attentos tenet, magnos ueritate paruulos nutrit affabilitate.\textsuperscript{777}

[10v] Dies ergo ille primus angelica scilicet creatura presentatus est omnibus operibus Dei, hoc ordine presentie quo scientie, qua in uerbo facienda presciret et in creatura facta sciret, non per interuallla temporum sed prius et posterius habens in conexone creaturarum in efficatia creatoris omnia simul. Sic enim fecit Deus futura, ut non temporaliter temporalia sed ab eo facta current per tempora. Lux enim creata spiritualis omnibus operibus Dei per senarii perfectionem presentari potuit atque inde in septimam requiem Dei mane habere non uesperam, ut non sit hoc Deo requieuisse vi\textsuperscript{a} die tanquam ipso eguerit ad requiem, sed quod in conspectu angelorum requieuerit ab omnibus operibus, non nisi in se ipso qui factus non est, id est, ut creatura angelica que cognoscendis operibus in ipso et in illis tanquam dies cum uespera presentata est nichil post omnia opera bona ualde melius cognoscerent quam illum qui ab omnibus operibus in se ipso quiesceret, nullo eorum egente quo sit beatior. In qua cognitione non habente uesperam, benedici et sanctificari ob hoc meruit.\textsuperscript{778}

\textsuperscript{775} \textit{Alia translatio...ad septimum.} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} V, 1 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 137–139].
\textsuperscript{776} \textit{Cum enim... intelligimus.} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} V, 2 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 139–140].
\textsuperscript{777} \textit{Item cum... affabilitate.} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} V, 3 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 140–141].
\textsuperscript{778} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} IV, 35 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 136].
Mistice. *Iste sunt generationes celi et terre*, et cetera. Numerati sunt septic dies quibus uniuersa seculi a capite usque ad finem quasi breuis imago figurata est, unde hec pars libri “liber generationis celi et terre” dicta est. In hac uero conclusione unus dicitur dies quo fecit Deus celum et terram uirgultum et herbam, in quo tempus significatur.\(^{779}\) His ergo paucis uerbis insinuata est omnis creatura ante peccatum. Nomine *celi et terre*, omnis uisibilis creatura, nomine *diei*, omne tempus, quia simul sunt facta tempus et temporalia, nomine *uirgulti et herbe*, creatura uisibilis, propter uigorem uite inmarcessibilem si non peccasset.\(^{780}\) *Antequam oriretur in terra*, id est priusquam peccaret id est terrenis cupiditatibus se subderet. Vnde sequitur, *Non enim pluerat Dominus Deus super terram*,\(^{781}\) hoc est, nondum propheticis uel euangelicis nubibus imbre uerbi misso animam uirebat. *Homo non erat qui operaretur terram*, quia post peccatum homo laborare cepit in terra et necessarias habuit nubes illas.\(^{782}\) Vnde ergo *uirgultum*, id est anima uirebat. *Irrigabat eam fons uite*, id est mundatio ueritatis loquens in intellectu eius ut pluuia de nubibus non egeret antequam peccaret.\(^{783}\) Hic erat status hominis ante peccatum.
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[11r] *et omne uirgultum agri antequam oriretur in terra omnemque herbam regionis priusquam germinaret. Non enim pluearat Dominus Deus super terram*

**et homo non erat qui operaretur terram**

*et omne.* omnium inuisibilium propter uigorem uite  
*herbam.* propter uitam inmarcessibilem  
*regionis.* mala scilicet concupiscencia coalesceret in mente  
*Non enim.* prophetica uel euangelica predicacione  
*super.* Quasi non ex prouentu pluu iarum nati sunt fructices aut herbe nec usque ad diluuium legitur pluisse

\(^{779}\) *Iste sunt... significatur.* Augustine, *DGCM* II, 4 [CSEL 91, 121].  
\(^{780}\) *His ergo... non peccasset.* Augustine, *DGCM* II, 7 [CSEL 91, 126].  
\(^{781}\) *Antequam oriretur...super terram.* Augustine, *DGCM* II, 5 [CSEL 91, 123].  
\(^{782}\) *Hoc est...nubes illas.* Augustine, *DGCM* II, 5 [CSEL 91, 123–124].  
\(^{783}\) *Vnde ergo...antequam peccaret.* Augustine, *DGCM* II, 6 [CSEL 91, 124–126].
super. mentem humanam
homo. non erat necesse humano opere corda hominum irrigari

[11r] Augustinus. Nondum pluerat Dominus Deus, et cetera. Quasi non sic fecit Deus tunc, quomodo nunc cum pluit, et operantur homines et per moras temporum fiunt que non erant cum fecit omnia simul.\textsuperscript{784} Tempora enim non fuerit ante creaturam, sed cum creatura et ipsa creatata. Motus enim si nullus esset uel temporalis uel spiritualis creature, quo per presens preteritis futura succederent, tempus omnino non esset, nec creatura moueri posset.\textsuperscript{785}

Omnem uirgultum agri. Antequam oriretur in terra, et cetera. Intelligitur terra causaliter produxisse herbam et lignum, id est producendi accepisse uirtutem. In ea enim tanquam in radicibus facta erant que per tempora futura.\textsuperscript{786} Fecit ergo antequam essent super terram secundum formabilitatem materie que formanda erat uerbo eius, precedens formationem non tempore sed origine.\textsuperscript{787}

2:6

\textbf{Sed fons ascendebat e terra irrigans uniuersam superficiem terre.}
\textit{Sed fons.} uite inundatio ueritatis
\textit{Sed fons.} fons sapientie diuisus in quatuor partes uirtutum\textsuperscript{788}
\textit{irrigans.} inspirans omnia utilia et honesta

\textit{Sed fons ascendebat} et cetera. Hic intimare uidetur que fiunt secundum temporum interualla ex prima conditione ubi fiunt omnia simul, incipiens ab elemento ex quo omnia germina nascurtur, animalium, herbarum, uel lignorum, ut agant temporales numeros propriis naturis distributos. Primordia enim omnium seminum humida sunt et ex humore concrescunt.\textsuperscript{789} Si dicatur non

\textsuperscript{784} Nondum pluerat...omnia simul. Augustine, DGAL V, 6 [CSEL 28 III 1, 149–150].
\textsuperscript{785} Tempora enim... moueri posset. Augustine, DGAL V, 5 [CSEL 28 III 1, 145].
\textsuperscript{786} Omnem uirgultum... tempora futura. Augustine, DGAL V, 4 [CSEL 28 III 1, 144].
\textsuperscript{787} Fecit ergo... sed origine. Augustine, DGAL V, 5 [CSEL 28 III 1, 147].
\textsuperscript{788} Rabanus Maurus, CG I [PL 107:469A].
\textsuperscript{789} Sed fons... concrescunt. Augustine, DGAL V, 7 [CSEL 28 III 1, 150].
posse quantolibet fonte omnem faciem terre irrigari, et si montes rigaret diluuium esset, respondetur quia uicissim fieri posset,\textsuperscript{790} sicut Nilus plana Egipti irrigat. Possunt et per unum multi intelligi fontes, regiones proprias irrigantes et omnis terre facies irrigata, sicut omnis uestis facies colorata, si non continuatim sed maculatim, ab hoc fonte que narrantur per moras temporum fiunt, non simul.\textsuperscript{791} Cum ergo aliter sint creaturarum rationes in uerbo Dei, aliter opera a quibus die septimo requieuit, aliter que ex illis usque nunc operatur, ultimum utcumque corporis sensu et consuetudine cognoscimus. Duo remota a nostris sensibus et humane cognitionis usu, prius auctoritate diuina credenda, post per hec que nota sunt utcumque noscenda.\textsuperscript{792}

Sed fons ascendebat et cetera. Huius fontis qualiscumque irrigatio, iam terra herbis lignisque uestita superuenit. Fons unus ascendisse dicitur, pro aliqua in terre finibus unitate, uel singularis positus est pro plurari.\textsuperscript{793}
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\textit{formauit igitur Dominus Deus} \textit{[11v] hominem de limo terrae} \textit{[12r] et inspirauit in faciem eius spiraculum uite et factus est homo in animam uiiuentem.}

\textit{formauit.} iubendo, uolendo

\textit{limo.} quantum ad corpus

\textit{et inspirauit.} id est, spiritum contemplatiue uirtutis dedit

\textit{et inspirauit.} uit. rationali animauit

\textit{faciem.} totum quidem corpus animauit sed hec pars sensibus ornata est ad intuenda superiora per quam rationali anime naturaliter inditum est ut sapiat que sunt sursum

\textit{in animam.} prius animalem deinde spiritualem

Mistice. \textit{Formauit igitur Dominus Deus} et cetera. Latior de homine narratio figurate explicatur, ut querentes instruat et exerceat. Hec formatio non est noui operis inchoatio, sed diligens

\textsuperscript{790} Si dicatur... fieri posset. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} V, 9 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 152–153].

\textsuperscript{791} sicut Nilus... non simul. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} V, 10 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 153–154].

\textsuperscript{792} Cum ergo... noscenda. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} V, 12 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 155–156].

\textsuperscript{793} Bede, \textit{IG I ii}, 5–6 [\textit{CCCL} 118A, 42].
retractatio. Si hic hominem ex corpore et anima iam factum intelligimus, bene ista commixtio limus dicitur. Sicut enim fit homo commixtione pulueris et liquoris, sic anima corporis materiam uiuificando unit, nec patitur dissolui. Formauit igitur Dominus Deus hominem de limo terre et cetera. Factura hominis qui sexto die factus est, latius descriptur quid factus sit corpore, scilicet et anima et corpus de limo, anima uero de nichilo Deo [del. in]spirante creata est, et femina de latere dormientis. Sed ne putemus Deum corporeis manibus formasse corpus uel faucibus inspirasse uitam. Quod enim dictum est manus tue fecerunt me et plasmauerunt me tropica locutio est [Ps 118:73]. Spiritus enim est Deus, nec liniamentis membrorum compositus. Formauit ergo de limo hominem, id est

---

794 Formauit igitur... patitur dissolui. Augustine, DGCM II, 9 [CSEL 91, 128].

795 Inspirauit...renascamur. Augustine, DGAL II, 10 [CSEL 91, 129–130].

796 Paradisi uero... quod non est. Augustine, DGAL II, 12 [CSEL 91, 131–133].
uerbo suo de limo fieri iussit. *Inspiruit in faciem eius spiraculum uite* substantiam silicet anime et spiritus in qua uiueret creauit.\textsuperscript{797}

*Formauit igitur Dominus Deus* et cetera. Videndum est utrum recapitulatio sit ut dicatur quomodo homo factus sit quem sexta die factum legimus, an tunc cum *fecit omnia simul* etiam hominem in his fecit, ut accesu temporis et hoc modo fieret quo in hac perpetua forma uitam gerit, sicut fenum factum antequam exoriretur, accedente tempore et fontis irrigatione exortum est ut esset super terram.\textsuperscript{798}

Secundum recapitulationem prius uideamus, forte factus est homo die sexto, sicut ipse dies prius factus, sicut firmamentum terra et mare que non sunt dicenta, an in primordiis iam facta latuisse et post in hanc faciem qua mundus instructus est accessu temporum tanquam exorta claruisse, nec sidera in elementis prius facta et recondita accessu temporis in has formas emicuisse. Sed senario perfectionis creata sunt simul omnia cum factus est dies.\textsuperscript{799} Sic forte sexto die hac uisibili forma de limo factus est homo, sed tunc non commemoratum, quod nunc recapitulando insinuatur. Sed hoc scripture congruere non uidetur. Scriptum est enim cum adhuc sexti diei opera narrarentur *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram* et cetera. Iam ergo de limo factus erat homo, et mulier ex eius latere. Non enim sexto die factus masculus, et post accessu temporis femina. Inquit enim *masculum et feminam fecit eos.* Quomodo ergo iam in paradiso homine constituo facta est mulier? Sed forte hoc pretermissum scriptur recolit. Nam secundum hoc sexto die paradisus plantatus est, ubi locatus homo soporatus est ut formaretur eu, qua formata euigilauit nomenque imposuit.\textsuperscript{800} Verba uero hominis, cum animantibus uel mulieri nomen posuit uel cum dixit *propter hoc relinquet homo patrem* et cetera, non nisi temporali mora fieri potuerit. Non ergo hec facta sunt, sicut *creata sunt omnia simul.*\textsuperscript{801}

\textsuperscript{797} Bede, *IG* 1, ii, 7 [CCCL 118A, 4].

\textsuperscript{798} Augustine, *DGAL* VI, 1 [CSEL 28 III 1, 170–171].

\textsuperscript{799} *Secundum recapitulationem... est dies.* Augustine, *DGAL* VI, 1 [CSEL 28 III 1, 170–171].

\textsuperscript{800} *Sic forte... nomenque imposuit.* Augustine, *DGAL* VI, 2 [CSEL 28 III 1, 171–172].

\textsuperscript{801} *Verba uero... omnia simul.* Augustine, *DGAL* VI, 3 [CSEL 28 III 1, 172–173].

Sed aiunt: quomodo renouamur, si non recipimus que prodidit homo primus? Recipimus quodammodo et non recipimus. Non immortalitatem spiritualis corporis recipimus, quam nondum habuit homo, sed iustitiam a qua per peccatum lapsus. Renouabimur a uetustate peccati, non in corpus animale in quo fuit, sed in melius, id est in spirituale. Renouamur mente secundum imaginem Dei, que peccando perdita. Renouabimur carne, cum hoc corruptibile induet incorruptionem in quam mutandus erat adam, nisi mortem corporis animalis peccando meruisset. Non ait Apostolus “corpus mortale propter peccatum” sed mortuum. Illud enim ante peccatum mortale et immortale, quia poterat mori et non mori. Aliud est autem non posse mori, aliud posse non mori. Quodammodo creatus est homo immortalis quod erat ei de ligno

802 Formavit igitur... quali resurgemus. Augustine, DGAL VI, 19 [CSEL 28 III 1, 192].
803 Vnde queritur...in resurrectionem. Augustine, DGAL VI, 20 [CSEL 28 III 1, 194].
804 Sed si ita est... corpus animale? Augustine, DGAL VI, 21 [CSEL 28 III 1, 194–195].
805 Augustine, DGAL VI, 22 [CSEL 28 III 1, 195].
806 Sed aiunt... sed mortuum. Augustine, DGAL VI, 24 [CSEL 28 III 1, 196–197].
uite, non de conditione nature. Mortalis erat conditione corporis animalis, immortalis beneficio conditoris. Non enim immortale quod mori omnino non possit nisi spirituale. Ideo factum est peccatum non mortale quod erat, sed mortuum quod non fieret nisi peccaret.\footnote{Illud enim... nisi peccaret. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VI, 25 [CSEL 28 III 1, 197].} Animale enim est hoc corpus sicut primi hominis sed iam deterius. Habet enim necessitatem moriendi.\footnote{Animale enim... moriendi. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VI, 26 [CSEL 28 III 1, 197–198].}

Stola prima aut justitia est de qua lapsus est, uel si corporalem immortalitatem significat, hanc amisit cum peccando ad eam peruenire non potuit.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VI, 27 [CSEL 28 III 1, 198–199].} Sic ergo Adam corpus animale habuit non modo ante paradisum, sed etiam in paradiso, quamuis [12r] interiori homine fuerit spiritualis, quod amisit peccando et meruit corporis mortem qui non peccando meretur in corpus spirituale mutationem.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VI, 28 [CSEL 28 III 1, 199–200].}

Aut igitur non omnia opera sex dierum simul, aut si simul facta sunt secundum illud, \textit{qui uiuit in eternum creavit omnia simul}, non est dubium quod homo de limo terre formatus est, eique formata uxor ex latere, non ad conditionem qua simul facta sunt omnia pertinere, sed ad eam que fit per tempora qua Deus usque nunc operatur.\footnote{Aut igitur... nunc operatur. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VI, 3 [CSEL 28 III 1, 172–173].} Quod his uerbis innuitur, \textit{plantauit Deus paradisum in Eden et eiecit adhuc de terra omne lignum}, et cetera. Cum enim dicit \textit{adhuc}, aperit quod aliter nunc \textit{eicit} aliter \textit{cum productit terra herbam uirentem} et cetera. Tunc potentialiter et causaliter, sicut creantur omnia simul, nunc uisibiliter temporis accessu, nisi dicatur non omne genus ligni tercio die creatum sed aliquid dilatum quod sexto die formaretur cum factus est homo.\footnote{Quod his... factus est homo. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VI, 4 [CSEL 28 III 1, 173–174].} Sed frustra per singulos dies distincta sunt omnia, si remaneret permixtio ulla. Masculus ergo et femina, aliter sexto die, aliter nunc creati. Nec enim tunc et non postea, aut postea et non tunc, nec alii postea, sed ipsi autem tunc aliter, postea
uisibiliter scilicet non tamen de parentibus sed ille de limo, illa de costa. Tunc autem
inuisibiliter, causaliter, quomodo fiunt futura, non facta.\textsuperscript{813}

Sed forte anime sexto die facte ubi imago Dei, ut post corpora formarentur. Sed hoc credere
scriptur non permittit, tum propter senarium operum perfectionem, tum quia sexus masculi et
femine in corpore tantum sunt. Si quis secundum intellectum et actionem utrumque sexum in
una anima accipiendum putauerit, quid dicet de his que ad escam illo tempore data, que
corporibus tantum congrua? Si uero figurate acceperit, recedet a proprietate geste rei que
preponenda est in huiusmodi.\textsuperscript{814}

Non sunt audiendi qui putant animam esse partem Dei. Si enim hoc esset, nec a se nec ab alio
decipi posset, nec ad malum faciendum uel patiendum compelli, nec in melius uel deterius
mutari. Flatus autem quo hominem animauit factus est a Deo, non de Deo, nec hominis flatus
pars ipsius est, quem facit non de se ipso sed aerio alitu sumpto et effuso.\textsuperscript{815}

Deus uero potuit de nichilo uiuum et rationabilem facere, quod non potest homo. Quidam tamen
estimant, non tunc animatum hominem quando Deus insufflauit in eius faciem et factus est in
animam uiuam, sed spiritum sanctam accepisse. Animam uero ex nichilo factam, dubitare fas
non est.\textsuperscript{816}

Augustinus. Inspirauit in faciem eius spiraculum uite, et cetera. Sine dubitatione “flauit” uel
“sufflauit” dicendum est, non quod faucibus sufflauerit uel hominis animam de sua substantia
creauerit sed flauit, id est flatum, animam scilicet hominis, fecit.\textsuperscript{817} Flare enim est flatum
facere, flatum facere, animam facere est. Vnde, flatum omnem ego feci.\textsuperscript{818} Queritur autem
utrum animam ex nichilo fecerit, an ex re que iam facta erat sed anima non erat. Si enim

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{813} Sed frustra...non facta. Augustine, DGAL VI, 6 [CSEL 28 III 1, 176–177].

\textsuperscript{814} Augustine, DGAL VI, 7 [CSEL 28 III 1, 178].

\textsuperscript{815} Bede, IG I, ii, 7 [CCSL 118A, 45].

\textsuperscript{816} Bede, IG I, ii, 7 [CCSL 118A, 45].

\textsuperscript{817} Sine dubitatione... hominis fecit. Augustine, DGAL VII, 1 [CSEL 28 III 1, 201].

\textsuperscript{818} Flare enim... ego feci. Augustine, DGAL VII, 3 [CSEL 28 III 1, 202–203].}
dicimus Deum aliquid ex nichilo non creare, post quam omnia simul, non credimus adhuc ex nichilo animas creare.\textsuperscript{819} Sed si fuit materies unde anima fieret, uel adhuc anime fiunt, quid ipsa est? Quod nomen, quam speciem, quem usum in rebus conditis tenet? Viuit an non? Si uiuit, quid agit? Quid in uniuersitate efficit? Beatam uitam gerit, an miseram an neutram? Viuiificat aliquid, an non? Si nulla uita erat, quomodo erat future uite incorporea nec uiua materia? Aut falsum est, aut nimis latet. Si uiuebat nec beate nec misere, quomodo rationalis erat? Si tunc rationalis facta est, cum ex illa materia natura humane anime facta est irrationalis uita materia erat anime rationalis, id est humane. Quid ergo a pecoris anima distabat?\textsuperscript{820} Dicendum est ergo animam humanam Deum creasse, quam suo tempore corpori inspiraret. Quod enim dictum est ad imaginem suam, in anima et masculum et feminam, in corpore intelligitur. Credatur ergo hominem ita factum sexto die, ut corporis humani ratio causalis in elementis mundi, anima uero iam ipsa crearetur, sicut prius conditus est dies, donec eam suo tempore formato corpore insereret.\textsuperscript{821} Sed si iam facta erat anima, ubi ei melius esset quam ibi? Quare ergo innocenter uiuens carni inserta est, in qua creatorem offendaret, et merito periret? Sed forsitan ad corpus regendum uoluit inclinari, ubi et iuste et inique uiuere posset, et quod elegit hoc habuit, uel de iustitia primum uel de iniquitate supplicium. Cur igitur non credatur quid Dei nutu ad corpus uenerit, ubi si obedire uellet uitam eternam acciperet penam si contemneret?\textsuperscript{822}

Augustinus. Dicendum est etiam animam non sic creatam ut prescia esset operis futuri, iusti uel iniusti. Non enim credibile est spontaneam inclinari ad corporis uitam, si se ita sciret peccaturam ut supplicio puniretur perpetuo. Hanc creaturam qui non uult esse contradicit Dei bonitati. Qui uero non uult eam pro peccatis penam luere, inimicus est equitati.\textsuperscript{823}

Queri solet utrum si nolit, incorporari compellatur. Sed melius creditur hoc naturaliter uelle, id est sic creari ut uelit, sicut natura nobis est uelle uiuere. Male autem uiuere non nature sed

\textsuperscript{819} Queritur autem... animas creare. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VII, 5 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 204].

\textsuperscript{820} Sed si fuit... anima distabat? Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VII, 7 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 206].

\textsuperscript{821} Dicendum est...corpori insereret. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VII, 24 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 222–223].

\textsuperscript{822} Sed si iam... si contemneret? Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VII, 25 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 223–224].

\textsuperscript{823} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VII, 26 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 224].
uoluntatis [12v] perue.\textsuperscript{824} Si quis autem non uult eam existimare factam nisi cum formato corpori est inspirata, quid respondet cum queritur unde facta sit? Aut ex nichilo dicet Deum alicd fecisse, post illam consummationem operum, aut de iam existente factam, et laborabit querendo que illa natura sit.\textsuperscript{825}

Quod si uitare uoluerit, dicendo sexto die de limo factum esse hominem sed recapitulando post ea memoratum, uideat quid de muliere dicat quia masculum et feminam fecit eos.\textsuperscript{826}

Augustinus. \textit{Et plantauit Deus paradisum in Eden ad orientem} et cetera. Tres generales sententie de paradiso sunt. Vna eorum qui corporaliter tantum intelligi uolunt, alia eorum qui spiritualiter tantum, tercia eorum qui utroque modo paradisum accipiunt. Tertiam mihi placere fateor, ut homo factus ex limo, quod corpus humanum est; in paradiso corporali locatus intelligatur quomodo Adam et si aliud significet, quia est forma futuri in natura propria homo accipitur.\textsuperscript{827}

2:8

[12v] \textbf{Plantuerat autem Dominus Deus paradisum uoluptatis a principio in quo posuit hominem quem formauerat.}

\textit{Plantauerat.} Quasi, vbi posuit eum?

\textit{paradisum.} locum amenum

\textit{paradisum.} uitam beatam\textsuperscript{828}

\textit{paradisum.} ecclesiam

\textit{paradisum.} ortum deliciarum Ebraice eden

\textit{a principio.} Ieronimus. Apparet quod priusquam celum et terram Deus faceret, paradisum condiderat.\textsuperscript{829}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{824} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VII, 27 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 224–225].

\textsuperscript{825} Si quis autem... illa natura sit. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VII, 28 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 225].

\textsuperscript{826} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VII, 28 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 226].

\textsuperscript{827} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} VIII, 1 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 229].

\textsuperscript{828} Rabanus Maurus, \textit{CG} I [\textit{PL} 107:469A].
\end{footnotesize}
a principio. temporis
a principio. Christo
a principio. remotis aquis a superficie terre
a principio. datur intelligi non ibi fuisse conditum, quia Deus presciebat illum
peccaturum et inde pellendum ad hanc terram ubi condidit eum


Strabus. Plantauerat autem Dominus Deus paradisum uoluptatis. Quidam codices habent, “Eden ad ortum”, ex quo possumus conicere paradisum in oriente situm. Vbicumque autem sit, scimus eum terrenum esse et interiecto occeano et montibus oppositis remotissimum esse a

829 Jerome, HQLG 2, 8 [CCCL 72, 4].
830 Bede, IG I ii, 8 [CCCL 118A, 45–46].
831 Augustine, DGAL VIII, 3 [CSEL 28 III 1, 233–234].
nostro orbe, in alto situm pertingentem ad lunarem circulum, unde aque diluuii illuc minime perueinerit.

Augustinus. Queritur utrum Deus hominem repente in etate uirili fecerit, an perficiendo et per etates augendo, sicut nunc format in matris utero. Sed quicquid horum fecerit, hoc fecit quod Deum omnipotentem et sapientem decuit. Ita enim temporum leges generibus qualitatibusque rerum tribuit, ut uoluntas sua super omnia sit. Potentia enim sua numeros creature dedit, non ipsam eis alligauit, nec expectati sunt dies ut uriga Moysi urteretur in draconem, nec talia contra naturam fiunt nisi nobis quibus alter nature cursus innotuit. Deo autem est natura quod fecit. 832 Sic Adam in etatem uirili continuo factus est, quem tamen [del. non] <nunc> fecit secundum <id est non contra> causalem rationem, in qua prius factus est. Alioquin eum in sex dierum operibus non fecerat. Neque enim contra dispositionem suam faceret. Erat enim in prima causarum conditione, sic hominem posse fieri, sed non ibi erat necesse fieri. Hec enim non erat in conditione creature, sed in beneplacito creatoris, cuius uoluntas necessitas est. 833

Nos autem in rebus tempore ex ortis scimus quid in cuiusque natura sit quod experimento percepimus, sed utrum futurum sit ignoramus. In natura iuuenis est ut senescat, sed utrum in Dei uoluntate sit nescimus. 834 Hoc enim necessario futurum est quod uult et prescit. Multa uero secundum inferiores causas futura sunt, et si in prescientia Dei sunt, uere futura sunt. Si autem ibi aliter sunt, potius futura sunt sicut ibi sunt, ubi prescit qui not potest falli. Futura enim senectus est in iuuene, sed futura non est si ante moriturus est. Nam secundum quasdam futurorum causas moriturus Ezechias, cuius Deus addidit quindecim annos quod ante omnia se facturum esse presciebat. Non ergo fecit quod futurum non erat. Hoc enim magis futurum erat quod presciebat. Secundum ergo inferiores causas iam finiret uitam, sed secundum Dei uoluntatem et prescientiam quod ab eterno nouerat quod tunc facturus erat, tunc erat finiturus quando finuit. Etsi enim oranti concessum est etiam orando meriturum ille presciebat et ideo necessario futurum erat. 835

---

832 Queritur utrum... quod fecit. Augustine, DGAL VI, 13 [CSEL 28 III 1, 187–188].
833 Sic adam... necessitas est. Augustine, DGAL VI, 15 [CSEL 28 III 1, 189–190].
834 Nos autem... sit nescimus. Augustine, DGAL VI, 16 [CSEL 28 III 1, 190–191].
835 Hoc enim... futurum erat. Augustine, DGAL VI 17, [CSEL 28 III 1, 191–192].
Prodixitque Dominus Deus de humo omnem lignum pulchrum uisu et ad uscendum suae. [13r] Lignum etiam uite in medio paradisi, lignumque scientie boni et mali.

de humo. disciplinas utiles unde fructus sumitur

omnem lignum. mores scilicet piorum

lignum etiam. sapientiam que in medio ordinata ne usurpet quod non est, uel deiciat quod est

lignum etiam. hec est sapientia mater omnium bonorum

lignumque. quo tacto per experientiam scitur quod sit inter bonum quod relinquitur et malum quod sequitur

lignumque. hec est transgressio mandati in experimento


---

836 Rabanus Maurus, *CG I* [PL 107:469A].

837 Rabanus Maurus, *CG I* [PL 107:469A].
latronem, sed lignum uite creatum est in paradiso corporali, sicut scriptura dicit, que res suis temporibus gestas narruit. 838

Mistice. Ligno scientie boni et mali. Anime medietas et ordinata integritas significatur. Quod in medio paradisi plantatum, et scientie boni et mali dictum, quia anima que debet in Deum extendi, si Deo deserto ad se conuersa fuerit et potentia sua sine Deo frui uolerit, pena sequente experiendo discit quid sit inter bonum quod deseruit et malum quod cecidit, et hoc erit ei gustasse de ligno scientie boni et mali. 839

Beda. Lignum etiam uite in medio paradisi, lignumque scientie boni et mali. In altero homininis signum obedientie quam debebat, in altero sacramentum uite eterne quam obediendo mereretur. Lignum uite dictum quia diuinitus accepit ut qui ex eo manducaret corpus eius stabili sanitate firmaretur, nec ulla infirmitate uel etate in deterius uel in occasum laberetur. 840

Strabus. Lignum etiam uite hanc naturaliter uitam habebat, ut qui ex eius fructu comederet, perpetua soliditate firmaretur et beata immortalitate uestiretur, nulla infirmitate uel anxietaet uel senii lassitudine uel imbecilitate fatigandus.

Augustinus. Lignum scientie boni et mali erat corporale sicut arbores alie, nec cibo noxium. Qui enim fecit omnia bona ualde, nichil mali in paradiso statuit, sed mala transgressio precepti. Oportebat autem ut homo sub Domino positus ab aliquo prohiberetur, ut esset <ei> merendi uirtus obedientia, que sola uerissime uirtus est rationali creature degenti sub Dei potestate, sicut primum et maximum uitium tumoris uelle uti sua potestate quod est inobedientia. Non erat unde se habere homo Deum cogitaret, nisi ei aliquid iuberetur. Arbor ergo non erat mala, sed scientia dicta noscendi bonum et malum quia post prohibitionem erat in illa transgressio futura, qua homo experiencing disceret inter obedientie bonum et inobedientie malum quid esset, nec de fructu qui inde nasceretur nomen positum est, sed de ipsa re que transgressionem secuta est. 841

838 Augustine, DGAL VIII, 4 [CSEL 28 III 1, 234–237].
839 Augustine, DGCM II, 12 [CSEL 91, 133].
840 Bede, IG I ii, 9 [CCCL 118A, 46–47].
841 Augustine, DGAL VIII, 6 [CSEL 28 III 1, 239–240].

2:10–2:11

Et fluuius egrediebatur de loco uoluptatis ad irrigandum paradisum. Qui inde diuiditur in quatuor capita.

*fluuius.* affluentia intere iocunditatis

*fluuius.* Christus

*de loco.* Paterno fonte

*irrigandum.* uerbo et baptismo

*paradisum.* ecclesiam

*in quatuor.* uirtutes principales

*in quatuor.* quatuor euangelia

*capita.* flumina


---

842 Augustine, *DGAL* VIII, 5 [CSEL 28 III 1, 237–238].
montis, Geon qui et Nilus non procul ab Athlante qui est finis Affrice ad occidentem, Tigris et Euphrates ex Armenia. Fertur historici Tigrim et Euphratem et Nilum plerisque locis terre absumi et paulo post emergentia solitum agere cursum. \( ^{843} \)

**Nomen uni phison.** [13v] **Ipse est qui circuit omnem terram euilath ubi nascitur aurum**

*Nomen.* mutatio oris hic significat prudentiam que omnibus omnia

*Nomen.* mutatio oris quia uiliorem faciem habet apud nos qua in paradiso

*phison.* Ganges

terram. regio est Indie que post diluuium posessa est ab Euila, filio Iethan, filii Eber, patriarche Ebreorum

*aurum.* Plinius dicit regiones Indie pre ceteris uenis aureis abundare


2:12–2:14

**et aurum illius terre optimus est. Ibibique inuenitur bdellium et lapis onichinus.**

*bdellium.* secundum plinium arbor est aromatica magnitudine oleagina cuius lacrima lucida, gustu amara, boni odoris, sed odorator infusione uini

**Et nomen fluuio secundo Geon. Ipse est qui circuit omnem terram ethiopie.**

*secundo.* hiatus terre hic est nilus, qui significat temperantiam

---

\(^{843}\) Bede, *IG* I ii, 10 [CCCL 48].

\(^{844}\) Augustine, *DGAL* VIII, 7 [CSEL 28 III 1, 240–242].
circuit. tetros mores scilicet et incentuia libidinis absorbet

Nomen uero fluminis tercii tigris. Ipse uadit contra assirios fluuuius autem quartus ipse est euphrates.

Nomen. a nimia uelocitate hec est fortitudo
uero. constanter
fluminis. aduersarios prudentie
ipse. Frugifer nec dicitur quas terras circumeat, quia in uicino irrigat terram promissionis et facile a populo qui hec lecturus erat agnosci poterat.

ipse. frugifer quia terram facit frugiferam

Onyx est lapis preciosus sic dictus quia permixtum habet candorem ad humani unguis similitudinem quia unguis grece dicitur onix. Antiqua translatio habet “carbunculum et prasium”. Carbunculus est ignei coloris, et dicitur illustrare tenebras noctis. Prasius est uiridis, unde Grece a porro quod “prason” dicitur nomen accepit.845

Mistice. Fluuuius de paradiso egrediens, affluentia est eternae iocunditatis, de qua dicitur torrente uoluptatis tue potabis eos [Ps 35:9]. Quatuor flumina quatuor principales uirtutes: Phison, qui mutatio oris interpretatur est prudentia, que ad capacitatem auditorum mutat uerba sua, unde, Omnia omnibus factus sum. [1 Cor 9:22]. Hec circuit terram que habeat aurum optimum, id est uiuendi disciplinam a terrenis sordibus decoctam que nitescit ut aurum optiimum nec falsitate uincitur, sicut carbunculus nocte non obscuratur. Habet quoque spem uiuiuiuieternaequeuiuore prasii significatur propter uiuorem qui non arescit. Gion interpretatur hiatus terre qui significat temperantiam que illicitis motibus resistit, qui Ethiopiam circuit quia tetros mores et incentuia libidinis absorbendo consumit. Tigris nimia uelocitate fortituidinem significat qui uadit contra Assirios, quia impigram aduersarius eos qui consiliis prudentie resistunt exercet actionem. Assirii enim sepe pro aduersariis ponuntur quia Israelitas sepe expugnauerunt. Euphrates frugifer interpretatur, nec contra quos uadat dicitur, quia iustitia ad omnis anime partes pertinet, quia ordo et equitas anime est qua sibi copulantur, temperantia, prudentia, fortitudo. Iustum est enim

845 Bede, IG I ii, 12 [CCCL 118A, 49–50].
ut prudens sit anima ueritatem contemplando, temperans et concupiscentiam refrenando, fortis aduersa tolerando.\textsuperscript{846}

Gregorius. Quatuor fluminibus de paradiso egredientibus, terra irrigatur. Solidum mentis nostre edificium, prudentia, temperantia, fortitudo et iustitia continent, quia his quatuor uirtutibus tota boni operis structura consurgit. Quatuor flumina paradisi terram irrigant quia dum his quatuor uirtutibus cor infunditur, ab omni desideriorum carnalium estu temperatur.\textsuperscript{847}

2:15

\textbf{Tulit ergo Dominus Deus hominem} \textsuperscript{14r} \textit{et posuit eum in paradiso uoluptatis ut operaretur et custodiret illum.}

\textit{Tulit.} assumpsit scilicet carnem et factus est caput ecclesie

\textit{operaretur.} homo ex uoluptate paradisum uel Deus hominem faciendo iustum

\textit{operaretur.} id est ut ex omnibus gentibus ecclesiam impleret

\textit{custodiret.} homo paradisum ne amitteret vnde quos dedisti mihi custodiri.

\[13v\] Ieronymus. \textit{Et sumpsit Dominus Deus hominem et posuit in paradisio uoluptatis.} Pro \textit{uoluptate} in Ebreo habet “eden”. Ipsi igitur Septuaginta nunc “Eden” interpretati sunt uoluptatem. Simmacus uero qui “paradisum florentem” ante transtulerat, hic “amenitatem” uel “delicias” posuit.\textsuperscript{848}

Gregorius. \textit{Tulit ergo Dominus Deus hominem et posuit eum in paradisio uoluptatis ut operaretur terram et custodiret.} Pensandum est quia bona prodesse nequeunt, si mala non cauentur que subripiunt. Perit omne quod agitur, nisi sollicite in humilitate custoditur. Vnde \textit{ut operaretur et custodiret.} \textit{Operatur enim qui agit bonum quod precipitur, sed quod operatur non custodit, cui hoc subrept quod prohibetur.} Vnde oportet bona semper agere, et nos ab ipsis bonis operibus caute in cogitatione custodire, ne si mente eleuant bona non sint, que non auctori militant sed elationi. De libris quoque non canonicis sed ad edificationem editis testimonium

\textsuperscript{846} Augustine, \textit{DGCM} II 13–14 [\textit{CSEL} 91, 133–135].

\textsuperscript{847} Paterius, \textit{LEVNT} I, 11 [\textit{PL} 79: 689A].

\textsuperscript{848} Jerome, \textit{HQLG} 2, 8 [\textit{CCCL} 72, 4].
proferimus; Eleazar in prelio elefantum feriens strauit, sed sub ipso occubuit. Sunt enim qui uitia superant, sed sub ipsa superbiendo succumbunt [1 Mac 6:43–46].

Mistice. *Et posuit eum in paradisum, et cetera. Ex eo quod additum est et custodiret innuitur qualis operatio esset quia in tranquillitate beate uite, ubi mors non est omnis operatio est custodire quod tenes.* Datum est preceptum ut de omni ligno paradisi sumeret, sed non de ligno scientie boni et mali, id est non sic eo frueretur ut integritatem nature sue usurpando uetitum uiolare.


---


850 *Et posuit eum... quod tenes.* Augustine, *DGCM* II, 15 [*CSEL* 91, 135–136].

851 Augustine, *DGAL* VIII, 8 [*CSEL* 28 III 1, 242–243].

852 *Gemina enim... et custodiret.* Augustine, *DGAL* VIII, 9 [*CSEL* 28 III 1, 243–245].
accepit et preceptum quo custodiret, id est quo conservatu non perderet. Rem enim suam non
custodisse dicitur, qui sic agit, ut perdat etiamsi aliis sit salua. Sed precipe dicendum est, ut
ipsum hominem operetur Deus et custodiret. *Operatur homo terram* non ut faciet esse terram
sed cultam et fructuosam et Deus hominem quem creauit ut esset. homo operatur ut iustus sit si
ab illo per superbiam non discedit. Initium enim superbie hominis apostare a Deo. 853

2:16–2:17

**Preceptisque eis Dominus, Ex omni ligno paradisi comede.**

*Ex omni.* id est ex omni virtute ad beate uivendum utere

**De ligno autem scientie boni et mali ne comedas. In quocumque enim die comedest ex eo
morte morieris.**

*De ligno.* quasi medietatem qua Deo subes et creature praees non corrumpas
 scientie. proprii arbitrii quod in medio est positum ad cognoscendum bonum et malum,
de quo qui relicta gratia Dei gustauerit morte moriatur
 morte. anime Deo discedente qui eius uita uel corporis quam in fine uite accepit sed
statim necessitatem moriendi incurrir
 morte. priuatus uita beata
 morte. Jer. simacus melius mortalis eris
 morte. duplex mors significatur

**Preceptique eis Dominus ex omni ligno paradisi comede.** A ligno prohibitus est quod malum non
erat, ut ipsa precepti conservatio bonum, transgressio malum, nec melius consideratur quantum
malum sit inobedientia, cum ideo reus factus sit homo, quia prohibitus rem tetigit quam si non
prohibitus tetigisset, non peccasset. Si enim uenenosam herbam prohibitus tetigeris, pena
sequestur. Sed si nemo prohibuisset, similiter sequeretur. Si uero prohibetur res tangi que non
tangenti sed prohiberet obsit, sicut aliena pecunia, ideo prohibitio est peccatum quia prohibenti
damnosum. Sed cum tangitur quod nec tangenti obest, si non prohibetur nec cuilibet si tangatur,
quare prohibetur, nisi ut per se bonum obedientie et malum inobedientie monstreter? A peccante
autem tantum appetitum est non esse sub dominatione Dei, quando admissum est a quo debebat
sola iussio dominantis dehortari, ut Dei uoluntas humane proponeretur. Dominus uideat quod

853 *Hoc est forte... apostare a Deo.* Augustine, *DGAL* VIII, 10 [*CSEL* 28 III 1, 246–247].
iubet, seruus faciet. Magna est utilitas homini quod Deo seruit, qui iubendo utile facit.\textsuperscript{854} Grandi ruine patet uoluntas propria, si Dei uoluntati se extollendo proponat. Hoc expertus homo didicit quid sit inter bonum obedientie et malum inobedientie.\textsuperscript{855}

\textit{De ligno autem scientie boni et male ne comedas.} Lignum ex eo quod inde secutum est nomen accepit. Malum enim nisi exprimento non sentiremus, quia nullum esset nisi fecissemus quia malum natura non est, sed amissio boni sic uocata est. Si autem obedientes essent, nec contra preceptum peccassent, lignum tamen scientie boni et mali diceretur, quia hoc accideret si usurparetur. Sed inquiiunt quomodo intelligeret homo lignum esse scientie boni et mali, qui usum malum omnino nesciebat? Sed ex contrariis contraria noscuntur, ut ex plenitudo inanitas et auditum de silentio iudicamus. Sic ex uita que inerat potuit cognosci priuatio uite que mors uocatur. Vita autem dulcis erat, quam amittere deuitabant, nec peccatum persuaderetur, nisi ex illo non esse morituri prius dicerentur id est quod amabam non amissuri.\textsuperscript{856}

Beda. \textit{In quocumque die comederis}, et cetera. Non ait “si comederis mortalis eris” sed \textit{morte morieris}. Mortuus est enim homo in anima cum peccauit, quia recessit ab eo Deus qui est uita anime quam secuta est mors corporis, discendente ab illo anima que est uita eius que ade euenit, cum presentem uitam finiuit. Potest ita intelligi quod quando peccauerunt, statim morte illa puniti sunt de qua dicitur, \textit{Infelix ergo homo, quis me liberabit de corpore mortis huius?}[Rm 7:24] et alibi, \textit{Corpus mortuum est propter peccatum} [Rb 8:10]. Non ait “mortale” sed \textit{mortuum} quamuis mortale, quia moriturum. Non credendum est ita fuisse illa corpora, sed licet animalia nondum spiritualia, non tamen mortua que scilicet necesse esset mori, quod in Dei preuaricationis factum est.\textsuperscript{857}


\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{854} Augustine, \textit{DGAL}, VIII 13 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 251–252].
\textsuperscript{855} Augustine, \textit{DGAL}, VIII 14 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 252–254].
\textsuperscript{856} Augustine, \textit{DGAL}, VIII 16 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 255–256].
\textsuperscript{857} Bede, \textit{IG} I ii, 17 [\textit{CCCL} 118A, 52].
\end{footnotesize}
*enim die comederitis ex eo morte moriemini.* Forte quia facturus erat mulierem, sic precepit ut per uirum ad mulierem perueniret. Vnde Paulus, *Si quid discere volunt, domi uiros suos interroget* [1 Cor 14:35].

Queritur quomodo loqui potuerit, uel loquentem intelligere, qui non didicerant uel inter loquentes crescendo uel magisterio. Sed eos tales Deus fecerat, qui possent loqui, et si essent discere ab aliis.

Si queritur quomodo Deus ista locutus sit, non proprie a nobis comprehendi potest. Certum est tamen aut per suam substantiam loqui, aut per creaturam subditam sibi. Sed per substantiam suam non loquitur, nisi ad creandas omnis creaturas et ad spirituales illuminandas cum iam possunt capere locutionem, que est in uerbo Dei. His autem qui capere non possent per creaturam loquitur aut spiritualem sicut in extasi uel in somnis similitudine corporalium rerum aut etiam per corporalem dum sensibus corporis apparat aliqua specie uel insonante uoce. Si ergo Adam poterat capere locutionem Dei quam per substantiam suam prebet angelis, mentem eius ad oram mouit, miro modo et ineffabili. Si autem adhuc necessaria erat sanctioris creature auctoritas, qua cognosceret iussionem Dei sicut nobis prophetie et angeli, locutus est ei Deus per aliam creaturam uocibus quas intelligeret. Postea uero *audierunt uocem Domini in paradiso deambulantis,* non per ipsam substantiam, sed per subditam ipsi creaturam.

De Christo dicitur, *Priusquam sciat puer bonum aut malum contemnet malitiam* [Is 7:16]. Hec duo aliter sciuntur per prudentiam boni, aliter per experientiam mali. Per prudentiam boni malum scitur et non sentitur. Tenet enim bonum ne sentiatur malum. Per experientiam mali scitur bonum. Quid enim amiserit sentit, cui amisco bono mali fuerit. *Puer ergo antequam sciret* per experientiam *bonum* quo careret, aut *malum* quod bono amisso sentiret, *contempsit malum* ut eligeret bonum, id est noluit amittere quod habebat, ne sentiret amittendo quod amittere non debebat.

---

858 Augustine, *DGAL* VIII 17 [*CSEL* 28 III 1, 257].
859 Augustine, *DGAL* VIII 16 [*CSEL* 28 III 1, 256].
860 Augustine, *DGAL* VIII 27 [*CSEL* 28 III 1, 266–267].
861 Augustine, *DGAL* VIII 14 [*CSEL* 28 III 1, 252–254].
Dixit quoque Dominus Deus. Forte temporalibus uocibus uel ratio ipsa memorata est, que in uerbo Dei principaliter est. 

862 Qui sentiunt ad gignendos filios in paradiso misceri non licere, forte putant omnem concubitum peccatum esse. 

863 Quod qui non faciunt sed fecunditatem carnis propter successionem mortalitatis diuinitus datam sentiunt, primos homines potuisse concumbere non consentiunt, nisi propter peccatum. Sed si recte possunt successores queri morturis, rectius queruntur socii uicturis. 

864 Illi autem animales quidem sed non morituri nisi peccassent, accepturi angelicam formam celestemque qualitatem, ubi peccauerunt mox membris eorum egritudo letalis concepsta est. Et si enim nondum spirituale sed animale corpus erat, non huius mortis erat de qua et cum qua nati sumus. Cur ergo non credamus illos ante peccatum genitalibus membris ad procreationem imperare potuisse, sicut ceteris in quolibet opere anima sine ulla molestia et pruritu voluntatis habet? Cur etiam incredibile uideatur Deum tali corpora, ut si non peccassent illis membris sicut pedibus imperarent, ne cum ardore seminarent uel cum dolore pararentur, sed post peccatum motum legis illius que repugnat legi mens meruerunt, quam nuptie ordinant, continenta cohibet, ut sicut de peccato factum est supplicium, de supplicio fiat meritum? 

865 Facta ergo feminam uiro ex uiro in eo sexu in ea forma et distinctione membrorum qua feminine note sunt que peperit Chain et Abel, qui dubitat cogit omnia nutare que credimus. Quid autem iustius quam ut non ad omnem nutum seruiat corpus quasi famulus anime, sicut Domino noluit ipsa seruire, siue utrumque ex parentibus fiat, corpus ex corpore, anima ex anima, siue alio modo fiat anima? 
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[14v] Dixit quoque Dominus Deus, Non est bonum esse hominem solum. Faciamus ei adiutorium simile sui.

862 Augustine, *DGAL* IX 2 [CSEL 28 III 1, 269–271].
863 Qui sentiunt... peccatum esse. Augustine, *DGAL* IX 8 [CSEL 28 III 1, 276].
864 Quod qui... socii uirtutis. Augustine, *DGAL* IX 9 [CSEL 28 III 1, 276–278].
865 Illi autem... fiat meritum. Augustine, *DGAL* IX 10 [CSEL 28 III 1, 278–280].
866 Facta ergo... fiat anima? Augustine, *DGAL* IX, 11 [CSEL 28 III 1, 280–281].
Faciamus. quia in homine suscepto ecclesia Deo copulata est
Faciamus. feminam ad procreandos filios

Dixit quoque Dominus Deus. Sicut loquitur quibusdam sanctis in ipsis. Vnde, audiam quid loquatur in me Dominus Deus [Ps 84:9], aut aliqua ipsi homini facta est per angelum reuelatio, aut in somnis aut in extasi, aut aliter sicut prophetis, uel per corporalem creaturam uox sonuit sicut de nube hic est filius meus [Lk 9:35]. Sed si modum nescimus, Deum tamen dixisse non dubitamus. Si autem uoce corporali uel temporaliter expressa similitudine corporis dixit, non per suam substantiam sed per subditam creaturam, sicut uisus est albo capite sicut lana et inferius sicut auricalcüm [Rv 1:14–15]. Intelligamus ergo quid dixerit, quia adiutorium homini simile faciendum fuisse eterna ueritas habet, et in illa audit qui potest cognoscere, quid quare creatum sit. 867 Erat autem faciendum propter filios creandos, sicut adiutorium semini terra est, ut uirgultum ex utroque nascatur. Vnde, crescite et multiplicamini et cetera. Hec ratio coniunctionis nec post peccatum penamque defecit, secundum quam terra hominibus plena est. Emisse quidem de paradiso, conuenerunt et genuerunt, sed potuerunt in paradisio eis nuptie esse honorabiles, et thorus immaculatus sine ardore libidinis, sine labore pariendi non ut morientibus patribus filii succedereant, sed in aliqua forma statu manebant, et de ligno uite uigorem sumentibus, et filii ad eundem producerentur statum, donee impleto numero sine morte animalia corpora in aliam qualitatem transirent, quia omnino regenti spiritui deseriuerent et solo spiritu uiuificante sine corporis alimentis uiuerent. 868 Cur ergo non coierunt in paradiso? Quia creada muliere mox facta est transgressio, et eiciunt sunt de paradisio. [15r] Quantum enim fuerit inter eos factos, et natum Chain, scriptura non exprimit, uel quia Deus nondum iussisset ut coirent, et poterat diuina expectari auctoritas, ubi concupiscentia non urgebatur. Deus autem non iussisset, quia casum eorum presciebat. Vnde genus humanum mortale propagandum erat. 869 Si autem parentes filiis cedere oportebat, ut per successiones certus numeros exploraret, potuerunt genitis filiis perfectaque humani officii iustitia ad meliora transferri, non per mortem sed per aliquam mutationem, aut illam summam qua receptis corporibus fient sancti sicut angeli in celis, aut

867 Dixit quoque... creatum sit. DGAL IX, 2 [CSEL 28 III 1, 269–271].
868 Erat autem... alimentis uiuerent. Augustine, DGAL IX, 3 [CSEL 28 III 1, 271–272].
869 Cur ergo... propagandum erat. Augustine, DGAL IX, 4 [CSEL 28 III 1, 272–273].
aliquam inferiorem que haberet statum meliorem quam habet hoc corpus uel que prius facta sunt, uiri ex limo terre, mulieris ex uiri carne. Non enim putandum est Helyam esse sicut sancti erunt accepta retributione, uel sicut homines qui adhuc uiiunt. Si quis autem putat quod Helyas hec mereri non posset si uxorem duxisset et filios procreasset, creditur enim non habuisse, quia scriptura non dixit, quamuis de celebatu eius nichil dixerit, enoch genitis filiiis Deo placens, non mortuus sed translatus est. Similiter Adam et Eua transferre possent. Nam si Enoch et Helyas in Adam mortui et gestantes in carne propaginem mortis, unde creduntur ad hanc uitam ut moriantur redituri, nunc tamen in alia uita sunt ubi ante resurrectionem carnis antequam corpus animale fiat spirituale nec morbo nec senectute deficiunt, quantomagis primis hominibus daretur si non peccassent, ut in meliorem statum filiiis genitis cederent unde finito seculo cum posteritate in angelicam formam non per mortem sed per Dei uirtutem mutarentur. Facta est ergo mulier generandi causa que non est subtrahenda. Apud Deum enim excellit uirginitas, quia cum ad implendum sanctorum numerum largissima suppetit copia, libido non sibi uendicat, quod iam sufficiende procreata necessitudo non postulat. Infirmitas quoque prona in ruinam turpitudinis excipitur honestate nuptiali, et quod sanis officium, egretis est remedium. Incontinentia quidem malum, sed non ideo conubium non bonum, quo incontinentes copulantur. Nec propter illud malum, culpabile bonum, sed propter hoc bonum ueniale illud malum. Bonum enim nuptiarum non potest esse peccatum, hoc est fides, proles, sacramentum; fides, ne preter uinculum coniugale cum altero uel altera coeatur; proles, ut amanter suscipiatur, nutriatur, religioso educetur; sacramentum, ut coniugium non separetur, et dimissus uel dimissa nec causa proles alteri coniungatur. Hec est regula nuptiarum qua nature decoratur fecunditas incontinentie regitur praueitas.  
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[15r] Formatis igitur Dominus Deus de humo cunctis animantibus terre et uniuersis uolatilibus celi. adduxit ea ad Adam ut uideret quod uocaret ea. Omnem eium quod uocauit Adam anime uiuentis ipsum est nomen eius.

---

870 Si autem parentes... uirtutem mutarentur. Augustine, DGAL IX, 6 [CSEL 28 III 1, 273–275].
871 Facta est... regitur praauitas. Augustine, DGAL IX, 7 [CSEL 28 III 1, 275–276].
Deus supra uolatilia dixit produci ex aquis nunc omnia ex humo formari, sed in terra aquas comprehendit uel sub audiendum reliquit, quasi et uniuersis uolatilia celi de aquis celi. nutu quo condidit uel per angelos ut sic intelligeret Deum suum.

Adduxit ea ad adam et cetera. Non sicut uenatores uel aucupes, nec uox iussionis de nube facta est, quam rationales anime intelligere solent. Hanc enim naturaliter non intelligunt bestie uel aues, sed per ministeria angelorum, qui capiunt in uerbo eius quid quando fieri debeat. Omnis enim anima etiam irrationalis mouetur iussis, sed rationalis uoluntatis arbitrio consentit, uel non. Irrationalis que hoc non habet per suo genere iussu tacta popellitur. Cum autem iussa per angelos ministrantur, peruenit iussio Dei non solum ad homines, pecudes et aues, sed etiam ad pisces, sicut ad cetum qui glutiuit Ionam, nec solum ad ista maiora, sed etiam ad uermiculum. ⁸⁷² De piscibus non dicitur quod adam eis imposuerit nomina, sed credibile est paulatim cognitis pro diuersitate gentium esse imposita. Notandum autem quod non dixit formatis uolatilibus de aquis sed de terra secundum uniuersalem appellationem terre qua dicitur. ⁸⁷³ Deus qui fecit celum et terram siue de arida siue de aquis quecumque de terra creatana sunt. ⁸⁷⁴

Historice. Adduxit ea ad adam et cetera. Vel sexto die sicut ordo narrationis uidentur continere, uel longo tempore post quando diuersa in diuersis locis forte uident. Quod autem ad eum adducta sunt, hec est ratio scilicet quod futurus erat dominus super omnia illa, et ideo debeat ut per arbitrio suo daret eis nomina.

Omne quod uocauit Adam anime uiuentis et cetera. Videtur primam linguam humano generi fuisse ebream, quia nomina que usque ad diuisionem linguarum in genesi legimus, constat esse illius. ⁸⁷⁵
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---

⁸⁷² *Non sicut... ad uermiculum. DGAL IX, 14 [CSEL 28 III 1, 284–286].*

⁸⁷³ *De piscibus... qua dicitur. DGAL IX, 12 [CSEL 28 III 1, 281–282].*

⁸⁷⁴ *Deus qui... creatana sunt. Augustine, DGAL IX, 1 [CSEL 28 III 1, 269].*

⁸⁷⁵ *Bede, IG I, iii, 19–20 [CCCL 118A, 55–56].*
Appelluitque adam nominibus suis cuncta animantia et uniuersa uolatilia celi et omnis bestias terre. Adam uero non inueniebatur adiutor similis eius.

Appelluitique. Ebrea lingua que sola fuit ante confusionem turris nominibus. significans gentes que salve fierent in ecclesia per Christi nomen accepturas quod prius non habebant, unde uocabo seruos meos nomine alio.

Adam. Nullus fidelis uel iustus Christo equari potest, speciosus enim forma per filiis hominum. Nemo enim poterat generis humanum liberare nisi ipse unde nemo inuentus est dignus aperire librum et cetera.

inueniebatur. inter omnia animantia sibi adducta inueniebatur. Apostolis Dei adiutores sumus. Hii non inueniebantur ante Christi dormitionem

[15v] Adam uero non inueniebatur adiutor similis eius et cetera. Videndum est quomodo facta sit mulieris formatio, quod mistice dicitur “edificatio”. Angeli nullam possunt creare naturam, ergo nec formare costam in mulierem, nec carnis supplementum in coste locum, non quod nichil agant ut aliquid creetur, sed non ideo creatores, sicut nec agricole segetum aut arborum. 876 Solus Deus, id est Trinitas, creator est. Facta ergo femina a Deo etiamsi costa ministrata sit per angelos, sicut uir factus ex femina nullo concubitu, cum semen Abrahe dispositum est per angelos in manu mediatrix. 877 Sed queritur an ratio, quam primis operibus Deus creauit, id haberet, ut secundum ipsam ex uiri latere feminam fieri necesse esset, an hoc tantum, ut fieri posset, ut autem ita fieri necesse esset non ibi iam conditum sed in Deo erat absconditum. Omnis nature iustissimus 878 cursus habet naturales leges secundum quas et spiritus uite qui creatus est habet appetitus suos quodammodo terminatos, quos etiam mala uoluntas non possit excedere, et elementa mundi corporei diffinitam uim qualitatemque suam, quidquodque ualeat vel non, quid de quo fieri uel non. Super hunc naturalem cursum creator habet apud se posse de omnibus facere aliud quam eorum naturalis ratio habet, ut scilicet uirga arida repente floreat, fructum gignat, et in iuuentute sterilis femina in senectute pariat, ut loquatur asina, et huiusmodi. Dedit autem Deus naturis ut ex his etiam hec fieri possent, non ut in naturali motu

876 Adam uero...aut arborem. Augustine, DGAL IX 15 [CSEL 28 III 1, 286–287].
877 Solus Deus...manu mediatoris. Augustine, DGAL IX, 16 [CSEL 28 III 1, 289–290].
878 A contemporary addition adds an alternate reading: “uel usitatissimus”
haberent. Habet autem in se absconditas quorundam factorum causas, quas rebus non inseruit, easque implet non opere prouidentie quo nature subsistunt ut sint, sed quo illas administrat ut uluerit, quas ut uoluit condidit. Omnia ergo que ad gratiam significandam non naturali motu rerum, sed mirabiliter factura sunt, eorum abscondite cause in Deo fuerunt quorum unum erat quod mulier facta est de latere uiri dormientis, que per ipsum firma factura, quia ex osse eius. Ille propter ipsam infirmus, quia non costa sed caro suppleta. Non habuit prima rerum conditio quando sexta die dictum est, *masculum et feminam creauit eos*, ut femina sic fieret, sed ut fieri posset, nec contra causas quas Deus uoluntate instituit mutabili uoluntate aliquid faceret. Extasis ergo recte intelligitur ad hoc inmissa, ut mens Ade particeps angelice curie, et intrans in sanctuarium Dei nouissima intelligeret. Vnde euigilans prophetico spiritu eructant, *Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis*, et cetera. Que uerba cum Ade fuisse scriptura dicat Christus in euangelium Deum dixisse declarat, ut intelligamus per illam extasi Adam hoc diuinitus dixisse. Mistice. *Adam uero non inueniebatur* adiutor et cetera. Facta est mulier in adiutorium uiri, quia adhuc erat quod fieret ut non solum anima corpori dominaretur, sed etiam uirilis ratio subiugaret sibi animalem partem suam, per quod adiutorium imperat corpori, ad cuius exemplum femina facta, quam ratio uiro subiugat ut quod in duobus planius apparat, id est in masculo et femina, in uno consideretur, ut appetitum anime per quem de membris corporis operamur, mens habeat subiugatum, et iuste regat adiutorem suum. Demonstratur etiam homini quanto melior sit pecoribus que adducta nominatim distinguist, et discreuit iudicio rationis. Sed hic intellectus facilis, ille uero difficilior, quo intelligit aliud esse rationale quod regit, aliud animale quod regitur. In quo datum est ei irrationales motus discernere, et rationis dominio cooperante gratia subiugare.
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---

879 *Sed queritur ...motu haberent.* Augustine, *DGAL* IX, 17 [CSEL 28 III 1, 290–292].

880 *Habet autem... aliquid faceret.* Augustine, *DGAL* IX, 18 [CSEL 28 III 1, 292–293].

881 *Extasis ergo... diuinitus dixisse.* Augustine, *DGAL* IX, 19 [CSEL 28 III 1, 294].

882 *Augustine, DGCM II, 15–16 [CSEL 91, 136–137].*
Immisit ergo Dominus Deus soporem in Adam. Cumque obdormisset tulit unam de costis eius et repleuit carnem pro ea.

*Dominus*. Pater

*soporem*. per mortem crucis

*adam*. Christum

*tulit*. causa misterii non de terra plasmatur mulier sicut uir

*costis*. Ecclesia in Christo est fortis

*et repleuit*. quia Christus pro Ecclesia infirmus, alii posuit carnem postea Christus

scilicet moriendo pro ecclesia

[16r] *Et edificauit* Dominus Deus costam quam tulerat de adam in mulierem et adduxit eam ad Adam.

*Et edificauit*. ecclesia templum Dei per sacramenta de eius latere exunctia generata

*mulierem*. per fidem

*eam*. ecclesiam

*Adam*. Christum

Mistice. *Immisit ergo Dominus Deus soporem in adam* et cetera. Non possunt hec corporeis oculis uideri, sed quanto quis a uisibilibus ad secreta intelligentie quasi obdormiendo secesserit, melius et sincerius uidet. Ipsa ergo cognitio qua cognoscitur aliuad esse rationem que imperet aliuad quod obtemperet, quasi effectio mulieris est de costa uiri, propter coniunctionem significandam, ut hinc parti quisque dominet et fiat quasi coniugalis in se ipso, perfecta sapientia indiget cuius contemplatio secreta et a sensu corporis remota, que per soporem intelligitur. Tunc enim ordinatissime caput mulieris est uir, caput uiri est Christus. 883 In isto loco carnem posuit, non ut caro carnalem concupiscientiam significet, sed affectum dilectionis, qua quisque diligit animam suam, et non est durus ut eam contemnat, quo diligit quisque cui preest. 884 Vocauit ergo Adam uxorem suam tanquam potior et dixit, *Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis* et cetera. *Os de ossibus* propter fortitudinem, et *caro de carne* propter temperantiam. He due uirtutes ad inferiorem animi partem pertinent, quam prudentia rationalis regit. Vnde hec

883 *Immisit ergo... uiri est Christus*. Augustine, *DGCM* II 16 [CSEL 91, 137–138].

884 *In isto loco... cui preest*. Augustine, *DGCM* II 17 [CSEL 91, 138–139].
pars animi, “uirago” dicta, tanquam a uiro diriuata.\textsuperscript{885} Quod autem sequitur, \textit{propter hoc relinquit homo patrem et matrem}, prophetia est ad sacramentum Christi et ecclesie referenda.\textsuperscript{886}

[16r] Augustinus. Si queritur unde animam acceperit Christus, mallem audire meliores atque doctiores, tamen pro meo captu libentius respondeo non de Adam\textsuperscript{887} quam de Adam.\textsuperscript{888} Si uero non secundum animam, sed tamen secundum carnem dicimus Leui fuisse in Abraham, ibi erat et Christus, qui secundum carnem ex Abraham et ipse ergo decimatus est. Que est ergo differentia sacerdotii Christi et Leuitici, quod Leui decimatus est a Melchisedech, nisi quia necesse est aliquo modo ibi Christum non fuisse? Nam secundum carnem ibi fuit, secundum animam non fuit. Non est ergo anima Christi de traduce preuaricationis. Sed dicendum est quamuis nullius anima sit in lumbris patris, secundum carnem tamen in lumbis Abrahe decimatum Leui, Christum non decimatum, quia secundum rationem seminallem ibi fuit Leui, qua ratione per concubitum venturus in matrem, secundum quam non erat ibi caro Christi, quamuis secundum ipsum ibi fuerit marie caro. Leuide carnis concupiscientia nascitur, Christus secundum solam corporalem substantiam, in Abraham decimabatur quod curabatur, non unde curabatur.\textsuperscript{889} Sed si dicitur, sicut potuit ibi esse secundum carnem et non decimari, ita secundum animam, respondetur, si potuit de anima fieri quod de carne dictum est, ita est de traduce anima Christi, ut labere preuaricationis non traxerit. Si autem sine reatu non posset inde esse non est inde. Cetere anime de parentibus an desuper sint, uincant qui potueruit. Ego adhuc inter utrosque moueor, aliquando sic, aliquando autem sic. Ad omnia paria uel pene paria ex utroque latere rationum munimenta pronuntiarem, nisi sententia eorum qui animas ex patribus creari putant de baptismo paruulorum preponderaret, de quibus quid respondere possit, nondum michi occurrit.\textsuperscript{890}

\textsuperscript{885} \textit{Vocauit ergo... a uiro diriuata}. Augustine, \textit{DGCM} II 18 [\textit{CSEL} 91, 139–140].

\textsuperscript{886} \textit{Quod autem... et ecclesie referenda}. Augustine, \textit{DGCM} II 19 [\textit{CSEL} 91, 140].

\textsuperscript{887} Augustine’s text reads “ut de Adam”. \textit{DGAL} X 18 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 329].

\textsuperscript{888} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} 10 18 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 329–330].

\textsuperscript{889} \textit{Si uero...non unde curabatur}. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} X 20 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 322 324].

\textsuperscript{890} \textit{Sed si dicitur...nondum michi occurrit}. Augustine, \textit{DGAL} X 21 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 324–325].
Gregorius. *Immisit Dominus soporem in adam et cetera.* Culmen contemplationis non attingimus, si non ab exterioris cure oppressione cessemus. Nec nos ipsos intuemur, ut sciamus aliud esse in nobis rationale quod regit, aliud animale quod regitur, nisi ad secretum silentii recurrentes ab exteriori perturbatione sopiamur. Quod bene Adam dormiens figurauit, de cuius mox latere mulier processit. Qui enim ad interiora intelligenda rapitur, a rebus uisibilibus oculos claudit, et tunc intelligit in se ipso aliud esse quod regere debeat tanquam uir, aliud tanquam femina quod regatur. 891

Augustinus. Qui putant animam de anima sicut carnem de carne fieri, dicunt quia Deus unam animam fecit, sufflando in faciem uiri, ut ex illa cetere crearentur. Quoniam primo Adam formatus est, deinde Eu, et unde ille corpus et animam habuerit dictum est, sed non de illa quod flatu Dei sit animata, tanquam utrumque de uiro sit ductum, qui iam fuerat animatus. Sed si propterea putant animam mulieris ex anima uiri, quia scriptum non est quod eam Deus sufflando animauerit, cur ex uiro animatam credunt, cum hoc non sit scriptum? Si uero Deus omnis animas sicut prima facit, ideo de aliis scriptura tacuit, quia posset quod in una factum est de ceteris intelligi. Nam si aliud fiebat in femina quam in uiro, ut ex carne animata anima eius duceretur, non sicut uiri aliunde corpus, aliunde anima quod aliter fiebat, scriptura tacere non debuit, ne ita factum putaremus, sicut iam didiceramus. Quia ergo non dixit ex anima uiri factam animam mulieris, inuuit nichil aliud putandum quam de uiro fuerat dictum. 892
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*Dixitque adam, hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis et caro de carne mea. Hec uocabitur uirago quoniam de uiro supta est.*

*hoc.* quia Ecclesia Christi corpus est secundum Apostolum ex carne eius, et ossibus id est constans ex infirmis et fortibus membris

*hoc.* quia in ceteris simile sibi adiutorium non inuenit et quia non ex sua substantia sed ex aquis et terra esse nouerat

*ossibus.* in extasi prophetie spiritu intellexit costam sibi esse subductam et in mulierem formatam.

---

891 Paterius, *LEVNT* 1, 13 [PL 79:689C–689D].

892 Augustine, DGAL X 1 [CSEL 28 III 1, 295–296].
uirago. sic a Christo Christianum nomen datum est Ecclesie

uirago. Similiter in Ebreo congruit, quia ab is, quod est uir, issa, id est femina dicitur.

Theodocio aliam ethimologiam suspicatus est dicens, hec uocabitur assumptio, quia ex uiro sumpta est. Issa enim secundum uarietatem accentus etiam assumptionem sonat.

uiro. Christi scilicet latere

2:24

Quam ob rem relinquit homo patrem suum et matrem, [16v] et adherebit uxori sue et erunt duo in carne una.

Quam. formam serui accipiens

Quam. Exiui a Patre et ueni in mundum [Jn 16:28].

homo. uerbum caro factum

matrem. id est sinagoge obseruantiam, que mater Christi secundum carnem

adherebit. ecclesie

erunt. Christus et ecclesia

in carne. quia unum corpus caput et membra

Mistice. Quod per historiam completum est in Adam, per prophetiam significat Christum, qui reliquit patrem, id est non sic apparuit hominibus, sicut est apud patrem. Et matrem, id est sinagoge carnalem obseruantiam, de qua natus est secundum carnem. Et adhesit uxor, id est ecclesie. Ut sint duo in carne una, est enim caput ecclesie, et ipsa caro eius, qui soporatus est somno passionis, ut ei coniunx, id est ecclesiam, formaretur. Vnde, ego dormiui et soporatus sum et cetera [Ps 3:6]. Ergo formata est ecclesia de latere eius, qui ex semine Dauid secundum carnem, tanquam de limo terre, cum homo non esset qui operaretur in terra, quia nemo in uirgine operatus de qua natus Christus. Fons ascendebat de terra et irrigabat faciem terre. Facies, id est dignitas, terre, mater Domini, quam irriguit spiritus, ut de limo tali ille homo fieret, qui constitutus est in paradiso, id est in uoluntate patris. Vt operaretur et custodiret impleret, scilicet, et conseruaret. 893 Preceptum enim nos accepimus in illo qui ait. Quod uni ex minimis meis fecistis mihi fecistis [Mt 25:40]. Lignum autem paradisi [16v] spirituales significat

893 Augustine, DGCM II 37, [CSEL 91, 160–162].
delicias. Fructus spiritus est gaudium, pax, et huiusmodi. Lignum scientie boni et mali non debemus tangere, id est de natura que nobis media est superbire, ne decepti experiamur quid sit inter catholicam fidem et fallacias hereticorum. Ita enim peruenimus ad notitiam boni et mali. Oportet enim hereses esse, ut probati manifesti fiant. Serpens enim hereticorum uenena prefigurauit.  

2:25

**Erat autem uterque nudus. Adam scilicet et uxor eius et non erubescebant.**

*nudus*. uelamine duplicitatis
*erubescebant*. quia sine macula et ruga
*erubescebant*. quia nullum motum carnis sentiebant

Erat autem uterque nudus, et cetera. Si in uerbis Dei vel cuiuslibet propetie aliquid dicitur, quod ad litteram absurde intelligatur, figurate dictum ob significationem, tamen esse dictum non est dubitandum. Corpora uero duorum hominum in paradiso uere nuda, erant nec erubescebant, quia nullam legem in membris senserant, legi mentis repugnantem que inobedientiam secuta est. Nichil putabant uelandum quia nichil senserant refrenandum.

Mistice. Erat autem uterque nudus et cetera. Quod nudi erant nec erubescebant, simplicitatem anime et castitatem significat. Vnde despondi uos uni uiro uirginem castam exibere Christo. Timeo autem ne, sicut serpens euam seduixit, [del. a] ita corruppantur sensus uestri et cetera. [2 Cor 11:2–3]. Serpens diabolum significat qui non est simplex. Vnde sequitur, *Serpens erat callidior cunctis animantibus*, In quo significatur uersutia eius. Paradisus, uita beata, in qua iam serpens non erat quia diabolus iam erat. Locutio ista, temptatio occulta sicut accessit ad iudam persuadens ut ihesum traderet, quando *inrauit in cor eius* [Lk 22:3]. Sed uir repellit qui paradisum incolit, sed per mulierem decipit, quia ratio nostra ad consensum non deducitur, nisi delectatio mota fuerit in parte animi, que debet obtemperare rationi, ut uiro rectori, nec aliter

---

894 Augustine, *DGCM* II 38, [CSEL 91, 162–164].
895 Augustine, *DGAL* XI, 1 [CSEL 28 III 1, 335].
896 *Erat autem... sensus uestri et cetera*. Augustine, *DGCM* II 19, [CSEL 91, 140].
quis in peccatum labitur. In serpente suggestio, in muliere libido, consensus rationis in uiro. Si cupiditas mota est, mulieri persuasum est, si ratio consentit suadenti libidini, a beata uita tanquam a paradiso expellitur homo et imputatur peccatum, etsi non sequatur factum, et in consensu conscientia rea tenetur.\textsuperscript{897}

3:1

\textit{Sed et serpens erat callidior cunctis animantibus terre que fecerat Dominus Deus. Qui dixit ad mulierem, Cur precepit uobis Deus ut non comederis de omni ligno paradisi?}

\textit{Sed et.} diabolus uel error hereticus

\textit{callidior.} quia filii tenebrarum sapientiores sunt filii lucis \textit{in generatione sua} [Lk 16:8]

\textit{callidior.} quia plenus demonio

\textit{Qui.} non Christum sed Christianum fallit diabolus aut hereticus


\textit{Sed et serpens erat} et cetera. Alii “prudentissimus” translatiue. Quidam codices habent “sapientissimus”, non proprie sicut in bono solet accipi sapientia Dei, uel angelorum, uel anime rationalis, sed sicut apes et formicas dicimus sapientes, propter opera sapientiam imitantia. Quamuis serpens non rationali anima sed spirito diabolico possit sapientissimus dici, quia mali angeli superbia deiecti natura tamen sunt excellentiores omnibus bestiis propter eminentiam rationis. Non ergo mirum si diabolus suo spirito implens serpemtem, sicut uates implebat, sapientissimum reddiderat omnium bestiarum secundum animam uiuam et irrationalem uiuentium? Ita enim sapientia dicitur in malo, sicut astutia in bono, cum Latine proprie sapientes in bono accipiantur, astuti autem, male cordati. Nec putandum est quod diabolus serpemtem per quem temptaret elegerit, sed cum decipere cuperet non potuit nisi per quod animal posse permissus est. Nocendi enim uoluntas inest cuique a se sed potestas a Deo.\textsuperscript{898}


\textsuperscript{897} Serpens diabolum... rea tenetur. Augustine, \textit{DGCM} II 20–21 [CSEL 91, 141–143].

\textsuperscript{898} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} XI 2–3 [CSEL 28 III 1, 335–337.]

Strabus. Serpens erat callidior, et cetera. Sic loquebatur diabolus per serpentem ignorantem, sicut per energuminos uel fanaticos. Quemcumque enim arripit, intellectum ac rationem tollit. Spiritus uero bonus quoscumque gratia repleuerit, uidentes et intelligentes facit. Vnde, Spiritus prophetarum subiectus est prophetis [1 Cor 14:32].

Ieronymus. In Ebreo habet “arom”, quod Aquila et Theodocio nequam et uersipellem interpretati sunt. 900

Qui dixit ad mulierem, Cur precepit uobis, et cetera. Inexcusabilis est preuaricatio mulieris, quia memor erat precepti Dei. Obluiuo tamen unius precepti et tam necessarii, culpa esset negligentiae damnabilis. Inde autem maior transgressio, quia memor erat precepti, et Deus in illo tanquam presens contemnitur. 901

Strabus. Cur precepit uobis Deus. Ideo callidus hostis hoc interrogat et mandatum Dei memorat, ne cum peccauerit excussionem habeat quasi oblit.

3:2–3:3

[17r] Cui respondit mulier, De fructu lignorum que sunt in paradiso uescimur, [17v] de fructo uero ligni quod est in medio paradisi precepit nobis Deus ne comederemus et ne tangeremus illud ne forte moriamur.

[17r] Queritur cur temptari Deus hominem permiserit, quem decipiendum prescierit. Sed non esset laudabile homini, si bene uiuere posset, quia nemo male uiuere suaderet, cum in natura posse et in potestate habeat uelle non consentire, Deo iuuante. Recte ergo temptari permissus,

899 Paterius, LEVNT 1, 14 [PL 79: 689D–690A].
900 Jerome, HQLG 3,1 [CCCL 72, 5].
901 Augustine, DGAL XI, 30 [CSEL 28 III 1, 362–363].
qui facturus erat propria ululante per culpam et ordinandus Dei equitate per penam, ut ostenderet anime superbe ad eruditionem futurorum, quam recte uteretur animarum malis ululantatibus, cum ille bonis naturis peruerse uterentur.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} XI, 12 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 344–345].}

Nec putandum quod homo deiceretur nisi precessisset\footnote{\textit{Ad} has the more likely reading, “precessisset”.} in eo quedam comprimenda elatio, ut per humilitatem peccati sciret quam falso de se presupserit, et quod non bene se habeat natura ut a faciente recesserit. Commendatur enim quale bonum Deus sit, quando nulli bene est ab ipso recedenti.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} XI, 5 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 338–339].}

Sic autem mouentur quod Adam temptari Deus permiserit, quasi non uideant omnis diaboli insidiis cotidie temptari, quid Deus permittit, forte quia probatur et exercetur uirtus et est gloriosus non consensisse quam temptari non potuisse, cum etiam consentientes prebeant exemplum iustis cupiditatem deuitandi et timorem superbiendi. Frustra ergo dicitur: non crearet Deus quos presciebat malos futuros. Sciebat enim bonis profuturos, et iuste pro mala ululante puniendos.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} XI, 6 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 339–340].}

Talem inquiunt faceret hominem qui nollet omnino peccare. Concedimus melorem esse naturam que omnino peccare nolit. Concedant non esse malam que facta est ut posset non peccare si uellet, et iuste punitam que ululante non necessitate peccavit. Cum ergo hec bona sit illa melior, cur non utramque faceret, ut uberius laudaretur de utraque? Illa enim in sanctis angelis, hec in sanctis hominibus.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} XI, 7 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 340].}

Quis autem sanus dicat melius non crearet quem presciebat ex alterius iniquitate corrigi, quam quem presciebat pro sua iniquitate damnari? Hoc est dicere, melius non esse qui alterius malo bene utendo misericorditer coronetur quam esse qui pro suo malo iuste puniatur.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} XI, 8 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 340–341].}
Dicit aliquis, Si Deus uellet, etiam isti boni essent. Sed melius noluit ut quod uellent essent. Sed boni infructuose, mali autem impune non essent, et eo ipso utiles essent.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} XI, 9 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 342].}

Sed presciebat quod eorum futura esset uoluntas mala. Presciebat sane, et quia falli non potest eius prescientia, non ideo ipsius sed eorum est. Cur ergo creauit quos tales futuros presciebat? Quia preuidit quid boni de malis eorum esset facturus. Sic enim fecit, ut relinqueret eos unde alicud facerent et si culpabiliter agerent, illum de se laudabiliter operantem inuenirent. A se habent uoluntatem malam, ab illo naturam bonam, et iustam penam. Sibi debitum locum, alios exercitationis adminiculum et timoris exemplum.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} XI, 9 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 342].}


Quidam alienari conantur naturam diaboli a creatura Dei, et alterum dare ei principium contra Deum, qui non intelligunt omne quod est in quantum substantia est bonum esse, et ab alio esse non posse, malam uoluntatem inordinate moueri, bona inferioura superioribus proponendo, qua potestate spiritus delectatus tumuit et ecedit, et inuidia tabescit. In quo tamen bonum est quod uiuit, et uiuificat corpus, siue aerium ut diaboli, siue terrenum ut hominis.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} XI, 11 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 344].}

Hic autem querendum utrum ab initio sua potestate delectatus discesserit ab illa societate et caritate beatorum angelorum, an in sancto cetu fuerit aliquando angelorum iustus et beatus.

\footnote{\textit{Posset inquit...comparatione proficeret.} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} XI, 10 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 342–343].}
\footnote{\textit{Preuidet bonos... etiam malis.} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} XI, 11 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 344].}
\footnote{Augustine, \textit{DGAL} XI, 13 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 345–346].}
Dicitur enim ideo cecidisse, qua inuidit homini facto ad imaginem Dei, sed inuidia superbiam sequitur. Inuidendi enim causa est superbia que est amor proprie excellentie, inuidia uero odium felicitatis aliene. Qui enim excellentiam amat, uel paribus inuidet qui equantur, uel inferioribus ne sibi coequentur, uel superioribus quibus non equatur. Quando autem superbia diabolum deiecerit, ut naturam bonam prauam uoluntate peruerteret, scriptura non dicit, sed ex hac homini inuidisse ratio ostendit.

Non frustra putari potest in initio temporis diabolum cecidisse, nec cum sanctis angelis aliquando uixisse pacatum et beatum, sed mox apostatasse. Vnde, *ille homicida erat ab initio, et in ueritate non stetit* [Jn 8:44] ut intelligamus, quia in ueritate non stetit ex quo creatus est qui staret si uoluisset. Quomodo enim beatus inter angelos fuit, qui futuri peccati atque supplicii prescius non fuit? Queritur autem cur non fuierit. Neque enim sancti angeli beatitudinis sue sunt insci. Forte Deus diabolo reuelare noluit quid [17v] facturus uel passurus esset, ceteris uero reuelauit qui in ueritate mansuri. Sed sic non equaliter beatus, immo non plene beatus, quia plene beati de beatitudine certi. Sed quare discernebatur a ceteris, ut Deus ei que ad ipsum pertinentem non reuelaret, cum non prius ultor quam peccator? Non enim damnat innocentes. An de alio genere angelorum fuit, quibus non dedit prescientiam de se ipsis? Quomodo autem beati esse possent, quibus incerta sua beatitudo? Quidam enim senserunt non fuisse diabolum in illa sublimi natura angelorum que supercelestis est, sed eorum qui inferius in mundo facti sunt per officia distributi. Tales enim fortasse posset aliquid illicitum delectare, quam delectationem si non peccare uoluissent, libero arbitrio cohibere, sicut homo maxime primus, qui peccati penam nondum habebat in membris.

Hec questio de beata uita utrum eam habuerit, cum incertum sit an sit permansura, an succedat miseria, potest de primo homine fieri. Si enim peccati et pene prescius erat, beatus esse non poterat, ergo in paradiso non beatus erat. Si enim prescius non erat, per hanc ignorantiam

---

913 *Hic autem... quibus non equatur.* Augustine, *DGAL XI*, 14 [CSEL 28 III 1, 346].

914 *Quando autem... ratio ostendit.* Augustine, *DGAL XI*, 16 [CSEL 28 III 1, 348-349].

915 *Non frustra... si uoluisset.* Augustine, *DGAL XI*, 16 [CSEL 28 III 1, 348-349].

916 *Quomodo enim beatus...in membris.* Augustine, *DGAL XI*, 17 [CSEL 28 III 1, 349-350].
eiusdem beatitudinem incertus, quomodo uere beatus? Si falsa spe certus, quomodo non stultus?
Sed hominis in animali corpore constituti cui obedienti dandum erat angelorum consortium, et
mutato corporis ex animali in spirituale, possimus quodammodo intelligere uiam beatam,
etiam si non erat prescius peccati futuri, sicut nec illi quibus dicitur, vos qui spirituales estis
instruite huiusmodi, et cetera [Gal 6:1]. Beati tamen erant, quia spirituales erant non corpore sed
iustitia. Quanto magis autem beatus erat homo ante peccatum, quamuis incertus futuri casus, qui
gaudebat de premio future mutationis sic ut nulla esset tribulatio, cui patentia militaret, quamuis
enim uana presumptione de incerto certus uelut stultus, sed spe non infidelis, beatus esse poterat
minusquam in uita sanctorum angelorum.917

Dicere autem de angelis quod in suo genere beati esse possint, damnationis uel salutis incerti,
quibus nec espes esset quad aliquando ipsa mutatione in melius certi futuri essent, nimia
presumptio est, nisi forte dicatur ita creatos mundanis ministeriis distributos, ut per recte gestis
accipiant beatam uitam, de qua possunt esse certissimi, et eius spe dici beati, de quibus si
diabolus cecidit, simile est ei quod cadunt homines a iustitia fidei, superbia simili. Sed asserant
duo genera angelorum qui possunt, unum super celestium in quo nunquam fuit qui cecidit,
alterum mundanorum in quo fuit, mihi autem unde asserant non occurrit.918

Sed non frustra putandum est ab ipso creature, id est ab ipso temporis uel sue conditionis initio
cecidisse, et nunquam in ueritate stetisse.919 Vnde quidam in hanc malitiam libero arbitrio non
esse flexum, sed in hac quamuis a Deo putant esse creatum, secundum illud, hoc est initium
figmenti Dei quod fecit, [Jb 40:14, Vetus Latina] ut illudatur ab angelis eius et alibi, draco iste
quem formasti ad illudendum ei [Ps 103:26], tanquam primo factus sit malus, inuidus et
diabolus, non uoluntate depraauatus.920 Sed fecit Deus omnia bona ualde. Quamuis non indocte
conentur ostendere, non tantum prima conditione, sed etiam nunc depraauatis tot uoluntatibus,
omnia creatia in summa bona esse ualde, non quod mali sint boni, sed non efficuient malitia ut

917 Augustine, DGAL XI, 18 [CSEL 28 III 1, 350–351].
918 Augustine, DGAL XI, 19 [CSEL 28 III 1, 351–352].
919 Sed non frustra... in ueritate stetisse. Augustine, DGAL XI, 19 [CSEL 28 III 1, 352].
920 Vnde quidam... non uoluntate depraauatus. Augustine, DGAL XI, 20 [CSEL 28 III 1, 352–353].
sub Dei imperio ordo uniuersitatis in aliquo turpetur, cum etiam malis uoluntatibus sint certi
limites potestatum, et pondera meritorum. Sed quia iniustum est ut nullo merito hoc in aliquo
Deus damnet quod creatuit, non naturam sed uoluntatem malam puniendam esse credendum
est,921 nec eius naturam esse significatam cum dicitur, hoc est initium figmenti Dei, et cetera,
sed corpus aerium quod tali uoluntati aptauit, uel ipsam ordinationem in qua eum etiam iniuitum
fecit utilem bonis, uel quod presciens uoluntate malum futurum, fecit tamen eum, preuidens
quanta de illo sua esset bonitate facturus. Initium autem figmenti dicitur, non quod primitus
conditus, uel in principio malus conditus sed cum sciret eum uoluntate malum futurum, ut bonis
nocreret, creauit eum, ut de illo bonis prodesset. Sic enim luditur cum sanctis proficit temptatio
eius. Initium ad illudendum, quia et mali homines quos Deus futuros malos preuidens, creauit
tamen ad sanctorum utilitatem, similiter luduntur, cum prestatur sanctis eorum comparatione
cautela, et sub Deo humilitas, et exercitatio ad tollerandos malos, et probatio ad diligendos
inimicos. Sed ipse initium, quia precedit antiquitate et principatu malitie. Hoc autem per sanctos
angelos facit, sicut creatas naturas administrat, subdens eis angelos malos, ut non quantum
nituntur, sed quantum sinuntur possint, sicut et homines malos.922 Quod ergo putatur diabolus
nunquam in ueritate stetisse, nunquam beatam vitam dixisse, sed ab initio cecidisse, non sic
accipiendum est ut malus a Deo bono creatus putetur, quia non ab initio cecidisse dicetur.
Non enim cecidit, si talis factus est. Sed factus statim a ueritate se auertit, propria potestate
delectatus. Beate ergo uite dulcedinem non gustauit quam non acceptam fastidiuit, sed nolendo
accipere amisit. Sui ergo casus prescius [18r] esse non potuit, quia sapientia pietatis fructus est.
Continuo autem cecidit, non ab eo quod accept sed quod acciparet si subdi uoluisset.923 Quod
autem ait Ysaias, quomodo cecidisti Lucifer qui mane oriebaris et cetera, et Lezechiel, tu
signaculum similitudinis et cetera, quedam in eum plura in corpus eius conueniunt [Is 14:12; Ez
28:12].924

921 Sed fecit Deus...credendum est. Augustine, DGAL XI, 21 [CSEL 28 III 1, 353–354].
922 nec eius naturam...et homines malos. DGAL XI, 22 [CSEL 28 III 1, 354–355].
923 Quod ergo putatur...si subdi uoluisset. Augustine, DGAL XI, 23 [CSEL 28 III 1, 355–356].
924 Quod autem... eius conueniunt. Augustine, DGAL XI, 24 [CSEL 28 III 1, 356].
Notandum quod non permissus est femina temptare nisi per serpentem, nec uirum nisi per feminam. Serpente enim uelut organo usus est mouens naturam eius ad exprimendos sonos uerborum, et signa quibus suam monstraret uoluntatem. In muliere uero que rationalis erat non est ipse locutus, sed persuasio eius quamuis instinctu adiuuaret interius, quod per serpentem egerat exeritis.\textsuperscript{925} Serpens ergo nec uerba intelligebat, nec rationalis est facta. Quod enim serpentes morsorum uerbis trahuntur de latebris, diabolica uis est, quod permittitur ad primi facti memoriam, ut sciatur quia sit ei cum hoc genere familiaritas.\textsuperscript{926} Callidissimus dictus est serpens propter astutiam diaboli. Locutus est autem sicut asina Balam, sed hoc diabolicum, illud angelicum. Boni enim et mali angeli similiter operantur sicut Moyses et magi pharonis.\textsuperscript{927}

3:4

[18r] \textbf{Dixit autem serpens ad mulierem, Nequaquam morte moriemini.}

\textit{Nequaquam.} immortaliatatem promittunt heretici

Dixit serpens mulieri, \textit{non morte moriemini}. Quomodo his uerbis crederet, Deum scilicet a re bona et utili prohibuisse, nisi in esset eius menti amor ille proprie potestatis, et de se superba presumptio, que per temptationem fuerat conuincenda aut perimenda? Denique non contempta suasione serpentis, aspexit lignum bonum esu, decorum aspectu, nec credens se tamen posse mori, forte putauit Deum alcuius significationis causa dixisse, \textit{si manducaueritis morte moriemini}. Ideo \textit{manducuit et dedit uiro suo}, fortassum alicu suasione, quam scriptura intelligendam relinquit. Vel fortasse non fuit suaderi necesse, cum eo cibo non uideret eam mortuam fuisse.\textsuperscript{928}

3:5

\textbf{Scit enim Deus quod in quocumque die comederitis ex eo aperientur oculi uestri et erguson sicut dii, scientes bonum et malum.}

\begin{align*}
\textsuperscript{925} & \textit{Notandum quod...egerat exeritis.} \ Augustine, \textit{DGAL XI, 27 [CSEL 28 III 1, 359–360].} \\
\textsuperscript{926} & \textit{Serpens ergo... genere familiaritas.} \ Augustine, \textit{DGAL XI, 28 [CSEL 28 III 1, 360–361].} \\
\textsuperscript{927} & \textit{Callidissimus dictus... et magi pharonis.} \ Augustine, \textit{DGAL XI, 29 [CSEL 28 III 1, 362–362].} \\
\textsuperscript{928} & \textit{Augustine, DGAL XI, 30 [CSEL 28 III 1, 363–364].}
\end{align*}
...heretici diuinitatis meritum profitentur et scientie promissione decipiunt et simplices reprehenditur

oculi. oculos cordis uult claudere ut carnales aperiat

eritis. promissione altitudinis et scientie simplices decipit sic et heretici

Gregorius. Primum parentem diabolus tribus modis temptauit: gula, uana gloria, et auaritia, et superauit gula cum cibum uetitum comediendum suasit; vana gloria cum dixit, eritis sicut dii; auaritia cum addidit, scientes bonum et malum. Auaritia enim etiam altitudinis est, cum supra modum sublimitas ambitur. Vnde, non rapinam arbitratus est esse se equalem Deo [Phil 2:6]. Sed eisdem modis a secundo homine uictus est, quibus primum se uicisse gloriatur.929

3:6

Vidit igitur mulier quod bonum esset lignum ad uescendum et pulchrum oculis aspectuque delectabile. [18v] et tuit de fructu illius et comedit, deditque uiro suo, qui comedit,

Vidit. circumspiciens si quid in eo nocium uideret

bonum. decipitur carmalitas nostra uerbis serpentis et per illam adam id est Christianus

et comedit. carnales facilius seducuntur

dedique. quia per delectationem carnalis concupiscitie ratio seducitur

Gregorius. Vidit igitur mulier et cetera. Ne lubrica in cogitatione uersemus, non debemus intuere quod non licet concupiscere. Vt enim munda mens in cogitatione seruetur, a lasciuia uoluptatis sue reprimendi sunt oculi, quasi quidam raptore ad culpam. Non enim Eua lignum contigisset, nisi prius incaute respexisset. Pensandum ergo quantum ab illicitis debeamus uisum restringere qui mortaliter uiuimus, si et mater uiuementium per oculos ad mortem uenit. Hinc sub Iudee uoce que exteriora uidendo concupiscens, bona interiora perdidat, prophetia dicit, Oculus meus depredatus est animam meam [Lam 3:49]. Concupiscens enim uisibilia, inuisibles uirtutes amisit, et per oculus corporis, pertulit predam cordis. Ad custodiendam ergo cordis munditiam, exteriorum quoque sensuum disciplina seruanda est.930

929 Paterius, LEVNT I, 16 [PL 79:690C].
930 Paterius, LEVNT I, 17 [PL 79:691A].
Mistice. Interrogata, mulier respondit quid preceptum sit. At ille, *non morte moriendi, sciebat enim Deus*, et cetera. Patet his urbis per superbiam persuasum esse peccatum, quia dictum est, *eritis sicut dixit sciebat enim Deus* et cetera. Vbi notatur tantum persuasum esse ut sub Deo nollent esse, sed in propria potestate, ne eius legem obseruarent, qui inuideret ne se ipsi regerent, non indigentes interno lumine eius. sed utentes propria prouidentia, quasi oculis suis ad discernendum bonum et malum quod ille prohibuisset. Sic persuasum est ut potestatem suam nimis amarent, et quia pares Deo esse voluerunt, medietate sua qua Deo subiecti corpora habebant subiecta tanquam fructu arboris constitute in medio paradisi male utentes, amiserunt quod acceperant quia usurpauerunt quod non acceperant, id est ut per suam potestatem Deo non regente beati essent. Nullo enim regente per suam potestatem solus Deus beatus est. 931

Mistice. *Vidit igitur mulier* et cetera. Quomodo uidebant, si clausi erant oculi? Sed dictum est ut intelligamus eos oculos esse apertos postquam de fructu comederunt quibus se nudos uidebant et displicebant, id est oculos astutie quibus simplicitas displicet. 932

Strabus. *Et eritis sicut dixi*. Artificiali dolo uerba componitur ut si per inobedientie contemptum nequiuirit subuertere, saltem in hoc quod fidem corruperit et ad idolatriam persuaserit, uictorem se gloratur. Si autem per inobedientie contemptum seduxerit, in utroque uictor existat.


Alcuinus. Peccatum angeli tacitum et hominis patefactum quia illud incurabile, hoc curandum. 934

931 Augustine, *DGCM* II, 22 [CSEL 143–144].
932 Augustine, *DGCM* II, 23 [CSEL 144].
933 *Cum enim... quem uoluerunt.* Augustine, *DGCM* II 15 [CSEL 91, 135–136]. *Ad* introduces this part of the gloss, “Mystice”.
934 Alcuin, *IIG* 3 [PL 100:517C]
Mistice. *Deditque uiro suo* et cetera. De quibus iam dictum est tunc uiderunt quod nudi essent oculis, scilicet peruersis quibus nuditas, id est simplicitas erubescendauidebatur. Vt ergo non essent simplices fecerunt sibi succinctoria pudenda tegentes, id est simplicitatem occultantes, de qua erubescebat astuta superbia. Filia fici pruritum significant, quem patitur animus cupiditate et delectatione mentiendi. Vnde falsi dicuntur qui iocari amant, quia in ioci simulatio presidet.  

*Cum ergo deambularet Dominus in paradiso* et cetera, id est cum ad eos iam iudicandos ueniret. Ante penam deambulabat, id est mouebatur in eis Dei presentia, quia stabiles in precepto Dei non erant. *Ad auram post meridiem*, uel secundum alios “ad uesperam” cum scilicet sol eis occideret, et lux interior ueritatis, *audierunt uocem eius et absconderunt se*. Ille se abscondit a conspectu Domini, qui ipsum deserit, et quod suum est amare incipit. Iam enim habebant oerimenta mendacii. Qui autem loquitur mendacium de suo loquitur. Ideo ad arborem se dicuntur abscondere que est in medio paradisi, id est ad se, qui infra Deum et supra corpora ordinati. Ad se ergo absconderunt se, ut turbarentur miseris erroribus relictum lumine ueritatis, quod non erant ipsi. Particeps potest esse anima humana, sed ipsa ueritas Deus est incommutabilis super illam. Ab ea quisquis auersus est, et ad se est conuersus, nec de rectore et illustratore Deo sed de suis motibus quasi liber exultat, tenebratur mendacio. Qui enim loquitur mendacium de suo loquitur, et turbatur, secundum illud, *Ad me ipsum anima mea turbata est* [Ps 6:4].

3:7

*et aperti sunt oculi amborum. Cumque cognouissent se esse nudos consuerunt folia ficus et fecerunt sibi perizomata.*

*et aperti.* ad concupiscentiam et cognitionem bestialis motus

*oculi.* Peruersi quibus simplicitas pudenda uidebatur

*Cumque.* Heretici fidei se simplicitate nudatos

*cognouissent.* sentientes bestiam motum

*nudos.* gratia Dei

*consuerunt.* fingendo

---

935 *Deditque uiro suo... simulatio presidet.* Augustine, DGCM II 23 [CSEL 91, 144–145].

936 *Cum enim deambularet... turbata est.* Augustine, DGCM II, 24 [CSEL 91, 145–146].
folia. opermenta mendacii
folia. que pruritum carnis et libidinis ardorem significant
perizomata. succintoria uel braccas
perizomata. quibus se suggingere id est defendere querunt

Gregorius. Tribus modis culpa perpetratur. Suggestione, delectatione, consensu. Primo per hostem, secundo per carnem, tercio per spiritum. Hostis enim praua suggerit, caro se delectationi subicit, tandem spiritus delectationi consentit. Vnde et serpens praua suggestit, Eua quasi caro delectationi se subdidit, Adam uero uelut spiritus suggestione et delectatione superatus assensit. Suggestione ergo peccatum agnoscimus, delectatione uincimur, consensu ligamur.937

Qui comedit et aperti sunt oculi amborum et cetera. Ad concupiscendum, scilicet inuicem ad peccati penam morte carnis conceptam, ut esset corpus non tantum animale sed mortis, in quo lex membrorum repugnaret legi mentis [Rom 7:23]. Non enim ceci facti erant, aut prohibitos fructus palpantes decerpserant. Sed sicut in fractione panis aperti sunt oculi discipulorum, et cognouerunt quem cognoscere non ualebant, sic aperti sunt oculi istorum ad quod antea non patebant, quia anima rationalis bestialem motum in carne sua erubuit, et pudorem habuit, non solum quia hoc sentiebat ubi ante non senserat, sed etiam quia motus ille de transgressione ueniebat. Ibi enim sensit, ubi gratia uesteuебatur, cum in nuditate nichil indencens patiebatur. Ibi completum est, Domine in uoluntate tua prestitisti decori meo uirtutem, auertisti faciem tuam a me et factus sum conturbatus [Ps 29:8]. Pro hac conturbatione ad ficulnea folia concurrerunt et succintoria consuerunt, et qui gloriosa reliquerant pudenda texerunt. Nec puto eos in foliis illis putasse aliquid quo congureret tegi membra prurientia, sed occulto instinctu ad hoc conturbatione compulsi sunt, ut talis pene significatio a nescentibus fieret, quae conuinceret facto peccatorem, et doceret scripto lectorem.939

937 Paterius, LEVNT 1, 18 [PL 79:691B–691C].
938 Qui comedit... antea non patebant. Augustine, DGAL XI, 31 [CSEL 28 III 1, 364].
939 quia anima rationalis... scripto lectorem. Augustine, DGAL XI, 32 [CSEL 28 III 1, 366].
Alcuinus. Consuerunt folia ficus, et cetera. Quia gloriam simplicis castitatis amiserunt ad duplicem libidinis pruriginem confugerunt. Vnde cum esses sub ficu uidi te [John 1:48], et descendi, subaudis, liberare te, [cont. 19r] uel in nube audiri. Nunc tamen quod Dei deambulantis audierunt uocem, non nisi per creaturam factum est, ne substantia inuisibilis et ubique tota que est patris et filii et spiritus sancti corporalibus sensibus locali et temporali motu apparuisse credatur.

3:8

Et cum audissent uocem Domini Dei [19r] deambulantis in paradiso ad auram post meridiem abscondit se Adam et uxor eius a facie Domini Dei in medio ligni paradisi. audissent. per predicatores
deambulantis. non stantis uel inhabitantis
deambulantis. quia in eius precepto non steterant
deambulantis. per subiectam creaturam
paradiso. ecclesia
auram. frigescente caritate et luce declinante, appropinquabitibus tenebris errorum
post meridiem. unde hora nona Christus spiritum emisit qui sexta hora fuerat crucifixus ut eadem hora homo restitueretur qua de paradiso eictus est
abscondit. in medio ligni se abscondit qui auersus a precepto creatoris in erroris sui et arbitrii uoluptate uiuit
abscondit. auertens a ueritate
Adam. ratio
uxor. concupiscentia
a facie. Deum scilicet deserentes et quod suum est amantes
Dei. relictam medietate in qua facti erant

[18v] Et cum audissent uocem Domini Dei, et cetera. Ea enim hora tales conueniebat uisitari, quia defecerant a luce ueritatis. Fortassim enim intrinsecus effabilibus uel ineffabilibus modis Deus illis loquebatur ante sicut angelis, immutabili ueritate illustrans mentes eorum, ubi est

940 Alcuin, IIG 70 [PL 100:523]
941 Nunc tamen... aparuisse credatur. Augustine, DGAL XI 33 [CSEL 28 III 1, 367].
intellectus nosse simul quecumque non fiunt simul. Forte, inquam, sic eis loquebatur, et si non
tanta participatione divinae sapientiae quantam capiunt angeli, per humano tantum modo minus
sed in ipso genere locutionis. Fortassis etiam illo qui fit\(^942\) per creaturam, siue in extasi spiritus
corporalibus imaginibus, siue ipsi sensibus corporis aliqua specie presentata ad uidendum uel
audiendum, sicut solet in angelis uideri.\(^943\)

[19r] Historice. \textit{Abscondit se adam et uxor eius} et cetera. Cum Deus auertit intrinsecus faciem
et homo turbatur, fiunt similia dementie, nimo pudore ac timore, occulto quoque instinctu non
quiescente, ut nescientes facerent que aliquid posteris significarent, propter quos scripta sunt
hec.\(^944\)

3:9

\textit{Vocauitque Dominus Deus Adam et dixit ei, ubi es?}

\textit{Vocauitque.} Ut redeat per penitentiam uocat quia \textit{non uult mortem peccatoris} [Ez
18:23].

\textit{ei.} uerba increpantis et ad confessionem cogentis, non ignorantis

\textit{ubi.} quasi, quam miser

Gregorius. \textit{Vocauitque Dominus Deus Adam}, et cetera. Quia uidit in culpa lapsu iam sub
peccato uelut ab oculis ueritatis absconditum. Quia tenebras erroris eius non approbat, quasi ubi
sit peccator ignorat, eumque uocat ac requirit dicens, \textit{Adam ubi es}? Dum uocat, significat quia
ad penitentiam reuocat, dum requirit, insinuat quia peccatores iure damnandos ignorant.\(^945\)

\textit{Vocauitque Dominus Deus adam}, et cetera. Increpando scilicet non ignorando et hoc ad
significationem pertinet, quod sicut uiro preceptum datum est per quem ueniret ad feminam, ita
uir prior interrogatur. Preceptum enim a Domino per uirum usque ad feminam; peccatum a
diabolo per feminam usque ad uirum. Hec significationibus plena sunt, non id agentibus in

\(^{942}\) illo C in illo \textit{Am} sit \textit{Ad}

\(^{943}\) Augustine, \textit{DGAL XI}, 33 [CSEL 28 III 1, 367].

\(^{944}\) Augustine, \textit{DGAL XI}, 33 [CSEL 28 III 1, 367–268].

\(^{945}\) Paterius, \textit{LEVNT I}, 21 [\textit{PL} 79:692B–692C].
quibus facta sunt, sed de his sapientia Dei nunc autem non significata referimus, sed gesta defendimus. 

3:10

Qui ait, uocem tuam audiui in paradiso et timui eo quod nudus essem et abscondi me.  

uocem. stulte quasi displiceret nudus qui talis fuerat factus  

abscondi. non absconditur ut eius sceleram Dominus non uideat, sed ut se indignum aspectu eius ostendat. Artabantur ergo duplici uerecundia quia nunc primum obscenum motum in membris sentiebant et quia propter transgressionem hoc contingisse sciebant

Mistice. Vocem tuam audiui in paradiso et cetera. Respondit uoce eius audit, se occultasse quia nudus erat. Iam stulte respondit, quasi Deo nudus dissipiceret quem fecerat. Sed quod cuique dissipiceret hoc Deo dissipicere arbitratur. Sublimiter uero intelligendum est quod dicitur, quis enim indicavit tibi et cetera. Nudus enim erat simulacione, sed uestitus diuina luce. Unde auersus et ad se ipsum conuersus, quod significat de illa arbore manducasse, nuditatem uidit et displicuit, quia non habebat aliquid proprium, et more superbie non se accusat quod mulieri consensit, sed in eam culpam refundit, et de astutia quam conceperat in Deum retorquet quod peccauit, unde addidit, quam dedisti mihi. Proprium est enim peccantibus Deo uelle tribuere unde accusantur, quod inde est quia sic peccavit homo cum uellet <esse> par Deo, liber scilicet sicut ille ab omni Dominio. Quam ergo in maiestate par illi esse non potuit, in peccator parem sibi eum facere contendit, immo enim uult ostendere uocentem se autem innocentem. Mulier autem culpam refert in serpentem quasi obtemperare coegisset, aut ipsa potuerit uerba serpenti audire, et precepto Dei non obedire.

Historice. Vocem tuam audiui in paradiso, et cetera. Probabile est Deum per congruam creaturam solere forma humana primis hominibus apparere, quos tamen non permisit aduertere nuditatem in superna sustollens, nisi post peccatum cum pudendum in membris motum penali lege sensissent. Sic ergo affecti sunt ut solerent homines sub oculis hominum, quod erat de pena peccati, cum scilicet latere uelle, quem nichil latere potest, et carnem occultare, cum cor

946 Augustine, DGAL XI, 34 [CSEL 28 III 1, 368].

947 Augustine, DGCM II 25 [CSEL 91, 147].
inspiciat. Sed volentes esse sicut dii, euanuerunt in cogitationibus suis, et obscuratum est insipiens cor eorum et cetera [Rom 1:21]. Sed Deo faciems auertente stulti fact sunt. Erubescebant quidem erga se ipsos, et succintoria faciebant, sed magis ab illo etiam succincti uerebantur, qui tanquam familiari temperamentum per creaturam usibilem afferebat ad uidendum uelut humanos oculos. Si enim apparebat ut hominibus tanquam homo loqueretur, [19v] sicut Abrahe ad quercum Mambre, hac amicitia pudorem honerabat post peccatum, que ante dabat fiduciam. Nec nuditatem audebant ostendere talibus oculis, que displicebat et suis.948 Dominus ergo nolens peccatores punire, nisi pena qua cogebantur erubescere, quis inquit indicauit tibi quia nudus esses, et cetera. Inde mors concepta ex Dei sententia qui sic minatus fuerat, fecit aduerti concupiscentialiter membra ubi dicti sunt aperti oculi, et secutum est quod puderet.949

3:11–3:12

[19v] Qui dixit Deus, quis enim indicauit tibi quod nudus esses, nisi quod ex ligno de quo preceperam tibi ne comederes comedisti?

quis. Id est, quis te ad hanc informitatem adduxit, nisi quod preceptum meum non obseruasti?

Dixitque Adam, mulier quam dedisti sociam mihi dedit michi de ligno et comedi.

Dixitque. non humiliet confitens, sed superbe excusans et in auctorem mulieris culpam retorquens

Dixitque Adam, mulier quam dedisti mihi sociam, et cetera. Non dixit, “peccaui”, superbia enim habet confusionis deformitatem, non confessionis humilitatem. Ad hoc autem scriptum est, et interrogationes ad hoc facte; ut ueraciter et utiliter scriberentur, ut sciamus quomodo superbi laborent, hodie conantes malum in creatorem referre et si quid boni faciunt sibi tribuere. Mulier quam dedisti mihi sociam et cetera. Quasi ad hoc data sit, ut non ipsa obediret uiro et ambo Deo.950

948 Vocem tuam... dispicebat et suis. Augustine, DGAL XI 34 [CSEL 28 III 1, 368–369].
949 Dominus ergo... quod puderet. Augustine, DGAL XI 35 [CSEL 28 III 1, 369].
950 Augustine, DGAL XI 35 [CSEL 28 III 1, 369–370].
Gregorius. *Mulier quam dedisti mihi sociam*, et cetera. Quatuor modis peccatum perpetratur in corde, quatuor consummatur in opere. In corde: suggestione, delectatione, consensu, et defensionis audacia. Suggestio per aduersarium, delectatio fit per carnem, consenus per spiritum, defensionis audacia per elationem. Culpa enim que terrere mentem debuit extollit, unde et serpens suasit, Eua delectata est, Adam consensit. Qui etiam requisitus, culpam confiteri per audaciam noluit. Sic cotidie occultus hostis suggerit Eua, id est carnalis sensus delectioni se substrauit. Adam mulieri prepositus consentit, quia spiritus a rectitudine infirmatus inclinatur. Adam requisitus confiteri culpam noluit, quia spiritus peccando a ueritate disiunctus eo ipso in ruine sui audacia nequius declinatur. Adam per timorem se ipsum absconsurus fugerat, sed tamen timens tunebat. Cum enim ex peccato pena metuitur, et amissa Dei facies non amatur, timor ex tumore est, non ex humilitate. Superbit enim qui peccatum si liceat non puniri non deserit. Isdem etiam quatuor modis peccatum consummatur in opere, prius latens culpa agitur, post etiam sine confusione aperitur. De hinc in consuetudinem ducitur, ad extremum false spei seductionibus uel obstinatione misere desperationis nutitur. 951

3:13

*Et dixit Dominus Deus ad mulerem, quare hoc fecisti? Que respondit, serpens decepi me et comedi.*

*Que.* similiter superbe excusat et in conditorem serpentis culpam iactat

*Et dixit Dominus Deus ad mulierem,* et cetera. Nec ista confitetur peccatum, sed refert in alterum impari sexu, pari fastu. Ex his tamen natus, dicit usque in finem:* ego dixi, Domine miserere mei, sana animam meam quia peccavi tibi* [Ps 40:5]. Hoc istis dicendum sunt, sed nondum concise peccatorum cervices restabant labores et dolores mortis et contritio seculi et gratia Dei qua in tempora subuenit, docens afflictos non presumere de se. *Serpens seduxit* et cetera. Quasi cuiuslibet suasio preualeret Dei precepto. 952

3:14

951 Paterius, *LEVNT* 1, 22 [*PL* 79:692C–693A].

952 Augustine, *DGAL* XI 35 [*CSEL* 28 III 1, 370].
Et ait Dominus Deus ad serpem, quia fecisti hoc, maledictus es inter omnia animantia et bestias terre. Super pectus tuum gradieris et terram comedes cunctis diebus uite tue. *serpentem*. diabolum, qui occulte serpit. Sicut enim per serpem loquebatur, ita in serpentem maledicitur.

*Super*. in quo doli et insidiae

*Super*. Superbiam quia in pectore impetus animi dominantur.

*et terram*. peccatores

*et terram*. terrena opera

*comedes*. in Ebreo habet “aphar”, id est fauillam uel puluerem

*cunctis*. dum potestatem habes decipiendi

Et ait Dominus Deus ad serpem et cetera. Tota hcc sententia figurata est, ubi credendum tamen omnia dicta esse. Serpens non interrogatur quare fecerit, quia non ipse propria natura et uoluntate fecit, sed diabolus de illo et per illum et in illo, qui iam pro impietate et superbia eterno igni fuerat destinatus. Ad ipsum ergo refertur quod serpenti dicitur, et qualis humano generi futurus sit ostenditur.\footnote{Jerome, *HQLG* 3, 14 [cccl 72, 5].}


Et terram comedes dupliciter intelligitur: uel ad te pertinebunt quos terrena cupiditate decipies, uel tercium generis temptationis figuratur quod est curiositas. Qui enim terram manducat, profunda et tenebrosa penetrat et tantum temporalia atque terrena. Non ponuntur inimicitie inter serpentem et uirum, sed mulierem, quia a diabolo non temptamur nisi

\footnote{Et ait Dominus ad serpem...gaudet et gloriatur. Augustine, *DGCM* II, 26 [CSEL 91, 148].}
per animalem partem, que mulieris imaginem et exemplum in uno homine ostendit. Inter semen diaboli et mulieris [20r] inimicite ponuntur. semen diaboli, praua suggestio. Mulieris fructus, boni operis quo suggestioni resistit. Ideo obseruat plantam mulieris, ut si illucita labitur delectatio, illam capiat. Illa obseruat caput eius, ut ipsum initium male suasionis excludat.956

Ieronymus. Super pectus tuum gradieris et cetera. “Ventrem” Septuaginta addiderit, sed in Ebreo habet pectus tantum ut calliditatem et uersutias cogitationum eius aperiret et quod omnis gressus eius nequitie est et fraudis.957

Gregorius. Pectore et uentre repes. Malum luxurie aut cogitatione perpetratur aut opere. Hostis enim cum ab effectu operis expellitur, secreta cogitationis polluere molitur. Venter repit, dum lubricus per membra humana sibi subdita luxuriam exercet in opere. Serpit pectore, dum polluit in cogitatione. Sed quia per cogitationem ad opera uenitur, prius pectore et post uentre repere descriptur.958

3:15

[20r] Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem et semen tuum et semen illius. Ipsa conteret caput tuum et tu insidiaberis calcaneo eius.
   mulierem. animalem partem per quam temptat
   mulierem. ecclesiam
   semen. prauam suggestionem
   semen. omnem iniquitatem
   semen. originale peccatum
   illius. fructum boni operis
   illius. Christum
   illius. humanum genus
   Ipsa. fructus eius, qui est Christus
   Ipsa. ecclesia

956 Et terram comedes...male suasionis excludat. Augustine, DGCM II 27–28 [CSEL 91, 149–150].
957 Jerome, HQLG 3, 14 [CCCL 72, 5].
958 Paterius, LEVNT 1, 24 [PL 79:694A–694B].
Ipsa. resurgente Christo

*caput.* initium suggestionis

*caput.* quod est mors, unde, *super aspidem et basilicum ambuleris* [Ps 90:13]

*insidiaberis.* id est supplantabis Christum ut moriatur

*insidiaberis.* ut capias

*calcaneo.* si in illicita labitur

*calcaneo.* fini cui maxime insidiatur diabolus

Gregorius. *Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulerem* et cetera. Caput serpentes conterere est initia suggestionis manu sollicite considerationis a cordis aditu extirpare. Qui cum ab initio deprehenditur, percutere calcaneo molitur, quia quem prima temptatione non percutit, decipere in fine tendit. Si autem cor intentione corrumpitur, sequentis actionis medietas et terminus ab hoste possidentur, quia totam sibi arborem fructus ferre conspicit, quam ueneni dente in radice inciauit.\(^959\)

Ieronymus. *Ipsa seruabit caput tuum et tu seruabis eius calcaneum.* Melius in Ebreo habet, “Ipsa conteret caput tuum et tu conteres eius calcaneum”, quia et nostri gressus prepediuntur a colubro, et Dominus conterit Sathanam sub pedibus nostris.\(^960\)

3:16

*Mulieri quoque dixit,* *Multiplicabo erumnas tuas,* et conceptus tuos. *In dolore paries filios et sub uiri potestate eris et ipse dominabitur tui.*

*Mulieri.* que significat illam partem anime que gaudet carnalitate

*dixit.* historia patet

*dolore.* difficultate uincende praeve consuetudinis

*filios.* affectus ad bonum opus paratos per consuetudinem bonam.

*sub.* rationis

*uiri.* ut spiritus dominetur carni

---

\(^{959}\) Paterius, *LEVNT* 1, 25 [*PL* 79:694B–694C].

\(^{960}\) Jerome, *HQLG* 3,15 [*CCCL* 72, 5–6].
eris. victa consuetudine praua cautius obtemperabis rationi ne in aliquam pernitosam consuetudinem defluas.

Historice. Mulieri quoque dixit, multiplicabo erumpnas tuas, et cetera. Hec figurate et prophetice melius accipiuntur, sed quia dolor et gemitus parentis de corpore mortis est que transgressione concepta est, refertur et hec pena ad proprietatem littere. Sed quod dictum est, et sub uiri potestate eris et ipse dominabitur tui, uidendum est quomodo proprie accipi possit. Sic enim et ante peccatum facta est ut uir dominaretur ei, et ad eum convertus seruiret. Sed potest intelligi hanc seruitutem conditionis potius esse quam dilectionis, ut etiam talis seruitus qua postea homines seruiunt hominibus de pena peccati orae reperatur. Possunt igiturconiuges per caritatem seruire inuicem, sed mulier in uirum dominari non permittitur. Quod nisi caueatur deprauabitur natura, et augebitur culpa.961


961 Augustine, DGAL XI, 37 [CSEL 28 III 1, 371–372].
962 Muliere quoque dixit... consuetudinem defluat. Augustine, DGCM II, 29 [CSEL 150–151].
963 Sententiam uero... donec hanc uitam finiat. Augustine, DGCM II, 30 [CSEL 152–153].
*In dolore paries filios.* Iste dolor superat omnes dolores.
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[20v] *Ade uero dixit, Quia audisti uocem uxoris tue et comedisti de ligno ex quo preceperam tibi ne comederes, maledicta terra in opere tuo. In laboribus comedes eam cunctis diebus ute tue.*

*terra.* Ier. Non ruris colendi sed peccato sicut in Ebreo habet

*laboribus.* inueniende ueritatis

[20v] *Ade uero dixit, quia audisti uocem uxoris tue,* et cetera. Historice. Hos esse labores humani generis in terra nemo ignorat, et quod non essent si felicitas que erat in paradiso teneretur, indubitanter constat.964


Alcuinus. Terre maledixit, non aquis, quia homo de fructu terre contra uetitum manducauit, non de aquis bibit, et in aquis erat peccatum abluendum, de fructu terre contractum. Animalia

964 Augustine, *DGAL* XI, 38 [CSEL 28 III 1, 373].

965 This last comment is a second reference to the account of Simon in Acts 8. Paterius, *LEVNT* I, 26 [PL 79:694C–695A].
quoque terrestria plus maledictionis habent quam aquatilia, quia plus uiuunt de maledicta terra. Inde Christus post resurrectionem de pisce manducauit, non de terrestri animali. 966

Strabus. Terra maledicitur, non Adam, ut ceteri propter quos hec scripta sunt terrerentur, ne similia facientes simili pena plecertentur. Ipse uero Cain quia prime preuaricationi parricidium addidit, maledicitur dum dicitur, maledictus eris super terram.
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**Spinas et tribulos germinabit tibi et comedes herbas terre.**

*Spinas.* uitiorum

*et.* punctiones tortuosarum questionum et cogitationes de prouisione huius uite

3:19

**In sudore uultus tui uesceris pane donec reuertaris in terra de qua sumptus es, quia puluis es et in puluerem reuerteris.**

*pane.* id est donec finias hanc uitam

Gregorius. *Puluis es et in puluerem reuerteris.* Homo ita conditus fuit, ut manente illo decedenter tempora, nec cum temporibus transiret. Stabat ergo in momentis discurrentibus nec ad uite terminum per dierum incrementa tendebat quia semper stanti inherebat. Vbi uetitum contigit, offenso creatore ire cepit cum tempore. Vnde *terra es et in terram ibis.* Statu scilicet immortalitatis amisso, cursus cum mortalitatis absorbuit et ad mortem transeundo, didicit stando quid fuit cuius radicis amaritudinem quasi in uirgulto tenemus, quia eius cursum nascendo sortimur, ut ipso momento quo uiuimus a uita transeamus, dum infantia ad pueritiam, pueritia ad adolescentiam, adolescentia ad iuuentutem, iuuentus ad senectutem, senectus transit ad mortem. 967

3:20

**Et uocauit Adam nomen uxoris sue Eua, eo quod mater esset cuncorum uiantium**

*Eua.* id est uita

966 Alcuinus, *IIG* 10–11 [PL 100:518B].

967 *Paterius, LEVNT I, 27* [695B–695C].
eo. Quasi reddit causam cur uocauerit eam uitam

cunctorum. animalitas conuera ad rationem mater et uiuorum id est bonorum operum

uiuentium. recte factorum quibus contraria peccata que dicuntur mortua

Mystice. Post peccatum et iudicis sententiam uocat Adam uxorem suam “uitam”, quia mater

uiuorum sit, cum mortem et mortales fetus parere meruerit. Sed illos fetus scriptura attendit,
quos cum in dolore peperit, ad uirum convuertitura dominetur sibi. Sic enim est uita et mater

uiuorum. Vita in peccatis mors dicitur. Recte ergo pars animalis cum per rationem de uerbo uite

affectum recte uiuendi conceperit “uita” appellatur et “mater uiuorum”, id est bonorum quamuis

in dolore et gemitu male consuetudini resistens, bonam consuetudinem ad recta facta pepererit,
quibus contraria sunt peccata, que mortua solent appellari. Mors autem que debetur nature post

peccatum in tunicis pelliciis figuratur. Tamdui autem in paradiso fuerit, quamuis sub sententia
damnantis Dei, donec ad tunicas pellicias uentum est, huius uite scilicet mortalitatem. Bene

autem mors quam in corpore sentimus, in pellibus exprimitur que mortuis corporibus
detrahuntur.968

Istorice. Et uocauit Adam nomen uxoris sue Eua, et cetera. Verba primi hominis hec sunt

quoniam hec est mater omnium uiuentium, tanquam reddat causam nominis a se impositi, cur

scilicet eam “uitam” uocauerit.969
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[21r] Fecit quoque Dominus Deus Adam et uxor eiuis tunicas pellicias et induit eos,

Fecit. antequam eiceret de paradiso

tunicas. quibus significatur mors que post peccatum debetur nature

pellicias. quia mortales ex immortalibus

Fecit quoque Dominus Deus Adam et uxor eiuis tunicas pellicias et cetera. Hoc significationis

gratia factum est, et in factis queritur quid factum sit et quid significet et indictis quid dictum sit

quidue significet.970

968 Augustine, DGCM II, 31–32 [CSEL 91, 153–156].

969 Augustine, DGAL XI, 38 [CSEL 28 III 1, 373].
Ipsi fecerit sibi perizomata, ut peccatum suum Deo absconderent, Deus uero tunicas pellicias, quibus totum corpus eorum induit, quia et in corpore et in anima eos iuste damnauit. Stulta uero questio est qualiter uel quo operante pelles ab animalibus subducte sint querere. Qui enim de nichilu omnia condidit, quomodo et qualiter uoluit hoc fecit.\textsuperscript{971}
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et ait, Ecce Adam factus est quasi unus ex nobis sciens bonum et malum. Nunc ergo ne forte mittat manum suam et sumat etiam de ligno uite et comedat et uiuat in eternum.

Ecce. non sunt uerba insultantis Dei sed alios a superbia deterrentis

factus. quasi, nec illud quod uolebat affectus est et prodidit quod factus est

ex nobis. trinitatis mentio inculcatur

Nunc. simile dicit Apostolus ne forte det illis Dominus penitentiam [2 Tm 2:24]

Nunc. hec uerba Dei sunt

ne. aposiopesis, que irato uel perturbatio congruit

sumat. impleto numero electorum, gustaturi erant omnes de ligno uite et sic ad beatum statum migraturi, sed custodia est adhibita ne qui indigne facti sunt ulterius attingant.

de ligno. quod erat ei per sacramento

Historice. Et ait, Ecce adam factus est quasi unus ex nobis, et cetera. Propter Trinitatem pluralis numeros ponitur, sicut et ibi, Faciamus hominem et cetera. Replicatur igitur in caput superbi ad quem uenerit exitum quod a serpente est suggestum, eritis sicut dii, nec sunt uerba insultantis Dei, sed a superbia alios deterrentis, uidentes hominem non esse factum qualem uoluit sed amisisse quod factus sit.\textsuperscript{972} Videte ne forte de ligno uitate et cetera. Superiora uerba Dei sunt. Hoc autem factum propter uerba secutum, alienatus est a uita, non solum quam cum angelis accepturus erat si prestitisset, sed ab illa quam in paradiso habebat quasi excommunicatus a

\textsuperscript{970} Augustine, \textit{DGAL} XI, 39. [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 373–374].

\textsuperscript{971} \textit{Ad, Am} attribute this gloss to Strabo.

\textsuperscript{972} \textit{DGAL} XI, 39 [\textit{CSEL} 28 III 1, 374].
ligno uite quod erat ei per sacramento, sicut in ecclesia solent homines a sacramentis uisilibus ecclesie disciplina remoueri. 973

Mistique. Ecce Adam quasi unus ex nobis factus est, et cetera. Dupliciter intelligi potest, quasi unus ex senoribus, id est Deus, quod pertinet ad insultationem, sicut dicitur “ unus ex senoribus”, id est senor, uel quia Deus esset non natura sed creatoris sui beneficio, id est si sub eo manere uoluisset. Sciens bonum et malum. Quasi potestatem Dei pena sua discet esse ineuaetabilem, quam pati noluit beatus et consentiens, et habebit scientiam per penam quam Deus habet per sapientiam ad cognoscendum ueritatem. Videtur autem homo dimissus esse in labores huius uite, ut aliquando porrigat manum ad arborem uite, id est crucem, per quam uita reparatur eterna. Prohibito quoque intelligi potest, ut iusta pena post peccatum interclusus sit ad sapientiam aditus, donec Dei misericordia reuiouscat qui mortuus est. 974

In locum sibi congruum sicut plerumque malus cum inter bonos uiuere cepit, si in melius mutari noluerit, ex bonorum congregagione pellitur pondere praue consuetidinis sue, ut per mulierem scilicet uir preuaricaretur secundum illud, in similitudinem preuaricationis Ade. Seductus tamen non est, unde non ait, “ mulier seduxit me et comedi”, sed ipsa mihi dedit et comedi. Illa uero serpens inquit seduxit me. Ita Salomon, uir tante sapientie, non in simulachrorum cultu aliquid utilitatis esse credidit, sed mulierum amori resistere non ualuit, et quod sciebat non esse faciendum fecit, ne mortiferas delicias contristaret. Sic uxor etiam seducta manduauerat noluit Adam contristare, quam eredebat a se alienatam tabescere et sine solatio interire, non quidem carnis concupiscencia [cont. 21v] sed amicali beniuolentia qua sepe offenditur Deus, ne offendatur amicus. Alio ergo modo deceptus est quam mulier que falsum uerum esse putauit. 975
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Et emisit eum Dominus Deus de paradiso uoluptatis ut operaretur terram de qua sumptus est.

973 DGAL XI, 40 [CSEL 28 III 1, 375].
974 Augustine, DGCM II, 33–34 [CSEL 91, 156–158].
975 per mulierem... esse putauit. Augustine, DGAL XI, 42 [CSEL 28 III 1, 377–378].
emisit. quasi excommunicando sicut modo prau eiciuntur ab ecclesia
emisit. hec Dei actio
operaretur. id est ut in hoc corpore laboraret et ibi meritum redeundi sibi collocaret

Eiecitque Adam et collocauit ante paradisum uoluptatis [21v] cerubin et flameum gladium atque uersatilem ad custodiandam uiam ligni uite.

Eiecitque. quasi excommunicatum
flameum. plenitudine scientie, id est caritatem
flameum. angelicam potestatem
gladium. penam temporalem urentem sed transitoriain gladium. quia in aduentu filii remouendus
custodiandam. quia reuerti non possumus nisi per hec

[21r] Ieronymus. Et eiecit adam et habitare fecit contra paradisum uoluptatis et statuit cherubin et flammeam rupheam que uertitur ad custodiandam uiam ligni uite. Alius sensus est in Ebreo, aut enim “et eiecit Adam Dominus” scilicet “et habitare fecit ante paradisum uoluptatis cherubin et flammeum gladium” et cetera, non quod Adam habitare fecerit contra paradisum uoluptatis, sed illo eieicto ante fores paradisi cherubin et flammeum gladium posuerit ne quis posset intrare. 976

Historice. Et collocauit ante paradisum uoluptatis, et cetera. Hoc per celestes potestates etiam in paradiso uisibili factum esse credendum est, ut per angelicum ministerium illic esset quaedam ignea custodia, non tamen frustra sed quia alicquid de spirituali paradiso significat. 977

Mirum est si Adam spiritualis erat mente quamuis non corpore, quomodo serpenti credidit cum dicerit Deum lignum prohibuisse, quia sciebat eos si comederent futuros ut deos propter scientiam boni et mali, tanquam hoc solum creator creature inuideret. Sed nullomodo credere dum est spirituali mente preditione hoc credere potuisse, unde Adam non est seductus, et cetera [1 Tm 2:14]. 978

976 Jerome, HQLG 3, 34 [CCCL 72, 6].
977 DGAL XI, 40 [CSEL 28 III 1, 375].
978 Augustine, DGAL XI, 42 [CSEL 28 III 1, 376].
[21v] Mistice. *Et collocauit ante paradisum*, et cetera. Cherubin plenitudo scientie, hec est caritas, quia plenitudo legis dilectio. Gladius flammeus, pene temporales, que uersatiles quam tempora uolubilia sunt. Ad arborem ergo uite non reditur nisi per cherubin, id est plenitudinem scientie, id est caritatem, et per gladium uersatilem, id est tolerantiam temporalem.\(^{979}\)


\(^{979}\) Augustine, *DGCM* II, 35 [CSEL 91, 158–159].