

THE VULGATE IN ENGLAND

LONDON
Cambridge University Press
FETTER LANE

NEW YORK • TORONTO
BOMBAY • CALCUTTA • MADRAS
Macmillan

TOKYO
Maruzen Company Ltd

All rights reserved

HISTORY OF THE
VULGATE IN ENGLAND
FROM ALCUIN TO ROGER BACON

*Being an Inquiry into the
Text of some English Manuscripts
of the Vulgate Gospels*

BY

H. H. GLUNZ

Ph.D., Dr.Phil., Lecturer in the University of Cologne

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1933

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

Preface page ix

Classified List of Gospel Manuscripts Discussed or Quoted xiii

CHAPTER I

Difference between the Earlier and the Later
History of the Vulgate Text I

On the method of investigation. Effect of Christian ethics on the early tradition of the Vulgate. An example: the text of Gregory the Great. New tendencies in post-Carolingian times.

CHAPTER II

Last Currents of the Ancient Textual Tradition
on the Continent and in England 24

Alcuin's revision in conformity with early Christian ethics. Nature of Alcuin's text. The ascetic and ethical ideals of the monastic reformers: Benedict of Aniane. Gerhard of Brogne. Einold and John of Gorze. The reform of Cluny. Monastic Vulgate MSS representing the ancient textual tradition. English monasticism dependent on the Continent. Alfred's reform. Continental influence after Alfred. Conservative Vulgate texts in English monasteries. The new spirit in the Church superseding the monastic ideal.

CHAPTER III

The Early Scholastic Method of Interpretation
and its Influence on the Vulgate Text 72

Protests against the monastic 'Fog of Ignorance'. The new learning, a theory of interpretation: Fredegis of Tours. Origins of the new theory: Bede and Alcuin. First traces of the new method in the text of the Vulgate. Alcuin's part in the history of the Vulgate. His followers. Rabanus Maurus. Haymo of Halberstadt and Smaragdus of St Mihiel. Walafrid Strabo and the problem of the *Glossa Ordinaria*. Servatus Lupus of Ferrières. Heiric of Auxerre and the Irish scholars on the Continent. John the Scot and the Irish type of the Vulgate. Irish readings penetrating into the text of the post-Carolingian schools. Remigius of Auxerre and his principles of interpretation. Remigius's treatment of the Vulgate text. Contrast between the patristic and the early scholastic points of view. Odo and the new learning at Fleury. Abbo of Fleury. Fleury and the Cluniac reform of the English monasteries. The Winchester text: the York Minster gospels. Other Winchester books (and the Thorney gospels). The text of the Winchester gospels.

CHAPTER IV

Lanfranc and the Replacement of the Ancient English Types by the Text of the Universal Church 149

Importance of the post-Carolingian schools. Gerbert and the rise of dialectics. Fulbert of Chartres. Continental eleventh-century MSS in England. Lanfranc and the dialectic struggle. Lanfranc's revision of the gospel text. Reform of the English Church under Lanfranc. Lanfranc's Vulgate text in the English cathedrals and monasteries: Canterbury. St Albans. Dover Priory. Rochester. Winchester. Salisbury. Bury St Edmunds. Hereford. Durham. Lanfranc's part in the history of the English Church.

CHAPTER V

Twelfth-century Hermeneutics and the Scholastic Text of Peter the Lombard 197

Scholastic philosophy and the Vulgate text: Anselm of Canterbury. The French schools of interpretation in the twelfth century. The activity of Anselm of Laon. General structure of scholastic thought. Influence of hermeneutics on the Vulgate text. Peter the Lombard and the Glossa. Thomas Becket's and Herbert of Bosham's copies of the Glossa. Bosham on Peter the Lombard and the Glossa. The Lombard's school and Paris University. The Glossa in England: Christ Church, Canterbury. Hereford. Peterborough. Lincoln. Durham. Other monasteries. Relation between hermeneutics and the Vulgate text in the school of the Lombard. Analysis of Peter the Lombard's text. Scholastic idea of the Bible as an allegory of divine making. The words of the text subordinate to the divine meaning. The works of the Lombard the first classical example of the scholastic method as based on the Vulgate.

CHAPTER VI

Stabilisation of the Scholastic Text in the Thirteenth Century 259

Some prejudices as to origin and nature of the scholastic text. The glossed texts in the University of Paris. The Paris text in England. Oxford University. The stationers' share in the propagation of the scholastic text. The Friars in the Universities. Exegetical methods in the thirteenth century. True meaning of Roger Bacon's critical remarks on the Vulgate of his time. The 'Correctiones Bibliorum'. Conclusion.

CONTENTS	vii
APPENDIX A	
Notes on the Canterbury MSS X and O. Revised Collation of Codex X	294
APPENDIX B	
On the Gospel Commentaries of John the Scot and Remigius of Auxerre	305
APPENDIX C	
The Gospel Commentaries of Anselm of Laon	316
APPENDIX D	
The Gospel Glosses in the Harleian MS 1802 (about 1140, from Armagh)	328
APPENDIX E	
Herbert of Bosham's Prefaces to his Revision of the Great Gloss of Peter the Lombard	341
APPENDIX F	
Specimens of Three English Gospel Commentaries of the Thirteenth Century	351
<i>Index of MSS</i>	363
<i>Index of Gospel Passages</i>	365
<i>Index of Proper Names</i>	378

PREFACE

THE opinion still prevails, even among modern scholars, that the text of our numerous Vulgate manuscripts, which are later in date than the ninth or tenth century, is 'of no use'. The utilitarian manner of viewing the development of the Vulgate has been practised in this branch of literary history ever since textual critics recognised the considerable value which attaches to the history of the Vulgate text in regard to the task of sifting the manuscripts, and of reconstructing the original of St Jerome. Again, as the tale of 'the hopeless perversion and absurd triviality' of scholastic exegesis (Farrar) was commonly credited, the close connection between the Latin Bible and the religious and philosophical activity of the classical Middle Ages was ignored owing to a vague fear felt by certain scholars in the presence of medieval thought.

In the following pages an attempt has been made to explain in what way the later medieval Vulgate text (as distinct from the pre-Carolingian types of the Vulgate) was determined by the theoretical or, in a broad sense, scientific principles underlying the method of scholastic philosophy. Not only will the investigation thus throw light on the nature of the later medieval Vulgate text, but it will also help to elucidate the structure of scholastic thought itself, and lay a foundation upon which further study and a just estimate of scholastic philosophy may safely be built.

Furthermore, inasmuch as the study of the Vulgate has to take account of the learning of the time, it will help to emphasise the true significance of certain events and periods in ecclesiastical history. It will show that the reform of the English monasteries under Dunstan and Æthelwold was more than a mere revival of the monastic ideal, and that this movement towards reform first made known in England the new learning which was then the highest achievement of theological thought. A century later, the 'orthodox' Vulgate text, introduced into the

English Church, forms an exact parallel to the other branches of ecclesiastical culture which, by the influence of Lanfranc, were made to conform to the continental standards. One has only to think of Dr Z. N. Brooke's researches on Lanfranc's introduction of the continental Canon Law into England¹ to appreciate the importance of the fact that Lanfranc also imported a Vulgate text which had been evolved in French schools, and according to the exegetical rules of the General Church. Indeed, the more we learn about the ecclesiastical aspects of the Conquest, the more it appears that with the Conquest England surrendered the very last peculiarities of her ancient Church to the standards of the Greater Church. Lastly, the second half of the twelfth century saw the triumph of the Lombard's scholastic system in Paris and, owing to Becket's connection with France, almost simultaneously in England. Henceforth the interpenetration of continental and English thought remained uninterrupted throughout the later Middle Ages.

* * * * *

The author has pleasure in acknowledging the manifold obligations which he incurred while his work was in progress. Above all his thanks are due to the Council of Trinity College, Cambridge, whose generosity enabled him to pursue his studies in a two years' research course at Cambridge; and to Professor F. C. Burkitt, who acted as a wise supervisor during that period. For permission to examine manuscripts, and for their ever-ready assistance, he feels grateful to the librarians and staffs of the British Museum, the Bodleian, and the Cambridge University Libraries; and to the following librarians and assistants respectively: Canon W. H. Kynaston, of Lincoln Cathedral Library; the Rev. F. Harrison, the Rev. C. Jackson, and Mrs Hanks, of the Library of York Minster; Mr K. C.

¹ *The English Church and the Papacy from the Conquest to the Reign of John*, Cambridge 1931.

Bayley, Mr J. M. Falkner, and Mr E. H. Knight, of Durham Cathedral; Canon A. L. Lilley, of Hereford Cathedral; Canon C. Wordsworth, of Salisbury Cathedral; Canon A. W. Goodman, of Winchester Cathedral. At Oxford: Mr R. F. Bretherton, of Wadham College; Mr R. Jeffery, of Brasenose; Mr T. W. Allen, of Queen's; Mr A. L. Poole, of St John's; the Rev. J. P. Thornton-Duesbery, of Corpus Christi. At Cambridge: Dr C. W. Previt -Orton, and Mr C. C. Scott, of St John's College; Mr A. L. Attwater, of Pembroke; Mr H. Butterfield, of Peterhouse; the Rev. Sir E. C. Hoskyns, of Corpus Christi; and particularly to Mr H. M. Adams, of Trinity College, Cambridge, and his staff, the author's thanks are due. Owing to the never-failing kindness of the last-named the author's work in Trinity College Library, though often onerous to them, became a pleasure to him.

The author's friends, the Chevalier de St George, Comte d'Albanie, of the University of Cologne, and Mr S. B. Chrimes, of Trinity College, Cambridge, were good enough to read the manuscript of the book, and to make many valuable suggestions. The careful and painstaking work of the Printer and the correctors of the Cambridge University Press has contributed much to the accuracy that is so desirable in such works as the present. The liberal-mindedness of the Managers of the Hort Memorial Fund, and of the Council of Trinity College, Cambridge, in enabling the Press to undertake the publication, is deserving of the highest gratitude and admiration.

H. H. G.

TRINITY COLLEGE
CAMBRIDGE

August 1932

CLASSIFIED LIST OF GOSPEL MSS
DISCUSSED OR QUOTED

i. *The Roman, and Early Anglo-Saxon, Type.*

- (1) X, C.C.C.C. MS 286, the four gospels, about 600, written in half-uncials by an Italian scribe. The book belonged to St Augustine's, Canterbury. The text both of this MS (X*) and of all others in this group approximately represents that quoted by St Gregory.
- (2) O, Bodl. MS Auct. D. 2: 14, the four gospels, once belonging to St Augustine's, Canterbury. Written in England, in Roman half-uncials of the seventh century.
- (3) Hereford Cathedral MS P. 2. ix (Gloss on Proverbs, twelfth century), containing two leaves with Mt vii 25-viii 13, and a commentary on this text. The hand is a Roman half-uncial of the eighth century and was probably active in a Southern English monastery.
- (4) Worcester Cathedral, fragments of a late eighth-century gospel book written (at Worcester?) in insular half-uncials. Only the end of Matthew, the capitula of Mark, and Mc x 26-42 remain. A facsimile edition was made by C. H. Turner, *Early Worcester MSS*, Oxford 1916, pp. 1-6.
- (5) Durham Cathedral MS A. ii. 17, foll. 1-102, the gospels of John, Mark, and Luke, written by an insular (Northumbrian?) hand of the middle of the eighth century.

ii. *Sources of Alcuin's Revision.*

- (6) Brit. Mus. Royal MS 1. E. vi, the gospels, written at St Augustine's, Canterbury, in insular half-uncials of the eighth century. The script is modelled on the Northumbrian style, whilst the illuminations no less than the three purple leaves inserted in the book show continental influence. The text is Northumbrian of the Z*-X*-O type.
- (7) Brit. Mus. MS Harley 2788, a gold codex of the gospels written in Alcuin's time (or shortly afterwards?) in Central France. The script is a beautiful uncial, only the accessory matter (capitula, prologues, etc.) being given in Carolingian minuscules. The text is predominantly insular; only in one place is the influence of early ninth-century exegesis noticeable.
- (8) Brit. Mus. Royal MS 1. B. vii, the gospels, in an insular (or, more exactly, Irish) hand of the eighth century working in Northumbria. The text of the original hand is closely akin to Y.
- (5a) Durham Cathedral MS A. ii. 17, foll. 103-111, fragments of Luke (xxi 33-xxiii 44), in insular half-uncials of the eighth century; allied to A.

xiv CLASSIFIED LIST OF GOSPEL MSS

- (9) York Minster MS xvi.N.6, a small thirteenth-century Bible written at York. The gospels in the book were copied from an early MS (of the eighth or ninth century?) preserved at York in the thirteenth century.

iii. *Continental Conservative Tradition.*

- (10) Brit. Mus. MS Harley 2823, the gospels, written in France in the late ninth or early tenth century, in Carolingian minuscules. The text is akin to K; but it contains certain scholastic readings owing to the influence of the schools in the second half of the ninth century.
- (11) Brit. Mus. Add. MS 11849, a small gospel book in Carolingian minuscules of about 900 or shortly after. Written at Tours; Alcuinian text.
- (12) Brit. Mus. MS Harley 2830, the gospels, written at St Martin's, Louvain, in the first half of the eleventh century. The illuminations are in the Flemish style of the period. Just as no. (10), this book has some early scholastic readings.
- (13) Brit. Mus. MS Harley 2797, the gospels, of the late ninth century, from St Geneviève, Paris. A gold MS written in Carolingian minuscules. The text is a mixture of the various types to be found in the ninth century, but the Alcuinian element prevails.
- (14) Brit. Mus. Add. MS 40000 ('the Thorney Gospels'), of the ninth (or tenth?) century; Carolingian minuscules of Central France. The text of the first hand is that dominant at Tours in the time of Alcuin. Æthelwold, Bishop of Winchester and first Abbot of Thorney, presented the book to the house of his foundation. The insular corrections in the text date from the late tenth or the eleventh century and are of a group with the Winchester text.
- (15) Brit. Mus. MS Egerton 608, the gospels, of the late tenth century, in Carolingian minuscules. The illuminations and the ornamental pages of this beautiful MS mark it as a late specimen of post-Carolingian art flourishing in the preceding century. Accordingly, the text also is Carolingian, but not without having undergone alterations under scholastic influence.
- (16) Bodl. MS Douce 292, the gospels of Matthew and Mark only, about 1000, in Carolingian minuscules. The remarks made on the execution of no. (15) apply also to this MS. From Laon?
- (17) Bodl. MS Auct. D.2.16 ('the Leofric Gospels'), late tenth century, written at Landévennec, Brittany, and given by Bishop Leofric to St Peter's, Exeter. Traditional text.
- (18) Brit. Mus. MS Cotton Tiberius A.ii, the gospels, about 900, in Carolingian minuscules of German origin. The book was given by Emperor Otto the Great to King Æthelstan. Traditional text; but the influence of the schools is noticeable.

iv. *Insular Conservative Tradition.*

- (19) Brit. Mus. Royal MS 1.A.xviii, the gospels, given by King Æthelstan to St Augustine's, Canterbury. Written, just as E, about 870, in Carolingian minuscules by an Irish scribe working in one of the schools of Auxerre, Paris, Laon, or Rheims, where the influence of Irish scholars made itself strongly felt in the early second half of the ninth century. The text is almost purely Irish.
- (20) Brit. Mus. Royal MS 1.D.iii, the gospels, first half of the eleventh century, copied at Canterbury from no. (19) for Countess Goda of Boulogne and given by her to Rochester Cathedral.
- (21) C.C.C. Oxford MS 122 (F.2.14), the gospels, written at Dublin in the late Irish type of script, eleventh (or twelfth?) century. The text is Irish.
- (22) Brit. Mus. MS Harley 1023, the gospels, written about 1140 in Ireland.
- (23) Brit. Mus. MS Harley 1803, the gospels, written at Armagh about 1139-1140. The space in the margins and between the lines of the Irish text is in part covered by glosses which were read in the Cathedral school at Paris in the fourth decade of the twelfth century.
- (24) Hereford Cathedral MS P.1.ii, the gospels, in an insular hand of the late ninth century. Irish illuminations.
- (25) Pembroke College Cambridge MS 302, the gospel lessons, copied about the middle of the eleventh century at Hereford from a continental exemplar. The text is mainly Irish, but interspersed with scholastic elements.
- (26) St John's College Oxford MS 194, the gospels, about 1000, in small Carolingian minuscules. The MS belonged to, and was probably also written at, Christ Church, Canterbury. Alcuinian text.
- (27) Bodl. MS Bodley 155, the gospels, written for Barking Abbey in the late tenth (or early eleventh) century. Its original must have come from the North of France (Landévennec, Montreuil); the text is closely related to no. (17).
- (28) Brit. Mus. Add. MS 9381, the gospels, written for St Petroc's, Bodmin, about 940 in an insular hand using Carolingian minuscules. Both this fact and the text of the book necessitate the assumption that the MS was copied by an insular scribe trained on the Continent, from an original which came from a monastic school such as Laon, Rheims, or Paris.
- (29) Salisbury Cathedral MS 77, the gospels (Lc xii 18-xvii 10, Lc xix 39-Jo ii 22 are missing), of the late eleventh century. Considering the date of the book, its text is archaic and was probably written in a provincial town (Salisbury?).

xvi CLASSIFIED LIST OF GOSPEL MSS

- (30) Brit. Mus. Add. MS 11850, the gospels, about the middle of the eleventh century, probably written in one of the larger scriptoria in South England. The Northern French influence is very marked in the illuminations and the script of the book.

v. *Early Texts Containing Scholastic Variants.*

- (31) E, Brit. Mus. MS Egerton 609, the gospels, about 860-870, written at St Martin's, Tours (or Marmoutier), by an insular scribe practising the Carolingian minuscule. The Irish text of the book reached the Continent through the Irish scholars settling in continental schools under Charles the Bald; there it was influenced by the new variants resulting from post-Carolingian exegesis. Cf. nos. (19 a), (28 a).
- (15 a) Brit. Mus. MS Egerton 608. See no. (15). The text shows the influence of Remigius's schools.
- (19 a) Brit. Mus. Royal MS 1.A.xviii. See no. (19). As to the text of this book, the same remarks apply as to no. (31).
- (28 a) Brit. Mus. Add. MS 9381. See no. (28), and remarks on the text of no. (31).
- (32) York Minster, 'The Anglo-Saxon Gospels', about 960-970, written partly in France (Fleury?), partly in England (Winchester?), and taken to York by Archbishop Oswald (972-992). The earliest example of the Winchester text.
- (33) Copenhagen Royal Library MS Gl. kgl. S. 10. fol., the gospels dating from about 1000, from a Southern English monastery. Illuminations in the Winchester style.
- (34) Trinity College Cambridge MS B.10.4, the gospels, probably dating from 1008, written at Winchester. Both the text and the exterior (script, illuminations, etc.) of this and the following five books bear the definite characteristics of one school, viz. Winchester.
- (35) Brit. Mus. Add. MS 34890 ('the Grimbald Gospels'), probably of the early eleventh century, from New Minster, Winchester. Among the usual prologues, this MS contains a singular preface not to be found in any of the other gospel books; f. 5^v: '*Incipit praefatio sancti Victoris episcopi Capuae civitatis. Cum fortuitu in manus meas unum ex quattuor evangelium incideret...*' (etc.). The book is a valuable witness to the character of the Winchester text.
- (36) St John's College Cambridge MS 73, the gospels, eleventh century, perhaps from St Augustine's, Canterbury.
- (37) Brit. Mus. Royal MS 1.D.ix, the gospels, early eleventh century, from Canterbury.
- (38) Brit. Mus. MS Harley 76, the gospels, eleventh century, from Bury St Edmunds.

CLASSIFIED LIST OF GOSPEL MSS xvii

- (39) Pembroke College Cambridge MS 301, the gospels, eleventh century, perhaps from Ely (or Bury?). The last page (f. 134^v) contains, by the same hand, a peculiar preface to Luke: 'Lucas generatione syrus cuius laus in evangelio canitur apud antiochiam medicinę artis...' (etc.; ends:) 'sed etiam animarum eius proficeret medicina'. Just as no. (35), this book seems to be an independent witness of the Winchester text.
- (40) Brit. Mus. Add. MS 17739, the gospels, about the middle of the eleventh century, from the North of France. The beautiful illuminations and initials are in the Flemish style of the period.
- (25 a) Pembroke College Cambridge MS 302, see no. (25). The scholastic readings mark one source of the text of this MS as continental.

vi. *Lanfranc's Scholastic Text.*

- (41) Brit. Mus. Royal MS 1.B.xi, the gospels, first half of the twelfth century, from St Augustine's, Canterbury. The illuminations, in the Northern French (Norman?) style of the period, are unfinished, perhaps because even at the time when it was written the book was recognised as antiquated. Numerous interlinear notes.
- (42) Wadhams College Oxford MS ii (A.10.22), the gospels, about 1070 (or shortly after), written in Southern England. Taking only the character of the writing and of the illuminations into account, the MS is a late and decadent specimen of the Winchester style.
- (43) C.C.C.C. MS 72, the gospels, about 1180, from Canterbury.
- (44) Trinity College Cambridge MS B.5.1, Bible of large size, about 1175-1180, from Christ Church, Canterbury.
- (45) C.C.C.C. MS 48, second volume of a large Bible, end of the twelfth century, written at St Albans. The gospels are arranged in four parallel columns.
- (46) St John's College Cambridge MS 183, a small Bible, early thirteenth century, from St Albans.
- (47) C.C.C.C. MS 4, second volume of the 'Dover Bible', about 1170, from Dover Priory. Perhaps written at Canterbury.
- (48) Phillipp's Collection, Cheltenham, 'the Gundulf Bible', in two vols., written at Rochester under Bishop Gundulf in the last quarter of the eleventh century. The exterior of this book is very similar to no. (54).
- (49) Winchester Cathedral, the Great Bible, in three vols., about 1160-1170, written at St Swithin's, Winchester.
- (50) Salisbury Cathedral MS 148, extensive fragments of the second volume of a large Bible, written at Salisbury in the first half of the twelfth century. The gospels cover foll. 81^v-113^v.
- (51) W, Brit. Mus. Royal MS 1.B.xii, a Bible written at Salisbury in 1254. A mere copy of no. (50), when the latter was still complete.

xviii CLASSIFIED LIST OF GOSPEL MSS

- (52) Pembroke College Cambridge MS 120, New Testament, early twelfth century, from Bury St Edmunds; six leaves of beautiful illuminations.
- (53) Hereford Cathedral MS O. 1. viii, the gospels, first half of the twelfth century; from Hereford.
- (54) Durham Cathedral MS A. ii. 4, second volume of 'Carilef's Bible', about 1080-1090, written at Durham for Bishop William of St Carilef. Illuminations; the writing is reminiscent of the style practised in the scriptoria of Normandy in the eleventh century.
- (55) Durham Cathedral MS A. ii. 2, a Bible in two vols., second half of the twelfth century, written at Durham. The text is copied from no. (54).
- (56) Durham Cathedral MS A. ii. 1, 'Pudsey's Bible', in four vols., the fourth volume containing the New Testament. Written at Durham, late in the twelfth century, for Bishop Hugh Pudsey. Illuminations.

vii. *Peter the Lombard's Scholastic Text* (*'Textus Parisiensis'*).

- (57) Bodl. MS Rawlinson G. 169, gospel of St Matthew, about 1160, English (in 1279 the book was in the possession of Master Michael, Rector of Crophorne, Worcestershire). A contemporary cursive hand added the Glossa, in dry-point.
- (58) Trinity College Cambridge MS B. 5. 5, the gospels with the Gloss, about 1160, from Christ Church, Canterbury. Written for Archbishop Thomas Becket, probably by a French scribe. The style of this and similar books determined all later copies of the Glossa, first of all in the Canterbury scriptorium.
- (59) Trinity College Cambridge MS B. 5. 3, the gospels with the Gloss, early thirteenth century, from St Albans.
- (60) St John's College Oxford MS 111, the glossed gospel of Matthew, about 1150-1160, English. Arrangement of the Gloss earlier than that in no. (58).
- (61) Queen's College Oxford MS 317, the glossed gospels of Matthew and Mark, thirteenth century; from Reading?
- (62) St John's College Oxford MS 129, the glossed gospel of John, about 1150-1160, English. Cf. no. (60).
- (63) Salisbury Cathedral MS 41, the glossed gospel of John, about 1160; from Salisbury? First leaf is missing (begins at Jo ii 12).

viii. *The Paris Text Established.*

- (64) Brit. Mus. MS Cotton Domitianus A. vii (the Durham *Liber Vitae*, from ninth to fourteenth century), containing at the beginning several leaves with short extracts from the gospels, about 1160-1170, from Durham.

- (65) Brit. Mus. MS Harley 4747, the gospels, first half of the thirteenth century. Probably written at Durham.
- (66) Brasenose College Oxford MS v, a Bible, early thirteenth century, probably produced by a professional scribe in Oxford University. Careless text, often corrected.
- (67) Queen's College Oxford MS 52, a Bible, first half of the thirteenth century. The modern division into chapters (by Stephen Langton) has been introduced, as in all following numbers.
- (68) York Minster MS xvi.D.3, a Bible, late thirteenth century, probably produced at York. According to an inscription (on the last leaf but one) the book was in 1510 given to St Martin's Church in Coney Street, York.
- (69) Wadham College Oxford MS ix (A.10.24), a very small Bible, thirteenth century, English.
- (70) C.C.C.C. MS 463, a Bible, late thirteenth century, perhaps from St Albans. The writing is very good. A cursive hand added numerous glosses in the margins.
- (71) Wadham College Oxford MS i (A.5.2), a Bible, thirteenth century, probably written for the Oxford house of Black Friars. Inscription on fol. 431^v: 'Anno domini .m^o.cc^o.xl^o. quarto perfecta est Biblia ista. Guillelmus dictus miles Parisiensis consummavit eam. Sit ipse particeps omnium honorum qui in ea comprehenduntur'.
- (72) Trinity College Cambridge MS B.10.21, a Bible, thirteenth century, from an English Dominican house.

ix. *Corrections.*

- (73) Bodl. MS Auct. D.3.1, a Bible, late fourteenth century, from Syon Monastery; Paris text. Foll. 387-407 contain the 'Correctiones Bibliac', by the same hand as the text.
- (74) Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37487, a Bible, middle of the thirteenth century, from an Italian Dominican monastery; Paris text. The margins contain numerous notes from a Correction.
- (75) St John's College Cambridge MS 74, a large Bible, about 1300, from Gisburne Priory (Yorks); detailed notes from a Correction in the margins.

* * * * *

The variant readings from these codices are quoted so as to show first the Vulgate reading (also given under the symbol vulg), then the variant of the MS in question, both readings being separated by a colon. The Vulgate text is given according to the edition of I. Wordsworth and H. I. White, *Novum Testamentum Domini nostri Iesu Christi latine*, Oxford 1889-1898. Wherever possible, the previous history of a variant

xx CLASSIFIED LIST OF GOSPEL MSS

has been indicated by adding the symbols of those codices (from the Apparatus Criticus of the Oxford Vulgate) that contain the variant. For lists of these symbols, and the MSS they denote, see Wordsworth and White's edition, pp. xi, xxviii, xxxi; H. Glunz, *Britannien und Bibeltext*, Leipzig 1930, p. 13. The MSS thus cited are arranged according to the types to which they belong, viz.

- (a) AYX^oH*ΔS(F), the Southern Italian, or Northumbrian, type representing what is comparatively the best MS tradition of St Jerome's text;
- (b) Z*MJIPΣ¹(Bℱ*ℙG), the early Italian mixed type, which is more or less marked by Old Latin elements and well known from St Gregory's quotations. An English offshoot of this is
- (c) X*O*, the Anglo-Saxon type, prevailing in Bede's quotations;
- (d) CT, the Spanish type;
- (e) Dℙ^{ms}LQRE, or ir, the Irish type;
- (f) H^oΘ, Theodulf of Orleans's revision;
- (g) KMTVZ^o(O^o), or alc, Alcuin's revision;
- (h) W, a specimen of the early scholastic text (as revised by Lanfranc); cor. vat., a Correction of the thirteenth century; ⚭ ⚮ ⚯, or vg, the text of some sixteenth-century editions. Where W and vg agree, mod (i.e. 'moderni') has often been put.

Old Latin texts are indicated by the usual small letters (or, more frequently, by vett), Greek MSS by the usual symbols (or, gr). Dots after a symbol mean that not all manuscript witnesses are quoted. Where it was thought necessary to make the finding of the word under discussion easier in a particular verse, the preceding or the following word has been given in brackets.

*	m. pr.	first, or original, hand of the MS.
°	corr., m.sec.	second, or the corrector's, hand.
1, 2, 3		hand of the first, second, etc., corrector.
ms	in mg	reading in margin of MS.
	sup. lin.	reading above the line.
	eras.	reading, or word, erased.
	in ras.	word written on an erasure.
	om	word omitted.
	+	word added.
	>	order of words inverted.

¹ The symbol Σ is used for the Codex Sangallensis no. 1395, of the early sixth century, edited by C. H. Turner, *The Oldest MS of the Vulgate Gospels*, Oxford 1931.

CHAPTER I

Difference between the Earlier and the Later History of the Vulgate Text

ON THE METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

THE history of the Vulgate text from the ninth century onwards has not hitherto been investigated at any length. The main reason for this is that textual criticism, seeking to reconstruct the original of St Jerome, has found it of no practical value and, therefore, of little interest.¹

It cannot be denied that the textual development of the Vulgate, in the period with which we propose to deal, differs essentially from that of the earlier centuries, during which traditions were clearly established. The MSS that survive could be divided into distinct families or types, each of which, at least a priori, claimed to be derived from the unknown original. Indeed, no matter what were the intermediate links, the Italian, Spanish, Irish, Gregorian, Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, Theodulfian, and Alcuinian texts are the final derivatives from a common source and there is always the possibility that in many places a comparatively late type, like Alcuin's edition at the beginning of the ninth century, might offer a better text than, say, MSS of the sixth century.

To explain this, we must inquire how the Vulgate spread in its early days down to the time of Alcuin and even beyond it. In another study we have endeavoured to show² that the numerous recensions to which the text was subjected in the course of its journey from Italy, to Spain,

¹ This has been demonstrated by H. Quentin, *Mémoire sur l'établissement du texte de la Vulgate*, Rome et Paris 1922 (Collectanea Biblica Latina vi), pp. 94, 97 f., 385 ff.

² H. Glunz, *Britannien und Bibeltext* (Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten xii), Leipzig 1930.

2 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EARLIER AND

Gaul, Ireland, and England were the natural results of the practical attitude adopted by those who were concerned in the propaganda. Each type was founded on a form, or forms, of text and the forms themselves were derived in a similar manner from earlier sources. The researches of French Benedictine scholars such as Dom de Bruyne and Dom Quentin¹ have gone far to make it very probable that the Vulgate reached the beginning of the ninth century in a twofold or threefold line of tradition. So the connection between St Jerome and Theodulf, Alcuin, or the Spanish ninth-century MSS is in itself a guarantee that in these later types we possess all the material necessary for a reconstruction of the original. And that is as much as textual criticism can expect from the mere MS material.²

The question may be raised, however, whether such an arrangement of the MSS, extremely useful and convenient as it is for the textual critic, will be necessarily correct from the historical point of view. It would seem that the various lines of tradition have not remained distinct from each other in the course of their development, but that they mixed at an early date, so that the greater number of the MSS are the outcome of many interpenetrations of types, that is to say, none of them actually is the pure representative of a type. The question is admittedly of minor importance for the earlier history of the Vulgate, but it has a bearing on the later period, when the intermixing has become so general that the retention of the distinction would not be justified. It has so far been customary to regard the post-Carolingian text, even one so late as the Paris text of the thirteenth century, as a mixture of separate traditions. This view carried with it the tacit assumption that the history of the Vulgate in post-Carolingian time moved in lines more or less analogous

¹ D. de Bruyne, 'Étude sur les origines de la Vulgate en Espagne' (*Revue Benedictine* xxxi, 1919, 373 ff.); H. Quentin, *op. cit.*

² See the stemma in Quentin, *op. cit.* p. 352. Also in Glunz, *op. cit.*, an attempt has been made to outline the two separate branches of the tradition down to the ninth century.

to those of the earlier centuries. The vague notions which have been held as to the nature and character of the so-called *Exemplar Parisiense*, a text never properly studied, appear to be responsible for a view which has little in common with the facts. There is one fact, however, which alone should have been sufficient warning; it is that after Alcuin's revision there has never been another text to play any considerable part whatever in the Vulgate history. Alcuin's text, mixture as it is of at least two distinct textual traditions,¹ remains, in the following centuries, the only genuine type, and the only link with Jerome which supports the claim of the Paris text to be called a derivative of the Vulgate. It furnishes an illustration of what Professor Allgeier says of textual development in general²—that in the history of a text a point will invariably be reached at which the increase of the number of variant readings comes to a standstill. This is the case when the various types have attained their full growth and, for one reason or another, one of them becomes predominant and in the end remains supreme. And, from the ninth century onwards, this is the position of the Alcuinian text.

But if this is the situation shortly after A.D. 800, what, it might reasonably be asked, constitutes the further history of the Vulgate? The answer must take account of the fact that the history of a text differs essentially from those constructions which are intended to guide textual criticism. From the point of view of the latter the Alcuinian recension is indeed the last type to be taken account of in the enucleation of Jerome's original; to the critic of the text the true tradition comes to an end in the ninth century.³ To the historian, however, the critical annotations in the edition of Wordsworth and White are sufficient proof to

¹ See Glunz, *op. cit.* p. 129 ff.; and below, chap. II. De Bruyne, *op. cit.* p. 393. In Quentin's analysis of the Alcuinian text this important fact does not come into consideration at all. There Alcuin's revision appears as a representative of the pure Amiatine tradition.

² A. Allgeier, *Die altlateinischen Psalterien*, Freiburg i. B. 1928, p. 55 f.

³ Glunz, *op. cit.* p. 175.

4 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EARLIER AND

make him realise that the text does more than simply retain such readings as existed in the century after Charlemagne. New variants appear on the scene, to which Wordsworth's *W* and *vg* witness, and of which not a trace is to be found in the MSS up to the Emperor's time. These variants seem to indicate that there were forces at work tending towards a further development of the one text as distinct from the earlier types. In the ninth century the point is reached where the various chains of tradition which lead back to St Jerome cease to grow, because the forces to which they owed their origin are being superseded by something else. No longer is the spirit of practical activity, which first carried the Vulgate to the various parts of newly converted Europe, the inspiring power required for the preaching and transcribing of the gospel and, in many cases, the altering of the text. It is now a question of finding, in the words of Professor Allgeier, the intrinsic principle which in the future will be responsible for any textual changes that might occur. We shall see in due course how a theoretical principle becomes closely associated with almost all the uses to which the text of the Bible was generally put in the post-Carolingian period. In order to understand clearly the textual history of that period the historian who approaches it from a study of the preceding period is faced with the necessity of altering his point of view. He will find himself constrained to abandon all considerations as to the usefulness and value of the results for the criticism and reconstruction of the text. The principle underlying the new readings in the text merely serves to explain these, and it is this principle on which the attention of the historian will have to be concentrated.

EFFECT OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS ON THE
EARLY TRADITION OF THE VULGATE

Before attempting the main problem it may seem advisable to enter somewhat more deeply into the nature of the forces to which the shaping of the Vulgate text was due before the period under consideration. Was there in the interval between the fifth and the ninth century but one single theoretical principle which could have influenced the character of the text? We have endeavoured to show in a previous study that this was not the case, that on the contrary there were only the practical needs of the moment and of the society or the individual in whose activities the Bible played a part, which could at all impress on the text a certain typical stamp. The reason for this is found in the fact that in the first centuries after St Jerome's work the character of Christianity was essentially dynamic, active, and practical. The missionary monks, who first carried the Latin version of the Bible into the parts they were about to christianize, as well as the scholars, who undertook the correcting or the collecting of the version of St Jerome in the form of an edition, were the authors of what we call to-day groups or types of the text, and there is a close connection between the spirituality and the intention that lay at the bottom of their zeal, and the influence they exercised upon the Latin text of the Bible. It certainly is not mere speculation to say that the spirit which drove the early missionaries to foreign and dangerous parts was in full conformity with those ethical precepts of practical activity by which it was made the duty of the individual Christian at every moment and in all situations to act up to the Christian principles by a definite decision of the will. According to the ethical ideas of St Augustine¹ (who was the greatest spiritual power in the Church for

¹ On the important part which Augustinian ideas played throughout the Middle Ages, cf. M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode* i, Freiburg i. B. 1909, 126 ff., 135.

6 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EARLIER AND

centuries after his death), the Church was hardly anything more than the spiritual ground within the folds of which the individual member participated in divine grace, that is to say, he was given freedom of decision; he could convert the possibility to act either way, for or against God, to his positive spiritual gain or his actual spiritual detriment. God has given equal chances to all Christians, it lies with them to prove their being children of God, or of the devil, by making good use of their chances, or by rejecting them. This equality of chances is, with St Augustine, an essential characteristic of the Church:

God has given worldly goods both to the good and to the evil, lest his followers who are not yet far advanced in the spirit should covet them as something great; and this is the sacrament of the Old Testament, in which the New lies concealed, that there promise is made of worldly goods to those eager for the spirit, though not yet able to manifest it. The temporal gifts of those times signify the eternal life; in these gifts of God the true bliss was to consist.¹

But the happiness and bliss of the Christian is a mere possibility which, if it is to become reality, must receive substance through the actions of the individual. It is a question of choice between two sides in a given opportunity which decides whether the Christian will attain to that felicity or not. So Augustine says of Christian princes that it is not a sign of their having found favour with God, if they enjoy such wealth and power as they have been endowed with; if, it may be, they reign longer than a pagan prince, if they leave the realm to their sons and die in peace, if they succeed in vanquishing their enemies or keeping order at home;

but we call them blessed by God (*felices*) if they govern in justice; if the words of those who extol them or the obsequious manners of humble petitioners do not make them proud, but make them mindful of being human; if they make their power the servant of God's majesty by propagating the worship of Him; if they fear, love, and worship God; if they take vengeance

¹ *De civitate Dei*, lib. iv, c. 33 (Migne xli 139 f.).

only as necessary for the governing and protecting of the State, not in order to satiate their hatred of the enemy; if they dismiss a criminal not because they would foster iniquity, but because there is hope for his conversion; if when compelled to act severely they make up by an act of lenient mercy and beneficent liberality; if they check lust the more, the easier it is to be licentious; if they would sooner govern bad inclinations than subjects of any kind; and if they do all this not for the sake of vainglory, but for the love of eternal bliss, and if they do not omit to make a sacrifice of humility, repentance and prayer to God for their sins.¹

The law of the gospel is, therefore, not to recoil from an opportunity which offers itself to the Christian for proving his loyalty to the party of God by a decision forced upon him in a given situation. It is important to notice in this ethical precept the absence of all considerations as to the end or purpose of a moral act. No definite aim is set forward towards which the act might be directed; implications or definitions of goodness, piety and other virtues as inherent in some end to be achieved by the act are entirely wanting. The place of a narrowly limited or defined end of action is taken by an infinite series of historical events, sent and predestined by God in the course of time with the express purpose of offering to his children opportunities to prove their loyalty, i.e. to act morally, or to fail to do so. History in the broader sense of the word, especially the history of Christianity, appeared to Augustine as a mere series of events in the encountering of which the citizens of the City of God succeeded, or failed, in manifesting their allegiance to the standard of Christian ethics: the adherents of God practised the Christian principle, whereas their antagonists were drawn yet further into their ignorant and blind strife against the principle of all good, the *Summum Bonum*. So the historical theory is largely bound up with the system of ethics. The human will is free from restrictions which a predisposed end-in-view might exercise

¹ *Ib.* lib. v, c. 24 (*ib.* col. 170 f.).

8 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EARLIER AND

upon the action itself.¹ The members of the Celestial City live a moral and Christian life by constantly attending to and obeying the call of God in all situations in which they may be called upon to act. The Christian in all daily emergencies requiring a definite action on his part decides the turn of his action in conformity to the will of God; he meets each situation with the best of his mental and intellectual capabilities and then adopts suitable means to direct it so as to make it agree with what he takes to be the divine will:

Man is gifted with a rational soul, and therefore he subordinates all he has in common with animals to the peace of his soul, so that he may contemplate a situation and act accordingly. Then there will be that perfect agreement between intellect and action which we have called the peace of the rational soul. In order to attain to that cognisance of the useful, and accordingly to arrange his life and habit of acting, he must not heed sorrow nor be guided by desire or frightened by death. But lest through the weakness of the human mind in the very examining of a situation he fall into some error, he must needs have divine advice that he may obey with equanimity, and divine help that he may obey with freedom. And because during this mortal life he is separated from God, he must walk in the faith and so ordain all peace of mind or body to that peace which is between mortal man and immortal God, so that his obedience be to the eternal law, in the faith.²

These words might have been said of any of the missionary monks to whom we owe the early propagation of the Vulgate in Europe. They contain the two principal elements for which their activity was conspicuous, the belief that divine inspiration and the will of God overshadowed their work, and the conviction that they had to make full use of their insight into the conditions, requirements, and possibilities of a given situation.

Nor is St Augustine the only one to stress these points, especially the latter. They form part of early Christian ethics and can frequently be found in the reflections of

¹ Cf. *De civitate Dei*, lib. xix, c. 15 (*ib.* col. 643).

² *Ib.* lib. xix, c. 14 (*ib.* col. 642).

historians on the course of history. Their common view is that history has no extrinsic end or purpose, but offers merely opportunities, to the righteous for making good use of the possibilities and facts resulting from a certain constellation of events, to the iniquitous for acting in the contrary way. The *Historiarum Libri Septem* of Orosius, a pupil of St Augustine, was the early medieval authority on questions of general history, and there we find Orosius expressing the view that the variety of historical events tends to disclose the existence of God inasmuch as these witness to the fact that the Christian participants in them have individually realised the peace of which Augustine is speaking ('Pax hominis mortalis et Dei: ordinata in fide sub aeterna lege obedientia', *De Civ. Dei* xix 13). This peace they achieve by an act of the will that decides to assist the cause of God, and by prudent and intelligent action on behalf of that cause. By making use in his action of all expedients at his disposal man is acting as morally as he can do, and his reward is the peace of God: 'From the outset mankind was created and established that under the rule of religion they might live in peace and without labour, and as the reward of obedience earn eternal life' (*Hist.* vii 1). History according to Orosius does not enumerate results achieved, it pays regard only to the force whereby a certain turn of events came about. The force is either a motive of the children of God or of those of the World.¹ As to the result Orosius states the barren

¹ *Historiarum*, lib. vii, c. 1 (Migne xxxi 1059): 'Sufficiencia, ut arbitror, documenta collecta sunt, quibus absque ullo arcano, quod paucorum fidelium est, probari de medio queat, unum illum et verum Deum, quem Christiana fides praedicat, et condidisse mundum creaturamque eius cum voluit, et disposuisse per multa, cum per multa ignoraretur, et confirmasse ad unum, cum per unicum declaratus est, simulque potentiam patientiamque eius multimodis argumentis eluxisse. In quo quidem angustas delectasque mentes offendi paulisper intelligo, quod tantae potentiae patientia tanta miscetur. Si enim potens erat, inquit, creare mundum, componere pacem mundi, insinuare mundo cultum ac notitiam sui, quid opus fuit tanta vel (ut ipsi sentiunt) tam pernicioza patientia, ut in ultimo erroribus, cladibus, laboribusque hominum fieret, quod a principio virtute eius quem praedicas Dei, sic potius coepisse potuisset? Quibus quidem veraciter respondere

fact, there is no predetermined aim in it. He is far from trying to make the series of historical issues into a chain of evidence for the providence of God, in order to prove that throughout the troubles, dangers, fears, and entanglements of history God has constantly awarded ultimate success to the faithful. It was left to Bossuet to work out so injudicious a theory. To Orosius history merely points out the moral and religious standards of the actors on either side. It is a touchstone which, through the manner in which the individual decides to act for or against God, reveals the moral value of the individual and so gives the reader a lesson to act likewise, for God's reward is great. Historical events merely happen, accidentally and by chance, and it is not their results in which Orosius is interested, but the way the events received a definite turn and determination at the hands of those who had to take action in connection with them. The celestial citizen can convert any event to a definite gain, if only at the right moment he sides with the right party. These ideas are common to all Christian historians of the early days, however they may differ in subject or treatment; historical events retain their character of something unique and accidental, of something infinitely variable. History is a fight between the armies of God and those of the devil: 'I will write down the wars of the kings against hostile tribes, of the martyrs against the pagans, of the Churches against the heretics, and therefore I will first make a confession of faith, that the reader may not doubt my being a *catholicus*',¹ so Gregory of Tours says in a significant

possem, ad hoc ab initio creatum et institutum humanum genus, ut sub religione cum pace sine labore vivens, fructu obedientiae aeternitatem promereretur: sed ab usum bonitatis creatoris, libertatem indulgentis in contumacem vertisse licentiam, atque ex contemptu in oblivionem deflexisse, iustamque nunc esse patientiam Dei, et iustam in utramque partem, ut nec contemptus disperdat in totum, cui misereri velit; et affici laboribus, dum velit, sinat contemptus potens. Deinde subsequens esse, iuste semper adhibere quamvis ignorantem gubernationem, cui aliquando pie restitutus sit poenitenti antiquae gratiae facultatem. Sed haec, etsi verissime fortissimeque dicuntur, fidelem tamen atque obedientem requirunt'.

¹ *Hist. eccles. Francorum* i, Prol. (Migne lxxi 161).

passage in the prologue of his *History*. Such a confession is necessary, for no inkling as to the writer's own party can be gathered from the narrative itself, which has to deal equally with both parties and to record the alternation of failure and success in each of them. Christians use all possible means to turn the events for the benefit of their ideals; as also do their antagonists. But even if in some instance or other the scales do not incline to the Christian side, the moral gain is theirs at all events. The essential point in that philosophy is that it leaves the true, active Christian no alternative but to act up to his principles as well as the situation allows, by seizing any possibilities that may present themselves to serve God. Accordingly to Bede history as such is only a collection of facts and sayings.¹ But beyond this it contains a moral lesson by teaching the Christian on which side and by what means to act, if faced with situations such as he records.²

To return to the Vulgate and the gospel text in particular, we observe that in the course of being carried to the newly christianized parts of Europe it was subject precisely to those chances and contingencies which play so great a part in the theoretical aspects of the early Christian historians and moralists. From Italy, the home of the Vulgate, the MSS reached the various countries where the gospel was being preached; the missionaries one day found themselves in need of MSS and naturally had recourse to the most easily available sources. The practical requirements of the moment did not allow theoretical considerations to interfere with the first duty of the missionary, that of being active in the cause of Christ. To so ethical and practical an outlook as described above questions as

¹ *Hist. eccles. Anglorum*, Praef. (Migne xcvi 21): 'Nosceret priorum gesta sive dicta et maxime nostrae gentis virorum illustrium'.

² *Ib.*: 'Sive historia de bonis bona referat, ad imitandum bonum auditor sollicitus instigatur; seu mala commemoret de pravis, nihilominus religiosus ac pius auditor sive lector devitanda quod noxium est ac perversum, ipse solertius ad exsequenda ea quae bona ac Deo digna esse cognoverit accenditur'.

to the nature of the biblical text did not very much matter. They may have seemed important to a man like Cassiodorus, in whom the late Roman and Alexandrian ideal of the scholar was yet alive; but even in regard to him we cannot go far wrong in saying that in collecting the Jeromian translations of the various books of the Bible into his celebrated *Pandectes* he acted in accordance with the ethical rules of St Augustine: he worked for the party of God in his own particular field and within the range of his talents. The scholarship of the Irish and Anglo-Saxon missionary monks, on the other hand, served a definitely practical purpose. They regarded it as a means by which they were enabled to make the fullest possible use of the opportunity to act in the spirit of Christ. Their position of missionaries was to them an appeal to act in a Christian way within the limitations as well as the possibilities of the particular case facing them. There was no calculated or detailed plan which they might have set out to put into practice, and therefore they did not use or copy their Bible MSS with a specific end in view. The only aim of the missionaries was to manifest and practise Christian loyalty in the sense shown in the views of Augustine. So it is to be explained that Bede in his *Historia Ecclesiastica* does not in a single instance give the desire to convert a certain pagan country as the motive force which impelled the insular monks to migrate to the Continent. On the contrary he always puts forward as the sole reason for monks 'going to strange countries beyond the sea' moral considerations of a strictly personal nature. There we have essentially the ascetic strain of the Middle Ages inducing men to regard the value of their action not in the aim achieved, but in the compulsion they put upon themselves to act in that particular way. All they did was to them a welcome opportunity to prove to themselves that they were faithful members of Christ's body. So it was with the Irish, Anglo-Saxon, and Frankish monks as a result of whose efforts the Vulgate spread over a large part of Europe. There is no evidence

that the idea of a complete and finished work to be undertaken for its own sake as outlined, say, in Mt xxviii 19, ever entered their minds. They pursued undeviatingly their ascetic ideal.¹ The forms of the Vulgate text they propagated seem to be mere chance products of the copying of the originals, whether these contained the Vulgate or a pre-Jeromian text. They simply took over the text from any available source, without ever inquiring to what extent it was correct or corrupt. The text of ancient times was handed down and copied, and so in a ninth-century MS we may find the Jeromian reading of a passage, whereas an earlier copy of a different line of tradition may contain the corresponding Old Latin form. The early monks, or the copyists of the early examples of the various types of text, did not acknowledge a rigid system of philosophy or theology according to which they might have altered or revised the original they copied. Yet we have to account for the rise of that variety of traditional types which constitute the mass of our MS sources, and it is there that the ethical principle regulating the movements and acts of scribe and missionary finds an important application. It was in order to meet the requirements of a particular situation that the scribes who first wrote copies of the Bible to be used in a certain area introduced heterogeneous matter into the Vulgate of Jerome, which in the most part were readings taken from the Old Latin, glosses, or other interpolations.

If, then, we wish to understand the early history of the Vulgate text as a whole we have to take account of this twofold treatment which the text experienced at the hands of the early scribes. Individual writers at a very early time altered the pure Vulgate; they replaced certain Jeromian readings by readings derived from other sources, because they desired to create a text that would be particularly apt to render useful service in a specific situation which called their own spirit of religious activity into action. And

¹ Glunz, *op. cit.* p. 69 f.

then, owing to the missionary and practical zeal of the early monks, these individual redactions of the text spread over certain areas where they were copied again and again. In this way certain types of the Vulgate text as we know them to-day were evolved, and the geographical distribution of each is clearly traceable. The copyists of the Vulgate in the early centuries did not feel themselves bound to adhere strictly to St Jerome's recension, because the Bible to them differed from any other piece of writing in so far as it was not a piece of writing pure and simple, but a weapon, a truth capable of changing men's minds, a spiritual instrument to be used in the everlasting struggle between the City of God and that of the World. Roger Bacon, centuries later, was one of the first to abjure this view. He indignantly contended that the Vulgate should be treated in the same way as the classical poets, that no one had the right to alter anything in the true text of Jerome. This was a sound principle, but to the Christians of the earlier times their own attitude must certainly have appeared as justified. They were at great pains to make exact copies of the poets, but they could not look at the Bible as a piece of poetry or oratory, or as a field for exercising their sense of appreciation of style and fine language. To them the Bible was an instrument of spiritual life, the strength of which lay in its significance, not in its verbal form; the value of which consisted in the uses to which it could be put, not in its aesthetic qualities. It was the store of spiritual power on which they drew for strength in lives devoted to the practice of ethical principles. Their unwavering belief was that the spirit of the Bible and the spirit of their own Christian activity were identical.

AN EXAMPLE: THE TEXT OF GREGORY THE GREAT

The philosophical reason for the early tradition of the Vulgate text taking the shape of a number of more or less differentiated types may be sought, therefore, in the Augustinian system of ethics and philosophy of history, according to which each act requires an individual decision of a moral nature. It was left to the individual in a certain circumstance to take such measures as would be in agreement with the spirit of the Church and would mark himself as a faithful member of the Church. An example may serve to illustrate this. The Roman type of the gospel text represented by the MSS X and O, which in consequence of the christianization of England became also the archetype of the early Anglo-Saxon text as quoted by Bede, most probably owes its peculiar mixture of Old Latin and Vulgate readings to the ascetic inclinations and tendencies of Gregory the Great and his circle, the influence that carried this text to England.¹ In the instructive and interesting dedicatory letter of the *Moralia* to Leander, Gregory gives some information as to the causes which induced him to adopt the particular method of exposition used in the book. He had withdrawn, he says, from the restless sea of this world and taken refuge in the quiet harbour of the monastery, where for a time only the daily exercises of contrition and mortification occupied him.

Then, as you will remember, it pleased you and the brethren to put before me the inopportune request that I should make an exposition of the Book of Job, for, they argued, truth would give strength, and I should explain to them secrets so profound. And they added to the burden of their demand by saying that I should not only interpret allegorically the words of the story, but also go further and point out the moral applications of the allegorical meaning.²

¹ J. Chapman, *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*, London 1908, chap. x.

² Migne lxxv 511 D.

So Gregory was faced with a task imposed from without. It arose unawares; it demanded for its solution some sort of action; and at the same time it offered an opportunity to demonstrate his character as a Christian by an appropriate act. Gregory felt the appeal of the brothers to be a call, and he was determined to make the actual execution and realisation of it as good and efficient as possible, in spite of the difficulties of the work:

But I soon found that my poor little work, the like of which had never before been written, had to deal with things too great and sublime, and the very thought of this, I must own, discouraged me and I almost despaired of ever achieving it. But then again I was filled with awe and devotion when lifting my mental eyes up to the giver of all good I became certain, after a time of hesitation, that nothing could be impossible which charity in the hearts of the brethren bade me do.¹

So Gregory's exposition of Job is determined on the one hand by a chance event compelling him to take action, on the other hand by his own convictions and capabilities directing his own individual way of solving the problem put before him; and this is precisely the sort of situation with which St Augustine's ethics are concerned. According to Gregory's personal belief the Church is the community whose members are united by the common bond of a pious, ascetic and moral life, and consequently knowledge and truth have any value only inasmuch as they are applied to this ultimate good: 'What are the sayings of truth, if we do not take them to be food for the nourishment of the soul?'² This is the general basis of Gregory's moral interpretation. Two minor points resulting from his essentially ethical outlook Gregory has himself indicated: his carelessness as to the style and the outward appearance of the things he has to say, and the particular mixture of Vulgate

¹ *Ib.* col. 512.

² *Ib.* col. 513. See also Migne lxxvi 217: 'Non est segura laetitia in divinis paginis vel fortia vel multa cognoscere, sed cognita custodire. Nam qui bene intelligit, quid intelligendo debeat agnoscit. Quanto enim intellectu latius extenditur, tanto ad explenda opera enixius ligatur'.

and Old Latin he uses as the text to be expounded. He has interspersed many Old Latin variants among the Vulgate so as to obtain a text which might easily lend itself to moral or ascetic interpretation. He declares this himself: 'I shall expound the new translation; but whenever it is necessary for the justification of my exposition, I adopt the old translation in between the new one as testimony; for the Apostolic See, which I, by the will of God, am holding, uses both translations, and so shall also the work of my study be supported by both'.¹ It would be unwise to find fault with this methodical mingling of the Vulgate with the Old Latin. It was the outcome of a deep conviction that both, as compared with the inherent significance of the Bible, were of the same standing, and that it was far less important to preserve them clearly separated than to have a text which would satisfy the particular needs of the moment for which it was composed.

What has been preserved of the early Anglo-Saxon text in MSS and fragments exactly corresponds to what must have been St Gregory's text, i.e. the Italian text of the late sixth century. The question is as yet undecided whether codex X (C.C.C.C. MS 286, in half-uncials) and, what is still less likely, O (Bodl. MS Auct. D. 2. 14, in similar characters) were brought to England by Augustine, or whether they were perhaps written in England by his companions.² However this may be, the text of both books is Roman and a mixture of Vulgate and numerous Old Latin elements.³ Some supplementary notes as to the text of these two gospel books are given in Appendix A.

Here we shall proceed to discuss briefly a few fragments of the same Roman or Gregorian type.

¹ Migne lxxv 516.

² Thomas of Elmham's (beginning of fifteenth century) catalogue, which is inserted in his *Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis* (R.S. London 1858, p. 96 ff.), says nothing of a Gregorian gospel book (though he mentions two *Textus Evangeliorum*). On the question of the provenance of X, see above all M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, Cambridge 1903, p. lxxvii.

³ Glunz, *op. cit.* p. 90 f.

In the Hereford Cathedral MS P. 2. 9 there are inserted two vellum leaves in half-uncials of the end of the eighth century.¹ They were written in the South of England (Canterbury?) and represent a fragment of what must once have been an extensive commentary on Matthew.² The two leaves contain Mt viii 1-13 and the corresponding part of the commentary. The textual readings singularly agree with O and X: Mt viii 3 om *iesus* together with k, O* D, Greek NBC^* ; 5 *introisset + iesus* vett O Q; + *quidam (centurio)* vett DE L Q; 7 + *et (ait)*, all MSS (including X*) except A Y X^c F M O; 13 om *et (sicut)* vett X* DE L W; *in illa hora : ex illa hora* vett O L R ϵ . All these variants, it will be observed, are extant in the Old Latin and most probably were introduced into the Vulgate in Italy.

The text of a fragment in Worcester Cathedral has been made known by the late Professor C. H. Turner.³ It is written in insular half-uncials of the late eighth century and comprises Mt xxviii 5 to end, the capitula of Mc, and Mc x 26-42. Some of the readings are: Mt xxviii 6 *venite + et (videte)* vett F X C T H Θ ir alc mod; 8 > *gaudio magno* vett Z O X . . . ; 12 > *accepto consilio* c; 15 *docti : edocti* Q vg. The capitula of Mc are identical with those in X O, a few minor discrepancies excepted. Mc x 32 *in hierosolyma : in hierosolymis* vett X* M; 34 om (*flagellabunt*) *eum* Z X* alc; 39 *baptizor : baptizar*; 40 *dexteram : dextram* X M A H G.

Last of all, the text on foll. 1-102 of the Durham MS A. II. 17 (insular half-uncials of the middle of the eighth century) may be mentioned. It is closely related to O.⁴

To resume our argument concerning the Gregorian type of text we propose to show in what way the Vulgate text was affected by Gregory's interpretation. It is, of course,

¹ This MS is a gloss on Proverbs, twelfth century.

² The commentary on Mt viii 1 ff. begins: 'Ecce iste leprosus, qui de voluntate interrogavit de virtute, non dubitavit. . .'. I am unable to identify the work from the fragment preserved in this MS.

³ C. H. Turner, *Early Worcester Fragments*, Oxford 1916, pp. 1-6.

⁴ C. H. Turner, 'Iter Dunelmense: Durham Bible MSS' (*Journ. of Theol. Studies* x, 1909, 529 ff.).

more than likely that the type Z* X* O dates back to a time long before Gregory, and it is quite possible that it was formed soon after St Jerome and in the course of the fifth century. Yet Gregory's interpretation, at the end of the sixth century, is still near enough to the origin of that type to make us realise the importance of certain Old Latin readings for the success of his specific mode of interpretation. We can recognise that he adopted a reading foreign to the Vulgate for the sole reason that it was better suited to the interpretation he wanted to give a certain passage. In Mt ii 8 instead of the Vulgate reading *ite et interrogate diligenter de puero* an Old Latin type (namely a q) reads *ite, interrogate de puero*. The omission of *et* is apt to stress the element of command denoted in the passage, and Gregory obviously wanted to dwell on this shade of meaning by ironically remarking in his exposition:¹ 'Renuntiari sibi ubi puer inveniretur postulat, adorare eum velle se simulat, ut (quasi hunc invenire possit) extinguat'. X* (as also DPLR) in fact reads *ite, interrogate de puero*, obviously the genuine reading of Gregory.² iv 9 *si cadens adoraveris me: si procidens adoraveris me* vett J X*, and so Gregory (Migne lxxvi 1136). xxii 10 *congregaverunt . . . malos et bonos* vulg; in Gregory's order of things, however, the first place belongs to the good, as they complete their journey through life according to the plan of God (*ib.* 1285):

Ecce iam ipsa qualitate convivantium aperte ostenditur quia per has regis nuptias praesens Ecclesia designatur, in qua cum bonis et mali conveniunt. . . . Quousque namque hic vivimus, necesse est ut viam praesentis saeculi permisti pergamus. Tunc autem discernimur, cum pervenimus. Boni enim soli nusquam sunt nisi in caelo, et mali soli nusquam sunt nisi in inferno. . . . Si ergo boni estis, quandiu in hac vita subsistitis, aequanimiter

¹ *Homilia x* (Migne lxxvi 1111 c).

² The biblical quotations in Migne's edition are not always reliable, sometimes because even the MSS of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which were used for the editions printed in Migne, had the quotations altered according to the modern text.

tolerate malos. . . Sic in tritura areae grana sub paleis premuntur; sic flores inter spinas oriuntur; et rosa quae redolet crescit cum spina quae pungit. Duos quippe filios habuit primus homo: sed unus horum electus est, alter reprobus fuit.

The reading *bonos et malos* to be found in vett (cf and others) was adopted, in accordance with this or a similar interpretation, by X*OEPR. Lc ii 11 *natus est vobis hodie salvator*; Gregory and perhaps other interpreters before him referred these words to their own time and the present (*ib.* 1104): 'Priusquam Redemptor noster nasceretur per carnem, discordiam habuimus. . . Coeli Rex terram nostrae carnis assumpsit', and to this explanation an Old Latin variant (see Sabatier) aptly corresponds: *natus est nobis hodie salvator*, which was adopted by X*YGD^cW. iii 9 *securis ad radicem arborum posita est*; the allegorical and moral exposition of this passage, however, would not very well fit this text (*ib.* 1164): 'Arbor huius mundi est universum genus humanum. Securis vero est Redemptor noster. . . Quae videlicet securis iam ad radicem arboris posita est, quia etsi per patientiam exspectat, videtur tamen quid factura est'. So the Vulgate of Gregory's time chose the Old Latin form *ad radicem arboris*, which already occurs in Cyprian and is present in ZX (and in later medieval MSS). xv 7 *super uno peccatore paenitentiam habente*. To the ascetic, however, it is less essential to feel contrition and remorse than to do penance, as Gregory says in the explanation of the passage (*ib.* 1248): 'Hi qui se aliqua illicita egisse meminerunt, ex ipso suo dolore compuncti, inardescunt in amorem Dei, seseque in magnis virtutibus exercent, cuncta difficilia sancti certaminis appetunt, omnia mundi derelinquunt, honores fugiunt, acceptis contumeliis laetantur, flagrant desiderio, ad coelestem patriam anhelant; et quia se errasse a Deo considerant, damna praecedentia lucris sequentibus recompensant', and this active ideal of life is better represented by the Old Latin *paenitentiam agente*, which has gained a place in ZIX*FFER and later manuscripts. Perhaps verse 10 has also contributed to the

alteration. xviii 34 *ipsi nihil horum intellexerunt et erat verbum istud absconditum*. The second half of this passage was felt to be an antithesis to the first, witness Gregory (*ib.* 1082): 'Redemptor noster . . . eis passionis poenam et resurrectionis suae gloriam praedicat. . . Sed carnales adhuc discipuli nullo modo valebant capere verba mysterii'; accordingly the more suitable variant *erat autem verbum istud absconditum* was accepted by Gregory and ZX*OKVW. Jo i 27 *cuius ego non sum dignus ut solvam eius corrigiam calciamenti*. Gregory quotes the verse in an Old Latin form: *cuius non sum dignus solvere corrigiam calciamenti* (*ib.* 1101). It is significant, however, that only the omission of *ego* was imitated in the Vulgate MSS X*DER, whereas *ut solvam* was retained, because *solvere* was not required by the moral exposition. But the omission of *ego* takes away the contrast in the Vulgate between the two halves of the verse. This is what Gregory wants, for his point is to state a general moral precept (*ib.* 1102): 'Quid est ergo dicere, *Non sum dignus solvere corrigiam calceamenti eius, nisi aperte et humiliter suam ignorantiam profiteri?*' xii *bonus pastor animam suam dat pro ovibus*. The explanation will have it that Christ laid his life down for man (*ib.* 1127): 'Bonus pastor pro ovibus suis animam suam posuit', and Gregory quotes the verse accordingly: *bonus pastor animam suam ponit pro ovibus suis*. *Ponit* is Old Latin and also to be found in ZX*OQK. xx 15 *illa existimans quia hortulanus esset*. Gregory understands the whole scene spiritually; to him the gardener of the soul is a reality (*ib.* 1192): 'An non ei spiritaliter hortulanus erat, qui in eius pectore per amoris sui semina virtutum virentia plantabat?' This explains the indicative *est* in ZJX*TDERK, the Old Latin again being the source of the reading. xxi 3 *nihil prendiderunt*. For some reason or other Gregory prefers the more classical *capere* to *prendere*, for he exclusively uses it in the commentary on this verse (*ib.* 1185). Two MSS of his *Homilies on the Gospels* also quote *ceperunt* as the form of the text and it was undoubtedly Gregory's own reading.

22 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EARLIER AND

We find indeed the Old Latin *ceperunt* replacing the Vulgate term in X*OB^rR^pmg.

This is cited as only one example of how in the early days of Christianity the spur of the moment drove men to use the Bible as an effective weapon in the strife between good and evil, the character of the Vulgate text being then determined by the necessity of the moment, when certain readings from other sources accorded better with the purpose to be achieved. In this or some similar manner the various types of the textual tradition must have acquired their first shape. As to the Roman or Anglo-Saxon type X*O its formation had probably already begun before St Gregory wrote. But even in these earlier stages the reason for introducing certain variants from the Old Latin must have been the same.

NEW TENDENCIES IN POST-CAROLINGIAN TIMES

It has been shown in another context what the various situations were to which some of the early types of the Vulgate tradition owed their origin. Underlying these different types is the Augustinian principle of ethics, whose essentially practical nature was the cause of the manifold tradition of the Vulgate. Where correctors or revisers of the text come into the field their work can be seen to be subject to the same, or similar, ethical or at least practical considerations. Even Alcuin's recension, as we shall see in the next chapter, is one of the types of text in the old sense. In the ninth century and in some cases even later the propagation and shaping of the Vulgate text are still largely due to the practical attitude which for the present purpose may be said to have been fully realised in the monastic ideal. From the ninth century onwards, however, the practical attitude no longer exclusively holds the field. By the side of it and almost unnoticeably there is growing up another principle which in due time will take the place of the older one, not without coming into sharp conflict with it. Its first manifestations can be traced to Alcuin's

school of St Martin at Tours, the very spot where the last genuine type of the Vulgate text was produced. The theory on which the textual form of the Vulgate comes to be based, will be seen to be closely woven with ideas fundamental to the theology and philosophy later called scholasticism, and especially with its conception of the Church and its theory of logic and language. To the development of the Vulgate under the influence of these new ideas the main part of the following study will be devoted. From the investigations one outstanding fact will proceed, namely, that the new epoch of the Vulgate history so differs from the earlier period that the later medieval text can on no account be compared with the various groups of the text in the earlier centuries. New readings come into existence, and they are exactly those which disfigure the so-called text of Paris and the editions of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and so greatly differentiate these from the early medieval MSS.

CHAPTER II

Last Currents of the Ancient Textual Tradition on the Continent and in England

ALCUIN'S REVISION IN CONFORMITY WITH EARLY CHRISTIAN ETHICS

IT is not difficult to see that Alcuin's revised text of the Vulgate belongs to the group of texts characterised above. By ordering Alcuin to make a new edition of the Bible which would guarantee a uniformity of text for the whole of his realm, Charlemagne created a situation similar to that in which St Gregory had found himself when the brethren entreated him to expound to them the Book of Job. Alcuin was placed in a position in which he was faced with the necessity of acting in the sense of the Augustinian ethical principle.

Charlemagne clearly saw¹ that for the promotion of religion and culture among his subjects, especially among the clergy, it was necessary to have Bibles with an authoritative text and correct explanations. Alcuin's task, therefore, was to introduce a uniform text for the study of the Bible into a large territory which up to then had hardly known an element of ecclesiastical organisation. Only recently had it begun to feel the effects of greater order and regularity in administration, ecclesiastical and civil, and in education. The way Alcuin approached this task is characteristic of the worldly wisdom which played so great a part in the moral system of a period completely dominated by Augustinian ideas: in order to serve God the Christian had to apply all his powers of mind and

¹ *Admonitio Generalis* of 789, c. 72 (MG. Leges ii, Capitularia i 60); *Epistola de litteris colendis* (*ib.* p. 79); *Epistola Generalis*, A.D. 786-800 (*ib.* p. 80); in the *Decretum* of Benedictus Diaconus there is the command, 'ut in ecclesiis libri canonici veraces habeantur'.

body to the realisation of what at first was a mere appeal to his moral consciousness. In Alcuin's case action in accordance with Charles's command was determined by his education and upbringing in England. In England, and especially in Northumbria, there were at the time the best organised schools of Western Europe, and to them Alcuin turned for a model. It is interesting to see how during the whole of his life the first minister of continental education remained the Anglo-Saxon scholar who in everything tried to follow in the footsteps of the Venerable Bede, the pattern scholar of the English. His biographer is at pains to lay due stress on Alcuin's reaction to the Anglo-Saxon scholarly tradition:¹

He was then put under the supervision of Ecgbert, a pupil of the most learned of the English, the blessed Bede, whose learning was equalled by that of his pupil. . . . Ecgbert had as his pupils a number of sons of noblemen, some of whom he instructed in the elements of grammar, others in the various parts of the liberal arts, some even in Holy Scripture. . . . But all were taught faith, hope, charity, humility, fasting, mortification of the flesh, obedience, and pious and sincere solicitude for the Church, and not only through words, but also through the example of their worthy preceptor, Father Ecgbert. In him was rekindled that superior gift of teaching which had been shining bright in his teachers, in St Gregory, the apostle of the English, in his pupil Augustine, in St Benedict,² in Guthbert and Theodore, the successors of the first Father and apostle, and above all in Ecgbert's own master, the God-beloved priest Bede. . . . Bede also had brought up his pupils in all the liberal arts, . . . and his example was followed by Ecgbert, who devoted all his life to the divine truth by exploring the mysteries of Holy Writ. For unless he was prevented by some undelayable business, or some high ceremony, or the feast of a saint, he would from the rising of the sun to the sixth and often to the ninth hour sit on his bed and explain the mysteries of the Bible to his pupils as far as they were prepared to receive them.

¹ *Vita Alcuini*, c. 4 (MG. Script. xv 186).

² This is Benedict Biscop, the friend of Theodore and Hadrian, and the founder of Wearmouth and Jarrow.

Similar words are used by the biographer for Alcuin's second master, Ælbert (Æthelbert of York). Such a tradition of scholars, and the height of spiritual culture closely connected with the existence of an effective teaching body, were unknown on the Continent. In the Frankish realm Alcuin was the first of a series of scholars, and he had to depend entirely on his own resources. If he compared the conditions in his Northumbrian home with those in his continental field of activity, York must truly have appeared to him as a paradise, where the fruit grew without the labourer's toil, while he found himself in the waste garden on the Loire, where the seed had yet to be sown.¹ The study of the Bible and of the few literary and scientific (or mathematical) subjects, which alone had a place in the curriculum of the schools, was, if we except a few places in Italy and Spain, well established only in England, where it could boast of a tradition going back to the seventh century. Alcuin distinctly felt himself an inheritor of that tradition. His letters even more than his biography (written by a monk of St Martin's, Tours, between 821 and 829²) bear witness to the view he held of his home country as the storehouse of Christian knowledge and as a source of true religion. In England, and especially at York, the great treasure of scholarship was being preserved: ³

Praise and honour be to Almighty God, who found me worthy, the last native member of the Church, of instructing one of my pupils so that he should be able to work in my place in the church of York, where I have been brought up and taught, and to be the head of those treasures of wisdom which were left me by my master, Archbishop Ælberhtus.

¹ In a letter to Charlemagne, *MG. Epistolae* iv 176 f.

² See especially the first nine chapters of the biography. In chap. 8 it is maintained that Alcuin was the instrument selected by God to make the Franks acquainted with the exemplary English ways of study and discipline (*MG. Script.* xv 189).

³ To his pupil Eanbald of York, who had been appointed preceptor in the school at York, *MG. Epp.* iv 167.

As he considered the teaching of the schools to be subservient to godly living,¹ York was to him also the home of Christian education. From France he wrote to the clergy of the church of York:²

You have nursed the frail years of my childhood with motherly affection; in the time of my lusty boyhood you did not lose patience with me, but brought me up to mature manhood in the stern discipline of a father and strengthened me with instruction in the sacred sciences.

Again and again his pride in the old tradition of English scholarship broke through and he was anxious lest England should lose the first rank in the teaching of Christian doctrine. Æthelbert of Canterbury he exhorted with the words:³ 'Remember what predecessors you have, the teachers and lights of all Britain', and he rejoiced in the thought of coming from such a country⁴ and of having 'such spiritual fathers begetting us in the Lord. Let us emulate their lives, in order to become worthy of participating with them in eternal bliss'.⁵ In a word, England was to him the home of genuine Christianity and true religion.⁶

You are the gate to the salvation of the English, the beginning of prosperity, the harbour of those who enter, the triumphal glory, the fountain of wisdom; from you went forth the power of the empire and with you the catholic faith took its origin. With you rest the brightest of Britain, through whom the fire

¹ *Ib.* p. 73: 'Ideo necessaria est sanctorum lectio librorum, quatenus in eis quisque intelligat, quid sequi, vel quid cavere debeat... Pueros adolentesque diligenter librorum scientiam ad viam Dei docete... Talis locus sine doctoribus aut non, aut vix salvus fieri poterit... Sicut pastor providus gregi suo optima praevidere pascua curat, ita doctor bonus suis subiectis perpetuae pascua vitae omni studio procurare debet'.

² *Ib.* p. 85.

³ *Ib.* p. 45.

⁴ To the monks of Jarrow, *ib.* p. 445.

⁵ To the clergy of York, *ib.* p. 92.

⁶ To the clergy of Canterbury, *ib.* p. 191. On the points here raised, see also W. Delius, 'War Alchvin Mönch?' (*Theologische Studien und Kritiken* ciii, 1931, 465), who comes to the conclusion: 'Alcuin was an Anglo-Saxon monk, and to his death he remained faithful to the rule of the monastery at York'.

of truth spread all over Britain. From you emanated both the splendour of philosophical teaching and the clarity of sacred religion. You have always had religious teachers of the Christian faith, wise princes endowed with royal dignity, men strong in fighting and just in giving judgment, men of conspicuous nobility of life, of provident counsel, praiseworthy piety, honourable countenance, venerable looks and excelling in every dignity.

In Britain scholarship was thriving, whereas everywhere else it was almost extinct.¹

If such was Alcuin's sincere conviction, he was morally bound to act according to it, when the King's command enjoined him to act as a Christian,² and he did so by making full use of the possibilities at his disposal. In other words, he availed himself of the resources which lay open to him by collecting the materials for his revision of the Vulgate in the very country where he believed letters and religion to be cultivated intensely in their purest form. Charlemagne had called on him to organise the ecclesiastical administration of his realm after the English model,³ and the long chain of tradition, of which he felt himself the last link,⁴ suggested that Alcuin should make some of the English treasures bear fruit on the Continent. 'Truly, I have never become unfaithful to King Offa or the English nation', he replied in defence when reproached with having deserted his country,⁵ 'I shall serve, as well as I can, both the new friends given me by God, and those

¹ MG. Epp. iv 107.

² It is significant that here again the impulse which gave rise to the creation of a type of the Vulgate text came from outside. The scholar, the preacher, the missionary, they were faced with the necessity of expounding and of propagating the Bible, and they reacted to the appeal by establishing and copying a text which seemed to be the most appropriate for the purpose. Cf. Alcuin in the prefatory letter of his commentary on John to Lucia and Columba (Migne c 737 f.): 'Fateor siquidem, propemodum ante annos triginta me voluntatem huius habere operis; sed quievit calamus meus, quia non fuit qui excitaret eum, donec vestra bona intentio illum revocavit ad studium scribendi'.

³ *Alcuini Carmina* cviii iii 1-4 (MG. Poetae Lat. Carol. Aevi i 334).

⁴ *Versus de Patribus, Regibus et Sanctis Euboracensis Ecclesiae*, 1651 (*ib.* p. 169 ff.). To Beornwine (MG. Epp. iv 125).

whom I left at home'. Consequently his country, to which he remained faithful and to which his imagination used to wander, furnished him alone with the books on which he drew for revising the Vulgate text. Whenever Alcuin mentioned books at all, he meant books from England.¹

So Alcuin's revised text is another corroboration of our proposition that it is the idiosyncrasies and inclinations of individuals as well as almost accidental historical situations and connections which called into existence the various types of the Vulgate text. By these we understand groups of MSS of which each helps to form the direct and uninterrupted textual tradition, but of which each at the same time has its own characteristic features differentiating it from any other type.

NATURE OF ALCUIN'S TEXT

The collations of some new gospel MSS will enable us to fix correctly the sources of the Alcuinian text.

The Royal MS of the B.M. 1. E. vi is a gospel book of the eighth century. It belonged to St Augustine's, Canterbury, and the palaeographical evidence suggests that it was copied there from a Northumbrian exemplar.² The book shows that among the MSS which he borrowed from York, Alcuin also imported a text which so far has not generally been recognised as existing in Northumbria at that date.³ The MS goes a good way to prove that the Italian, or Anglo-Saxon, type, in reaching England through the mission of St Augustine, was preserved in the Northern province for centuries later and side by side with the Jeromian A-Y type. Perhaps we may go further and say, because of the three purple leaves inserted at the beginning of Mt, Mc, and Lc, as well as the continental style of some

¹ To Charlemagne (*ib.* 177); *Versus de Patribus*, etc. 1525 ff. (*l.c.*).

² See Warner and Gilson, *Catalogue of the MSS in the Old Royal and King's Collection in the B.M.* i 20; M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, p. lkv. The palaeographical evidence is in E. M. Thompson, *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*, Oxford 1912, pp. 384-386.

³ Yet Bede's biblical quotations belong to the same or a very similar type. They would be well worth a thorough investigation.

of the illuminations, that after the completion of the text the book was carried to the Continent, and even to Tours. Typical Anglo-Saxon variants (i.e. agreeing with X*O*Z*) are plentiful: Mt ii 16 *inclusus esset : delusus est* X*L; 23 *per prophetas : per prophetam* Z*; iii 6 *om in iordane* Z*X*; iv 9 *cadens : procedens* X*J; 10 *vade + retro* Z*X*DEPLQR; ix 18 *adorabit* Z*X*TBW; *manum + tuam* X*Birvg; x 26 *nihil enim + est* X*Birvg; Mc i 5 *egrediebantur* Z*G*BCT*; Lc iii 8 *potens est* MX*HΘKvg; xii 2 *om autem* vett ZX*O*K; Jo v 24 *transit* ZJX*O...; viii 12 *ambulat* ZJOTHKvg; and many others.

This mixed type (ZXO) was not only carried from York to Tours, but also actually copied there in Alcuin's time. Alcuin largely used it in his own revision of the text, as is shown by numerous cases in which Royal MS 1. E. vi and alc (KMV) agree: Mt iii 5 *circum : circa* ZJX*alc Wvg; 10 *exciditur...mittitur* Z*X*HV*; viii 3 *> iesus manum tetigit eum* ZX*O*alcvg; ix 31 *in totam terram illam* X*BalcZ²; xiii 14 *prophetia esaiiae dicentis* X*JB... V₅; xvi 3 *potestis + scire* ZX*HΘalcW ⊗ ⊗; Lc vi 35 *inde sperantes : desperantes* ZJMF XO*...KV*; vii 37 *accubuit : accubisset* ZXOFalc; xii 52 *tres in duos* ZTQ KV₅; xiii 4 *+ et (sicut)* ZOBalcW; xvii 8 *dicet : dicat* ZOalcW ⊗ ⊗; xx 32 *novissima : novissime* vett Vvg; 35 *nubunt : nubent* ZFE*alcW ⊗ ⊗; xxii 37 *iniustis : iniquis* ZX*O_PalcWvg; xxiv 5 *declinarent : declinaverunt* EV; 49 *mitto : mittam* ZX_FalcW₅ ⊗; Jo ii 10 *tu + autem* ZIOBHΘalc mod; 13 *hierosolymam* JI_FΘalc; v 4 agreeing with X*O_F...alc mod; 10 *sanatus : sanus* Z...alcW; vi 71 *iudam : de iuda* X*OHΘQalcW₅ ⊗; etc.

About that time MSS of the Z*-X* type existed on the Continent. Most of the so-called gold MSS of the Tours scriptorium belonged to that type. Harleian MS 2788 is one of these and may possibly have been written in Alcuin's school at Tours.¹ The text resembles that of the Royal

¹ The book is not mentioned, however, by Rand in his *Survey of the MSS of Tours*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1929.

MS.¹ We might further quote: Mt xx 29 *secutae sunt eum turbae multae* vett X* O T R W; xxiii 16 *debet : debitor est* Z* X* O M irς; 25 *pleni sunt : pleni estis* X. . . mod; xxiv 23 *hic + est* Z* X* O^c. . . mod; 36 *caelorum + neque filius* vett J X* O B; Mc ii 22 *novellum : novum* X* F W vg; iii 9 *ut navicula sibi deserviret : ut in navicula sibi deservirent* Z I X* G E^c W ς Ⓢ; Jo viii 50 *quaerat et iudicet* vett X* O I. . . mod; xv 6 *mittunt : mittent* vett X* I. . . mod; xvi 3 *facient + vobis* X* I D W vg; etc. This MS, too, has many readings identical with the Alcuinian text, simply because its type had a large share in the making of that text.

Alcuin, therefore, must to a great extent have used a York text representing the mixed type Z* X* O. It is known, on the other hand, that he drew largely on the pure Jeromian A-Y type, which was also well known at York.² A few readings from the Royal MS 1. B. vii (in insular half-uncials of the second half of the eighth century, from Northumbria) may be quoted as making it certain that the A-Y type was still copied and easily to be had at York: Mt ii 13 *somnis : somnio* Y A* X^c; iii 16 *om iesus* Y A M* J X alc; iv 15 *om terra* Y A F; v 14 *supra monte* Y; 33 *reddes : reddens* Y; *iuramenta : vota* Y; 41 *angariaberit* Y A T; vi 3 *elemosynam : elemoysyna* Y; ix 10 *discipulis : discipuli* Y ir; xvi 18 *om et (super hanc petram)* Y F; xxvii 44 *crucifixi : fixi* Y A* Z* X H* C T*; etc. The interesting feature of this MS is that the scribe, or a corrector working at the same time, was also conversant with the Z*-X*-O type, the existence of which at York has just been shown. His corrections, written above the line, all belong to that type: Mt ii 4 *sciscitabatur : et interrogavit* sup. lin., J; 22 *quia : quod* sup. lin., Z J ir alc mod; iv 9 *cadens : procidens* sup. lin., X* J; 10 *vade + retro* sup. lin., Z* X* ir; 12 *audisset + iesus* in mg, Z ir alc mod; vi 22 *corporis + tui* sup. lin., Z X* O B alc. . . ; vii 13 *intrate + ergo* sup. lin., O*; viii 18 *iussit + discipulos suos* sup. lin., O* B; xvi 13 *quem + me*

¹ The prefatory matter of the gospels agrees with A-Y, especially with Y.

² Glunz, *Britannien und Bibeltext*, p. 130.

sup. lin., Z*X*OJBir; xvii 18 *eum : ei* in ras., Z*X*XJCT; xxiv 42 + *duo in lecto* (etc.) add in mg, ZX*OB...; xxv 24 om *et (metis)* eras., ZX*B...alc mod; and others. So we have in this MS both the types out of which Alcuin's text resulted.

Lastly, mention may be made of Durham MS A. II. 17, foll. 103-111, which contain eighth-century fragments of the gospel of St Luke. According to C. H. Turner the text is a representative of the A-Y group and was perhaps the original of Y.¹

Alcuin's text is the last genuine type of text in the history of the Vulgate, i.e. a text linked up with the original of St Jerome by an uninterrupted chain of tradition, and, therefore, is a source of some value to the textual critic. At Tours, within the very circle of Alcuin's activity, there grew up, in the course of the ninth century, a new philosophical and theological system, which in due time was to supersede, and even form a contrast to, the moral and ethical fundamentals of the Augustinian teaching. Philosophical systems and the categories of thought have, in medieval times, always had some effect on the study of the Bible and on the text of the Vulgate. One result of the new movement will prove to be the interruption of the direct textual tradition in favour of a very different principle of developing and treating the text.

THE ASCETIC AND ETHICAL IDEALS OF THE MONASTIC REFORMERS: BENEDICT OF ANIANE

For the present, however, it must be noted that in the ninth century and after the death of Charlemagne a digression from the well-known and time-honoured ideals of the past was made very difficult. The first Emperor's intellectual interest had centred round his antiquarian,

¹ C. H. Turner, 'Iter Dunelmense' (*Journ. of Theol. Studies* x, 1909, 529 ff.). The fragment has now been printed by Turner in *The Oldest MS of the Vulgate Gospels*, Oxford 1931, p. 199 ff.

theological, and even classical inclinations.¹ Under Louis, his successor, instead of another Alcuin, Benedict of Aniane became the leader of the spiritual life of the Emperor and his court. The tide once more turned to the old monastic views and determined the spirit within the walls of the monasteries. The whole contrast is apparent in the fact that Alcuin had to reproach Benedict of Aniane with his 'rusticitas, de qua te excusare soles'.² The zealous monk loathed all literary work, and the horror of mere literature is a typical and important feature of monastic life for a century and a half after Alcuin's death. It is the time of the monastic reforms, which follow each other in close succession. Though none of the larger monasteries was ever deprived of its scriptorium or even of a more or less conspicuous library, writing and reading remained merely part of the monks' duties and of the godly life of ascetic contemplation. They belonged to the work and handicraft which had been prescribed by the founder of the Benedictine Order, and had been practised ever since. Besides, books were necessary for the purpose of preaching and the education of the clergy. As his biographer Ardo relates, Benedict of Aniane's first and foremost care was to introduce into the monasteries the strict Benedictine Rule and to teach the monks the severe life of asceticism. Then Ardo enumerates the means which Benedict found appropriate to the promotion of this ideal. Among them he also mentions the schools in which the *Scientia litterarum* was taught.³ The *Capitulare Monasticum*, promulgated by Louis in 817, explicitly decreed that schools should only

¹ On the reaction see A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (3rd and 4th eds.) ii 578 ff.

² To Benedict of Aniane (MG. Epp. iv 100 f.).

³ *Vita*, paragr. 18 (MG. Script. xv 206 f.): 'Dedit autem cor suum ad investigandum beati Benedicti regulam, eamque ut intelligere possit satagere, circumiens monasteria, peritos quosque interrogans quae ignorabat, et omnium sanctorum, quascumque invenire potuit, regulas congregavit. Normamque utilem et monasteriorum salubres consuetudines didicit suisque eas tradidit monachis observandas. Instituit cantores, docuit lectores, habuit gramaticos, et scientia scripturarum peritos . . . , adgregavit librorum multitudinem'.

be tolerated as institutions for the preparatory instruction of the future monks,¹ and it is made very clear that studies were regarded as a mere aid to the realisation of the monkish ideal.² Scholarship was now not seldom condemned as worldly corruption. Lupus, the learned Abbot of Ferrières, complained that learning was being deprecated and despised as superstition and indolence.³ 'Literary studies being almost extinct,' he exclaims,⁴ 'who can refrain from justly complaining of the ignorance of teachers, the scarcity of books, and the want of leisure?' But Lupus was a scholar of a new type and one of those who had to suffer from the rising wave of extreme monasticism. Study to a large extent was no longer disinterested: it was reduced to the position of a handmaid which it had held before Alcuin's time. The Bible teaches us how to imitate Christ and to fulfil the will of God through living a good life—such is the opinion expressed by the Fulda monk Bruun Candidus in the introduction to his mystical and moral exposition of the Lord's Passion according to the gospels,⁵ and there is no difference between this view of the biblical word and that of Gregory the Great. It is easy to suppose why Bruun took up his work. It was felt in the monastery of Fulda, which had recently been subjected to the reform, that in Holy Week the monks should be occupied with a special subject of contemplation, which was to intensify their spiritual life during that time, and in that way to make them realise and practise the very essence of asceticism. Bruun undertook the work, and the outcome

¹ MG. *Leges ii* (*Capitularia i*) 346 (c. 45): 'Ut scola in monasterio non habeatur, nisi eorum qui oblati sunt'.

² The same *Capitulare*, *ib.* pp. 345, 347 (cc. 19, 63).

³ MG. *Epp.* vi 7.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 42.

⁵ See Migne cvi 59: 'Audiamus, fratres, intento corde et mente devota, quomodo ipse dominus noster ad hanc pro nostra salute suscipiendam passionem venire dignatus est; et quam patienter sibi illatam toleraret, qualeque exemplum patientiae suis fidelibus praebere (ut eum sequerentur) dignatus est; ut his auditis et memoriae commendatis possimus Deo auxiliante ad gaudium eius resurrectionis parati et bonis operibus impleti audiendum pervenire'.

was his little book. On a like plane was the treatment of the Bible in all the monasteries which had undergone the reform, and that means, at least in the first half of the century, most convents in France and in the western part of Germany.¹

We propose to show in brief that all the monastic reforms were dominated by ascetic ideals and, therefore, did not at all modify the Vulgate text in the biblical manuscripts that were produced under their influence.

Benedict's reform took its origin in Aniane, whence it spread to the whole valley of the Rhône, and to Inden (or Cornelimünster, near Aix-la-Chapelle), which gradually extended its authoritative position as a model foundation over Central France and Brittany, regions which at first had resisted the reform. In Germany Reichenau and Fulda were the chief places where the new movement rapidly took root.² But however far the propagation of the strict monastic Rule went, even after Benedict's death, literary studies profited nothing by it, because it was part of the ascetic nature of the reform to avoid anything which might divert attention from the main purpose of the monastic life. Benedict, and those working with him and in his spirit, laid stress on the Rule and on the disciplined life of the monks. At the end of his life he could justly say:³ 'Many monasteries, once neglected, now, by the grace of God, seem to have received from us some sort of reform'. His detailed prescriptions as to the observation of the *Consuetudines*⁴ force us to conclude that his aim was more the organisation of monasticism than the reconstruction of religious consciousness in the individual. Books were written, because they were needed in the system, e.g. for Church services, or for the edification of the monks. No regard whatever was paid to questions of text; such con-

¹ Hauck, *op. cit.* ii 604 ff.

² On Reichenau see MG. Epp. v 302, 305; on Fulda, *Candidi Vita Eigilis* (MG. Script. xv 223).

³ Benedict of Aniane's *Vita*, c. 43 (MG. Script. xv 220).

⁴ *Ib.* c. 38 (*l.c.* p. 216 f.).

siderations lay outside the narrow pale of Aniane's interests. The reading of the Scriptures was a daily exercise,¹ because the Bible was solely an instrument to instruct the reader in a right mode of life, according to the saying of Benedict of Nursia: 'Where is the page, where the sentence in that divine authority, the Old and the New Testament, which does not give a most correct standard of human life?''² This sentence from the last chapter of the Rule of St Benedict, Aniane put at the head of his own *Concordia Regularum*, indicating that his compilation was nothing new, but a re-establishment of what for centuries had existed in theory, if not in practice. So Aniane confined himself to a very narrow scope, and was not influenced by those forces and factors which would have tended to alter the existing Vulgate text.

GERHARD OF BROGNE

Nor did the tenth century bring a change, as far as the influence of the monastic system on the Vulgate is concerned. The decay of monasticism towards the end of the ninth century, furthered by the repeated invasions of the Norsemen and the Hungarians,³ was followed by local reforms in Flanders and Lorraine and, simultaneously, by the more general Cluniac movement. Howsoever these revivals of the ascetic ideal may have differed in detail from each other or from similar attempts in the preceding century, fundamentally the monastic aspect of tenth-century civilisation was only a continuation of the im-

¹ Cf. *Concordia Regularum* (Migne ciii 1101 ff., 1107): '[In refectorio] unus in medio residens, benedictione accepta, de Scripturis aliquid legat, caeteri vescentes tacebunt lectionem intentissime audientes, ut, sicut corporalis cibis refectioem corpori praestat, ita mentem spiritalis sermo reficiat'.

² *Ib.* col. 718.

³ *Chronicon Medii Monasterii* (MG. Script. iv 89); Inden (or Corneli-münster), Stavelot, and Malmédy were sacked in 881, St Maximin in 882, Prüm in 882 and in 892. It is said (*Gesta Episcoporum Tull.* MG. Script. viii 639) of the diocese of Toul at the beginning of the tenth century that 'Regula S. Benedicti huius regni habitatoribus omnibus ignota'.

mediate post-Carolingian era.¹ In Flanders the reform was started by Gerhard of Brogne, who as abbot of his newly founded monastery in Lorraine (923) acquired great fame as the pattern of a monk who insisted on austere and stern discipline within the walls of the monastery. Duke Gisbert of Lorraine entrusted him with the reformation of St Ghislain (931) and other houses in Northern Lorraine, and in the service of Count Arnulf of Flanders he undertook the same work in some Flemish monasteries, especially in the various houses at Ghent and at St Bertin.² Abbot Gerhard's ideal was the negation of worldly life, an existence of self-sacrifice and of devotion to the will of God. Man was to live in obedient subjection to the Eternal Being. One of Gerhard's pupils, a monk of Brogne, wrote to him:³ 'I am not conscious of any good within me, I only recognise with what inestimable mercy Omnipotent God is treating me by calling forth from me that which is not, as well as that which is'. Education in such a state of mind is often called 'studium' by Gerhard, but it is obvious that the meaning of the word here is rather pious zeal than study. In the words of his biographer,⁴

his learning chiefly consisted in the knowledge of the Rule. The brethren under his care he taught in a twofold way. According to the salutary advice of St Benedict he explained to the more capable pupils the divine commandments,⁵ whereas to the more simple ones he taught these through his example. So he taught his pupils to avoid what was contrary to the commandments, and by putting forth old and new material from the rich store of his experience he taught like a scholarly scribe who illustrates his teaching by his mode of living.

It is significant that the scribe, the monk occupied in the scriptorium, is here represented as of exemplary learning,

¹ Hauck, *op. cit.* iii 304.

² *Vita Gerhardi* (MG. Script. xv 664 ff., 668). St Bavo, Ghent, was reformed in 937 (*ib.* ii 187); Blandinium in 941 (*ib.* v 25); St Bertin in 944 (*Folcwinii Gesta, ib.* xiii 628 f.).

³ MG. Script. xv 647.

⁴ *Vita*, c. 18 (*l.c.* p. 668).

⁵ 'Dominica mandata', i.e. the gospels.

while his teaching is wholly of a moral and ascetic nature and to be valued only inasmuch as it is of use in the monastic life. Books certainly were only accepted as means to a practical and moral end. The spiritual food coveted by the monks who were eager for moral knowledge and instruction was given them by Gerhard in the shape of biblical expositions which were inspired by his ideal of piety and asceticism. He accepted any text he happened to find, and overlaid it with his own ideal, because he did not pay any regard to textual questions at all. That was the secret of his success:¹

So great a fervour filled him to convert souls to God that he solicitously applied himself to this purpose in monasteries as well as in the houses of individual persons, in order to kindle, by his preaching, the hearts of his hearers to the love of the heavenly country. Working successfully in that way he gradually attracted and became acquainted with many men. From various districts a great number of monks came to him to be edified. They were eager, with all their might, to imitate the chaste and exemplary life of so great a man. It was as if bees from various hives were flying to one blossoming tree, that they might fill the empty honeycombs with the nectar of mellifluous dew. He received them all with a benevolent and grateful mind, refreshed them with the lore of monastic discipline, and taught his pupils to be good preceptors and the more advanced to be perfect teachers. When some went away fully instructed in morals and religion, others arrived to be taught. Unceasingly he poured forth like nard the sweet fragrance of the virtues, and by opening the fountain of the Scriptures watered their dry minds. So he studied to make the spiritually weak brethren take the life-giving herb of the divine word, that by digesting it diligently they should be healed of all vice and learn from the taste how merciful is the Lord with those who trust in Him. Let no reader think it improper to speak in that way of the word of Scripture. The divine word is rightly called a herb, because the more it is meditated upon the more it yields its pleasant taste and smell, relieving the system of its deadly disease; and though in its purity it may seem bitter in the mouth, yet its effective sweetness is wholesome to the heart.

¹ *Vita*, c. 20 (*l.c.* p. 671).

There can be no doubt that the Bible was approached with the intention of finding an answer to the question of the right mode of life. Questions as to the biblical text itself did not arise, these being outside the sphere of interest of ascetically minded monks.

EINOLD AND JOHN OF GORZE

About the same time, in 933, a small circle of enthusiastic priests and anchorites refounded Gorze monastery in Southern Lorraine. Here again it is seen how quickly an ascetic movement, once on the way, exerted a great influence over a wide range of houses in the circumference. In the diocese of Metz, Bishop Adalbero started the reform in the monastery of St Arnulf (940), and shortly afterwards monks from Gorze introduced the strict Benedictine Rule in St Felix, Longeville, and Hornbach. In the diocese of Toul the fourth decade of the century saw corrective measures carried out at St Aper, St Mansuet, Senones, and Moyenmoutier; in the Trèves district the chief places were St Maximin and St Èvre. Other houses were St Mihiel in the diocese of Verdun, and Waulsort, Stavelot, and Malmédy in the Liège district. The chronicler of the Gorze foundation underlines the fact that the original founders, though very learned and in one case even skilled in the writing of books, deliberately used their knowledge in the service of a rigorous monastic life.¹ We have a detailed account of the first Abbot Einold's studies.² He had read almost the whole of the theological literature then current, 'until, with the help of the Holy Ghost, he had acquired a complete knowledge of the Scriptures'. As a matter of fact, 'studies in those days being almost extinct and even the very books hard to obtain', his reading had not gone beyond the four Fathers, i.e. the works of Gregory and Augustine, and a few writings of Ambrose and Jerome. The chronicler, it is true, acknowledges this industry of his

¹ See *Vita Iohannis Gorziensis*, cc. 26, 27 (MG. Script. iv 344).

² *Ib.* c. 83 f. (*l.c.* p. 360 f.).

hero, but nevertheless it all appears to him somewhat overdone and not entirely in accordance with what ought to be the business of a true monk. He, therefore, praises Einold for having soon returned to the golden mean, away from the dangers of too subtle a learning, and for having devoted himself to the simple reading of the Bible.

Soon Father Einoldus went back to more moderate undertakings. For he had been engaged in these things for some time and knew from experience how much labour they absorbed. Unwilling to spend more time on them he abandoned them all of a sudden, determined to apply his mind rather to the sacred reading [i.e. of the Bible] where he was sure to find more than enough matter not only for knowledge, but for edification also. This man, who had sworn not even once to transgress the limits of obedience, soon renounced what he had (wrongly) begun and, as before, devoted himself wholly to divine things.¹

A similar impression is produced by the account given of John, the second abbot of Gorze. He had read through the Old and the New Testament, he knew by heart the pericopes and the prayers for all the days of the year, and he had a wide knowledge of ecclesiastical law, homiletic literature, and hagiology. Yet all this was abandoned for his sole aim: 'He longed with all his desire to relinquish the world and renounce human faculties altogether'.²

It is true that the monastic reformers were always careful to re-establish the schools as well,³ but in these no more

¹ *Vita Iohannis Gorziensis*, c. 83 (*ib.* p. 360). The contempt of mere studies and the aspiration to the *mediocritas* is a peculiar feature of post-Carolingian monastic reform. In the chronicle of Moyennoutier (this monastery was reformed by the abbot of Gorze between 950 and 960; see MG. Script. iv 89) it is said of Abbot Almannus, who became abbot in 985 (*ib.* p. 91): 'Almannus corpore elegantissimus, statura procerus, moribus et actu modestus, in eruditione litterarum minus perfectus, in restructione abbatiæ vigilantissimus, iuxta mediocritatem sui ingenii in revocando subiectos ad instituta regulæ fervidus. Hic denique eruditionem suorum credens suam, mercede duxit eis doctorem grammaticæ, quin et volumina artis eiusdem plurima studuit loco conquirere'. The lack of literary education obviously served the abbot as a recommendation.

² *Vita Iohannis Gorziensis*, c. 20 (*l.c.* p. 342).

³ E.g. at Moyennoutier (MG. Script. iv 91); at Gorze (*Vita Adalberonis II episc. Mett.* MG. Script. iv 660).

was taught than the elementary subjects which enabled the monks to read the chief books of devotion and edification. We hear but rarely of a library.¹ A careful reading of the sources cannot fail to convince one that the various monastic revivals were inspired by the spirit of conscious resistance to the pre-scholastic learning which in some schools of France began to take root in the course of the ninth and tenth centuries. The representatives and protagonists of asceticism discouraged the building up of a system of thought on the basis of the biblical word (which was, of course, regarded as the highest and last authority by the scholastics also). The ground of contention was chiefly that philosophical thinking about religious subjects appeared to the ascetic reformers as arrogance, where nothing but humble submission to the divine word in a devout life was desirable. John of Gorze's biographer, with obvious satisfaction, relates a story of Archdeacon Blidulfus of Metz, which needs no comment as to the writer's, and all ascetics', feelings.² 'Blidulfus was of a noble and prosperous family, he excelled in every exercise of the faculties of his mind [whether that is knowledge or cunning I cannot tell] and was superior in the science of letters to everybody else in Metz, inasmuch as he had been a pupil of Remigius. In those days he was so completely given to worldly things that one could hardly detect any traces of religion left in him.' The historian goes on to tell that Blidulfus fell ill and Einold, the Abbot of Gorze, was called to his bedside. The pious man's effect on the renegade was such that he made him enter Einold's monastery after his convalescence. Later he withdrew to the Vosges mountains, where he lived as a hermit. 'And there, in the sweet contemplation of God, in the bitter mortification of the body, and dead to the world, he lived some ten years and then died in peace.' Such was

¹ We hear of one at St Emmeram, Regensburg; it was stocked by Abbot Ramwold, who had been a monk in the reformed monastery of St Maximin (see *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft f. ält. dt. Geschichtskunde*, Hanover 1885, x 389).

² *Vita Iohannis Gorziensis*, c. 69 (*l.c.* p. 356).

the pattern of ascetic life, and (as will be shown later) it formed a strong contrast to the subject-matter of Remigius's teaching at Rheims. There was a kind of learning which was highly mistrusted by the monasteries of the old spirit; our historian, at any rate, did not think very highly of it. He reveals his attitude again in another episode. Among the schools, where John of Gorze was educated, he mentions¹ 'the monastery of St Mihiel on the Meuse, where a certain Hildebold, a pupil of Remigius, the most learned teacher of the time, was moderator of the school and teacher of grammar. John himself often used to say that he took very little away from Hildebold's lessons, either because of the master's negligence, or on account of a certain aloofness, in spite of being well paid by John's father'. There was only one thing which made the monks take to books and bookish learning, a desire to be taught the right mode of life in their sphere of humility. The Book of books was high above them. It was their law of spiritual conduct, an authority beyond which they dared not raise their thought. Their attitude forbade them to approach it with a critical mind and to question or to alter its text.

THE REFORM OF CLUNY

Lastly, something must be said of the Cluniac movement, the name of which is connected with the most thorough and permanent of the tenth-century monastic reforms. The Cluniac reform soon became so all-embracing that at a very early period the very tendency to which the reformers on the whole were so hostile found a secure, though for a long time never officially recognised place in it. Originally the reform proposed, on a large scale, the reconstruction of monastic life, as all other similar movements had done. Its regulations for one thing were furnished by the *Concordance of Rules* of Benedict of Aniane.²

¹ *Ib.* c. 10 (*i.e.* p. 340).

² See Odo's *Life* by his pupil Iohannes (Migne cxxxiii 53 f.), where the Rule of Cluny is said to be that of Pater Euticus (*i.e.* Benedict of Aniane).

Furthermore, the first abbot of Cluny, Berno (910–926), specially insisted on the ‘regular’ character of the new house,¹ and on leaving behind him, at his death, a small number of reformed monasteries (Beaume, Gigni, Massay, Bourg-Dieu), he fixed with a firm hand the lines along which the movement was to develop in the future.² This proved very important in the case of Odo, the second abbot (926–942), for his education had been such as rather to turn him from the smooth path of asceticism to the dangers of scholarship. His father, we are told,³ used to read Justinianus and the ancient historians side by side with the gospels, and he sent his son to the school of Remigius of Auxerre at Paris.⁴ But the knowledge taught by Remigius, as has already been said, was regarded with suspicion by those who stood for rigorous monastic discipline, as fraught with pride and worldliness. The monk John, who wrote the life of Odo, makes it clear enough that the revered master was in danger of succumbing in his youth to influences which, from the monastic point of view, were to be deprecated. The worldly wisdom of Priscianus and Virgil had taken hold of him, the chronicler says, but fortunately a dream led him back to the right path;⁵ but his troubles were not at an end. After his conversion Odo turned to religious literature and began to write his *Collationes*, which, as he says himself,⁶ were going

¹ In Berno’s will (*Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, Paris 1614, col. 9 ff.), in which he appoints his successors ‘per sanctae Regulae auctoritatem’. Also the wish of the first founder, William the Pious of Aquitania (*ib.* col. 2): ‘Ut in Cluniaco in honore sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli monasterium regulare construatur, ibique monachi iuxta regulam b. Benedicti viventes congregentur’.

² On the history of the Cluniac movement: E. Sackur, *Die Cluniacenser*, 2 vols. Halle 1892–1894. The sources are well used in Mabillon’s *Annales* iii (especially p. 387 ff.). A map of the extension of the Order is to be found in Heussi-Mulert, *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte*. The most important monasteries reformed by Odo were Aurillac, Romainmoutier, Tulle, Fleury.

³ *Vita Odonis* i 5 (Migne cxxxiii 46).

⁴ *Ib.* c. 19 (*l.c.* col. 52).

⁵ *Ib.* c. 12 (*l.c.* col. 49).

⁶ In the prefatory letter (Migne cxxxiii 517): ‘Recolitis, domine mi, quid dudum iusseratis mihi, ut scilicet, quia . . . ad consolationem scripturarum

to be a devotional work extracted from various exegetical writings of the Fathers on passages of the Bible. The work was not yet finished when he entered Beaume in order to become a monk, for his friends at Tours had felt serious misgivings in view of even so modest an ambition as his. The learning Odo manifested was identical with that propagated by the schools of Remigius and some others:¹ 'With a furious bark nearly all the canons rushed upon him. What is in your mind, they said, why are you meddling with the works of others [i.e. the commentaries of the Fathers]? You merely disfigure the precious treasure and at the same time spoil the bloom of your youth. Change your mind, abandon those profound, unfathomable writings, and open your Psalter.'² The same scene was repeated when he was asked by some friends to make an abstract of St Gregory's *Moralia*. The biographer is at pains to explain this work, the *Epitome Moralium*, too, as the outcome of the author's piety and obedience, not as the result of a secular accomplishment.³

Odo humbly confessed that he could not make the abstract, and he added that, even if he possessed the necessary faculties, the task could not be performed, as he wished to avoid being called an innovator who lacked respect for the work of so great a man [St Gregory] and sought to deprive it of its lustre. Others maintained that he would sooner fail altogether than attempt such a work, and if he accepted their advice he would give up the attempt and devote himself to the Scriptures rather than perish under the burden of an impossible task. So every day this affair caused discussion among them. But I know [monk John continues] that many were indignant at Odo's plan and that he said the above words only to silence them. For he undertook the work not out of arrogance, but in accordance with the will of God,

and he tries to save Odo's character as an obedient monk by relating that St Gregory himself appearing in a dream

libris absentibus recurrere nequitis, quaedam ex Patrum sententiis deflorarem, quae et huius temporis qualitati convenirent'.

¹ On this subject more will be said in chap. III.

² *Vita Odonis* i 13 (*l.c.* col. 49).

³ *Ib.* i 20 (*l.c.* col. 52).

had commanded his devotee to write the *Epitome*. After entering Beaume, Odo seems no longer to have indulged in his scholarly extravagances, although there is a certain probability that later in his life he wrote at least one more work, this time not at Cluny, but at Fleury, where literary originality was more encouraged.

Yet it would not be altogether true to class the Cluniac movement unreservedly under one heading with other reforms of the time. The one important difference is that the body of Cluniac houses consciously and willingly formed a member of the great body of the Church, intent on realising the pure monastic ideal, but at the same time ready to assimilate and to utilise the values developing out of other parts of the Church organism. This broadmindedness, largely due to Odo, the pupil of Remigius, explains the longevity of the order, whereas the other reforms by their isolation from all Church influence had only an ephemeral existence.¹ Nevertheless, for almost two centuries the new schools had little or no influence on the Cluniac monasteries (a noteworthy exception was Fleury, as will be seen later). Odo almost alone of all early Cluniac monks or abbots was a 'Vir Scholasticus' and on entering Beaume brought a hundred books with him.² But owing to the severe rule and the firmness of Abbot Berno even he, instead of using his learning in the sense of his teacher Remigius, had to subordinate it to the ascetic spirit of his monastery.

Odo's writings deal with the word of God as laid down in the Bible. They expound it morally and differ widely from the exegetical works produced at certain schools of the time. He is filled with admiration for the acts of patience and devotion exemplified in the Book of Job and sets out to communicate this feeling to the reader and so

¹ A good definition of the Cluniac conception of monasticism in its relation to the Church was given by Abbot Odilo of Cluny, *De Vita Beati Maioli* (Migne cxlii 945 A-B).

² *Vita Odonis* i 23 (*l.c.* col. 54).

to do useful service, rather than to display the vanity of scholarship.

I thought of my weakness [he declares in the introduction to the *Epitome Moralium S. Gregorii in Job*¹], the frailty of my body, the good my neighbours might derive from the book, and there I turned against my weaker self, God knows not full of vain arrogance, or swollen with pride, or because I wanted to follow my empty inclinations. But I started to work because I burned with the mighty flame of Job's story, which I wanted to retain in my memory with all the powerful impression it had left on me, and so I wrote down my unassuming work in this little book.

The Bible is to him the book of devotion, a guide to a divinely inspired life. He will be saved who follows its instructions:²

If there is anything which makes a wise man remain constant in the turmoil of this world, it is above all, I believe, meditation upon Holy Writ. For all insight by which we know God or ourselves comes from the holy books. . . . The whole purpose of the book is to keep us from the evils of this life. For that reason its terrible phrases wound us like daggers. Man shall be seized with horror and recall to mind the just judgment of God, which, in fleshly lusts or worldly cares, he so often forgets. It announces that on the Day of Judgment everyone shall receive what he has earned by his deeds. . . . Furthermore, as heavenly joy is only to be had by worldly pain, it strengthens us to bear ills patiently by opening the prospect of the bliss which is to follow this temporal misery. So the hope of eternal joy will moderate the fear of passing troubles. . . . Another thing is how mercifully God chose the words of his book, now threatening us with sudden imprecations, now soothing us with sweet words of comfort. He mixes fear with hope and hope with fear. He makes humble the heart of the sinner by the promise of terror, he raises the afflicted heart by the prospect of future comfort. He metes out both with the wonderful moderation of a father, who neither renders us a prey of despair nor leaves us to the deceptive appearance of security.

¹ Migne cxxxiii 108.

² *Collationes*, lib. i (Migne cxxxiii 519 ff.).

Odo, the pupil of Remigius, could hardly have manifested less of his master's spirit than he does in this passage as in all his writings. It should be noted that the Cluniac Order always remained faithful to the example set by Odo, if we may judge from the attitude of the abbots (which is permissible, considering the organisation of the Order, by which the abbot of Cluny exerted a great power over the dependent houses). Aimard, the third abbot (942-948), did not venture at all upon the literary field. He was, Odilo tells us,¹ the son of blessed simplicity and innocence, keen on the observance of the Rule. All his *studium* consisted 'in augmentatione praediorum et acquisitione temporalis commodi'. Maiolus however (948-994), sometime librarian of Cluny, was a great friend of books, who also read the profane authors, though only because of their usefulness for grammatical purposes, and he seems to have acquired a certain amount of literary knowledge.² Yet to him again the Bible was the highest code of the monastic virtues.³ He read St Gregory by preference (i.e. the *Moralia*), and he too, in his youthful state of worldly learning, experienced a *conversio a saeculo*, as his successor Odilo says. One of his friends, a monk, produced in him, by the grace of God, a contempt for the world. . . . He laid down his office as a dignitary of the Church, resigned the secular prerogatives of his birth, left the company of his friends and parents, and entered heavenly tutorship, so that he could freely serve the true King Christ. . . . He wanted to become poor in spirit with the poor, so that the heavenly King might reward him with the kingdom of heaven.⁴

¹ Migne cxxxvii 699; cxlii 946.

² *Vita auctore Syro monacho*, lib. ii, cc. 3, 4 (Migne cxxxvii 755).

³ *Ib.* lib. ii, c. 3: 'Ut speculi fieri solet inspectione, ita se interius divina considerabat lectione, et ex hac mentis ornatus componebatur; deformitatis vero si quid deprehendebatur, iustitiae moderamine corripiebatur. Ideo divinorum praeceptorum plus delectabatur eloquiis, quam dapium ditissimis ferculis; quia ex his et suos mores componere, et sibi commissos instruebatur docere et corrigere. Cunctis tamen seipsum bene vivendi praebebat exemplum. Et ideo sicut in ordine, ita primus studebat ut esset in opere. . . . Adeo lectioni semper erat deditus, ut in itinere positus, libellum saepius gestaret in manibus. Itaque in equitando reficiebatur animus legendo'. Also lib. i, cc. 5, 15.

⁴ Odilo, *De Vita Beati Maioli* (Migne cxlii 949, 952).

Odilo himself, the fifth abbot (994-1049), though acquainted with Abbo of Fleury and Fulbert of Chartres, two eminent scholars of the time, was an ascetic. It is significant that Fulbert asked his advice as to the best way of living a saintly life, whilst Odilo in his reply humbly bowed to the great scholar 'whose learning shines like a bright star in the sky'.¹ In a word, all we can elicit concerning the attitude of the first leaders of the Cluniac movement tends to show that many of them possessed the best education of their time, whereas all of them, once at the head of the Order, devoted themselves exclusively to the cultivation of the monastic virtues. It is an important point, for the scriptoria within the monastic walls were still the only centres of book production. At the same time the Bible was the highest moral authority. To question anything in this moral and devotional code, be the critic's intention ever so pure, would have been equal to doubting the *auctoritas*. The Cluniac reform as well as all others had reasserted the true relation between the gospel and the life of man. What had to be modified and altered was the life, not the biblical text.²

MONASTIC VULGATE MSS REPRESENTING THE ANCIENT TEXTUAL TRADITION

What has been said of post-Carolingian monasticism will suffice to explain why so large a number of Vulgate MSS of that period represent the entirely unaltered text of the Alcuinian and pre-Alcuinian types. The continental gospel MSS of which extracts will now be given were all written in monasteries which had been influenced in some way or

¹ Migne cxlii 939.

² It is too often assumed by modern scholars that the Cluniac movement brought about a revival of learned studies. The Cluniac monks revived the old kind of monastic learning, which consisted in reading and writing for the sake of moral edification. The learning which was characteristic of the tenth century was cultivated in the episcopal schools of theology, not in the monasteries. Cf. Robert, *Les écoles et l'enseignement de la Théologie dans la première moitié du xiii^e siècle*, 1919, pp. 17-19.

other by a monastic reform of the ninth or tenth century. Their textual characteristics point to the sphere in which, and for which, they were written. They make it clear that the monastic spirit of asceticism had a conservative effect on the Vulgate. For two centuries the monastic text in the post-Carolingian monasteries remained traditional.

Manuscripts with Alcuinian text are very frequent. Harl. MS 2823 (late ninth century) may be regarded as an almost pure type. The rubric of the 'Epistola ad Damasum' and the capitula are identical with those of K, except for some minor differences. Mt iii 16 *sicut columbam* + *et* MX* alc mod; iv 5 *assumpsit* alc mod; 6 *mandabit* vulg alc, against most other MSS; 12 *audisset* + *iesus* Z ir alc mod; 16 *in regione et umbra : in regione umbrae* VH^o vg Hier.; v 20 *dico enim : dico autem* M V E^o; 23 *offeret : offers* VH^o W vg; 24 *offers : offeret* alc mod; 39 *in dexteram maxillam tuam* O ir alc mod; > *et illi alteram* KM V Z²; vi 23 + *ipsae (tenebrae)* JBDLH^o alc vg; 25 *corpus* + *plus* QE alc Z⁴ O^c mod; 33 *omnia haec* Z . . . alc W; vii 10 *petet : petierit* X* E . . . alc Z⁴ O^c mod; 22 > *in nomine tuo, in tuo nomine, in tuo nomine* ZX* . . . alc W; 28 *doctrinam : doctrina* ZJFBCT alc X^c mod; viii 27 *om et (venti)* vett ir BM V Z^c mod; 29 *tibi* + *iesu* X* Bir alc Z⁴ vg; ix 2 > *in lecto iacentem* ZX* B P^o alc; 12 *medico : medicus* CTB ir H^o alc mod; xii 44 *invenit* + *eam* Z . . . alc mod; xviii 26 *orabat : rogabat* MB . . . alc O^c X^c; xxi 41 *reddant : reddunt* K; xxii 17 *dari : dare* Z* OB . . . alc vg; xxiii 13 *intrare : introire* ZX* E alc; xxvi 10 + *huic (mulieri)* BE H^c O^o alc O^o Z³ mod; etc. Readings typical of Alcuin's revision:¹ Mt xvii 1 *assumpsit : assumit* V^o H^o E^o; Mc vi 32 *in navi : in navem* IX* CTKM V Z³ mod; viii 37 *commutationem : commutationis* ZX* KM V W vg; x 17 *in viam : in via* ZIKVW^o H^o E^o; Lc xix 37 *discipulorum* vett V^o E^o, as against most others; Jo v 24 *transiit* vulg V^o E^o : *transit* K . . . ; vi 23 *gratias agente domino* V G H^o E^o vulg, against all others; 64 *credentes : non credentes* vett

¹ See Glunz, *op. cit.* pp. 127, 132.

V $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{C}$; vii 8 *non : nondum* V Harl. 2826; xiii 29 *quia dicit : quod dixisset* vett ZK V mod; xiv 24 *sermonem : sermo* VT^e ir; xv 6 *aruit : arescet* EK VW vg; *eos : eum* VTDE RW vg; *in ignem mittent et ardet* VT mod; xix 18 *hinc et hinc : hinc et inde* KV X^e Y* G Δ SW. The subscriptions at the ends of the various gospels are typically Alcuinian and agree with KV: *Mt habet uersus $\bar{I}\bar{I}$ DCC*; *Mc habet uersus \bar{I} DCC*; *Lc habet uersus $\bar{I}\bar{I}\bar{I}$ DCCC*; *Jo habet uersus \bar{I} DCC*.¹

Add. MS 11849 of the B.M. (about 900) agrees with Harl. MS 2823 in most places. The book strongly resembles the products of the Tours scriptorium,² and that is probably the reason why it still bears the marks of the pre-Alcuinian Z*-X*-O type: Mt ii 6 *reget : regat* J* X* \mathfrak{P} * E H^e Θ TR mod; iv 6 *mandabit : mandavit* Z* A Y X... mod; vi 4 *abscondito : absconso* J M B* ir; etc. But the overwhelming mass of readings are Alcuinian: Mt iv 5 *assumit : assumpsit* D alc Y^e mod; 12 *audisset + iesus* Z... alc mod; 16 *in regione umbrae*; ix 2 *et videns : videns autem* ZX* B \mathfrak{P} K M V \mathfrak{C} ; xvii 1 *assumpsit : assumit*; Mc vi 32 *in navi : in navem* IX*... alc Z³ mod; x 17 *in viam : in via*; Jo v 24 *transiit* vulg V \mathfrak{C} ; xv 6 *et arescet et colligent eum et in ignem mittent et ardet* E V W vg. There are many cases where a corrector has substituted the Alcuinian reading for the non-Alcuinian one of the first hand. We quote the latter first, then that of the corrector: Mt iii 2 *adpropinquavit : adpropinquabit* H^e Θ K M V L^e W \mathfrak{C} $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{C}$; iv 10 *om enim* Z* A Y... : + *enim* vulg ir X* alc Z⁴ mod; 13 *maritima : maritimam* Z A Y... alc; vi 16 *demoliantur : exterminant* X A Y... alc Z⁴ mod; viii 3 *om iesus : + iesus* ZX* O* alc vg; 29 *tibi fili : tibi iesu fili* X* B ir alc Z⁴ vg; Mc vi 21 *natalis sui : natali suo* Z* V...; viii 37 *commutationem : commutationis* ZX* alc mod; Lc xix 37 *descendentium : discipulorum* V \mathfrak{C} ; Jo v 2 *super probatica :*

¹ Wordsworth and White, *Novum Testamentum Latine*, p. 736. The figure \bar{I} DCC for John is probably an error (for \bar{I} DCCC).

² It is definitely ascribed to Tours by E. K. Rand, *A Survey of the MSS of Tours*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1929, p. 162, plate 144.

om *super* ZJ OCTVA^c mod; vi 23 *gratias agentes domino: gratias agente domino* VG^hⓈ; 64 *credentes: non credentes* V^hⓈ; vii 8 *non: nondum* V; xix 18 *hinc et hinc: hinc et inde* K V X^c . . . W. These corrections above the line help us to explain in what way mixtures of various types originated.

Such a mixture we find in Harl. MS 2830 written at St Martin's, Louvain, in the first half of the eleventh century. There is a good proportion of readings of the Z*-X*-O type: Mt v 36 *iuraveris: iuraberis* F P; 43 *odio habebis: odies* J M B ir W; vi 10 *adveniat: veniat* Z* X* O . . . B H ⊕; ix 18 *adoravit* Z* X* B W; xv 6 *honorificabit: honorificavit* Z X* O A Y . . .; xx 1 om *enim* vett Z* X* J C ir vg; xxi 9 *venturus est: venit* Z* O ir ⊕ vg; xxiv 1 *aedificationes: edificationem* I X* B C T . . .; xxv 4 I *praeparatus: paratus* Z* J O* B . . . mod; xxvi 39 *pater: mi pater* M I C T . . .; 53 *duodecim + milia (legiones)* Z J X O B, but *milia* erased afterwards; etc. But typically Alcuinian variants are not less frequent: Mt xvii 1 *assumsit: assumit* V^hⓈ; Mc i 15 *adpropinquabit* I X H* ⊕ K V W; iii 26 *consurrexit: consurrexerit* I X* . . . K V Z² mod; iv 15 *incorda: incordibus* V W vg; vi 21 *natali suo* vulg Z* V . . .; 32 *in navem* I X* C T alc Z³ mod; 34 > *vidit iesus turbam multam* Z O X K V; vii 3 *traditionem: traditiones* Z K V X^c W; viii 13 *ascendens + navem* M I O X* . . . alc W; 23 *adprehendens manum: adprehensa manu* Z* I* X* . . . alc Z² mod; 37 *commutationis*; Jo v 24 *transiit*; viii 10 *ubi sunt + qui te accusabant* I F . . . alc mod; xvii 23 *et dilexisti eos: et dilexi eos* vett Z V; etc.

A good example of the diverse types current in the monastic texts is Harl. MS 2797, which was written at St Geneviève, Paris, late in the ninth century. The usual prefaces represent a mixture of X*-B-E and K-M-V readings¹ and so does the text. The following pre-Alcuinian and Irish variants may be quoted: Mt iv 4 *vivit: vivet* Z* B L; v 40 *dimitte* ir mod; vi 4 *absconso* J M B* ir;

¹ We refrain from quoting variants in the prologues. The capitula of the book are printed in Wordsworth's Vulgate.

10 *veniat* Z*X*O...; 33 *autem: ergo* ir; 34 > *solliciti esse* FX*ir mod; vii 4 + *frater* PR^{sa}W₅⊗; ix 30 *illis: eis* ER; x 10 om *enim* LR; xv 9 *doctrinas mandata* vulg Z*JX*O*YFH; xvi 15 *illis + iesus* vett Z*X*BirO^c mod; xviii 17 om *et (ecclesiam)* Z*JPLQ mod; xxi 9 *venturus est: venit* Z*Oir mod; xxviii 7 *praedixi: dixi* vett ICT^eELR*, sed corr.; Mc v 17 a (*finibus*): de MIOB CTH⊗vg; 38 *ad domum* OM; ix 2 *solos: solus* ZOX AY...; x 24 om *in (regnum)* ZX*CTLK; 40 om (*dare*) vobis vulg ZAY...; xiii 32 *vel hora: et hora* FGCTirM; xiv 3 *spicati: pistici* TDgat; 9 *evangelium istud: hoc evangelium* B; 14 *refectio mea: diversorium meum et refectio mea* ZOBH⊗M; 27 *omnes + vos* Q; 38 *vero: autem* X*OB₂ PDMW; Lc ii 29 *nunc dimitte* irgat; etc.

But the Alcuinian variants are not less conspicuous. As in KV and Harl. MS 2823, each gospel is followed by a note indicating the number of cola (*uersus*); for John the figure is $\bar{I}DCCC$. Furthermore we note such common readings as: Mt iii 2 *adpropinquabit*; iv 12 + *iesus*; 16 *in regione umbrae*; viii 29 *tibi + iesu*; x 36 *hominis: homines* VYX^cO^c; Mc i 2 *viam tuam + ante te* ZG...KV mod; iv 15 *in cordibus* vettV mod; v 19 *et: iesus autem* vett Z⊗KV; 40 *ingrediuntur* Z...alc W₅⊗; vi 15 + *quia (propheta)* P^{mg}H^c⊗MV*Z^a mod; 21 *natali suo* vulg Z*V...; 32 *in navem* IX*...alc mod; 56 om *in (civitates)* ZCTRalc mod; vii 4 om (*multa*) sunt ZX*alc; 24 *in fines: in finibus* X*QV; viii 13 *iterum + navem* vettIX*O...alc mod; 23 *apprehensa manu* ZI*X*CTBalc mod; 34 om *post (me)* ZX*Dalc mod; 37 *commutationis*; 38 *confessus...confundetur* H*alc; ix 48 *moriatur...extinguetur* Talc; x 11 *dicit: dixit* ZOalc; 17 *in via*; 46 *bartimaeus* ZYK Vvg; 52 *ait illi: dixit ei* ZX*Oalc; xi 2 om *et (prim.)* V; xii 29 *noster: tuus* IX*...KV mod; 38 *ab* ZX*GMV; xiii 11 *id loquimini* iralc; 15 *nec: ne* ZV; xiv 2 *populi: in populo* GH₂PD₂RMV₅⊗⊗; 21 *bonum est: bonum erat* ZITLKV mod; 27 *scandalizabimini + in me* ZLKV mod; Jo v 24 *transiit* vulg alc; etc.

The most interesting feature of the book are the numerous corrections which were made not long after it had been written. In all cases they replace readings of the first hand by Alcuinian ones and go far to prove that in the monasteries the strict and unaltered text of Alcuin was regarded as the norm. We put the reading of the original hand first, then that of the corrector. Mt iii 3 *qui dictus : de quo dictum* VT D ϵ S; *esaiam : isaiam* alc \mathfrak{H} S \mathfrak{C} ; 16 *iesus confestim* : om *iesus* AY JX . . . M V; *columbam* : + *et* MX* . . . alc mod; iv 4 *vivet* Z* BL : *vivit* vulg alc; v 9 om *ipsi* : + *ipsi* vulg AY alc Z³; 39 *illi et* : *et illi* alc Z²; 40 *dimitte* ir : *remitte*; vi 2 *facis* : *facies* vulg V; 4, 6, 18 *absconso* : *abscondito* vulg alc; 10 *veniat* : *adveniat*; viii 20 *et dicit* : *dicit* ZX* alc; ix 2 *iacentem in lecto* : *in lecto iacentem* ZX* B P alc; *et videns* : *videns autem* ZX* B P alc \mathfrak{S} ; 5 *peccata* : + *tua* ir alc \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{C} ; 18 *dicens* : + *domine* ZX* . . . alc mod; x 13 *domus* : + *illa* ZX* O . . . alc mod; 18 *ad reges* : *reges* . . . alc W; 22 *omnibus* : + *hominibus* Z . . . alc \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{S} ; xi 10 *ecce ego* : *ecce* Z* X . . . alc; 12 *rapiunt* : *diripiunt* ZX OT B P alc; xii 44 *invenit* : + *eam*; xiii 14 *et adimpletur* : (*ut*) *adimpleatur* ZAY X^c T^c alc \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{S} ; xiv 9 *iuramentum* : *iusiurandum* Z JX* O B P* alc \mathfrak{S} ; xv 2 *traditionem* : *traditiones* ZX* alc W \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{S} ; xvi 9 *et quinque milia* : *in q. m.* JB . . . alc O^c \mathfrak{H} \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{C} ; 21 *oportet* Z* . . . V; 26 *mundum universum* : *universum mundum* ZX* B P Q alc; xvii 1 *assumpsit* : *assumit* V \mathfrak{H} \mathfrak{C} ; 7 *et nolite* : om *et* JX* C T alc; xxvi 10 *mulieri* : *huic mulieri* B . . . alc O^{sl} Z³ mod; *opus* : *opus enim* VR^{sa}x Z³ \mathfrak{H} \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{C} ; 72 *novi* : *novisset* E alc; xxvii 16 *habebat autem* : om *autem* M V; Mc i 27 *doctrina haec* : om *haec* VD; ii 24 *faciunt* : + *discipuli tui* ZX* . . . alc \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{S} ; iii 11 *et clamabant* : *et exclamabant* GK V; and similarly throughout the remainder of the book.

A few more MSS of a conservative character can be mentioned. MS Egerton 608 of the B.M. was written in Central France in the tenth century. The pre-Alcuinian tradition is preserved in the capitula, which are identical with those in cod. lat. 10438 of the Bibliothèque Nationale

(cf. Wordsworth and White, p. 677 ff.), and in various readings of the Anglo-Saxon and Irish type which have already been mentioned as occurring in other MSS. The usual prefaces in this book excel in typically Alcuinian characteristics no less than the text itself. In the latter we again find variants such as Mt iii 2 *adpropinquabit*; 3 *de quo dictum*; 9 *potest : potens est*; iv 16 *in regione umbrae*; v 28 *concupiscendum : concupiscendam* YX^eirM^eVZ^a; 36 *iuraveris : iurabis* K M Z^e; Mc viii 33 > *hominum sunt* Z O D K V; 37 *commutationis*; Lc v 7 *innuerunt* D K V; vi 26 *prophetis : pseudoprophetis* vett V O Q P vg; vii 32 *om tibiis* vett G K M W; xii 28 *fenum + agri* Z D* K V; xiii 5 *egeritis : habueritis* Z X* alc vg; xx 40 *om quicumque* (m. pr., + sup. lin.) Z K V; xxiv 28 *adpropinquaverunt : appropinquabant* (sed corr.) Z K V; Jo iii 4 *iterato : rursus* Z X* O . . . K V; v 10 *sanatus : sanus* Z . . . M V W; vii 6 *est : adest* F Q alc Z² X^e; xiv 24 *sermonem : sermo* ir V T^e; xx 15 *existimans : estimans* Z F K V; etc. Of this MS more will have to be said later on.

The Bodl. MS Douce 292 was written shortly after 1000, perhaps at Laon. To-day only Mt, Mc, and the prologue and the capitula of Lc remain of the book to show that the text was largely Alcuinian. The capitula of Mt agree with those in Harl. MS 2790 (Wordsworth and White, p. 677), the others with CT. Mt iii 2 *appropinquabit*; Mc v 19 *et : iesus autem*; vii 3 *traditiones*; viii 37 *commutationis*; xii 34 *eum + amplius* H ⊖ K Z^a.

Another interesting mixture marks the Bodl. MS Auct. D. 2. 16, the famous gospel book given to the cathedral of Exeter by Bishop Leofric (1042-1072). It contains, besides a list of his other gifts, the first English catalogue of books. The Latin text of the book was not written at Exeter, but at Landévennec in Brittany. The Irish and Anglo-Saxon readings can be seen in the following specimens: Mt ii 23 *per prophetas : per prophetam* Z*; iii 12 > *triticum in horreum suum* Z* X* B T^e; iv 6 *mandavit* Z* X A Y . . .; v 38 *om et (dentem)* ir; 40 *om ei (et pallium)* A Y X^e J F P* O*; 43 *odies* M J B ir W; vi 34 *sufficit + enim*

ir K; viii 20 *tabernacula* vulg ZX* O . . . ; x 2 *apostolorum : discipulorum* ZX* OBJR* S; 34 *in terram : in terra* Z* P* M; xiv 34 *in terra* Z* M; Lc xix 30 *in quod : in quo* ZX* O G F P D E; etc. On the other hand the Alcuinian type is represented: Mt ends with the colophon *Expl. evangl. s. math. habens uersus II DCC*. Mt iii 2 *appropinquabit*; 9 *potens est*; ix 18 *dicens + domine*; x 13 *domus + illa* ZX* O . . . alc mod; *si (alt.) : sin* ZHΘ K V; 22 *omnibus + hominibus*; xiii 14 *ut adimpleatur ; dicens : dicentis* X* J B i r V O^c S; Mc v 19 *et : iesus autem*; vii 3 *traditiones*; viii 37 *commutationis*; Lc vi 15 > *thomam et mattheum* Z O K V W; viii 52 *mortua + puella* Z . . . K V O^c mod; xi 28 *quippini : quinimmo* Z J B* K V mod; xiii 5 *egeritis : habueritis* ZX* alc vg; xvi 21 *ulcera : vulnera* Z K V; xvii 33 *salvam facere : salvare* Z . . . K V; xviii 34 *et erat : erat autem* ZX* O K V W; xx 14 *ut : et* Z J P R K V; 24 *dixerunt + ei* Z F K V W S S; 47 *accipient : percipient* Z X K W.

As a similar mixture from a German monastery the Cotton MS Tiberius A. ii may be quoted, which was written about 900. Emperor Otto presented it as a gift to King Æthelstan, who gave it to Christ Church, Canterbury. After the passages quoted above, it would only involve a repetition to quote any variants from this book. Suffice it to say that once again the conservative influence of the monastic scriptorium is manifest in the mixture of the same pure types which we have met in the other MSS.

ENGLISH MONASTICISM DEPENDENT ON THE CONTINENT

Little is known of the state of monasticism in England during the ninth and tenth centuries, that is, before Dunstan and Æthelwold subjected all the more important monasteries of the country to the reform instigated by the example of Fleury. About the time when Benedict of Aniane became a power on the Continent the English monasteries were attracting hordes of rapacious Norsemen. The accounts of their disastrous visits fill the chronicles

of the ninth century.¹ In 851 they landed on the Kentish coast and sacked Canterbury and London. Thirteen years later we find them in Essex, whence in the two following years they went northwards across the Humber to York. As they spared no monastery within their reach one cannot but assume that the regular monastic life, which is an indispensable condition for the existence and effective working of a scriptorium, was almost extinguished. It is touching to read Symeon of Durham's pathetic story of the vicissitudes suffered by the few monks who in 875 with the coffin of St Cuthbert on their shoulders left Lindisfarne, which had been devastated several times, to find after years of wandering a new home in Chester-le-Street.² Yet even there the chronicler stresses the fact that during the whole time of the exile the usual rites and the Hours were duly kept. Most monks, it is true, had been killed or had fled;

but the younger ones who at the age of childhood had taken the clerical gown to be brought up and educated, followed wherever the body of the holy father was carried, and they always kept the custom of saying the offices of the Hours as they had learned it from their teachers. So the whole of their successors clinging to the paternal tradition observed much more the customs of monks than that of clerics in singing the Hours, and we have often heard them so sing.³

There is no reason to doubt this account. One must imagine that in most places the monks, after the departure of the invaders, quickly settled down again to the ordinary course of life. It is at all events astonishing to read that in the short interval between 795 and 832 the ancient Irish foundation on Iona was pillaged no fewer than five times. It shows that some of the monasteries must have had resources which enabled them to accomplish reconstruction in a comparatively short time. In fact, the

¹ The first invasion took place in 793 (Lindisfarne). Cf. *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (ed. Plummer) i 54 ff., passim; Florence of Worcester (ed. B. Thorpe, *Engl. Hist. Soc.* 1848), ad ann. 793.

² Symeon of Durham, *Hist. Dunelm. Eccl.* lib. ii, c. 6 (ed. Arnold, R.S. 1882, p. 57 f.).

³ *Ib.* p. 57 f.

Danish invasions cannot alone have been responsible for the laxity of English monasticism before Alfred's time. One factor not to be underrated was the total lack of a Rule suited to the particular English situation.

On the Continent two Rules were in use: that of Chrodegang of Metz for canons, and the *Concordance* of Benedict of Aniane, both compiled for the special needs of continental monasticism. As there was no other Rule in Western Europe, the Anglo-Saxon kings or bishops who wanted to establish a more regulated monastic system in the parts under their jurisdiction and so to promote religion, arts, and letters, were forced to resort to one of these two. That is precisely what happened. We find, as far as details are at all available, that from the ninth century onwards English monasticism is wholly dependent on the Continent. This trend of things first becomes conspicuous in Alcuin's letters to the bishops and clergy of Northumbria, Mercia, and Kent, in which he exhorted his English friends to strive after a more modest and devout Christian life, to be diligent in the reading of the Bible, and to observe the *regularis disciplina*. In 797 he wrote to the monks of Kent:¹

First those who serve God in Christ's Church should learn to please God and faithfully to keep his commandments, and to preach the Catholic faith implanted by our masters. Again, ignorance of the Scriptures means ignorance of God, and if the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the pit. But a great number of wise men do honour to a country. Send for teachers and men who can instruct you in Scripture, lest you lack the word of God or strong leaders of the people and your fountains of wisdom dry up. Do not wear, against the custom of the Church, garments too splendid and costly, but show your nobility in your life and by the zeal to preach the word of God, so that nobles and commons be strengthened by you and the people go the way of salvation. . . . The teachers of truth have disappeared out of Christ's churches. All worldly vanities are sought, and the *disciplinae regulares* are hated.

¹ MG. Epp. iv 191 f.

Words like these admit only of one conclusion, namely, that already before 800 English monasticism was not all it might have been if the tradition of order and discipline which had been inherited from the days of Bede and which had remained predominant in Alcuin's teachers had been maintained. It seems probable that the monks, though still adhering to the monasteries, did not live an exemplary life in houses which in most cases were rich and well provided. In 813 Archbishop Wulfred (805-832) appears to have attempted a kind of reform at Christ Church, Canterbury, for we have a charter¹ in which he puts the cathedral clergy of Canterbury in free and unlimited possession of the whole property of the monastery, provided

that they be always humble and grateful servants of God, the giver of all goods; and provided that they regularly visit Christ Church to observe the canonical Hours, fervently praying for themselves and their own little faults, and imploring the mercy of God for the forgiveness of other sinners; also provided that they have a common refectory and dormitory, and that they order their lives according to the rule of monastic discipline. So that in all things God be honoured and our life and good behaviour be salutary to us and ours. If there be a monk who by the audacity of his ill will would have this constitution null and void and surrendered to oblivion; who would have guests for dinner and supper; who would have [the monks] sleep in cells of their own: whoever he be, he shall be regarded as offending against his own house and he shall be handed over to the archbishop's power to be treated as may seem fit.

This was strong language, especially in the England of those days. Presumably the monastery had lapsed and become an institution similar to a secular cathedral chapter, on which Wulfred intended to impose the Rule of Chrodegang. He cannot have had much success, for in England this Rule was always felt to be something foreign and continental.² For a time, however, it was the only regular

¹ Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain* iii, Oxford 1871, 575 f.³

² William of Malmesbury, *G.P.* ii 94 (R.S. p. 201): 'Canonici, qui contra morem Anglorum ad formam Lotharingiorum uno triclinio comedunt, uno cubiculo cubitant'.

standard having any hold on English monasteries. Up to Alfred we hear of single instances where even kings insisted on the observance of a regular monastic life.¹ In these cases, too, Chrodegang's Rule must have formed the model for a short-lived reform.

ALFRED'S REFORM

It is a fact never contested that King Alfred's reformatory endeavours had to look to Frankish monks for assistance. The learned men whom he needed for the royal school and for the education of his officials were only to be found in small numbers in Mercia and Wales,² and even in selecting these he seems to have often been influenced by the advice of continental clerics. The appointment of Plegmund as archbishop was most probably arranged on the recommendation of Fulco, Archbishop of Rheims, who took Plegmund to be the fit man for eradicating certain abuses which had then gained ground among the English clergy.³ For Alfred was keen on organising the clergy, secular and regular, in his new realm and on establishing a well-founded and permanent ecclesiastical system, which he knew would be a stronghold of the State.⁴ As archbishop he chose a 'bonum virum et devotum ecclesiasticisque regulis congruentem', Plegmund, whose protector Fulco

¹ Haddan and Stubbs, *op. cit.* iii 618.

² On the want of skilled teachers see Asser (ed. F. Wise, Oxford 1722), p. 17, and Florence of Worcester (ed. Thorpe) i 87. On Alfred's palace school, Asser, p. 42 f.; Flor. Worc. i 88. On scholars coming to England from France, Brittany, Wales, and Scotland, Asser, p. 44. On the education of Alfred's officials, Asser, p. 70 f.; Flor. Worc. i 107. Alfred's chief assistants were: Asser, from Wales (see himself, p. 47); Werfrid, Bishop of Worcester ('in divina Scriptura bene eruditus'), who translated St Gregory's Dialogues into Anglo-Saxon; Plegmund, a Mercian, Archbishop of Canterbury; Æthelstan and Werwulf, two scholars from Mercia (Asser, p. 46; Flor. Worc. i 91).

³ The letter is lost in which Fulco of Rheims asked Alfred to make Plegmund archbishop; but we know of it through Floardus of Rheims, MG. Script. xiii 566, 568. Another letter was sent by Fulco to Plegmund himself (*ib.* p. 568). There was also a letter from Pope Formosus to Plegmund on the same subject (William of Malmesbury, *G.P.* i 38, R.S. p. 59).

⁴ Asser, ed. cit. p. 58 f.; Florence of Worcester, ed. cit. i 103 f.

in his own province of Rheims upheld the regular monastic discipline¹ instituted by his predecessor Hincmar. Hincmar on his part had learned the rule at St Denis, a monastery reformed by Benedict of Aniane himself.² In monastic reform proper Alfred could do nothing without assistance from the Continent, as he admits himself with a wistful look at the brilliant history of England:³

It often came to my mind what wise men there once were among the English, both clerical and secular, and what happy times those were for the English. In those days the kings reigning in the country obeyed God and His representatives. They wielded a strong hand and kept peace and order at home, but were powerful abroad too. Many brought to them strength and wisdom; and also the clerical orders enjoyed teaching or learning and performing the duties demanded from them by God. People from abroad came hither to seek learning, whereas now we have to get it from abroad, if we want to have it at all.

Two of Alfred's best scholars and helpers indeed were continental monks, Grimbald (from Flanders; diocese of Rheims) and John (from Saxony, perhaps Corvey).⁴ Grimbald had already proved at St Bertin to be a useful organiser;⁵ John the Old Saxon found his field of activity in the newly founded monastery of Athelney. Asser says that Alfred could not find monks for the new house, because the monastic ideal was altogether extinct. Only a few boys were in the monasteries; no grown-up man was willing to take up the hard life of a monk. Most of the buildings were still intact, but the Rule was observed in none, either because of the plunderings of the Danes, or because (and this seems to have been the main reason,

¹ *Folcwini Gesta Abbatum S. Bertini Sith.* paragr. 98 (MG. Script. xiii 624).

² Hincmar of Rheims, *Ep. ad Nicolaum Papam* (Migne cxxvi 62); Flodoardus iii 1 (MG. Script. xiii 475).

³ In the preface to his translation of the *Cura Pastoralis* (ed. Sweet, E.E.T.S. 1871, p. 3).

⁴ Asser, p. 46 ('Legatos ultra mare ad Galliam magistros acquirere direxit').

⁵ *Folcwini Gesta*, paragr. 98 (*l.c.* p. 624).

says Asser) of the increase of riches and luxury.¹ So when John became abbot of Athelney, the monks for the new establishment were largely sent over from France. It is very probable that the first inmates of New Minster, Winchester, were monks from Flanders or Lorraine.² As far, then, as we can speak of a fundamental change in English monastic life under Alfred, it made room for entirely continental customs, and it is not surprising to find that the biblical MSS produced in England at that time are representative of the same more or less pure types of text which occur on the Continent. Texts current in England in the eighth century continued to be copied for two and even for three centuries later. In addition to these, continental types, especially the Alcuinian one, were introduced.

CONTINENTAL INFLUENCE AFTER ALFRED

Alfred's successor Edward (901-924) was 'litterarum cultu patre inferior',³ yet he knew at least how to preserve the results Alfred had achieved. A new vogue of monastic life is noticeable under Æthelstan, but here again, as Stubbs has shown in his introduction to the *Memorials of St Dunstan*,⁴ continental influence was predominant. One may assume that the continental relations of the kings after Alfred began to call forth and keep up a slight tradition, which, if it did not bear much fruit, yet carried on some of the old inheritance.⁵ Under Æthelstan, Abingdon enjoyed a period of peaceful activity.⁶ The same may be said of Glastonbury, where young Dunstan was brought up. The King was a great benefactor of this monastery,⁷

¹ Asser, p. 61.

² William of Malmesbury, *G.P.* ii 78 (R.S. p. 173).

³ Florence of Worcester, ed. cit. i 117.

⁴ R.S. London 1874, p. cxx ff.; Glunz, *op. cit.* p. 156 f.

⁵ The *Historia Monasterii de Abingdon* (ed. J. Stevenson, R.S. 1858, p. 50) says that all the successors of Æthelred contributed to the well-being of the monastery.

⁶ *Ib.* p. 59.

⁷ Iohannes Glastoniensis (ed. T. Hearne, Oxford 1726) i 113 f. No MSS, however, are mentioned among the King's donations.

and its outward well-being seems to have had a good effect on the study carried on there. It is said of Dunstan that he diligently applied himself to literary study, that he derived much profit from his occupations in the monastery and drew comfort from the Scriptures.¹ The life in Glastonbury must have been fairly regular, for he acted there as scribe, painter, sculptor and goldsmith. When Dunstan became abbot of Glastonbury there must have been a good school as well.² But the time of his abbacy already belongs to the great reform, of which more will be said in another chapter. For the moment it may suffice to say that according to Dunstan's biographers books were written at Glastonbury, when he was still a boy. There is all reason to believe that the gospel text copied at that time was no other than that of the traditional texts.

Moreover it must be remembered that many monasteries were not touched at all by the great reform in the second half of the tenth century and that these consequently kept their own local traditions and customs up to the time of the Conquest. Osbern, one of Dunstan's biographers, well and justly sums up the state of English monasticism in the following words:³

At that time the monasteries enjoyed the royal grants, but were wholly ignorant of monastic religion. For England did not yet cultivate the spirit of common life, the men were not yet accustomed to abandon their own will. The name of abbot had hardly been heard. Nobody had seen real monks' convents. But whoever was taken with some chance fancy took up the pilgrim's life. Now alone, now with some comrades of a like mind, he would leave his country and live as a stranger wherever an opportunity was offered him.

This describes the essential characteristic of the last representatives of typically Anglo-Saxon monasticism: that it had not yet become an Order. The inmates of the mon-

¹ *Vita S. Dunstani auctore Osberno*, paragr. 6 (ed. Stubbs, R.S. p. 74); *Iohannes Glastoniensis*, ed. cit. p. 115.

² *Iohannes Glastoniensis*, ed. cit. p. 124.

³ *Vita S. Dunstani*, paragr. 6 (*l.c.* p. 74).

asteries clung to their local peculiarities of life, they still had 'their own will'. Anglo-Saxon monasteries had not quite shaken off the signs of their first, more or less accidental foundation, which had been suggested by local needs or the individual taste of small groups. They had not yet entered the large structure of the General Church. This individualism is prominent even in the gospel MSS that were produced in the English monasteries of that time.

CONSERVATIVE VULGATE TEXTS IN
ENGLISH MONASTERIES

Manuscripts written by insular scribes in the ninth and tenth centuries often show a very archaic text as compared with continental types of the same date. Royal MS 1. A. xviii of the B.M. dates from the ninth century and once belonged to St Augustine's, Canterbury. Though the book was almost certainly not written in England, but in France,¹ its scribe was of insular provenance. The text is Irish with many singular (Old Latin?) readings. A copy of this MS is Royal 1. D. iii of the tenth century, which was written in England and presented by Countess Goda to the church of Rochester.²

The running headlines sometimes read *cata* (*marcum*, etc.) instead of the ordinary *secundum* (cf. E). Mt i 2 *abraham + autem* DE* LR; 3 *zaram* (*sarram* 1. D. iii) D P LR mod; ii 7 *herodes clam vocatis magis diligenter didicit: erodis clam vocavit magos diligenter et exquisivit*, cf. vett D; 8 om (*ite*) et X* ir; *ut et ego veniens adorem: ut et ego veniam et adorem* gr vett; 11 *intranses + in* D; *invenerunt: viderunt* gr vett; 12 + *sed* (*per aliam*) ir; 13 *puerum + istum* ir; *ad perdendum eum: perdere*; 15 *obitum: mortem*; 23 *vocatur: dicitur*; iii 2 om et TE L^e; 3 om *esaiam; semitas eius + omnis vallis replebitur et omnis mons et collis humiliabitur et erunt prava in directa*

¹ See chap. III. Warner and Gilson, *Catalogue of the MSS in the Old Royal and King's Collection in the B.M.*, where it is maintained that the book was written on the Continent. We may add, by an Irish scribe who was practising the continental minuscule.

² She was the sister of King Edward, and wife of Eustachius of Boulogne (William of Malmesbury, *G.R.* paragr. 199, ad ann. 1051).

et aspera in vias planas; 4 *autem : enim* E; 9 *quoniam : quia* ir; 16 *descendentem + de caelo* ir; iv 3 *om et*; *accedens + ad eum* vettir; 4 *scriptum est + enim quia* vettir; 10 *ei : illi* ER; 12 *quod : quia* E; 14 *esaiam + dicentem* vettir; 16 *in regione et in umbra* vettir FO; 18 *rete : retia* vett MX* ir; 20 *retibus + suis* R; 25 *de (galilaea) : a* vettir; v 1 *sedisset + ibi*; 2 *aperiens os suum et docebat (!)* vettir; 5 *lugent + nunc* ir; 13 *mittatur : proiciatur* vett F; 24 *veniens : venies* ir; 30 *eat : mittatur* Q; 32 > *causa fornicationis*, cf. παραεκτός λόγου πορνείας; 38 *om et (dentem)* vett ir; 41 *quicumque : qui* vett EQ; 42 *+ et (qui petit)*; 44 *vestros + et* vettir; vi 2 *receperunt : perciperunt* vettir; 5 *non eritis : nolite fieri*; 13 *inducas : patiaris nos induci* vett DR; + *amen* vg; 18 *videaris + ab* E P^{mg}; viii 30 *pascens : pascentium* vettir; x 23 *+ et cum in alia persequuntur vos fugite in tertiam* vett E; xi 1 *iesus + omnia verba haec* EW; 3 *ait illi : ait illis euntes dicite* vettir; xiii 3 *seminare + semen suum* vett Q ες; 11 *mysteria : mysterium* vettir ε; xvi 9 *in ·V· (i.e. quinque milia)* E; 27 *opus eius : opus suum* P; xvii 19 *eiecere eum* E; xviii 24 *debebat + ei* vett mod, cf. > εἰς αὐτῶ ὀφειλέτης NB; xix 7 *dimittere + uxores († -m 1. A. xviii)* E, + *uxorem* vett; xx 28 *+ vos autem quaeritis de pussillo crescere et de maiore minores esse. intrantes autem et rogati (: rogat 1. A. xviii) ad cenam nolite recumbere in locis eminentioribus, ne forte clarior te superveniat et accedens qui te ad cenam vocavit dicet († dicat sup. lin. 1. A. xviii) tibi adhuc deorsum accede et confundaris. si autem in loco inferiore recumberis et supervenerit humilior te dicet tibi qui te ad cenam vocavit adhuc susum (! : sum 1. D. iii) accede et erit tibi utilius*; cf. OH^{mg} Θ, West Saxon version; xxvii 39 *blasphemabant : blasphemant* Q; 52 *qui dormierant surrexerunt : dormientium surrexerunt* vett X* O* ir; xxviii 3 *vestimentum eius + candidum* Q; 5 *iesum + christum* gat EL; Mc i 12 *expellit : emisit*; ii 1 *om post dies* E; 2 *caperet + domus* ir; 21 *nemo + enim* vettir; 23 > *praegredi coeperunt* E; iii 9 *ut navicula sibi deserviret : ut navicula praesto esset illi*; xv 15 *tradidit : redidit* gat; 33 *totam : universam* gat W; 36 *unus + ex eis* gat Q; Lc i 1 > *rerum quae in nobis completae sunt* GR; 9 *poneret :*

poneretur; 10 > *populi erat* Z* vg; 11 *incensi* : *supplicationis* gat; 13 *quoniam* : *quia ecce* vett gat L; *deprecatio* : *oratio*; 21 *quod* : *quid*; 22 *innuens* : *adnuens* vett gat Q; 26 *a deo* : *a domino* CT; 56 *cum illa* : *apud illam* gat; 64 *deum* : *dominum*; 66 *etenim* : *nam et*; 67 *prophetabat* gat; 80 + *in (spiritu)* gat ir; ii 2 *cyrino* + *nomine* gat ir vett; 5 *pregnante* + *de spiritu sancto* gat L Q; 6 *cum* : *dum*; 8 *pastores autem* vett; 9 *iuxta* : *circa* gat Q; 10 *evangelizo* : *nuntio* gat; 15 + *dicentes* (not in 1. D. iii) G L, N; 24 *hostiam* : *hostias* vett Q R; 25 *cui nomen* : *nomine* fgat; 29 *dimitte* (sed corr. in 1. A. xviii) vett gat ir; 37 *serviens* + *deo* gat ir; v 3 *in una navi*; *reducere* : *ducere* gat; vii 34 *devorator* : *vorator* vett gat E W; ix 55-56 om *et dixit nescitis* . . . *salvare* gr vett gat F Y G ir; xvi 11 *verum* : *vestrum* vett Z* X* . . . ; *credet* : *reddet* r D; xxiv 4 + *et (ecce)* vett ir; 48 > *testes estis* D E vg; 49 *promissum* : *promissionem* (: *repro-missionem* 1. D. iii) vett E; *quoad usque* : *usquedum* gat E; 51 *ferebatur* : *elevatus est* r gat; Jo iii 1 > *nomine nicodemus* vett J E; 2 *ad eum* : *ad iesum* vett E mod; 4 *ventrem* : *utero* vett gat E; 6 *et quod* : *quod autem* gat E; om *et natum est* (alt.) gat E; vi 23 *gratias agentes deo* ir ⑆ ⑆; 71 *autem* : *enim* E; vii 1 *perambulabat* gat E; viii 12 *lux* : *lumen* vett; xii 7 *sine* : *sinite* M J B ir ⑆ ⑆ ⑆; etc.

These are only a few glaring cases of primitive readings in the two MSS. It should be noted that they are particularly akin to the two continental Irish MSS gat and E, and E as well as Royal MS 1. A. xviii together with the Bodmin gospels will later on be seen to form one group which greatly elucidates a new form of text that was growing up on the Continent.

An Irish text is contained in MS F. 2. 14 (no. 122) of C. C. C. Oxford, which was written at Dublin in the eleventh century. (The book is sporadically quoted in the Oxford Vulgate.) We may add a few more examples: Mt i 2 *abraham* + *autem* D E* L R; 17 *generationes* + *sunt* (ter) D E^c R; 22 *per esaiam prophetam* vett ir; 23 *habebit* : *concipiet* E; 25 *vocavit* : *vocabit*, cf. E; ii 8 *inveneritis* + *eum* vett ir; 9 *regem* + *missi*; 10 *stellam* + *eius* (in ras.); 13 *puerum* + *istum* vett ir;

15 om a domino EL; 23 *prophetas : prophetam Z**; + *dicentem*; iii 3 *semitas eius + omnis vallis adimplebitur et omnis mons et collis humiliabitur. et erunt prava in directa et aspera in vias planas. et revelabitur gloria domini et videbit omnis caro salutare dei*, cf. 1. A. xviii; 16 *descendentem + de celo ir*; 17 *vox de celis + facta est D*; + *bene (complacui) vett ir W*; iv 3 *accedens + ad eum ir*; 10 *vade + retro Z* X* ir*; 14 *prophetam + dicentem vett ir*; 18 *vocabatur X* ir*; *rete : retia sua*, cf. 1. A. xviii; xxvii 52 *qui dormierant : dormientium X* O* ir*; Lc viii 1 *et + exierunt (duodecim) ir*; 12 *tollit : sustulit ir*; 13 *petram + hi*, cf. vett; *suscipiunt : accipiunt Q*; 14 *audierunt : audiunt vett*; *voluptatibus : voluntatibus D P*; 17 *cognoscatur : reveletur r (ir)*; 23 *complebatur fluctibus navicula et periclitabatur vett ir*; 53 *scientes : dicentes*; Jo i 32 *quasi : sicut E QR*; v 4 *angelus autem secundum tempus discendebat in natatoria et movebatur aqua. quicumque ergo prior discendisset in natatoria post motationes (!) aquae sanus fiebat a languore (!) quo cumque tenebatur*, cf. MJ ir; etc.

Nor is this MS the last representative of the pure Irish type. Down to the middle of the twelfth century that type continued to be copied in Ireland. Harl. MS 1023 dates from about 1140 and is of Irish provenance.¹ Mt xxiii 28 > *foris apparetis Q*; 31 *testimonio : testimonium ir*; 35 *occidistis : occiderunt O P*; 37 *alas + suas ir*; xxiv 1 *accesserunt + ad eum Cir*; 3 *erunt : fient*; 4 *seducat + ullo modo E*; 10 *tradent + se H^o ir*; 14 *et (pr.) + tunc*; 15 *ergo : vero*; 17 *qui in tecto sunt non discendent (X* E*)*; 27 *sicut : si E*; *apparet ir*; 30 *plangent + se Fir*; 38 *bibentes + et O ir*; *noe in arcam ir vg*; 43 *qua die vel qua hora ir*; 49 *om meus E*; 51 *venit (!) + autem R*; xxv 9 *dicentes : et dixerunt X**; + *non ir*; 11 *novissime + autem ir*; 12 *vobis + quod ir*; xxvi 50 *amice ad quod venisti + fac D Q*; Lc xii 3 *dixistis : dixistis t audistis ir*.

The Irish type was also current in England, especially near the border of the British settlements.² Hereford Cathedral MS P. 1. ii of the late ninth century is written in an insular hand and has illuminations in the Irish style.

¹ E. S. Buchanan, *The Four Gospels from the Irish Codex Harleianus*, 1914.

² On the texts on the Western border, see Glunz, *op. cit.* map 4.

Mt i 2 + *autem*; 17 *generationes* (ter) + *sunt*; at the end of the verse: *omnes ergo generationes abraham (!) usque ad xpm generationes sund (!) .xlii.*, cf. D; ii 10 *valde* + *nimis*; 13 *puerum* + *istum*; 15 *om a domino*; 16 *inclusus* : *delusus* DL; iv 3 *accedens* + *ad eum* ir; 6 *de te* + *ut custodiant te in omnibus viis tuis* R P; 10 *vade* + *retro*; 18 + *iesus* irvg; *vocatur* : *vocabatur* X* ir; *rete* ; *retia*; xix 21 *vende* + *omnia bona tua*, cf. ir; 22 *verbum* : *verba haec* QR; 28 *generatione* ir; 29 *reliquit* : *relinquerit* irvg; xx 1 *om enim* vett Z* X* irvg; Lc i 74 *manibus* I irgat; xv 20 *pater ipsius* : *pater suus* rD; xvii 1 *scandala* + *verumtamen* vett; 2 *illi* + *ut non nasceretur aut* vett D; Jo i 31 *manifestaretur* + *plebi* vett DR; 32 *discendentem* + *et manentem super eum*, cf. R; 33 *me* missit vett E; iii 3 *denuo* : *de novo* vett ir; v 3 *aridorum* + *paraliticorum* vett Q; 6 *vidisset* : *audisset*; 13 *declinavit turbam constitutam* Z ir; 19 *ille* : *pater* vett; *haec* + *eadem* vett gat E; etc.

Conservative influence in the Hereford district is also manifest in another MS which was written there, Pembroke Coll. Camb. 302, a book containing only the gospel lessons and written in the eleventh century for the use of a bishop of Hereford. Mt iii 3 + *omnis vallis implebitur et omnis mons et collis humiliabitur et erunt prava in directa et aspera in vias planas*; 5 + *omnis* (hieros.) E; iv 3 + *ad eum* ir; 10 *vade* + *retro* Z* X* ir; 18 + *iesus*; v 37 *abundantius* : *amplius* vett R; vii 3 *et trabem* : *trabem autem* gr vett; 4 + *frater* ir mod; 9 *porrigat* : *dabit* L; xxv 36 *nudus* + *eram* QR; 37 *pavimus* + *te* aut ir; xxvi 3 *sacerdotum* + *et scribae* gr vett; 33 *ait illi* : *dixit* L; Lc i 30 *deum* : *dominum*; 42 *clamavit* ir; 59 > *zachariam nomine patris sui* O X^e D P L; ii 14 *in excelsis* vett ir; xviii 14 *ab illo* + *magis quam phariseus* ille vett; Jo i 9 *erat* + *autem* fD; 43 *exire* : *ire* ir; 48 *sub ficu* : *sub fici arbore* vett ir; iii 5 *spiritu* + *sancto* vett CT ir mod; 16 *deus dilexit hunc mundum* vett ir; 18 *credidit* : *credit* vett ir mod; xiv 22 + *huic* (mundo) vett E; 29 *credatis* + *quia ego sum* I gat; xv 4 *ferre* : *facere* qR; xx 8 *ille* + *alius* vett gat; xxi 1 *tiberiadis* + *discipulis suis* E. Yet this book also shows signs of another class of readings which will be discussed later.

In the monasteries of the South and the East the influence of the Continent becomes very apparent in the tenth century. The Alcuinian text in particular gained an easy entrance into the English convents.

MS 194 of St John's Coll., Oxford, of the late tenth century, used to be the property of Christ Church, Canterbury. Its text is Alcuinian: Mt i 20 *natum est : nascetur* M V^e; iii 2 *adpropinquabit*; iv 12 + *iesus*; v 20 *enim : autem* E M V^e; xiii 14 *adimpleatur* Z A Y alc^e S; xv 2 *traditiones*; 12 *verbo + hoc* M Z⁴ vg; xvi 3 *potestis + scire* Z X* H^o alc O^e W S^e; 9 *in quinque milia* J B...alc O^e S^e; xvii 3 *apparuerunt* J K M mod; Mc v 19 *et : iesus autem*; vii 3 *traditiones*; viii 37 *commutationis*; xiv 27 *scandalizabimini + in me* Z L K V mod; Lc vi 15 > *thomam et mattheum* Z O K V W; xiii 5 *egeritis : habueritis*; etc.

The Bodleian MS Bodl. 155 testifies that in the matter of the Vulgate text England was dependent on continental monasteries. The book was written in the tenth century, probably for Barking Abbey. The text closely resembles that of Leofric's gospels, MS Auct. D. 2. 16, so that it is more than probable that the original of MS Bodl. 155 was brought over from the North of France (Montreuil, Landévennec), i.e. the home of Leofric's gospels.¹ The capitula of the English book agree with those of MS Auct. D. 2. 16. Mt ii 23 *per prophetam* (m. pr.) Z* : *per prophetas* (corr.); iii 12 > *triticum in horreum suum*; x 2 *discipulorum*; 34 *in terra*; Lc xix 30 *in quod : in quo* Z X* O G F P D E; etc. Besides pre-Alcuinian readings of this kind there are many Alcuinian characteristics as in Leofric's book: Mt iv 16 *in regione umbrae*; Mc v 19 *iesus autem*; vii 3 *traditiones*; 4 *om sunt* (pr.) Z X* alc; viii 34 *om post (me sequi) ; neget*; 37 *commutationis*; ix 45 > *tibi est* Z O alc; x 11 *dixit* Z O alc; 20 *magister + bone* Z O alc; Lc vi 15 > *thomam et mattheum*; x 4 *nolite + ergo* Z O F K M W; xi 28 *quinymmo ; custodiunt + illud* H^o B² K V mod; xiii 5 *habueritis*; xvi 21 *vulnera*; xvii 33 *quicumque + autem* vett D R K M; *salvare*; xviii 34

¹ *Catalogue of MSS in the Bodleian Library*, no. 1974.

erat autem; xix 35 *supra pullum: supra illum* ZCK (sed corr.); 37 *discentium: descendantium discipulorum* (the latter word sup. lin.); 44 *consternent* ZOH^cΘKV; xx 24 + *ei*; 47 *percipient*; etc.

The archetype of Add. MS 9381 of the B.M., a gospel book from St Petroc's Priory, Bodmin (Cornwall),¹ must have been a text of the Irish class. The book abounds in Irish variants: Mt ii 8 *inveneritis + eum* vettir; iii 9 *enim: autem* E; *de: ex* vett Z*Fir; 10 *radices* TirW; *quae: qui* E; 16 *descendentem + de celo* ir; *venientem + et manentem in ipsum* vett; 17 *vox de celo facta est* vett (D); iv 18 *retia*; 19 + *iesus* ir; v 5 + *nunc* ir; 13 *mittatur: proiciatur* F; 16 *glorificent: magnificent* ER; 19 *ergo: enim* ir; *docuerit* (alt.) + *sic* ir; 22 *suo* (pr.) + *sine causa* vett OBE; 29 *unum: una pars* ir; vi 4 *redet* (!) + *in palam*; 8 *eum: ab eo* ir; 13 *patiaris nos induci* DR; 21 *est: fuerit* Q; 23 *erunt: sunt* ir; 26 *respicite: intuemini*; 28 *nent + neque congregant*; 31 *quid vestimur* (m. pr.) L; 32 *quia his omnibus: quid horum omnium* R; vii 10 *porriget: dabit* L; 12 *homines + bona ita* ir W; 25 *et venerunt* (m. pr.): *innundaverunt* (corr.); viii 24 + *erat autem illis ventus contrarius* ir gat; 25 + *ad eum discipuli eius* ir ⓈⓈ; 30 *pascens: pascentium* ir; Mc ii 2 *caperet + domus* ir; etc.

Besides these there is a great percentage of Alcuinian readings such as: Mt v 36 *irabis* K M Z^e; vii 25 om *et* (pr.) Z* X* alc; viii 3 > *iesus manum tetigit eum*; ix 2 > *in lecto iacentem; et videns: videns autem*; x 13 *si* (alt.): *sin*; xii 49 *manum: manus* ZJ PK M X^e; xiii 14 *ut adimpleatur; dicens: dicentes* d V O^c; xiv 19 *turbis: turbas* V*; Mc ii 15 om *et* (*sequebantur*) vett Q M V ⓈⓈ; xi 7 *et inponunt: inponentes* X* K V; xiii 1 *ex: de* K V; xv 15 *tradidit + eis* Z K V; Lc xiv 28 *non: nonne* A Y X^e E alc Ⓢ; xix 23 *illud: illam* vett J X. . . alc mod; xx 14 *ut: et* vett ZJ PK K V; Jo vi 64 + *non* (*credentes*) vett V ⓈⓈ; viii 25 *principium qui* Y alc mod; 27 *dicebat + deum* F C T K M O^c vg; xv 6 *arescet et colligent eum*

¹ H. Jenner, 'The Bodmin Gospels' (*Journal of the Royal Institution of Cornwall*, 1923, p. 113). The best edition of the Anglo-Saxon charters in the book was made by Professor M. Förster, in *Festschrift für Jespersen*, 1930.

et ignem (!) mittent et ardent EV mod; and many others. The question arises, where and how the mixture of the two types was effected. We shall see later that this particular mixture was peculiar to a text which was evolved on the Continent at the end of the ninth century.

The mixture of insular and continental readings can be found in so late a book as Salisbury Cathedral MS 77, which dates from about 1100. We read: Mt iii 16 *descendentem + de celo* ir; iv 3 *accedens + ad eum* ir; 4 *est + enim* ir; 25 *secutae : secuti* R; v 12 + *et (prophetas)* X*HΘ ir; 28 om *eam* DL; 30 *eat : mittatur* Q; 41 *angarizaverit* ir; vi 18 *videaris + ab* ir; 20 *nec : neque* ir; ix 16 *immittit : mittit* E; xxii 5 *alius vero : alii vero* ir; Mc v 35 *veniunt archisynagogo (!)*; Lc ii 41 *sollemni : sollemnis* L; etc.—together with Alcuinian characteristics: Mt v 28 *ad concupiscendam*; vi 8 *enim : namque*; Mc iv 15 *in cordibus eorum*; 26 *iaciat homo*; 35 *in die illa*; 36 *in navi erat*; v 2 om *ei* (alt.); etc.

Mention may be made of Add. MS 11850 of the B.M., the text of which much resembles that of Cott. MS Tib. A. ii, although it is about 150 years younger than the Cotton MS. It was probably written in a southern monastery (Canterbury?). Of remarkable readings in this book not agreeing with the Cotton codex, one deserves special attention. In Mc vi 21 the good Vulgate and Jeromian reading *natali suo* is still preserved, where no continental MS of that period (eleventh century) would have it. Again it appears how conservative a part the British Isles played in that chapter of the Vulgate history which has been treated in the preceding pages.

THE NEW SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH SUPERSEDING THE MONASTIC IDEAL

We have passed in review what in the history of the Vulgate text may be called the last products of the Augustinian spirit of Christian ethics. All the various types of text down to the latest eleventh-century MSS enumerated above, are derivatives of the Vulgate of St

Jerome, differing from each other, it is true, but the differences of form are, as it were, unconscious. They were by-products of the acts of Christian morality to which the types owed their origin.

But Christianity gradually underwent a change. It may only have been a different way of interpreting the essential conceptions. Instead of the undetermined, something more strictly defined was developed. In ethics, for instance, individual initiative was being ousted by fixed standards of morality which were set up by the Church. The idea of the Church itself became more defined and restricted. Instead of St Augustine's spiritual community of the Christians, St Bernard was to give an idea of the Church as a visible institution which had a definite place in the social order of mankind and even more so than other social institutions, because it was privileged in Christ's participation. Its members do not act spontaneously, but receive detailed instructions from the body general. The Christian does not himself find truth, as Augustine after a hard battle had found it; but it is presented to him in the doctrine and tradition of the Church. The Church is guardian of the truth; there is no truth outside the Church.¹

The fact that in the twelfth century the Church could hold this position, presupposes the accumulation in the meantime of a substantial tradition legal and dogmatical, perhaps also philosophical. This was actually the case. But this is not the place to inquire into the nature and the extent of the new ideas springing up in post-Carolingian times. We are concerned with them only as far as they influenced the text of the Vulgate.

¹ S. Bernhardus, *Sermo lxxv* (*Opera*, ed. Mabillon, 4th ed. Paris 1839, i 3061 f.).

CHAPTER III

The Early Scholastic Method of Interpretation and its Influence on the Vulgate Text

PROTESTS AGAINST THE MONASTIC 'FOG OF IGNORANCE'

THOUGH the re-establishment of monasticism in the ninth and tenth centuries absorbed the energy of many of the best minds of the Church, it did not remain sole victor in the field. Side by side with monasticism, and starting from very small beginnings, another movement was growing up which in the end was going to lead to scholasticism and to push into the background the hegemony of the monastic ideal. The new learning, taught chiefly in the episcopal and certain abbey schools, was above all of a theoretical nature and not primarily concerned with the practical questions of life and ethics. The two tendencies could not well be contemporaneous without coming into conflict, and the conflict becomes evident in the distrust and suspicion with which the monks of Gorze and Cluny regarded certain aspects of contemporary scholarship. The antagonistic spirit must have been mutual, for Alcuin could reproach Benedict of Aniane with his rusticity, and Servatus Lupus of Ferrières, a pupil of Rabanus Maurus, openly complained of the rapid growth of the ascetic mentality, which with its emphasis on the ethical side of life exerted such a sway over many minds that pure literary learning, which ought to be cultivated for its own sake, was deprived of all attractiveness. 'The love of the literary sciences', Lupus wrote to Einhard in the hope that his trouble would be understood,¹ 'has been innate in me almost since the day of my birth, and I never tired of its superstitious or super-

¹ MG, Epp. vi 7; also p. 42.

fluuous diversion, as many prefer to call it now. Perhaps, if teachers had not become so rare and if studies, which even among our fathers had been on the decline, had not died out altogether, I should be able with the grace of God to satisfy my hunger.' No doubt this was aiming at the rigorous monastic reforms contemplated and carried out by Louis and his advisers. His own time appeared to Lupus divided into two camps. He provided a monk of Ferrières travelling to Rome with a letter of recommendation asking the faithful to assist the man as best they could, 'for though he is an expert in letters, he does not only read in the book the commandments of God, but he also practises them in his deeds and in a short time gains not only the love, but also the veneration of all with whom he becomes acquainted'.¹ Lupus was not the only scholar to resent the contrast between the two views. Meginhard, a monk of Fulda, too, was aware of the two-fold division, but he thought both equally necessary to render mature and fruitful the powers hidden in man.² Walafriid Strabo in his prologue to Einhard's *Vita Karoli*³ compared the decay of studies under Louis with the brilliant state of learning under his father Charlemagne: 'In the realm entrusted to him by God Charles dissipated the fog of ignorance and made learning shine in new and luminous radiation unknown to our former barbarity. But now studies are declining again, the light of wisdom is less cherished and becoming dim in most men'. It is clear that under Louis there were circles insisting on some kind of scholarly education, because they saw endangered what had so propitiously been begun under Charles. As early as 813, the year of Louis's enthronization, the Frankish bishops, assembled at Châlons-sur-Seine, demanded 'that as Emperor Charles, a man of singular mildness, fortitude, prudence, justice and temperance had commanded, the bishops shall institute schools, in which shall be learned

¹ *Ib.* p. 93.

² *Ib.* p. 164.

³ Ed. Waitz, *Script. rer. Germ. in usum schol.*⁴ Hanover 1880, p. xx f.

the literary disciplines and the documents of the Holy Scriptures'.¹ The same request was brought forward by the bishops in 822² and in 829.³

THE NEW LEARNING, A THEORY OF INTER-
PRETATION: FREDEGIS OF TOURS

The nature of this young and tender branch of ecclesiastical activity can be discerned in the quarrel between Alcuin's successor at Tours, Abbot Fredegis of St Martin, and Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons. The quarrel concerned what may roughly be called the new theology. Fredegis, a pupil of Alcuin, in his epistolary tractate *De Nihilo et Tenebris*,⁴ maintained that 'Nihil', Nothing was a thing, an object having existence and reality, as each name necessarily signified something which existed; things having no existence cannot bear a name. This argument, it will be admitted, was but an extreme formulation of the logical realism which had been known long before (e.g. in Isidore of Seville), even in Aristotle himself. Fredegis expresses the theory in the following sentences:

Omne nomen finitum aliquid significat, ut homo, lapis, lignum. Haec enim uti dicta fuerint, simul res, quas significant, intelligimus. Quippe hominis nomen praeter differentiam aliquam positum universalitatem hominum designat.⁵

He goes on to quote an example:

Libri Genesis historia, sacrae Scripturae auctoritate prolata in medium, sic inquit: *Et tenebrae erant super faciem abissi*: Quae si non erant, qua consequentia dicitur, quia erant? . . . Nam verbum substantiale hoc habet in natura, ut cuicumque subiectum fuerit iunctum sine negatione, eiusdem subiecti declaret substantiam.

This is the peculiar combination of grammar, logic and metaphysics which in scholasticism is known as realism.

¹ C. 3 (Mansi xiv 94).

² Synod of Attigny, cc. 2 and 3 (MG. Leges ii, Capitularia i, 357). Louis's assent, *ib.* p. 304.

³ Synod of Paris (MG. Leges iii, Capitularia ii, 40; also p. 37).

⁴ Migne cv 751; MG. Epp. iv 552.

⁵ MG. Epp. iv 553.

Logical realism of the spoken language, which at the back of each word (or noun) assumes something of real existence, is its most extreme form, and there is every reason to believe that this radical realism was first taught in Alcuin's school at St Martin, Tours. It is also important to note that the Bible, the *auctoritas* of scholasticism, is brought into the realistic conception of language. In the study of the *artes liberales* as in later scholasticism, the Bible was always regarded as authoritative, its very words were beyond all doubt and were often taken as direct realities. The extreme realist view was that to each noun of Scripture corresponded a substance of real existence, not necessarily a concrete object, but a real substance in the Platonic and Aristotelian sense. This view, if it was detached from the particular context in which Fredegis had put it forward, and taken as an absolute principle, could become of great consequence for the formation of the biblical text.

Yet it would perhaps merely have given rise to a school of extreme realist biblical exegesis, had it not been for another principle formulated on the same occasion. Fredegis's thesis, sudden as its appearance was in theology, which up to then had chiefly moved in the secure paths of St Augustine and St Gregory, called forth vehement contradiction, so that the author was led to reply in a work called *Obiectiones*, which has not come down to us. We know from Agobard's refutation of this second pamphlet that in it Fredegis had also quoted the Fathers of the Church and the commentators as authorities for his own realist opinion. One passage of the *Obiectiones* said:¹

Uno modo apostoli et evangelistae et totius divinae scripturae interpretes cum catholicis eius expositoribus ab imperitiae calumnia rationabiliter defendi queunt. Nihil enim omnino contra regulam grammaticae dixerunt, quod non ita aut ratio aliqua aut causa mysterii dici exigeret.

¹ *Agobardi Liber contra Obiectiones Fredigisi Abbatis*, c. 9 (*Opera S. Agobardi*, ed. Baluzius, Paris 1666, i 165 ff.); Migne civ 159 ff.; MG. Epp. v 214.

Fredegis's opinion obviously was that not only the Bible but also the works and the biblical commentaries of the Fathers as recognised by the Church in the so-called decretal of Gelasius were to be regarded by the Church as having binding authority. The biblical expositions of the Fathers may not be altered on any account, because they determine and contain the sense of the biblical word, and this sense is authoritative for the Church at present. The doctrine of the Church is once and for all time deposited in the writings of the Fathers and Doctors—such is Fredegis's argument.

To those practising the Augustinian religion of the past Fredegis's position must have appeared as a startling innovation, setting up detailed precedences and written precepts unthought of in the ethical system of the time. Agobard of Lyons was a whole-hearted champion of the more liberal view, and his attack on Fredegis is a defence of the older principle. It is wrong, he says, to put the translators and expositors of the Bible on one rank with the gossellers and the apostles. The primary source and the foundation of the Catholic faith consist in the Bible, and he who follows its teaching is walking in the path of rectitude.¹ It was certainly more than accidental that Agobard in support of his view quoted St Augustine of all men:

De expositoribus multo aliter, quam vos dicitis, beatus pater Augustinus tenendum tradidit, qui non solum de illis qui reprehensi sunt a doctoribus, etiam de probatissimis, in libro quem adversus Faustum Manicheum scripsit (lib. xi, c. 5) ita dicit: 'Quod genus litterarum, id est expositionum, non cum credendi necessitate, sed cum iudicandi libertate legendum est'. Soli namque divinae auctoritatis libri legendi sunt non cum iudicandi libertate, sed cum credendi necessitate. Quam formam apostolus (1 Thes. v 19) tradidit dicens: *Spiritum nolite extinguere, prophetias nolite spernere, omnia autem probate, quod bonum est tenete, ab omni specie mala abstinete vos.*²

¹ MG. Epp. v 215.

² *Obiectiones*, c. 10, *ib.* p. 215.

Agobard defended the Augustinian freedom of deliberation and decision against a rigid code of laws and detailed prescriptions. In his eyes there would follow from Fredegis's view 'the absurdity, that the sound and the letter of the words are understood in that literal way, whereas the sense will be totally ignored'.¹

We have here an instance of the strong contrast between the patristic and the scholastic way of thinking. The Fathers had endeavoured to produce in the Christian the consciousness of his own ethical responsibility, to make him act in the spirit of the Bible (which did not imply a licence to interpret the Bible for himself) and to make him realise that his whole being was required to live in a godly fashion. This the Bible impressed again and again on the reader, and it was this spirit of individual freedom in the mode, though not in the sense, of human actions which induced St Jerome to translate *sensum ex sensu*. The new tendency, on the other hand, went towards simplifying and facilitating the action of the individual by relieving him of the compulsion to deliberate with himself on the best ways and means of fulfilling his moral duty as a Christian. Instead the Church took on itself the burden of prescribing in detail how in each particular situation the Christian had to act. As to the meaning of the biblical word, the authority of the Church assumed the right to explain it out of the store of Church doctrine, i.e. the writings of the Fathers. In the quarrel between Fredegis and Agobard the alternative is not so clearly pronounced as it has been here, but it undoubtedly lay at the root of the matter.²

We do not here propose to deal with the problem.³ But

¹ *Obiectiones*, c. 12, *ib.* p. 216.

² That it really existed is proved by the fact that the dilemma gave rise to the controversy on predestination, in which Godescalc was the chief defendant.

³ The Church never officially pronounced for or against one of the two principles. The passage from Augustine, *Adversus Faustum*, which Agobard quoted against Fredegis, was in the twelfth century received into Gratian's *Decretum*. But it was then no longer regarded as a rule of textual criticism,

it is not difficult to see that, given certain circumstances, the narrower idea of the Church as an institution the dogmatical structure of which was unchangeably fixed by the works of the orthodox Fathers, could exercise a great influence on the biblical text. It was possible to regard the biblical commentaries of the Fathers as parallels to the corresponding text itself, as writings which contained and laid down for ever the meaning of the words in the text. The relation between text and commentary then was one of the unexplained word to the sense, meaning, or contents of that very word. This conception of the dual nature of the language of the Bible indeed had long been prevalent in the early schools. Cassiodorus and Isidore of Seville already affirmed that in the Scriptures a difference must be made between the *auctoritas*, i.e. the pure and simple text, and the *expositio* denoting the inner sense and the profound meaning hidden in and conveyed by the word. A noun (*nomen*) has its etymology and a vocable its sound (*vox*), Isidore declared categorically.¹ The etymology is nothing else than the explanation of the word, which denotes the significance of the sound. The form of a word on the one hand and its sense on the other can be compared with a word and its scholium or explanation. This idea of duality always lay at the bottom of biblical science as taught in the schools of the *sapientia divinarum litterarum*, even if not always explicitly stated. Cassiodorus often draws the distinction, e.g. in the exhortation,² 'Mentem nostram in illa contemplatione defigamus, quae non tantum auribus sonat, sed oculis interioribus elucescit'. If then the writings of the Fathers were really and methodically received as the orthodox expositions of the biblical text, it

and the biblical text had already undergone all the chief changes of which we propose to speak. This movement of a gradual alteration has never been clearly recognised, because it was a development which went on below the surface of Church history, and in close connection with the development of religious consciousness in the Western mind.

¹ *Etymologiarum*, lib. i, cc. xxix, xxx (Migne lxxxii 105 f.).

² *De Institutione Divinarum Litterarum*, c. xxiv (Migne lxx 113 f.).

meant that the text and the ever-unalterable commentaries were so to speak arranged in two parallel columns. Furthermore, if to this arrangement the principle of logical realism as formulated in the school of St Martin was applied, it was easy to reverse the realist sentence and, instead of saying: Each word of the text is co-ordinated with something real, a profound meaning elicited by some Father in a moral, allegorical or anagogical exposition of the passage, to assert: Each real substance, being part of the meaning of a biblical passage and expressed as such in some patristic commentary, requires a corresponding word, or *nomen*, in the text. With this, there would be a door open for all sorts of new readings to penetrate into the text.

We have so far only spoken of a theoretical possibility which might result from the two new principles of theological method expressed in Fredegis's tractate. Whether and to what extent the consequences of an acceptance of these principles were really seen and brought to bear on textual criticism, will have to be ascertained by an exact historical investigation. But if there was any development of the Vulgate text at all, it was in the direction outlined above. Logical realism and a belief in the unconditional authority of the Fathers were two important factors in the teaching of the post-Carolingian schools.

ORIGINS OF THE NEW THEORY: BEDE AND ALCUIN

Bede, Alcuin's predecessor in biblical exegesis, had as yet been far from narrowly limiting himself to the opinions of the Fathers. He never described a Father as an authority. On the contrary, he put himself, in all modesty, on the same plane as they. His was the same aim, namely from the literal story to extract the profound sense, 'a medicine for the soul'.¹ His predecessors, the Doctors who before him had commented upon the same text, he regarded as

¹ In the dedicatory letter of the *Expositio super Acta Apostolorum* (Migne xcii 938).

welcome aids to his own undertaking. He quoted them with due reverence and let them speak in the first place, as he confesses himself (and his commentaries bear him out): 'I collected all the most excellent and worthy artists of that field, namely the works of the Fathers, and then I decided to examine diligently what blessed Ambrose, what Augustine, what careful Gregory, what Jerome the translator of the sacred Books, what all the other Fathers had thought and said about Luke, and this I wrote on parchment either in their own words, or in an abridged form, as I thought fit'.¹ But his commentaries were more than simple compilations made of extracts from the Fathers;² he interwove the sayings of the Fathers with many expositions of his own coining, exactly because he did not look upon the Fathers as authorities determining the doctrine of the Church. He was as yet unacquainted with the conception of a Church whose main characteristic was that its dogmatic authority rested in a collection of books, the writings of the Fathers. His was the older and more naïve point of view that the Fathers were excellent commentators on the Bible, but without an exceedingly prominent position in history. Even to-day learning and knowledge of the Scriptures can be found, Bede modestly subjoins: 'A few points which, by the grace of the Author of light, I worked out myself, I added where I thought proper. For I feel no doubt that I have spent not a little time on the meditation of the divine law and the study of the Scriptures, and in this work as in all others I only put down what the Author of light deigned to allow me to see, or to recognise and understand aright'.³

The first one among the commentators of the Bible to

¹ In the introductory letter to his commentary on Luke (Migne xcii 304).

² We refer only to Bede's genuine works. The commentaries on Matthew and John printed among his works are not his: A. E. Schönbach, 'Ueber einige Evangelienkommentare des Mittelalters' (*Wiener Sitzungsberichte*, 1903, vol. 146, no. iv).

³ Migne xcii 305. Similarly in the dedication of the commentary on Mark, *ib.* col. 134.

regard the patristic heritage as authoritative and binding seems in fact to have been Alcuin, the Anglo-Saxon, the chief minister of Charlemagne, the founder of the Carolingian school, the abbot who revived the school of St Martin at Tours, the teacher of Abbot Fredegis.¹ It would perhaps be difficult to give specified reasons for the new attitude in Alcuin. It is possible that, as in his recension of the Vulgate text, so in its exposition, he was influenced by the desire to create in the new realm a uniform, objective, sufficiently authoritative, and not easily subverted basis for the education of the clergy. At first sight the innovation introduced by Alcuin into the methods of teaching in the schools may seem slight and of little importance. He himself certainly did not see its later and far-reaching effects. He adopted the principle of patristic authority for reasons of his own. His successors and pupils extended further its field of application.

The first manifestation of a method of biblical study which was to become predominant in later days is Alcuin's commentary on the gospel of St John.² A passage in the dedicatory letter of that work is significant enough to be printed in full:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was the Word. These words are always to be venerated with a pure faith and cherished in perpetual devotion, and not to be overmuch discussed in the poor reasonings of man, which are most often deceived when he thinks to know what transcends the compass of human understanding. All, however, pious charity and humble questioning were ever able to make out,

¹ Even in Charles the Bald's time, according to Notker Balbulus (*De Gestis Caroli Magni*, Migne xcvi 1373), there existed the curious tradition that Alcuin ('qui erat in omni latitudine Scripturarum supra caeteros modernorum temporum exercitatus') had been a personal pupil of Bede, 'peritissimi post sanctum Gregorium tractatoris'. The fable was refuted long ago; but Notker probably recorded only a tradition then current among scholars, which placed Alcuin at the beginning of a definite scholastic school. It is a common feature in the Middle Ages that famous teachers are attributed to a famous man.

² This commentary is actually the first example of a mere compilation of authorities, as was shown by A. E. Schönbach, *op. cit.* p. 43 ff.

can be found expressed, though sporadically, in the most sacred writings of the holy Fathers. So also in the complete text of the present gospel much matter of exposition can be read useful for certain times and places, for the confirmation of the orthodox faith, against the depravity of heretics, or in defence of the apostolic tradition. Now I believe I have found an intermediate way between my refusal and your petition, which will enable me not to offend your charity by my silence nor to make me liable to reprehension because of my temerity in complying with your request. The doctors are accustomed to mix a medicine out of many kinds of ingredients for the healing of a patient, and yet they cannot pretend to be the creators of the herbs and other parts of which the medicine is composed, but only the ministers, inasmuch as they collect and mix them. Similarly the labour of my devotion may do your charity some good. But I do not even gather my flowers in some meadow of my father's. On me it is enjoined with a humble heart and a prone head to wander through the blossoming fields of many Fathers, so that without endangering myself I may satisfy your most holy wish. First of all I asked the assistance of St Augustine, who, with very great learning, has investigated the most sacred words of this holy gospel. Next I drew something from the works of the most holy doctor St Ambrose. Much I took also from the homilies of that eminent Father Pope Gregory, and from the homilies of blessed Bede and of other holy Fathers, as I could find them. I rather made use of the meaning and the words of them all than relied on my own judgment. Any curious reader may easily prove the truth of this. With a most cautious pen and by the help of the divine grace I took care to put down nothing contrary to the sense of the holy Fathers.¹

This programme for the first time united various tendencies which had already appeared, but had never been combined with the intention to make them serve a special end or to deduce from them a clearly formulated method. The first words of the passage give utterance to Alcuin's profound veneration for the word of God as contained in the Bible, the understanding of which was the sole aim of teaching in the schools. But man, such was the belief of

¹ Migne c 743 f.

the time, may not presume to fathom the meaning of the evangelic word. All the human mind could ever discern and understand in Holy Writ was exclusively to be found 'in the most venerable writings of the holy Fathers'.¹ The sense of the Bible was deposited in the writings of the Fathers as the highest authorities. To dissent from them in any way by alterations or additions was profane arrogance. The task of the modern teacher was to collect the precious sayings dispersed in many places, and to take care that whatever he wrote was the opinion of the Fathers, and nothing but that opinion, which formed the substance and contents of the biblical word.

It must be assumed that Alcuin's own teaching was in accordance with this programme, for those of his pupils who later on embarked upon exegetical works of their own followed the path indicated by him. We have seen to what an extreme his pupil Fredegis carried Alcuin's principle of the supreme patristic authority in matters of interpretation. Others followed in Alcuin's footsteps even later. In the palace school of the emperors, which existed at least up to Lothar's time, Claudius, later Bishop of Turino, continued to study and teach various Books of the Bible on Alcuin's lines. 'He possessed great experience in the exposition of the gospel pericopes and was to impart the comfort of the sacred doctrine to the Italian people, who had largely lost the power of understanding the holy gospels.'² Claudius's catena on Matthew is a commentary strictly adhering to the pattern set up by Alcuin, as the author himself declares in the introductory letter.³ Angelomus, a monk of Luxeuil (c. 855), famous by his commentaries on Genesis, Kings, and the Song of Solomon, confessed in a letter to the Emperor Lothar that he had learned his method of biblical exposition in Lothar's

¹ 'In sacratissimis sanctorum Patrum scriptis.' Patristic writings are beyond the humble intellect of man.

² Jonas of Orleans to Charles the Bald (Migne cvi 306).

³ MG. Epp. iv 594; Schönbach, *op. cit.*; M. Manitius, *Die lateinische Literatur des Mittelalters* i 390 f.

palace school.¹ He, too, regarded it as the essence of exegesis to get to the root of the words by finding out their real, i.e. spiritual, sense which contained the religious truths.² This real or spiritual sense he believed to be contained in the writings of the Fathers.³

Such signs as these bear witness to the process of the gradual growth of the new method initiated by Alcuin in the palace school of Charlemagne. The method was as yet in a stage of formation, and though gradually spreading to many other episcopal schools it was for a long time represented by but a small number of prominent scholars in very few of the bigger schools.⁴ In the eyes of these scholars lecturing to their pupils on the Bible, the text pure and simple was considered to be something incomplete, only one half of a complete whole, mere sounds and words. It was to be complemented by the other half, the sense and meaning of the words as contained in the expositions of the Fathers. This was the real substance, as important as the outwardness of the word itself. On the contrary, the text was worthless, unless one was in possession of the inner meaning. It was the characteristic mark of biblical studies in the school of Alcuin and his successors (and, we may venture to generalise, of all scholasticism) that a literary work, which to-day we are accustomed to conceive of as an undivided and indivisible unity, with the sense indissolubly wedded to the sound, was thought of as composed of a duality of word and sense, of outward text and inward meaning. The text was, as it were, a mask rather

¹ Migne cxv 551.

² *Ib.* col. 554: 'Hoc nobis solerter intuendum est, ne cum verba exterioris amoris audivimus, ad exteriora sentienda remaneamus. Sic est enim Scriptura haec in vobis, sicut pictura in coloribus et rebus. Et nimis stultus est, qui sic coloribus picturae inhaereat, ut res ignoret. Nos enim si verba quae exterius dicuntur amplectimur, et sensus ignoramus, quasi ignorantes res quae depictae sunt solos colores tenemus'.

³ *Ib.* col. 551 ('iuxta sensum antiquorum Patrum').

⁴ Such extolling words on the cultivation of letters as those of Jonas of Orleans (Migne cvi 309) have to be accepted with caution. Studies of the particular kind which we have described were *not* flourishing everywhere, but in a very limited number of schools; see above, chap. II.

hiding the true meaning from the inquiring student than revealing it. The meaning had to be approached by way of the Fathers. The word of the text called for its co-ordinate sense, and this latter was to be found in a patristic exposition.

One essentially new element in the method of biblical studies, therefore, was what may be called the reception of the patristic authority. In Alcuin's school the orthodox catholic doctrine was identified with what the Fathers had believed, and not only as to questions of dogma, but also as to the *studium litterarum divinarum*. Alcuin clearly expressed this in his work *De Fide S. Trinitatis*:¹ 'Every rational soul shall, at a suitable age, learn the catholic faith, especially the preachers to the Christian people and the teachers in God's churches, that they may be able to resist those who contradict the truth, and give peace to those who love it'. Alcuin's work on the Trinity was based on the pre-supposition that that particular dogma was contained in the Bible, but could only be understood if the Bible was read *catholice*, i.e. in conformity with the authority of the Fathers.²

While the reception of the patristic authority presented early Carolingian scholasticism with its matter, the manner in which this was connected with the study of the Bible can be seen in Alcuin's work on Dialectics.³ The paragraph on interpretation (*De Perihermeniiis*) opens with a definition of the noun in close imitation of Aristotle: 'Nomen est vox significativa. Nam omne nomen aliquid significat, visibile vel invisibile, substantiale vel accidens'. Fredegis's sudden innovation, therefore, his ultra-realism of language, had been prefigured in Alcuin's teaching. The sentence that each noun was co-ordinated to a substance or reality meant the raising of logical realism to the

¹ Lib. i, c. 1 (Migne ci 14).

² *Ib.* c. 2 (*l.c.* col. 14): 'Omnis Scriptura Veteris et Novi Testamenti divinitus inspirata, si catholice intelligitur . . . '.

³ *De Dialectica*, c. 16 (Migne ci 973).

rank of a principle.¹ The spiritual and real substance is now the essential and unchangeable part of what, metaphysically speaking, is. The words are only accidental, material expressions and significations of the substances underlying them; they are set, in Boethius's translation of Aristotle, *secundum placitum*.² So it could easily happen that the realist principle was reversed, and the reversed form can actually be read in another passage of Alcuin:³ 'Substantia commune est nomen omnium rerum quae sunt: coelum, sol, luna, terra, arbores, herbae, animalia viventia quaeque, homines etiam, substantiae dicuntur; nam quod nulla substantia est, nihil omnino est, substantia ergo aliquid esse est'. This decided beyond all doubt the question of how the noun and its substance were related to each other. Not only did a substance correspond to each noun, but also in all cases a noun corresponded to a substance. A substance is something which exists, and everything existing has a word in the language. This massive realism, establishing a compulsory union between a word and something of real existence, and similarly between something existing and a word or the thing's name, could not fail to affect the Vulgate text, if it was made a principle of hermeneutics. This was done in the school of St Martin. The patristic commentaries contain substances, or the things signified by the words of the biblical text. Or, vice versa, the substances, as laid down in the commentaries, must necessarily find their counterparts in words of the text.

FIRST TRACES OF THE NEW METHOD IN THE TEXT OF THE VULGATE

This was the method arrived at in Alcuin's *studium litterarum* by the blending of the two principles of patristic

¹ The realist principle was necessary for the defence of the dogma of the Trinity. There could only be the dialectic way of explaining this dogma. Cf. *De Trin.* i, cc. 3, 9, 10, 11 (*l.c.* cols. 16-19).

² Migne ci 973 B-C.

³ Migne c 418; MG. Epp. iv 426³⁵.

authority and logical realism. The earliest trace of the method's having influenced the gospel text is to be found in the Harleian MS 2788 of the British Museum, a gold MS from Tours, which, as has been said, was probably written there in Alcuin's time. The text of the codex contains nothing surprising except a single peculiar reading. In Lc xv 17, instead of the Jeromian form *quanti mercennarii patris mei abundant panibus*, we find the variant *quanti mercennarii in domo patris mei abundant panibus*, a reading which never occurred in the whole preceding history of the Latin Bible, and which in the Apparatus Criticus of the Oxford Vulgate is (incorrectly) reported as first occurring in the thirteenth century (W). The addition *in domo* would remain a puzzle, if the new method of biblical interpretation arrived at in St Martin about that time did not give a clue to the solution. In Bede's commentary on Luke the prodigal son of the parable is explained as signifying worldly philosophy which would fain satisfy its hunger after truth, because the empty phrases of the philosopher leave it unsatisfied, but it has left the true master, Christ. The master's servants, however, the Christians, have faithfully stayed with him; they work in his home (i.e. heaven) and for their reward they shall not want.¹ But this passage in Bede is derived from St Ambrose's commentary on Luke,² where it says:

Mercenarii non siliquis, sed panibus abundant. . . . O Domine Iesu, si nobis auferas siliquas, et panes tribuas! Tu enim dispensator es *in domo Patris*,

and from the *Quaestiones evangeliorum* commonly attributed to St Augustine, where the substance or true sense of the parable is explained in the following way:³

Iam poterat talis [i.e. peccator ut filius prodigiosus] animadvertere multos praedicare veritatem, inter quos quidam essent non ipsius amore veritatis ducti, sed cupiditate com-

¹ Migne xcii 523 c.

² Migne xv 1848 c.

³ Migne xxxv 1345.

parandorum saecularium commodorum. De quibus dicebat Apostolus, esse quosdam qui Evangelium annuntiarent non caste, existimantes quaestum esse pietatem. Non enim aliud annuntiabant, sicut haeretici; sed hoc quod apostolus Paulus, non eo tamen animo quo apostolus Paulus; unde et *mercennarii* recte appellantur, *in eadem* quidem *domo* eundem panem verbi tractantes; non tamen in haereditatem aeternam vocati, sed temporali mercede conducti.

Then the reader is addressed:

Intelligas igitur hoc nunc accipiendum esse: venire ad patrem, *in Ecclesia constitui* per fidem, ubi iam possit esse peccatorum legitima et fructuosa confessio.

To the interpreter who was convinced that the biblical interpretations of the Fathers contained the true sense and the metaphysical reality hidden in the words of the text, a very important point in Lc xv 17 was that it concealed an allusion to the Church. The father's house is the Church, which the prodigal son, i.e. the sinner, has deserted, whereas many Christians, though for selfish reasons, are serving God in the Church and receive ample reward. If this was the sense of the passage in its real and spiritual essence, those who applied the hermeneutic principle: 'substantia commune est nomen rei quae est', were compelled to arrive at the conclusion that the idea of the Church required to be represented in the text as well. What happened was that a word already present in Ambrose and Augustine, *in domo*, was received into the text. Now there could be no doubt about the relation between text and exposition. All the chief realities said by the interpretation to be hinted at in the text now found a corresponding expression in it.

It will be admitted that this fundamentally new way of treating the Vulgate text was or could become a revolution of great consequence. Not so much because new readings would have disfigured the text and altered its natural meaning, nor because the old principle lying at the bottom of the various types of the Vulgate text and warranting to a certain extent the preservation of the

Jeromian text in the traditional lines of development was given up and replaced by another that involved a divergence of the text from the pure MS tradition. The change rather lay in the fact that the new variants, which very rarely altered at all the literal sense of the text, were gradually taken to be symbols standing for the conviction of the Church that the text pure and simple of the word of God was incomplete and in need of supplement from the patristic and orthodox Church doctrine. A small alteration, seemingly irrelevant, as the addition discussed above, was to the faithful reader a sign directing him to a particular passage in patristic literature that aided a clear understanding of the text. One might almost say that the reading for ever united the text to a particular commentary of some Father. We can here perceive the reason for that tenacity with which centuries later, not only the simple faithful, but also the Church officially defended that 'versio vulgata quae in Ecclesia recepta est', the version which contained the textual symbols particularly dear to the Church, because they stood for the patristic tradition and the Church's teaching.

This is the trend of the later development. In the ninth century, of course, these consequences had not yet penetrated to the consciousness of the few scholars who aimed at perfecting a final method of reading the Bible in the schools. The new variants were few in number and were above all of local application. In the schools, where the new method happened to be used, its influence on the Vulgate text was comparatively strongly marked, at Tours first of all.

Wordsworth's MS E (B.M. Egerton 609)¹ was written, not before the middle of the ninth century, at St Martin or, perhaps, at Marmoutier, which depended on Tours,

¹ The collation of E in Wordsworth and White's Vulgate is not always accurate. E.g. Mt i 2 *abraham + autem* also E*, sed eras. E^c; Mc i 10 *et statim descendit (!) de aqua vidit (!)* E; Lc viii 23 *complebantur : complebatur fluctibus navicula* E together with vett D \mathfrak{P}^{ms} .

probably by an Irishman.¹ The book is a product of the same Irish movement on the Continent to which Royal MS 1. A. xviii, of which more will be said later, owed its origin. E is rich in early scholastic readings derived from the Fathers through the hermeneutic method then in use at Tours.

Mt i 23 Vulgate: *ecce virgo in utero habebit et pariet filium et vocabunt nomen eius emmanuel*. E reads: *ecce virgo in utero concipiet et pariet filium et vocabitur nomen eius emmanuel* (Royal MS 1. B. vii has *in utero accipiet*, corrected out of *habebit*). The verbal alteration is obviously caused by the realistic substance, or meaning, of the passage given by Jerome (in the commentary on Matthew, Migne xxvi 25) as follows: '*Ecce virgo in utero habebit et pariet filium et vocabitur nomen eius emmanuel. Pro eo quod evangelista Matthaeus dicit in utero habebit, in propheta scriptum est in utero accipiet. Sed propheta, quia futura praedicit, significat quid futurum sit, et scribit accipiet: evangelista autem... mutavit accipiet et posuit habebit*'. Yet the direct source of the reading in E seems to have been the commentary of Christian of Stavelot (see Appendix B), Migne cvi 1279: '*Omnia ista praedicta sunt a prophetis. Istud vero per Isaiam dictum, sed ibi concipiet, quia ille de futuro. Iste [Mt] habet habebit, quia iam praeterita narrabat*'.

ii 2 *vidimus enim stellam eius in oriente et venimus adorare eum vulg: vidimus enim stellam eius in oriente et venimus cum muneribus adorare eum* E. The addition *cum muneribus* was demanded by the realistic sense given in the exposition of Augustine (*De mirabilibus sacrae Scripturae* iii 4, Migne xxxv 2195): '*Nascente ergo illo puero, quem Israelitarum et gentium prophetae utriusque populi salvatorem fore praedixerant, magi de terra Hevilath ducti stella ad eum cum muneribus longo admodum itinere venerant. Qui oblati muneribus, et adorato per tempus puero, reversi sunt*'.

viii 33 *pastores autem fugerunt et venientes in civitatem nuntiaverunt omnia vulg: ... nuntiaverunt haec omnia* E. *Haec* is required by the sense as expounded by Jerome (*l.c.* 56): '*nuntiaverunt haec omnia... Salvator dixit ite, ut per interfectionem porcorum hominibus salutis occasio praeberetur. Pastores enim ista cernentes statim nuntiant civitati*'.

xiv 12 *et accedentes discipuli eius tulerunt corpus (eius) et sepelierunt*

¹ E. K. Rand, *A Survey of the MSS of Tours*, no. 140, plate 151.

illud et venientes nuntiaverunt iesu vulg : . . . et sepelierunt illud in monumento et venientes nuntiaverunt iesu E. The addition *in monumento* has been adopted on the authority of Augustine (*De consensu evangelistarum* ii 44, Migne xxxiv 1123): 'Et accedentes discipuli eius tulerunt corpus et sepelierunt illud, et venientes nuntiaverunt iesu. Marcus hoc similiter narrat [Mc vi 29 *tulerunt corpus eius et posuerunt illud in monumento*]'.

xv 33 *unde ergo nobis in deserto panes tantos ut saturemus turbam tantam vulg (ut saturarentur turbae tantae ir) : unde ergo nobis in deserto ut saturarentur turbae tantae E.* The sense of the passage, according to Augustine (*De consensu* ii 46, Migne xxxiv 1125), is better expressed in John, where Augustine gives the following explanation (Migne xxxv 1594): 'Discipuli turbas volebant pascere, ut non remanerent inanes, sed unde pascerent non habebant'.

xviii 12 *si fuerint alicui centum oves et erraverit una ex eis, nonne relinquet nonaginta novem in montibus et vadit quaerere eam quae erravit vulg : . . . nonne relinquet .xcviii. in deserto et vadit quaerere eam quae erravit E.* Most commentaries (Origen in *Patrol. Graeca* xiii 1173 f.; Jerome in Migne xxvi 135) refer to Lc xv for the sense of the passage. Hilary (Migne ix 1020) says the real meaning of *in montibus* is *in Heaven*: 'Nonaginta novem non errantes, multitudo angelorum coelestium opinanda est, quibus in coelo est laetitia et cura salutis humanae'. But Lc xv 4 meant exactly the same thing, as Bede witnesses (Migne xcii 520): 'Dimisit autem nonaginta novem oves in deserto, quia illos summos angelorum choros reliquit in coelo. Cur autem coelum desertum vocatur, nisi quod desertum dicitur derelictum?' If, therefore, both *desertum* and *montes* mean *Heaven*, i.e. if the substance of Mt xviii 12 and Lc xv 4 is the same, the verbal expression (*nomen*) also must be the same. So instead of *in montibus* the scribe of E put *in deserto*.

xxi 17 *et relictis illis abiit foras extra civitatem in bethaniam ibique mansit vulg : . . . in bethania ibique mansit et docebat eos de regno dei E.* The origin of the addition is unknown. (Perhaps it resulted from the exposition of *in bethaniam* = into the country of the Gentiles, to whom Christ began to preach after the Jews had contradicted him. Notice that the whole complex of meaning is absent in e, where even *in bethaniam* is omitted.) At any rate the addition fits well Jerome's explanation (*l.c.* 158): 'Ivit Bethaniam, quod interpretatur domus obedientiae, iam tunc vocationem gentium praefigurans'. (Cf. Origen in *Patrol.*

Graeca xiii 1459; also Rabanus, Migne cvii 1044.) Conforming to these authorities the scribe added *et docebat eos de regno dei*, which he found in some source unknown to us.

33 *et aedificavit turrem* vulg : *et aedificavit turrem in medio eius* E. According to Hilary the tower means the law of the Old Testament (Migne ix 1041): 'In turri autem eminentiam legis exstruxerit'. With this the pseudo-Jeromian commentary (Migne xxx 575; presumably by Remigius of Auxerre) agrees: '*turrem in medio*: ostendit doctrinam legis'. Possibly the addition was taken from Jerome's commentary on Isaiah (Migne xxiv 77): 'Aedificavit quoque *turrim in medio eius*, templum videlicet in media civitate', which is practically identical with Jerome's exposition of the present verse (Migne xxvi 162).

37 *misit ad eos filium suum dicens: verebuntur filium meum* vulg : *misit ad eos filium suum dicens: forsitan verebuntur filium meum* E. Jerome on Mt (*l.c.* 163): 'Quod iungitur, *Verebuntur filium meum*, non de ignorantia venit. Quid enim nesciat pater familias, qui hoc loco Deus Pater intelligitur? Sed semper ambigere dicitur Deus, ut libera voluntas homini reservetur'. But precisely the same meaning is given by Bede (*l.c.* 576) for Lc xx 13. This verse, however, reads *forsitan cum hunc viderint verebuntur*. As Bede specially emphasises the dubitative associations of *forsitan*, and as the sense of the two verses is exactly the same, *forsitan* was also added to the passage in Mt.

Mc v 42 *et obstipuerunt stupore maximo* vulg : *et obstipuerunt parentes eius stupore maximo* E. Again the meaning is identical with that of another verse, Lc viii 56 (Bede, *l.c.* 183 f., 445). For that reason the words were assimilated to each other, too; i.e. *parentes eius* of Lc was added to the corresponding verse in Mc.

Lc vii 37 *ecce mulier quae erat in civitate peccatrix ut cognovit quod accubuit in domo pharisaei* vulg : . . . *ut cognovit quod iesus accubuit in domo pharisaei* E. Some MSS of Gregory's *Homilies* (Migne lxxvi 1239) quote this text as *ut cognovit quod iesus accubisset*. The addition of *iesus* is amply justified by the commentaries of Ambrose (Migne xv 1757 f.) and of Augustine (Migne xxxviii 595).

ix 14 *ait autem ad discipulos suos: facite illos discumbere per convivia quinquagenos* vulg : . . . *facite illos discumbere per convivia centenos et quinquagenos* E. The source was Augustine, *De consensu* (Migne xxxiv 1127): 'Sane praetermittere non oportet hoc loco intentum et ad caetera, quae talia forte occurrerint, facere

lectorem, quia Lucas dixit *quinguagenos* iussos esse discumbere, Marcus vero et *quinguagenos et centenos*. Quod hic ideo non movet, quia unus partem dixit, alter totum: qui enim etiam de centenis retulit, hoc retulit quod ille praetermisit: nihil itaque contrarium est. Verumtamen si alius de quinquagenis tantum commemoraret, alius tantum de centenis, valde videretur esse contrarium'. See also Bede (*l.c.* 450).

xi 25 *et cum venerit invenit scopis mundatam* vulg : *et cum venerit invenit eam scopis mundatam et ornatam* E. Cf. Bede (*l.c.* 478): 'Hoc est, [domum vel animam] gratia baptismatis a peccatorum labe castigatam, sed nulla boni operis industria cumulatam. Unde bene Matthaeus hanc domum *vacantem, scopis mundatam, atque ornatam* dicit inventam: *mundatam* videlicet a vitiis pristinis per baptismum, *vacantem* a bonis actibus per negligentiam, *ornatam* simulatis virtutibus per hypocrisin'.

xii 35 *sint lumbi vestri praecinctorum et lucernae ardentes* vulg : . . . *et lucernae ardentes in manibus vestris* E. The addition is required by Gregory's explanation (*l.c.* 1124): '*Et lucernae ardentes in manibus vestris*. Lucernas quippe ardentes in manibus tenemus, cum per bona opera proximis nostris lucis exempla monstramus'. This was copied by Bede (*l.c.* 495).

Jo vi 25 *dixerunt ei: rabbi quando huc venisti* vulg : *dixerunt ei: rabbi quomodo huc venisti* E. Augustine on John (Migne xxxv 1600): '[In the verses 22 to 24] insinuatam est illis tam magnum miraculum. Viderunt enim quod discipuli soli ascendissent in navem, et quia alia navis non ibi erat. Venerunt autem inde et naves iuxta locum illum ubi manducaverunt panem, in quibus eum turbae secutae sunt. Cum discipulis ergo [Iesus] non ascenderat, alia navis illic non erat: unde subito trans mare factus est Iesus, nisi quia super mare ambulavit, ut miraculum monstraret?' This explanation suggested to the scribe that the question of the disciples was rather, In what way (ordinary, or miraculous) did you come hither? than, When did you come hither? If really a miracle is insinuated by the story, *quomodo* was the appropriate word.

xi 49-51 *caiaphas . . . dixit eis: vos nescitis quicquam nec cogitatis quia expedit nobis ut unus moriatur homo . . . ; hoc autem prophetavit* vulg : . . . *quia expedit vobis ut unus moriatur homo . . .* E. Already Alcuin (on John, Migne c 904) quoted *expedit vobis ut unus homo moriatur*, because the prophecy was applied to the Jews by Caiaphas, who was addressing them. For so Alcuin's commentary explains the passage (see also Augustine, Migne xxxv 1757):

'Caiphias de sola Iudaeorum gente prophetavit, in qua erant oves'.

xvii 6 *sermonem tuum servaverunt* vulg : *sermonem meum servaverunt* E. Augustine (*l.c.* 1908) and Alcuin (*l.c.* 961): 'Quanquam et haec omnia de omnibus futuris fidelibus dici potuerint specie imperfecta, cum adhuc essent futura : tamen et haec specialiter de discipulis dici possunt, ad quos tunc praesentialiter loquebatur, quia illud quod sequitur . . . magis huic sensui convenit, ut apostolis specialiter haec loqueretur'.

It will be noticed that all these readings in E are such as attracted the special attention of the editors of the Oxford Vulgate;¹ and not without just reason. For in the mass of traditional readings preserved in the majority of MSS, they constitute an entirely new element. It is not yet a stable element, but one liable to variations. Some of these variants never appeared again in the subsequent history of the Vulgate, others were preserved and, as time went on, were increased by many additional readings of a similar nature. We shall be able to trace throughout the later history of the text some of the readings in E; many have found their way into the early editions (vg). Thus wherever E and vg agree they are joined by the majority of later medieval MSS. (The assumption made in the Oxford edition of the Vulgate gospels, p. 715, that codex E was used by the sixteenth-century editors, is therefore untenable.)

MS E is not the only instance of a gospel book showing the first marks of school influence in the text. MS Egerton 608 of the B.M., the original text of which is predominantly Alcuinian (see *ante*, p. 53), has been corrected in a few passages. These corrections are of the same nature as the scholastic variants in E. A few specimens may be quoted:

Jo i 29 *ecce agnus dei* (+ *ecce Z* . . . Bvg*) *qui tollit peccatum mundi* vulg : *ecce agnus dei ecce qui tollit peccata mundi* vett OEgert. 608 (and later MSS; see Oxford ed.). The meaning of the verse

¹ Wordsworth and White, p. 715. The true explanation of these readings, therefore, lies in the fact that the MS was read in conjunction with certain patristic commentaries. In Matthew the source of the new readings was chiefly Jerome, in John it was the commentary of Augustine.

is expounded by Alcuin as follows (Migne c 755): '*Ecce qui tollit peccata mundi. . . . Ecce qui tollit peccata mundi, ecce qui iustus inter peccatores, mitis inter impios (hoc est, quasi agnus inter lupos apparens), etiam peccatores et impios iustificandi habet potestatem. Quomodo autem peccata mundi tollat, quo ordine iustificet impios, apostolus ostendit. . . .*'

iii 31 *qui est de terra de terra est et de terra loquitur* vulg : *qui est de terra de terra loquitur* vett DE Egert. 608. The omission of *de terra est* may only be a mistake of the scribe. Yet it may also be a conscious alteration called forth by Alcuin's exposition (*l.c.* 788): '*Qui de sursum venit, super omnes est, et qui de terra est, de terra loquitur. . . . Qui autem est de terra, terra est et de terra loquitur, id est Iohannes. Quomodo ergo de terra loquitur? Omnis homo terrenus est, et dum terrena loquitur, de terra loquitur. . . . Ergo Iohannes de terra est et de terra loquitur*'.

33 *qui accipit eius testimonium signavit quia deus verax est* vulg : *qui autem accepit eius testimonium signavit quia deus verax est* H O E Egert. 608. *Autem* emphasises a contrast which is expressed in Alcuin's commentary (*l.c.* 789): '*Testimonium eius qui venit de coelo nemo accipit; qui autem accepit testimonium eius, signavit, quia Deus verax est*'.

xi 50 *expedit nobis* vulg : *expedit vobis* E Egert. 608. See above.

xviii 28 *adducunt ergo iesum a caiapha in praetorium* vulg : *adducunt ergo iesum ad pilatum in praetorium* r R Egert. 608. It should be noted that most MSS have the corrupt reading *adducunt ergo iesum ad caiphā in praetorium*, and this was also Augustine's reading. Alcuin also quotes *ad caiphā* (*l.c.* 974), and as Augustine he tries to solve the difficulty inherent in the corrupt variant by the following explanation: '*Si ad Caiphā, cur in praetorium? Quod nihil aliud vult intelligi, quam ubi praeses Pilatus habitabat; aut damnationis causa Christi Caiphā perrexit in praetorium ad Pilatū; aut Pilatus in domo Caiphāe praetorium habebat*'. To the scribe the first alternative given by Alcuin appeared to be the more plausible one.

xix 6 *crucifige crucifige* vulg : *crucifige crucifige eum* gr vett E Egert. 608. Augustine (Migne xxxv 1942; originally also in *De consensu* iii 8, Migne xxxiv 1180) already quoted: *crucifige crucifige eum*. See also pseudo-Bede (Migne xcii 906): '*Crucifige crucifige. Dicit eis Pilatus: accipite eum vos et crucifigite eum*'.

xx 13 *dicit eis: quia tulerunt dominum meum* vulg : *dicit eis: quia*

tulerunt dominum de monumento ff²° E Egert. 608. Cf. Jerome Ep. cxx (Migne xxii 989); Ambrosius, *De Virginitate* (Migne xvi 285). Probably Alcuin's commentary was the actual source (*l.c.* 990): 'Mulier quid ploras? Dicit eis: Quia tulerunt dominum meum a monumento et nescio ubi posuerunt eum'.

It would often seem to our modern sense of language that many of these new readings were totally unnecessary. It might be thought that certain words from the commentaries were mechanically absorbed by the text, if it were not that in reading over the expositions and the corresponding text, it again and again becomes apparent with how deep and penetrant an imagination every word of the text was studied, and how manifold the associations were which were assumed to be concealed beneath the surface of the word. Above all the scholastic variations of the Vulgate text there loomed the idea that the words were mere material signs for something much more profound and spiritual. In the ninth century, however, this idea was not yet systematically applied to all cases where an application was possible. That is the reason why the changes were as yet sporadic and occasions selected at random.

ALCUIN'S PART IN THE HISTORY OF THE VULGATE. HIS FOLLOWERS

The part played by Alcuin in the history of the occidental mind was a double one, as we have endeavoured to show. On the one hand the chief minister of Charlemagne was intent on the propagation and confirmation of Christianity in the realm inherited and enlarged by the Emperor, and in revising the text of the Vulgate he acted according to the demands of Augustinian ethics. On the other hand, he was a divine and a philosopher driven by his personal inclinations to study Augustine and Bede, Cassiodorus and Isidore, Porphyrius and Boethius, and to make various rudimentary suggestions and beginnings into a system of teaching, which he put into practice

in his own school at Tours.¹ The two spheres of interest did not to him involve an interior conflict. In the one he acted as a minister of the realm; his authority and the effect of his revision reached as far as the power of the Emperor went. In the other he was the abbot of his monastery, who instructed the monks entrusted to him in the knowledge of Scripture, and who probably never dreamed that his teaching would result in the emergence of the system which was to be known as scholasticism.

Yet Alcuin had pupils who carried on the method of biblical studies initiated by him, and it is remarkable that one place or one monastery never enjoyed for a long period the fame of a particularly high standard of theological learning. Under Alcuin and perhaps Fredegis, his successor, St Martin was at the height of its fame. After that its reputation became obscured by other places, though its school did not cease to exist.² But when, in the eleventh century, Berengar caused some of the old fame to return the school had changed its character and had become the home of Berengar's particular dialectic method. It was a peculiarity of all the early schools that they received the imprint of the great personalities teaching in them. The tradition of certain scholastic methods did not attach to certain schools and places, but to generations and genealogies of teachers and pupils. The investigation, therefore, of how the Alcuinian method of biblical learning spread will lead us from teacher to pupil, whilst the places of their activities vary.

RABANUS MAURUS

Rabanus of Fulda, a pupil of Alcuin, held the first place among immediate post-Carolingian scholars. In the dedication of *De Universo* to one of his former fellow-students, Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt, he mentioned

¹ The fact that Alcuin played this twofold part was already known to Notker Balbulus. Cf. *De interpretatione div. script.* c. 6 (Migne cxxxix 999).

² I. Launois, *De scholis celebribus, etc.* c. 5 (Hamburg 1717, p. 32 f.).

what he had learned at Tours:¹ 'I remember, holy Father, the praiseworthy zeal you showed as a boy and a youth in the study of letters and in the meditation of the Sacred Scriptures, when we used to read together not only the divine books and the expositions of the holy Fathers on them, but also the books of the wise men of this world on the nature of things, in which they had deposited the description of the liberal arts and the investigation of other subjects'. The divine letters, therefore, he had already learned at Tours with the typical distinction between the word and the exposition, and his encyclopaedic work *De Universo* itself is another *Etymologia* in the sense of Isidore's work. It treats on the one hand of words and names of the things, on the other hand of their force and contents. To Rabanus *mysticus* meant everything concealed within the letter, it meant the sense of a word.² His whole fruitful exegetical activity centred round the two poles of the historical and the mystic sense of the Bible.³ The meaning of biblical words, with the teaching of which he was employed at Fulda,⁴ is arrived at by collating the sayings of the Fathers with the corresponding text, and Rabanus never tired of insisting that the Fathers were the sole authorities and their writings the foundation of right and orthodox studies. He says that he compiled his commentary on Matthew only because his pupils at Fulda complained that this gospel was not so well annotated and interpreted as the others. He quotes his sources in great detail, and declares his aim to have been to collect in one work the sayings of the Fathers on Matthew (*sensus et sententias*), in order to lead the reader, who left to his own resources would never recognise the profound significance of the biblical words, to a correct understanding.⁵

¹ Migne cxi 11; MG. Epp. v 470; Carmen xxviii 19 (MG. Poetae Carol. ii 190).

² MG. Epp. v 471.

³ Even in his own century he was regarded as the most fertile expositor. Notker Balbulus, *De interpretatione div. script.* c. 4 (Migne cxxxi 998).

⁴ Rudolfus, *Vita Rabani*, paragr. 5 (Migne cvii 43).

⁵ MG. Epp. v 388 f.

Rabanus devoted his whole leisure to the reading of the patristic commentaries and to making extracts from them.¹

He could not follow his inclinations without being attacked and contradicted. One reproach brought against him was that he lacked originality. But this was not felt by Rabanus to be a valid reason against his method. The idea was that the Bible was divided into two essentially different halves, one the audible and visible material word which told a story, the other the transcendent moral or allegorical sense telling of spiritual truths and of the doctrine of the Church. Unless the student chose to become a prey of relativism, there was only one conclusion open, namely that the given word had one true meaning, which was the meaning intended by God, the author. As the interpretations of the Fathers were generally known and available, it would have been unjustifiable to turn these down, considering the high reputation such authority enjoyed. On the contrary it was obligatory to accept them as the only possible, correct and orthodox interpretations of the text, since the truth about the Scriptures was that established by the Church. After all there could be only one truth. All these considerations necessarily produced that lack of originality to be met with in most of the commentators writing after 800. Nobody but the Fathers showed the way from the letter to the spirit, and it was natural for Rabanus to write to Freulfus of Lisieux:² 'By reflecting on the creation of the visible things you will be moved to meditate on the effect of the invisible ones, the course of the bodily world will lead you to explore the essence of the spiritual microcosm, and from the historical series of the Fathers you will learn about the mystic fruitfulness of the Church'. The Church upheld what wiser men had said; the moderns had to yield to ancient and venerable judgment. The truth had been dis-

¹ *Ib.* pp. 393, 395, 396, 397, 399.

² *Ib.* p. 394.

covered by the patristic writers long ago; for the moderns there was nothing to do but to repeat and teach it.¹

It is important that the difference between the new way of unoriginal exposition and the patristic method of commentation be understood as the outcome of two contrasting attitudes towards the essence of religion. The Fathers of the Church had written for practical life, because on some occasion or other a need had been felt for special instruction on a particular question; but the scholastic commentators worked for a theoretical and more or less bookish motive. Their task was not to solve a question of conduct, but to find an answer to the theoretical question, What is the true sense of the biblical word? a question never asked by the Fathers. They had put forward what they thought would answer the requirements of the given moment and the given situation. The theorists in the schools, however, started from the logic and the hermeneutics of Aristotle. "Όνομα μὲν ἐστὶ φωνὴ σημαντικὴ κατὰ συνθήκην. . . . Τὸ δὲ κατὰ συνθήκην, ὅτι φύσει τῶν ὀνομάτων οὐδέν ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ὅταν γένηται σύμβολον."² The duality of sign and meaning was a purely theoretical distinction. Its application to the biblical language above all was the starting-point of scholastic exegesis. Biblical interpretation had shifted from the field of moral action to that of logic, and the individual was deprived of the right and the power to create something new. His own share was limited to collecting and co-ordinating the biblical text and its interpretation. All thoughts of originality had to be abandoned.

In the third book of *De Clericorum Institutione* Rabanus treated his exegetic principles systematically.³ In the Bible the things signified by a story or an historical account do not only mean the things themselves, but also immaterial,

¹ Cf. his letter to Emperor Lothar, MG. Epp. v 477.

² Περὶ ἑρμηνείας, c. 2. Boethius's commentary on the passage (Migne lxxiv 301 ff.).

³ It is of little consequence that many of Rabanus's principles are borrowed from Augustine and Cassiodorus. Rabanus has given them his own interpretation.

spiritual truths and facts.¹ The first condition for the understanding of the Bible is that the literal story be understood, for 'rerum ignorantia facit obscuras figuratas locutiones'.² But this is not enough; it would be a mistake to go no further than the literal explanation of a passage meant to convey profound spiritual truths. The Jews were guilty of such negligence; the Christians must try to find the hidden truth,³ intended by the divine author of the Bible.⁴ This truth constitutes the real and unshakable contents of Scripture, compared with which the words or the formal language of the text are but a human convention to which no reality adheres at all.⁵ The interpreter of the Scriptures 'must be a defender of the right faith and a fighter against error. He must teach good and warn of evil'.⁶ If he is in doubt about the explanation, he has to accept what recognised authorities regarded as the truth. It is safest if even for the expressions he uses he follows some illustrious predecessor, preferably a Father of the Church. That cannot be plagiarism, for the inner meaning of the divine word can only be one, it has never changed and is common to all Christians. The modern commentator does not steal, he gives, he imparts something.⁷

So Rabanus became the first systematiser of the new exegetical method by defining more clearly what he had learned from Alcuin. The reality expressed in the Bible, but hidden under the veil of the words, is openly exposed in the writings of the Fathers. In view of this fact questions of text are of a subordinate rank.⁸ Rabanus even goes so far as to mistrust the naked and unreliable word, if it is not clothed with the correct exposition. The naked word lends itself to anything, it is fickle like a harlot:

¹ Also in *De Universo*, lib. ix (Migne cxi 257 f.).

² *De Clericorum Institutione*, lib. iii, c. 10 (Migne cvii 386).

³ *Ib.* c. 12 (*l.c.* col. 389).

⁴ *Ib.* c. 15 (*l.c.* col. 391).

⁵ *Ib.* c. 16 (*l.c.* col. 392 f.).

⁶ *Ib.* c. 28 (*l.c.* col. 406).

⁷ *Ib.* c. 36 (*l.c.* col. 413).

⁸ Rabanus had a strong sense of the oneness of truth in Scripture; cf. Migne cviii 856 (ad *Deuter. iv*); cix 881 (ad *Ecclesi.*).

He who abuses the witness of Holy Scripture by applying it to his own perverse opinion erects, as it were, a brothel at the beginning of every way [of truth] by declaring: So says Isaiah, so says Hosea, these are the words of Moses, these of Daniel. And be it known that he erects that house not in the middle of the path or at the end, but at the beginning. For if he had attained to the understanding and the profundity of the holy books, he would not be so deceived.¹

The heretic is willing to copulate anything with the pure word, if only he can put the union to his own advantage. The text is unreliable without the catholic, orthodox expositors: such is the tenor of Rabanus's exegetical works.²

HAYMO OF HALBERSTADT AND
SMARAGDUS OF ST MIHIEL

Rabanus's fellow-student, Haymo of Halberstadt, seems to have drawn the same conclusions from Alcuin's lessons as his friend, if we may judge from the fact that all his exegetical writings are excerpted from the Fathers.³ Even the three books of his *De varietate librorum sive de amore coelestis patriae* are compiled from various patristic sources. Haymo's Vulgate text is accordingly interspersed with the readings which arise, if the patristic commentaries are regarded as the only writings giving the true sense of Scripture.⁴ Among others he quotes Lc xv 17 in the form to be found in Harl. MS 2788: *Quanti mercennarii in domo patris mei abundant panibus.*⁵ In a like way Smaragdus, Abbot of St Mihiel, treated his explanation of the pericopes for the whole year, in which his aim was to lay down the true meaning of the gospel lessons according to the Fathers. His sharp distinction between the naked word and the

¹ *In Ezechielem* (Migne cx 683).

² On the sources of the commentary on Matthew, see Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte* (3rd and 4th eds. ii 648, note 6).

³ The commentaries printed in Migne cxvii are not Haymo's, but belong to Remigius of Auxerre.

⁴ He confesses that he depends on the Fathers, Migne cxviii 875; his realist view, *ib.* col. 816.

⁵ *Ib.* col. 248.

commentary supplementing and safeguarding it,¹ again led to a mere copying of the sources.

WALAFRID STRABO AND THE PROBLEM OF
THE GLOSSA ORDINARIA

Lastly there is Walafrid Strabo, one of the pupils of Rabanus, and later abbot of Reichenau (807-849), who is said to be the author of the *Glossa Ordinaria* on the whole Bible. While such a complete commentary entirely based on the Fathers would very well fit into what we know of Rabanus's and his pupils' fashion of writing, yet there is not much historical evidence for the usual assumption. What is to-day known as *Glossa Ordinaria* is wholly a product of the second half of the twelfth century. The gloss to be found in MSS of that date, and no other, was often printed as Walafrid's *Glossa Ordinaria*, and this belief has been held since the very late Middle Ages. Even Notker Balbulus, who unmistakably mentions Rabanus's *Glossulae* on the whole Bible (whatever that may have meant), knew nothing of Walafrid as a commentator, and so it is with all the cataloguers and historians of literature down to the fifteenth century.² All S. Berger could ascertain from an examination of the Reichenau MSS was that a tenth-century commentary on the Epistle of St James (Karlsruhe Aug. 135) has a very vague resemblance with the *Glossa Ordinaria* on that Epistle, and furthermore that a glossed copy of the Minor Prophets, of the early tenth century (St Gall 41), recalls in a few passages the *Glossa*.³ The

¹ *Praefatio in Collectiones Epistolarum et Evangeliorum de Tempore* (Migne cii 13 f.).

² Sigebert of Gembloux (writing in 1111), in his *Liber de illustribus viris* (Migne clx 563), mentions no glosses of Strabo. Nor does the anonymous author of the Prüfening list (about 1130; see Migne ccxiii 963 ff. no 44). Vincent of Beauvais possibly comes nearest the truth in assigning to Rabanus's pupil Strabus (*Spec. histor.* lib. xxiv, c. 28; *Spec. doctr.* lib. xix, c. 59), 'quaedam commentariola super quosdam libros Pentateuci'; or, in greater detail, 'Ipso Rabano dictante scripsit breviando tractatus in Exodum librum unum, in Leviticum librum unum. Videtur etiam scripsisse super Genesim, ut patet in glosis'.

³ Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 132 ff. This chapter of Berger is up

Glossa is a collection of extracts from widely different authors, some of them writing after Walafrid's time, so that it is impossible to ascribe it to one author. We shall see that even long after the ninth century the copying and extracting of ancient and recognised commentaries was still practised; and that there is evidence that the Glossa in its present-day shape was written in the twelfth century. There used to be, in the late Middle Ages, a tradition that Walafrid had taken a share in the fabulous Old High-German version of the Bible under Charlemagne,¹ and one cannot help feeling that the authorship of the Glossa attributed to him was a legend of similar kind. One thing may be admitted, namely, that the collections of Rabanus in a way formed the basis of the Glossa on many biblical books. This seems to be true above all of the Glossa on the Pentateuch. So far, however, we are ignorant of what exactly he and his pupils contributed to the Glossa. Notker's remark concerning the *Glossulae* on the whole Bible might be interpreted to mean that Rabanus had written some glosses resembling the Glossa Ordinaria. This conjecture would be more acceptable than the assumption of Strabo's sole authorship of the Glossa. Nevertheless it is very likely that Walafrid collaborated with Rabanus and some others when in Fulda in collecting material for biblical commentaries, and that later he continued this work at Reichenau. The development of the Glossa proper was not decided and finished at Reichenau, but in the schools of Ferrières, Auxerre, Laon, and Paris, for it is beyond doubt that the gradual growth of the Glossa and the springing up of new readings in the Vulgate text was only one process, since the extracts taken from the writings of the Fathers were the material from which the Glossa was

to now the only reliable contribution to the history of the Gloss. It is hoped that the present work will do its share in dispelling the blind belief, which even modern scholars have inherited from the past, that Walafrid Strabo was the author of the Glossa Ordinaria, and Anselm of Laon that of the Glossa Interlinearis.

¹ Reuss, in *Revue de Théologie*, Jan. 1851.

compiled, but at the same time also the sources for the new readings in the text. The exegetical works of Rabanus, among others, were much in use in and shortly after his time and were often revised and re-written, as is shown by a commentary on Matthew printed as a work of Bede, but actually a ninth-century compilation from Rabanus's work.¹ Traube has a note on gloss-like annotations on Matthew in a Würzburg MS (MSS th. f. 61), which were probably taken during a lecture of Rabanus.² In a like way we must assume that various pupils took notes in the lessons of masters famous for their biblical interpretation, and that these notes came to be the base for the future Glossa.

SERVATUS LUPUS OF FERRIÈRES

We know that this is true of one of Rabanus's pupils, Servatus Lupus, who later became abbot of Ferrières. It is evident from a remark of his master³ that he had learnt the hermeneutic method in Rabanus's school at Fulda. Rabanus mentions in a letter, that when teaching at Fulda he used to collect with the help of his pupils the material, the *sanctorum patrum dicta*, for his own expositions from various patristic commentaries, and that Lupus was among his assistants. Rabanus's collections on the Pauline Epistles had been written at the request of Lupus;⁴ on the other hand the commentary on Numbers was not Rabanus's own work, but that of his pupils Lupus and

¹ See Schönbach, *op. cit.* Strangely enough Schönbach ascribes to the author of this commentary the critical remarks on the text which occur in it. But these are all copied from Rabanus.

² Traube, *Neues Archiv* xvii 458 f.; *Vorl. u. Abhandlungen* iii 176. Schönbach (*l.c.* p. 132) contests Traube's view with regard to the glosses in the Würzburg MS. In Boulogne-sur-Mer MS 20, which was written at St Bertin at the end of the tenth century, there is a marginal gloss on the Psalter. This gloss is a simple and very little modified extract from Jerome's *Breviarium in Psalmos* (Migne xxvi 863). The fact proves that at that date the Gloss was not yet thought of.

³ Lupus, Ep. i (MG. Epp. vi 8); Rabanus to Lupus, MG. Epp. v 429.

⁴ *Ib.* v 430.

Gerolfus.¹ So Lupus, besides being a learned philologist, also became acquainted with the method of biblical criticism. The study of the Bible he held in high esteem,² and he probably treated the subject in the fashion then in vogue, i.e. he wholly relied on the sayings of the Fathers for certainty about the meaning of Scripture. To his work *De Tribus Quaestionibus* he appended a collection of notes called *Collectaneum*, in which he corroborated the statements made in the work by quotations from the Doctors.³ He acknowledged how much he had learnt and was still learning from the Fathers, extolling St Augustine above them all in expressions such as *hic auctor certissimus, quia divinarum Scripturarum observantissimus*, or *divinae auctoritatis observantissimus*.⁴ The manner in which he cites Augustine shows that he was deeply versed in the works of that Father. Lupus certainly regarded him as an authority on matters of textual criticism. To estimate Augustine thus was, at any rate, the tendency of the time.

HEIRIC OF AUXERRE AND THE IRISH SCHOLARS ON THE CONTINENT

Heiric of Auxerre, a pupil of Lupus, contributed an element of great importance to the growth of the medieval Vulgate text. He first studied grammar under Lupus, then he migrated to Laon, which at the time was the chief continental centre of Irish learning. As the Irish factor played an important part in the later history of the Vulgate, it may be well to deal with it here in some detail.

The particular method of biblical studies cultivated by the Irish differed widely from the post-Carolingian one. Their tradition, as far as the Vulgate was concerned, had very little in common with what had developed in the Frankish empire. They were still acquainted with philo-

¹ Manitius, *op. cit.* i 484; MG. Epp. v 397.

² MG. Epp. vi 18, 38.

³ Migne cxix 621, 647.

⁴ *Liber de tribus quaestionibus* (Migne cxix 641); Epp. 30, 129 (*ib.* cols. 492, 606).

logical methods of textual criticism; they knew, at least to some extent, the Greek original of the New Testament, and their Vulgate text consisted of an ancient type, for the most part a mixture of a good Vulgate text and Old Latin readings. When, after the death of Louis, the Continent became a ground somewhat more favourable to pure learning and a few episcopal schools were opened to scholars of all sorts, the Irish began to resort to the Continent more freely and, presumably, in considerable numbers. Especially at Laon and Auxerre they formed a kind of colony, where they were under the protection of the Emperor, Charles the Bald, who warmly welcomed the learned strangers to his shores. Charles the Bald's chief prize, however, was John the Scot, who became instructor at the imperial palace school, and to him the initiative in the biblical studies of the Irish on the Continent must be largely ascribed.¹

JOHN THE SCOT AND THE IRISH TYPE OF THE VULGATE

John the Scot's method of biblical studies bears witness to the wide gulf between the typically Irish and the continental attitude to the philosophical foundations of such studies. As against Alcuin, Rabanus, and others, John the Scot refused to rely on patristic authority only for the understanding of Scripture. He demanded that what was written should be understood rationally and with the inquirer's own intellect; furthermore, that the interpretation should be concentrated first of all upon the literal sense of the words. These principles John tried to realise in his commentary on the gospel of St John. He naturally admitted that the literal meaning is only the outside and the shell surrounding the true and spiritual

¹ On the Irish as Greek scholars, especially in the ninth century, Traube, *Vorl. u. Abhandlungen* ii 84; iii 207. The only two Greek-Latin glossaries of the ninth century which we possess were written in the Laon district; cf. M. R. James, in *Camb. Medieval Hist.* iii 526 f.

meaning hidden within and behind the word.¹ This does not mean that he defended the rigid separation between sound and meaning as insisted upon by the continental exegesis of his time. His view was that faith is necessary for the understanding of the divine word, i.e. faith in what the Church, or the Fathers, said to be the truth. The human intellect, however, may not remain behind, for it is as necessary for the understanding as faith. Without one the other could not attain the aim, the intelligence of Scripture.² In propounding this view John reduced to a monism the duality believed by the Carolingian theologians to exist between sound and sense, the verbal sign and the thing signified, the historical and the mystic meaning. The literal, and the spiritual, real, or mystic sense of a word in the Bible do not differ in essence, they are not two distinct realities which might be considered separately, as the logical realists believed. The distinction is entirely false, according to John the Scot. The relation between the material sound-complex of a word and its spiritual significance is not a mere relation between two totally different spheres. There is but one sphere, namely, the word with its meaning resulting from the context of the passage in which it occurs. The word is something material, but at the same time and to the same degree it is something spiritual. From the ontological point of view the two things are identical. The human mind only draws the distinction because of the frailty of human nature. Man can directly apprehend only material things, and through them he must be led to the intelligence of the immaterial. The path on which the mind goes from the material to the immaterial exists only in our mind, it is one of logical necessity. There is no metaphysical reality attached to the distinction. The word with all its associations of meaning is one indivisible whole.³ Owing to this

¹ Migne cxxii 283.

² *Ib.* col. 284 f. *De div. nat.* ii, paragr. 20 (Migne cxxii 556 B).

³ The chief passages are: *Expositiones super hierarchiam caelestem Dionysii*, c. i, paragr. 3; c. ii, paragr. 1 (Migne cxxii 143, 139 f., 146).

conception of language John as an interpreter of Scripture confined himself to the word of the text as the sole guide to the understanding and exposition of the Bible. The meaning is fully contained in the text, there is no need for differentiating between sound and sense, still less are special books, the patristic commentaries, necessary in which the sense is written down or separated from the text. For the truth is implied in the word, we have to start from the material word, and, by following its lead, find out the spiritual sense which it has in the particular passage. The work of explanation has to be done by the intellect. The *scientia divinarum litterarum* of the liberal arts explains the meaning of the Bible to him who inquires after it with diligent application. The quintessence of John's method is: *Nulla sacra Scriptura est, quae regulis liberalium careat disciplinarum.*¹ The word and nothing else leads the human mind, fettered as it is to the apprehension of material objects, to the understanding of the word. Inasmuch as the nature of language is symbolical, there lies hidden within it both the material and the spiritual.

John applied these axioms in writing his own commentary on the Fourth Gospel. He proceeds from the word itself to inquire after the etymologies of the various terms in the text presenting difficulties, he treats of the grammatical use of certain verbs,² resorts to the Greek, if it seems to offer an easier access to the meaning than the Latin, and collects variant readings of a passage, if they facilitate the intelligence of the *voces*.³ This latter point drove John the Scot of necessity to look for textual variants and 'different versions'. These he found in the learned tradition of his own country. The Irish type of the Vulgate text differed greatly from the continental text of the ninth century, and John adopted the strange readings of Irish MSS often derived from the

¹ Migne cxxii 140.

² E.g. the explanation of the verb substantive, *ib.* col. 286.

³ *Ib.* col. 309 (on Jo i 29): '*Altera die*, vel, ut in Graeco significantius scribitur, *alia die*. *Alia*, inquit, *die*, hoc est *alia cognitione*'.

Greek or the Old Latin, wherever they seemed to him preferable to the continental readings, because of the facility with which they lent themselves to his particular method of interpretation. We append a selection of peculiar Irish variants in the text quoted in the few preserved fragments of the commentary on John.¹

Jo i 5 *eam* : *eum* gr vett; 9 *erat* + *autem* f D; 12 *his qui credunt* : *credentibus* gr vett E; 15 *testimonium perhibet* : *testatur* δ; *venturus est* : *venit* vett; 21 *dicit* : *dixit* vett F . . . mod; om *et* (*respondit*) r G; 23 *ego* + *sum* T R vett; 26 *stetit* : *stat* X* ir vett; *non scitis* : *nescitis* vett H C T D E R vg; iii 2 *ad eum* : *ad iesum* gr vett E mod; 4 *iterato* : *secundo* δ; 8 *non scis* : *nescis* D R vett vg; *sic est* + *et* (*omnis*) b; 10 om *in* (*israhel*) M J F Y X* S A^c vett; 13 > *de caelo descendit* vett Z* H E D^c; 15 *qui credit in ipso* : *credens in eum* vett; 16 > *deus dilexit* vett mod; 23 om *et* (*iohannes*) vett E Z^c; 31 *de terra est* : om *de* gat J; 36 *incredulus est* : *non credit in* vett; *vitam* + *aeternam* b cor. vat.*; iv 5 *ergo* : *autem iesus* e; 9 om *illa* vett Z R K V; > *a me bibere petis* vett; *quae sum* : *dum sim* vett E; 10 om *forsitan* vett; 11 *in quo haurias* : *hauritorium* gr vett; 14 om *ego* vett; 17 *dixit* + *ei* vett; 24 *eos qui adorant eum* : *adorantes se* gr vett; 25 om *ergo* gr vett; 26 *tecum* : *tibi* δ; vi 9 *pisces* : *pisciculos* gr e; *inter* : *in* vett; 10 *dicit autem* vett S R ε δ; *discumbere* : *recumbere* de; *recubuerunt* vett; 11 *ergo* : *autem* vett; *recumbentibus* vett; 12 *impleti* : *saturati* vett A Δ S Y X^c; *dixit* : *dicit* gr vett; *ne pereant* : *ne quid pereat* gr d δ; 14 *signum* + *iesus* gr vett; *venturus est* : *venit* vett.²

This was a text entirely unusual on the Continent. Its introduction into the post-Carolingian schools, owing to the Irish scholars having settled in some French episcopal cities, is illustrated by a couple of MSS, both of which

¹ The fragments of the commentary on John are printed in *Catalogue général des mss des bibliothèques publiques des départements* i, Paris 1849, 503 ff. (and Migne cxxii 283 ff.; together with the homily on the prologue of John).

² Other variants in Erigena's quotations cannot be found in the Old Latin and are possibly direct translations from the Greek: Jo iii 12 *dixero* : *dicam*; 14 *ita* : *sic*; 20 *qui mala agit* : *mala agens*; *et non* : *nec*; 24 *nondum* : *non*; 27 *de caelo* : in quibusdam codicibus Graecorum legitur nisi fuerit ei datum desursum de caelo; 34 *ad mensuram* : *ex mensura*; iv 2 *quamquam* : *etsi*; etc.

have been discussed in a previous chapter. One is the Royal MS 1. A. xviii of the B.M.¹ The typically insular text of this gospel book, we are now able to say, became known in continental schools about the middle of the ninth century. Moreover E, the Egerton MS, was written about the same time, and the reader will have observed the close resemblance between the text as quoted by John the Scot, and that of E and Royal MS 1. A. xviii.² (The Codex Gatianus, on the other hand, though often agreeing with this group, is the result of a pre-Alcuinian wave of Irish influence due to the Irish missionaries of the seventh century.) As regards Royal MS. 1. A. xviii in particular, we can be more precise. The codex must have been written on the Continent, for its characters are Carolingian minuscules, which were introduced into English scriptoria not before the middle of the tenth century, whereas our MS was executed about 860–870. Furthermore, the scribe must have been an Irishman, to judge from the rude initials in the text recalling the Irish style of illumination. Lastly, the scribe must have worked at a place where the Fathers were recognised as authorities on questions of biblical meaning, that is, in a school of Rabanus's tradition, for the book contains one or two readings only to be explained by assuming that patristic commentaries were read side by side with the text.³ (All these peculiarities,

¹ The quotations in the fragmentary commentary on John agree with Royal MS 1. A. xviii in the following variants: Jo i 26 *stetit: stat; non scitis: nescitis*; iii 2 *ad eum: ad iesum*; 13 *>de caelo descendit*; 23 *om et (iohannes)*; 27 *>fuerit ei*; iv 9 *quae sum: cum sim (: dum sim Evett)*.

² Both the variant readings in the commentary on John and those in Royal MS 1. A. xviii have a close affinity with those in Egat.

³ Royal MS 1. A. xviii reads in Mt iv 12: *quod iohannes traditus esset in carcerem* (see Jo iii 24). The addition *in carcerem* is to be found in pseudo-Bede's commentary on Matthew (Migne xcii 21), which was written after, and copied from, the commentary of Rabanus. The addition must have arisen in a school which carried on the tradition of Rabanus, and at the time when the MS was written this meant the district of Auxerre and Laon. Lc i 54 *recordatus* (instead of *memorari vulg*) *misericordiae suae. Recordatus* was probably taken over from Bede (Migne xcii 322). ii 51 *conservabat omnia verba haec in corde suo*. Above the line *conferens* has been added, from Bede (Migne xciv 67; the exposition of the verse in Migne xcii 335 D). iv 5 *duxit illum*

be it said in parenthesis, are exactly the same in MS E, a proof that this book, too, was written, at Tours, by an Irish scribe writing shortly after 850 and copying an insular original, which was modified by scholastic readings.) So we may assume with some probability that the Royal MS was written not far from Laon or Auxerre. The original from which it was copied had been brought there by some Irish monk who, like John the Scot, had seized the opportunity for availing himself of the chances offered by some continental schools. In one of them, where the new learning was taught, our MS was written.¹ Another witness for the presence of the Irish text on the Continent is the Bodmin gospel book B.M.Add. MS 9381, written about 940 at Bodmin, Cornwall, and possibly the earliest known example of the Carolingian minuscule used in England. The scribe had perhaps been trained on the Continent, and the book he copied must have come from a Frankish monastery, otherwise the large amount of Alcuinian readings in the Irish text would be unaccounted for. Moreover in Jo v 4 (this verse is given in the usual medieval form called no. 2 by Wordsworth in the Oxford Vulgate) the MS has a variant which can only be the outcome of the realist interpretation in the schools: *et movebatur aqua et sanabatur unus et qui prior descendisset*. . . . The addition *et sanabatur unus* is taken from Augustine's commentary (Migne xxxv 1528: 'Post aquam turbatam mittebat se unus qui poterat, et sanabatur solus'. Similarly Bede, Hom. i 16, Migne cxiv 84 c, and Alcuin, Migne c 805 A). Again we see,

diabolus. Above the line *in montem excelsum valde* has been added (Mt iv 8). Bede (Migne xcii 368) does not quote the addition, it is true; but his exposition presupposes it ('quid ergo mirum, si se permisit ab illo *in montem duci?*').—That Remigius was acquainted with the Irish text is proved by the fact that in Homily iii (Migne cxxxi 881 A, D) he quotes Mt iii 3 with the addition: '*Omnis vallis implebitur, et omnis mons et collis humiliabitur. Et erunt prava in directa et aspera in vias planas*'. This addition occurs only in Irish MSS such as Royal MS 1. A. xviii.

¹ Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 49. Æthelstan gave the MS to St Augustine's, Canterbury, where it was copied in the second half of the tenth century (Royal MS 1. D. iii). In several instances this copy lapses into the insular type of script!

this definitely Irish text was familiar in continental schools of the middle and second half of the ninth century, again there are singular agreements between Add. MS 9381 and E.¹

IRISH READINGS PENETRATING INTO THE TEXT
OF THE POST-CAROLINGIAN SCHOOLS

REMIGIUS OF AUXERRE AND HIS PRINCIPLES
OF INTERPRETATION

The value of these data lies in the fact that they are documentary evidence that the impulse given to continental scholastic learning by the Irish immigrants was made use of to the best advantage of the Carolingian heritage. Whereas hitherto a homogeneous Vulgate text had prevailed in post-Carolingian schools, namely that of Alcuin or its ancestral type, the school tradition now experienced the influx of a new type, the Irish text containing material derived from the Old Latin and the Greek. The two types were at once blended with each other, chiefly in Laon and Auxerre, where the most famous Frankish teachers of the time were active. Heiric of Auxerre enjoyed at Laon the lessons of Elias, an Irishman, who himself had been a pupil of John the Scot.² Elias taught him some Greek, but all the Greek employed by Heiric in his poems seems to be taken from the works of John the Scot. Heiric was one of the scholars who united the Carolingian heritage with the new Irish element, not only as far as the biblical text is concerned, but also as regards the general method of biblical studies.

A new feature also introduced by the Irish is the weight which philological considerations obtained in the school of Auxerre. For the first time readings were adopted which affected the style or the clarity, precision and

¹ These agreements are too numerous to be quoted here. But they include such singular variants as Mt ix 16 *inmittit* : *mittit*; 23 *principis* + *cuiusdam*; x 34 *venerim* : *veni*; xii 36 *rationem de eo* : *pro eo rationem*; 45 *om secum*; etc.

² Manitius, *op. cit.* i 500; Traube, *MG. Poetae Lat.* iii 422, note 2.

logical sequence of thoughts and language. This was partly caused by the new Irish readings which became known. Scholars had to decide whether the continental or the insular variant was the correct one. The commentaries also on the grammatical works of Priscianus, Donatus, and Martianus Capella, which were written in Auxerre at the instigation of Irishmen like Elias, Dunchad, or John, tended to sharpen interest in grammatical questions. The chief exponent of all these new tendencies, however, was Heiric's illustrious pupil, Remigius of Auxerre.

The important part played by Remigius in the growth of the scholastic structure is somewhat obscured by the unfortunate circumstance that very little is known of him. That he regarded himself in his philosophical and religious views as a pupil of John the Scot, is implied by a passage in his commentary on the Psalms, in which he not only emphasises the necessity of faith, but also the need for the intellect to penetrate into the secrets of the divine will.¹ But he at once adds that true knowledge is only possible with the guidance of the Church: 'There is no ascension to God except through the Church. The Church holds a most sublime building hidden away, whilst openly on the earth it has a temple, in which if you walk, and if you are not moved by the confusion of things, you will be guided to the joy of the inner and spiritual sound, so that you will despise everything outward, enraptured by that pleasure of the interior'. Such a view puts Remigius back again behind John the Scot. He reassumes the conception of the Church, enunciated by Rabanus and others, as an institution holding the sole right of the permanently true interpretation of the Bible, because its doctrines are deposited in patristic literature. Remigius's numerous biblical commentaries are dominated by this idea of the Church. The spirit of philosophical inquiry is allowed to move freely, as long as it leads the intellect to what the Fathers

¹ *In Ps xli* (Migne cxxxi 367). Hauréau, *Hist. de la phil. scol.* i 200, does not draw a correct inference from this passage.

recognised to be the profound truth. Wherever the limits set by the interpretation of the Church are transgressed, the philosopher falls into error. This is nothing new, of course; a similar view had been held before, at Tours and Fulda, but Remigius did positive and constructive work by joining the Irish textual tradition to the Carolingian stock. Though none of his innumerable commentaries on the gospels is preserved, it seems very likely that he wrote glosses on at least a part of the gospels. In Appendix B notice is given of two MS commentaries on Matthew and Mark, for Remigius's authorship of which we believe we have made out a certain case. Even if they are not of his making we must still assume that in his school at Auxerre he expounded the gospels in part, for his name is affixed to a number of glosses in the *Glossa Ordinaria*, a sure sign that the twelfth-century compiler of the *Glossa* knew and extracted gospel commentaries passing under Remigius's name.¹ It is interesting to find that John the Scot's commentary on John was used in the *Glossa* on this gospel, and it would be very satisfying to ascribe to Remigius the work of extracting portions from the original of John the Scot and compiling from them a sort of catena on John, which would have formed a preliminary stage of the *Glossa*.² This hypothesis would be specially attractive, as we know that Remigius abbreviated and revised John the Scot's commentary on the *Opuscula Sacra* of Boethius.³ There is, however, nothing to prove the conjecture, while there are weighty reasons which make it seem probable that the commentary of John did not become a constituent of the *Glossa* before the twelfth century. However that may be, we can at least prove that

¹ Sigebert of Gembloux, *Liber de illust. vir.* (Migne clx 573); author of the Prüfening catalogue (Migne ccxiii 963, no. 66).

² See Appendix B.

³ Many of Remigius's commentaries are as yet unknown. Codex cxcvii of Monte Casino (fourteenth century) contains *Epistolae Pauli glosatae*, the gloss of which is ascribed to Remigius in *Bibliotheca Casinensis* iv 116. See E. K. Rand, 'Iohannes Scottus' (*Traubes Quellen und Untersuchungen* i 2, München 1906, p. 97).

Remigius received a strong impulse from the Irish text as imported by the Irish scholars at Laon and Auxerre.

We may take it as a general rule that the exposition of the gospels by a teacher inclining to literary work produced glosses or compilations from abstracts of commentaries, and at the same time alterations in the text itself. The two things invariably go together, and, therefore, the history of the Vulgate text in a way is the history of the commentaries on the Vulgate. As regards Remigius we find that with him the Vulgate gospel text became impregnated with Irish and Old Latin readings which had become known through the Irish books brought over to the continental schools. A large number of readings formerly foreign to the post-Carolingian text were now received into it. The small selection of such readings given in the following list, therefore, must be understood to be formed of genuine scholastic readings taken over from the Irish texts in the school of Remigius at Auxerre as the result of a deliberate decision.

Harleian MS 2823, which we recognised above as representative of the Alcuinian recension, contains a number of variants from an Irish or Old Latin source, e.g. Mt vi 34 *sufficit + enim* vett DE^c PQRK; x 14 om *de (civitate)* vett Z^c mod; perhaps caused by gr $\xi\omega$ τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως; xi 1 *iesus + omnia verba haec* vett gatEW; xvi 9 *quinque milium : et quinque milia* vett Z^c W^c S; xviii 13 *gaudebit : gaudet* gr vett mod; xxi 5 om *et (sedens)* gr vett W^c S^c S^c; xxv 11 *novissime + vero* vett mod; Lc ii 7 *eis : ei* F PDLKW^c S^c.

Of Cott. MS Tib. A. ii the following variants belong to this category: Mt x 11 *quacumque + autem* H^o mod; xiii 23 *porro aliud : aliud vero* gr vett CT mod; Mc v 23 *manus : manum* vett W^c S^c S^c; viii 1 *cum turba multa esset + cum iesu* g₂ O^c W^c S^c S^c; ix 49 *victima + sale (sallietur)* gr vett F mod; Lc ix 15 *discumbere fecerunt : discubuerunt* gr vett G^c S^c; xxi 9 *non : nondum* vett vg (Mt xxiv 6); Jo iii 15 *in ipso : in ipsum* gr vett JCT* W^h S^c S^c; v 28 *eius : filii dei* gr vett aur^c S^c; xvi 3 *facient + vobis* gr vett IX* D mod; xix 6 *crucifige + eum* E mod.

Also in Egerton MS 608 this class of readings is represented: Mt v 30 *gehennam* : *perditionem* (sup. lin.); vi 6 *cum orabis* : *cum oraveris* E H^c mod; cf. *oras* vett according to ὅταν προσεύχη; perhaps *oraveris* is an attempt at a better rendering of the Greek form; see Chromatius of Aquileia (Migne xx 357 D); vii 11 *bona + data* (pr.) gr vett B E M K O^{g1} mod; Mc vi 13 *sanabant* : *sanabantur* gr g₂ X* Θ W ε ς; Lc i 54 *memorari* : *recordatus* a aur X* W ḡ ς ς; v 7 *ita ut + pene* vett W ε ς ς; vii 36 *rogabat* : *rogavit* vett G M; viii 18 om *ergo* vett; 27 *egressus* : *ingressus* Q; ix 39 *illum* : *eum* vett R M vg; x 7 om *autem* (m. pr.) vett R; xviii 36 *interrogabat* : *interrogavit* vett K; xxii 1 om *festus* (m. pr.) vett, cf. ἡ ἑορτή; Jo iii 4 *nasci* (alt.) : *renasci* vett O B Q Θ ε ς ς; 8 *et (quo vadat)* : *aut* gr vett J W ε ς ς; xiii 12 *sua + et* gr vett O* T B F D E ε ς; xv 15 *quaecumque* : *quae* gr vett; xvi 7 *si enim + ego* gr vett O B Q E^c M.

There are a few Old Latin or Irish readings also in Harl. MS 2830: Mt xxv 41 *praeparatus* : *paratus* f Z* J O* C B D E Θ mod; 44 *respondebunt + ei* vett C T H^c Θ mod; Lc i 35 *nascetur + ex te* gr vett G M P B. . . M O^c T^c mod.¹

Not only did these readings become known at Auxerre, but they also ousted the corresponding Alcuinian readings from their long-held positions. This can only have happened after they had undergone a critical examination, i.e. when it was thought that they represented a better verbal shell for surrounding the involved sense than the expressions hitherto in use. A similar method of criticism had been used before by John the Scot, who had adopted readings from the Old Latin and the Greek, if they seemed to fit the sense better than the alternative ones. But he would never have admitted the rigid distinction between the literal or historical, and the mystic or allegorical meaning of the Bible, the latter being the reality which the Bible purported to convey. John saw in the biblical

¹ These are not all the new variants penetrating from insular MSS into the traditional text of the schools. They can easily be discerned in the Apparatus of the Oxford N.T. by the group ir W vg.

word merely a sign with one meaning, the spiritual one conveying the reality which it is the purpose of the Bible to convey. With John theology was a science only understood by the initiated who were full of the spirit. He who is not a priori inspired by the commandments of Christian morals, the belief in God, the sacraments, and the Church, is unable to understand the realities of Scripture at all. 'Quis de natura ineffabili quippiam a seipso repertum dicere praesumat, praeter quod illa ipsa de seipso in suis sanctis organis, theologis dico, modulata est?'¹ God has revealed himself in the Book; of him alone, therefore, something can be found in it. Such a super-realism, to which the spiritual was the only reality, differed from continental scholastic realism. The difference is also obvious in John's attitude to patristic literature. It is not a guardian of the sense, endowed with authoritative power. The Fathers are no more than collaborators in the same work of eliciting the realities from the veiled mystery of the Bible.² Accordingly, John in his rather original commentary on the Fourth Gospel was often influenced by the opinions of St Augustine.

Remigius follows John the Scot, inasmuch as he selects from alternative readings the one which appears best to correspond with the real, spiritual sense of the passage.³ Yet, again, he dissents from the Irishman in believing that the sense is permanently fixed by patristic teaching and the commentaries of the famous Doctors. This obviously is a return to the Rabanian school looking up to the Church as sole trustee of the absolute dogmatic truth inherited from the Fathers. Remigius, therefore, holds an intermediate position between the dualism of the early school tradition and the super-realistic monism of the Irish tradition. Consequently his attention was directed to textual criticism, whereas the method he applied to that purpose was based

¹ *De div. nat.* i 64 (Migne cxxii 509 B).

² *Ib.* ii 16 (*l.c.* col. 548 f.); also *ib.* col. 1244.

³ E.g. *In Genesisim* xiii 1 (Migne cxxxii 83).

on the authority of the usual patristic commentaries. The spiritual realities with which the Church had to deal were chiefly codified in the Prophets (i.e. the Old Testament), the Evangelists (i.e. the New Testament), and the Doctors of the Church (i.e. the patristic commentaries).¹ The two former and the latter were inseparably bound together, because only in their union was the grand conception of the Bible revealed.² The true contents of the Bible had to be found in the writings of the Fathers, or, what was fundamentally the same thing, in the teaching of the Church.³ For the Church was completely at one with the patristic doctrines; without these there would have been no Church.⁴

REMIGIUS'S TREATMENT OF THE VULGATE TEXT

In such ideas must be sought the justification for Remigius receiving into his text variant readings for the sole reason that they were required by the biblical expositions of the Fathers. All the readings cited above and taken over, in most cases from a small number of Irish or Old Latin MSS, were in reality submitted to a regular examination and only absorbed into the text of the school at Auxerre if they fulfilled the conditions. Such readings were retained throughout the later history of the text, as testified by W vg. As to their provenance, then, these readings were of Irish or, more often, Old Latin origin, taken from such texts as Royal MS 1. A. xviii or Add. 9381, or others of the same family as that quoted by John the Scot.⁵ But their appearance in the continental Vulgate text at the end of the ninth century and after is due to the realistic principle of textual criticism as applied by teachers like Remigius. We now proceed to quote the patristic passages to which the reception of the above readings by Remigius may possibly be ascribed (see p. 116 f.).

¹ *Expos. in Epp. s. Pauli, ad Ephes. iv* (Migne cxvii 720 A).

² *In Cantica canticorum i* (*ib.* col. 299 c).

³ *Ib.* cols. 299-300.

⁴ *Ib.* col. 301 c.

⁵ In some cases, however, even the verbal form of the new reading was determined by the patristic commentary.

Mt v 30 *gehennam : perditionem*. The reading *perditionem* has as its only foundation Jerome's exposition of Mt x 28 (*l.c.* 68: 'Futura ergo supplicia et poenae perpetuae, quibus peccatores cruciandi sunt, huius loci, i.e. gehennae, vocabulo denotantur'). It may seem strange that for an explanation of v 30 Remigius should have resorted to Jerome's remark on x 28. Such nevertheless was the case, for in the Glossa Ordinaria, too, Jerome's note just cited served as the only comment upon v 30.

vi 34 *sufficit + enim*. The addition is supported by Jerome (Migne xxvi 47: 'Sufficit ergo nobis praesentis temporis cogitatio'), Hilary (Migne ix 950: 'satis enim vitae nostrae malitia . . . et peccata sufficiunt'), and Augustine (Migne xxxiv 1294: 'sufficit enim, inquit, diei malitia sua').

vii 11 + *data*. Augustine, *Sermones* (Migne xxviii 409: *bona data*); and *De Sermone Domini in Monte* (Migne xxxiv 1303): 'Bona vero quae dant secundum eorum sensum bona dicenda sunt, quia haec pro bonis habent. Quanquam et in rerum natura ista bona sint, sed temporalia et ad istam vitam infirmam pertinentia; et quisquis ea malus dat, non de suo dat: Domini est enim terra et plenitudo eius'. So the sense is that good things are *given* to bad men, and this makes the addition of *data* (i.e. past participle, 'given') necessary.

x 11 *quancumque + autem*. There is a contrast contained in this sentence, according to Hilary (*l.c.* 968): 'Sed introeuntes civitatem de digno iubet interrogare'.

14 om *de (civitate)*. In this form the verse is quoted by Jerome (*l.c.* 66), Rabanus (Migne cvii 896), pseudo-Bede (Migne xcii 53).

xi 1 + *omnia verba haec*. Rabanus's commentary presupposes the addition (*l.c.* 907f.: 'Ostendit evangelista ipsum dominum id factis ut bonum magistrum implere, quod eum constat verbis ante mandasse'). Also pseudo-Bede (*l.c.* 56).¹

xiii 23 *porro aliud : aliud vero*. The latter form is quoted by Jerome (*l.c.* 91 D) and twice by Rabanus (*l.c.* 945 C, D).

xvi 9 *et quinque milia*. Jerome interprets his quotation *et quinque milium* as follows (*l.c.* 118): 'Docet eos quid significant quinque panes, et septem; quinque millia hominum, et quattuor millia'. See Rabanus (*l.c.* 988).

xviii 13 *gaudet*. The present, instead of the future, tense is

¹ Even comparatively modern authors were often regarded as authorities in hermeneutical questions. See Remigius's remark, Migne cxvii 720 B.

constantly used in the explanation of *gaudet* (*gaudebit*) by Hilary (*l.c.* 1020) and Rabanus (*l.c.* 1010).

xxi 5 om *et* (*sedens*). *Et* is omitted by Jerome (*l.c.* 152). Also cf. Bede (*Homilies*, Migne xciv 122f.: 'Rex vero mansuetus mansuetis terram pacis tribuit. . . : *sedens*, inquit, *super asinam*'), and Rabanus (*l.c.* 1037f.).

xxv 11 + *vero*. Quoted by Jerome (*l.c.* 193).

41 *praeparatus* : *paratus*. See Jerome (*l.c.* 197) and Rabanus (*l.c.* 1097).

44 + *ei*. Jerome (*l.c.* 197).

Mc v 23 *manus* : *manum*. The alteration is based upon the authority of Augustine, *De consensu*, ii 28 (Migne xxxiv 1109f.): '*Sed veni, impone manum tuam super eam et vivet. Dicunt hoc et alii duo, Marcus et Lucas . . . [Iesus sic venit,] ut manum imponendo [filiam] mori non sineret, non ut qui posset mortuam suscitare*'.

vi 13 *sanabant* : *sanabantur*. The latter form in pseudo-Jerome (i.e. Remigius; *l.c.* 629 A). Also Bede (*l.c.* 183): 'Patet ab ipsis apostolis hunc sanctae Ecclesiae morem esse traditum, ut . . . aegroti unguantur oleo pontificali benedictione consecrato'.

viii 1 + *cum iesu*. This addition seems to have arisen in liturgy books, cf. the Roman Missal of Milan, 1474, ed. for the Bradshaw Society, by Lippe, p. 265; also in all modern Missals, but not in \mathcal{C} . The addition naturally occurs in expositions of the pericopes: in Bede's *Homilies* (Migne xciv 280), in Smaragdus of St Mihiel (Migne cii 407), and in Haymo of Halberstadt (Migne cxviii 634).

ix 49 + *sale*. The addition is supported by pseudo-Jerome (i.e. Remigius himself? cf. Appendix B) on Mark (Migne xxx 639): '*Omnis enim victima sale salietur. Vere victima Domini est . . . , qui non sale aspergitur, sed igne consumitur. . . . In omnibus sacrificiis sal, quia nullum opus bonum sine sapientia*'. Also Bede (Migne xcii 227): '*Victima sale salietur. . . . Caro recens sale conditur. . . . Quod enim sale salitur, vermis putredinem arceat*'.

Lc i 35 + *ex te*. See Bede (*l.c.* 319 A).

ii 7 *eis* : *ei*. *Ei* is quoted by Gregory (Migne lxxvi 1103). But Ambrose (Migne xv 1648) was the first to refer the pronoun not to Mary and Joseph, but to the Child: 'Lege quid Christus egerat [in diversorio]'. Also Bede (*l.c.* 331): 'Qui ad dexteram Patris sedet, in diversorio loco eget, ut nobis in domo patris sui multas mansiones praepararet'.

v 7 + *pene*. Ambrose (*l.c.* 1720): 'Mihi cumulus iste [piscium]

suspectus est, ne plenitudine sui naves *pene* mergantur; oportet enim et haereses esse, ut probentur boni'.

ix 15 *discumbere fecerunt: discubuerunt*. See Mc vi 40, Jo vi 10. Ambrose (*l.c.* 1777): 'Illi [Mc vi] supra fenum discumbunt, isti supra terram recumbunt'. Bede (*l.c.* 450): 'Diversi convivantium discubitus non solum quinquageni, sed [attestante Marco] etiam centeni discubuerunt'.

xxi 9 *non: nondum*. Cf. Ambrose (*l.c.* 1899 A); Gregory, *Homilies* (Migne lxxvi 1259 A, C).

xxii 1 *om festus*. Bede (*l.c.* 592): 'Evangelii scriptura indifferenter et diem azymorum pro pascha, et pro diebus azymorum pascha ponere solet... Septem ex ordine dies sequuntur azymorum'.

Jo iii 4 *iterato introire et renasci*. *Renasci* expresses more appropriately the element of repetition inherent in the sentence, according to Augustine (*l.c.* 1478): 'Iam natus sum de Adam, non me potest iterum generare Adam; iam natus sum de Christo, non me potest iterum generare Christus'. Also Bede, *Homilies* (Migne xciv 198; Alcuin, *l.c.* 778): 'Nicodemus secundae nativitatis adhuc nescius erat... ideo de una quam noverat nativitate, an posset iterari, vel quo ordine regeneratio posset impleri, quaerebat... Hoc etiam de spiritali est regeneratione sentiendum'.

8 *et: aut*. Cf. Bede, *Homilies* (*l.c.* 199), Alcuin (*l.c.* 780).

15 *in ipso: in ipsum*. Bede, *Homilies* (Migne xciv 201): 'Qui credit in ipsum, quia qui credit in Christum, perditionem evadit'. Also Alcuin on John (Migne c 782).

v 28 *eius: filii dei*. The variant is required by Alcuin (*l.c.* 813 f.): 'Resurgant nunc in mente per verbum Dei, Filium Dei... Distinctio est inter illud verbum quod dicit, quod *Mortui audient vocem Filii Dei*, et inter illud quod ait, *Venit hora, in qua omnes qui in monumentis sunt, audient vocem Filii Dei*'.

xiii 12 + *et (cum recubisset)*. Alcuin (*l.c.* 926): 'Accepit vestimenta sua tertio die de sepulcro resurgens... *Et cum recubisset iterum, ascendit in coelum*'.

xv 15 *quaecumque: quae*. Gregory (*l.c.* 1206; and Alcuin, *l.c.* 946): 'Omnia quaecumque audivi a patre... Quae sunt omnia, quae audivit a Patre suo, quae nota fieri voluit servis suis?'

xvi 3 + *vobis*. Christ is speaking to his adherents about the evils they will have to suffer for his sake—such is the meaning of the passage according to Augustine (Migne xxxv 1866): '*Haec facient vobis*. Hoc est, non cognoverunt Deum nec eius

Filium, cui se in vobis occidendis praestare arbitrantur obsequium. . . . Praenuntiat suis quae mala essent pro eius testimonio perpressuri?.

7 *si enim* + *ego*. There is an antithesis in the verse, see Alcuin's exposition (*l.c.* 951). This fact prepared the way for the introduction of *ego* into the text.

Another class of readings to make their first appearance in the school of Auxerre were those of a grammatical nature. In a way these are on the same level as those grounded on patristic authority, for if the words of the text were subordinated to the realities believed to be contained in the Bible and expounded by the Fathers, it was also possible to elevate the rules of Latin grammar to the rôle of readjusting the grammatical form of the material outside, the mere sound, especially as the works of the Latin grammarians formed a subject warmly cherished by the Irish (Dunchad was especially famous for his knowledge of grammar), and cultivated by Heiric and Remigius. From the ninth century onwards there existed grammatical treatises closely following the steps of Martianus Capella, Donatus, Priscianus and others, and commenting upon their works.¹ Writings of this kind probably caused the numerous small alterations noticed in late ninth-century and later MSS, as in the tense and the mood of verbs, in the case of nouns (e.g. Mt iv 13 *habitavit in capharnaum maritima* J C T W vg, instead of the accusative *maritimam* in the Vulgate), in the choice of the pronoun (e.g. Lc ix 39 *illum : eum* R M vg), in the order of words, etc. Especially in the latter category a systematical uniformity becomes noticeable at the end of the ninth century, first of all in those MSS which experienced the effects of the Auxerre school of textual criticism.

Harl. MS 2823, Cott. MS Tib. A. ii, and other MSS read: Mt iv 9 > *haec omnia tibi* T E Q R Z³ mod; Mc viii 1 > *in diebus illis* vg; in Mt iv 16 the original hand of Harl. MS

¹ On medieval grammatical conceptions, cf. C. Thurot, 'Divers mss latins des doctrines grammaticales au moyen âge' (*Notices et Extraits* xxii, part 2, 1 ff.).

2830 read *lucem vidit magnam* with vulg; a corrector changed the order of the words into *vidit lucem magnam* with D vg. Other MSS write Mt ii 19 > *angelus domini apparuit* R mod; iii 11 > *baptizo vos* TYDER vg; v 16 > *opera vestra bona* OTir mod; Mc vi 31 > *spatium manducandi* mod; etc. Readings of this kind, which remained a permanent feature in the text from the late ninth century onwards, were in conformity with grammatical rules drawn up and taught in the schools about the same time.¹

CONTRAST BETWEEN THE PATRISTIC AND THE EARLY SCHOLASTIC POINTS OF VIEW

It will be useful at this point of our inquiry to revert to the problem formulated at the beginning. It cannot be denied that there is indeed a sharp contrast between the pre-Carolingian, or Augustinian, manner of biblical studies and that cultivated at Tours, Fulda, and Auxerre. Not only were the motives of these studies very different—Augustine asked for guidance in a Christian life of moral action, the early scholastics for a guide to theoretical truth—but the methods also belonged to two different systems of thought. In books II and III of *De Doctrina Christiana*, St Augustine developed a primarily inductive method of exegesis which relied chiefly on the knowledge of languages and of the figurative meaning of the various terms and on other means of philological criticism current in the classical scholarship of his time.² The third book is of greatest interest, for it treats of the difficulties in interpretation, especially as regards the secondary, spiritual sense of many passages. In all ambiguous passages, where it is not certain whether the literal or the allegorical meaning is to be accepted, the true meaning is that which promotes Christian action or confirms the faith.³ This was the only deductive element in Augustine's method

¹ The rule for the reversion of the order of words, see Thurot, *op. cit.* p. 87.

² *De doctr. Christ.* lib. ii, cc. 9 ff., 26, 27, 29.

³ *Ib.* lib. iii, cc. 2, 10.

of interpretation, and it was unavoidable, because all allegory is necessarily tied to preconceived thought. The Bible being the authority of the Christian Church, the literal sense must be understood wherever possible; in all other cases the allegorical meaning must be accepted.¹ Augustine's exegesis is characterised by his idea of the Church. The Church holds the true faith, and therefore differs from the pagans as well as from the Jews, who, though they possessed the divine word in the Old Testament, were unable to penetrate to its depths.² To be a Christian is to understand aright the things revealed in the holy books of the Jews and to refer them to Christ. From the Jews and from late Roman and Greek scholarship Augustine took over the method of interpreting the Old Testament, i.e. the allegorical method of the Alexandrian school, but for the false belief of Jews and pagans he substituted the *Auctoritas Ecclesiae* as a warrant for the truth of the explanation.³ In what this authority consists is not very clear; it seems to be the custom or use of the Christians who are full of the desire to serve God along the lines laid out by Augustine's ethics.

The new element emerging in the post-Carolingian schools is not, as might perhaps be supposed, the idea of the allegorical meaning (this is as old as Christianity itself), but the specific limitations given to ideas which were current before. St Augustine's aim had been to expound the Christian meaning of the text and to safeguard it against false beliefs. The Frankish scholars of the ninth century set out to provide the true belief with a theoretical and logical, we might even say, an epistemological foundation. This aim drove them to Boethius and Isidore and led to the rigorous dualist conception of word and meaning, a distinct methodical advantage, for it took away the uncertainty of the question, which passages were to have a literal, which an allegorical interpretation.

¹ *Ib.* lib. iii, c. 10; also c. 15.

² *Ib.* cc. 7, 9.

³ *Ib.* cc. 2, 6.

Throughout the whole Bible there was now the distinction between verbal sound and metaphysical realities, between the story and its mystic meaning. Moreover, as to the question, What exactly is the allegorical or mystic sense of a passage? all subjectivism was cut away by the new principle that the true meaning of the Scriptures was for ever contained in the patristic commentaries. Thereby a certain vagueness hovering round Augustine's *Auctoritas Ecclesiae* was successfully removed.

We see that the general scheme of biblical exposition had hardly changed, but the methodical innovations become obvious, if we compare *De Clericorum Institutione* of Rabanus with *De Doctrina Christiana* of St Augustine. There were two new principles which had risen from the Augustinian tradition. They did not much reflect Christian zeal and enthusiasm, it must be confessed. But they formed the first generally applicable method of hermeneutics, and, let it not be omitted, of textual criticism. For these subjects are closely interwoven, because they are two different aspects of the realist theory of language.

ODO AND THE NEW LEARNING AT FLEURY

Remigius of Auxerre became the instructor of a new generation, especially when he was called upon to teach at two schools (first at Rheims (893) and later at Paris (about 900–908)), which were to gain a wide reputation.¹ His greatest pupil at Paris was Odo, and we have seen with what diligence that young cleric acquired a taste for scholastic learning, to indulge in which, however, he was strongly discouraged, when he went back to Tours and afterwards turned monk at Beaume. Nor did he enjoy more freedom when he became abbot of Cluny. But it was of the greatest consequence for the history of early monasticism that in 930 he also reformed Fleury monastery on the Loire, where he was the first abbot until his

¹ Flodoardus, *Hist. Rem.* lib. iv, c. 9 (MG. Script. xiii 574). *Vita Odonis Cluniac.* i 19 (*Bibl. Cluniac.* col. 21).

death (942). Already under his rule, but still more under his successors, Fleury developed into a monastery where one-sided asceticism was less appreciated than in other dependencies of Cluny. Instead, the abbots and monks of Fleury aimed at cultivating ecclesiastical and theological education after the model of Remigius's schools at Rheims and Paris. This tendency lent Fleury an individual position among most monasteries of the time, and it was strengthened by the fact that the monastery could boast of a tradition of learning reaching back to the days of Theodulf of Orleans.¹ Fleury soon made itself independent of Cluny and was free to develop of its own accord into a new centre of monastic reform.

It is significant that during the whole tenth century there was a lively intercourse between Rheims and Paris on the one hand and Fleury on the other. When Archbishop Fulco of Rheims desired to reform the monastery of St Remy, he did not apply to the abbot of Cluny, but to Ercambold, Odo's successor at Fleury.² It can be deduced from the connections with England upheld by Ercambold, that he, too, was well versed in the *scientia divinarum litterarum*. But the most influential part in the relations between Fleury and early scholastic learning was played by a later abbot, Abbo (988-1004). Long before he became abbot he had been a pupil at Fleury under Ercambold's successor, Abbot Wulfald (about 950-962), and at the same time he had attended the schools at Rheims and Paris. Already during the lifetime of Wulfald he became head-preceptor at Fleury, and he held this office until he was elected abbot in 988. It enabled him by continual teaching to attain to a yet higher proficiency in the study of the Scriptures and of the commentaries than he had gained in his youth. At Fleury, therefore, we meet with the singular phenomenon that from Odo's reform until at least the death of

¹ Cf. the ancient *Catalogus abbatum Floriacensium* (Migne cxxxix 581 A).

² Flodoardus, lib. iv, c. 32 (*l.c.* p. 583).

Abbo the particular kind of learning taught in the schools of Remigius was focussed at one point whence it could spread to all the monasteries whose abbots, eager for monastic reform, came to Fleury to ask for the assistance of Fleury monks.

There is yet another testimony to the chief subjects studied at Fleury, and indubitably recalling the scholastic system of Remigius, namely the catalogue of the library.¹ The following numbers of this catalogue have a reference to our subject:

2. Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomus, commentariis illustrata, quorum initium est: Confirmo si quis quaerat cur libri legis divisi sint.
15. Annotationes in libros Regum, quarum initium est: Fuit vir unus.
23. Liber cuius inscriptio est: Odonis abbatis monasterii expositio Apocalypsis evangelistae Johannis, cuius initium est: Incipiunt capitula libri primi expositionis.
26. Liber expositionum in duodecim prophetas qui vocantur minores.
32. Glossae de veteri et novo Testamento.
48. Expositio anonymi in evangelium Joannis.
49. Expositio anonymi in evangelium Matthei et Marci.
73. Quaestiones in Evangelia.
90. Expositio in Tobiam, Judith usque ad Machabeos. Liber Regum, quem praecedit praefatio sancti Hieronymi.
96. Priscianus. Glossulae eiusdem et glossulae super Apocalypsin.
103. Expositio multorum doctorum in epistolas Pauli ad Romanos, Ephesios, usque ad Hebraeos.
104. Expositio in Genesim, Exodum, et alia, usque ad Acta Apostolorum, cuique initium est: Reverendo domino patri.
123. Glossae super Cantica canticorum.
134. Scholia in evangelium Joannis.
157. Ecclesiasticus cum explicatione cuiusdam anonymi.

¹ Unfortunately it dates back only to 1552. But (according to Manitius ii 668) none of the works entered therein reached Fleury library later than the eleventh century. The catalogue was printed by L. Delisle, *Notices et Extraits xxxi*, part 1, 426 ff.

202. Expositio anonymi cuiusdam in Genesim, Exodum, Leviticum, Numerum et Deuteronomium.
219. Glossulae super epistolas Pauli; super Apocalypsin et super totum Priscianum.
295. Glossae antiquorum auctoritate roboratae et studio eruditorum collectae.

There is unfortunately no clue to suggest at what time exactly the books of this remarkable list were written. But they make it certain that for nearly two centuries the school at Fleury must have been second to none in the study of the patristic commentaries.¹ Extracts from these commentaries (nos. 73, 295), containing the true spiritual meaning of the biblical word, were collected in special books. What Odo had not been able to do at Cluny, he seems to have indulged in at Fleury, for no. 23 must have been a commentary by him on the Apocalypse, which is lost to-day. Probably this work conformed to the Remigian style of biblical commentaries; it may have been a preliminary stage of what later became known as the *Glossa Ordinaria* on the Apocalypse. It is likely that nos. 2, 15, 104, 202 were works of Rabanus, retouched probably at Auxerre, Rheims, or Fleury.² No. 32 recalls the *Glossulae in totam Scripturam* ascribed to Rabanus by Notker Balbulus. Nos. 48 and 134 might have had some connection with John the Scot on the gospel of St John.³ Nos. 96 and 219 unmistakably bear the imprint of the grammatical and exegetic studies predominant at Auxerre and Rheims and leading to the production of glosses and other explanatory writings on the authors

¹ There are no less than forty (of a total of 300) items representing original patristic commentaries on various Books of the Bible.

² No. 202 might be Rabanus's commentary on the Pentateuch; no. 15 certainly is a work of his, for the Incipit agrees with that of his printed commentary (Migne cix 11). No. 2 is possibly a revised form of part of his commentary on the Pentateuch; the Incipit occurs in one of the prefaces of the *Glossa Ordinaria* on Leviticus (Migne cxiii 297). The Incipit of no. 104 resembles that of Rabanus's commentary on Genesis (MS P, see MG. Epp. v 393).

³ No. 203 is another work of Erigena: *Dionisii Areopagitae libri iiii*.

studied.¹ So it can confidently be maintained that the field of biblical study, with all that the subject involved at the time, had moved in the tenth century from the schools of Remigius to Fleury. At Fleury the Vulgate text of Remigius became generally received and recognised, for it bore the imprint of Church authority in the guise of variant readings, which owed their existence to the same sources in which the Church held its doctrine to be deposited.

ABBO OF FLEURY

The idea of the sublime authority of the Church in all matters haunts the writings of Abbo, the eminent teacher at Fleury. Remigius had been the first to put a greater emphasis on the unconditional authority of the Church in questions of doctrine and biblical exegesis. In Abbo this tendency becomes even stronger, for he extends it to legal matters as well, for which he has recourse to the writings of the Fathers and the decrees of the councils. The sum of legal customs and decisions, the usage as developed in the course of time, forms the body of ecclesiastical law to which Abbo appeals in defending the rights of his monastery against the transgressions of bishops and nobles. According to him absolute certainty can be achieved on matters relating to the present as well as the future life in the teaching of the Church, which has ever been above misconception, because the code, patristic literature, to which the Church refers, is beyond ambiguity. Unless we are convinced that the Fathers recognised and gave utterance to the truth in their writings, all security is gone, we must despair of ever knowing the absolute truth, theoretical no less than practical and moral:

¹ L. Delisle (*op. cit.* p. 365) gives a description of no. 219 (now Orleans MS 87, twelfth century). The Incipit of the gloss on the Pauline Epistles resembles that of Rabanus's commentary (Migne cxi 1275). The Incipit of the gloss on the Apocalypse agrees with that of Remigius's commentary (Migne cxvii 937). Both glosses may have been notes taken at lectures in which these commentaries were read.

As the key-holder of the heavenly kingdom is the head of the Apostles, so the Roman Church has the prerogative of authority over its members all over the world. He, then, who doubts the Roman Church, what does he else but surrender his membership and join the enemies of Christ? That great and unapproachable council of Nicaea, which according to the saying of St Gregory ought to be esteemed like the gospel itself, decreed that the privileges of every church should be observed. Let us not adduce the writings of holy men and especially of the bishops of Rome, in order to defend the prejudices of the moderns; let us not ignore their verdicts, while we venerate their memory. For if the moderns despise the decrees of the ancients, which they ought to obey, to what should we come? Is it not as if lead swam on water, while wood sank to the ground?¹

The appeal to the meaning (*sententia*) of the patristic sayings shows the scholar trained in the exegetical methods of the time. The patristic commentaries belonged to the Bible, both were complementary and equally necessary.² The Fathers had expounded the true contents of Christ's teaching.³ They were, therefore, the foundation of the Church, the Church taught what they had taught, and he who dissented from the Church was not faithful, but heretical.⁴ Thus was the medieval concept of the Church.

Abbo's biographer Aimoinus tells us that even during his abbacy Abbo was occupied with literary studies.⁵ His spare moments are said to have been filled with reading, writing, or dictating. He studied the Bible, gleaning expository passages from the Fathers, in the typical early scholastic method.⁶ Perhaps he also did some work in textual criticism. We have at any rate a letter to Odilo, Abbot of Cluny, in which he explains the figures of the Eusebian sections affixed to the gospels. In the English gospel MSS of the Winchester class a very careful notation

¹ Epist. 5 (Migne cxxxix 423 f.).

² Epist. 14 (*ib.* col. 443).

³ St Augustine is called (Epist. 7, *ib.* col. 428): 'Omnium ecclesiasticarum quaestionum singulariter subtilissimus expositor'.

⁴ *Apologeticus* (*ib.* col. 462).

⁵ *Vita S. Abbonis* (*ib.* col. 393 D).

⁶ *Ib.* col. 394 A.

of these sections is to be found, and it is perhaps not mere fancy to assign to Abbo a certain share in the well-proportioned execution of the English gospel MSS of that time.

FLEURY AND THE CLUNIAC REFORM OF THE ENGLISH MONASTERIES

In the second half of the tenth century there was a flourishing traffic between Fleury and some southern English monasteries, and as a consequence the Vulgate text of the continental schools found its way to England. Soon after the reform of Fleury the fame of the monastery on the Loire had spread to the Island, for Archbishop Oda of Canterbury, who was elected in 942, considered it a special favour that before his enthronisation he was received into the Order of monks by no less a personage than the Abbot of Fleury.¹ A second and more decisive step in establishing closer connections with Fleury was taken by Oswald, a nephew of Archbishop Oda, who held the revenues of Winchester monastery and after a time became dissatisfied with the worldly, irregular life of the inmates. 'In those days', Oswald's biographer says,² 'there was nobody in England who lived a monastic life, and the very rules of the holy institution were unknown. Although the inmates were quite worthy clerics, they did not apply the wealth they greedily accumulated to the benefit of the Church, but spent it on their wives.' Serious and religious minds were eager to see the monasteries submitted to the severe discipline reigning on the Continent. Everywhere there was a desire for monastic reformation, partly for reasons of ecclesiastical organisation, but chiefly because of the increasing wave of asceticism among personalities responsible for the conduct of the monasteries. These persons considered the

¹ *Vita Odonis Archiep. Cantuar.* (Wharton, *Anglia Sacra* ii 82).

² *Vita Oswaldi auct. anon.*, in *Historians of the Church of York* i (R.S. 1879, 411).

literary (or, to use the term of the period, the scientific) education of some continental schools, and particularly of the monastic school of Fleury, as a means for realising their asceticism.¹ Among the Englishmen thus minded there was Oswald. Archbishop Oda advised his nephew to go to Fleury, and for a time Oswald lived as a monk at Fleury and apparently excelled in practising the monastic virtues. Some years after his return to England Oswald went to Fleury for a second time,² accompanied by his pupil Germanus, whom he left behind at Fleury 'to learn the Rule'. On these journeys he was presumably able to bring back to England some book or other from the well-stocked library at Fleury. Among these were the first copies of the gospel books which, from their uniform style of illumination and script, may be classed together and are usually known as the Winchester gospels. The first copies were actually written at Winchester (later on the Winchester style was imitated in other English monasteries), where Oswald went in 958 to take part in the monastic reform under Dunstan. His pupil Germanus soon returned from Fleury to become prior of the newly founded monastery of Ramsey. On his invitation Abbo of Fleury paid him a two years' visit at Ramsey, in order to instruct the young monks in the *scientia litterarum*.³ We know that even after this visit Abbo did not lose contact with Oswald and Dunstan.

THE WINCHESTER TEXT: THE YORK MINSTER GOSPELS

With the possible exception of the Copenhagen Codex Gl. kgl. S. 10. fol., the first English gospel book connected

¹ Before Æthelwold became Abbot of Abingdon, he intended to 'go beyond the sea' (*Vita Ethelwoldi*, c. 10; *Acta Sanct., mens. Aug.* i 91): 'Vir Domini Adelwoldus, adhuc cupiens ampliori Scripturarum scientia doceri, et monastica religione perfectius informari, decrevit ultramarinas adire partes' (also cc. 6, 9). With almost the same words Oswald asked his uncle to send him to a continental monastery: *Vita Oswaldi auct. anon. l.c.* p. 412.

² Eadmer, c. 9 (*Historians of the Church of York, l.c.* ii 14).

³ *Vita s. Abbonis*, cc. 4, 5 (Migne cxxxix 392).

with Fleury and Winchester is a MS the presence of which on English soil must needs be associated with Oswald. In 972 Oswald became Archbishop of York, and the MS in question dates from about 960-970 and was taken by Oswald to York, where it is still preserved to-day. This book, the York Minster gospels, was written partly on the Continent, and partly in England.¹ The design of the pictures of the evangelists prefixed to each gospel, as well as the bulk of the text, were probably done on the Continent, but by an Anglo-Saxon hand. The first leaf of the text proper, containing Mt i 1-18, was written by a different (and continental?) hand and possibly served as the model which the Anglo-Saxon scribe was required to emulate throughout the text. At this stage the quires must have been taken to England, where the colour was added to the drawings and the initials. Moreover one quire was added at the beginning containing the ordinary prefatory matter (namely: (1) Hieronymus ad Damasum; (2) Argumentum: *Sciendum tamen...*; (3) Eusebius Carpiano...; (4) Prologus: *Plures fuisse...*; (5) eight pages with the tables of the canons; (6) Prologus: *Mattheus ex iudea...*; (7) Breviarium: *Nativitas Christi...*, agreeing with C in Mt, with K in the other gospels). As to its origin, therefore, we may justly call this book symbolical of the products of the Winchester scriptorium, all of which may be described as a specially refined English variety of a continental model.

The text of the York Minster gospels shows the mixture characteristic of the Winchester text. First there is a number of archaic Irish readings, such as: Mt i 2 *abraham + autem*; iv 10 *vade + retro*; v 43 *odio habebis : odies*; Mc v 2 *exeunti ei : exeunte eo* D; vi 3 *fabri filius et mariae*; 9 *sandalis : scandalis*; Lc i 71 *salutem + et liberavit nos (!)*; 74 *manu : manibus*; viii 23 *complebatur fluctibus navicula*; etc. Then there are variants of the Alcuinian type: Mt iii 2 *appropinquabit*;

¹ The book is discussed by J. P. Gilson, *Description of the Saxon MS of the Four Gospels in the Library of York Minster* (privately printed), York 1925.

v 47 *facitis* : *facietis*; Mc v 2 *omei* (alt.); 7 *dixit + ei*; vi 15 + *quia* (*propheta*); 32 *in navem*; vii 4 *om sunt* (pr.); viii 13 + *navem*; 33 > *hominum sunt*; 34 *om post*; 37 *commutationis*; 38 *confessus . . . confitetur*; Lc i 77 *remissionem* : *remissione*; xix 37 *discentium* : *discipulorum*; Jo i 15 *om vobis*; v 2 *om super*; xviii 28 *ad caiphan*. Lastly, there are the readings which were adopted and gradually recognised in the schools, outcomes of the hermeneutic method: Mt iv 9 > *omnia tibi* Z³ W vg E Q R; 16 *in regione umbrae* V vg H Θ B (cf. Jerome on Matthew, *ad loc.*); v 23 *offeres* : *offers* H^c V mod; 40 *tecum + in* M O^{gl} W ε ϣ ε; *remitte* : *dimitte* ir mod; Mc ii 2 *caperet* : *caperentur*; v 23 *manus* : *manum* vett W ε ϣ ε; 35 *ad archisynagogum* K W ε ϣ ε; vi 13 *sanabant* : *sanabantur* X* Θ W ε ε; viii 29 > *esse dicitis* Q M vg; Lc i 29 *vidisset* : *audisset* A-Y M O^{sax} mod; 45 *beata + es* (*quae credidisti . . . tibi*) Ambrose, Augustine; 50 *a progenie in progenies* cor. vat. mg vg; ii 15 *quod fecit dominus et ostendit* A-Y X^e K W ε ε; 34 + *in* (*resurrectionem*) vett vg; 51 *verba haec + conferens* cor. vat.*; iii 14 *eum* : *illum* Z-alc cor. vat.*; 18 *populum* : *populo* vett T Θ X^e mod; iv 18 *misit me + sanare contritos corde* vett Q V cor. vat. mod; v 7 *ita ut + pene* vett W cor. vat.* ε ϣ ε; xv 17 + *in domo* W ε ϣ ε; xvi 21 *divitis + sed (!) nemo illi dabat* K T W ε ϣ ε; Jo i 29 *peccatum* : *peccata* vett O W cor. vat. ε ε.

The Copenhagen MS Gl. kgl. S. 10. fol. dates from the late tenth or early eleventh century.¹ The writing and the illuminations (pictures of the Evangelists) place the book into the near neighbourhood of the other Winchester books. The text, too, is that of the Winchester gospels. Conspicuous scholastic readings are: Mt vii 11 *bona* (pr.) + *data* vett E K M O^{gl} Augustine, mod; Mc iv 10 *parabolas* : *parabolam* W vg; Lc v 7 + *pene*; xv 17 + *in domo*; Jo xviii 28 *ad caiphan* (m. pr.), *a caipha* (m. alt.).

¹ E. Jørgensen, *Catalogus Codicum Latinorum Medii Aevi Bibliothecae Regiae Hafniensis*, 1923-1926; *Greek and Latin Illuminated MSS in Danish Collections*, 1921, no. 7.

OTHER WINCHESTER BOOKS (AND
THE THORNEY GOSPELS)

The other Winchester MSS of the gospels were written some decades later than the York codex. Their text, though not agreeing with the York book in all details, is representative of the same fundamental strata of Vulgate history. They all had one ancestor in common, possibly a MS of continental provenance copied several times at Winchester. This prototype may perhaps be connected with the activities of Æthelwold, the greatest of Anglo-Saxon monastic reformers. Even when a monk in Glastonbury he was desirous to go to Fleury and obtain some knowledge of the Benedictine Rule and of monastic life established on its lines. But King Eadred, appreciating his talents, kept him at home and made him Abbot of Abingdon. There Æthelwold had sufficient scope for his plans. He sent his pupil Osgar to Fleury to become acquainted with the regular life of the continental practice and afterwards to be of help in the English reform. Osgar returned in 963, when Æthelwold had just been made Bishop of Winchester, and then there began, under the auspices of Æthelwold and Dunstan, the radical reform of the Island monasteries.

First of all at Abingdon, then in the two houses at Winchester, the secular clergy were forced to leave the premises and their places taken by new men willing to bear the hardships of regular monastic life.¹ Then, with the consent of Dunstan, who had been Archbishop of Canterbury since 959, Æthelwold and his assistants introduced the rigours of the Rule into a series of monasteries.² Special mention is made, in the chronicles, of Ely, Peterborough, and Thorney, which were either founded or refounded and put into the charge of trustworthy abbots.³

¹ *Vita s. Ethelwoldi* (*Acta Sancti*, mens. Aug. i 92 f.).

² On Dunstan's part in the reform, cf. *Vita auct. Osberno* (Stubbs, *Memorials of St Dunstan*, R.S. 1874), p. 110 ff.

³ *Vita s. Ethelwoldi* (*l.c.* p. 93 D, E).

Æthelwold attended with the greatest care to the necessities of spiritual and material life in the new monasteries.¹ Peterborough monastery was presented about 984 with some two dozen books. Of these MSS, 'þe Adeluuold biscop gesealde in to Burch', as the ancient list recording the gift says,² the following numbers are of particular interest from our point of view:

1. Beda in marcum.
2. Expositio hebreorum nominum.
13. Commentum in cantica canticorum.
15. Commentum martiani.
19. De litteris grecorum.

These are writings recalling the studies in the schools of Auxerre, Rheims, and Fleury. From the newly founded monastery of Thorney at least one book given by Æthelwold is known to us to-day, the gospel MS Add. 40000 in the B.M. written on the Continent (ss. 9-10). This book, on account of its age and venerable associations with the founder, was honoured later with the entries of various data and events referring to the history of the monastery, e.g. the Liber Vitae and a list of relics. A fifteenth-century hand added an important list of the abbots, from which it is evident with what minute care Æthelwold provided for the houses of his founding.³

¹ Ordericus Vitalis, *Hist. Eccles.* P. ii, lib. iv, c. 9 (Migne clxxxviii 324).

² M. R. James, *Lists of MSS formerly in Peterborough Abbey Library* (Bibliogr. Soc. Oxford 1926), p. 19.

³ Add. MS 40000, fol. 11^r: 'Anno dominice incarnationis Nongentesimo lxxiiij^o Inclitissimus Rex et Princeps preclarissimus Eadgarus concessit Sancto Aethelwoldo Winton^o episcopo Cartam Fundacionis et construccionis huius monasterii Thorney, anno etatis sue xxx^o, regni sui xiiij^o et Coronacionis sue primo, sicut patet in fine tenoris illius Carte [the charter is printed in Dugdale ii, 1846, 598]. Et postquam monasterium esset constructum, Ipse sanctus prefatus Aethelwoldus episcopus Winton^o illud in honore beate Marie virginis dedicauit et eidem tamquam Abbas et pius pastor fere ad terminum sue mortalis vite presidebat, monachos quos istuc secum adduxerat et nouicios quos receperat regularibus instruens institutis. Reliquias eciam sanctorum Botulphi Abbatis et Adulphi presulis et ceterorum quamplurimorum per monachum suum Wlfcatum nomine ad hoc monasterium de diuersis locis transferri faciebat. Capas vero iij^{or} cum totidem amictis et albis ecclesie vestiario contulit et reliquit. Duas itidem mappas operis subtilis refectorio prebuit et dimisit. Multaque predia et alias possessiones

The archaic text of the Thorney gospels may be demonstrated by the following selection of readings in the book, all of which are either of the pre-Alcuinian Z*-X*, or of the Alcuinian type: Mt iii 6 om *in iordane* Z*X*; 12 > *triticum in orreum suum* Z*X*BT ϵ ; 16 om *iesus* A-Y M V; v 36 *iurabis* K M Z ϵ ; vi 32 om *enim* (pr.) X*; vii 22 *dicent : dicunt* Z*T; 25 om *et* (pr.) Z*X*alc; viii 3 > *iesus manum tetigit eum* ZX*O*alcvg; ix 2 > *in lecto iacentem* ZX* Φ Balc; *et videns : videns autem* ZX*alc ϵ ; 12 *medico : medicis* Z 2 ; x 2 *apostolorum : discipulorum* ZX*O... ϵ ; 13 *domus + illa* ZX*O...alcvg; *si : sin* ZH Θ K V; 27 *audistis* ir M; xi 12 *rapiant : diripiunt* ZXalc; xiii 14 *ut adimpleatur* ZAYalcT ϵ ϵ ϵ ; 32 *maius : maior* Z*K; xv 38 *hominum : virorum* RMZ 4 ; xvi 8 *dixit + eis* H 1 Θ alcO ϵ ; 23 *post : retro* MVZ 4 ; xvii 3 *apparuerunt eis* (ZX*)alc (Wvg); 24 *venissent : venisset* Z*Y; xviii 9 *cum uno oculo* (m. pr.)alc : *unum oculum* (!) (correction by second hand) Σ E*(Z*); 16 om *adhuc* M; xxi 34 om *suos* ZK; xxii 4 *servos + suos* ZX*Jalc; xxiv 27 om *et* (*adventus*) ZDRalc; 43 *sit : est* alc; colophon at the end: *Explicit evangelium secundum mattheum et habet uersus ·II· DCC*; Mc iii 6 *eum : iesum* GEKV; v 19 *iesus autem* Z Θ KV; vii 3 *traditiones*; viii 34 om *post* ZX*alc mod; *neget* Z*X*OKV; 37 *commutationis*; ix 15 *et accurrentes : accurrentesque* ZX*O*LKV; xii 34 *eum + amplius* KZ 4 ; xiv 13 *baiulans : portans* KVZ 2 ; Lc iii 9 *arborum : arboris* ZXK ϵ ϵ ; 13 *faciatis t exigatis* (sic!) vett M; iv 20 *reddidit : reddit* (m. pr.) XD; v 32 *non + enim* DKVW; 34 *potestis filios . . . facere ieiunare : possunt . . . filii ieiunare* vett ZK; vi 28 *vos : vobis* vett XO Φ VZ 2 ; 37 *dimittimini : dimittetur vobis* ZX*JOKV; 39 *cadent : cadunt* ZX...alcvg; 46 *autem : enim* Zalc; 49 *cecidit : concidit* Z...alcW; vii 32 om *tibiis* vett KMW; xiii 5 *egeritis : habueritis* ZX*alcvg; 27 *operarii : operamini* vett M; xiv 14 *resurrectione : retributione* Zalc; 24 *gustabunt* ZO-Ealc; xvii 5 *adauge : auge* per suam industriam perquisita[s] monasterio dedit et confirmavit. Et tandem cum cognouisset sui exitus diem ab hoc seculo nequam imminere, prefecit et instituit capellanum suum monachum Godemanum nomine Abbatem, quem idem sanctus benedixit et installavit¹.

vett X* O K Z^c; 28 om *sicut* vett Z X*M; 31 *redeat* : *recedat* H* (!); 33 *salvam facere* : *salvare* Z alc; xviii 15 *quod* : *quos* Z alc W; xx 14 *ut* : *et* vett Z alc; 33 *siquidem* : *nam* vett K; xxi 38 *manicabat* : *magnificabat* vett T; Jo i 15 *clamat* : *clamabat* R; v 19 om *enim* R; xii 5 *veniit* : *vendidit* E (M); 50 om *ego* vett; xiv 3 *et praepravero* : *praeprare* vett D.

This MS is another proof of what we have endeavoured to show in the preceding chapter—that the Z-X type played a considerable part in the making of Alcuin's revision.

At Thorney interlinear glosses were added to this archaic text in order to modernise it. The Latin interlinear readings date from the tenth or eleventh century and aim at replacing ancient readings by such as were customary in the continental schools and in the Winchester MSS. Thus in Lc xv 17 the Anglo-Saxon hand added the typical scholastic reading *in domo* above the line, and so on in many other places. Another English hand at about the same time added a few Old English glosses, scratched into the vellum with a dry-point and forming a sort of very rudimentary interlinear version. We have maintained in another context that the Old English version of the gospels made about A.D. 1000 was based on a similar, but complete, interlinear version.¹

Canterbury should probably be included among the monasteries reformed under Dunstan, for Dunstan's categorical imperative was, 'Aut canonicè est vivendum aut ecclesiis exeundum'.² Now among the beneficial effects of the reform one was the return of the monasteries to various kinds of cultural work. The scriptoria were re-established, and Winchester became the seat of the most important scriptorium of the period. In the *Concordia Regularis* for English monasteries, drawn up by Dunstan and promul-

¹ H. Glunz, *Die lateinische Vorlage der westsächsischen Evangelienversion*, Leipzig 1928, p. 81 ff. Similar, but more numerous glosses from an Anglo-Saxon gospel book in private hands were printed by Napier, *Old English Glosses* (Anecdota Oxon. Oxford 1900), p. 234 f.

² *Memorials of St Dunstan* (ed. cit. p. 113).

gated by King Eadgar at the Council of Winchester, the monastic school was assumed to be a necessary part of every monastery.¹ Perhaps this is a trace of Dunstan's own initiative, for even when a pupil at Glastonbury, and afterwards as abbot, he had practised the arts of writing and illuminating.² The products of the Winchester scriptorium in the (tenth and) eleventh century were numerous.³ The gospel text of these books is that imported from Fleury, whereas the style of the illuminations has also experienced the influence of Rheims and Flanders.

Of the gospel books the following can be shown to be derived from one common ancestor at Winchester:

s = Trin. Coll. Camb. B. 10.4, probably written at Winchester in 1008.⁴

t = B.M. Add. 34890, also from Winchester.

u = St John's Coll. Camb. 73, of the eleventh century, probably from St Augustine's, Canterbury.⁵

x = B.M. Royal 1.D.ix, of the beginning of the eleventh century, from Canterbury.

y = B.M. Harl. 76, eleventh century, from Bury St Edmunds.

z = Pembroke Coll. Camb. 301, eleventh century, perhaps from Ely.

THE TEXT OF THE WINCHESTER GOSPELS

As to the gospel text in these MSS, we may say that of all MSS quoted in the critical apparatus of the Oxford Vulgate it most closely approaches W, i.e. the representative of the medieval text, according to Wordsworth. But it would be erroneous to draw from this the conclusion that the Vulgate text of the thirteenth century was already

¹ Migne cxxxvii 478 c.

² *Vita auct. B.* (*Memorials*, pp. 10 f., 20); John of Glastonbury (ed. Hearne, 1724), p. 116.

³ On the Winchester school see: O. Homburger, *Die Anfänge der Malschule von Winchester*, 1912; E. G. Millar, *La miniature anglaise du x^e au xiii^e siècle*, Paris-Bruxelles 1926, p. 4 ff. Palaeography: E. M. Thompson, *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*, Oxford 1912, p. 429 ff.

⁴ E. M. Thompson, *op. cit.* p. 429 f.

⁵ M. R. James, *A Catalogue of MSS in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge*, ad loc.

full-grown at the end of the tenth. For we shall see in another chapter that W, far from being typical of the thirteenth century, actually contains a text current in England at the end of the eleventh century, and that the editors of the Oxford Vulgate Testament were deceived in assuming that the thirteenth-century MS W contained a thirteenth-century text. There is now nothing startling in the fact that the Winchester gospels, of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, resemble a text introduced into England in the late eleventh century.

In the Winchester text (as well as in W) we can distinguish three strata: first, the Alcuinian basis, which remained part of the textual tradition in the schools and, let us add, all through the Middle Ages, so that the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century editions were yet full of it; then, Irish and Old Latin readings, received into the text as a result of the textual criticism practised at Auxerre and Rheims by Remigius and other pupils of the Scotti; and, lastly, readings which owed their existence to the methods of scholastic exegesis, but the very words of which are determined by the patristic commentaries.

Of the Winchester gospel books enumerated above, suxy form a particular group which often agrees upon a variant against the other MSS. Where this is the case, the group will be denoted in the following list by the symbol v.

Of the Alcuinian readings not much need be said. They belong to the continental heritage of the Winchester text. Specimens are: Mt ii 1 *iudaeae* : *iudae* s-z X* ir alc Z^c W ε ℑ ℑ; iii 2 *adpropinquabit* s-z H^c Θ alc L^c W ε ℑ ℑ; 9 *potest* : *potens est* s-z J X* . . . alc mod; iv 12 + *iesus* s-z alc mod; 25 + *de (iudea)* v z ir A-Y X^c K V mod; v 24 *offers* : *offeres* s-z Y . . . alc O^{g1} mod; 47 *facitis* : *facietis* s-z Z X* . . . alc W; vi 8 *quibus* : *quid* s-z Z X* . . . alc mod; 25 *corpus* + *plus* s-z Q E K M Z⁴ O^c mod; 33 > *omnia haec* s-z Z X* . . . alc W; vii 10 *petet* : *petierit* s-z ir alc Z⁴ O^c mod; viii 28 *viam* : *villam* v (lapsu?); ix 12 *medico* : *medicus* s-z C T . . . alc mod; 17 om

et (vinum) v; 18 *dicens + domine s-z ZX** . . . alc mod; x 12 + *dicentes pax huic domui s-z ZY* . . . alc O^c mod; 13 *revertetur st u y z ZX** . . . alc mod, *revertitur x* E* (scholastic variant), *revertetur x¹*; 36 *hominis : homines v z Y* VX^c O^c*; xii 11 *habeat : habet sCTirKV*; 25 *desolabitur s-z AY* . . . alc Z⁴ O^{sax} mod; 29 *diripiet s-z M* . . . M V mod; xiv 12 *corpus + eius v JirKM W^c S*; xv 2 *traditiones v ZX* alc W^c S*; xvi 3 *potestis + scire v ZX* H^o alc O^c W^c S*; xvii 3 *apparuerunt v JK M mod*, *t apparuit* (sup. lin.) s; xviii 26 *orabat : rogabat v M* . . . alc O^c X^c; xxiii 23 *quia : qui s-z FDR VX^c W^c S*; xxiv 34 om *haec* (alt.) s-z vett J R M Z^c; xxvi 10 + *huic (mulieri) s-z BE H^c O alc Z³ O^c mod*; xxvii 35 *mittentes + ut adimpleretur quod dictum est per prophetam dicentem diverserunt sibi vestimenta mea et super vestem meam miserunt sortem v z EZ* . . . K W^c S^o; Mc i 15 *adpropinquabit s-z XI H* O K V W*; ii 20 *in illa die : in illis diebus s-z Z* . . . M V mod; iii 9 *deserviret : deservirent s-z X* IGH^c O KE^c Y^c Z² W^c S*; 21 *furorem : furore s x Z* EK*; 26 *con surrexerit v X** . . . K V Z² mod; iv 15 *corda : corde s x y X** . . . K Z²; v 2 om (*occurrit ei s-z K V Z^c mod*; vi 32 *in navem s-z X** . . . alc Z³ mod; vii 3 *traditionem : traditionum (!) s x*, cf. *traditiones Z K V X^c W*; viii 23 *apprehensa manu s-z Z* X** . . . alc Z² mod; 37 *commutationis v z (commutationi t) Z alc mod*; 38 *sanctis : suis u K V*; x 9 *iunxit : coniunxit s-z DH¹ K mod*; 17 *viam : via s-z Z I K V W^c S*; xi 33 *iesu : ad iesum v (iesu x*, ad iesum x^c) ZX* CT alc*; xiv 27 *scandalizabimini + in me v Z L K V mod*; xv 15 *tradidit + eis s^c Z K V*; 27 om *eius s x K*; xvi 15 *eis + iesus s^c x^c Z O B alc*; Lc iii 8 *potest : potens s* (cf. V in Mt iii 9); 9 *radicem : radices vir V*; *ergo : enim v Z O K*; iv 35 *illum* (alt.) : *eum s x Z O alc X^c*; 38 *autem + iesus v ZX* O B alc v g*; v 13 *illum + iesus s* x V*; 34 *potestis filios . . . facere ieiunare : possunt filii . . . facile (!) ieiunare s x* (vett Z K); vi 15 > *thomam et matheum v Z O K V W*; 26 *prophetis : pseudoprophetis v z O Q P V v g*; vii 37 *accubisset v Z X O F alc S^o S*; ix 9 > *ego audio s x M V W*; x 4 *nolite + ergo s y Z* . . . K M W; xi 28 *quippini : quinimmo s-z Z* . . . K V mod; *custodiunt + illud s-z H^o K V B² mod*; 42

quia : *qui* s-z M . . . E V W ζ ; xiii 5 *egeritis* : *habueritis* v Z X* alc vg; xiv 14 *resurrectione* : *retributione* v Z \mathfrak{F} K V; xv 7 *super* (alt.) : *supra* v K; xviii 3 > *erat quaedam* v K; xix 8 *dominum* : *iesum* v M V R¹ ζ \mathfrak{C} ; xxii 37 *iniustis* : *iniquis* v Z X* O \mathfrak{P} K V mod; xxiv 4 *secus* : *iuxta* v Z O K V; 5 *declinaverunt* s* E V; 6 *est* (alt.) : *sit* v Z X O* K; 28 *adpropinquaverunt* : *adpropinquabant* s Z K V; Jo v 1 *hierosolymis* : *hierosolimam* s-z J I C T alc mod; 4 s-z agree in this verse with (2), K V Z^c mod; 24 *transiit* vulg t u y V \mathfrak{C} ; vi 21 > *in navem accipere eum* v V W; 71 *iudam* : *de iuda* v X* Q Θ K V Z² W ζ \mathfrak{C} ; vii 29 + *et si dixero quia nescio eum ero similis vobis mendax. et scio eum* v Z . . . K M W ζ ; viii 27 *dicebat* + *deum* F C T K M O^c vg; ix 16 *in eis* : *inter eos* s Z X* K V vg; xiii 2 *corde* : *cor* s-z I C T K V O^c mod; xv 6 *aruit* : *arescet* s-z K V mod; xviii 28 *a caiapha* : *ad caiphan* s-z Z* X . . . H^c Θ K M O^c W ζ ; xxi 6 *ergo* + *retia* v z Z D E T H K V (*retiam* t); and all other Alcuinian readings which have survived in W vg.

Of greater interest, however, are the readings which were introduced into the Alcuinian text in the post-Carolingian schools. These can be distinguished into three groups:

(1) Variants which were taken over from ancient types, because they were supported by the meaning of the particular passage expounded in some patristic commentary. E.g. Mt i 2 *abraham* + *autem* v D E* L R; ii 19 > *angelus domini apparuit* v z, R mod; iii 10 *radicem* : *radices* v T D L R W; 17 *mihi* + *bene* v J D E Q W; iv 9 > *omnia tibi* s-z i r Z³ mod; v 16 > *opera vestra bona* v T O i r mod; 40 *remitte* : *dimitte* s-z i r mod; 43 *odio habebis* : *odies* s-z M J i r W; vii 11 *bona* + *data* (pr.) v z, vett Aug. B E K M O² mod; viii 13 om *et* (*sicut*) z X* i r W; ix 38 *eiciat* : *mittat* s-z X* O* . . . i r W ζ \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{C} ; x 38 *sequatur* s* (corr. s^c) x i r; xiii 32 om *quidem* v Q; 43 *ares* + *audiendi* s-z B i r T^c mod; xiv 9 om *autem* v z (+ sup. lin. s^c) i r; xv 12 *audito* + *hoc* v i r W; 35 *discumberet* : *discumberent* s-z J X* i r . . . Z³ mod; 36 *accipiens* + *iesus* s-z L Q Θ Z⁴ W; xvi 2 om *eis* v R* W;

27 *opus* : *opera* s x z J i r T ⊕ mod; xvii 11 *eis* : *illis* v i r; xviii 17 *om et (ecclesiam)* s-z Z* J i r mod; 33 *non* : *nonne* s t z J Y i r T mod; xix 20 *custodivi + a iuventute mea* s-z F i r T W ς ϩ ϫ; 21 *vende + omnia* v i r W ς ϩ; xx 1 *om enim* s-z Z* X* J i r v g; 16 *autem : vero* s-x i r H O^{sa} x v g; xxii 13 + *et (mittite)* s^c x E Q; 45 *dauid + in spiritu* v F i r W; xxiii 16 *debet : debitor est* s x Z* X* O i r M ϩ; xxiv 1 *accesserunt + ad eum* s-z P Q C; *aedificationem* s-z X* B I C T i r W; 30 *parebit : apparebit* s-z i r cor. vat. mg; xxv 42 *potum : bibere* z* Q R; xxvi 39 *pater : mi pater* s-z M I . . W; 53 *duodecim + milia* v Z X O J B; 54 *oportet : oportuit* s X*; 61 *reaedificare* s-z D P mg H^c ⊕ O^{gl} mod; xxvii 16 *habebant* s-z M E L ⊕ K; 20 *populis : populo* s E* R; 32 *cyreneum + venientem obviam sibi* s-z (> *hominem cyreneum nomine simonem venientem obviam sibi* t H mg ⊕) Z X* I i r O^c Y^c; 35 *diviserunt + sibi* s x (sup. lin. in both) X* B Q; xxviii 7 *surrexit + a mortuis* s^c J F i r; M c i 8 *baptizavi : baptizo* s x B D C T M; ii 2 *caperet + domus* s x z (sup. lin. s x) i r : *caperentur* t; iii 16 *petrus : petrum* s* x i r; iv 6 *exaestuavit : aestuavit* s^c x^c Z* X* O B E L C T; v 9 > *mih i nomen* v Z* L Q v g; vi 37 *om vos* s-z A-Y i r W ϩ; viii 33 *sapis + ea* s-z Q W; ix 30 *volebat : volebant* s x Q T*; x 26 *mirabantur* s* x* Q R; xi 10 *quod : qui* s x Q; 13 *in ea + fructum* s* O; xiii 1 *lapides + sint* s* x Z X* O B M; *structurae + templi* v z Z X* O . . M; 11 *sanctus + qui loquitur in vobis* v L Q; xiv 3 *spicati : pistici* s-z D T; 14 *diversorium meum et refectio mea* s x O B H ⊕ M; L c i 35 + *ex te* s-z M . . H ⊕ M T^c O^c mod; 45 *credidisti . . . tibi* s-z J i r H ⊕ K ϩ ϩ ϫ; ii 7 *eis : ei* s-z i r K W ϩ ϩ; 21 *circumcideretur + puer* s-z i r H ⊕ mod; 40 *in illo : cum illo* v z X* O i r; iii 13 *faciatis : exigatis* v z v e t t D M; iv 33 *synagoga + eorum* s x D; vi 1 *transiret + iesus* v F P Q; 11 *facerent + de* s-z v e t t i r ϩ ϩ; 49 *terram : petram* v H* Y D; vii 39 *qualis + esset* s-z T, > *mulier + esset* u A-Y O; 48 *illam + iesus* s g a t D cor. vat.*; viii 12 + *hi sunt* s-z Z E H ⊕ X^c mod; 26 *enavigaverunt : et navigaverunt* s-z O B* G v g; 49 *venit + quidam* s-z i r mod; ix 10 *narraverunt : nuntiaverunt* s x y, δ P; 25 *homo : homini* s t z i r X^c cor. vat.; 54 *illos + sicut helias fecit* v M ⊕ O^{gl}; xiv

14 *habent + unde* s u x, Z* X* O... H ⊙ cor. vat.*; etc.; Jo i 9 + *hunc (mundum)* s-z ir C T H ⊙ M O^{sl} mod; 15 *clamat : clamabat* s t u y z, R; 18 *umquam + nisi* v J ir C T H ⊙ M W; ii 9 *factam : factum* s X* Y E cor. vat.; iii 18 *credidit : credit* v ir T K* W ⊆ ⊆ ⊆; 31 *qui (alt.) + autem* s D R M; vi 21 *terram in qua* v Z O F D; 66 *ex hoc + ergo* v vett; vii 8 *ascendo : ascendam* y Z X O K W; 47 om *ergo* s* u x vett; viii 12 *lucem : lumen* s-z vett ir mod; 33 *ei + iudaei* v z D M cor. vat.^{mg}; ix 9 *ille + vero* s-z I H ⊙ M mod; xi 1 *sorum* s* u x z Z ir W ⊆ ⊆; xii 7 *sine : sinite* s-z M J B D R ⊆ ⊆ ⊆; xviii 18 *calefiebant : calefaciebant se* v J B C T ⊙ mod.

(2) Scholastic readings which were not taken from earlier MSS, but originated in the schools as the result of the new exegesis. Most of these remained as part of the later medieval text. Mt i 17 *ergo : autem* v W; 23 *vocabunt : vocabit (!)* s x^e, see *vocabitur* E* ⊆ ⊆; 24 > *ei praecepit* v W; iii 7 *demonstravit : demonstrabit* v ⊆; *futura : ventura* s-z W v g; iv 4 > *in solo pane* v X^e W v g; 18 *autem : enim* v; v 18 *terram* v E* M; 25 > *cum eo in via* v E W; 46 *diligatis : diligitis* s-z E H^e ⊙ L^e Z³; vi 13 > *nos inducas* s-z, of liturgical origin; 15 *hominibus + peccata eorum* s u x z W; x 2 > *haec sunt nomina* v W; 6 *oves : gentes t̄ oves* s; 11 *quacumque + autem* v z vett H ⊙ mod; 14 *neque (pr.) : nec* v z; xi 18 *enim : autem* v z; 23 *hunc : hanc* v mod; xii 30 > *mecum est* s x W; xiii 1 *die : tempore* v z E (liturgical); 23 om *verbum* s* u x* T W; *porro aliud : aliud vero* s-z C T mod; 36 *dissere : edissere* v T ⊙ E² W v g; 55 > *filius fabri* s x E W; xv 31 *videntes (pr.) + autem* s x T; *magnificabant : laudabant* v; 33 *saturemus : satiemus* s* u x W; xvi 9 *quinque panum quinque milium hominum : quinque panum et quinque milia hominum* s-z vett Z^e W ⊆; 13 om *autem* v E; xvii 19 > *ad iesum discipuli* v W; 26 *dixit (alt.) : dixitque* v W; xviii 9 *unoculum : unum oculum habentem* v M R C T W ⊆ ⊆; 12 *relinquet : relinquit (!)* v W (F J v g); xix 7 *dari : dare* s x X H ⊙ v g; xx 31 *turba... increpabat : turbae... increpabant* v W (E); xxi 4 *autem + totum* s-z vett E R W ⊆ ⊆; 5 om *et (sedens)* s* u x W ⊆ ⊆ ⊆; 17 + *et docebat eos de regno dei*

z E; 32 *enim* : *autem* v W; om *autem* (after *publicani*) v W; xxii 14 *autem* : *enim* v R mod; 25 *et primus* : *primusque* v W; 30 om *dei* s-z (+ s^c) Z* E; xxiii 3 om *ergo* v E W; 21 *qui* (pr.) : *quicumque* v P^{mg} W ⊗ ⊗; 23 *vae* + *autem* v W; xxiv 31 *congregabuntur* v E*; 33 *haec omnia* : *haec fieri* v E* W; 34 > *generatio haec* v E R mod; 52 *illic* : *ibi* v W; xxv 11 *novissime* + *vero* s-z mod; 14 *homo* + *quidam* s W; 24 *acceperat* + *et* s E H^e ⊗ W; xxvi 33 *illi* : *ei* s x W; 51 *erant* : *erat* v (corr. x^c) W; Mc i 7 *venit* : *veniet* s x M W ⊗ ⊗; ii 12 > *sur-rexit ille* s x vg; 16 > *publicanis et peccatoribus* v vett mod; 22 *novellum* : *novum* s-z vett X* F mod; iii 6 > *pharisaei statim* s* x T vg; iv 10 *parabolas* : *parabolam* u mod; v 4 *domare* : *dominare* z E; 23 *manus* : *manum* s-z G W ⊗ ⊗ ⊗; 24 *illum* : *eum* s x vg; 35 *ad archisynagogum* s-z K W ⊗ ⊗ ⊗; 43 *dixit* : *iussit* t X* W ⊗ ⊗; vi 13 *sanabantur* s^c x^c z X* ⊗ W ⊗ ⊗; 31 > *spatium manducandi* s x W^e vg; 34 om *multam* (*turbam*) s* u* x* E; viii 1 *esset* + *cum iesu* s x O^e W ⊗ ⊗; 38 *confundetur* : *confitetur* s-z vett (YTH* O^e W ⊗ ⊗); ix 3 *splendens* + *et* s-z H^e ⊗ mod; 5 *hic nos esse* : *nobis hic esse* v vett T; 15 *eum* : *iesum* s-z M mod; 49 *victima* + *sale* v F mod; x 28 > *ei petrus* s-z mod; 41 *coeperunt indignari* : *indignati sunt* s* x D ⊗ ⊗; 51 > *tibi vis* s x mod; xii 16 *inscriptio* : *superscriptio* s* G W; xiii 13 *omnibus* + *hominibus* s* B D cor. vat.; xiv 21 *non esset natus* : *natus non fuisset* s x W; 27 *dispersentur oves* + *gregis* s x (*dispersentur gregis* z!) Q cor. vat.*; xv 33 *totam* : *universam* s W gat; xvi 1 *eum* : *iesum* s x vg; Lc i 5 *illi* : *illius* s x vg; 42 *inter mulieres* : *in mulieribus* s* W; 50 *a progenie in progenies* s x z cor. vat.^{mg} vg; 54 *memorari* : *recordatus* s-z X* W ⊗ ⊗ ⊗; 77 *eorum* : *meorum* st* R W; ii 46 *interrogantem* + *eos* st u y z, C T mod; iv 9 *pinnam* : *pinnaculum* s x R W cor. vat.^{mg}; 18 + *sanare contritos corde* v Q V mod; 27 *neman* : *naaman* s-z H¹ ⊗ mod; v 1 *in eum* : *ad iesum* v (O^e); 7 *ut* (alt.) + *pene* s-z W ⊗ ⊗ ⊗; vi 9 *sabbatis* s-z M vg; 27 > *oderunt vos* v X* mod; 38 *bonam* + *et* s-z O mod; vii 41 + *et respondit iesus* s (W) cor. vat.^{mg}; 45 *intravit* : *intravi* st Y B D W ⊗ ⊗; viii 2 > *septem daemones* s y vg; ix 15 *discumbere fecerunt* : *discubuerunt* s-z G ⊗ ⊗; 47 *eum* : *illum* v C vg; xi 25 *mundatam*

+ *et ornatam* s x E R W § § §; xii 27 *lilia + agri* v D Q K W cor. vat.*; xiii 5 *si non : nisi* s y E; xv 17 *mercennarii + in domo* s t x y z, W § § §; 19 *de : ex* s x y cor. vat. mg; xvii 11 *iret + iesus* s x cor. vat.*; xviii 8 *in terra : super terram* s cor. vat.; 31 *duodecim + discipulos suos* s x y (cor. vat.*); xix 26 *dabitur + et abundabit* s-z Q E F^c W § § §; xxi 9 *non : nondum* s-z G v g; 38 *manicabat : magnificabat* s T l^c; Jo i 29 *peccatum : peccata* s-z O W § §; iii 2 *eum : iesum* s-z E mod; 33 *qui + autem* s x E H ⊕ W § §; v 2 *cognominabatur* s-z D cor. vat.*; vii 8 *ego + autem* v E cor. vat. mg § §; viii 38 *patrem + meum* v cor. vat.* § §; ix 28 *maledixerunt + ergo* v H ⊕ v g; xiii 18 *mecum : meum* s u* x z B T; xiv 1 + *et ait discipulis suis* v M §; xvi 3 *facient + vobis* z X* I D mod; xix 6 *crucifige* (alt.) + *eum* s-z E mod; xx 9 *oportet : oportuit* v M § (*oportet* t); 19 > *cum ergo sero esset* v E v g; xxi 18 *quo + tu* v D E § § §.

(3) There is a number of variant readings which occur in the Winchester MSS only. These may have been partly errors, partly scholastic readings which gained no importance in the further history of the Vulgate. For that very reason they need not concern us here.

Let us sum up this part of our research by saying that the Winchester text is the first insular, or English, example of the typically scholastic form of the Vulgate text. If we judge by the way it originated, it must be described as being of an essentially local nature and confined to the narrow circle of a few monastic schools. Its continental source and equivalent had not even advanced as far as that, for it was known only to a comparatively small number of episcopal schools (and a very few monasteries, as St Martin, Fulda, Reichenau, Fleury). The further history of the Vulgate will prove to be not so much the story of how new readings sprang up, as an inquiry into the ways and means by which the text already existing came to be generally adopted by the Church. Firstly, the scholastic text, at the end of the eleventh century and in the course of the twelfth, found its way into the libraries

of all English monasteries. Later again, it conquered the episcopal school, or what was afterwards called the University, of Paris; and lastly, in the thirteenth century, there was hardly a Bible written anywhere which does not represent the scholastic text. This threefold process will form the subject of our further inquiry.

CHAPTER IV

Lanfranc and the Replacement of the Ancient English Types by the Text of the Universal Church

IMPORTANCE OF THE POST-CAROLINGIAN SCHOOLS

IF we are asked to define in short terms the Vulgate text emerging from that rudimentary form of scholasticism which we have called post-Carolingian, we may say that it is the outgrowth of a specific method of philological interpretation applied to the Bible only, and to no other literary work. As this method was at first practised by few scholars, the scholastic text did not become very widely diffused except in singular and more or less accidental cases as in that of the Winchester text. Moreover, the narrow sphere in which the new text was built up explains why from the tenth century onwards all texts of a progressive character, i.e. containing the scholastic readings, proceeded from a rather small district that can be circumscribed by the names of Auxerre, Laon, Rheims, and Paris. Central and Northern France was the cradle of the modern Vulgate text, and to this French text European Christianity of the Latin rite had to surrender by degrees. Perhaps the expression 'French' with reference to the Vulgate text is no longer perfectly appropriate, for the more the text detached itself from regional or national and local associations, and the more it was determined by critical principles which had the authority of an international Church behind them, the less was it significant of regional or national Churches. While the early types had been thus significant to a high degree, a point was reached in the twelfth century with reference to which it becomes meaningless to speak of an Irish, Anglo-Saxon, Spanish, or Alcuinian type. There is then only the one Catholic text,

a text which is symbolical of a uniform system of religion, philosophy, and theology.

Ademar of Angoulêmes, writing in the third decade of the eleventh century, was the first historian to take account of the early scholastic tradition as outlined above.¹ Later historians of the University of Paris went even further, and described these schools following each other in quick succession as the direct precursors of the University of Paris.² This view is untenable, if it rests upon the assumption that there was any close relation between the philosophical systems as taught in them both.³ Yet it should be remembered that during the centuries preceding the height of scholasticism, the material, in the form of the patristic writings, was collected, revised and analysed, by means of which scholastic philosophy was made possible.⁴ But the development from early to classical scholasticism was far from smooth or continuous. The scholastic method of biblical interpretation encountered hostility, especially from dialectical tendencies which threw doubts on the authorities upon whom the exponents of Scripture relied.

GERBERT AND THE RISE OF DIALECTICS

The school of Rheims flourished a second time under Gerbert of Aurillac. But among all the liberal arts he directed his foremost attention to logic, attempting a solution of logical problems by dialectic methods. Hermeneutics seems to have held a secondary place with him; nevertheless Richerus, his pupil and biographer, also enumerated Aristotle's *Perihermenias* (!) among his master's

¹ Ademar of Angoulêmes (d. 1029), *Hist. lib.* iii, paragr. 5 (MG. Script. iv 119). Ademar is confused enough in his list, as Mabillon has already shown (*Iter Germanicum*, p. 13 ff.), but he saw that the post-Carolingian tradition of the schools was something peculiar to the general history of the time.

² Bulaeus, *Hist. Univ. Paris.* i, 1665 ff., 109, 210.

³ H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* i, 1895, 274.

⁴ M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode* i 179 ff.

books.¹ In the days of Gerbert the dialectic tendency was on the increase. Dialectics was the subject in which the mind could freely philosophise and exercise the logical faculties. The first object of attack was the exegetic method as practised in the schools. There the Bible had been treated as a very special kind of work, for it preserved the words spoken by God to man. These were the only safe ground from which constructive thought about religious truths could start, and, therefore, the explanation of these words was the first object of all philosophy. But as the Bible was sacred and holding a rank high above all other works of language, as it was the most sublime work and beyond emulation or imitation, human reason might not venture upon interpretation. For explanation or exposition, and for ultimate definition, the intellect was dependent on another, subordinate work which contained only the meaning of the Bible. The school tradition, reaching from Tours to Rheims, had assumed that this expository work, which discussed the religious truths contained in the Bible and taught by the Church, already existed in the authoritative patristic writings. This was the view of an essentially literary school, contented with recording and revising what was believed to be certain and undisputed truth. The numerous secondary commentaries (i.e. such as were compiled from primary, or original, commentaries) and *Deflorationes Patrum* served this purpose. In the end the whole Bible was to have a commentary running parallel with the text and which was to be a digest of all the Fathers had ever affirmed on the subject.

The dialecticians, on the other hand, also had recourse to patristic authority. Yet they did not quote the Fathers as the source of final truth in questions of interpretation, but as authorities for what they themselves con-

¹ Richerus, *Hist.* lib. iii, cc. 46-48, 58-65. The treatise on logic, *De rationali et ratione uti*, in Migne cxxxix 159 ff. On his classical inclinations, E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, p. 705 ff.

tended was the truth. For they said that the explanations contained in the commentaries were not Scripture, and, therefore, nobody was bound to accept them as literal truth. The patristic writings are capable of various interpretations, and often have to yield to the opinions of the moderns, who may come nearer the truth than did the Fathers. So the dialectic view contradicted the exegetic doctrine of the ninth and tenth centuries. The patristic works, they said, do not always contain the truth, but often furnish merely the material which in the hand of modern scholars serves to build up the true meaning of the biblical words. So the controversy on transubstantiation between Berengar of Tours and Lanfranc was waged (as far as it was strictly dialectical, which it was not entirely) about the personal opinions and convictions of each of the combatants. Both believed in the truth of their own view and reproached the other with violating the truth by sophistication. Each quoted the same passages from St Ambrose as testifying to his own belief. But there was the important difference that Lanfranc's dialectic argument always led back in the end to the patristic dictum, which it proved absolutely true and the ultimate issue of all ratiocinations whatsoever upon the subject; whereas Berengar used the patristic testimony for the purpose of introducing his own proposition. In the *Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini* Lanfranc accused Berengar of thus perverting patristic authority:¹

You abandon the sacred authorities and seek refuge with dialectics. If reasons should at all be alleged for certain mysteries of the faith, I would rather have them consist in the sacred authorities than in dialectic arguments. But even to these I shall well be able to reply, lest you should think that I was inferior to you in the art of dialectics. Some may think me rather arrogant and eager to gain glory than to be advised by necessity. But God and my conscience bear witness to my unwillingness in matters concerning divine letters ever to propound dialectic questions and solutions, or to reply to them.

¹ Migne cl 416 f.

Although the subject of a disputation may be such as to yield much better to dialectical art, yet I always as far as possible put the nature of my proofs above mere technique, so that nobody should suspect me as trusting rather to dialectic technique than to the truthful authority of the holy Fathers.

As matters stood at the time the victory was necessarily to this view.

FULBERT OF CHARTRES
CONTINENTAL ELEVENTH-CENTURY MSS
IN ENGLAND

The principle of patristic authority was still being defended by the disciples of Remigius. It was the only method which absolutely guaranteed certainty in the result. As soon as the human intellect was at liberty to apply dialectics to matters of religious doctrine, the conclusion that there was a twofold truth was forced upon it. Besides patristic authority there was another truth to be discovered by independent reasoning (Petrus Damiani!). Fulbert, a friend of Abbo of Fleury and a pupil of Gerbert, in 990 founded the school at Chartres and later was bishop there until 1028. He was a staunch defender of patristic authority: 'But we ought to walk the familiar and often trodden ways of the Fathers, to bear their memory in mind, and to have their example before our eyes. If we can rationally understand the things they did, let us keep those; but if their spiritual insight ordained something which our ignorant weakness cannot always understand, let us beware of gnawing the bone of contention with the tooth of temerarious cavilling, as long as it does not injure the Faith'.¹ Consequently we find that most gospel MSS of the eleventh century continue the textual tradition of the preceding centuries. England was not yet able to produce proper work of its own on the subject that busied continental scholars. Under King Ethelred the country was oppressed by the Danes. Canute re-established some of the old order and gave the monasteries time to recover.

¹ Migne cxli 192 f.

He seems to have communicated with Fulbert, for he made a contribution to the building of the new cathedral at Chartres.¹ Canute's archbishop, Ethelnoth, had connections in Italy.² To relations of this kind we may attribute the fact that a few gospel MSS reached England in the first half of the century.

To judge from the illuminations, Add. MS 17739 of the B.M. was written in Northern France. Outwardly the book rather resembles Add. MS 11850. The text is that of the exegetic schools, i.e. an Alcuinian basis overlaid with readings originating in the interpretative method of the schools.

There are the usual Alcuinian readings, such as: Mt iii 2 *appropinquabit*; 9 *potens est*; iv 16 *in regione umbrae*; x 13 *veniat : veniet*; xvi 9 *in quinque milia hominum*; xxv 27 *committere*; Mc iv 15 *in cordibus eorum*; vi 32 *in navim*; vii 3 *traditiones*; viii 13 *iterum + navim*; 23 *adprehensa manu*; x 17 *in via*; xi 24 *veniet : evenient*; xiv 21 *bonum est : bonum erat*; Lc xxiv 24 *viderunt : invenerunt*; etc. In addition to these there are scholastic readings, e.g. Mt xxiii 14, which is quoted in Jerome's wording (Migne xxvi 176); Lc xv 17 + *in domo*; etc.; and, lastly, variants from earlier types which penetrated into the text in the school of Remigius, for reasons which we have tried to give above: Mt iii 7 *demonstrabit* ζ; *futura : ventura mod*;³ vii 4 *fratri tuo + frater* P R^{sax} W ζ ⊗; 11 *bona (pr.) + data*; ix 13 *peccatores + in poenitentia*, see Lc v 32;³ x 11 *quamcumque + autem*; 14 *om de (civitate)*; xiii 23 *aliud vero*; xviii 9 *unum oculum habentem* (cf. Rabanus, Migne cvii 1008); 13 *gaudebit : gaudet*; Mc viii 1 + *cum iesu*; ix 49 + *sale*; Lc i 54 *recordatus*; ii 7 *eis : ei*; v 7 + *pene*; etc.

Pembroke College, Camb. MS 302, must again be mentioned here. For though the text of this book, as has been

¹ Migne cxli 235; William of Malmesbury, *G.R.* ii 186 (R.S. i 226).

² William of Malmesbury, *G.R.* ii 184 (ed. cit. p. 224).

³ The addition is taken over from Luke, because the exposition of the two parallel passages (according to the patristic commentaries) was the same.

shown, was derived mainly from an Irish stock, there are a number of scholastic readings included in it which must have come from the Continent. In fact, Bishop Walter of Hereford, the owner of the book, is mentioned, about 1060, as one of the foreign bishops whom Edward the Confessor had nominated to English sees (Florence of Worcester, ad ann. 1060).¹ Walter may easily have been acquainted with the continental scholastic text, and this may account for certain school variants which appear to be superimposed on the Irish text of his gospel book. Mt ii 10 *gavisi sunt + magi* (Rabanus, Migne cvii 759: 'Gaudebant namque magi. . .'); 22 *somnis + ioseph*; v 35 > *pedum eius est E*; vi 6 *orabis : oraveris EH^c mod*; vii 1 *iudicemini + nolite condemnare, et non condemnabimini* ㊄㊄ (Lc vi 37; Augustine, *De serm. Dom. in monte*, Migne xxxiv 1297, gives an explanation of Mt vii 1 which was copied by Bede for his exposition of Lc vi 37. If the masters in the schools used the two commentaries, they saw the identity of the meaning of the two passages, and they proceeded to bring the verbal expressions into conformity with each other); xxv 44 *respondebunt + ei; vel : aut vg*; xxvi 10 *opus + enim VR^{sax} Z³ ㊄㊄*; 64 *virtutis + dei FT vg*; Mc i 7 *venit : veniet MW ㊄㊄* (cf. Bede, Migne xcii 137); Lc i (39 *iuda : iude KM V*; continental!); 50 *in progenie et progenies* (m. pr.; Bede, *l.c.* 322), *a progenie in progenies* (sup. lin.) *vg*; 54 *recordatus*; ii 46 *interrogantem + eos*; 51 *+ conferens*; Jo i 29 *ecce qui tollit peccata*; xviii 14 *expedit + vobis*; etc.

LANFRANC AND THE DIALECTIC STRUGGLE

The Berengarian controversy shows that the mild exhortations of a Fulbert of Chartres were of little avail against the rising tide of dialectics. Rationalistic doubts were threatening to corrode what previous generations had built up. The dialecticians maintained that in the very

¹ H. Boehmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert*, Leipzig 1899, p. 68.

writings which were usually regarded as authoritative, there were difficulties of interpretation, especially as the Fathers often seemed to contradict each other. Even before the subtle attempt of Abelard, Berengar tried to arrive at the truth in spite of contradictory authorities. His solution was that in this case the human intellect was entitled to give judgment, even though a precedent was created. But therein precisely consisted the arrogance of the moderns so vehemently attacked by Lanfranc. He argued that the dilemma could not be solved by declaring the meaning of the Fathers to be whatever the modern philosopher would have it. The moderns according to him had to aim at understanding and acknowledging the patristic sayings. He who is incapable of finding out the true meaning of seemingly contradictory passages has not the right to call himself a dialectician and still less a member of the teaching body of the Church, to which the authority of the Fathers is indispensable. According to Lanfranc dialectic was used to make truths which at first seemed pretentious, unfounded, or paradoxical, appear palatable and intelligible to the human mind. Only the humble will profit from such science:

In very difficult sentences of the holy Fathers, to which the simplicity of his mind does not stretch, it is safer for the reader, if a question is put to him, to confess that he does not know, than with pertinacious arrogance and arrogant persistency to say something contrary to the Faith, damaging himself and others; especially if he is a person who, owing to his biblical knowledge, or to the probity of his life, and, more yet, to both these proficiencies, is known to be an authority.¹

In matters of faith the last appeal was to the Fathers. When Berengar tried to stigmatise St Hilary as a heretic, he was refuted by Lanfranc, who quoted against him the canonical law (i.e. the rulings of the councils and the decree of Gelasius), St Augustine, and St Jerome.² In the eyes of

¹ Migne cl 544. He exhorts Berengar to be more humble and to yield to patristic authority in all circumstances: *De corp. et sang. Dom.* (Migne cl 429).

² Migne cl 544.

Lanfranc Berengar's fault was to have put his own opinion in place of the patristic doctrine, to have invented 'new interpretations of the words'. In proof of things which he did not understand, he had quoted the Bible, 'which often has been a trap for those who err'.¹ Lanfranc's pupil Guitmund says of Berengar:²

As he could not attain to the profound mysteries of philosophy (for he lacked sagacity, and the study of the liberal arts had become rare in Gaul) he attempted by new interpretations of the words to gain the reputation of a great thinker. . . . But when in a dialectical quarrel Lanfranc had defeated him in a matter of small importance, he began to disturb the mysteries of the holy Scriptures. . . . for the fool preferred being a heretic admired by men, to being an orthodox believer known to God alone.

Lanfranc, on the other hand, continued to emphasise the final authority of the Fathers. In his commentary on the Pauline Epistles he declared that to the theologian the greatest danger is the *sapientia verbi* which clings to the outward properties, the sound, of the words, whereas the metaphysical truths of religion, which ought to be the primary end of all biblical study, are neglected.³ The merely verbal arts of argument and a style highly cultivated by the ancients are pleasant but empty nullities, because they are devoid of the precious matter of religion, without which the arts of logic and dialectics are meaningless.⁴ There is another danger in ancient literature: it may insinuate things which run contrary to Christian religion.⁵ If used in the service of the sublime truths of religion, however, the arts of grammar and logic are valuable and bear fruit.⁶

Lanfranc's suspicion of mere verbalism was founded upon his attitude to theological literature at large.

¹ Guitmund of Aversa, *De corp. et sang. Christi veritate in Eucharistia* (Migne cdxix 1429).

² *Ib.* col. 1428.

³ Commentary on St Paul (Migne cl 158).

⁴ *Ib.* col. 161.

⁵ *Ib.* col. 158.

⁶ *Ib.* col. 163.

For he thought that all literature, as distinct from the Bible itself, i.e. human literature, should deal with the meaning and the contents of the sacred text. The scholar was not to be occupied with words, but with things, i.e. the actual facts and truths of the Christian faith. Otherwise he was but one of the 'pseudo-apostles', 'qui verba Dei per malam interpretationem adulterabant; nam tollentes divinum sensum, humanum ponebant'.¹ This truly metaphysical matter of the sacred word was in the last instance to be found in the interpretation of the Church, i.e. in the writings of the Fathers, 'the pillars of the Church'.² Accordingly, Lanfranc's own commentary on the Epistles is, for the greater part, a compilation from patristic sources. It consists of brief sentences, sometimes only a few words, which could easily be added in the margin and between the lines of already existing MSS of the Epistles. It was composed with a view to protect the reader from false interpretations of the text, and to guide him to the true matter hidden behind the words.

LANFRANC'S REVISION OF THE GOSPEL TEXT

It is not astonishing, therefore, to find a note of Milo Crispinus to the effect that Lanfranc emended the Bible, and did so, as we are expressly told, 'according to the orthodox faith'.³ Milo adds that Lanfranc's correction of the text was then generally used in the Church. There is no reason to doubt the assertion. Similar reports of a correction of the biblical text by various scholars were not

¹ Migne cl 223.

² *Ib.* col. 353.

³ *Vita Lanfranci* (Migne cl 55): 'Lectioni erat assiduus, et ante episcopatum, et in episcopatu, quantum poterat. Et quia Scripturae scriptorum vitio erant nimium corruptae, omnes tam veteris quam novi Testamenti libros, nec non etiam scripta sanctorum Patrum secundum orthodoxam fidem studuit corrigere. Et etiam multa de his quibus utimur nocte et die in servitio Ecclesiae ad unguem emendavit, et hoc non tantum per se, sed etiam per discipulos suos fecit. Qua de causa... merito illum Latinitas cum honore et amore veneratur magistrum'.

infrequent after the tenth century.¹ Petrus Damiani stated that he himself had corrected both Testaments.² Lanfranc's correction, 'according to the orthodox faith', can only have been a revision in part of the biblical text, in order to make it agree with the true spiritual meaning of the Bible as contained in the patristic commentaries. Traces of Lanfranc's correction can still be found to-day, although the original copy of his revision is probably lost. There are two English gospel MSS, Oxford, Wadham College A. 10. 22 (Coxe no. ii) and B.M. Royal MS 1. B. xi, which afford us a glimpse of the nature of Lanfranc's correction.

The Royal MS unfortunately dates from the first half of the twelfth century and is, therefore, over fifty years later in date than the Wadham College book, which must be assigned to the early second half of the eleventh century. It was obviously copied at Canterbury from an older original which came from the North of France, for the outlines of the illuminated but uncoloured initials (the book was never finished) bear a close resemblance to those in Add. MS 17739 and Harl. MS 2830. Both the Royal and the Wadham MSS belong to the same recension, as is proved by the special form of Jerome's preface to the gospels, *Plures fuisse qui evangelia scripserunt*, etc. Usually this preface ends with the words, *quam ecclesiasticis vivis canendas* (see Wordsworth's edition, pp. 11-14). Both our MSS, alone of all that have come to our knowledge, go on to give, with new initial letters, the continuation of this dedicatory letter of Jerome, beginning with the words, *Satisque miror, Eusebi dilectissime*, down to, *sibi postea scribenda concludat*. This addition is, of course, taken from Jerome's commentary on Matthew.³ It provides us with a first clue as to the nature of Lanfranc's correction, which

¹ It is said of Dunstan that he corrected books; *Vita auct. B.* (Stubbs, *Memorials of St Dunstan*, paragr. 37). Other references to the correcting of MSS in C. Vercellone, *Variae Lectiones*, vol. i, Rome 1860, p. xvii, note 2.

² Migne cxlv 334.

³ Migne xxvi 20-22.

set out to fix the text so as to make it fit the sense of the various passages elicited by the Fathers. The text of the two MSS renders it very probable that they are English copies of the gospels as corrected by Lanfranc when teacher at Bec (1042-1063) and Abbot of Caen (1063-1070).

The text of the original hand in Roy. MS 1. B. xi does not offer anything notable. It is the well-known combination of the Alcuinian text with variants from other types introduced during the early scholastic tradition. Some typically Alcuinian readings are: Mt iii 2 *appropinquabit*; 9 *potens est*; v 28 *ad concupiscendam*; Mc vii 3 *traditiones*; viii 23 *apprehensa manu*; Lc ix 58 *caput + suum*; Jo iv 45 *om enim V*; v 24 *transiit*; and others. Together with these there are readings due to early scholastic interpretation: Mt iv 4 *> solo pane*; vi 15 *dimittet + vobis*; vii 11 *bona (pr.) + data*; xiii 14 *et adimpleatur (!) FX^c*; 23 *aliud vero*; Mc i 7 *veniet*; 11 *de caelis : de celo (in mg) X**; Lc xv 17 *mercennarii + in domo*; etc.

The interesting feature of this book, however, is the numerous corrections and interlinear glosses which were added to the text, partly in ink, partly with a dry-point, by a contemporary hand. We shall first give a selection from the glosses:

Mt xxi 25 *baptismum iohannis*. Above the line is the gloss: 'dicite mihi'. Precisely the same words constitute the Glossa Interlinearis (usually attributed to Anselm of Laon) on this passage.

Mc xii 14 *viam dei doces*. Above the line there occurs the gloss: 'dic ergo nobis' (cf. Tir), which may possibly be derived from Bede (Migne xcii 253).

Lc i 50 *et misericordia eius in progenies*, with the interlinear gloss: 'scilicet a me inchoata extenditur'. For the source, see Bede (*l.c.* 322; *Homilies*, Migne xciv 19; particularly also Origen, in Jerome's translation, Migne xxvi 250 f.). It is important to note that a similar gloss ('in me incepta dilatatur') accompanies this passage in the Glossa Interlinearis.

51 *fecit potentiam*, with the gloss: 'id est opera singularis potestatis'. See Bede (*l.c.* 322: 'Quia omnia per ipsum facta

sunt, ideo brachium Domini dictus est, id est Dei Verbum, quia per verbum operatus est mundum... Dei virtutem et sapientiam cogitemus, per quam facta sunt omnia').

55 *abraham et semini eius*, with the gloss: 'id est a principio seculorum'. See Bede (*l.c.* 323 B; *Homilies, l.c.* 21 A).

61 *quia nemo est*. Gloss: 'quasi dicat, non vocabitur sic quia etc.' This is an explanation of the literal meaning, a kind of commentation habitually practised in Lanfranc's commentary of the Pauline Epistles. The same purpose is served by the gloss on

63 *pugillarem*: 'id est parvam tabulam'.

ii 34 *signum*. Gloss: 'scilicet federis'. Source?

38 *ipsa hora*. Gloss: 'scilicet qua symeon acceperat puerum'. See Bede (*l.c.* 347). The Glossa Interlinearis reads: 'Qua symeon accepit'.

41 *paschae*. Gloss: 'id est parasceve'.

43 *consummatisque diebus*. Gloss: 'scilicet octavis'. The Glossa Interlinearis reads: 'Quia octavis protelabatur diebus'.

iii 1 *herode*. Gloss: 'antipa'.

2 *verbum domini*. Gloss: 'scilicet vade predica evangelium'. See Ambrose on Luke (Migne xv, ed. 1887, 1659 A). The Interlinear Gloss reads: 'Istud, vade et predica baptismum'.

4 *parate viam*. Gloss: 'id est, serva mandata'. This is a rendering of Bede's explanation (*l.c.* 352 B; also Alcuin on John, Migne c 754). The Glossa Interlinearis uses the very words of Bede's exposition; which is not the case in the present gloss.

7 *genimina*. Gloss: 'venenati et venenatorum filii'. Cf. Bede (*l.c.* 353 A, B): 'Malae soboles... genimina viperarum vocantur..., quasi venenati filii de venenatis parentibus nati sunt'.

8 *de lapidibus*. Gloss: 'id est, de gentibus habentibus corda lapidea'. Cf. Bede (*l.c.* 353 C, D).

11 *det*. Gloss: 'unam'. (Bede, *l.c.* 354 C.)

15 *ne forte (esset Christus)*. Gloss: 'id est, an'. Cf. Bede (*l.c.* 355 B): 'Non solum cogitabant, sed etiam missis ad eum sacerdotibus et levitis, an esset Christus inquirebant'. The Glossa Interlinearis also has, 'Id est an'.

iv 27 *nisi*. Gloss: 'nisi pro sed'.

29 *civitas illorum*. Gloss: 'nazareth'. Cf. Bede (*l.c.* 378 C): 'Necdum locum passionis, qui non in Nazareth... figurabatur, adierat'.

vii 37 *alabastrum*. Gloss: 'id est vas marmoreum'. Bede (*l.c.* 423 c): 'Alabastrum est genus marmoris candidi . . . , quod ad vasa unguentaria cavare solent'.

viii 5 *aliud cecidit secus viam*. Gloss: 'luxuriosi'. See Bede (*l.c.* 430 A): 'Via est cor sedulo malarum cogitationum transitu attritum atque arefactum'.

6 *supra petram*. Gloss: 'superbi'. Bede (*l.c.* 430 B).

7 *inter spinas*. Gloss: 'avari'. Cf. Rabanus on Matthew (Migne cvii 940 f.).

8 *in terram bonam*. Gloss: 'id est, mite cor et docile'. See Bede (*l.c.* 430 D): 'Terra bona fructu centuplo fecundatur, quando cor docile virtutum spiritualium perfectione donatur'.

ix 24 *animam suam*. Gloss: 'vitam carnalem'. Bede (*l.c.* 452 D).

26 *erubescet*. Gloss: 'id est abiciet'. Source? The Glossa Interlinearis has the same words.

31 *excessum*. Gloss: 'id est passionem'. From Bede (*l.c.* 455 B).

The relation between some of these Lanfrankian glosses on the gospels and the Glossa Interlinearis calls for an explanation. The connection between the two is not so close as to force upon us the conclusion that the Interlinear Gloss might have influenced the glosses in Royal MS 1. B. xi. For in most cases the gloss of the Royal MS and the Interlinear Gloss agree only as to the sense, not as to the verbal form. A comparison shows that the latter always follows its sources very closely, while Lanfranc usually renders the source in his own wording and in a very abridged form. These fragments of his gospel glosses are composed on the same model as his commentary on the Epistles.¹ There again it can be demonstrated that Lanfranc's short annotations in many places anticipated the Interlinear Gloss on the Epistles. The real reason for the similarity is the fact that both Lanfranc and the author of the Glossa did not draw their material from the patristic sources, but from secondary material. In the gospels and the Epistles both had recourse to the commentaries of

¹ A comparison shows that there is a close relation between Lanfranc's gloss and the Glossa Interlinearis on the Pauline Epistles.

Remigius of Auxerre. In particular, it should be noted that large parts of Lanfranc's exposition of the Epistles are digests of passages from Remigius.¹ It was the natural course to follow. Remigius had written expositions of many books of the Bible and he was famed as one of the greatest early scholastic teachers. His numerous abstracts of patristic commentaries were found very useful in the schools after his death, and became part of the permanent stock of scholastic exegesis. We shall have to show later that the authors of the Glossa made use of Remigius's works to great advantage. As far as his commentaries are concerned we may say, then, that Lanfranc formed a link in the chain of biblical interpreters stretching from the post-Carolingian schools to the twelfth-century authors of the Glossa. Each one used the material left by his predecessors, i.e. chiefly biblical commentaries, enlarging and revising it, until in the end the height of scholasticism saw the birth of the Glossa, the standard commentary of the Middle Ages. In Lanfranc's school, besides the Epistles and the gospels, the Apocalypse was taught and explained in imitation of Remigius, as we shall see later. These are the only books of Lanfranc's teaching of which traces have come down to us.

So we may call Lanfranc the direct descendant of the interpretative methods taught in the schools of Auxerre and Rheims, and from this it is possible to venture a suggestion as to the orthodox correction of the Bible ascribed to Lanfranc by Milo Crispinus. As far at least as the gospels are concerned, this correction was to adjust the words of the text to the corresponding metaphysical truths discovered by the Fathers and, therefore, taught by the Church. Lanfranc wrote his glosses in order to render the biblical meaning more fixed and stable.² But this also

¹ Remigius's commentary on the Epistles in Migne cxvii 364 ff. The beginning of the commentary on Romans there should be compared with Migne cl 105.

² In the case of the gospel glosses mentioned we presumably have only traces of his lectures at Bec.

entailed, to a certain extent, an adaptation of the text to the more narrowly defined sense, for, as we have shown, under the sway of the super-realist principle of language interpretation necessarily carried with it a certain amount of textual revision.

Nor was Lanfranc an exception to the rule. Royal MS I. B. xi does indeed present a number of new readings rightly called orthodox, because they fit very well the meaning of the Fathers, the 'Pillars of the Church', and most of these readings were preserved all through the Middle Ages. All the gospels betray the influence of interpretation according to the patristic writings, a sure sign that Lanfranc at Bec and Caen did more exegetic work than his solitary commentary on the Epistles would have us suppose.

Mt iv 16 *sedebat* (first hand): *ambulabat* (corrector, above the line). The source for the second reading is Jerome on Matthew (Migne xxvi 33 A).

xiv 22 *et statim iussit* (m. pr.): *vel compulit* (corr. sup. lin.). Jerome (*l.c.* 101 C): '*Et statim compulit iesus... Discipulis praecepit transfretare, et compulit ut ascenderent naviculam*'.

xv 33 *unde ergo nobis in deserto panes tantos* vulg: *... panes tanti* (so already first hand). See Hilary (Migne ix 1005).

xix 20 *custodivi* (m. pr.): + *a iuventute mea* (corr. sup. lin.). See Mc x 20, Lc xviii 21. Hilary (*l.c.* 1025 f.): '*Sed respondet haec omnia fecisse se a iuventute sua*'.

Lc i 54 *memorari* (m. pr.): *sive recordatus* (corr. sup. lin.).

ii 15 *quod factum est, quod dominus ostendit nobis* (m. pr.): *quod factum est quod fecit dominus et ostendit nobis* (corr. sup. lin.) A-YKW e. The corrector's reading is a revival of that in old and good MSS, caused by Bede (Migne xcii 334): '*Verbum quod semper erat, videamus quomodo pro nobis factum est, quod fecit Dominus et ostendit nobis... Videamus quomodo hoc ipsum Verbum, hoc est Dominus, ipse se fecerit, et ostenderit nobis carnem suam*'.

34 *in ruinam et resurrectionem* (m. pr.): + *in* (added after *et* by corr. sup. lin.). Bede (*l.c.* 346): '*Bene in resurrectionem, quia lumen est, quia gloria plebis Israel*'.

51 *conservabat omnia verba haec in corde suo* (m. pr.): + *conferens* (added after *haec* by corr. sup. lin.). Explanation has been given above.

iv 14 *egressus* (m. pr.) A-YBR : *regressus* (corr.) vulg. The corrector's reading is supported by Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum* (Migne xxxiv 1097).

18 *evangelizare pauperibus misit me* (m. pr.) : + *sanare contritos corde* (corr. sup. lin.) vettVmod. The addition is advocated by Bede (*l.c.* 374) : 'Ideo missum sive unctum se dicit, ad medendum confractis sive contritis corde; iuxta quod et Psalmista de illo: *Qui sanat, inquit, contritos corde, et alligat contritiones eorum*'.

34 *scio te, qui sis, sanctus dei* (m. pr.) : *quia* (instead of *qui*, corr.). According to Bede (*l.c.* 379 c) the demoniac confesses that Christ is God. This idea obviously caused the alteration.

v 7 *ita ut mergerentur* (m. pr.) : + *pene* (corr. sup. lin.). See above.

25 *tulit in quo iacebat* (m. pr.) : *tulit lectum in quo iacebat* (*lectum* added by corr.). The word *lectum* is important, because it is associated with a complex of meaning which is given by Ambrose (Migne xv, ed. 1887, 1724 A) as follows: 'Hic lectus qui tolli iubetur, quid est aliud nisi quia humanum iubetur corpus attolli? . . . Hic est lectus doloris, in quo anima nostra gravi conscientiae aegra cruciatu iacebat'. Similarly Bede (*l.c.* 388).

vii 3 *salvaret* (m. pr.) : *sanaret* (corr. sup. lin.) alc S. The corrector introduced the Alcuinian reading. See also Bede (*l.c.* 414 D), who also uses *sanare*.

ix 29 *et factum est species vultus eius* (m. pr.) : *facta* (instead of *factum*, corr.). A variant of a strictly grammatical nature and preserved even in the editions vg.

62 *in aratrum* (m. pr.) : *ad aratrum* (corr.). So in vg.

xi 25 *mundatam* (m. pr.) : + *et ornatam* (corr. sup. lin.). See above.

29 *nisi signum ionae* (m. pr.) : + *prophetae* (corr. sup. lin.). Bede (*l.c.* 480 D) : 'Alii tentantes signum de caelo quaerebant ab eo . . . , quale Ionas propheta naufragus'. Ambrose (*l.c.* 1724).

32 *ad praedicationem* (m. pr.) : *in predicatione* (corr.), an early scholastic reading to be found already in E M^T, and taken over from Mt xii 41, because Jerome's explanation of the latter verse used to be quoted for Lc xi 32 (as can be seen from the Glossa Interlinearis).

xix 26 *dabitur* (m. pr.) : + *et abundabit* (corr.), from Mt xiii 12, because the interpretation of both passages was the same.

Jo ii 22 *quia hoc dicebat* (m. pr.) : + *de corpore suo* (corr. sup.)

lin.), from verse 21, on the authority of Augustine (Migne xxxv 1472) and Alcuin (Migne c 776).

iii 33 *qui accipit* (m. pr.): *qui autem acceperit* (corr.). Derived from Augustine (*l.c.* 1507), or Alcuin (*l.c.* 788 D f.).

vi 71 *iudam* (m. pr.): *de iuda* (corr.). Alcuin (*l.c.* 840 A).

vii 25 *nonne hic est quem quaerunt interficere* (m. pr.): + *iudei* (added after *quem* by corr.); see T cor. vat.* Augustine (*l.c.* 1636 D).

Other readings introduced by the corrector are: Jo viii 9 *autem + haec*; xi 37 *oculos caeci + nati*; 45 *ad mariam + et martham*; 49 *caiphas + nomine*; xiv 1 + *et ait discipulis suis*; 19 *videtis: videbitis*; xvii 4 *ut faciam: ut facerem*; xviii 35 *pontifices + tui*.

The Wadham College MS (written about 1070 in an English monastery) lacks the glosses to be found in the Royal MS, but it has the same remarkable readings in the text, partly by the first scribe, partly added by a corrector working not much later. Moreover, this MS, being the elder of the two, contains some additional variants which have disappeared again in the later copy. They all conform to the same principle:

Mt iii 10 *ad radices arborum* (instead of *radicem* vulg) TirW. Hilary (Migne ix 926): 'Securis vero radicibus arborum apposita...'. Rabanus (Migne cvii 771): 'Securis sententiam iudicis altissimi significat, quae ad radices arborum, id est ad finem regni populi Iudaici posita est'.

17 *et ecce audita est vox de caelis dicens* (vulg omits *audita est*). *Audita est* represents a reality, or an idea, which is expressed by Augustine as follows (*De consensu*, Migne xxxiv 1092): 'Vox enim coelestis unum horum [filium Dei esse] dixit; sed evangelista ostendere voluit ad id valere quod dictum est, *Hic est filius meus*, ut illis potius qui audiebant indicaretur, quod ipse esset Filius Dei, atque ita dictum referre voluit, Tu es Filius meus, ac si diceretur illis, *Hic est Filius meus*. Non enim Christo indicabatur quod sciebat, sed audiebant qui aderant, propter quos etiam ipsa vox facta est'.

vi 6 *et clauso ostio ora patrem* (vulg adds *tuo* after *ostio*) Z*T O¹vg. See Jerome (Migne xxvi 42). Augustine (*De serm. dom.*, Migne xxxiv 1274): 'Claudentes ostia orate, ait, Patrem. Parum est intrare in cubicula, si ostium pateat importunis; per quod ostium ea quae foris sunt, improbe se immergunt, et

interiora nostra appetunt. Foris autem diximus esse omnia temporalia et visibilia, quae per ostium, id est per carnalem sensum, in cogitationes nostras penetrant. . . . Claudendum est ergo ostium, id est carnali sensui resistendum est’.

13 *a malo amen* (vulg omits *amen*). From Jerome (*l.c.* 43).

30 *modice fidei* (: *minimae fidei* vulg). From Augustine (*De serm. dom.*, *l.c.* 1291); Jerome (*l.c.* 46).

vii 11 *bona + data*; see above.

13 *quia lata et spatiosa via* (vulg adds *porta* after *lata*). The omission of *porta* is due to Jerome’s explanation of the passage (*l.c.* 47 D): ‘*Lata via est saeculi voluptas, quam appetunt homines. Angusta, quae per labores et ieiunia panditur. . . . Considera, quam signanter de utraque via locutus sit. Per latam multi ambulant, angustam pauci inveniunt. Latam non quaerimus, nec inventionem opus est: sponte se offert, et errantium via est*’.

14 *arta via est* (vulg omits *est*). Probably from the same source as the preceding variant. Also Augustine (*De serm. dom.*, *l.c.* 1304).

viii 15 *ministrabat ei* (: *eis* vulg). From Rabanus (*l.c.* 861): ‘[*Ecclesia*] per spiritale officium Domino quotidie ministrat’.

ix 11 *quare cum publicanis et peccatoribus manducat et bibit magister* (vulg omits *et bibit*). The same reading is contained in E. Augustine (*De consensu*, *l.c.* 1107): ‘*Praetermissum est a Matthaeo quod Marcus addidit, et bibit: sed quid ad rem, cum plena sit sententia, insinuans pariter convivantes?*’

15 *ieiunare* (m. pr., but erased and replaced by the Vulgate reading *lugere*). Augustine (*De consensu*, *l.c.* 1109).

x 2 *discipulorum nomina ZJX*OBR*ε* (vulg has *apostolorum nomina*). Augustine (*De consensu*, *l.c.* 1112).

xii 45 *ingressi* (vulg reads *intrantes*). From Lc xi 26, but via Rabanus’s commentary on Matthew, where this passage is explained by a sentence copied from Bede on Lc xi 26 (Rabanus, *l.c.* 936: ‘*Unde recte nequiores tunc eum spiritus dicuntur ingressi, quia. . .*’; and Bede, Migne xcii 478).

xiii 1 *in illo tempore* (vulg has *in illo die*). Augustine (*De consensu*, *l.c.* 1120): ‘*In illo die* (nisi forte dies, more Scripturarum, tempus significet) satis indicat hoc consequenter gestum’.

xiv 2 *hic est iohannes baptista quem ego decollavi* (vulg omits *quem ego decollavi*) vettir. Augustine, *De consensu* (*l.c.* 1122).

15 *ut euntes in castello emant sibi escas E* (vulg has *in castella*). According to Rabanus (*l.c.* 964) *castellum* means ‘conventicula

haereticorum, sive pseudoprophetarum, seu philosophorum', in which unwholesome food is to be found, the food of the world. So the word was construed as depending on *ut emant escas*, not on *euntes*, and this required the form *in castello*.

xvi 20 *quia ipse esset christus* (vulg has *iesus christus*). See Jerome (*l.c.* 118 c).

xviii 12 *in deserto* (: *in montibus* vulg). See above.

xxi 31 *quia publicani et peccatores praecedent vos* (vulg has *meretrices* instead of *peccatores*). Claudius of Turino (B.M. Royal MS 2.C.x, fol. 128^v): 'Ideo publicani et meretrices in regno erunt priores, quia iohanni crediderunt et in remissione peccatorum baptizati in adventum christi confessi sunt'.

xxiii 14. This verse, omitted in vulg, agrees with the form given in Jerome's commentary and contained in vg. In 15 there is an erasure between the words *unum* and *proselitum*, where the original hand seems to have read *rarum*. See Hilary (*l.c.* 1049): 'Proselyti sunt ex gentibus in Synagoga recepti. Quorum futurorum raritas in uno indicatur'.

In the other gospels there are readings of a similar nature, such as Mc i 24 *venisti + ante tempus* (sed eras.) $\xi \text{ S}$; ii 16 > *cum publicanis et peccatoribus* vett mod; v 43 *dixit: iussit* X*W $\xi \text{ S}$; viii 14 *obliti sunt + discipuli eius* Mir; ix 3 *splendens + et* vett H^cΘ mod; 15 *videns eum: videns iesum* M mod; xi 32 *timebant: timemus* ir M W $\xi \text{ S C}$; Lc vi 26 *secundum haec + enim* vett mod; viii 26 om *autem* vg (Bede, *l.c.* 436 D); ix 15 *discumbere fecerunt: discubuerunt* vett $\xi \text{ S}$; xiii 35 *donec veniat cum dicetis: donec dicatis* vett gat E (Bede, *l.c.* 510); Jo vii 23 *sanum: saluum* vett ir, Ambrose, Augustine; x 12 *mercenarius + autem* vett T vg; etc.

These remarkable readings are superimposed on a basic text roughly identical with that of the early schools, i.e. Alcuinian with an admixture of scholastic variants. E.g. Mt iii 7 *futura: ventura* Wvg; 12 > *triticum in horreum suum* Z*X*BT $\xi \text{ S}$; iv 4 > *solo pane* X^c mod; v 32 > *causa fornicationis*; viii 9 + *constitutus* irΘvg; 20 om *et ZX*alc*; xxiii 20 *ergo: autem* V*; Mc i 7 *veniet* MW $\xi \text{ S}$; v 19 *et: iesus autem* Zalc; Lc ii 46 *interrogantem + eos* mod; etc. There are also a number of Old Latin readings characteristic of Remigius's school.¹

¹ The two twelfth-century catalogues of Bec (G. Bekker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum antiqui*, Bonn 1885, pp. 201, 265f.) mention John the Scot's translations of pseudo-Dionysius, and glosses of Remigius.

REFORM OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH
UNDER LANFRANC

A detailed analysis of the Lanfrankian text was necessary, because this correction remained for about a hundred years the standard text in the larger English monasteries. Let us remember the seemingly extravagant words of Milo Crispinus, that in his time Lanfranc's emendation of the Bible was generally used, that the whole Latinity revered him as their master,¹ and that all Europe was influenced and improved by his learning.² It may well have been an exaggeration, but there was some foundation for it, as far as the century after Lanfranc's consecration as Archbishop of Canterbury (1070) was concerned. The English Church before the Conquest had always inclined to segregate itself and remain aloof from the ecclesiastical movements of the Continent.³ This state of things was radically altered when the Conqueror wisely decided to have a man for his archbishop who was conversant with the most up-to-date methods in matters of ecclesiastical organisation, law, and dogmatical doctrine. Even while Lanfranc was a monk and preceptor at Bec, the monastery had become the centre of a small circle of monasteries, which had been reformed by the Abbot of Bec (St Evroult, Russerie). The most important one was Caen, where Lanfranc became the first abbot (1063-1070). Lanfranc's education in his Italian home and at Bec predestined him to direct the main force of his activities to the fields of organisation and of ecclesiastical law. It is to be regretted that the earliest preserved catalogue of the library at Bec does not date back further than the second half of the twelfth century (about 1160), but it may confidently be said that a great part of the original stock of the library was due to Lanfranc's activity. The greater half of the books were biblical commentaries and other

¹ Migne cl 55 c.

² *Ib.* col. 41 f.

³ H. Boehmer, *Kirche und Staat*, p. 44 ff.

writings of the Fathers, after which books of legal nature came as a good second.¹ When Lanfranc was archbishop, a MS containing decrees of councils and papal decrees was sent to him from Bec.²

In England he regarded it as his first duty to restrain the pretensions of the Archbishop of York and to obtain recognition as Primate of all England. Next, his ambition was to bring the bishops into closer contact with the primatial see. Formerly the bishops had held their office in the fashion of local noblemen. They governed and performed their functions as they thought right and not, as it seemed to the Norman clergy, always to the best purpose.³ Lanfranc's consecration as archbishop, therefore, amounted to a reform of many branches of English ecclesiastical life.⁴ At the time of the Conquest, England contained no more than forty-five monasteries, all of which were situated south of the Humber. The whole of the once flourishing monasticism of Northumbria was extinct, with the sole exception of the cathedral monastery of Durham.⁵ The re-establishment and organisation of monasticism was, from the point of view of civilisation, one of the most important acts of Lanfranc. Just as in his time the new cathedrals were built in the Norman style, so the monasteries reformed under him preserved for a long time the stamp which he had left upon them.⁶

¹ Cf. the numbers (G. Bekker, *Catalogi*, p. 201): 64 Hilarius de sinodis; 67 dicta Gregorii; 68 decreta Gratiani; 69 codex (i.e. the *Corpus Iuris*); 70 tres partes et digesta nova; 71 digesta vetera; 72 inforciata et liber autenticorum; 73 liber institutionum et tres libri codicis; and the nos. 74, 79, 80, 81. In the second catalogue (*ib.* p. 264) the nos. 120-125.

² Trin. Coll. Camb. MS B. 16.44. See M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, Cambridge 1903, p. xxx; H. Boehmer, *Die Fälschungen Erzbischof Lanfranks von Canterbury*, p. 65 ff.; A. J. Macdonald, *Lanfranc*, Oxford 1926, p. 294. James's and Boehmer's observations on the book are now superseded by what is the best authority on the legal aspect of Lanfranc's reform, Z. N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy, 1050-1200*, Cambridge 1931.

³ A. J. Macdonald, *Lanfranc*, p. 70 ff.

⁴ Milo Crispinus (Migne cl 42 D).

⁵ H. Boehmer, *Kirche und Staat*, p. 73.

⁶ Eadmer, *Hist. Novorum* (Migne clix 353 D).

LANFRANC'S VULGATE TEXT IN THE ENGLISH
CATHEDRALS AND MONASTERIES: CANTERBURY

Lanfranc began his work in his own cathedral of Christ Church at Canterbury, which in 1067 had been destroyed by fire. He collected MSS for the library of the new building, and his regulations for monastic life provided that every monastery should possess liturgical books as well as others for the purpose of study.¹ Furthermore, numerous MSS of the eleventh and twelfth centuries have come down to us acquainting us with a peculiar type of script which is identical with that used in Bec at the period. Palaeographers have gone so far as to speak of a Lanfrankian type of script.² With patient tenacity the primate succeeded in introducing monks into the cathedrals. At least he resisted all attempts of the bishops to replace the monks by canons. It appears that some bishops who were eager to have canons in their cathedrals, as Walkelin of Winchester, approached the clergy of Christ Church, Canterbury, after several failures to realise their intention, soliciting them to favour the establishment of a secular chapter, for 'they knew very well, that the see of the primate held a superior position and that its incumbents were entitled and even bound to watch over the affairs and the order of the cathedrals throughout all England'.³

Lanfranc could not only rely on the King's assent to his reformative measures, but he was also backed by the authority of the Pope. So he was enabled to lay down the lines of a long and stable development which was to be of the greatest benefit to the cultural activities of the English clergy, especially in the cathedral monasteries. Later events prove that in Lanfranc's time the foundation was laid for the legal rights and privileges of which the

¹ Migne cl 488, 502; on the monastic school, *ib.* col. 506; also William of Malmesbury, *G.P.* (R.S. 1870) p. 69.

² M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries*, pp. xxix-xxxii.

³ Eadmer, *Hist. Novorum* (ed. Rule, R.S. 1884), p. 19.

ecclesiastical hierarchy could justly boast. The quarrels of Anselm with William Rufus and Henry I, or of Thomas Becket with Henry II, speak for themselves. These cases, it is true, were partly evoked by the Roman ecclesiastical law, which found its way to England under Lanfranc. Yet there must have been something corresponding to this possessive spirit in the attitude of the monks, who defended the *status quo ante* and kept a jealous watch over their customs and privileges. It would sometimes happen that even the monks took part against their own archbishop, if he dared to encroach upon the rights of the cathedral clergy. We may recall the feud between the monks of Christ Church and Archbishop Baldwin, which raged for two years (1187–1189), because the archbishop proposed to erect a church for canons in the neighbourhood of the monastery, a plan which was regarded by the monks as violating their rights. The end of the affair was that Baldwin had to give in and to settle his canons at Lambeth near London.¹ It is perhaps not too much to say that the high position with which the monasteries were credited under Lanfranc, gave rise to their segregation from the universal organisation of the Church in certain points of law. They looked upon themselves as independent and self-governed communities within the English Church. In many cases they obtained, or at least claimed, exemption from episcopal jurisdiction.²

The monastic scriptoria undoubtedly profited from this state of things. They enjoyed a spell of unbroken rest favourable to the cultivation of a new tradition of writing and illuminating. The opportunity did not pass by unused, for some of the most beautiful MSS date from the century after Lanfranc. Perhaps the Eadwine Psalter of Trinity College, Camb. (R. 17. 1), is only a fair example of the height to which book production attained at that time. Many monastic libraries which formerly had only

¹ *Annals of Osney* (ed. Luard, R.S.), ad ann. 1189; *Annales Monastici* (R.S. 1869) iv 43; *Vict. Hist. of Kent* ii, London 1926, 116.

² *Vict. Hist. of Kent* ii 114.

been meanly provided with books or had lost them for some reason or other, accumulated conspicuous libraries in the twelfth century. Such was the case even in comparatively small houses like Whitby, of which there is a library catalogue dating from about 1180. We hear that in 1091 the library of Croyland, consisting of about 400 volumes, was burnt down. The Peterborough catalogue (about 1180) opens with two Bibles, one of which comprised four volumes.¹ This latter book must have been a specimen of monastic Bible production typical of the second half of the twelfth century. These Bibles are of an unusually large format, written in large, clear characters, the predecessors of the Gothic script and of French origin. The design and the colouring of the admirable and often illuminated initials is also French.² Many Bibles of this type, which belonged to English monasteries, have been preserved. Their text reveals the predominant feature of English monasticism in the twelfth century, the tendency to cling to custom and tradition. The monasteries preserved what had been impressed upon them by Lanfranc's initiating energy. It will be seen that in the greater part of the twelfth century the large English monasteries cultivated the very text that had been used, interpreted, and 'corrected' in the schools of Bec and Caen. They took no notice of the progress in matters relating to biblical studies that was being made elsewhere, simply because they insisted on their own specific heritage of monastic learning which had been given to them by Lanfranc.

There are three Bibles of this class from Christ Church, Canterbury, known to-day, none of which appears to be older than 1180. Perhaps they owe their existence to the revival of activity which the Canterbury scriptorium experienced after the burning of the cathedral in 1174. (The reconstruction was begun in the following year.³)

¹ E. Edwards, *Memoirs of Libraries* i, London 1859, 109-117.

² On the outward appearance of this category of MSS see E. G. Millar, *English Illuminated MSS* i.

³ Gervase of Canterbury (*Opera*, ed. Stubbs, R.S. 1879) i 1-19.

We propose here to quote a few readings from two of these Bibles.¹

C.C.C.C. MS 72, the four gospels, from Canterbury, about 1180; Trinity Coll. Camb. B. 5. 1, a Bible of large size and of about the same date. In the Corpus book distinct traces of the Irish text are noticeable, e.g. Mt i 2 *abraham + autem*; 17 *generationes + sunt* (three times); iv 7 *scriptum est + autem*; viii 12 *regni + huius*; xiv 2 *baptista + quem ego decollavi* (but see Wadham Coll. MS A. 10. 22 for an explanation of the addition); Jo vi 23 *gratias agentes deo*; etc. All these ancient relics, however, have been corrected by a contemporary hand.

Both MSS agree in their percentage of typically Alcuinian readings, such as Mt iii 2 *appropinquabit*; v 28 *ad concupiscendam*; xvii 3 *apparuerunt*; Mc i 43 *+ et (statim)*; vii 3 *traditiones*; viii 34 *neget*; 37 *commutationis*; 38 *sanctis : suis*; ix 15 *accurentesque*; x 17 *in via*; xi 24 *evenient*; Lc viii 49 *ad principem*; Jo v 24 *transiet* Trin. Coll. MS, *transi (!)* Corp. MS (the scribe hesitated with respect to the correct reading!); etc.

There is a goodly number of early scholastic readings. Mt i 18 *mater iesu* Corp. c; 23 *vocabunt* Corp.*; *vocabitur* Corp.^c Trin. E c S; iii 17 *de celo* Corp. T; iv 4 *solo pane* X^c mod; 16 > *vidit lucem* D vg; v 23 *offers* Corp. H^c V mod; vii 11 *bona + data* vett BEKM O^{gl} mod (see above, where this addition is discussed); ix 1 *ascendens + iesus* (liturgical addition) Corp. (sup. lin.) cor. vat. c S; 18 *adoravit* Z* X* BW; x 10 *non (pr.) : neque*; 11 *quacumque + autem* H^o mod; 14 om *de (civitate)* Z^c mod (see above); xiii 14 *et adimpleatur* Corp. F X^c, *ut adimpleatur* Trin. A-Y alc T^c c S; xv 12 *verbo + hoc* M Z⁴ vg; xxi 4 *autem + totum* Trin.^{mg} ER W c S; 21 *tollere et iactare* Corp. c cor. vat.*; xxiii 14 the verse is omitted by Corp.* (and vulg), but in mg there is the note: 'deficit unus versus', Trin. reads the verse

¹ The third copy (in two vols.) is now in the Maidstone Museum and in the Lambeth Palace Library (MS 4) respectively. Another large monastic Bible, but of uncertain provenance, is Bodl. Auct. E. infra 1. 2.

in the form of Jerome's commentary and vg; xxv 11 *novissime + vero* Wvg; xxvii 16 + *qui propter homicidium missus fuerat in carcerem* Corp. X* H^{mg} Θ W; Mc ii 1 *post dies + octo* (sup. lin. Corp.^c) WϵϢ; v 35 *ad archisinagogum* K WϵϢϢ; viii 1 *esset + cum iesu* O^c WϵϢ; xvi 14 *apparuit + illis iesus* cor. vat.*; Lc i 45 *credidisti...tibi* Corp.^c Trin....; ii 7 *eis : eirr* WϵϢ; 46 *interrogantem + eos* C T mod; iv 4 > *solo pane* T Θ vg; 5 *diabolus + in montem altissimum* M H Θ (see Ambrose on Luke, *ad loc.*); v 22 *cogitatis + mala* cor. vat.* ϵϢ; vii 11 *ibat + iesus* Corp. (in rubrica sup. lin.) H¹ WϵϢ; 34 *vorator* E W; ix 15 *discumbere fecerunt : discubuerunt* G vett ϵϢ; xii 51 *pacem mittere t dare* Trin. vett ϵ; xv 17 + *in domo*; xvii 11 *iret + iesus* Corp. (in rubrica sup. lin.) cor. vat.*; xxi 9 *non : nondum* vett cor. vat.^{mg} vg; Jo iii 15 *in ipso : in eum* Corp. vett (W Ϣ Ϣ Ϣ); v 2 *cognominabatur* D cor. vat.*; xv 15 *dico : dicam* Y* S W ϵ Ϣ Ϣ; xvi 3 *facient + vobis* I X* D mod; xix 6 *crucifige* (secd.) + *eum* E mod; xx 9 *oportet : oportuerat* Corp. (see above, MS Add. 34890, of the Winchester class, *ad loc.*), *oportuit* Trin. M ϵ; xxi 23 *iesus + quia* vett W; and others.

ST ALBANS

The history of the scriptorium at St Albans during the century after Lanfranc's reform is available in greater detail. In 1077 Lanfranc's nephew and pupil, Paul, of Caen monastery, became Abbot of St Albans (d. 1093), where he introduced the same reformatory measures as had been adopted in Canterbury by his uncle. He restored the decaying buildings and brought back into the possession of the monastery certain property which had been lost through negligence in the past. Both the church and the monastery were provided with the requisites for the ritual and for the daily needs of the brethren, and the strict Rule was reasserted with the necessary force.¹ As a pupil of Lanfranc Paul had received a literary education, i.e.

¹ Walsingham, *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii S. Albani* (ed. Riley, R.S. 1867) i 51 ff.

he had become acquainted with the pre-scholastic form of biblical study together with the patristic expositions. Lanfranc himself endowed the library with a first stock of a hundred volumes,¹ a very appropriate gift, for in the years of decline preceding the Conquest the old library had gradually been dispersed. A knight made a grant of land to the monastery on the express condition that the revenue from it should be used for the writing of books. Paul showed his gratefulness by rewarding the generous donor with a missal, among other things, and various other books he needed. 'But then it was resolved that nothing further should be done or written for that knight in connection with the donation. Paul so having provided for the knight's library commanded that in the scriptorium built by himself books of special importance should be copied. The originals of these were sent him by Lanfranc'.²

The mention of Lanfranc's name is noteworthy: at the beginning of the brilliant history of the St Albans scriptorium, which later was to be the scene of the work of a Matthew Paris, we find books and in particular Bibles being copied which contained the text as explained and corrected by Lanfranc at Bec. Moreover, we are explicitly told that on Lanfranc's suggestion Paul retained at St Albans the well-proven customs (*consuetudines*) of Bec (i.e. probably the *Decreta pro ordine S. Benedicti*), and that the old ones hitherto in use at St Albans were ordered to be discontinued. There must have been a similar change in the biblical text of St Albans. Unfortunately none of the Bibles written to Paul's order³ can be found to-day, but the scriptorium continued to flourish under his successors. Under Abbot Richard (1097-1119) three scribes were permanently employed in the scriptorium⁴ and some very precious books were copied.⁵ Richard's successor was the

¹ L. F. R. Williams, *Hist. of the Abbey of St Alban*, London 1917, p. 39.

² Walsingham, *Gesta* i 57 f.

³ *Ib.* p. 58: 'Dedit igitur [Paulus abbas] huic ecclesiae viginti octo volumina notabilia, et . . . librum in quo continentur Evangelia legenda per annum; duos Textus [i.e. Bibles], auro et argento et gemmis ornatos'.

⁴ L. F. R. Williams, *Hist. of the Abbey of St Alban*, p. 46.

⁵ Walsingham, *Gesta* i 70.

learned Norman Geoffrey, whose reputation as a teacher had induced Abbot Richard to call him to St Albans, where he became monk and preceptor, and later abbot. Under him the monastery attained to a prosperity unequalled before, and this had a good influence on the work of the scriptorium.¹ About the middle of the century we notice the first signs of the jealousy with which abbots and monks guarded their privileges, especially after Pope Hadrian IV had exempted the house of his youth from the jurisdiction and the visitation of the Bishop of Lincoln.

This completed the process of secluding the monastery from all influences which might have introduced another form of the Vulgate text, for if the St Albans Bibles preserved to-day belong to the time of Abbot Simon, they prove that under him Lanfranc's text was copied with but little modification. The text is that of the Canterbury MSS of the twelfth century. Abbot Simon's permanent scribes wrote 'exceedingly beautiful books and volumes both of the New and of the Old Testament, the like of which we never saw before or since'.² They were carefully kept in decorated chests, and a code of regulations for the scriptorium was drawn up, in which among other things it was enjoined on Simon's successors always to employ at least one scribe.³ It is more probable, however, that the Bibles to which we refer date from the time of the Warin brothers (abbot and prior respectively) and of their nephew of the same name. They are: C.C.C.C. MS 48; Eton Coll. MS 26 (which was presented to the monastery by Matthew Warin); Trin. Coll. Dublin MS A. 2. 2, and, a little later, St John's Coll. Camb. MS 183.⁴ The first three Bibles are closely connected with each other, as the text is written in three parallel columns, an arrangement very unusual at the time. We quote a few typical passages from the Corpus MS and the St John's MS.

¹ *Ib.* p. 59. The books written under Geoffrey, *ib.* p. 94.

² *Ib.* p. 184.

³ *Ib.* p. 192.

⁴ F. G. Millar, *Engl. Illumin. MSS* i 47.

C.C.C.C. MS 48, second volume of a Bible from St Albans, of the end of the twelfth century. The four gospels are written side by side in four parallel columns, an arrangement which is probably due to Prior Senatus of Worcester (1189-1196), who corrected the Eusebian sections, as appears from a letter of his which is prefixed to the gospels in the present MS.¹ Some noteworthy readings of the book are: Mt iv 6 *tollent t tollant* D S; v 23 *offers*; vii 11 *bona* (pr.) + *data*; xvi 9 *quinque milium : et quinque milia* Z^c W S; Mc i 18 *retibus t omnibus* vett; Lc i 54 *memorari t recordatus* X* W S S S; ii 7 *eis : ei*; 15 *quod fecit dominus et ostendit nobis*; 38 *hierusalem : israel* (m. pr.) vett vg, sed corr. in rasura; iv 18 + *sanare contritos corde* Q V mod; v 7 + *pene* W S S S; viii 23 *complebantur : complebatur* vett; xv 17 + *in domo*; xvi 21 + *et nemo illi dabat* K T W S S S; xvii 28 *om sicut* Z X* M (a scholastic reading!); Jo i 29 *peccata* O W S S; etc.

St John's Coll. Camb. MS 183 is a St Albans Bible of small size and dating from the first years of the thirteenth century.² In addition to the variants mentioned from C.C.C.C. MS 48, the following may be of interest: Mt iii 7 *ventura* W vg; v 30 *gehennam : perditionem*; xiv 22 *iussit t compulsit* cor. vat.^{mg} S S; xvii 17 *respondens + autem* E R S S S; xviii 10 *enim : autem* E; xxvi 75 *egressus + petrus* F W; Mc ii 1 *dies + octo* W S S; v 35 *ad archisinagogum* K mod; viii 1 *esset + cum iesu* O^c W S S; ix 49 + *sale* G F mod; Lc i 54 *memorari t recordatus*; ii 7 *ei*; viii 23 *complebatur fluctibus*; 49 *venit + quidam* ir mod; xi 28 *custodiunt + illud* H O B² K

¹ Burrows (*Collectanea* ii, Oxf. Hist. Soc. 1890, 180) supposed that the letter, or the whole Bible C.C.C.C. MS 48, was Senatus's autograph. This is not the case. The book is a typical St Albans product of the time. The letter is printed in C. H. Turner, *Early Worcester Fragments*, Oxford 1916, p. xlv. Senatus's statement that he had corrected the Eusebian canons from an ancient gospel book of King Offa should be received with more doubt than it usually meets with. It savours suspiciously of the tendency to indicate fabulous sources, which is so frequent in the Middle Ages. See below, chap. vi, p. 292, note 3.

² The capitula of the gospels in this MS have a peculiar form not represented in Wordsworth's collations. The same can be found in another St Albans MS, Trin. Coll. Camb. B. 5. 3 (see below, chap. v, p. 236, note 1).

V mod; 44 *apparent* Z* X* W § ⑤ ⑥; xii 35 + *in manibus vestris* E mod; xv 17 + *in domo*; xvi 21 + *et nemo illi dabit*; xvii 7 + *bovem (pascentem)* (m. pr.), X* O Z² W, *boves* corr., Z* T* cor. vat.* ⑤ ⑥; 28 om *sicut*; Jo i 29 *peccata*; v 28 *eius : filii dei* cor. vat.^{mg} ⑤ ⑥; 39 *quia vos putatis in ipsis : in quibus vos putatis* vett; xviii 28 *a caiphan* (!) vett; xix 6 *crucifige* (alt.) + *eum* E mod.

DOVER PRIORY

In the twelfth century the same text was also brought to Dover. Lanfranc does not seem to have meddled with the church of St Martin there, in spite of the fact that the clergy responsible for the service did not live up to the standard of clerical life. In 1130 Henry I put an end to further abuses by presenting the church with all its property to Christ Church, Canterbury,¹ whereupon Archbishop William set himself the task to reform the church of Dover in all respects. The old building was unsightly and neglected, so a new and larger church was erected, and as the former clergy had lived rather irregularly the archbishop planned to establish a house of canons to take over the duty in the new church. This plan, however, was forcefully resisted by the monks of Christ Church, who contended that Dover Church had been given to their own house, and that the archbishop was not entitled to invite to their own property canons coming from other parts of the country and living according to a different Rule. Here we have a flagrant instance of the spirit of independence among the monks who wished to have their own tradition prevail wherever they had the legal right to extend their self-government. The dispute remained unsettled until the death of Archbishop William. His successor Theobald conceded to the monks what they so ardently desired, and so twelve monks under the prior, William of Longueville, entered Dover.² This almost

¹ C. R. Haines, *Dover Priory*, Cambridge 1930, p. 60.

² Gervase of Canterbury (R.S.) i 96-99. C. R. Haines, *Dover Priory*; on the library at Dover, *ib.* p. 382 ff.; facsimiles of the large Bible, *ib.* p. 391.

automatically caused the Canterbury form of the biblical text to spread to Dover, and in spite of the never-ceasing quarrels between the parent house and its offshoot, the scribes working at Dover, if we may go by palaeographical evidence, often seem to have been monks of Christ Church.¹

MSS 3 and 4 of C.C.C.C. are the two volumes of a twelfth-century Bible mentioned in the old catalogue of Dover library.² The gospels in the second volume (MS 4) present such readings as: Mt i 17 *ergo : autem* (in ras.) W; iv 4 > *solo pane* X^c mod; vii 4 *tuo + frater* P R^{sax} W ξ ξ ; i 1 *bona + data*; 25 *supra + firmam* (*petram*), a scholastic addition, but cancelled in the MS; x 11 *quancumque + autem* H Θ mod; 14 om *de* (*civitate*) Z^c mod; xii 30 > *mecum est* W; xiii 20 *verbum + dei* ξ ; 36 *edissere* T Θ E^c mod; xiv 2 *eo : illo* E W; 19 *turbam : turbas* J V, sed corr.; xv 12 *verbo + hoc* M Z⁴ vg; 13 *ille : ipse* W; xvi 9 *et quinque milia* Z^c W ξ ; xvii 19 > *ad iesum discipuli* W; 26 *dixit* (alt.) : *dixitque* W; xviii 13 *gaudebit : gaudet* mod; 16 > *te non* R vg; 21 om *et* (*dimittam*) W; xix 1 *iesus : dominus* Winchester text; 21 *vende + omnia* ir W ξ ξ ; xx 16 *autem : vero* (in ras.) ir O^c vg; xxi 4 *autem + totum* E R W ξ ξ ; 5 om *et* (*sedens*) W ξ ξ ξ ; xxii 45 *david + in spiritu* Fir W; xxiii 14 was added later from Jerome's commentary; 21 *qui : quicumque* P^{mg} mod; xxv 11 *novissime + vero* mod; 30 *illic : ibi* J E W; Mc i 7 *veniet*; ii 2 *ita ut + iam*; v 23 *manus : manum* G mod; viii 1 + *cum iesu* O^c W cor. vat. * ξ ξ ; 34 *semetipsum* T H¹ Θ mod; x 28 > *ei petrus dicere* W vg; 41 *coeperunt indignari : indignati sunt* D ξ ξ ; 51 > *tibi vis* mod; Lc i 66 *quid : quis* (sed corr.) I vg; iv 9 *pinnaculum* R W cor. vat. mg; 18 + *sanare contritos corde*; v 7 + *pene*; viii 49 *venit + quidam* vettir mod; ix 54 *illos + sicut helias fecit* vett Θ O^c cor. vat. *; xii 35 + *in manibus vestris*; xv 17 + *in domo*; xvi 21 + *et nemo illi dabat*; xvii 7 + *bovem* (*pascentem*); xix 26 + *et abundabit*; Jo i 29 *peccata*; iii 8 *non scis : nescis* D R vg; v 24 *transiit* V Augustine; vii 8 *ego*

¹ M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries*, pp. xc, 523.

² *Ib.* p. 413.

+ autem E Ɔ Ɔ; viii 12 *lucem : lumen* vettir mod; 21 *quaeritis : quaeretis* V Aug., mod; xi 1 *sorum* Z ir Aug., W Ɔ Ɔ.

ROCHESTER

There is one other house in which the reform was wholly guided by Lanfranc, namely Rochester Cathedral. The old Anglo-Saxon bishop, Siward, managed to keep up the service with only four canons, who presumably did not altogether fulfil Lanfranc's ideal. After Siward's death the Primate chose Ernest, one of his former pupils at Caen, to be bishop. Ernest died six months later, whereupon another pupil of Lanfranc, Gundulf, became bishop in 1077. Gundulf rebuilt the cathedral, erected new monastic buildings and installed monks.¹ His was a practical nature,² that of a monk after Lanfranc's desire.³ Lanfranc favoured him with many signs of his benevolence; he assisted him to establish the monastery by defraying the costs of the new buildings and by contributing to the furnishing and the interior decoration of the house. We may take it that there were also books among Lanfranc's numerous presents to Rochester of which we hear.⁴ Gundulf became the founder of a library, and perhaps also of a scriptorium, at Rochester; about a hundred years after his accession there was a conspicuous collection of books to be found there.⁵ There is, however, only one item in the catalogue of 1202 which can with any certainty be connected with Gundulf. No. 48 is called *Vetus et Novum Testamentum secundum translationem Jeronimi in .II. voluminibus veteribus*;

¹ Eadmer, *Hist. Novorum* (Migne clxx 355 c).

² *Vita Gundulfi* (Migne clxx 818).

³ *Ib.* col. 820.

⁴ *Ib.* col. 829. The assumption of some historians that Gundulf had corrected the biblical text was proved to be a mistake: S. H. Thompson, *Speculum* iv 426.

⁵ A twelfth-century catalogue of Rochester library is in the possession of the Dean and Chapter of Rochester (W. B. Rye, 'A Memorial of the Priory of St Andrew at Rochester, with a Catalogue of the Monastic MSS', *Archaeologia Cantiana* iii, London 1861, 18). This catalogue is as yet unprinted. Some items from it are mentioned in Hearne's *Textus Roffensis*, p. 234.

it is the famous Gundulf Bible.¹ It is just possible that the book was not written at Rochester, but its text, at any rate, is that of Lanfranc to be met with in the large monastic Bibles of the twelfth century. Apart from Carilef's Bible at Durham the Gundulf Bible is the only preserved copy of the large eleventh-century Bibles which were written immediately after the post-Conquest reform of the English cathedrals and monasteries; for most Bibles with the Lanfrankian text are twelfth-century copies of late eleventh-century originals. Gundulf also gave two missals to the library,² the character of which cannot be ascertained to-day. During the twelfth century the library was continually growing, as is obvious from a list of donations.³ Especially Bishop Ernulfus (1115-1124), formerly a monk of Bec, appears to have greatly enriched both the church and the library.⁴

WINCHESTER

In Winchester again Lanfranc prevailed against Bishop Walkelin's original intention to replace the cathedral monks by canons. After the bishop's resistance had been broken, he became a faithful shepherd of his monkish flock, and laid the foundation for the favourable development of St Swithin's after 1100.⁵ The founder of the new Winchester scriptorium was Godfrey of Cambrai, who was prior under Walkelin.⁶ He was famed for his culture and true devotion. Among other things he changed the antiquated liturgy of Winchester for the Roman, or Gallic, type and enforced the continental Rule in the monastery. Of the products of his school no MS seems to have sur-

¹ W. B. Rye, 'A Memorial . . .', p. 9. The catalogue of 1202 is printed, from Royal MS 5.B.xii, in Rye, pp. 8-15. Gundulf's Bible is now in the Phillips Collection, Cheltenham.

² W. B. Rye, 'A Memorial . . .', p. 16.

³ *Ib.* p. 17; among them there is a number of biblical books.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 17; William of Malmesbury, *G.P.* p. 138.

⁵ Annals of Winchester, ad ann. 1098 (*Annales Monastici*, ed. Luard, R.S. 1865, ii 39).

⁶ William of Malmesbury, *G.P.* p. 172; *G.R.* p. 516. Godfrey's poems were edited by T. Wright, *Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets* (R.S. 1872) ii 103 ff.

vived. The earliest post-Conquest book of Winchester dates from the episcopate of Henry of Blois (1129-1171), the brother of King Stephen. The chronicler says of him that he showed 'great zeal in augmenting and adorning the property of his church'.¹ The book is the Winchester Bible, once consisting of two volumes of huge size, now divided into three, and still preserved in the Cathedral library at Winchester. This beautiful Bible already existed in 1186, for in that year King Richard presented it to St Hugh of Lincoln, who was eager to study the Bible, but too poor to employ scribes for making a copy. The historian goes on to tell that the holy man could in no wise be persuaded to keep so precious a treasure, so that after a time the book was sent back to Winchester.² The gospel text only confirms what we have found already: Mt ii 19 > *angelus domini apparuit* R mod; iv 4 > *solo pane*; 16 > *vidit lucem magnam* D vg; vi 6 *orabis : oraveris* E H^c mod; vii 23 *qui operamini : omnes qui operantur* (!), *omnes* is added in Q E W ε S; viii 9 + *constitutus* ir cor. vat.* vg; 20 *caput + suum* ir T ε S; 32 + *in (impetu)*; x 11 *quancumque + autem*; xi 23 *hunc : hanc* W vg; xiii 22 *verbum + dei* ε; xvi 9 *et quinque milia*; xviii 30 + *universum (debitum)* P^{mg} (T); xxviii 13 *nobis : nocte* (sed corr.); Mc iv 34 + *non (disserebat omnia)*; 35 *contra + stagnum*; v 2 *om ei* (alt.) alc Z^c mod; 23 *manum*; 35 *ad archisinagogum* K W ε S; vi 6 + *per (castella)*; vii 3 *traditiones* Z alc X^c W; viii 1 + *cum iesu* O^c W ε S; Lc i 54 *recordatus* X* W S; ii 7 *ei*; 15 *quod fecit dominus et ostendit nobis*; 21 *circumcideretur + puer* ir T H Θ mod; v 7 + *pene*; 13 *illum + iesus* V cor. vat.*; vi 14 *om fratrem eius*; viii 23 *complebantur : complebatur navicula fluctibus* vett W; ix 37 *illi : illis* Z J O B P ε S; xi 14 *erat* (pr.) + *iesus* E K W; xii 49 *nisi + ut* F T Θ V mod; xv 17 + *in domo*; xvi 21 + *et nemo illi dabit*; xvii 7 + *bovem*; Jo i 29 *peccata*; xi 1 *sorum*; 49 *caiphas + nomine* vett Z* cor. vat.* vg.

¹ Annals of Winchester, *l.c.* p. 60.

² Adam of Eynsham's *Vita S. Hugonis Lincoln.* (ed. Dimock, R.S. 1864), pp. 91-94.

SALISBURY

One of the few cathedrals in which, after the Conquest, regular canons instead of monks were installed is Salisbury. St Osmund (bishop from 1078 to 1099) began his work by completing the cathedral at Old Sarum, the dedication of which took place in 1092.¹ Medieval chronicles usually attribute to him the authorship of the Salisbury liturgy (the Use of Sarum), but modern research has made it clear that the Sarum Use has gone through a long period of development and that consequently no single person can be credited with it. Nevertheless, St Osmund's 'Constitutions' for the service in his own cathedral form the beginning of that development.² Osmund had been consecrated by Lanfranc, and it can well be believed that he established a severe regime for the new cathedral clergy.³ He set an example of scholarship by being himself, of all the learned clerics he received into his chapter, the foremost to copy, illuminate and bind books with his own hands.⁴ Nor did the keenness of the scriptorium, which was attached to the school of the cathedral chapter, relax after the founder's death, for we have the remains of what must once have been a large two-volume Bible of the first half of the twelfth century written at Salisbury (Salisb. Cath. MS 148). More than a hundred years later we have another Salisbury Bible in the Royal MS 1. B. xii of the Brit. Mus., which presents the typical appearance of a thirteenth-century Bible (it is quoted as W in the Apparatus Criticus of the Oxford Vulgate N.T.). On fol. 431 the Royal MS has the inscription:

Hunc librum scripsit Willelmus de Hales magistro Thome de la Wile, quem vocavit magister Radulfus de Hehham tunc

¹ Hoveden, *Chronica* (ed. Stubbs, R.S. 1868) i 145.

² The history of the Use of Sarum was written by Canon C. Wordsworth, in H. Bradshaw, *Statutes of Lincoln Cathedral*, part ii (Cambridge 1897), pp. 860-888.

³ *Ib.* p. 869 f.

⁴ William of Malmesbury, *G.P.* p. 184; Higden, *Polichronicon*, lib. vii, c. 3 (ed. Lumby, R.S. 1879, vii 294).

cancellarius Sarisburiensis ad regimen scholarum Sarisburiensium, quibus deus in hoc seculo et in futuro propicietur. Amen. Factus fuit liber anno M.CC.L. quarto ab incarnatione domini.¹

So as late as 1254 books were being written in connection with the school at Salisbury, although now by professional scribes. The relation existing between the two Salisbury MSS testifies to the conservatism with which a biblical text was adhered to, once it had become current in a monastery or a cathedral. A careful comparison of the fragments now forming Salisbury MS 148 with Royal MS 1. B. xii has put it beyond all doubt that the Royal MS is a faithful copy of the early twelfth-century Salisbury Bible. This is the case in spite of an interval of over a hundred years between the writing of the two books, and although Salisbury school in the early thirteenth century was practically a new establishment founded by the University of Oxford.² The tradition of the cathedral chapter, and the esteem in which the beautiful large Bible was held (perhaps there was a tradition that the book was connected with St Osmund himself), were stronger than the more modern text of the University. We have here a good instance of how the text of Lanfranc's correction, accepted in Canterbury, remained unaltered in the English monasteries and other foundations built up on monastic lines, because the tendency of monastic establishments often did not admit of new forms of text. As the complete collation of the gospel text in Royal MS 1. B. xii is given in the Oxford edition of the Vulgate gospels, we may confine ourselves to quoting at random a few passages from Salisbury MS 148, in order to demonstrate the identity of the two books as to their text.

Mt i 17 *ergo : autem* W; ii 19 > *angelus domini apparuit* W and R.vg; iii 7 *demonstravit* W vulg, another hand has

¹ A facsimile of a page of this MS in Warner and Gilson, *Catalogue of Western MSS in the Old Royal and King's Coll. in the B.M.* iv, 1921, plate 8.

² H. Rashdall, *The Universities* . . . ii 396.

changed this into *demonstrabit* ξ ; *futura : ventura* W and vg; 10 *radicem : radices* Wir T; 12 *triticum suum in horreum suum* W; 17 + *bene* W J ir; iv 4 > *solo pane* W X^c vg; 16 *in regione et umbra* W vulg, but then changed into *in regione umbre* (H Θ V vg); 24 om *et paralyticos* W; v 25 > *cum eo in via* W E; 44 *his : iis* W; vi 15 *hominibus + peccata eorum* W; xviii 13 *gaudet* W vg; 22 om *usque* (pr.) W \mathfrak{P} *; xxi 5 om *et (sedens)* W ξ Θ \mathfrak{C} ; Lc xviii 31 *duodecim + suos secreto* W; and similarly the Salisbury Bible and W agree in all other variants.¹ This fact accounts for the frequent agreements between W and other MSS here quoted. W is the copy of a Bible which belonged to the class of MSS that were propagated in English monasteries after Lanfranc's reform.

BURY ST EDMUNDS

St Edmund's monastery at Bury also experienced an era of flourishing prosperity after the Conquest. The first monks had settled down there under Canute (in 1023), and the first church, a basilica, had been completed in 1032. Under Abbot Baldwin (1065-1097) a new church was built, to which the relics of the saint were translated in 1096.² How firmly monastic order was rooted in Bury, can be inferred from the fact that in 1198 Pope Coelestin III asked Bishop Hugh of Lincoln and Abbot Samson of St Edmund's (1182-1211) to reimpose the monastic rule upon the cathedral clergy of Coventry. The order was carried out to the Pope's satisfaction; in place of the secular canons of Coventry regular monks were appointed. Already about the middle of the eleventh century there were a few books at Bury. They increased rapidly, so that the first catalogue compiled under Samson about 1200

¹ So Wordsworth and White's assumption (*Novum Test.* p. 720) that W is a scholastic text is in part justified. But W does not give the *whole* scholastic text; it is merely the late eleventh-century stage of the scholastic text proper; the latter was growing up in the twelfth century.

² *Annales S. Edmundi* (T. Arnold, *Memorials of St Edmund's Abbey*, R.S. 1892) ii 3 f. On the early history of Bury, see F. Hervey, *The History of King Eadmund the Martyr and of the Early Years of his Abbey*, Oxford 1929.

contained no less than 250 items. Of one of the Bibles mentioned therein (no. 2: *Bibliotheca in ij^o volumina*) a few details are available. A good deal of the prosperous rise of the monastery in the early twelfth century had been due to the energy of the sacrists, to whose care the buildings and the movable belongings of the house were entrusted. When Anselm, the nephew of the first scholastic, was abbot (1121-1148), a sacrist called Herveus was particularly prominent in making donations for providing the church with the necessary equipments. Among other things he enabled Prior Talbot to have a large Bible copied, which was admirably illuminated by the skilful hand of Master Hugo.¹ Unfortunately only the first volume of this Bible remains to-day (C.C.C.C. MS 2).² As a substitute for the lost second volume we will quote MS 120 of Pembroke College, Cambridge, a New Testament of the early twelfth century. It is not certain where this book was written; its presence in the Bury library cannot be traced back further than to the beginning of the fourteenth century.³ Yet its text agrees with that of other Bibles of this category.

Mt v 1 *turbas + iesus* ir c S C; 25 > *cum eo in via* EW; viii 32 + *in (impetu)*; x 10 *non : neque*; xi 23 *in hodiernum t hanc diem* (W vg); xvi 3 *tempestat + erit*; xix 21 *vende + omnia* ir W c S; xxi 4 *autem + totum* ER W S C; 32 *enim : autem* W; xxiv 28 *ibi t illic* L mod; Mc ii 1 *dies + aliquot (!)*; 2 *caperet + eos domus*; v 23 *manum*; 35 *ad archisinagogum*; 40 *ingrediuntur*; vi 1 *illum : eum* D P* mod; vii 28 > *comedunt sub mensa* vg; viii 1 + *cum iesu*; 38 *sanctis t suis*; Lc i 54 *recordatus*; ii 15 *quod fecit dominus et ostendit nobis* (in ras.); iii 8 *potest t potens est*; 9 *ad radices arborum t radicem arboris (!)*; iv 18 + *sanare contritos corde*; v 7 + *pene*; vi 26 *pseudoprophetis* O ir V vg; vii 3 *salvaret : sanaret* vett alc cor. vat.* S; viii 49

¹ *Gesta Sacristarum* (T. Arnold, *Memorials* . . .) ii 289 f.

² E. G. Millar, *Engl. Illumin. MSS* i 35, 94, plates 37-40.

³ According to an inscription the book was given by Sacrist Reginald of Denham, who flourished at the beginning of the fourteenth century (see James's *Catalogue, ad loc.*).

venit quidam ad principem; ix 16 illis: illos W cor. vat.^{ms}; xv 17 + *in domo*; xvi 18 + *et* (ad init.) ZKV; 21 + *et nemo illi dabit*; xvii 28 om *sicut*; xix 26 + *et abundabit*; xxiii 15 *remisit eum ad nos t remisi vos ad illum*; Jo i 29 *peccata*; ii 23 *esset + iesus* vett; v 39 *in quibus putatis vos* vett; vi 33 *dei: dei t verus*, and after *mundo* there is the addition: *Pater meus dat vobis panem verum. Panis enim deus (!) est qui de celo descendit et dat vitam mundo*. This is a conflation of the Vulgate reading and the scholastic form of the passage as it is found in E (see Augustine on John, Migne xxxv 1602 f., for the explanation of the variant); 36 *credidistis* (in ras.) ir O T cor. vat.^{ms} ε Ⓢ Augustine; 49 > *manna in deserto* vett JQvg; vii 8 *ego + enim* ZKVW ε; viii 12 *lucem: lumen* vett ir E mod; 27 *patrem eius dicebat deum* cor. vat. ε Ⓢ Ⓢ; 29 *est + et* D ⓪ mod; 35 *filius + autem* ir ε Ⓢ Ⓢ; 38 *patrem + meum* cor. vat.* Augustine, Ⓢ Ⓢ; xi 1 *sorum*; 45 *ad mariam + et martham* cor. vat.* vg; 49 *caiphas + nomine* vett Z* vg; 50 *nobis: vobis* E ε Ⓢ Ⓢ; xiii 18 *mecum: meum* T; xvi 3 *facient + vobis*; xviii 11 *gladium + tuum* (in ras.) ir vg; 28 *sed + ut* vett E T^c mod Augustine; xix 38 *occultus: occulte* vett D M.

In a like way as the Canterbury gospels C.C.C.C. MS 72, this MS contains certain Irish relics, e.g. Mt vi 15 *enim t autem* D; xiv 19 *discipulis + suis*; xvi 2 + *cras*; 23 + *sunt (hominum)*; xix 22 *verbum: verba haec* (in ras.); Lc v 8 *vidisset t videret* Q; vi 20 *pauperes + spiritu*; x 11 *vestra + in pedibus nostris*; xviii 16 *regnum dei t celorum* D; Jo ii 23 om *eius* (after *signa*) D; and others.

HEREFORD

A gospel MS in the cathedral library of Hereford (O. 1. viii) differs in size and shape from the usual monastic Bibles of this time, yet its script places it in the first half of the twelfth century. Bishop Robert Losinga of Lorraine (1079-1095), the first Bishop of Hereford ordained under Lanfranc, had begun to build the new cathedral after the pattern of the minster at Aix. He is said to have been

trained in the liberal arts, especially in astronomy and computation, and perhaps he had founded the library at Hereford.¹ But there were no strongly marked signs of cultural life, until in 1101 Hugh of Laci made over the whole canonical foundation of St Peter at Hereford to the monastery of St Peter at Gloucester. The monks of Gloucester then changed the Hereford house into a priory. Under Bishop Robert Bethune of Hereford (1131-1148) another monastery was founded and dedicated to St Guthlac.² This new foundation seems to have been the cradle of the Hereford MS O. I. viii.

Mt ii 19 > *angelus domini apparuit*; iii 3 *hic est enim quod* (! probably for the usual scholastic *de quo* MVTϷ) *dictum est*; v 32 > *causa fornicationis*; vi 6 om (*ostio*) *tuo* Z*TO^gvg; vii 11 + *data*; ix 18 *adoravit* Z*X*BW; x 2 > *hec sunt nomina* W; 30 om *et* (*capilli*) LRϷ; xii 8 > *enim est* Jvg; 27 *beelzebub* + *principe demonium*; 31 *remittetur* (alt.) + *eis* (E); xiii 11 *mysteria* : *mysterium* irϷ; 15 > *videant oculis* Rvg; xviii 10 om *in caelis* (pr.); Mc ii 2 *caperent*; v 2 om *ei* (alt.); 9 *quod* : *quid* QW; 14 *facti* : *factum* X*P^{mg}ϷϷ; 21 *illum* : *eum* Evg; 23 *manum*; 35 *ad archisinagogum*; 43 *dixit* : *iussit* X*WϷϷ; Lc ii 15 *quod fecit dominus et ostendit nobis*; iv 18 + *sanare contritos corde*; v 7 + *pene*; viii 23 *et complebatur et periclitabatur navicula fluctibus*; xv 17 + *in domo*; Jo v 11 > *me sanum fecit* cor. vat. vg; 28 *eius* : *filius dei* cor. vat. ^{mg}ϷϷ; 31 *de me* + *ipso* vett cor. vat. *vg; 35 > *ad horam exultare* vg; 39 *in quibus putatis vos* vett; vi 23 *gratias agentes deo* irϷϷ; 26 om *eis* M; etc.

DURHAM

There is some good material available relating to the re-birth of the Northumbrian monasteries. At the time of the Conquest these were in a state of decay, and monasticism almost completely extinct. Nor did the Arch-

¹ A Hereford list of books dating from 1404 is given by W. W. Capes, *Charters and Records of Hereford Cathedral*, Hereford 1908, p. 259.

² Dugdale, *Monasticon* iii, 1846, 620.

bishop of York take the lead in the revival. He was engaged in the conflict with Lanfranc and the Pope regarding the question of precedence, so that he could not at first devote himself to what had once been the monasteries of his province.¹ Nevertheless apostles soon arose who undertook the task. In the time of Bishop Walcher of Durham three monks of Winchcombe and Evesham, full of pious enthusiasm, set out in search of a new home. They had gone as far as Newcastle-on-Tyne, when Walcher, who was eager to keep these ardent servants of God in his own diocese, offered to concede to them the derelict monastery of Jarrow. Soon the number of monks attracted by the life at Jarrow increased, and it was not long before monks were to be found again at Whitby, York, and Wearmouth.²

Walcher's early death in 1080 prevented him from reforming his own cathedral clergy at Durham. This was left to his successor William of St Carilef, who had been a monk, then Prior of St Carilef near Bayeux in Normandy, and later Abbot of St Vincent in the same province. His excellent learning in the secular and ecclesiastical sciences, and his experience in matters of administration, attracted the attention of the Conqueror, by whose wish he was made Bishop of Durham. He found things at Durham in a hopeless state. Not only were there no monks at all, but also most of the canons had abandoned the church. Bishop William decided to install monks in the cathedral and asked King William, Archbishop Lanfranc and Pope Gregory VII for their advice and consent. This given, the monks of Jarrow and Wearmouth were united and in 1083 entered their new home at Durham. Ten years later the building of the new cathedral church was begun. It is quite certain that the reform of Durham was constantly guided and advised by Lanfranc. A MS of Lanfranc's

¹ See, however, Hugh the Chanter's *History of the Archbishops of York* (ed. Raine, *History of the Church of York*, R.S. 1886) ii 107 f.

² Symeon of Durham, *Hist. Dunelm. Eccl.* (ed. Arnold, R.S. 1882) i 108-113; id. *Hist. Regum, ib.* ii 201.

Decreta, which became the leading code of reform also at Durham, is still preserved in the cathedral library to-day (B. iv. 24).¹ The same book also contains a list of the monasteries with which Durham was united by a bond of fraternity (according to which prayers had to be offered for the deceased members of the respective communities). The list shows how close the contact was between the monks of Durham and many monasteries in Brittany and England, a few of which we have had occasion to mention in this chapter. It might even be called a witness to the far-reaching influence of Lanfranc's monastic reform,² and, consequently, of the Vulgate text propagated under his aegis.

The first list of Durham books dates from the time of William of Carilef and records the books which he left to the cathedral at his death in 1095.³ The works of the Doctors and the commentaries of Bede and Rabanus are represented; there is also a copy of the *Decreta Pontificum*. The whole is a selection well suited to a scholar who had received his education in the monasteries of Northern France. The first item of the list is given as: *Bibliotheca, id est Vetus et Novum Testamentum in duobus libris*. It is the famous Bible of Carilef, of which only the second volume has survived, a brilliant example of the Anglo-Saxon style of writing and illuminating (Durham MS A. ii. 4, about 1080-1090). Before turning to the text, which does not offer any new readings, mention may be made of a commentary on the Apocalypse appended at the end of the

¹ Durham MS B. iv. 24, of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, contains the Benedictine Rule, and the *Constitutiones Lanfranci Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis de convento Dunelmensi* (see Migne cl 444). On f. 6^v is the formula by which the monks had to profess their obedience to the regulations. Cf. A. Robinson, *Journ. Theol. Stud.* x, 1909, 375 ff.

² The list comprises the monasteries of: Christ Church, Canterbury; Winchester; Bury St Edmunds; Westminster; Fécamp; St Stephen, Caen; Chester; York; Glastonbury; Selby; Whitby; St Nicolaus, Angers; Dunfermline; St Martin, Tours; Croyland; Winchcombe; St Albans; Norwich; Keiso; Revesby.

³ It is to be found on the first leaf of the only preserved volume of Carilef's Bible, Durham A. ii. 4, and was first printed by B. Botfield, *Catalogi veteres librorum eccles. cathedr. Dunelm.* (Surtees Soc.), London 1838, p. 117; C. H. Turner, *Journ. Theol. Stud.* xix, 1918, 121 ff.

text and written by another, but contemporary, hand. This brief gloss may possibly be another short-lived work of Lanfranc, which did not spread beyond the narrow circles of the schools at Bec and Caen. Its home must at least be sought in the proximity of Lanfranc's school,¹ whence William of Carilef took it with him to Durham. Its presence in Carilef's Bible is a safe enough clue as to the text of that Bible: Mt (i 2 *abraham + autem ir*; 17 *generationes* (pr.) + *sunt ir*;) iii 16 *sicut : quasi*; iv 4 > *in solo pane*; 9 > *omnia tibi ir* T Z³ mod; 16 > *vidit lucem magnam* D vg; 18 *autem + iesus ir* vg; v 1 *autem + iesus ir* Ⓢ Ⓢ Ⓢ; 12 *gaudete + in illa die* (sup. lin.); vi 13 + *amen* cor. vat., vg; 15 *dimittet + vobis ir* mod; vii 3 *in oculis* (!); 11 + *data*; viii 32 *impetu uno* (see K Ⓢ Ⓢ); Mc ii 2 *convenerunt + ad eum* (sup. lin.) L; *caperet + domus*; v 2 *om ei* (secd.); 23 *manum*; 35 *ad archisynagogum*; 38 *in : ad* OM; vii 3 *traditiones*; viii 1 + *cum iesu*; 28 *dicentes + alii* (sup. lin.) D cor. vat.* Ⓢ Ⓢ; 29 > *esse dicitis* Q M vg; ix 37 *misit + qui habet aures audiendi audiat* (no other MS!); Lc i 50 *a progenie in progenies*; 54 *recordatus*; ii 7 *eis : ei*; 15 *quod fecit dominus et ostendit nobis*; 21 *circumcideretur + puer ir* T H Θ mod; iii 9 *arborum : arboris* Z X K Ⓢ Ⓢ; iv 18 + *sanare contritos corde*; v 7 + *pene*; vi 28 *pro + persequentibus et*; vii 32 *plorastis : planxistis* vett; ix 9 > *ego audio* vett M V mod; 29 *factum : facta* Θ J⁶ vg; 45 > *eum interrogare* mod; xv 17 + *in domo*; xvi 21 + *et nemo illi dabat*; xvii 7 + *boves (pascentem)* Z* T* cor. vat.* Ⓢ Ⓢ; 31 *ne : non* vett EM; xix 26 + *et abundabit*; 29 *appropinquasset bethphage et bethanie* vett DK; xx 34 > *huius seculi* K vg; Jo i 29 *peccata*; ii 20 + *in (tribus diebus)* S ir mod; iii 4 *nasci* (ult.) : *renasci* O B Q Θ Ⓢ Ⓢ Ⓢ; xi 1 *sorum*; 27 *dei + vivi* T E X^c W* Ⓢ Ⓢ Ⓢ; 49 *caiphas + nomine*; xii 29 *audierat : audiebat* vett C cor. vat.^{mg}; xviii 11 *gladium in vaginam : gladium tuum in locum suum* (see irvg; *in locum suum* is a typically scholastic reading).

¹ This gloss in Durham MS A. ii. 4 is a mere extract from Remigius's commentary on the Apocalypse (Migne cxvii 939), in a similar way as Lanfranc's commentary on the Epistles borrowed much from Remigius's commentary on the same. See above, p. 163.

There are also two twelfth-century Bibles of Durham preserved there to-day, both of which furnish us with instances of how faithfully the post-Conquest text was copied in the English monasteries even long after its first introduction. The successors of William of Carilef (Ranulfus Flambard and Geoffrey Rufus) took care to preserve and to enrich the cathedral and its property by completing the buildings and supplementing the equipment.¹ Bishop Hugh of Pudsey (1153-1194), though at first very unpopular with the monks, later on gave proofs of his benevolence by regaining lands which had been in danger of being lost, and by enlarging the cathedral.² At his death he left a number of books,³ of which those of interest for us are called, in the list of the donation:

Una Biblia in ·IV· magnis voluminibus,

and

Alia Biblia in duobus voluminibus.

Of the two-volume Bible only the second volume is known to exist to-day (Durham MS A. ii. 2), a beautifully written large codex, which may well have been produced in the early second half of the twelfth century. Its interesting feature is that it is a mere copy of Carilef's Bible, except that, by way of making corrections, the scribe has added a few readings here and there, which he drew from some other source.

The text of the first hand fully agrees with that of MS A. ii. 4, e.g. Mt i 2 + *autem*; 17 *generationes* (pr.) + *sunt*; iii 16 *quasi*; Lc vii 32 *planxistis*; Jo xviii 11 *gladium tuum in locum suum*, etc. After the completion of the book the scribe made certain corrections, of which the following may be quoted: Mt vi 6 *oraveris* (in ras.; the first hand and A. ii. 4 read *orabis*) E H^c mod; vii 13 *via + est* (in ras.) vg; x 22 *omnibus + hominibus* Zir alc εϞ; Mc ii 2

¹ *Continuatio Sym. Dunelm.* (R.S.) i 139-142.

² *Ib.* p. 168; Henry of Newbury v 10 (*Chronicles of Stephen*, etc., R.S., ii 437); Dugdale (1846) i 226.

³ B. Botfield, *Catalogi Veteres*, p. 118; G. Bekker, *Catalogi*, p. 256.

caperet eos domus sed ad ianuam (!); vii 19 *introiit* (m. pr. and A. ii. 4 : *introit* vulg) : *intrat* (m. sec.) Qvg; ix 37 + *qui habet aures audiendi audiat* (m. pr.), cancelled by corrector; Lc i 54 *recordatus* (m. pr.) : *rememoratus* (sup. lin. corr.); vii 32 *plorastis* (m. pr.) : *plorastis* (sup. lin. corr.); xii 47 + *plagis* (before *vapulabit*, in ras.) cor. vat.*; xiii 35 *vestra* + *deserta* (in ras.; not in original text nor in A. ii. 4) ir Wvg; xvii 31 *non* (m. pr.) : *ne* (sup. lin.); Jo vi 33 *panis enim dei est* (m. pr.) : *verus* (above *dei*, corr.) E ζ S; xi 29 *surgit* : *surrexit* (sup. lin.) alcW ζ S; xii 29 *audiebat* : *audierat* (sup. lin.) vulg; xviii 11 *in locum suum* (m. pr.) : *in vaginam* (sup. lin.) vulg; etc. In other words, the scribe felt some readings of his original, the Bible of Carilef, to be wrong or not up to date, and he corrected these according to a more modern text.

Pudsey's four-volume Bible dates from the end of his episcopate (about 1190), and must have been one of the presents with which the grasping bishop in his later years wished to soothe the indignation of the monks. The book, which has been preserved complete (Durham MS A. ii. 1), is a perfect example of the twelfth-century art of writing and illumination.¹ The character of the text does not differentiate the book from other monastic Bibles of the time. So profound was the influence exercised by the text of Carilef that even a hundred years later, in this Bible of Pudsey, the gospel text (in vol. iv) displays in the margin numerous readings taken from Carilef's Bible and usually quoted under the lemma *alius* (i.e. *codex*).

Mt iii 7 *futura* : *ventura*; iv 4 > *solo pane*; 13 *maritimam* (m. pr.) : *maritima* (corr. according to A. ii. 4) JCT mod; 18 *autem* + *iesus* irvg; vi 6 *oraveris*; 15 *dimittet* : + *vobis* (corr. in mg) A. ii. 4 irmod; vii 4 + *frater*; xv 39 *naviculam* : + *et discipuli eius cum eo* (in mg); xvi 2 *erit* : + *cras* (in mg); 9 *in quinque milia* (m. pr.) : *et q. m.* (corr. in mg) A. ii. 4 Z^cW ζ ; xxvi 75 *ploravit amarissime* *et flevit amare*; Mc ii 2 *multi* : + *ad eum* (corr. in mg) A. ii. 4; *caperet* : + *domus* (in

¹ E. G. Millar, *Engl. Illumin. MSS* i 42, plate 50.

mg) A. ii. 4; 8 *spiritu sancto* (m. pr.) : *s. suo* (in mg); 13 *egressus est* : + *iesus* (in mg); 22 *novellum* : *novum* (corr. in mg) A. ii. 4 vett X* F mod; iii 32 *foris* : + *stantes* (in mg) A. ii. 4; v 2 om *ei* (secd.) alc mod; 35 *venit ab archisinagogo* (m. pr.) : *v. ad archisinagogum* (corr. in mg) A. ii. 4 K W ε ϩ ϩ; 43 *dixit* (m. pr.) : *iussit* (in mg) A. ii. 4 X* W ε ϩ; vi 5 *virtutes multas* (m. pr.) alc : *in alio* (namely in A. ii. 4) *virtutem ullam* (in mg) vulg; vii 19 *introit* : *intrat* Qvg; viii 28 *dicentes* : + *alii* (in mg) A. ii. 4 D ε ϩ; ix 1 *regnum dei veniens* : *filium hominis venientem* (m. pr.),¹ *in alio* (i.e. A. ii. 4) *regnum dei veniens*; 49 *victima* : + *sale* (in mg) A. ii. 4 vett F mod; Lc i 50 *in progenies et progenies* (m. pr.) : *in alio* (i.e. A. ii. 4) *a progenie in progenies* (in mg); 54 *recordatus*; iv 18 vulg (m. pr.) : + *sanare contritos corde* (in mg, from A. ii. 4); v 7 vulg (m. pr.) : + *pene* (in mg); vi 28 *calumpniantibus* (m. pr.) : *persequentibus* (in mg, from A. ii. 4); 37 *dimittimini* (m. pr.) : *dimittetur vobis* (in mg) A. ii. 4 Z X* O K V; ix 29 *factum* : *facta* ⊕ J^cvg; xv 7 *in celo* (m. pr.) : + *coram angelis dei* (in mg) A. ii. 4;² 17 + *in domo*; xvi 21 + *et nemo illi dabit*; xix 26 vulg (m. pr.) : + *et abundabit* (in mg) A. ii. 4; 37 *adversus montem oliveti* (m. pr.) : *ad descensum montis oliveti* (in mg) A. ii. 4 vulg; Jo v 39 *in quibus vos putatis* (m. pr.) : *quia vos putatis in ipsis* (in mg) A. ii. 4 vulg; vii 8 *ego* + *enim* (sup. lin.) A. ii. 4 Z alc W ε; xviii 11 *gladium* + *tuum* irvg; etc.

LANFRANC'S PART IN THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH

The account we have given of the Vulgate text predominant in the English monasteries and cathedrals at the end of the eleventh and in the twelfth century, enables us to say that in the field of the Vulgate text, too, Lanfranc effected a change. He provided a most important section of the English Church with a text which was supported by the new learning then arising within the fold of the Greater Church. Through him England, as far as the text

¹ Mt xvi 28.

² Ambrose on Luke (Migne xv 1846).

of her monastic Bibles was concerned, was brought into conformity with the other provinces of the Church organization. The local and provincial peculiarities of the Vulgate text formerly used in England were superseded by something new which was to become characteristic of the whole Church. Lanfranc, it will be remembered, must be credited with some other more obvious reforms in England. He reformed English monasticism; he effected a change in the liturgy, as Cardinal Gasquet has shown;¹ he accomplished an improvement in English ecclesiastical administration; and, as was recently proved by Dr Z. N. Brooke,² he introduced into England the canonical law of the General Church. All this meant that England was being brought into close connection with the Roman Church. We may now add to the list his importation of the continental biblical text. The theological method which was being evolved in some episcopal schools of France had gradually developed a Vulgate text of its own, a text with certain characteristics which were symbolical of the philosophical and religious attitude lying behind them. That this text began to be common in England amounts to saying that the island was becoming dependent on continental thinking. England was on the way towards being assimilated to the great philosophical movement of the Church called scholasticism.

¹ A. Gasquet and E. Bishop, *The Bosworth Psalter*, London 1908, p. 28; F. Liebermann, *Die Heiligen Englands*, Hanover 1889.

² Z. N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy, 1050-1200*, Cambridge 1931.

CHAPTER V

Twelfth-century Hermeneutics and the Scholastic Text of Peter the Lombard

SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY AND THE VULGATE TEXT: ANSELM OF CANTERBURY

LANFRANC was the last of the early scholastic scholars who thought it incumbent upon them to defend the principle of the absolute authority of the Fathers in questions of biblical exegesis. In the writings of Anselm of Canterbury, his great pupil, that principle did not even find expression in words, because it was then tacitly understood and generally acknowledged. Anselm never found it necessary to doubt, or even to discuss, the question whether those who had practised the hermeneutic method for some generations in the famous continental schools were justified in assuming that the expositions of the Fathers actually set forth metaphysical realities and, therefore, truths upon which a secure structure of knowledge could be based. He never doubted that the tradition maintained in the schools was indisputably right, in the same way as in the legal dispute with William Rufus and Henry I over the question of investiture he never critically examined the foundations of the canonical law on which he so rightly insisted. He was of one mind with his teachers as to the super-realist conception of language and the dual nature of the biblical text consisting of the two spheres of sound and meaning.¹ In Bec he studied philosophy under Lanfranc and was trained in the Scriptures; when he became abbot he

¹ E.g. Epist. II viii (Migne clviii 1156 f.), on his realist conception of language; *Proslogion*, c. iv (*ib.* col. 229). His own works he calls 'tractatus pertinentes ad studium sacrae Scripturae', *De Veritate* (*ib.* col. 467).

took care to have the monks instructed in the same subjects.¹

The structure of Anselm's philosophy is only intelligible if it is recognised that belief in the Bible and in the truth of the orthodox patristic explanations was the indispensable condition, without which all his thinking became meaningless. Anselm's thinking was neither more nor less than a rationally and logically sound means for the intellect to grasp the same supreme truths which were revealed and laid down in the Bible. In his philosophy Scripture plays the part of the test of truth. It controls the straggling intellect, because it contains the absolute truth; but as there can only be one truth on any given subject, reason, if it is on the right track, must necessarily lead the intellect to that truth; if reason fails here, there can be no doubt that it has gone astray and needs to be set right, until pure logic leads it to the revealed and only truth. The process of thinking has been correct, if it has led to the identification of the ultimate result with revealed truth. The Bible becomes the standard norm of truth and error: logical conclusions contradicting it must be wrong; those which are not contradicted, or which are positively confirmed by the Bible, are true.² This is the meaning of Anselm's famous *Credo ut intelligam*; reasoning as well as faith aim at the same object, both are equally capable of leading to the truth; they are two lines converging in one point.

Anselm's writings adopt the method of purely rational thinking.³ He was the first philosopher to rise above the pre-philosophical attempts, as we may call them, of his

¹ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, lib. i, c. 1, paragr. 5 (Migne clviii 52 f.). Anselm corrected books (*ib.* col. 56) and had books corrected (*ib.* col. 61). See also *Epist.* i ii (*l.c.* col. 1064).

² This principle of Anselm was made very clear by M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode* i 266 f.; Anselm, *De concordia praescientiae Dei cum libero arbitrio*, q. 3, c. 6 (Migne clviii 528 B).

³ As differing from, and methodically opposed to, faith in revealed truth. Cf. introduction to the *Monologion* (Migne clviii 143 A); *De fide Trinitatis*, c. 4 (*l.c.* col. 272).

predecessors. The early schools had hardly ever ventured beyond evolving and applying a method of hermeneutics which grew almost naturally out of the dual, or allegorical, conception of the Bible, and of the two sources of the Church doctrine, the Bible and patristic tradition. The text of Scripture had been to them mere words, behind which some deeper meaning was looming; the clear expression of that meaning was found in the patristic writings. Anselm left this philological method behind. Not that he attacked or refuted it; it even forms the indispensable presupposition of his whole work. But neither the Bible nor any of the Fathers is ever quoted in his philosophical reasonings. (The Fathers too, like the Bible, are to him but guarantees for the correctness of his thought. The sayings of the Fathers, especially of St Augustine, on matters of faith are absolutely true. With them the findings of the philosopher who claims to be an authoritative thinker must agree.¹) Anselm goes beyond biblical and patristic authority, the two factors with which primitive scholasticism was chiefly concerned; and yet, these are the ultimate aim to which his thought is tending.² His reasoning starts from them only in order to return to them; the field across which his thought has travelled in this process, is his philosophy. His writings contain a few dispersed hints upon this characteristic of his thought. He describes it as an exercise of the mind struggling on a hard road for truths which faith could have attained in an easier and quicker way;³ or as a first attempt to obtain knowledge which the Fathers had not touched upon, yet which never contradicted what they had said;⁴ or as a rational way to truths which hitherto had been accessible to faith only.⁵ He must, thus, have felt that his philosophy differed from the method of the Fathers as well as from the philological studies

¹ He insisted on the fact that the results of his thought agreed with the teaching of the Fathers, especially of St Augustine; cf. introduction to the *Monologion* (*l.c.* col. 143 f.).

² *De fide Trinitatis*, c. 2 (*l.c.* col. 263 f.).

³ *Ib.* cols. 263; 259 f.

⁴ *Ib.* col. 272 f.

⁵ *Cur Deus Homo*, c. 1 (*l.c.* col. 361).

cultivated in the post-Carolingian schools. These latter had given better formulations and definitions of religious truths by constantly collating the biblical text with the orthodox expositions. Anselm did not interfere with that part of theological study at all, he merely took it as his starting-point. In other words, he contributed nothing to the development of the Vulgate text.

One is driven to this conclusion in the case of all philosophers among the scholastics, and it applies especially to those of the thirteenth century. Philosophy in the proper sense of the word is an activity of the pure *λόγος* and cannot affect a literary work such as the Vulgate. The interests of the great teachers from Alcuin to Lanfranc had in the first place been philological or exegetical; they had tried to discover and explain the various aspects of the biblical word, in which they recognised an outward form and an inner meaning. Anselm's philosophy, on the other hand, turns away from hermeneutical considerations altogether and is solely concerned with the properties of pure reason.

THE FRENCH SCHOOLS OF INTERPRETATION IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY

The philological method, however, was far from being discontinued. The high tide of the French episcopal schools was in no wise on the turn.¹ A large number of famous 'studies' were to crop up in the twelfth century, one of which was to be the cradle of Paris University, essentially a University for students of Arts.² Most of the famous scholars were heads of special schools.³ But in spite of the large number of students there were only a few to whom a definite share in the evolution of the scholastic text of the Vulgate can be ascribed. For again it can be noticed that the more philosophy comes into its own in the schools, the smaller becomes the number of the students who con-

¹ G. Lefèvre, *De Anselmo Laudunensi Scholastico*, 1895, pp. 52-56, 72.

² H. Denifle, *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters*, 1885, p. 656 ff.

³ G. Roberts, *Les écoles et l'enseignement de la théologie pendant la première moitié du xii^e siècle*, Paris 1909.

centrate on questions of interpretation, and to such alone we may turn in the hope of finding material for our purpose. It must be added that the lives and often even the works of the few scholars who come under consideration are wrapt in obscurity. Probably the French libraries preserve a certain amount of unexplored MS material which may one day help us to clear up some of the moot points in the complicated history of scholastic glosses and biblical text. We shall confine ourselves in the following pages to the material which has come to light in English libraries. For the most part it consists of MSS of biblical glosses, often the only sources from which anything can be deduced as to the nature of the Vulgate text in the scholastic period.

THE ACTIVITY OF ANSELM OF LAON

Lanfranc's gloss on the Pauline Epistles, as has been shown above, had a certain resemblance to a twelfth-century gloss which is usually referred to as the *Glossa Interlinearis* of Anselm of Laon. The similarity even extended to the outward appearance of the two works, inasmuch as both were short biblical glosses written between the lines (and in the margin) of copies of the text. So great must have been the resemblance that Prior Eastry of Christ Church, Canterbury, made the following entry in the list of Christ Church books which he drew up shortly after 1300:¹

Libri Lanfranci Archiepiscopi:

Epistole Pauli secundum Anselmum.

Item epistole Pauli secundum Anselmum.

Item epistole Pauli secundum Anselmum.

None of these books is known to exist to-day, but it is easy to see that the prior must have made a mistake. For if the three books were given by Lanfranc, they cannot have been copies of Anselm's gloss, because at Lanfranc's death that gloss was not yet written; if they contained

¹ M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, 1903, p. 88.

Anselm's gloss, Lanfranc can have had nothing to do with them. The most likely explanation is, perhaps, that in Eastry's time Anselm of Laon's name was so closely woven up with the *Glossa Interlinearis* that *secundum Anselmum* merely meant, 'after the manner of Anselm'. So the meaning of the entry was: 'Lanfranc's glosses on St Paul arranged like those of Anselm'. We may say, then, that about 1300 the tradition that Anselm of Laon was the author of the Interlinear Gloss was already fixed. The astonishing fact is, however, that the earliest known MSS of that gloss are not older than the second half of the twelfth century, which is very late, considering that a large number of MSS quite suddenly appear about 1160, and that Anselm died as early as 1117. Another remarkable fact is that the Interlinear Gloss in all MSS of which we have knowledge occurs together with the *Glossa Ordinaria*. There is no twelfth-century MS of the former which does not contain the latter, and vice versa. Anselm of Laon's claim to the authorship of the Interlinear Gloss will have to be examined by an inquiry into the history of that gloss, before we can make a definite pronouncement on the share its author had in the shaping of the twelfth-century Vulgate text.

Anselm of Laon was acquainted with Lanfranc's commentary on the Epistles, for he had been brought up at Bec and he may even have known Lanfranc himself in the last years of his priorate. His most eminent teacher at Bec was the great Anselm, whose teaching moved on the lines laid down by Lanfranc.¹ Lecturing on the Bible consisted in investigating the authentic sense of the words as it had been first set forth by the Fathers. In a letter which the later Dean of Laon wrote to Abbot Heribrand of St Laurence at Liège, he stated his opinion as to the relation between the realities contained in the biblical text and the contradictory and obscure words (*voces*):²

¹ Guibert de Nogent, *De Vita Sua* i 17 (Migne clvi 874).

² Migne clxii 1587.

The question which troubles you so much does not concern the meaning at all, it is but a fight about words. It is manly to penetrate to the right meaning, but haggling about words is a boyish thing, for boys understand but superficially what they say or hear. Many who pride themselves on their knowledge, but are ignorant of the true meaning of the Fathers, spend their time in a useless quarrel about words. For the sentences [i.e. opinions on certain matters] of all orthodox doctors do not contradict each other, but they agree with each other, they converge upon one point, though it may sometimes happen that the verbal expressions do not seem to be in unison. Small minds will then take offence, strong ones will show their vigour, arrogant ones will start a controversy. But those who know will not be touched at all. While others indulge their fancy, these will show that the contradictions are easily solved.

This belief that the true doctrine in all things was deposited with the Fathers, and guarded by the Church, was the motive of all commentaries of Anselm of Laon. It was a thoroughly conservative principle which did not meddle with the rising philosophical thought of the time, but confined itself to protecting the biblical word against the charge of ambiguity. This aim was in accordance with Lanfranc's moderate dialectics, in which he did not refrain from facing contradictory authorities, but reconciled them by leading them to an issue upon which they agreed.

Already at Bec Anselm began collecting material for his commentaries, for a note in a St Evroult MS of his commentary on Matthew says that he 'multa praecipue ex Anselmo Cantuariensi magistro suo congegessit'.¹ He continued his compilations at Paris and Laon. There can be no doubt that he is the author of the *Enarrationes in Cantica Canticorum* and the *Enarrationes in Matthaëum*, which have both been printed² and can be described as *Glossae interiectae*. A few words of the text are quoted and im-

¹ *Hist. litt. de la France* x 171; G. Lefèvre, *De Anselmo*, p. 9.

² Migne clxii 1187, 1227. The commentary on the Apocalypse is unprinted. The one printed in Migne (*ib.* col. 1499) is not Anselm's, but a work of the thirteenth century founded on the *Glossa Ordinaria* (Manitius iii 238 f.).

mediately followed by an exposition of moderate length. It should be noted that all authentic works of Anselm are arranged on these lines.

Apart from the commentaries just mentioned Anselm wrote *Enarrationes in Epistolas S. Pauli*, with which hitherto other writers have always been credited. The first editors of this commentary on St Paul assigned it to Anselm of Canterbury, naturally enough, for he was the more famous of the two and his name ensured a good sale of the edition.¹ But since the twelfth volume of the *Histoire littéraire de la France* (p. 347 f.) had without much ground assumed Herveus of Bourg-Dieu (fl. about 1150) to be the author, later critics have acquiesced in that statement.² But there is little reason to doubt that Anselm of Laon is the real author. For one thing the MS used for the editio princeps called the work *Enarrationes*, the standard expression in the MSS for Anselm's other commentaries. The arrangement is that of the *Glossa interiecta* as in Anselm's similar works. The source was the commentary of Remigius of Auxerre on St Paul, i.e. the same as that on which Lanfranc very largely drew for his own commentary on Paul (and this circumstance explains why Lanfranc's glosses sometimes recall the *Glossa Interlinearis*, as we had occasion to show above), yet Anselm rather extended his original by adding material of his own and from the Fathers. The most important point,

¹ *Divi Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi, theologorum omnium sui temporis facile principis. . . luculentissimae in omnes sanctissimi Pauli Apostoli epistolas, et aliquot Evangelia, enarrationes*, Parisiis, Apud Poncetum le Preux, 1544; this was a complementary volume of the same publisher's *Omnia Divi Anselmi. . . Opuscula*, 1544. Second edition 1549. A Cologne reprint of this edition appeared a year later, Coloniae 1545, with a new preface. There is nothing unusual in a work of Anselm of Laon being ascribed to the more famous Anselm; see G. Lefèvre, *De Anselmo*, p. 119.

² Migne clxxx 591. H. Denifle, *Die abendländischen Schriftausleger bis Luther*, Mainz 1905, p. 54, in assigning the work to Herveus of Bourg-Dieu, repeats merely the usual opinion. He mentions a twelfth-century MS of the work, which, however, is anonymous. Though Denifle is sure that Herveus was the author of the work, and not Anselm (of Canterbury; to say nothing of Anselm of Laon), he assumes on p. 252 that there was a genuine commentary of Anselm of Canterbury on the Epistles. He does nothing, however, to substantiate this passing remark.

however, is that the *Enarrationes in Epistolas S. Pauli* were the direct source of the Interlinear Gloss on the Pauline Epistles, as the latter appears in the MSS of the Glossa dating from the second half of the twelfth century.¹ For a detailed comparison easily shows that nearly all the glosses of the Interlinearis on Paul are almost literally anticipated, though together with other expository material, in the *Enarrationes*.² So if Anselm had anything to do at all with the Interlinearis, we must unhesitatingly regard him as the author of the *Enarrationes* on St Paul.

We may, therefore, as far as the Pauline Epistles are concerned, take one thing for granted: that there is as yet nothing to show that Anselm of Laon invented the Glossa Interlinearis, that concise and most convenient commentary which was so great an aid to the reading of the text.³ On the other hand, the matter from which that gloss was extracted was of Anselm's composition and indirectly derived from patristic and other sources.

We proceed to Anselm's gospel commentaries. Of these only that on Matthew has been printed, but not in its original form. For we possess of the *Enarrationes in Matthaeum* a very early MS which is possibly an autograph of Anselm (B.M. Royal MS 4. A. xvi). It is a fact that as early as 1200 this MS was in the library of Rochester Cathedral,⁴ and as it must have been written about 1100, it is just possible that Ralph, one of Anselm's pupils at Laon, took the book with him to England, when he was consecrated Bishop of Rochester in 1108.⁵ In many instances this MS of the *Enar-*

¹ The Glossa Interlinearis was still growing in the thirteenth century; for in the Gloss on Mt iv 18 reference is made to the *ordo praedicatorum*.

² The parallels are apparent everywhere. The present writer has selected a passage at random from Anselm of Laon's *Enarrationes in Paulum* (ed. cit. 2 Cor iv, fol. 114^r in the 1544 edition) and collated it with the Interlinear Gloss on 2 Cor iv. The unmistakable result of the comparison is that the substance of the Interlinear Gloss was taken from the *Enarrationes*.

³ G. Lefèvre, *De Anselmo*, p. 59 f.

⁴ The book is inscribed by a thirteenth-century hand: 'Liber de claustro Roffensi .G. Archidiaconi'. It is mentioned in the Rochester catalogue of 1202 (W. B. Rye, 'A Memorial . . .', no. 128).

⁵ G. Lefèvre, *De Anselmo*, p. 73 f.

rationes in Matthaeum has a shorter text than that printed in Migne's edition, and a comparison shows that the additions in Migne's text were taken from the Fathers and added later. There is also an interesting preface, hitherto unknown, and printed in Appendix C, which leaves one with the impression that Anselm's field of activity in matters of interpretation was rather wider than is suggested by the commentaries that have come down to us.¹ Again we notice that besides various patristic sources Remigius of Auxerre was one of Anselm's models. The abstract by Remigius of Christian of Stavelot's commentary on Matthew (see Appendix B) furnished some of the material for Anselm's *Enarrationes*. What has been said of the *Enarrationes* on the Epistles must be repeated here: Anselm's commentary was the source from which the Interlinear Gloss on Matthew was later provided with its expository material. A comparison shows that the Gloss was verbally dependent on the commentary.²

No lectures were given at Laon on the gospel of Mark, as Robert Grosseteste unmistakably witnesses.³ As to Luke the MSS have not so far enabled us to make a definite statement.⁴ The case is different as regards the Fourth Gospel. Two anonymous MSS have come to light containing a *Glossa interiecta* on the gospel of St John, which is very similar to the *Enarrationes* on other biblical books mentioned above. One is at least tempted to suggest Anselm

¹ Unfortunately the book is anonymous; but the first three leaves seem to be missing. See Appendix C.

² A comparison of the Interlinear Gloss on Matthew with Anselm's *Enarrationes* on Matthew (Migne clxii 1458) will easily prove this statement to be exact.

³ Grosseteste, *Postillae super Evangelium Marci* (Pembroke Coll. Camb. MS 7, fol. 228^v, col. 2): 'Marcus pene intactus [i.e. not yet commented upon], quia pedissequus est Mathei. Etiam pro difficultate eum intactum reliquerunt antiqui, nec legit eum magister Anselmus nec magister Rodolfus'. The *Glossa Interlinearis* on Mark is in fact a mere extract of the *Glossa Ordinaria*, and the latter is composed of Remigius's and Bede's commentaries on Mark (Remigius on Mark is printed in Migne xxx 579), as well as of the commentaries on Matthew and Luke.

⁴ The *Glossa* on Luke can almost wholly be explained by the help of Bede's commentary.

as the author of this work, too, for it has been the direct source of the *Glossa Interlinearis* on John. The oldest MS is Durham A. iv. 15, of the first half of the twelfth century. Perhaps the original from which it was copied was brought from Laon to Durham by the sons of Ralph Flambard (Bishop of Durham till 1128), who had received their education in Anselm's school. The other MS (Lincoln 122) is also of the twelfth century. A specimen of this commentary is given in Appendix C.

Difficult as it is to-day to ascertain which were the works of Anselm, in his own time and for some decades after his death they were justly famous as an achievement which met with great appreciation from contemporaries. John of Salisbury gave Anselm and his brother Ralph the first place among those modern teachers who were not held in great esteem by those who despised the study of letters.¹ There is a school to-day, he says, where more care is paid to the words than to the things. The true and well-qualified teachers (among whom he also classes Gilbert de la Porrée, Alberic of Rheims, William of Champeaux, Hugh of St Victor, Robert Pullus) taught the real science which consists in eliciting from the Scriptures the true sense, which again is based on the sentences [of the Fathers]; whereas the *Cornificii* deny all possibility of methodical research, declare the results of the other teachers to be wrong, and never tire of disparaging what others have recognised as the truth; nor do they admit Holy Writ to be the standard measure of truth.²

In estimating Anselm's part in the development of those writings without which scholasticism would have assumed a different form, it is not advisable to rely on judgment such as that of Abelard, inspired as he was by a feeling of wounded pride.³ For the collecting of the patristic material was an exceedingly important stage, since scho-

¹ *Metalogicus* i, c. 5.

² *Ib.* c. 5; c. 3.

³ *Hist. Calam.* iii (Migne clxxviii 123 f.).

lastic philosophy was essentially a logical structure erected on, and contributing to, the traditional doctrines of the Church. But the propositions had first to be made known and accessible, before the systematic work could begin. Even Abelard confessed immediately after his inconsiderate attack on Anselm, that he could not embark on his philosophy before collecting the dogmatic material from the Fathers.¹ Only after he had provided himself with a substance could the form of his particular dialectical method begin to take shape. Perhaps it is even possible to detect a resemblance between his commentary on Romans and Anselm's *Enarrationes* on that Epistle in the general sequence of thought.² The real cause of Abelard's indignation was that 'the old man' did not venture beyond the mere fundamentals, and that he did not aspire, by the aid of a rationalistic method, to make a complete and logically constructed whole out of the material he had collected.

GENERAL STRUCTURE OF SCHOLASTIC THOUGHT

It is well to remember in this connection that, from the point of view of the philosophical method, scholasticism was built up of various strata into the form of a pyramid. At the base, on which the whole structure rested, there was the Vulgate, for all scholastic thinking was exclusively concerned with religious truths and metaphysical realities revealed in the Bible. The next step in the proceedings was to draw these truths out of the biblical context, to deprive them of the verbal veil behind which they were hidden, and to set them forth undisguised. This task had been undertaken by the numerous compilers of secondary biblical commentaries from the ninth century onwards down to Anselm of Laon. In Anselm's work this stage of collecting and

¹ *Hist. Calam.* v (l.c. col. 126).

² Migne clxxviii 787 ff. should be compared with *Anselmi Enarrationes in Paulum*, ed. cit. 1544, fol. 2^r ff.

collating the patristic sources of biblical exposition had almost reached perfection. Yet the truths so drawn forth from the Bible were not arranged in logical order; they as yet existed in commentaries which closely followed the various books of the Bible. It was necessary to tabulate these truths (*sensus* or *sententiae*, as they were called, i.e. the profound teaching contained in the Bible) systematically. This was done in the so-called systematical Sentences, the most famous of which were to become the *Libri Quattuor Sententiarum* of Peter the Lombard, of which more will have to be said later. It is certainly not an accident that at the beginning of the large sentential literature of the twelfth century we find the names of Anselm of Laon and of his pupil William of Champeaux.¹ Anselm had satisfied the first requirement, he had deduced from the patristic writings an orthodox explanation of the Bible; he therefore could approach the next step of systematising the doctrine. In this sense Anselm's Sentences presuppose his commentaries. The apex of the pyramid was formed by confirming and strengthening the Sentences with the help of rational thought. By a series of syllogisms and logical conclusions it was attempted to reconcile apparent contradictions and to make the ultimate truth proof against attacks. This was the philosophic stage in the process, and it cannot be denied that Abelard was the first to insist upon its importance, and to assign to it its proper place in the scholastic method, but the method was not to come fully into its own until, a century later, Aristotelian logic became known in all its detail to western thinkers.

Such was the inner structure of scholastic philosophy in the order of gradual evolution. It is fundamentally the same in the teaching of the greatest scholastics, as, for instance, in that of St Thomas Aquinas. He, too, wrote a number

¹ They were only preceded by the Sentences of Radulfus Ardens, Grabmann i 246; Manitius iii 87. On the meaning of the term *Sententiae*, see Grabmann ii 22, 162. Anselm's Sentences were edited by F. P. Bliemetzrieder, 1919 (*Baeumkers Beiträge*, 18, 2-3).

of biblical commentaries, made ample use of the Sentences, and completed, in his *Summa theologica*, a method of philosophical inquiry which became the model for the later Middle Ages. St Anselm of Canterbury, alone of all scholastics, was capable of rising to the sphere of pure philosophy without first going through the preliminary stages; but then, he was a genius without equal in his own time.¹

If such was the situation, it is not astonishing to find Anselm of Laon generally regarded by his contemporaries as a teacher through whose school it was necessary to pass before approaching more difficult subjects. He supplied the propaedeutics. He made the future philosopher acquainted with the field to which he had to confine his activities, he taught the matter upon which logic and dialectics could seize. As he strictly limited his teaching to the Vulgate and the patristic sentences, he was considered a severe teacher.² When, at the Council of Rheims (1148), St Bernard charged Gilbert de la Porrée with holding unorthodox views, Otto of Freising, in recording the event, could not defend the accused party better than by alleging that Gilbert had passed through the severe discipline of Laon and was quite able to see where liberty became license.³

Gilbert, in fact, forms an intermediate link between Anselm of Laon and the first teachers of the episcopal school at Paris, both in his commentaries and in his philosophy.⁴ His commentary on St Paul closely follows Anselm's *Enarrationes*,⁵ though rather abbreviating them. It almost seems as if all the commentaries which were

¹ Anselm actually did apply himself to the interpretation of the Bible: Guibert de Nogent, *De Vita Sua* i 17 (Migne clvi 874).

² *Ib.* iii 4 (*l.c.* col. 912); *Prooemium ad comment. in Genesim* (*l.c.* col. 19); Hermannus, *De miraculis* (*l.c.* col. 964); John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pontificalis* (MG. Script. xx 516 ff., paragr. 8).

³ Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici* (MG. Script. xx 379).

⁴ Grabmann ii 408.

⁵ As far as can be seen by comparing MS Casinensis ccxxxv (*Catalogus* iv 273) with Anselm's *Enarrationes*, ed. cit. 1544.

composed between 1100 and 1160 in some way or other depended on Anselm of Laon.¹ Anselm was indeed a *Doctor doctorum*, as John of Salisbury honourably called him.²

INFLUENCE OF HERMENEUTICS ON
THE VULGATE TEXT

What in certain circumstances the effect of this passion for commentaries could be, is clearly manifested by the Harleian MS 1802 of the B.M. This small gospel book was written at Armagh about 1139-1140³ and is a copy of the notes which an Irishman had taken in one of the French schools (probably in the school of Notre Dame at Paris) about that date. The margins as well as the space between the lines of the gospel of Matthew and the beginnings of Mark and Luke are covered with glosses in a minute Irish hand. These are extracts taken in the last instance from patristic commentaries, but directly from the *Enarrationes* of Anselm, though not always in literal agreement with them. Many of the glosses are very similar to those of the *Glossa Ordinaria*, which, however, was not yet published in 1140. Traces of their having been used in the schools are found in the questions and answers which occur here and there. These glosses, some of which are printed in Appendix D, are an important witness to the fact that about 1130-1140 the commentaries of Anselm of Laon were still being used in some Paris school the fame of which attracted even foreigners. Side by side with Anselm's works other compilations were obviously read, because Anselm wrote nothing on St Mark, whereas our MS contains a few glosses on that gospel. Furthermore, there is the far-reaching similarity between these glosses

¹ *Hist. litt. de la France* x. Possibly also Gilbert the Universal (Bishop of London 1127-1134), who is said to have glossed the whole Bible, was a pupil of Anselm of Laon. Cf. *D.N.B.* xxi 314; St Bernhard, Epist. 24 (ed. Mabillon).

² Other known pupils of Anselm are enumerated by J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du xii^e siècle*, Paris 1914, p. 93.

³ *Catalogue of Harleian MSS in the B.M.*, no. 1802.

and the *Glossa Ordinaria*. This tends to suggest that the MS precludes the birth of the *Glossa*, that most important biblical commentary of medieval times, which embodied, in the Marginal and in the Interlinear Glosses, so much of the material of Anselm of Laon and of earlier expositors. No student would have bothered to take notes, during the lectures, of matters which were more easily available in the conveniently arranged *Gloss*. But out of these lectures undoubtedly the *Gloss* was one day developed. Before the publication of the *Gloss*, philosophers such as Hugh of St Victor had to resort, for the material of their works, to the secondary commentaries themselves, e.g. those of Rabanus, Remigius, or Anselm. The patristic originals, too, were much in use. It will be shown later that in 1140 the *Gloss* was actually in the course of being compiled.

Harl. MS 1802 also reveals in what way the biblical text was affected in the schools where the glosses were read. The original text of the book is typically Irish.¹ Among others there is the following Irish reading in Mt iv 6: *angelis suis mandabit de te, ut custodiant te in omnibus viis tuis, et in manibus tollent te . . .* In the margin there is a gloss on this passage which runs as follows:

·hīr· Diabulus nihil amplius dixit nisi hoc: *Quoniam angelis suis mandavit de te ut in manibus portent te ne forte offendas ad lapidem pedem tuum. Mediam partem dimisit; hic enim dicitur: Quoniam angelis suis mandavit de te ut custodiant te in viis tuis. Hoc non dixit diabulus, ut custodiant te in viis tuis. Sciebat enim contra se esse. Poterat enim dominus ei respondere: Si custodit me dominus in omnibus viis, ergo et a te custodiar. Tacuit ergo quod sciebat contra se esse, et posuit quod pro se erat.*

This interesting note is not literally taken from Jerome's commentary on Matthew (Migne xxvi 32 B), but it is the words of the teacher on the particular reading of the text, and these were certainly inspired by Jerome's comment:

¹ Mt ii 3 *cum illo* : *cum eo*; 5 + *dicentem*; iii 9 *de lapidibus* : *ex lapidibus*; 17 *vox* + *facta est*; vi 21 *ibi est* : *ibi erit*; 33 *autem* : *ergo*; viii 5 *cum autem* : *post haec autem cum*; ix 3 *blasfemat* + *quis potest dimittere peccata nisi solus deus*; etc.

'Male ergo [i.e. to his own advantage] interpretatur Scripturas diabolus. Certe si vere de Salvatore scriptum noverat, debuerat et illud dicere, quod in eodem psalmo contra se sequitur' (Ps xc 13). Here we obtain a glimpse of the effect which the various commentaries and glosses could have upon the text, a glimpse of scholastic textual criticism, as it were. Jerome's words forced upon the teacher the conclusion that the words *ut custodiant te in omnibus viis tuis* in the pupil's copy had no right to be there, because they obviously spoil the meaning of the passage, particularly as that meaning had been emphasised by so great an authority as St Jerome. Consequently, the Irish addition in the text was deleted by a row of dots put underneath it. To judge from this example we may say that the commentaries served as internal criteria for the 'correction' of the text. Unfortunately in most cases the correction did not, as it here chanced to do, improve the text, but introduced a new reading, for which there was not much justification in the history of the text. But with a pure form of the text nobody was concerned. What mattered first of all was the sense of the passage, its true reality. The text merely had to conform to it.

We shall see in due course how, in a like way, the text came to be highly affected in the school where the Glossa took its origin. First the obscure and complex history of that Gloss will have to be cleared up.

PETER THE LOMBARD AND THE GLOSSA

The commentaries of Anselm of Laon, Gilbert de la Porrée, and numerous others faded into the background, when Peter the Lombard published his glosses. Just as his *Sententiae*, later the textbook of the University of Paris, superseded all previous attempts at a systematical digest of the doctrine of the Church,¹ his glosses at once rose into favour. They, too, summed up all earlier endeavours

¹ J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement . . .*, pp. 2, 6, 17, 24.

of a similar scope, namely to furnish an anagogical explanation of the whole Bible. In the past the close connection between the Lombard's Sentences and his glosses has often been neglected; and yet the relation is the same as in Anselm of Laon's case. It is a fact that at least the Great Glosses, as they are called, namely those on the Psalter and the Pauline Epistles, preceded the Sentences.¹ These glosses were a necessary preliminary work involving collection of material which was to undergo systematisation in the philosophical work. Both the Great Glosses are closely related to previous commentaries, especially to those of Anselm of Laon and of Gilbert de la Porrée on the Psalter and on St Paul.²

To confine ourselves to the Gloss on St Paul we may say that the Lombard was particularly dependent on Anselm's *Enarrationes*. In many places he followed them literally, but he always quoted other sources as well, which had perhaps been inaccessible to Anselm. The Lombard's intention in the Great Glosses was to combine seemingly contradictory patristic authorities and to reconcile them as the result of a dialectical discussion. Peter, even more than Anselm, followed the sources literally, wherever he cited his authorities,³ so that we are led to conclude that at this stage of his life's work he made use of the patristic originals. In the best MSS of the Maior Glossatura (i.e. on the Psalms and St Paul) we find the sources indicated with the utmost care in the margin,⁴ which could not have been the case if secondary commentaries had been used. But apart from these additions, and Peter's own dialectic

¹ J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement...*, pp. 127, 156 note 3. The Great Gloss on Paul became known about 1142, the Sentences about 1150.

² Already Gerhoh of Reichersberg knew this, *De ordine donorum s. Spiritus* (MG. Libelli de Lite iii 275). H. Denifle, *Die abendländischen Schriftausleger bis Luther*, Mainz 1905, p. 346 ff.

³ Migne cxc1 1301 ff. should be compared with *Anselmi Enarrationes in Paulum*, ed. cit. 1544.

⁴ E.g. in the MSS Trin. Coll. Camb. B. 5.4; Bodl. Auct. E infra 6 (glossed Psalter in two vols.); Trin. Coll. Camb. B. 5.6 and 7 (glossed Epistles in two vols.). All these were written about 1160-1170 at Christ Church, Canterbury.

reasonings on what must be taken to be the real sense of the particular passages under consideration, the Great Gloss follows Anselm continuously.

It is astonishing that the identity between certain words and phrases in the Great Gloss and the Glossa Interlinearis has never been pointed out with any emphasis. A comparison shows at first sight that the Interlinear Gloss on the Psalter and on St Paul is a mere verbal extract from the Lombard's larger commentaries, arranged so as to form a running exposition of the text. The resemblance goes so far that each individual word of the Interlinearis can be shown to be simply taken over from the larger work. This rules out the possibility, which might otherwise exist, of the Lombard's Great Glosses being an adaptation of the Interlinearis; for it is extremely unlikely that each individual word of so disconnected a gloss as the Interlinearis appears to be if read without the text, should have been adopted by the Lombard in precisely the same form for his larger commentaries. The subject-matter, and in most cases even the words of the Interlinearis, were, as has been shown, already contained in the *Enarrationes* of Anselm. But as the agreement is even closer between the Interlinearis and the Great Gloss,¹ the former cannot have come into existence before the latter was written. To be exact, it is more than credible that the author of both these glosses was one and the same person, Peter the Lombard himself.

As regards the Interlinearis on the other books of the Bible the Lombard had no Great Gloss to go upon. But it is significant that evidence has been accumulated of late which tends to show that besides his acknowledged commentaries the Lombard wrote numerous other ex-

¹ See p. 205, note 2, and compare with the passages there indicated Lombardus, *In Ep. ii ad Cor.* c. iv, Migne cxcii 29 ff. It will appear that all the matter of the Interlinear Gloss is already contained in Anselm's *Enarrationes*, but that the Lombard's particular form of Anselm's work (i.e. the Great Gloss on Paul) must have been the immediate source of the Glossa Interlinearis.

positions, some on books of the Old Testament, and some on the gospels.¹ Most of these have not been preserved in their original shape, because they were mere collections of material, which was not, as in the Great Gloss, subjected to a logical synthesis. Of the lost commentary on the gospels only the preface has been preserved,² which is merely an extract from Anselm's preface to the *Enarrationes in Matthaeum* printed in Appendix C. This makes it very probable that also the lost expositions themselves were collections from previous commentaries, especially from those by Anselm of Laon, Remigius, and others. For the lost commentary on St John's gospel, for instance, Peter combined Anselm's commentary on that gospel with that of John the Scot. The chief reason why these expository collections have not survived is that the author regarded them as rough drafts of what he was actually going to compose: the Glossa. He first collected his material from the various sources mentioned, and then arranged it in the form of the *Interlinearis* and *Ordinaria*. This explains why in the gospels the *Ordinaria* and the *Interlinearis* so often agree, mostly even in the choice of certain terms. They were both drawn from the same collection of material by the same author; only each had to satisfy somewhat different requirements. As regards St John's gospel the case is quite clear. There are early twelfth-century MSS of Anselm's commentary which has largely contributed both to the *Ordinaria* and to the *Interlinearis* (see Appendix C). On the other hand, the latter two glosses also contain considerable extracts from John the Scot (see Appendix B) which were not yet embodied in Anselm. The only possible inference to be made from this is that after Anselm a writer combined the works of Anselm and John the Scot on the Fourth

¹ B. Smalley and G. Lacombe, 'The Lombard's commentary on Isaias' (*The New Scholasticism* v, 1931, 123 ff.). On the possibility of a gospel commentary by the Lombard, *ib.* p. 143.

² This was printed, *ib.* pp. 160-162. It should be compared with Anselm's preface to the *Enarrationes* on Matthew (below, Appendix C).

Gospel, and arranged them in the way represented by the Glossa. This writer must have been the Lombard, according to what we know of the *Interlinearis* on the Psalter and St Paul. Furthermore, the first MSS of the Glossa appeared about and shortly after 1150, i.e. at the time of the highest fame of the Lombard's school. The distinction between *Maior* (or *Magna*) and *Parva Glossatura*, which is already to be met with in the twelfth century, is best accounted for by the assumption that two distinct works by the same author had to be designated.¹ Also it might be mentioned that from the twelfth century down to the fourteenth there was an unbroken tradition that the Master of the Sentences was the author of the Glossa.²

The obscure origins of the Glossa (which term is here taken as comprising both the *Ordinaria* and the *Interlinearis*; indeed we know of no MS in which one may be found separate from the other) receive some additional light, if we investigate the relations which existed between the school of the Lombard and certain English personalities of the time. By means of the ancient library catalogues the path can be traced by which the first glossed copies of the Vulgate³ entered a number of English monasteries and cathedrals. In all cases we are ultimately led to the school of the *Magister Sententiarum* at Paris.

¹ Sometimes, however, the Great Gloss was called *Glossa Ordinaria*.

² Trin. Coll. Camb. MS B. 1.6 (late twelfth century) contains at the beginning a short list of books, one item of which is called 'Glosulas petri maiores et minores'. This might mean, a volume with the Marginal and the Interlinear Glosses of the Lombard. See Bandini on the glossed Bibles of the Laurenziana at Florence, *Catalogus* iv, 1777, 335 ff.; G. Lacombe, *The New Scholasticism* v 155. If the editors of the Douai edition of the Glossa were right in maintaining (Migne cxiii 17 c) that the Lombard called the Glossa an *Auctoritas*, this fact would weigh heavily against our proposition that the Lombard was the author of the Glossa. But by the expression in the particular passage (*Sent. lib. iv, dist. 4, paragr. 5*; Migne cxcii 848), the Lombard did not refer to the Gloss at all, but to St Augustine, from whom he had borrowed the authoritative remark which he quotes in the passage of the Sentences. See also J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement . . .*, p. 347.

³ I.e. copies of the *Biblia Ordinaria*, to use the expression of C. Vercellone, *Variae Lectiones* i, Rome 1860, p. lii ff.

THOMAS BECKET'S AND HERBERT OF BOSHAM'S
COPIES OF THE GLOSSA

The earliest volume of the glossed gospels that can today be seen to have existed in the library of Christ Church, Canterbury, is a folio volume of excellent workmanship which contains in the central column of each page the gospel text written in large characters. The lines of the textual column vary in length according to the size of the marginal gloss (i.e. the *Glossa Ordinaria*) corresponding to a particular text. The whole is so arranged as to make the marginal gloss begin on the same line on which the corresponding passage of the text is to be found. The Interlinear Gloss is written in small characters between the lines of the text. The writing, the illuminated initials, and the size and arrangement of this book (to-day Trinity College, Cambridge, MS B. 5. 5) place it in the near neighbourhood of a complete four-volume set of the *Maior Glossatura* of Petrus Lombardus, i.e. of a Psalter and the Pauline Epistles, each in two volumes, containing the Great Gloss (the Psalter is contained in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS B. 5. 4, and Bodl. Auct. E infra 6; the Epistles in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS B. 5. 6 and 7). These five volumes, which bear a strong resemblance to each other, were written at the same time (about 1160-1170) at Christ Church, perhaps even by the same scribe. All five are listed in Prior Eastry's catalogue of the Christ Church library written at the beginning of the fourteenth century. The gospel volume is entered under the heading *Libri Sancti Thome*, and forms one of twenty-one glossed volumes embodying the whole Bible from Genesis to Apocalypse. This set is followed by the entry: *Sententie Longobardi*. Then a number of other books, also the gift of Thomas Becket, are enumerated, after which there is a new paragraph which reads as follows:¹

¹ M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries*, nos. 854-858 of Prior Eastry's catalogue of Christ Church library (p. 85).

Libri M. Herberti de Boseham.

Prima pars psalterii secundum Longobardum.

Secunda pars psalterii secundum Longobardum.

Prima pars epistolarum Pauli secundum Longobardum.

Secunda pars epistolarum Pauli secundum Longobardum.

Thomus [i.e. Herbert's *Vita S. Thomae*].

These data permit us to say that Thomas Becket and his friend and secretary Herbert of Bosham must have been among the first to introduce the products of the Lombard's school at Paris (namely the Maior Glossatura, the Parva Glossatura or Gloss, and the Sentences) into Christ Church, and perhaps even into England.

BOSHAM ON PETER THE LOMBARD
AND THE GLOSSA

Herbert of Bosham, before entering the service of Becket, had been educated on the Continent.¹ This may be taken a priori to mean at Paris about the middle of the century. This fact has a bearing on the history of the four volumes of the Great Gloss, which are attributed to Herbert in the extract given from the Canterbury catalogue. For both to Herbert's copy of the Psalter (Trinity College, Cambridge, MS B. 5. 4) and to that of the Epistles (B. 5. 6) there are prefixed prefaces written by Herbert himself which constitute a source of the highest interest and importance not only for Bosham's own life, but also for the history of the Gloss and the scholastic text of the Vulgate.²

According to these prefaces, which are in the form of letters addressed to Archbishop William of Sens, Bosham completed the revision of the Lombard's commentary on the Psalter about 1170.³ He declares that he thought himself the appropriate person to supplement and polish what

¹ According to Leland. Hardy, *Descriptive Catalogue* ii 328.

² First printed by L. Delisle, *Journal des Savants*, 1900, pp. 732-739. As Delisle's edition is rather inexact and not easily accessible, the letters are re-edited in Appendix E.

³ Namely immediately after Becket's death. Note the difference in the tenor of the two prefaces.

the Lombard had left behind in an unfinished and rude state. For Peter the Lombard had once been his teacher in the subject of biblical interpretation, a teacher whom he had always regarded with the highest esteem and reverence.¹ When the Lombard composed his Glosses, Bosham continues, he had no intention of lecturing on them in the school, and he used to say as much in Bosham's hearing. The master's plan had been merely to expand, illuminate and explain the commentaries of Anselm of Laon, which in many places were obscure and gave rise to difficulties. So it was that the Lombard's Gloss came to be something in the nature of a gloss on Anselm's commentaries, because the latter was one of the Fathers who spoke with authority.

These interesting remarks of Bosham confirm what we have deduced from a comparison of the Lombard's Glosses with the commentaries of Anselm. Lombardus adopted the sequence of problems treated by Anselm, and indeed he even borrowed many of the words of Anselm. Nor can this treatment of his predecessor have been limited to the Psalter and the Pauline Epistles; Anselm's other *Enarrationes*, especially those on the gospels, so much resemble such traces of the Lombard's lost expositions of the gospels as remain to-day, and, above all, the Glossa on the gospels, that it cannot be doubted that in his commentaries and in the Glossa on these and other biblical books he was guided by such exegetical works of Anselm as were known to exist. But only in the Great Gloss did the Lombard (as Gilbert de la Porrée had already done) go beyond Anselm by quoting several, and often contradictory or seemingly contradictory, patristic opinions on a passage. In the Great Glosses he first made use of the Sic-et-non method of Abelard, which was to become famous in the Sentences.

¹ Trin. Coll. Camb. MS B. 5. 4, fols. 1^v and 2^r. The fact that Bosham was a pupil of Peter the Lombard removes the difficulty in book vii of the *Vita S. Thomae* (Robertson, *Materials for the History of Becket*, iii (R.S. 1877) 523), which was pointed out by Hardy, *Descriptive Catalogue* ii 328, note 2.

Instead of Anselm's eclectic procedure of selecting and compiling extracts from the Fathers, the Lombard's Great Gloss solved contradictions between the Fathers in a dialectical way. In practice it meant that he took over Anselm's *Enarrationes*, but enlarged them by additions from the Fathers whose dicta formed a contrast to Anselm's authorities, and that he tried to solve the contradiction.¹ Bosham's remark that the Lombard had not prepared his Glosses to be read in public shows that these were intended to be a preliminary collection of the patristic material for the Sentences, the Lombard's systematic work. Not before the Sentences were beginning to become known (shortly after 1150) did his pupils request him to lecture on the Glosses also. Bosham goes on to say that the unexpectedness of the suggestion, his election to the bishopric of Paris (in 1159), and his sudden death shortly afterwards (in 1160), prevented the Lombard from correcting his Glosses and from revising not quite orthodox passages in them. These observations make it clear that the Lombard himself lectured on his Glosses in his own school. An insinuation also implies that at the time when Bosham wrote, objections were brought against the Glosses charging them with heterodoxy.

THE LOMBARD'S SCHOOL AND PARIS UNIVERSITY

Both these points are borne out by what we actually know of the fate of Peter the Lombard's works. The sudden death of their author found the school of Notre Dame full of students who had come to hear the lectures of the famous man. He had just begun to lecture upon his works, which at the time revolutionised the methods of theological disquisition. Here the patristic material, which for generations had been acknowledged as representing the

¹ Bosham indicated even the dialectical character of the Lombard's Great Glosses, Trin. MS B. 5.6, fol. 4^{rv}. A detailed analysis of the Great Gloss was given by H. Denifle, *Die abendländischen Schriftausleger bis Luther*, p. 346 ff. Cf. also Vincent of Beauvais, *Spec. Hist.* lib. 29, c. 1.

orthodox doctrine of the Church, was for the first time subjected to, and combined with, the dialectical method that even a few years ago had excited the indignation of orthodox Bernard of Clairvaux, because its use had been unaccompanied by the reverence due to religious truth and ecclesiastical authority. For the first time a scholar had succeeded in welding together dogmatic material and a strictly philosophic method of inquiry. It was unfortunate that owing to the author's death the great achievement was not more generally known; but a way was soon found out of the difficulty. We are at a loss to say with any certainty what this way was. We can only state the barren fact that after the Lombard's death his works continued to be read by a successor or by a number of successors in the school of Notre Dame. It is tempting to suppose that his works were seized by a teacher or, more probably, by a body of teachers who established themselves in the island of the Seine and began to build up the reputation of the Paris *Studium*.¹ It may have been the large number of students who were attracted to the episcopal school by these lectures on the works of the dead master which roused the envy of the other schools; for immediately after 1160 the works of the great Lombard became the object of suspicion, a suspicion unknown during his lifetime. His writings were accused of heterodox teaching with regard to Christ's human nature, and a law-suit was brought against him at the papal court. Abbot Joachim of Floris, an enemy of what he considered to be worldly learning, charged Peter in a vehement attack with propounding an unorthodox doctrine of the Trinity; John of Cornwall wrote several violent pamphlets against him. Walter of St Victor stormed against the 'diabolical arguments' of the Lombard, whom he called 'one of the labyrinths

¹ It is noteworthy that in 1160 Peter of Blois, who had been a Doctor of Law at Bologna, suddenly decided to teach Divinity at Paris. Perhaps there were material reasons for the sudden change, though they do not appear in Peter's own tale (Denifle-Chatelain, *Cartularium Univ. Paris.* i 32).

of France who, inflated with the Aristotelian spirit, dare to apply their scholastic levity to the ineffable mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation'.¹ The rivalry is also apparent in the resolution of the Council of Tours of 1163, that no monk under any circumstances should study science or law.²

Such was the situation at Paris when, in consequence of his own obstinacy and that of his King, Thomas Becket arrived there, in Bosham's company, on his way to the South of France.³ At Paris the refugees learnt of the dispute between the rigorous ecclesiastical party and that of the philosophers. Bosham uses a mild expression: it was generally agreed that the works of the Lombard had not yet been subjected to the pruning-knife. The quarrel came to a crisis in 1164. On the day before Christmas Pope Alexander III presided over a synod held at Sens, where Becket had just arrived. Possibly he was a spectator during the proceedings of the synod, where all the divinity professors of Paris were present. Two resolutions were taken. Nobody should be allowed to treat theological subjects 'in artful words or undisciplined questions'; and the old orthodox doctrine was reasserted that Christ was true man. It was precisely the sentence against which the Lombard was said to have offended.⁴ The Synod of Sens can perhaps be said to mark the birth of the University of Paris, when the supporters of the scholastic method of the episcopal school, which was no other than that of the Lombard, were forced to join the opposition. Unless the teachers of

¹ H. Denifle, *Arch. f. Lit.- u. Kirchengesch. d. Mittelalters* i 406.

² Canon viii, Mansi xxi 1179; Denifle-Chatelain, *Cartularium* i 3. See also the letter of Abbot Peter Cellensis of St Remy to John of Salisbury, who had then just arrived at Paris; Denifle-Chatelain, *Cartularium* i 24.

³ This is proved by a passage in the letter of Abbot William of St Denis to Bosham (see Appendix E): 'Poposcerat namque sollicitudo tua, quatinus yponima temporis predicationis beati Pauli, quod me legente nuper audieras, de greco sermone verterem in latinum'. In 1163 William of Gap (or, le Mire) was a monk of St Denis (abbot 1172-1186), cf. L. Delisle, *Journal des Savants*, 1900, p. 722 ff.; *Hist. litt. de la France* xiv 374.

⁴ Annals of Reichersperg, ad ann. 1164 (Mansi xxi 1201; MG. Script. xvii 471).

the Lombardic works were willing to abandon philosophy altogether, they had to rally yet more closely round their textbooks. At any rate, the possession of the Lombardic works ensured to the Cathedral school of Paris the position of being the most modern of all schools, and it was natural that it soon tried to transform the privilege into a monopoly.¹ But whatever the details of the process may have been, a point which cannot be stressed too much is the fact that the connection between the University of Paris and the writings of Peter the Lombard, which we find so well established in the thirteenth century, is not one of contingency, but of causality. The works called forth the institution, and in a way they determined all later efforts both of scholastic interpretation and of philosophy. The Lombard's text of the Vulgate was closely woven into the whole process. Without any considerable modification it became the text of the University of Paris and, through the University, also that of the later Middle Ages.

Of the way in which that text was evolved in the Lombard's school, little need be said. In compiling his exegetical works, especially the glosses, the Lombard confirmed the pre-scholastic text of the Vulgate, and he even intensified its scholastic character by introducing new readings.

THE GLOSSA IN ENGLAND: CHRIST CHURCH, CANTERBURY

Before considering the nature of that text we propose to investigate the various ways in which it penetrated into England, accompanied by the Gloss. The resolution of the Synod of Sens was the reason why attempts were made to purge the works of the Lombard of the offensive passages.²

¹ About 1170-1172 Pope Alexander had to ask the French King, 'ut eis districte precipiatis, ut quicumque viri idonei et litterati voluerint regere studia litterarum, sine molestia et exactione qualibet scolas regere patiantur, ne scientia de cetero pretio videatur exponi, que singulis gratis debet impendi'. Denifle-Chatelain, *Cartularium* i 5.

² But even in 1170 the false doctrines were not yet quite suppressed; see Mansi xxii 119; Denifle-Chatelain, *Cartularium* i 4. Again protests were raised in 1177, Denifle-Chatelain i 8. On the whole controversy, see Oudin, *De Script. Eccles.* ii 1223.

From the outset judicious men had been inclined to compromise. William of Sens, archbishop from 1168 onwards and papal legate of France, was the friend of Becket and Bosham, and these men, who conformed to the severest rule of the Church and were yet educated enough to recognise and appreciate the value of the scholastic school, sought a way to unite orthodoxy and philosophy. As William of Sens was the papal representative and responsible for the carrying out of the decree and for the behaviour of the schools, he induced Becket to consider the correction of the Lombard's Great Gloss. Becket chose his companion Herbert of Bosham, a former pupil of the author, to do the work.¹ Bosham, during his sojourn with Becket in Pontigny,² corrected the Gloss on the Psalter. Becket seems to have followed with great interest the progress of the work. Indeed he seems to have worked with Bosham, who gives an account of their common biblical studies.³ It is too full of rhetorical flourishes to be quoted here; yet there is hidden behind his words the consciousness of a learning then new in England, and revealing knowledge such as had never been heard of before. It is obviously an impression of the method in use at Paris. Writing of their occupations at Pontigny Bosham particularly mentions the Psalter and the Epistles, the two books in the correcting of which he was at that time employed:⁴

[At Pontigny, Thomas] so loved Holy Scripture that after he had delivered the regular prayers, the sacred books were all but never out of his hands, especially those two, the Psalter

¹ Bosham's preface to his copy of the Great Gloss on the Psalter (Appendix E): 'Christus Domini, summus sacerdos Christi, neomartyr noster sanctus Thomas ita fieri voluit'.

² In the margin of the first volume of the Psalter (B.5.4) there is a coloured drawing of a bishop (Becket) who gives an order to a man clothed in a simple dress (Bosham). The latter is holding an open book in which the words 'Doce illum' are legible. Above there is the inscription: 'Sanctus Thomas . . . et pontifex'.

³ *Thomus* (i.e. *Vita S. Thomae*) lib. iii, cc. 10-12 (Robertson, *Materials for the History of Becket* iii (R.S.) 203 ff.).

⁴ *Ib.* lib. iv, c. 14 (ed. cit. iii 379).

and the Epistles, which are like two spiritual eyes, a mystical and a moral one. He used to say that the one taught moral, the other metaphysical knowledge. Owing to his love of Scripture and his diligent reading he made rapid progress, so that even in nice and difficult points of biblical meaning he saw more clearly than his teachers. In that way we spent our stay at Pontigny.

Bosham's correction of the Lombard's Glosses on the Psalter and the Epistles (the latter he finished about 1175)¹ is in fact hardly more than a careful copy of the original works of the Lombard. Bosham has merely added a three-fold series of marginal notes. First, he gave exact references to the patristic source of each extract borrowed by the Lombard; then, when the same extract occurred twice in the whole of the Great Gloss, cross-references were added; lastly, the places were specially marked where the Lombard quoted contradictory authorities, and particular attention was drawn to the passage which gave the solution of the dilemma. Bosham was therefore putting up mere signs of caution which were to set the reader on the right road and to avert from the Lombard the suspicion of heterodoxy.

We may safely conclude that Becket's set of twenty-two glossed volumes of the Bible formed part of the property which he had acquired in France, and which he had studied during his exile. They, as well as the Great Gloss, contained the stock material of interpretation as cultivated in the former school of the Lombard, and the new learning of which they formed a part was first carried to Canterbury by Becket and Bosham. In one of his prefaces Bosham speaks of his intention to emend the other glossed books of the Bible, too, 'by adding analogous or contradictory expositions to biblical passages agreeing with one another or contradicting each other'. This also he was going to do by the order of Becket, but he did not think of writing any

¹ Namely between 1172 (William le Mire is called abbot; he became Abbot of St Denis in 1172) and 1176 (in that year Archbishop William of Sens was translated to the province of Rheims; Bosham calls him Archbishop of Sens).

more prefaces.¹ Obviously Bosham would not have expressed himself in these terms, if the other glosses of which he speaks had not also come from the same source as the Great Gloss. The Glossa on the gospels in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS B.5.5, may well be one of the books written for Becket under the supervision of Bosham.

HEREFORD

Hereford Cathedral library possesses to-day about twenty volumes of quarto size, which must have been written between 1150 and 1170, and each of which represents a biblical book supplemented by the Glossa.² An inscription in each volume says that they were given by Archdeacon Radulfus, i.e. Ralph Foliot, who was Archdeacon of Hereford from 1163 to 1195. He was a relative of Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of Hereford (1147-1163, afterwards of London), whom he had accompanied to France, when in 1148 Gilbert attended the Council of Rheims to give witness to the charges brought against Abelard and Gilbert de la Porrée.³ Gilbert Foliot introduced Ralph into the circle of scholars at Paris and perhaps Ralph became a pupil of Lombardus; he certainly was acquainted with Robert of Melun. When in 1163 Robert of Melun became Bishop of Hereford, he made Ralph archdeacon.⁴ It seems doubtful whether Ralph could have made the acquaintance of the Glossa in Melun's school, for this scholar had not much praise for the teaching of the Lombard.⁵ Ralph Foliot must have been on the spot where the Glossa was being written, for some of the Hereford volumes do not contain the Glossa in the complete form which we meet in the

¹ Trin. Coll. Camb. MS B.5.4, fol. 3^v; B.5.6, fol. 5^v (Appendix E).

² A. T. Bannister, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the MSS in the Hereford Cathedral Library*, Hereford 1927.

³ John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pontif.* paragr. 8 (MG. Script. xx 523).

⁴ Robert of Melun was a friend of Becket; Becket made him at once Bishop of Hereford (1163); cf. Bosham's *Thomas*, lib. iii, c. 21 (ed. cit. iii 260).

⁵ Grabmann ii 342 ff., 349.

MSS after 1160, or in the editions,¹ but in various unfinished stages; yet such glosses as there are do not differ from those of the final Glossa. E.g. MS O. 2. ii, a glossed copy of St John's gospel written about 1150, has neither the careful arrangement of gloss and text which has been described as existing in Trinity College MS B. 5. 5,² nor is the Gloss complete. We can see the Lombard, as it were, in the course of compiling the material for his Small Gloss. Similarly the Glossa on Matthew in MS O. 6. iv has been interrupted in the process of growth. Other glossed books of Ralph, however, already contain the fully grown Glossa.³ So the Hereford MSS allow us to see the Lom-

¹ It is significant that after about 1160 the Glossa Ordinaria is fixed and stable and does not undergo further alterations. This stable form is that printed in all the good editions (e.g. Trechsel, Lyons 1545; F. Feu-Ardenius, Paris and Lyons 1590; I. Meursius, Antwerp 1634). It is the only form of the Glossa which has ever been known and which, for that matter, has ever existed.

² A copy of O. 2. ii, produced at Hereford at the end of the twelfth century, shows already the more careful arrangement of text and Gloss (Hereford MS O. 5. vii).

³ There are over a dozen more glossed volumes at Hereford (see Bannister's *Catalogue*) which, as closer inspection may find, will throw light on the history and gradual growth of the Glossa in the Lombard's school. MS O. 6. xii, a glossed Psalter, is called 'Psalterium de parva Glosatura Anselmi'. The book was the property of Bishop Robert Foliot (1174-1186), who had accompanied Becket into his exile (Bosham, *Thomas*, lib. vii, ed. cit. iii 524); so the book probably came from Paris. The Gloss is the *Parva Glossatura* on Psalms, i.e. an extract from the Great Gloss. The expression 'secundum Anselmum' did not denote the author of the Gloss, as modern scholars have always tacitly assumed, but a particular manner of glossation practised by the Lombard and called, in his school, the gloss after the method of Anselm, as opposed to the gloss after the manner of the Lombard ('secundum Langobardum'), i.e. the Great Gloss. The two manners were indeed very different, the former being hardly more than a convenient arrangement of expository material which had been compiled on the same lines as Anselm's *Enarrationes*; whilst the latter was an invention of the Lombard (dialectic structure of the Gloss) and therefore called by his name. But both Glosses actually were works of the Lombard.

There is an interesting list of authors written shortly after 1182 (printed by A. Miraeus, *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, Antwerp 1639, p. 173 f.), which begins with Anselm of Laon, goes on to mention half a dozen scholastics writing shortly after Anselm, and closes with Peter the Lombard. This list is obviously an echo of the tradition, in the first days of the University of Paris, that the 'modern' study of the Bible was begun by Anselm of Laon and crowned, after the efforts of several other scholars, by the achievement

bard's work in progress; they would be well worth close inspection by an historian of medieval interpretation, and of the Glossa in particular.¹

PETERBOROUGH

Observations in other libraries lead to the same result. Before the Lombard began his teaching at Paris, copies of the Glossa were nowhere to be found. The first copies come into view about 1150, i.e. at the height of his activity, and they become plentiful after his death. Peterborough received the first glossed volumes from Abbot Benedict, who in his youth had been a monk under Becket at Christ Church. He became secretary of the archbishop's successor Richard, later on Prior of Christ Church, and Abbot of Peterborough in 1177.² He wrote two books on St Thomas, the *Passio* and the *Miracula*,³ and while at Canterbury he made the acquaintance of the Glossa as imported by Becket and Bosham. According to an ancient catalogue, he left to Peterborough two Bibles, also the whole Bible glossed in fifteen volumes, and two copies of the Sentences of Lombardus.⁴

LINCOLN

The catalogue of Lincoln written about 1200 enumerates in a first paragraph the books which were in the library up to 1150. These are the usual commentaries (Augustine,

of the Lombard. It seems highly probable that the Lombard himself in his lectures appealed to the great example of Anselm, and that he introduced himself as one merely continuing the works of the great orthodox teacher. This then gave rise to the belief, even at the end of the twelfth century, that Anselm was the author of the Minor Gloss.

¹ Salisbury MS 41 is identical, in the Gloss, with Hereford MS O.2.ii. Also York Minster MS xvi.M.9 is very similar, but here the sequence of the glosses is a little different. Both the Salisbury and the York books may have been written shortly after 1150.

² Robertson, *Materials*, ii, p. xxiii.

³ *Ib.* pp. 1-281.

⁴ Edwards, *Memorials of Libraries* i 116 f.; Bekker, *Catalogi*, p. 238; M. R. James, *Lists of MSS formerly in Peterborough Abbey Library* (Bibliogr. Soc. Oxford 1926), p. 20.

Gregory, Bede), lives of the Saints and liturgical books. Then the compiler continues:¹

Postquam vero Cancellaria data fuit magistro Hamoni, superadditi sunt hii libri in armario ecclesie de dono Alexandri episcopi:

Genesis non integer glosatus.

Iohannes glosatus.

Lucas glosatus.

Epistole canonice.

Apocalipsis.

Iob glosatus.

Cantica canticorum, Ecclesiastes, et Parabole Salomonis, simul omnes tres in uno volumine.

Hos reddidit ecclesie Willelmus archidiaconus norhamtoniensis nepos eius.

There can be no doubt that Bishop Alexander of Lincoln, who died in 1148, brought at least the glossed books of his donation with him from Paris, where he must have stopped in 1146 on his return from Rome. He had to hasten home, for his cathedral had been burnt down. In 1146 the Lombard, though he had begun in 1142 to lecture on the Great Gloss, could not have made much progress in the Glossa, his minor compilation, and we must perhaps understand the first item of Bishop Alexander's books as 'a not completely glossed copy of Genesis'.² After Alexander's death the glossed books in Lincoln are more copious; mention is made of two glossed volumes of Gilbert de la Porrée, one copy of the Sentences, and St Hugh (1186-1200) gave a *Psalterium cum magna glosatura*.

¹ Lincoln MS i (A.1.2); printed in Dimock, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opp.* (R.S. 1877) vii 165; R. M. Woolley, *Catalogue of the MSS of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library*, Oxford 1927.

² See above, p. 216, note 1, on the possibility of commentaries by the Lombard on the Pentateuch, Isaiah and the gospels. Copies with the Glossa incomplete are no rarities; e.g. B.M. MSS Burney 26 and 36, two twelfth-century *Mathaei glosati* with rudimentary glosses.

DURHAM

The Durham catalogue of 1200 naturally abounds in glossed Vulgate texts.¹ More illuminating in this respect are the Durham lists of gifts which are appended to the catalogue proper. According to these, Prior Laurence, who held office from 1149 to 1153, left the following books:

- Psalterium glosatum secundum Magistrum Anselmum.
- Psalterium glosatum aliud secundum Magistrum Ivonem.
- Epistolae Pauli glosatae.
- Isaias glosatus.

With the exception of the puzzling second item, these are glosses from the Cathedral school of Paris. There is the Lombard's commentary on Isaiah lost to-day, or only preserved in the Glossa,² then the Great Gloss on St Paul, and a glossed Psalter 'after the manner of Anselm [of Laon]', which is the usual expression by which the Minor Gloss, or Glossa, was distinguished from the Great Gloss of the Lombard. The designation meant, as Bosham's comment on the work of Peter the Lombard enables us to affirm, that in the Glossa the Lombard merely followed the example of exposition set by Anselm in the *Enarrationes*. There is another Durham list which records the gifts of Bishop Hugh of Pudsey. As Pudsey died in 1194, the list is naturally much longer. It comprises glosses on the Psalter, the Epistles, Gospels, Minor Prophets, the Pentateuch, and on Isaiah, also several copies of the Sentences, and the *Historia scholastica* of Peter Comestor,³ the first chancellor of the Paris *Studium generale*.⁴

¹ T. Rud, *Codicum manuscriptorum ecclesiae cathedr. Dunelm. catalogus classicus*, Durham 1825, p. 210 ff.; B. Botfield, *Catalogi veteres*; Bekker, *Catalogi*; C. H. Turner, 'The Earliest List of Durham MSS', *Journ. Theol. Stud.* xix, 1918, 121.

² See p. 216, note 1.

³ B. Botfield, *Catalogi veteres*, p. 118; Bekker, *Catalogi*, p. 256 f.

⁴ In 1174, see Mansi xxi 971, 1058; Denifle-Chatelain, *Cartularium* i 8.

OTHER MONASTERIES

At Rochester the first copies of works of the Lombard were given by Bishop Walram (d. 1183).¹ At St Albans, Abbot Simon (1167-1183) had the first copies of the Gloss written by his own scribes. He was an intimate friend of Becket, from whom he may well have borrowed the originals.² In a word, the Glossa became an indispensable work, which no library or school willingly lacked at the end of the century. In the thirteenth century St Edmundsbury owned more than thirty volumes of glossed biblical books.³

The Glossa was the important link between scholastic philosophy and the biblical word. It did not essentially differ from secondary commentaries in earlier times; but it was in fact the commentary on which the Lombard had built up his philosophical treatment of theology, and as it was the fate of the Sentences to serve as a pattern for all subsequent scholastic efforts, the Glossa shared the Lombard's influence on philosophy.

RELATION BETWEEN HERMENEUTICS AND THE VULGATE TEXT IN THE SCHOOL OF THE LOMBARD

There was yet another element which shared the widespread influence of the Lombardic school, the biblical text itself. For it is characteristic of the schools of Anselm and Peter the Lombard that these scholars did not begin with philosophy, but with the biblical text, on which they logically built an exposition of the biblical meaning in their

¹ W. B. Rye, *A Memorial of the Priory of St Andrew at Rochester*, p. 16 f.

² Walsingham, *Gesta Abbatum* (ed. Riley, R.S. 1867) i 184.

³ The catalogue of Bury, in M. R. James, *On the Abbey of St Edmund at Bury* (Camb. Antiq. Soc. 1895). Bury had nine glossed volumes of the gospels alone. Most of the Bury Glosses are now in the library of Pembroke Coll. Camb. (M. R. James, *Cat. of MSS in Pemb. Coll. Camb.*). The ancient catalogue of Leominster (*Engl. Hist. Rev.* ix, 1888, 123) had a proper section with the heading: *Hii libri glosati* (T. Gottlieb, *Ueber mittelalterliche Bibliotheken*, Leipzig 1890, p. 168). A thirteenth-century catalogue of Glastonbury with numerous glossed texts was printed in T. Hearne's *Johannes Glaston.*, Oxford 1726, p. 423.

commentaries and glosses, and only then did they proceed to dialectics and speculation. Other scholastics, such as Abelard, Gilbert de la Porrée, William of Conches, and the school of Chartres, had often been too impatient to raise the dialectical structure on a sound basis, and consequently they had often been attacked and charged with erroneous teaching. The Lombard started at the bottom of the pyramid and worked his way upwards to the rarefied atmosphere of speculative thinking. He actually grounded his philosophic thought on the Bible.

We may infer from what has been said concerning earlier examples of biblical interpretation, that the Lombard did not rear his philosophical structure on the Vulgate without leaving marks of his activity on the text. For one thing, he adopted all the scholastic readings the origin of which has been demonstrated in the previous chapters. In addition, he created new ones by adhering to the old principles of the realist conception of language, and of patristic authority in questions of biblical meaning.

The radical innovation which the text of the Lombard represented in the non-scholastic textual tradition is shown by the Bodl. MS Rawlinson G. 169, containing the gospel of Matthew and written in England about 1160 or 1170. The text is written in the ordinary manner of a gospel book. Afterwards another scribe writing with a dry-point in a hurriedly cursive hand added the Glossa in the narrow margins of the book and between the lines. The result is not pleasing to the eye, but it is interesting from the point of view of the text. The original hand was responsible for a text of medium quality, but almost without any scholastic readings. The second scribe, however, cancelled all passages in the text which did not conform to the text of the Lombard (i.e. of the *Biblia Glossata*, or *Ordinaria*) and replaced them by such readings as were required by the Lombard's interpretation. In the following list we quote in front of the colon the original reading, afterwards that of the corrector.

Mt i 18 *mater eius : mater iesu* (cor. vat.^{mg} ε); 23 *vocabunt* (unaltered); ii 21 *surgens : consurgens* (alc mod); iii 2 *appropinquavit : appropinquabit* (alc W ε ξ ℑ); 3 *qui dictus : de quo dictum* (V ε ℑ); 7 *futura : ventura* (mod); 9 *potest : potens est* (alc mod); 10 *arborum : arboris* (schol.); 17 *celis : celo* (T schol.); iv 13 *in capharnaum : in civitatem capharnaum* (cor. vat. ε); 16 *sedebat : ambulabat* (ε ℑ); v 11 *cum maledixerint vobis : + homines* (W ε ℑ); 17 *non veni solvere : + legem* (cor. vat.*); 20 *enim : autem* (alc ε); 39 *dextera maxilla tua : dexteram maxillam tuam* (alc mod); 40 *iudicio : in iudicio* (W ε ξ ℑ); *remitte : dimitte* (ir mod); vi 6 *orabis : oraveris* (mod); *om tuo* (O^{g1} vg); 13 *a malo : + amen* (cor. vat. vg); 15 *dimittet : + vobis* (ir mod); 32 *gentes : + mundi* (scholastic); vii 1 *ut non iudicemini : ut non iudicabimini* (cor. vat.^{mg} ε ℑ); 10 *petit : petierit* (alc mod); 11 *bona* (pr.) : + *data* (O^{g1} mod); *bona* (alt.) : *spiritum bonum* (W); 12 *homines : + similiter*; 24 *supra firmam petram* (already first scribe); 25 *supra petram : supra firmam petram*;¹ viii 3 *tetigit eum iesus : iesus tetigit eum*; 9 *sub potestate : + constitutus* (cor. vat.* vg); 20 *caput : + suum* (ε ℑ); 26 *eis : + iesus* (W ε ℑ ℑ), but above the line: 'vacat. est lucas'; 28 *duo : + homines* (ir); 31 *eicis nos : + hinc* (ε ℑ ℑ); 32 *impetu : magno impetu* (ε ℑ); 33 *omnia : hec omnia* (E ε); 34 *rogabant : + eum* (ε ℑ); ix 1 *ascendens : + iesus* (cor. vat.* ε ℑ); 2 *et videns : videns autem* (alc ℑ); 6 *habet potestatem in terra dimittendi peccata : habet potestatem dimittendi peccata in terra*;² 18 *dicens : + domine* (alc mod); 38 *eiciat : mittat* (ir W ε ℑ ℑ); x 12 *vulg : + dicentes pax huic domui* (the reading of the first hand is of very good quality!); 22 *omnibus : + hominibus* (alc ε ℑ); 34 *non : + enim*; xii 18 *puer meus : + electus* (cor. vat.*); xiii 1 *in illo tempore* (E) : *in illo die* (vulg); 3 *seminare : + semen suum* (ε ℑ);

¹ Christianus Stapulensis (Migne cvi 1324): 'Is qui terrenum fundamentum collocat, in firmo loco debet collocare'. Augustinus, *De Sermonibus Domini in Monte* (Migne xxxiv 1308): 'Non enim quisque firmat in se quod audit vel percipit, nisi faciendo'. Glo. Ord.: 'Supra petram. A qua Petrus nomen accepit pro firmitate fidei'.

² So reads the text of the Lyons edition of the Glossa, 1545. Glo. Interl.: 'in terra. Positus'.

4 *volucres* : + *celi* (vg); 14 *et adimpletur : ut adimpleatur* (alc $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}$); *eis* : *in eis* (Z⁴ mod); 29 *ait* : + *illis* (E); 36 *dissere* : *edissere* (mod); *zizaniorum* : *tritici et zizaniorum* (ir W); xiv 1 *famam iesu* : *famam de iesu*; 3 *uxorem* : + *philippi*; ¹ 19 *discipuli autem* : + *dederunt* (\mathfrak{C}); xv 7 *prophetavit* : *prophetat*; 33 *panes tantos* : *panes tanti*; xvii 17 *respondens* : + *autem* (Hier. $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{C}$); xviii 7 *homini* : + *illi* (gr vett vg); 9 *unum oculum habentem* : *cum uno oculo* (alc Hier. cor. vat. $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}$); 10 *angeli eorum in celis* : *angeli eorum* ¶ ‘deputati eis ad custodiam’ (sup. lin., from Jerome, Migne xxvi 135, and the Glossa Ordinaria); 12 *relinquit* (Hier. vg) : *relinquet* (vulg); *in montibus* : *in deserto* (E) ¶ ‘in celo ab homine derelicto’; xix 9 *nisi ob fornicationem* : *excepta causa fornicationis*; 20 *vulg* : + *a iuventute mea* (vett W cor. vat. * $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{C}$); 21 *vende* : + *omnia* (W $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}$); 22 *verbum* : *verba hec*; xx 7 *vineam* : + *meam* (ir W $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{C}$); 23 *et sinistram* : *vel sinistram* ($\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{C}$); 32 *eos* : + *ad se*; xxi 4 *autem* : + *totum* (W $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{C}$); 5 *mansuetus et sedens* : *mansuetus sedens* (W $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{C}$); 25 *baptismum* : *dicite mihi, baptismum*; *non credidistis illi* : *vos non credidistis ei*; 29 *abiit* : + *in vineam*; xxii 40 *universa* : *tota* (E); xxiii 14 the verse is omitted (vulg) : the verse is added in margin, according to Jerome’s commentary (vg); xxiv 1 *accesserunt* : + *ad eum*; 29 *commovebuntur* : *movebuntur* (E); 30 *parebit* : *apparebit* (ir cor. vat. ^m \mathfrak{S}); 35 *vero* : *autem* (vg); 37 *autem* : + *fuit* (ir); 38 *in diebus* : *in diebus illis noe* (from verse 37); xxv 11 *novissime* : + *autem* (ir); 14 *homo* : + *quidam* (W); 22 *accessit . . . et ait* : *accedens . . . ait* (Z alc); *lucratus* : *superlucratus* (ir); 34 *possidete paratum vobis regnum a constitutione mundi* : *percipite regnum quod vobis paratum est ab origine* (vettir); xxvi 10 *mulieri* : *huic mulieri* (alc mod); *opus* : + *enim* (V Z³ $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{C}$); etc.

The Rawlinson MS shows that the Lombard’s text must have possessed an original character which distinguished that text from all previous forms; and yet it is only a continuation of the scholastic text which had been long in existence (cf. resemblance with W).

¹ Irish; but also Glo. Ord., and Jerome on Matthew (Migne xxvi 100).

ANALYSIS OF PETER THE LOMBARD'S TEXT

We now proceed to give the collation of two typical glossed gospel books. Trinity College, Cambridge, MS B. 5. 5 (called x in the following list) is the Christ Church volume the history of which has been already described. The book is representative of the best Canterbury style of the period. Another volume of *Quattuor Evangelia glosata* is MS B. 5. 3 of the same library (called y in the collation). It was written at St Albans shortly after 1200.¹ The sources of the readings will only be quoted when not previously given, or when difficult to find, or otherwise of interest. We hope to dispel by the collation at least one myth, namely the belief that the text of the Glossa, or the scholastic text, was merely an Alcuinian text infected by words that penetrated into it from the Gloss. Indeed the origins of the scholastic text were much more complex than has hitherto been conjectured.

(Readings which became common in Alcuin's recension and were retained throughout the medieval text (Wvg) will not be mentioned. Furthermore, owing to the large number of new variants in the Lombard's text, only a selection will be quoted.)

Mt i 5 *raab* xy cor. vat.* ε; 17 *ergo* : *itaque* xvg; 18 *eius* : *iesu* x cor. vat.* ε; 23 *vocabunt* : *vocabitur* xyE* εS; ii 10 *videntes autem stellam* + *magi* xy; 17 *dictum est* + *a domino* xy; 19 > *angelus domini apparuit* xymod; iii 3 *qui dictus* : *de quo dictum* xyV εS; 5 *omnis iudea* : *omnis turba* x; *iordanem* xyFvg; 6 > *ab eo in iordane* xyvg; 7 *baptismum* : *baptisma* xy (corr. y^c); *futura* : *ventura* xymod; 10 *arborum* : *arboris* xy; 12 *triticum suum in horreum suum* xyW; 14 *ego* + *autem* xyW; 17 *de celis* : *de celo* xyT; iv 13 *in* + *civitatem (capharnaum)* xy (ε); 16 *sedebat* : *ambulabat* xy εS cor. vat.* Hier.; v 30 *in gehennam* (m. pr.) : *in perditionem* (m. sec.) y; 48 om *vos (perfecti)* xy; vi 2 *cum facies* : *quando facis* x, *cum*

¹ MS B. 5. 3 has a peculiar type of capitula, which is, roughly speaking, an abridged form of those in JXBCTHΘ Harl. 2797 (see Oxford *Novum Testamentum*, p. 18 ff.). See above, chap. iv, p. 178, note 2.

facis y; 6 *om tuo* (after *ostio*) y O^g1 vg; 13 *malo* + *amen* x y cor. vat. vg; 22 > *si oculus tuus fuerit simplex* x y vg; vii 4 + *frater* x W^ϵⓈ; 11 *bona* (pr.) + *data* x y alc mod; *bona* (secd.) : *spiritum bonum* x, 'Luc. *spiritum bonum*' (sup. lin.) y;¹ 25 *supra* + *firmam* (*petram*) x y; 29 *habens* + *et* x Hier. vg; viii 1 *descendisset* + *iesus* x y Ⓢ; 4 *munus* + *tuum* x y (*vacat* above *tuum* y) Ⓢ; 9 + *constitutus* x cor. vat.* vg; 20 *caput* + *suum* x ir ⓈⓈ; 29 *om huc* x y; 31 *nos* + *hinc* x y ⓈⓈⓈ; 32 *porcos* : *gregem porcorum* x y; ix 1 *ascendens* + *iesus* x cor. vat.* ⓈⓈ; 5 *aut* : *an* x (*aut an!* y) vg; 35 *om iesus* x y X*B; x 3 > *philippus et bartholomeus, iacobus zebedei et iohannes frater eius* x y; 10 *non* (pr.) : *neque* x y; 11 *quancumque* + *autem* x y vett mod; 14 *om foras* y, *om de domo vel* x; 18 > *et ad reges et presides* x y; 34 *non* + *enim* (*veni*) x y; xi 8 *vestiuntur* : *induuntur* x;² 25 *confiteor* : *confitebor* x W Chrysost.; xii 8 > *enim est* x y vg; 18 *puer meus electus quem elegi* x y cor. vat.*; 30 *spargit* : *dispargit* x y cor. vat.*;³ 32 *dixerit* (alt.) + *verbum* x y; 45 *intrantes* : *ingressi* x y; xiii 3 + *semen suum* x y cor. vat.* ⓈⓈ; 4 + *celi* x y cor. vat.* vg; 11 *mysteria* : *mysterium* x Ⓢ; 16 *quia* (alt.) : *que* x y T^c; 24 *seminavit* : *seminat* x E vett gr; 36 *parabolam* + *tritici et* x ir W; 48 *vasa* + *sua* x y; 57 *et* + *sic* x y; xiv 1 *famam* + *de* x y; 14 *exiens* + *iesus* x y; 19 *discipulis* + *suis*, and *om panes* x y (X*B); 22 *iussit discipulos* : *compulit iesus discipulos suos* x y cor. vat.^{ms} ⓈⓈ; xv 12 *verbo* + *hoc* x y M Z⁴ vg; 14 *caeci sunt* + *et* y cor. vat.* ⓈⓈⓈ; 28 *vis* : *petisti* x;⁴ 30 > *mutos cecos claudos debiles* y X* J Hier. vg; *ad pedes* : *ante pedes* x; 33 *panes tantos* : *p. tanti* x y; xvii 17 *respondens* + *autem* y ⓈⓈⓈ; 19 > *ad iesum discipuli* x W, *ad eum discipuli* y; *illum* : *illud* x y; xviii 7 *homini* + *illi* x y vett X* vg; 9 *unum oculum habentem* x y W^ϵⓈ; 10 *om (angeli eorum) in celis* x y; 12 *montibus* : *deserto* x y E cor. vat.*;⁵

¹ Augustinus, *De Consensu*: 'Et sciendum, quod ubi Matheus sic dicit, *dabit bona*, Lucas dicit, *dabit spiritum bonum*. Sed non debet videri contrarium'.

² Glo. Ord.: 'mollibus induti adulantes...'

³ The Glo. Int. quotes *dispargit*.

⁴ From Glo. Ord. on verse 24: '*Non sum missus*'.

⁵ From Lc xv 4, by means of the anagogical exposition which is the same in both passages. Glo. Int.: '*in deserto*. In celo ab homine derelicto. Alius evangelista dicit, *in montibus*, i.e. in excelsis'.

25 *dominus + eius* xyE vg; 30 + *universum (debitum)* yP^{mg}; xix 1 *sermones istos: verba hec* yE;¹ 9 *nisi ob fornicationem: excepta causa fornicationis* y; 12 + *multi* (before *eunuchi*) y;² 20 *custodivi + a iuventute mea* xyW cor. vat.* εϣϢ; 21 *vende + omnia* xyirW εϢ; 22 *verbum: verba hec* yR; xx 1 *om enim* xyir vg; 19 *deludendum: illudendum* xyvg;³ xxi 4 *hoc autem + totum* xyW εϢ; 5 *om et (sedens)* xyW εϢ; 17 + *et docebat eos de regno dei* xyE; 25 *credidistis: creditis* xy;⁴ 27 *nec ego dico: neque ego dicam* y;⁵ 29 *abiit + in vineam* yvett; 37 *reverebuntur + forte* xyεϢ (Winchester texts and T: *forsitan*; see Lc xx 13; and Origen on Matthew, Tract. 19); xxiii 14 xy have the verse in Jerome's form; 25 *pleni sunt: pleni estis* xy (Xir mod Hier.); xxiv 1 *accesserunt + ad eum* x; 3 *signum + erit* xyT cor. vat.*; xxv 11 *novissime + vero* xy mod Hier.; xxvi 10 *opus + enim* xyalc ϣϢ; 39 *pater: mi pater* xyWHier.; xxvii 33 *quod: qui* xy; 40 *destruit... reaedificat: destruis... reedificas* xy Hier. cor. vat.^{mg} vg; xxviii 7 *discipulis eius + et petro* xy; 15 *docti: edocti* xyvg.

Mc i 43 *ei + est, statim + que* xy mod; ii 2 *caperent* xyW; 9 *om et (tolle)* xy mod; 12 *mirarentur* xy mod; 16 > *cum publicanis et peccatoribus* xy mod; iii 21 *sui: discipuli sui* xW (see Interlinear Gloss); 25 *poterit: potest* x mod; iv 4 *volucres + celi* xy cor. vat.* vg; 10 *cum duodecim: duodecim* xyalc mod;⁶ *parabolas: parabolam* xy mod; 28 *frumentum: fructum* xBHier.; 29 *se: ex se* xyεϢ; v 7 *om iesu* x; *summi: altissimi* xy mod;⁷ 11 *pascens + in agris* xy cor. vat.* εϢ;⁸ 21 *in navi: in navim* xyε; 23 *manum t manus* y, *manum* xWεϢ; 35 *veniunt + nuntii* xyεϢ; *ab archisynagogo: ad archisynagogum* xyWεϣ; 39 *ingressus + iesus* x; 43 *dixit:*

¹ Glo. Int.: 'verba haec. Que habuit in galilea de humilitate'.

² Glo. Int.: 'eunuchi. Continentes multi'.

³ Is this perhaps the influence of the Greek (εις τὸ ἐμπαίξαι)? In all other places in the gospels ἐμπαίξω is rendered by 'illudere'.

⁴ Also the Glo. Ord. has *creditus*.

⁵ Glo. Int.: 'Quid (v. 28). Hec non dicam, sed vos mihi hec respondete'.

⁶ The Glo. Int. removed the reading *cum duodecim* for ever by glossing *duodecim* with the nominative *discipuli*.

⁷ For this verse the Glossa copied Bede, who gives exactly the same exposition of Mc v 7 and of Lc viii 28.

⁸ A typical scholastic variant; from Augustine, *De consensu* (below, p. 271, note 1).

iussit xX*W ξ Ⓢ; vi 13 *et sanabant : et sanabantur* xW ξ Ⓢ, *et sic sanabantur* y; 14 > *rex herodes* xW^cvg; *inoperantur virtutes : virtutes operantur* xyW^cvg (Mt xiv 2); 21 *natali suo* (m. pr. of y, see ξ), the corrector altered into *natalis sui*, the usual medieval form; 30 *om illi* xy;¹ 31 *et + ait (requiescite)* x;² 41 *om panes* x; vii 8 *traditionem : traditiones* xyX* ξ ⓈⓈ; 27 *saturari : sanari* xy; viii 1 *esset + cum iesu* xyO^cW cor. vat.* ξ Ⓢ; 33 *sapis + ea* xW; 38 *confessus . . . confitebitur* xyW ξ Ⓢ; ix 1 *veniens : viventis* x (by mistake? instead of *venientis* cor. vat.^{mg}W); 3 + *et (candida)* xyH^cⓈ mod; 5 *om et (mosi)* xⓈ; 15 *eum : iesum* xy cor. vat.^{mg} mod; 19 *generatio + prava et* xy cor. vat.; 41 *aque + frigide* xy vett cor. vat.* ξ Ⓢ (Mt x 42); x 10 *om de eodem* x;³ 11 *dicit : ait* xyvg; 18 *unus : solus* x;⁴ 26 *qui : quidam* x; 29 *propter me : propter nomen meum* x (see xiii 13); 38 *bibo : bibiturus sum* xW; 39 *calicem + meum*, but *om quem ego bibo* x; xi 1 *appropinquaret* xW; 6 *iesus : dominus* xy; 7 *pullum : illum* x;⁵ 15 *veniunt + iterum* xy ξ Ⓢ; + *in (templum)* xy mod; 32 *dicemus : dixerimus* xy mod; xii 29 *om deus* (alt.) xW; 33 *corde + et ex tota mente* xW; xiii 3 *olivarum : oliveti* x; 7 *oportet enim + hec* xyⓈⓈⓈ; *nondum + statim* x (Lc xxi 9); 26 *multa : magna* xQ; xiv 12 *ut manduces : comedere* x; 21 *esset : fuisset* xyW; 27 *oves + gregis* x cor. vat.*; 37 *vigilare + mecum* xyW cor. vat.*; 44 *om eius* xW ξ ; xv 27 *alium : unum* x cor. vat.^{mg}; 29 *destruis . . . reedificas* xyⓈⓈⓈ; *templum + dei* xy cor. vat. ξ Ⓢ; xvi 1 *eum : iesum* xyvg; 12 *ostensus est : apparuit* x; 14 *novissime + vero* xy; *apparuit + illis iesus* xy cor. vat.*

¹ Perhaps caused by Glo. Int.: '*remuntiaverunt. Gratias agentes*'. This left no room for *illi*.

² Glo. Ord. (from pseudo-Jerome's (i.e. Remigius's) commentary on Mark): '*et ait illis: requiescite pusillum*'.

³ Very puzzling, unless one assumes that the scribe took *de eodem* to be part of the Interlinear Gloss, which reads: '*interrogaverunt. De eodem de quo pharisei*'.

⁴ Glo. Int.: '*unus. Qui solus bonus per se*'.

⁵ A typical case of how the meaning prevailed upon the text. In verse 6 the Glo. Int. interpreted *dimiserunt* by adding 'pullum'. This gloss was read together with the text, and in verse 7, therefore, 'pullum' could be replaced by the pronoun 'illum'.

Lc i 3 *omnibus : omnia* xyA-Yvg; 5 *illi : illius* xvg; 10 > *populi erat* xyvg; 45 *credidisti . . . tibi* xalcε⊗⊗ Ambr., Aug.; *credidisti tibi t̄ credidit ei* y; 50 *a progenie in progenies* xcor.vat.^{mg}vg; 54 *recordatus t̄ memorari* xyWcor.vat.*⊗⊗; 66 *quid : quis* xyvg; ii 7 *eis : ei* xyWε⊗; 11 *vobis : nobis* xWcor.vat.*; *salvator + mundi* y; 15 *quod fecit dominus et ostendit nobis* xyA-YWε⊗;¹ 18 *audierant* xcor.vat.*ε; 22 *eius*, above the line the words of the Glossa: 'marie vel domini', xy; see Wcor.vat.^{mg}; 34 *in ruinam et + in (resurrectionem)* xyvettcor.vat.*vg;² 37 *vidua + erat* xy⊗; 38 *ierusalem t̄ israel* yvg;³ 46 *interrogantem + eos* xy mod; 48 *et ego + mater tua* x; 51 *verba hec + conferens* xy cor.vat.*; iii 9 *arborum : arboris* xyε⊗;⁴ iv 2 *in diebus illis + postea* x; 5 *diabolus + in montem excelsum* x mod; 7 *tu ergo + procidens* yAYε⊗; 9 *pinnam : pinnaculam* xyWcor.vat.^{mg}; om *hinc* yX^cW; 18+ *sanare contritos corde* xy mod;⁵ 27 *neman : naaman* xy mod (Bede); 34 *qui sis : quia sis* xyMTe;⁶ v 7 *naviculas : naves* y;⁷ + *pene* xy mod; 13 *manum + iesus* xcor.vat.*; 22 *cogitatis + mala* xy cor.vat.*ε⊗; 24 *dimittere : dimittendi* xyvg; 25 *tulit + lectum* xy mod; vi 10 *restituta est + sanitati* xcor.vat.*; 11 *iesu : de iesu* xy cor.vat.*ε⊗; 24 *quia : qui* xyvettWε⊗; 26 om *omnes* xDX*cor.vat.^{mg}; *hec + enim* xvett mod; 29 *prebe + illi* xyvettWε⊗; 37 *dimittimini : dimittetur vobis* xyvettZ-alc;⁸ 38 *bonam + et* xy mod; 42 *et*

¹ This reading is demanded by the Glo. Ord.: 'Quod dominus pater et filius et spiritus sanctus fecit, id est incarnari constituit, et sic factum ostendit'.

² Glo. Ord.: 'In ruinam et resurrectionem . . . ; vel *in ruinam* vitiorum et *in resurrectionem* virtutum'.

³ Both *ierusalem* and *israel* are supported by the interpretation in the Glossa: 'Omnibus fidelibus qui iugo herodis alienigene gravati liberationem civitatis et populi exspectabant'.

⁴ Glo. Ord.: 'Iam enim securis. Arbor humanum genus, securis redemptor.'

⁵ Required by Glo. Ord. (from Bede).

⁶ Glo. Ord.: 'Scio te quia sis sanctus dei. Extorta confessio non habet meritum . . .'. If the words of the demoniac were a 'confessio', *quia* was the appropriate reading.

⁷ According to the Glo. Int. the two boats are the Church and the Synagogue. *Naves*, therefore, is the more suitable expression.

⁸ The Glo. Int. adds 'Peccatum vestrum', with which *dimittimini* would not have agreed.

(pr.): *aut* xy edd. vg; 48 *fundamenta*: *fundamentum* xvg;¹ vii 3 *salvaret*: *sanaret* xalc cor. vat.* Ⓢ; 23 *quicumque*: *qui* y vett;² 34 *vorator* y EW; 36 *de phariseis*: *phariseus* xy vett;³ 37 *quod* + *iesus* xy E cor. vat.* Ⓢ Ⓢ Ambrose (whose explanation of this verse was received into the Ordinaria); 45 *intravit*: *intravi* xy ir mod; 48 *peccata* + *tua* xE vett Ⓢ; viii 4 *plurima*: *multa* xT; *conveniret*: *convenirent* x Ⓢ Ⓢ; 16 om *ponit* (alt.) x cor. vat.^{mg}; 23 *compellebantur* xy Ⓢ Ⓢ cor. vat.^{mg}; 29 *deserta*: *deserto* xy vett Z²W; 36 om *et* (*qui viderant*) x vett cor. vat.^{mg}; 49 *venit* + *quidam* xy vett mod; 51 > *petrum et iacobum et iohannem* x vett vg;⁴ ix 13 *escas*: *escam* yD;⁵ 49 *sequitur* + *te* x cor. vat.*; 56 *filius* + *enim* x vett; 62 *in*: *ad* xvg; *respiciens* xy vg, *† aspiciens* x; x 6 *super illam*: *super illum* xy T^c cor. vat.*;⁶ 21 + *in* (*spiritu*) xy vett cor. vat. Ⓢ Ⓢ; 33 om *autem* yE; xi 17 *dixit*: *ait* yE; 24 *perambulatur*: *ambulat* xy vett Ambr. mod; *unde* + *prius* (*exivi*) y;⁷ 29 *ione* + *prophete* x vett W cor. vat.* Ⓢ Ⓢ Ⓢ; 52 *scientie* + *et* y W Ambr.; xii 22 *corpori* + *vestro* x cor. vat.*; 27 *non* (*nent*): *neque* xy vg; 35 *ardentes* + *in manibus vestris* xy E mod; xiii 12 *vidisset*: *videret* xy cor. vat. vg; *vocavit* + *eam* x cor. vat.* vg; 14 *curasset* + *hominem* x;⁸ 34 *mittuntur ad te*: *ad te mittuntur* y, *ad te missi sunt* x;⁹ 35 *domus vestra* + *deserta* xy ir mod; *veniat*: *veniet* x;¹⁰ xiv 12 *neque vicinos divites*: *neque*

¹ Glo. Ord.: 'Beda. *Fundamenta* pluraliter, doctores; singulariter *fundamentum*, doctor doctorum christus'. Int.: 'Petra erat christus, cuius fidei et dilectioni ecclesia sancta nihil preponit'.

² From Mt xi 6, because the exposition of both passages given in the Glossa is the same.

³ Glo. Ord. (from Bede): 'Mystice. Phariseus... iudaicum populum significat'.

⁴ Glo. Ord.: '*Petrus et iacobus et iohannes*, fides spes caritas'.

⁵ The singular denotes a particular food to which allusion is made in the Glo. Ord.: 'discipulis sue carnis et sanguinis mysterium dedit'.

⁶ The Glo. Int. connects this with *filius*: 'Offerte pacem, ut ipse (i.e. filius) ingressus pacis benedictione celebretur'.

⁷ Glo. Ord.: 'Beda. *Cum immundus spiritus*. Possunt hec referri... Tunc dicit, *Revertar in domum meam unde prius exivi*,...'

⁸ Beda in the Glo. Ord.: 'lex in sabbato non hominem curare prohibuit'.

⁹ Glo. Ord.: '*ad te mittuntur*, i.e. hactenus ad te missi sunt'.

¹⁰ A puzzling alteration, unless one is acquainted with the fact that the mystical meaning used to determine the verbal shape of the text. Glo. Ord.: 'Cogit mystice hoc de adventu claritatis intelligi [i.e. at the Last Judgment]'.

vicinos neque divites xv vett cor. vat.^{mg} ε S;¹ *reinvitent : invitent* x vett Z;² 35 *in terram neque in sterquilinum : in terra neque in sterquilinio* x (Glossa Ordinaria, from Bede); xv 10 *om coram* x E;³ 14 *consummasset : dissipasset* y;⁴ 17 *mercennarii + in domo* x y mod; 19 *om et* x v g; 32 *erat : fuerat* x cor. vat.^{mg}; xvi 8 *fecisset : egisset* x (Glossa); 11 *verum : verum t vestrum* x y Z*-B^o cor. vat.* (see 12; the Interlinearis presupposes *verum*, the Ordinaria *vestrum*); 21 *divitis + et nemo illi dabat* x y T K mod; 26 *possint : possunt* y T E Q;⁵ xvii 3 *peccaverit + in te* x y D E mod Ambr.; 6 *diceretis : dicetis* x Ambr., mod; *oboediret : obediet* x Ambr., mod; 28 *similiter sicut factum est : om sicut* x y vett;⁶ 33 *salvam facere : salvare* x y alc (and Glossa Ordinaria); 37 *illuc : illic* x vett, *ibi* y d, *illo* Glossa; + *et (aquilae)* x y v g; xix 8 *dominum : iesum* x y alc ε S; 26 *dabitur + et abundabit* x y ir mod;⁷ 39 *de turbis : de turba* y vett;⁸ xx 10 *in tempore misit servum : in tempore vindemie misit servum* x;⁹ 17 *om hoc* x y vett; xxi 9 *non : nondum* y vett cor. vat.^{mg} v g (see Mt xxiv 6, Mc xiii 7; for the three passages the Glossa reads alike); xxii 13 *illis + iesus* x cor. vat.*; 20 *calix novum testamentum : calix novi testamenti*

¹ Bede in Glo. Ord.: '...amicos neque cognatos neque vicinos neque fratres tuos neque divites'. The Glossa Interlinearis, however, demands the Vulgate reading.

² Glo. Ord.: 'Quasi dicat, Si intendis invitare ut te invitent'.

³ Glo. Ord.: 'Duabus premissis parabolis, quantum ipse cum angelis gaudeat...'

⁴ From verse 13, but only because the Glossa identifies the sense of *dissipavit*: 'consumit omnia bona nature', with that of *omnia consummasset*: 'ornamenta nature'.

⁵ One of the few cases where a variant was directly taken from the words of the Glossa: 'Beda. *Qui volunt transire*. Sicut reprobi a penis ad gloriam sanctorum transire, ita iusti per misericordiam mente ire volunt ad positos in tormentis, ut eos liberent, sed non possunt'. The variant proved very persistent in the thirteenth century.

⁶ Glo. Int.: 'Similiter fiet impiis'.

⁷ From Mt xxv 29 (not Mt xiii 12, as conjectured in Wordsworth's edition), for, according to the Glossa, the meaning of the two verses is the same. Bede must have quoted the addition in his commentary, for there we read: 'Spiritualis gratia... doctoribus abundanter conferetur'.

⁸ So also the text of the Lyons edition of the Glossa, 1545. The Interl. seems to presuppose *turba*.

⁹ Mt reads, *in tempore fructuum*. *Vindemia* is taken from Ambrose (Migne xv 1893): 'Tempus est nostra vindemia, ... ubi totius orbis est vinea'.

x vett, Canon Missae; 51 *sanavit eum : sanavit eam* y (see vett);¹ xxiii 8 *audiret : audierat* y V $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}$; 15 *remisi vos ad illum : remisit illum ad nos* x O* H* Θ cor. vat.*; 33 *alterum : unum* y vett E M; xxiv 29 *nobiscum + domine* y (liturgical?); 32 *in nobis + de iesu* y E; 36 *autem hec* xy E mod; *loquuntur : loquerentur* xy vett T Θ ; > *stetit iesus* xy E vg;² 47 *praedicari : predicare* x E ζ .

Jo i 19 *ad eum : ad iohannem* x; 26 *non scitis : nescitis* xy vett ir cor. vat.^{mg} vg; 29 *peccatum : peccata* xy vett W cor. vat. $\zeta\mathfrak{S}$; 39 *ubi maneret et apud eum manserunt : et manserunt ibi* x (ii 12, iv 40); 43 *om et (dicit ei)* x Augustine; ii 2 *om autem et* x E, *om et* y; 9 *factam : factum* y Y cor. vat.* (the Gloss requires *factam*); 12 *post hoc : post hec* y vett T W $\zeta\mathfrak{S}$; 13 > *iesus ierosolimam* xy vg; 22 *ergo : autem* x, *ergo vel autem* y; *quia hoc dicebat + de corpore suo* x cor. vat.*;³ *sermoni + eius* x cor. vat.*; iii 2 *ad eum : ad iesum* xy vett E mod; 4 *nasci (ult.) : renasci* xy vett $\zeta\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}$; 5 *spiritu + sancto* xy vett ir W $\zeta\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}$; 8 *non scis : nescis* xy vett cor. vat.* vg Glossa; *et quo : aut quo* xy vett W $\zeta\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}$ Glossa; 15 *in ipso : in ipsum* xy C T* W $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}$; 16 > *deus dilexit* xy mod; 29 *hoc : in hoc* xy;⁴ 33 *qui + autem* xy E W $\zeta\mathfrak{S}$;⁵ *accipit : acceperit* x cor. vat.^{mg} ζ ; 36 *vitam (alt.) + eternam* y cor. vat.*; iv 3 *abiit : venit* y;⁶ 30 *exierunt : et exierunt ergo* y vett (cor. vat.* vg); 31 *discipuli + eius* xy vett cor. vat.*; 52 *habuerit : habuerat* x vett ir cor. vat.^{mg}; v 10 *sanatus fuerat : sanus fuerat factus* xy; 27 *om et (iudicium)* y vett E $\zeta\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}$; 28 *eius : filii dei* x cor. vat.^{mg} $\zeta\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{C}$ (see 25); 30 + *sed (sicut audio)* y vett T ζ Glossa; *misit me + patris* (see 37) xy vett T H Θ cor. vat.*;

¹ According to the Glo. Ord., the right ear means 'spiritualis intelligentia. Quae auris in his qui credere maluerunt pietate domini restituitur. Vel auris amputata et sanata significat. . . '.

² According to the Glossa, Jo xx 19 was the model for the latter two alterations.

³ Glo. Int.: 'dicebat. Corpus suum morte solvendum et a se suscitandum'.

⁴ Glo. Ord.: 'In hoc gaudium meum impletum, quod factus sum amicus sponsi. . .'. This gloss is taken from John the Scot, Migne cxxii 327 A.

⁵ An early scholastic variant, introduced because of the antithesis between 'nemo accipit. De populo sinistro', and 'qui autem. De populo dextro' (Glo. Int.).

⁶ Glo. Int.: 'Quia de galilea venerat in iudeam'.

31 *de me + ipso* y vett mod; 32 *testimonium* (alt.) + *eius* x T cor. vat.* ε S; 39 *quia vos . . . in ipsis : in quibus vos . . .* x vett; vi 5 *maxima : magna* y (πολύς ὄχλος); 10 *dixit : dicit* xy Augustine cor. vat. ε H; 13 *ordeaceis + et duobus piscibus* y edd ε S;¹ 25 *quando : quomodo* xy E; 26 *panibus + meis* x Augustine, Alcuin; 33 *panis enim dei : panis enim verus* xy E edd ε S Augustine; 36 *credidistis* xy vett ir Augustine cor. vat.^{mg} ε S; 39 *dedit mihi + pater* x vett E; *illum : illud* xy mod; 51 *dabo + ei* xy (see iv 14); vii 8 *vos + autem* xy vett; *ego + autem* xy vett E cor. vat.^{mg} S C; *ascendo : ascendam* xy ZXO-K mod; 46 *hic homo + loquitur* xy alc W cor. vat. ε; viii 9 *remansit + iesus* xy vett ir W cor. vat.* vg Glossa; 12 *ambulabit : ambulat* xy Z-K vg; *lucem : lumen* xy vett ir E W Augustine vg; 15 *vos + autem* x E; 21 *quaeritis : queretis* xy Θ V mod Augustine; 25 *principium qui* xy alc mod Augustine Glossa; 27 *eis t eius* y (*eius* cor. vat.^{mg} ε S C); *dicebat + deum* xy vett alc T mod; 29 om *ego* x cor. vat.^{mg}; 35 *filius + autem* y vett ir ε S C; 38 *patrem + meum* xy vett Augustine cor. vat.* S C; 45 *quia : si* x cor. vat.^{mg} edd ε S C (see 46); 46 *dico + vobis* xy cor. vat.^{mg} S C; 50 *querat et iudicet* xy X*-K mod Augustine; 54 *deus noster : deus vester* y vett W H S C; ix 1 + *iesus* x vett E cor. vat. mod; 9 *ille + autem* y vett, + *vero* x H Θ M mod; 11 *natoriam : natoria* x S C; x 12 *mercennarius + autem* xy vett T vg (see 13); 32 > *bona opera* xy vett mod Augustine; xi 1 *sororis : sororum* xy vett ir W ε S Augustine; 11 *exsuscitem : excitem* y vett Augustine H S C; 27 *dei + vivi* xy E T X^e W* cor. vat.* ε S C; 45 *fecit + iesus* xy vett vg; 49 *cayphas + nomine* xy vett cor. vat.* vg; xii 9 *est : esset* x X*-B M cor. vat.^{mg}; 29 *audierat : audiebat* y ir cor. vat.^{mg}; xiii 18 *mecum panem : meum panem* xy T gr; xiv 1 + *et ait discipulis suis* x vett M ε; 4 om *ego* y vett; 13 *petieritis + patrem* x J cor. vat.* ε S C; xv 15 *dico : dicam* xy Y* S W ε S C; 27 *perhibebitis* xy vett H Θ K mod Augustine; xvi 3 *facient + vobis* xy vett X* mod Augustine Glossa; 7 *enim + ego* x vett; xvii 5 *esset : fieret* x vett ε S; 6 *tuum* (alt.) : *meum* x

¹ From Lc ix 16, because of the spiritual sense underlying the parable of the five loaves and the two fishes.

gat E ξ ; 22 *quam + tu* x cor. vat.* edd. $\xi \mathfrak{S}$; xviii 11 *gladium + tuum* y ir E cor. vat.* vg; *non + vis ut* xy Z* cor. vat.* $\xi \mathfrak{S}$; 18 *calefiebant : calefaciebant se* xy vett J-B mod Augustine; 25 *ex discipulis : discipulus* x cor. vat.^{ms}; 28 *a caiapha : ad caiphan* xy Z*-B, O^c W Augustine ξ , cor. vat.: 'glosa' (the Gloss does in fact demand *ad caiphan*); xix 5 *dicit eis + pilatus* y; 6 *crucifige* (alt.) + *eum*. xy vett E mod Augustine; 27 *in sua : in suam* xy Z* ir H Θ M cor. vat.^{ms} ξ , Glossa Interlinearis; 40 *eum : illud* y CT Augustine vg; xx 1 *sublatum : revolutum* x cor. vat.* (Mc xvi 4); 9 *oportet : oportebat* y vett T $\mathfrak{H} \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{C}$, : *oportuerat* x; 14 *est* (alt.) : *esset* x vett; 19 > *cum ergo sero esset* x vett E vg; *in medio + discipulorum* x cor. vat.*; 29 *vidisti me + thomas* x cor. vat.^{ms} edd vg; xxi 2 *erant + autem* y E; 4 om *autem iam* y ($\xi \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{C}$); 6 *ergo + rete* x R cor. vat.*; 7 *tunicam : tunica* xy vett A^c T vg Augustine, Glossa Interlinearis; 18 *quo + tu (non vis)* x vett Augustine $\xi \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{C}$.

It should be noted that many of these scholastic readings were already in existence long before the Lombard wrote (namely those which are contained in E and W).¹ These the Lombard merely confirmed, by incorporating in the Glossa the patristic expositions to which the respective readings of the text corresponded. Nevertheless, many of the Lombard's readings were original. These were many more than have been indicated above; but those which have not been mentioned were for the most part very short-lived.

SCHOLASTIC IDEA OF THE BIBLE AS AN ALLEGORY OF DIVINE MAKING

It is the historian's function to explain the forces which were powerful enough so to alter 'the unalterable word of God'. It cannot have been one factor alone which produced this result, but a series of ideas and conceptions which were gradually evolved during the years with which

¹ It seems that also T (ninth century) is already influenced by post-Carolingian scholastic variants. Naturally also M, which was written at Tours.

we are dealing. The whole development of scholastic conceptions unswervingly tended to the point reached in the works of Peter the Lombard, namely the conception of the Bible as a literary work first and foremost; a work which was uniquely in need of exposition and interpretation. Human poetry and prose had their one literal meaning, they told their story. But the sacred text included within its pages and behind the face of the letter the most profound religious and metaphysical truths, identifiable with those of which the Fathers treated in their exegetical works. The letter and the mere word (*vox*) of the biblical text had become mysterious. There was a literal sense that seemed easily intelligible; but this was only a mirage, as it were, full of deception to the unwary. The real and true meaning was deeply hidden below the surface; it was disguised by the letter. It would be interesting to inquire into the origin of the idea that human language was an inefficient and imperfect means of communication, rather disguising than revealing the fervent spirit seeking to express itself. The theory is formulated by St Augustine,¹ and the great Doctor's example was followed by all subsequent writers who discussed the nature of human language.²

Considerations of this kind, however, paid regard chiefly to the language of the Bible. The language used in daily life was almost neglected by this theory. The reason is obvious: there was no spirit of eternal truth made manifest in the language of everyday. The theologian and the philosopher, on the other hand, cared only for metaphysical realities, not for merely material and, therefore, unreal objects. The poetical element, e.g. in classical poetry, was not recognised at all. The classics were useful,

¹ *De Civ. Dei* xvi 4, 6, 10, 11 (Migne xli 482 ff.). Rabanus *De Universo* xvi (Migne cxi 435, 437); Alcuin (Migne c 533 c); Thomas Aq., *S. th.* 1^a, q. 107, a. 1.

² Yet there are exceptions. Before the time of classical scholasticism some ancient and neo-Platonic views on the poetical quality of language had survived. But it is not here the place to treat of these.

because they taught grammar,¹ otherwise they were valueless and void of truth.

In these views all medieval periods were more or less at one. Differences arose as to how the two aspects of the supreme language of the Bible were related to each other. On this point St Augustine was again the speaker for the early Middle Ages. He began with the distinction between sound (*vox*), the audible enunciation of the human voice behind which there was no intention of communication, and word (*verbum*), which, though a sound, yet transmits to the hearer something of the speaker's mind or spirit.² In Book II of *De Doctrina Christiana* Augustine applies this to biblical interpretation. He demands that the expositor should be well instructed in the knowledge of the signs, i.e. the words, because in them is deposited the will of God. Then he proceeds to treat in great detail and in a philological manner the difficulties which usually beset the interpreter. The biblical scholar must know his grammar, the various stylistic figures, the meaning and the etymology of the words, in brief, all characteristics of a language. For the knowledge of these things is necessary, if the Bible and the divine spirit manifested in it are to be understood. Each word expresses the sense with which God has endowed it in the particular context. There is no difference between the literal and the mystical sense of a passage; the words have their one and only sense. It is this one sense which Augustine aims at explaining in his commentaries. To us to-day his explanations may not always seem conclusive or dictated by necessity, but then, our religious reactions are other than those of St Augustine.

Augustine's view that the biblical word is what God has intended it to mean, was modified under the influence of the authors of secondary commentaries from Alcuin onwards. By the side of the text a series of expositions was gradually accumulated which ran parallel with the text

¹ Rabanus, *De clericorum institutione* iii 18 (Migne cvii 396).

² Augustinus, *Sermones* (Migne xxxviii 1304).

and which was believed to contain the divine sense of the Bible as distinct from the word pure and simple. From the juxtaposition of text and meaning was derived the idea that the words of the text merely meant, or SIGNIFIED, the true sense as contained in the exposition. Instead of St Augustine's relation of identity, the relation between the word and the real truth it contained was now regarded as a symbolical or, to use a more appropriate term, an allegorical one. The word now directed the mind to a totally different sphere, where reality, the basis of all philosophical knowledge, was to be found. As scholasticism was interested in the transcendent reality only, mere words as such were necessarily neglected.

What it amounted to was that a wide gulf had been opened between ordinary human language and that language in which the divine revelation was clothed. All human writings were means of direct communication, they imparted material knowledge. But the Vulgate belonged to a quite different category. It was the only literary work which had a profound meaning, which did not so much communicate, as suggest and signify, and which was, therefore, in need of special interpretation. We might venture to describe the Bible in scholastic times as a work of poetic art recognised pre-eminently as such among numberless writings, the classics not excepted; for the Bible alone did not merely impart to man practical and useful knowledge. It led the mind upwards to lofty regions, not of imagination, it is true, but of metaphysical speculation. Again, even as poetry (if the high Middle Ages had been in a position to conceive of poetry in the modern sense) was capable of exposition by commentaries indicating the beauties hidden beneath the smooth surface of words, similarly the Bible was considered to need commentaries in which a vivid spirituality was expounded. The poet of this book of poetry was no other than the Great Maker, the Divine Ποιητής, whose inspired art had written a work in which all religious truth that can ever

be known is deposited, as beauty is deposited by the poet in the words of his verse.

The parable is not of our making; it is frequently found in authors of the twelfth century. In Hugh of St Victor's *Didascalion*, a work which was meant to be an introduction to the study of Scripture and which vied with similar endeavours of Augustine, Cassiodorus, Isidore, and Rabanus, the author affirms that the biblical words literally signify the objects which they are used to describe in everyday life. But this is far from constituting the ultimate meaning of Scripture. For the material objects again are symbols of real metaphysical facts, and these the words finally denote.¹

Sciendum est, quod in divino eloquio non tantum verba, sed etiam res significationes habent, qui modus non adeo in aliis scripturis inveniri solet. Philosophus solam vocum novit significationem,² sed excellentior valde est rerum significatio quam vocum; quia hanc usus instituit, illam natura dictavit. Haec hominum vox est, illa vox Dei ad homines. Haec prolata perit, illa creata subsistit. Vox tenera est nota sensuum, res divinae rationis est simulacrum. Quod ergo sonus oris, qui simul subsistere incipit et desinit, ad rationem mentis est, hoc omne spatium temporis ad aeternitatem. Ratio mentis intrinsecum verbum est, quod sono vocis, id est verbo extrinseco, manifestatur; et divina sapientia, quam de corde suo Pater eructavit, in se invisibilis per creaturas, et in creaturis, agnoscitur. Ex quo nimirum colligitur, quam profunda in sacris litteris requirenda sit intelligentia, ubi per vocem ad intellectum, per intellectum ad rem, per rem ad rationem, per rationem pervenitur ad veritatem.

Then he goes on to quote an example, in order to demonstrate how in exegesis the biblical words first lead us to things; behind the thing the metaphysical reality is hidden. The process of interpretation, therefore, goes through two phases.

Quod autem rerum significatione sacra utantur eloquia, brevi quodam et aperto exemplo demonstrabimus. Dicit Scriptura:³

¹ *Didascalion*, lib. v, c. 3 (Migne clxxvi 790).

² Hugh is probably thinking of Περὶ ἑρμηνείας, 1-4.

³ 1 Pet v 8.

Vigilate, quia adversarius vester diabolus tanquam leo rugiens circuit. Hic si dixerimus leonem significare diabolum, non vocem, sed rem intelligere debemus. Si enim duae hae voces, id est diabolus et leo, unam et eandem rem significant, incompetens est similitudo eiusdem rei ad seipsam. Restat ergo, ut haec vox leo animal ipsum significet, animal vero diabolum designet; et caetera omnia ad hunc modum accipienda sunt.

Human writings, then, have only an historical sense (*sensus*);¹ but in the Bible the *sensus* is only the first step to the understanding; from it the *sententia*, the real or true sense, is to be derived.² Hugh calls the second step the allegorical, tropological, or anagogical interpretation,³ according to the kind of truth to which it leads. The profound sense (*sententia*) is the real content of the divine word; it gives absolute and uncontradictory truth:⁴

Sententia divina nunquam absurda, nunquam falsa esse potest. Sed cum in sensu multa inveniuntur contraria, sententia nullam admittit repugnantiam, semper congrua est, semper vera.

The will and the meaning expressed by God is the sense of the Bible. Hugh has a beautiful image of God the harp-player,⁵ who desires to communicate only one thing, divine truth, and accomplishes this aim by playing a tune which consists of many diverse notes and in which many and various strings are touched. The living spirit in the Bible is the allegorical contents; the function of the material words is to lead us to an understanding of spiritual truth, which belongs to a different sphere altogether.

John of Salisbury may also be called to witness. All books composed by man, he says,⁶ serve the purpose of practical utility; they guide us to the reform of our lives, or they teach useful knowledge. In this consists their one and only meaning. It would be a mistake to try to inter-

¹ *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris*, c. 3 (Migne clxxv 12).

² *Ib.* (*l.c.* col. 11 f.).

³ *Ib.* c. 3 (Migne clxxv 12; clxxvi 789).

⁴ *Didascalion*, lib. vi, c. 11; also c. 8 (Migne clxxvi 808; 806).

⁵ *Ib.* lib. v, c. 2 (*l.c.* col. 789).

⁶ *Policraticus*, lib. vii, cc. 10, 11 (Migne cxcix 658).

pret them, for there is nothing that could be interpreted. Only the Bible is capable of exposition:

Divinae paginae libros, quorum singuli apices divinis pleni sunt sacramentis, tanta gravitate legendos forte concesserim, eo quod thesaurus Spiritus sancti, cuius digito scripti sunt, omnino nequeat exhauriri. Licet enim ad unum tantummodo sensum accomodata sit superficies litterae, multiplicitas mysteriorum intrinsecus latet. Et ab eadem re saepe allegoria fidem, tropologia mores variis modis aedificat. Anagoge quoque multipliciter sursum ducit, ut litteram non modo verbis, sed rebus ipsis instituat. At in liberalibus disciplinis, ubi non res, sed dumtaxat verba significant, quisquis pro sensu litterae contentus non est, aberrare mihi videtur, aut ab intelligentia veritatis, quod diutius teneantur, se velle suos abducere auditores.¹

The didactic dialogue of the Hirschau monk Conrad (b. 1070, d. 1150) represents exactly the same opinion.² Here the pupil puts forward the objection³ that the stories and parables of the poets often contain a moral, and therefore signify something beyond the literal meaning. But the master at once sets him right by declaring that the significative value of the words in the Bible is very different from that in a poetic fable; in the one realities are contained which are transcendental, whereas in the other the meaning centres round the trivial truisms of human behaviour.

THE WORDS OF THE TEXT SUBORDINATE TO THE DIVINE MEANING

The dual nature of the biblical text necessarily called for a second authority on the basis of which the obscure words of the text could be interpreted. If it was really held that the text differed by nature from the true contents and intelligence which the Bible was meant to impart, nothing could effectively bridge over the gulf between the word and the meaning. The words stood for something which was different in every respect from

¹ *Ib.* c. 12 (*l.c.* col. 666).

² *Didascalon*, ed. G. Schepss, Würzburg 1889, p. 75.

³ *Ib.* p. 38.

the ordinary, human, or 'worldly' sense of the words. In short, interpretation was absolutely necessary, if the Bible was to be understood in its true sense. There is an interesting anonymous tract of the twelfth century, in which the words of the biblical text are compared to the features of a man who is yet a stranger to us; from these features alone we should never be able to infer what was in the mind and in the heart of the person. All we can say is that the features correspond to certain parts of the man's soul which we have not yet explored, and of which therefore we have no knowledge.

But if we apply ourselves to the man in intimate conversation, we shall learn his thoughts from his speech. In a like manner Holy Writ offers us nothing but the face, if we consider only the literal meaning of the words. But if we work diligently, we shall be able to penetrate into the secrets of its spirit. For the words merely confirm the fact, that the sense of Scripture is other than the words alone suggest. We shall never approach true cognisance of the biblical meaning, if we cling to the surface of the letter.¹

The words alone are of no avail to the understanding of the Bible—this is the conviction which is reflected in the words of both the mystic² and the scholastic.³ In order to attain to a true understanding, we must in fact have recourse to a second authority; the features alone help us but little, we must also hear the voice.

To acquire a second authority, on the safe ground of which the Bible could be expounded, was indeed what scholasticism had achieved. This authority was found in the teaching of the Church, which was identified with the doctrines set forth by the Fathers of the Church. If the patristic doctrines on the meaning of the Bible were known, the difficulty of finding a second authority for interpretation was solved.

¹ Queen's Coll. Oxford MS 389, fols. 2 and 3. This is a fragment of a twelfth-century treatise (perhaps from the preface of some biblical commentary?). The hand recalls the St Albans school of the late twelfth century.

² St Bernard, *Sermo de Diversis* 110 (*Opera*, ed. Mabillon⁴, i 2563).

³ John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, lib. vii, c. 12.

Then the words were no longer ambiguous, but defined and explained. They had received their determination from the exposition.

To this conclusion scholastic thinking as applied to biblical interpretation was actually driven. St Bernard expressed it in unmistakable words. In a sermon on Exod xvi 6, 7 he reasons as follows:¹

Hodie scietis quia veniet Dominus. Verba haec quidem suo loco et tempore in Scriptura posita sunt: sed non incongrue illa Vigiliae Dominicae Nativitatis Ecclesia mater aptavit. Ecclesia, inquam, illa quae secum habet consilium et spiritum Sponsi et Dei sui, cui dilectus inter ubera commoratur, ipsam cordis sui sedem principaliter possidens et conservans. Nimirum ipsa est quae vulneravit cor eius, et in ipsam abyssum secretorum Dei oculum contemplationis immersit, ut et illi in suo, et sibi in eius corde perennem faciat mansionem. CUM ERGO IPSA IN SCRIPTURIS DIVINIS VERBA VEL ALTERAT VEL ALTERNAT, FORTIOR EST ILLA COMPOSITIO QUAM POSITIO PRIMA VERBORUM: et fortassis tanto fortior, quantum distat inter figuram et veritatem, inter lucem et umbram, inter dominam et ancillam.

This was a very natural view. If the Church, in the writings of the Fathers, possessed the true sense and meaning of the biblical text, she could not only do the text no harm by appropriate alterations, but she could even improve it by adapting it to the true sense. The interpretation laid down in the patristic commentaries called up new conceptions, new metaphysical ideas and complexes, which, when their existence became known, had to receive a corresponding verbal equivalent in the text. These new truths and newly discovered facts must find their counterpart in the language of the Bible. St Bernard even goes so far as to say that the patristic authors and the custom of the Scriptures compel us to invent new words (or, to be more exact, new verbal equivalents) for the newly formed concepts:² 'Docemur auctoritate Patrum et consuetudine Scripturarum con-

¹ *Sermo in vigilia nativitatis Domini* 3 (ed. cit. i 1716).

² *Sermo in Cantica* 51 (ed. cit. i 2575 f.).

gruentes de rebus notis licere similitudines usurpare; sed et verba non nova invenire, sed nota mutuari vel transferre, quibus digne et competenter eadem similitudines vestiantur'. This was but a logical development. A deeper insight into the meaning of Scripture involved alterations in the text, so that the two parts of the allegory should be equally poised.

We have seen how deeply the scholastic schools were engaged in creating a safe interpretation of the Bible by compiling, from the patristic expositions, secondary commentaries which in the end were crowned by the Glossa. The lack of originality in these scholastic products will now be recognised as having been essential to the structure of scholastic thought. In the search for another authority independent of the Bible (for only then the certainty of having attained to the reality of meaning was secured; the interpreter who started from the words of the text was guided by his own fancy, for the words could never lead to the truth) the Fathers were found to fulfil all the conditions. They formed an objective authority to which the Church always appealed, and the high estimation in which they were held protected the Bible against wilful and subjective explanations. Hugh of St Victor gives the following advice to prospective expositors:¹

If you want to obtain a reliable judgment on the [biblical] letter, you must not put forward your own opinion. You must learn and study first, so that you can lay, as it were, a foundation of unshakable truth, on which the whole structure is carried. Nor should you venture to instruct yourself, lest instead of finding the right way you be led astray. The way must be enquired from teachers and scholars who by the authority of the holy Fathers and by the testimony of Scripture can show it you, whenever you need guidance.

If this axiom of the absolute authority of the Fathers is granted, the scholastic theory of the nature of the biblical language is sufficient to explain the scholastic readings in the Vulgate text.

¹ *Didascalion*, lib. vi, c. 4 (Migne clxxvi 805).

THE WORKS OF THE LOMBARD THE FIRST
CLASSICAL EXAMPLE OF THE SCHOLASTIC
METHOD AS BASED ON THE VULGATE

It was unavoidable, therefore, that Peter the Lombard, in writing the Gloss and in constructing a well-balanced system out of the realities with which his Gloss had provided him, also developed what in a sense may be called a new Vulgate text. The pyramid with which the structure of scholastic thinking has been compared above is fully formed by the three great achievements which the Lombard accomplished. Namely, he revised and corrected, or, at least, reasserted and confirmed the early scholastic form of the Vulgate text. Then his Great Gloss began to be known (about 1142). It was followed by the Glossa, which was produced after years of labour, as the MSS are unanimous in witnessing. When in this way a sufficient amount of patristic material had been accumulated, the Sentences were composed (about 1150).

Thus the very chronological sequence of the works of the Lombard indicates how at the root they constituted a unity. The Sentences could not have been written without the Gloss, nor the Gloss without the scholastic text. Each of these stages depended on the other. Scholars have long realised the connection between the Sentences on the one hand, and the Glossa and the Maior Glossatura on the other, but it has never been pointed out that the latter were a necessary preliminary stage through which the author of the Sentences had to pass before attempting the philosophical treatment of the religious doctrines of his time.¹ It can easily be shown how narrow and close the connection was between the three strata of the scholastic pyramid of Peter the Lombard. There are passages where the scholastic reading of the text corresponds exactly with

¹ The fact that the Lombard made use of the Glossa was stressed by O. Baltzer, *Die Sentenzen des Petrus Lombardus* (Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und Kirche viii 3), Leipzig 1902, pp. 1-5. Also G. Robert, *Les écoles et l'enseignement de la théologie pendant la première moitié du xii^e siècle*, Paris 1909, p. 114.

*Jerome's Text : Revised Text
of the Lombard*

Mt vii 12: *Omnia ergo quaecumque vultis ut faciant vobis homines et vos facite eis : omnia ergo quaecumque vultis ut faciant vobis homines bona ita et vos facite eis* (see particularly Augustine, *De serm. Dom. in monte*, Migne xxxiv 1303).

xviii 10: *Videte ne contemnatis unum ex his pusillis. dico enim vobis quia angeli eorum in caelis semper vident faciem patris mei qui in caelis est : . . . quia angeli eorum semper vident faciem . . .*

Glossa

Interlinearis: Voluntas hic de bonis tantum dicitur.

Ordinaria: *Omnia*, i.e. bona, quae vultis accipere ab aliis, eadem facite illis, ut charitas proximi impleatur.

Ordinaria: *Quia angeli eorum*. Cur non sunt contemnendi? Quia pro eis quotidie mittuntur angeli. Hieron. Magna dignitas animarum, ut unaquaeque habeat ab ortu nativitatis in custodiam sui angelum delegatum.

Sententiae

lib. iii, dist. 37 c: *Illud Domini verbum, Omnia quaecumque vultis ut faciant vobis homines, etc., de bonis accipiendum est, quae nobis invicem exhibere debemus.*

lib. ii, dist. 11 A: *Quod quaeque anima habet angelum bonum ad sui custodiam delegatum et malum ad exercitium. Illud quoque sciendum est, quod angeli boni deputati sunt ad custodiam hominum, ita ut quisque electorum habeat angelum ad sui profectum atque custodiam specialiter delegatum. Vnde in Evangelio Veritas a pusillorum scandalo prohibens ait: Angeli eorum semper vident faciem patris. Angelos dicit eorum esse, quibus ad custodiam deputati sunt. Super quem locum Hieronymus tradit unamquamque animam ab exordio nativitatis habere angelum ad sui custodiam deputatum, inquit ita: 'Magna dignitas animarum est, ut unaquaeque habeat ab ortu nativitatis in custodiam sui angelum delegatum'.*

Thus the Vulgate text, the Glossa, and the Sentences of the Lombard recognise in Mt xviii 10 the doctrine of the guardian angel; yet each of the three strata represents that doctrine in a different form. The authority for the interpretation was furnished by Jerome's commentary and the Lombard incorporated this exposition in the Gloss. Then the Gloss supplied him with the material necessary for the Sentences. But Jerome's Vulgate did not support his doctrine unless he dropped the first *in caelis* (the guardian angels are not in Heaven, but on Earth!).

Jo i 29: *Ecce agnus dei qui tollit peccatum mundi: ecce agnus dei ecce qui tollit peccata mundi.*

Interlinearis: *Agnus*, quia non est cum traduce carnis natus. *Tollit*. Non de loco ad locum, sed ut omnino non sint.

lib. iv, dist. 18 D: Ille solus peccata dimittit, qui solus pro peccatis nostris mortuus est. Item Augustinus: 'Nemo tollit peccata nisi solus Deus, qui est *agnus tollens peccata mundi*'. Tollit autem et dimittendo quae facta sunt, et adiuvando ne fiant, et perducendo ad vitam, ubi omnino fieri non possunt.

When the Lombard in this way connected Jo i 29 with the doctrine of the remission of sins, the variant *peccata* was the only reading which made the text conform to his theory.

iii 5: *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu, non potest introire in regnum dei: . . . ex aqua et spiritu sancto, non. . . .*

Ordinaria: *Ex aqua*. Ex aqua, visibili sacramento; *et spiritu*, invisibili intellectu, ut symbolum baptismi visibiliter accipiat et spiritualem intellectum ipsius symboli perficiat. Vel *ex aqua visibili et spiritu sancto*.

lib. iv, dist. 3 F-H, where this verse is taken to refer to baptism. This is formally an immersion in water, virtually the sanctification of the soul by the *Holy Ghost*. Alii dicunt baptismum tunc esse institutum, cum Nicodemo Christus ait: *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu sancto*.

the realist truth contained in the passage and explained in the Gloss, and with the reasoning in the Sentences. In such passages it is made clear how strong a support the scholastic text lent both to the Gloss and to the philosophical system, where the Jeromian text would have failed to do so. A few examples are given on the two foregoing pages, where we have printed, in parallel columns, first the Vulgate text together with the text adopted by the Lombard; next the Gloss expounding that text; and then the passage from the Sentences which finds support in both the Gloss and the text.

Parallels such as these show without further comment how harmoniously, in the Lombard's various works, the three strata of scholastic thought were adapted to each other. It is not surprising that this aggregate, the first classical example of the scholastic method, soon became the textbook for all students eager to penetrate into the secrets of scholastic philosophy. We have adduced evidence tending to prove that the works of the Lombard played a part in the establishment of the University of Paris. Not only did this circumstance raise the Sentences to eminence in scholastic literature and make the Glossa for centuries the best-known commentary; but this was the reason why the text of the Lombard automatically became the text used by the University and, hence, by the later Middle Ages in general.

CHAPTER VI

Stabilisation of the Scholastic Text in the Thirteenth Century

IT would lead us too far, in view of our present purpose, to dwell on the theories of biblical language which were put forward by the scholastics of the thirteenth century. The authors of the great *Summae* in that age, above all Alexander of Hales and St Thomas Aquinas, occupy the first rank among the systematisers who, by great intellectual effort and with the aid of the Aristotelian philosophy, elaborated, among other things, the doctrines held on that subject by the twelfth-century scholastics. It may suffice here to say that as regards fundamental conceptions the two centuries were in full agreement. This fact may serve to support the a priori conclusion that the Vulgate text did not undergo further alterations to any considerable extent. In fact the collation of Peter the Lombard's text in the foregoing chapter is a manifest proof that the text of the Lombard was essentially that of the sixteenth-century editions, of which *ϵ*, *ϛ*, *ϣ* and *Ϟ* have been quoted as specimens. It remains to be seen in what way the text of the Lombard acquired the dominating position which it held from the thirteenth century onwards.

SOME PREJUDICES AS TO ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE SCHOLASTIC TEXT

It seems advisable, however, first to clear away some misunderstandings which have hitherto prevailed regarding the nature and the origin of the thirteenth-century 'text of Paris'. Since Hody first drew the attention of scholars to Roger Bacon's critical remarks on the Vulgate text of his time,¹ it has always been assumed that in the first half

¹ H. Hodyus, *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus*, Oxford 1705.

of the thirteenth century the *Textus Parisiensis* came into being as the result of a resolution taken by the University to the effect that the Vulgate should be revised and made uniform for the purpose of University studies. This opinion was based on all available evidence except that of the text itself. Following the example of C. Vercellone,¹ it was believed that the so-called *Correctoria Bibliorum* were the chief contribution of scholasticism to the history of the Vulgate. Martin propounded his view on the origin of the Paris text,² which, on Bacon's authority, he assumed to have been fixed by the masters of the University between 1200 and 1230, i.e. about the time when Stephen Langton introduced the modern division of the Bible into chapters. When Bacon wrote, the Paris text, according to Martin, was not more than about forty years old and as yet little known outside Paris, i.e. in the more distant parts such as England, where Martin was convinced that about 1270 the majority of biblical MSS would prove to be not yet affected by the text of Paris.³

Simultaneously Denifle published his important study on the works which he, like his predecessors in the field, called the *Correctoria*.⁴ His essay is the best contribution so far made to the history of the medieval Vulgate. According to Denifle the corruptions in the text, which began to be criticised after 1200, were not new, but only an augmented form of such as had already existed before that date. They were caused by admixtures of the Old Latin, by the addition of glosses, by spontaneous conjectures intended to remove difficulties, by negligent scribes, etc.⁵ Let it be remarked at once that none of these reasons given by Denifle to explain the character of the scholastic text, though they may have had

¹ C. Vercellone, *Dissertazioni accademiche*, Rome 1864.

² J. P. P. Martin, 'La Vulgate latine d'après Roger Bacon', *Le Muséon* vii, 1888, 88, 169, 278, 381; 'Le texte parisien de la Vulgate latine', *ib.* viii, 1889, 444; ix, 1890, 55, 301.

³ *Ib.* ix 307.

⁴ H. Denifle, 'Die Hss. der Bibel-Correctorien des 13. Jahrhunderts' (*Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters* iv, 1888, 263, 471).

⁵ *Ib.* pp. 270 ff., 279.

a share in the making of that text, did justice either to the origins of the scholastic readings or to the part they played in the structure of the scholastic method of thought. Denifle, too, relied mainly on Bacon's criticism for his hypothesis. He thought, however, that the masters of the University did not entrust a committee with the recension of the text, but that they adopted the text of one particular MS which they deemed most suitable to the purpose, and had it copied for use in the University. It is painful to see Denifle searching for a MS,¹ which, of course, never existed. (On his proper subject of the *Correctoria*, however, Denifle's work is immune from criticism.)

Since then, Denifle's view of the *Exemplar Parisiense* has been generally accepted, even by S. Berger,² who, however, in his *Histoire de la Vulgate* does not extend his investigations to the scholastic text. The distinction between the scholastic text and the early types of the Vulgate was not realised, and the text of Paris was consequently treated as a direct descendant of the Alcuinian type.³ Recently Professor Landgraf has inquired into the scholastic prin-

¹ *Ib.* pp. 282-285. The references in the two Paris Bibles, lat. 15554 and lat. 16722, to a *Parisius* (or *Parisiensis*) do not, as Denifle believed, apply to the Paris text, but to the Paris Correction. How inveterate the belief in the *Exemplar Parisiense*, 'the MS which is preserved in the Dominican convent at Paris' (!), is even to-day, can be seen in an article by G. Prausnitz, 'Über einige Bibelkorrekturen des 13. Jahrhunderts' (*Theol. Studien und Kritiken* ciii, 1931, 457).

² S. Berger, *Quam notitiam linguae Hebraicae habuerint Christiani medi aevi temporibus in Gallia*, Paris 1893, pp. 20, 26. *Id.*, 'Des essais qui ont été faits à Paris au xiii^e siècle pour corriger le texte de la Vulgate' (*Revue de Théol. et de Phil.*, Lausanne 1883, p. 41 ff.). Martin's and Denifle's conclusions were also endorsed by T. Witzel, 'De Fratre Rogero Bacon eiusque sententia de rebus biblicis' (*Arch. Franc. Hist.* iii 3 ff., 185 ff.); and Cardinal Gasquet, 'R. Bacon and the Latin Vulgate' (*Roger Bacon, Essays*, ed. A. G. Little, Oxford 1914, p. 185).

³ D. de Bruyne, 'Étude sur les origines de la Vulgate en Espagne' (*Rev. Bénéd.* 1919). There the MSS are classified according to external criteria such as prologues, chapters, colophons, etc. This frequently results in a very superficial procedure, as the text need not have any relation at all to the accessory matter of a MS. H. Quentin, *Mémoire sur l'établissement du texte de la Vulgate*, treats the scholastic text like a direct descendant of the Alcuinian revision, without taking the least account of the other elements of which that complex text is composed.

ciples of textual criticism.¹ He found the principles easily enough, namely in certain passages from St Jerome and St Augustine, which had even found their way into the Decretum of Gratianus, and were often discussed at length by the commentators. But Professor Landgraf failed to find these theoretical principles applied in practice. If there are a few critical annotations on the text in the commentaries of Gilbert de la Porrée and of Langton, they were directly copied from the Fathers. The explanation is that this very thing, textual criticism, was foreign to the scholastic mind. That mind could not conceive of the text as an end in itself, and even if the critical principles of the Decretum seem not to have been quite overlooked by the authors of the Corrections, they were certainly not followed because they were taken to produce an improved text in the modern sense. Those changes that did enter the text, based as they were on patristic authority, flatly contradicted the provisions made by the Decretum.²

THE GLOSSED TEXTS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS

In fact the only reliable data for the history of the Vulgate text are furnished by the MSS. These inform us that about 1160 a text had taken shape in the school of Peter the Lombard which was in complete harmony with the scholastic method of interpretation. Whatever the connection may have been between that school and the Society or *Universitas*, of the existence of which the first

¹ A. Landgraf, 'Zur Methode der biblischen Textkritik im 12. Jahrhundert', *Biblica* x, 1929, 445.

² Decretum, P. i, dist. ix, cc. 8-10. To this Paucapalea (ed. J. F. v. Schulte, Giessen 1890) adds the following gloss: 'Nunc de canonica scriptura veteris scilicet ac novi Testamenti dicendum videtur, an tractatorum opusculis subiiciatur an praeponatur. Est sciendum, quia eis semper praeponitur. In illis namque opusculis multa corrigenda inveniuntur, in ea vero mendacia non admittuntur. "Si enim", ut Augustinus ait, "ad scripturas sacras admissa fuerint vel officiosa mendacia", i.e. iudicia quae officiant, "quid auctoritatis in eis remanebit?" Non ergo calumniae, ut idem dicit Augustinus, contra divina mandata sunt colligendae'.

piece of evidence appears about 1170,¹ it seems at least indisputably certain that the masters who were subordinated to the chancellor, i.e. the representative of the Bishop of Paris, stood in some relation to the Lombard's system of teaching and were occupied with propagating the Lombard's system as deposited in the works of the *Magister Sententiarum*. It is no exaggeration to say that all works of scholastic philosophy posterior to the Lombard found their model in the works of the twelfth-century philosopher who as the first authority had constructed an all-round system which they themselves could only improve in detail. The *Sentences* were the model for the later *Summae*; on the *Glossa* all subsequent commentaries were based. Both works were glossed over and over again, and later biblical commentators very often recognised no difference between the text and the *Glossa*; they commented upon both text and *Glossa*, as if both works formed one complete whole. The Vulgate text of the Lombard shared the success of his other works. It became the text of Paris in the same way in which the *Glossa* became the standard commentary, and the *Sentences* the textbook, of the University.

At first (i.e. in the last decades of the twelfth century) the text of the Lombard was largely bound up with the *Glossa*. Glossed copies of biblical books became very numerous in England from about 1170 onwards, when an increasing number of English students went to Paris.

We proceed to quote some specimens of the scholastic text in these MSS.

St John's Coll. Oxford, MS 111, a *Matthaeus glosatus* of English provenance (twelfth century), contains such variants as: Mt i 17 *ergo : autem*; 18 *mater eius : mater iesu*; iii 7 *futura : ventura*; 10 *arborum : arboris*; 14 *ego + autem (debeo a te) W*; iv 12 *secessit + de iudea (in galileam)*;² 16 *sedebat : ambulabat*; vii 4 + *frater*; 5 *om eicere*; 11 *bona*

¹ H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* i, Oxford 1895, 294.

² *Glossa Interlinearis*: '*secessit. A iudea post pascha*'.

(pr.) + *data*; *dabit bona : dabit spiritum bonum*; xii 45 *in-
trantes* : *ingressi* (but then changed into *intrans*); xiii 57
et + sic (*scandalizabantur*); xiv 19 om *panes*; xvi 18 om
et (*ego dico tibi*); 23 *vade post me : vade retro*;¹ xvii 17
respondens + autem; xviii 10 om *in caelis* (pr.); 12 *in
montibus : in deserto*; 30 *redderet + universum*; xxi 5 om *et*
(*sedens*); 17 + *et docebat eos de regno dei*; 25 + *dicite mihi
(baptismus . . .)*; *quare ergo + vos*; 33 *audite : locutus est eis
t audite*; etc.

The text of Queen's Coll. Oxford, MS 317 (*Matthaeus et
Marcus glosati*), thirteenth century, is very similar to
St John's MS 111. Mt i 17 *ergo : itaque*; 23 *vocabitur*; ii 10
videntes autem stellam magi; iii 10 *arborum : arboris*; iv 13
habitavit + in civitate (capharnaum); 16 *ambulabat*; vii 25 *supra
petram + firmam*; xiii 57 *et + sic*; xiv 19 *dedit discipulis panes :
dedit discipulis suis*; xviii 10 om *in caelis* (pr.); 12 *in deserto*;
Mc ii 2 *ita ut non caperet : ita ut non caperet eos domus*;²
8 *spiritu suo : spiritu sancto*; etc.

A *Iohannes glosatus* of St John's Coll. Oxford, MS 129
(twelfth century) has the following scholastic readings:
Jo iii 2 *ad eum : ad iesum*; v 16 *propterea + ergo*; 28 *quia + dixi
(veniet hora)*; 30 *quicquam + sed*; *qui misit me + patris*; 35 *ille
+ quidem (erat lucerna)*; vi 32-33 *dat vobis panem de caelo
verum. panis enim dei est qui descendit de caelo et dat vitam
mundo : dat vobis panem de celo. verus enim panis est . . . vitam
mundo. pater meus dat vobis panem verum. panis enim dei est
qui descendit de celo et dat vitam mundo* (this is a combination
of the Vulgate reading with one taken from Augustine
(Migne xxxv 1602 f.) and already contained in E); 36
creditis : credidistis; 39 *illum : illud*; xi 1 *sorum*; 49 *caiphas
+ nomine*; 50 *expedit vobis*; xiv 1 + *et ait discipulis suis*; xvi 3
hec facient + vobis; 15 *dixi + vobis*; xvii 6 (*sermonem*) *tuum :
meum*; xviii 11 *gladium + tuum*; *in vaginam : in locum suum*;
28 *ad caiphan*; xix 6 *crucifige (alt.) + eum*; etc.

¹ Jerome on Matthew (Migne xxvi 123 f.).

² Glossa Ordinaria: 'Predicante domino in domo non capiuntur, neque
ad ianuam'.

With this the text of a glossed copy of John, Salisbury Cathedral MS 41, of the same date, may be compared: Jo ii 14 > *oves et boves*; iii 2 *ad eum : ad iesum*; 3 *natus : renatus*; 4 *nasci (alt.) : renasci*; 5 *spiritu + sancto*; 8 *non scis : nescis*; *et quo vadat : aut q. v.*; 16 *in eum : in ipso*; 29 *hoc ergo (m. pr.) : t̄ in hoc ergo (sup. lin.)*; iv 30 *exierunt + ergo*; v 24 *transiet (m. pr.) : transiit* (a correction taken from Augustine); 28 *vocem eius : vocem filii dei*; 36 *om opera quae ego facio*; 38 *habetis : habebitis*; vi 25 *quando (m. pr.) : t̄ quomodo (sup. lin.)*; 32–33 *pater meus dat vobis panem de celo. verus enim panis est qui de celo descendit et dat vitam mundo. Pater meus dat vobis panem verum. panis enim dei est qui descendit de celo et dat vitam mundo* (the second sentence, from *pater meus* onwards, has been deleted by dots); 39 *quod dedit mihi + pater; illum : illud*; 41 *panis + vivus*; vii 8 *ego + autem; ascendo : ascendam*; viii 21 *quaeritis : queretis*; 27 *eis (m. pr.) : eius (corr.)*; 38 *apud patrem + meum*; xi 1 *sorum*; xvi 3 *ficient + vobis*; xviii 11 *gladium + tuum*; etc.

THE PARIS TEXT IN ENGLAND

Such was the text that reigned supreme in the Paris *Studium* at the end of the twelfth century; but it was not kept within the narrow limits of its place of origin. Since the theological system of Paris was soon imposed upon the lesser schools throughout Western Christianity by the officials and dignitaries of the Church who were educated at Paris, the text was carried to the episcopal schools in all countries. The large Bibles which had been written in England as late as 1160, and even later, were at once superseded by the more modern text from Paris. In the MS of the Durham *Liber Vitae*, Cott. Domitianus A. vii, there are inserted a few leaves written about 1170 and containing the beginnings of the four gospels (and a few very short extracts selected from the rest of the gospels). The text of these leaves is composed of two distinct elements. On the one hand there is the extremely archaic

mixture of Alcuinian, and Irish or Anglo-Saxon (X*-O), readings; on the other hand there are modern variants which must have come straight from Paris: Mt ii 1 *in diebus herodis : in temporibus herodis*, a singular reading originating from Anselm of Laon's *Enarrationes* (Migne clxii 1253; and thence in the Glossa Interlinearis); Mc i 8 *ego baptizavi vos : ego baptizo vos* (taken from the pseudo-Jeromian commentary on Mark);¹ 24 *qui sis : quia sis*; ii 5 *peccata + tua*; xvi 1 *eum : iesum*; Lc i 50 *a progenie in progenies*; 54 *recordatus*; and a few others.

Another gospel book from Durham is Harl. MS 4747, of the first half of the thirteenth century, upon which the same observations must be made. We refrain from quoting the numerous variants which agree with EQ or with K M V, and which do not teach us anything new except that these antiquated readings were still being retained in so late a text. There are, however, many erasures and corrections in the book where the scribe found the ancient readings unsatisfactory and replaced them by modern ones.

Mt iii 16 *sicut : quasi*; iv 4 *de ore : ab ore*; v 12 *gaudete + in illa die*; vi 13 *+ amen*; vii 23 *a me + omnes*; 25 *supra firmam petram*; viii 32 *impetu + uno*; ix 18 *adorabat : adoravit*; x 10 *non : neque*; xii 25 *divisum contra se : in se divisum*; xiv 6 *in medio convivii* (m. pr.)² : the corrector wrote *in medio triclinio*; xv 33 *tantos : tanti*; xvi 4 *generatio + autem*; xviii 13 *gaudebit : gaudet*; xxi 4 *autem + totum*; xxiv 3 *quod signum + erit*; Mc i 10 *spiritum + sanctum*; ix 1 *veniens : venientis*; xiii 7 *oportet enim + hec*; xiv 29 *fuertint + in te*; 46 *in eum : in iesum*; Lc i 50 *a progenie in progenies*; ii 15 *quod fecit dominus et ostendit nobis*; 38 *hierusalem : israel*; 51 *verba haec + conferens*; iii 9 *arboris*; iv 23 *cura te ipsum + dixerunt ergo pharisei ad*

¹ The text in Migne xxx 614 is corrected according to the Clementine Vulgate. In Harl. MS 3213 (see Appendix B) the quotation reads *baptizo*. The whole passage was taken over into the Glossa Ordinaria, where *baptizo* appears also.

² The expression *convivium* is used in Bede, *Homilies* (Migne xciv 240); Christian Stapulensis (*ib.* cvi 1379 D); Rabanus (*ib.* cvii 960).

iesum; v 7 + *pene*; xii 35 + *in manibus vestris*; xv 17 + *in domo*; Jo i 29 *peccata*; vi 25 *quomodo t quando*; etc.

These examples may serve as illustrations of the fact that the new text was imported by the cathedral schools not very long after its production and publication at Paris. It is extremely rare for a codex written after 1200 wholly to escape being influenced by the Paris text. Nevertheless, there are instances. We have come across one book, the York Minster Bible xvi.N.6, which, alone of all MSS examined, entitles us to speak of exceptional cases. In its external appearance this Bible of small size, with its leaves of extremely thin vellum, and the text in minute handwriting arranged in two columns to a page, has nothing to distinguish it from the University copies which are common in the thirteenth century. Even Langton's division into the modern chapters is not lacking. Yet all this does not prevent the gospel text of the book from being wholly free of the readings which are so significant in the Paris text. We find such excellent readings as: Mt i 17 *ergo*, instead of the Parisian *autem* or *itaque*; iv 16 *sedebat*, instead of the common *ambulabat*; xviii 10 *angeli eorum in celis*, whereas *in celis* is omitted in the Paris text and in the vast majority of MSS written after the time of the Lombard; Lc ii 15 *quod dominus ostendit nobis*, instead of *quod fecit dominus et ostendit nobis*; v 7 *ut mergerentur*, instead of *ut pene mergerentur*; viii 23 *complebantur*, instead of *compellebantur*, or some other evasive rendering of the passage; xiii 35 *relinquitur vobis domus vestra*, instead of *deserta* being added to the phrase; and, most surprising of all, xv 17 *quanti mercenarii patris mei*, instead of *in domo* being added, an addition to be found even in MSS written in the first years of the ninth century. The explanation of this extraordinary text is not, of course, the eminent critical sense of its scribe; nor is it, that the North, as Martin supposed, had resisted longer the introduction of the new text. It is the simple fact that this text was copied in the North from an ancient MS which may possibly

have dated from the ninth century or from an even earlier period.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY

Atavisms of this kind were naturally very rare. The position which the Universities soon gained in English ecclesiastical life was too powerful not to bring about the radical adaptation of all new texts copied to the text of the University. Paris for a long time was the first theological University in Europe, even long after the schools at Oxford had been transformed, at a date about 1170, into a *Studium* after the pattern of Paris. The Oxford chancellor, contrary to the custom of Paris, was the first master among masters, not the representative of the bishop,¹ and this explains why from the outset Oxford was a teaching University, averse from new influences. English scholars still continued to study at Paris by preference, or at least also at Paris, whence later they used to return to Oxford. As the latter University was intent on preserving and carrying on the Paris tradition, the Vulgate text of Paris gained immediate entrance there also. From the Universities the text of the Lombard spread to all the various parts of Latin Christendom by way of the scholars who, after their training, occupied positions in the Church.

THE STATIONERS' SHARE IN THE PROPAGATION OF THE SCHOLASTIC TEXT

There is another circumstance that was of the highest consequence to the infiltration of the Paris text into all the usages to which the Bible was put. From their very beginnings professional book production and the book trade were closely associated with the Universities. The guilds of scribes, parchment makers, illuminators, bookbinders, and booksellers, which acquired a definite standing in the Universities, were not trades that were allowed to

¹ L. Halphen, 'Les Universités au xiii^e siècle', *Revue Historique*, t. 166, 1931, 217 ff., 235; t. 167, 1931, 1 ff. Also Rashdall ii 355-357.

develop freely. Professional scribes and illuminators of books had probably been called into being to meet the express requirements of the University. At all events this holds true of the Universities of Paris and Oxford, and the result was that the various branches of the Stationers' Guild were subject to the jurisdiction of the University. The University alone had the right to admit new members to the book-trading professions, and sometimes they were even paid by the University.¹ Outside competition was steadily suppressed. The professional production, the hiring, and the selling of books were, therefore, in the University towns, a privilege of the University. The professional standing of the book merchants contributed to the increase in the output of books from the end of the twelfth century onwards, and it tended to bring about a certain uniformity in the texts copied. The University demanded an oath from the stationers to comply with the regulations of the University and to pay special care to the correct copying of the books.² Thus the scribes were prevented from introducing alterations of their own or from other sources into the text. The Vulgate text which left the scriptoria of the University stationers was of necessity that which was read and studied in the University. The text of the University was copied in numberless small Bibles which easily reached the cathedral cities, and sometimes even the parson's house.

For the technical innovation of the stationers consisted in the art of producing small and convenient volumes which comprised the whole Bible. The vellum of these books is very thin, and the writing small, but in most cases

¹ G. H. Putnam, *Books and their Makers during the Middle Ages* i, New York-London 1896, 199 ff.; T. G. Law, *Collected Essays and Reviews*, Edinburgh 1904, p. 4 ff.

² G. H. Putnam, *Books and their Makers*, pp. 201, 209. The University exercised a severe control over the book trade. There is an Oxford Statute of 1373 in which the University authorities complain of the growing number of unlicensed booksellers. The booksellers are warned not to sell any book exceeding the value of 6s. 9d. to a non-member of the University (*Munimenta Academica Oxon.* ed. Anstey, R.S. 1868, p. 233 f.).

clear. Paris, which at first led in the making of these books, was soon followed by Oxford. The document dating from about 1180, according to which the Oxford scribes, binders, and illuminators were pursuing their trade in Cat Street, witnesses not only to the existence of the University at that date, but also to the fact that its book trade was already organised.¹ The first products of the Oxford stationers that have remained date from the first decade of the thirteenth century.

MS v of Brasenose Coll. Oxford must be reckoned among the earliest copies of the Bible that left the workshops in Cat Street. The size of the book is not yet reduced to the extent that became customary a few decades later; but the modern division of the chapters has already been adopted. The copy is of some interest, because it shows in a very marked way the activity of the corrector, who also had a share in the making of a book, and whose work added conspicuously to the price.² The original scribe of the MS followed a rather ancient original with many Irish readings and others of the X type. Such a text would have been useless for the University lectures, because it failed to be the necessary support and counterpart of the spiritual meaning with which the Glossa and the Sentences were dealing. So the corrector was compelled to revise the whole text according to that used in the University. His corrective remarks cover the margin of the book. We quote a few specimens from the gospel text.

Mt ii 15 *om a domino* (ir) : + in mg; xvi 20 *iesus christus* (m. pr.) : *rex* (in mg); xxi 29 *abiit + in vineam* (in mg); 33 *aedificavit turrem : edificavit turrin in medio eius* (in mg); xxiv 38 *nuptum : in nuptum* (m. pr.), : *nuptui* (in mg) vg; Mc ii 2 *caperent* : in mg, 'quia non solum domum et atrium

¹ A facsimile in H. Rashdall, *The Universities in the Middle Ages*, vol. ii. Printed in Burrows, 'The University of Oxford in the twelfth century' (*Collectanea* ii, Oxf. Hist. Soc. 1890, 178 f.); S. Gibson, *Some Oxford Libraries*, Oxford 1914, p. 68. The first bookseller at Paris is mentioned about 1170 (Wattenbach, *Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*, 3rd ed. 1898, p. 558).

² T. G. Law, *Collected Essays*, p. 7 ff.

implebant, sed quidam prae multitudine ad ianuam attingere nequibant'; vi 21 *natali suo* : *in natali sui* (! m. pr.), *† natalis sui* (in mg); and some others. But apart from ancient relics the book is a mine of scholastic readings, most of which have already been mentioned as occurring in other MSS. We give some prominent examples: Mt ii 9 *supra domum ubi erat puer* : (in mg) 'Greg. Quia stabat supra quem querebant'; 10 *stellam* + *magi*; viii 32 + *magno* (*impetu*); x 5 *civitates* : *civitatem*; xiv 19 *panes* : *suis*; 22 *iussit* : *compulit*; xviii 8 *in ignem aeternum* : *in genhennam aeternum* (!); 12 *montibus* : *deserto*; xx 1 *om homini* X^c, + in mg; 27 *qui* (*voluerit*) : *quicumque* X^c; xxi 33 *edificavit turrim* + *in medio eius*; xxv 13 *vigilate itaque* + *et orate*; xxviii 7 *discipulis suis* (!) + *et petro*; Mc ii 1 *post dies* + *octo*; iv 29 *se* : *ex se*; v 11 *pascens* + *in agris*; ¹ x 41 *coeperunt indignari* : *indignati sunt*; 49 *caecum* : *eum* X^c; xii 6 *quia forte verebuntur*; 8 *vineam* : *civitatem* *† vineam*; Lc i 80 *crescebat* + *corpore*; ii 6 *dies* + *marie*; 13 *militie celestis exercitus* (see cor. vat., in Oxford ed.); 23 *domini* : *moysi*; 38 *ihusalem* (m. pr.) : *† israel* (in mg); iii 4 *semitas eius* : *semitas domini nostri*; iv 5 *diabolus* + *in montem altissimum* *† excelsum* (in mg); 7 *si* + *procidens* (in mg); 10 *conseroent te* + *in omnibus viis tuis* (in mg); v 25 *tulit* + *lectum suum*; vi 10 *restituta est* + *sanitati*; 17 *descendens* + *iesus de monte*; x 6 *illam* : *illum*; xv 14 *consummasset* (m. pr.) : *consumpsisset* *† dissipasset* (in mg); xvi 24 *clamans* + *desiderio* (sup. lin.); xxi 38 *manicabant ad eum* + *venire*; xxii 64 *prophetiza nobis christe*; Jo iii 8 *spiritus* + *enim*; 11 *quia* + *nos*; vi 25 *quando* : *quomodo*; 26 *ex panibus* + *meis* (sup. lin.); 28 *ut operemur* + *bona*; 33 *dei* *† vivus*; 35 *umquam* : *in aeternum*; 41 *panis* + *vivus*; vii 12 *multus* : *multum*; viii 9 *audientes autem* + *hec*; ix 11 *lutum fecit* + *ex sputo*; xi 27 *dei* + *vivi*; 45 *ad mariam* + *et martham*; xiii 2 *in cor* + *iude*; 27 *om post buccellam* (see Evg, where *tunc* is omitted); etc.

¹ A reading typical of the Lombard's school. Augustine, *De Consensu Evangelistarum* ii 24 (Migne xxxiv 1105): 'Nec quod Marcus dicit *circa montem* fuisse gregem porcorum, Lucas autem *in monte*, quidquam repugnat. Grex enim porcorum tam magnus fuit, ut aliquid eius esset in monte, aliquid *circa montem* [that is to say, in the fields]'.¹

It appears from this MS that the corrector only altered such readings as seemed to him relevant to the representation of the sense required by the Gloss. His method of correction was eclectic. This principle was followed in most Vulgate Bibles from the thirteenth century onwards. In most cases only the important readings, which were definitely required by the sense, were adopted. A few MSS of this kind may be quoted.

MS 52 of Queen's Coll. Oxford, a small Bible with the modern chapters, has a number of marginal notes taken from the Gloss, which indicate the scholastic nature of the text. E.g. Mt xviii 10 om *in caelis* (pr.); in the margin there is the following gloss: 'Magna dignitas animarum, ut unaqueque habeat ab ortu nativitatis in custodiam sui angelum delegatum. Cur non sunt contempnendi? Quia pro eis cotidie mittuntur angeli'.

A wholly scholastic text is contained in the York Minster Bible xvi. D. 3 of the end of the thirteenth century. Here again we find marginal notes taken from the Gloss.

The small Bible, Wadham Coll. Oxford, MS A. 10. 24 (Coxe, no. ix), was read together with the Gloss, perhaps in some theological school. There are numerous annotations in the margin. Mt xii 36 in mg: '*De omni verbo ocioso quod locuti fuerint homines etc. Igitur dicit interlinearis, quod quicquid sine utilitate loquentis vel audientis, ut de frivolis et fabulis. Scurrilia, ioculatoria non sunt ociosa, set criminosa*'. On Mt xviii 10 there is a note similar to that in Queen's Coll. MS 52. On xxiii 15 in mg: '*Unum proselitum, id est advenam de gentibus. Vnde glo^a: Proseliti sunt de gentibus in synagogam recepti. Quorum raritas per unum significatur, quia vix unus post Christum fuit conversus*'. xxiv 35 in mg: '*Celum et terra transibunt. Igitur dicit interlinearis: Invocabitur deposita priori forma, permanente autem terra. Vnde dicit ecclesiastes, id est terra autem in eternum stat*'. Mc ii 10 ait *paralitico*. In mg: '*B(eda). Quia de causis affliguntur homines. . . a vermicibus expiravit*'. x 25 in mg: '*facilius est camelum. Glo.*

Quomodo ergo in evangelio mattheus et zacheus...'.
Etc.

If the small Bible, C.C.C.C. MS 463 (late thirteenth century), really belonged to St Albans, as one is tempted to suppose for palaeographical reasons, the book proves that by then there was no longer a difference between the old monastic schools and the Universities with regard to the method of biblical study. For this Bible is not only a good specimen of the Paris text, but it also contains many marginal glosses which were entered by a student and taken from the exegetical writings of various Fathers, and from the Glossa.

THE FRIARS IN THE UNIVERSITIES

In the third decade of the century the new Orders of Friars gained admission to the Universities of Bologna, Paris, and Oxford, and it was not long before they excelled both as students and as lecturers.¹ According to the intention of their founder, the Dominicans aspired to a position in the Universities in order to acquire the knowledge necessary for the defence of orthodoxy. Nor were the Franciscans less diligent in taking up theological study, and the office of preaching, to which they devoted themselves in the cities, made the schools essential to them also. There is a general impression that the studies of the Friars were in contrast to what the secular students at the Universities learnt and taught. The Friars, it is held, were more inclined to concentrate on the Bible than to take part in the philosophical subtleties of the scholastics which were soon to attract the chief attention of the Universities.² This is certainly true of the period of Duns Scotus and Ockham, but hardly of the Friars during the greater part of the thirteenth century. At least down to 1253 the members of

¹ H. Felder, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Studien im Franziskanerorden*, Freiburg i. B. 1904, p. 97.

² H. Rashdali, *The Universities in the Middle Ages* ii 308 f.; id. in Burrows, *Collectanea* ii 202.

the mendicant Orders enjoyed exemption at Oxford from the normal rule that students of Divinity first had to graduate in Arts. The exemption was given by the University, because the regulations of the Orders forbade any Friar Preacher or Friar Minor to study Arts, as the Arts subjects were incompatible with the ideals of the Orders. Yet the study of Divinity was necessarily based on the Arts, so that the Friars were compelled to establish domestic *Studia* in their own friaries for propaedeutical purposes.

The rivalry between the Franciscan and Dominican schools and the University, which broke out in Paris at an early date, and later also at Oxford, was not due to a difference of opinion as to the general scope of studies, but to the jealousy of the masters in the Universities, who were not willing to suffer from the one-sided distribution of privileges and advantages which had been conceded to the Friars. At Paris the campaign of the masters for the unqualified validity of their own legislation was especially fierce. William of St Amour launched against the intruders his violent invective entitled,

Collectio catholicae et canonicae scripturae ad defensionem ecclesiasticae ierarchiae et ad instructionem et praeparationem simplicium fidelium Christi contra pericula imminencia ecclesiae generali per ypocritas, pseudopraedicatores, et penetrantes domos, et ociosos et curiosos et gerovagos,¹

in which on the ground of the uncanonical position of the Friars all their virtues were represented as vices. At Oxford the public quarrel did not begin until the first decade of the fourteenth century, when the number of teaching Dominicans had so increased that a long and acrimonious suit was brought before the papal court, in which the claims and the complaints of both parties were examined. Judgment was given in favour of the University; the entire teaching body was to be subjected to the

¹ Such is the title of the work in Hereford MS O. 1. xiii of the end of the fourteenth century. Sometimes the treatise is called 'De periculis novissimorum temporum'.

Statutes of the University.¹ The victory induced the University to repeal most of the privileges with regard to a simplified curriculum, which had formerly been granted to the Friars.² To this hostile spirit it must be imputed that the masters were not exuberantly favourable to the Friars; if they charged the Dominicans with ignorance and undue ambition,³ the explanation of the accusation must be sought rather in their animosity to their rivals than in the actual inferiority of the Friars in matters of University studies.

The contrary was the case. From the very moment of their foundation, the new Orders had every reason to emulate Paris and Oxford in their own fields of study; nor did the opportunity pass unused. The most fertile minds of the classical period of scholasticism were not the secular masters, but their Friar pupils, men like Alexander of Hales among the Franciscans, and Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas among the Dominicans.⁴ Thomas of Eccleston has described the assiduity with which the first Oxford Franciscans (since 1224) attended the theological schools, in order to be trained as preachers,⁵ and how easily several of them soon gained a high reputation in Divinity. They owed their success largely to the favour which was bestowed on them by the chancellor, Robert Grosseteste, who from 1229 to 1235 gave lectures on Divinity in the Franciscan convent at Oxford, and who

¹ Burrows, *Collectanea* ii 195-273; Rashdall, *The Universities in the Middle Ages* ii 380 ff. If in the course of the dispute the Dominicans alleged (*Collectanea* ii 202) that the study of the Bible ('*Bibliam legere biblice vel textualiter*') should precede that of the Sentences, this must not be taken to mean that in the University the study of the Bible was neglected. Roger Bacon, who was admittedly a very sensible scholar, maintained the reverse opinion, that the Text was more difficult than, and should follow, the philosophical questions (*Compendium Studii Theologici*, ed. Rashdall, Soc. of Franciscan Studies, 1911, p. 35); and this was presumably the view of the University also.

² E.g. the Statute of 1358 (*Munimenta Academica Oxon.* ed. Anstey, R.S. 1868, p. 206).

³ *Ib.* pp. 207 f., 208-212.

⁴ Ehrle, 'Die Hauptrichtungen der Scholastik' (*Arch. f. Lit.- u. Kirchengesch. d. Mittelalters* i 365 ff.; v 603 ff.).

⁵ *De Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam*, ed. A. G. Little, Paris 1909, p. 33.

afterwards, as Bishop of Lincoln, honoured the Friars with his friendship and protection.¹ Grosseteste regarded the study of the Bible as the subject most worthy of a theologian; his principle, the application of which had reached perfection in the work of Peter the Lombard, was that the Bible has to be the foundation and the starting-point for all further inquiries of a theological or philosophical nature.² He cultivated and supported the study of mathematics and the sciences (especially optics), and he was the first to lay due stress on the necessity of Greek studies; all these subjects, he demanded, should serve the better understanding of Scripture. He was impatient of the irreligious and worldly study of law, which must have drawn many to the University.³

These were views which the Friars shared wholeheartedly. Owing to Grosseteste's goodwill, and to the fact that even famous masters such as Adam Marsh⁴ and Thomas of Wales joined the mendicants, the Oxford Studies of the Franciscans and Dominicans⁵ soon rose to fame and even set the secular masters in the shade. Dr Little has given a long list of Franciscan scholars and professors at Oxford,⁶ from which it may be gauged that the Friars played no minor part in the University life. Also it should be noted that there was a lively intercourse

¹ *De Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam*, ed. A. G. Little, Paris 1909, p. 60; A. G. Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History*, Manchester 1917, p. 195 ff.; id. *The Grey Friars in Oxford* (Oxf. Hist. Soc. 1891), pp. 8 ff., 29 ff.; H. Felder, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Studien im Franziskanerorden*, p. 254 ff.

² Letter of Grosseteste (when Bishop of Lincoln) to the University of Oxford (*Letters*, ed. Luard, R.S. 1861, p. 347): 'Decet vestras lectiones omnes... legendas esse de libris novi Testamenti et veteris, ne, si secus fiat, inter fundamentales, vel pro fundamentalibus lapidibus, non fundamentales ponantur'.

³ Grosseteste's works are enumerated in A. G. Little, *Grey Friars in Oxford*, p. 57 f. The philosophical works were edited by L. Baur, in *Baeumkers Beiträgen*, Bd. ix, Münster 1912. L. Baur, 'Die Philosophie des Robert Grosseteste' (*ib.* Bd. xviii, 1919).

⁴ On Adam Marsh, see J. S. Brewer, *Monumenta Franciscana* (i, R.S. 1858, p. lxxvi ff.).

⁵ On the Dominicans, see A. à Wood, *Survey of the Antiquities of the City of Oxford* (Oxf. Hist. Soc. 1890) ii 329 f.

⁶ *The Grey Friars in Oxford*, p. 134 ff.

between the Oxford Friars and those at Paris; the mendicant scholars formed a uniting link between the two Universities.¹

As the Friars in their theological studies completely adapted themselves to the methods of University studies, they naturally also accepted without modification the Vulgate text used in the University.

The small Bible Wadham Coll. Oxford, MS A. 5. 2 (Coxe, no. i), dates from 1244. It has the modern division into chapters and was written for a mendicant house at Oxford (or Paris?).² The text fully agrees with that of the small University Bibles, of which specimens have been quoted above.

The small Bible Trinity Coll. Camb. MS B. 10. 21 (thirteenth century), with the modern chapters, belonged to an English Dominican convent. The text is a very good example of the Paris text.

We are entitled, then, to speak of an almost uniform Vulgate text in use in all branches of the Church in the thirteenth century. It was the text which had originated in the school of Peter the Lombard. Nevertheless no two MSS are exactly alike in the relative percentage of scholastic readings which they contain. On the whole it may be said that compared with the first glossed books which appeared about 1160, the small Bibles of the University show that some of the slighter alterations of the Lombard had been judged unfounded on the sense and meaning of the passage. As time went on, a certain standard type, containing a definite range of scholastic readings, can be seen to develop. Good examples of this traditional text of the later Middle Ages are the early editions of Stephanus (represented by ε), and the edition of Sixtus V (Ⓢ). These editions contain most of the scholastic readings for which the commentaries and the Gloss adduced evidence of some weight.

¹ Thomas of Eccleston (ed. Little, p. 64) mentions the following as equally active both at Oxford and Paris: Radulfus de Colebruge, Eustachius of Normanville, Richard Rufus Cornubiensis. The Oxford Minor Thomas of York is said to be the author of the tract '*Manus que contra Omnipotentem tenditur*', a countercharge against William of St Amour's attack.

² In the colophon the scribe is called 'Guillelmus dictus miles Parisiensis', which may possibly refer to a Parisian living at Oxford.

EXEGETICAL METHODS IN THE
THIRTEENTH CENTURY

The gradual purgation from the Paris text of a number of redundant and unjustified alterations was a slow work of generations. In it the influence of the University lectures on the biblical text can again be discerned. The Vulgate was studied in close connection with the works of the Lombard, which formed the proper subject-matter of the Arts courses. Both the Sentences and the Glossa were diligently glossed, and even original biblical commentaries were inclined to borrow much from the Lombard's expositions. One of the first commentators to expand the glosses of the *Magister Sententiarum* was Stephen Langton, who, before he was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury (1207-1228), taught at Paris and applied himself to biblical studies.¹ To him must be ascribed in part the stabilisation of the Paris text, and his name is associated with the division of the biblical books into the modern chapters. In his numerous biblical commentaries, none of which is yet edited, frequent mention is made of certain readings in the text of the Lombard, which Langton already regarded as more authoritative than other forms of the Vulgate.² He seems to have approved only of those readings in the Lombard's text to which an actual counterpart was found in the exposition

¹ F. Powicke, *Stephen Langton*, Oxford 1928. G. Lacombe and B. Smalley, 'Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton' (*Archive d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* v, 1930, 1 ff.). Lacombe says there: 'Langton lived at a period when the pedagogical methods in vogue at the University were in a state of flux. In the old days the lectures had been built about the *Textus*. At an indefinite moment after the composition of the Sentences of the Lombard and of the Histories of Peter Comestor, the [new] gloss[es then written] began to play on these handbooks instead of on the *Textus* itself'. The Glossa was one of these handbooks.

² Langton's commentary on Isaiah frequently refers to the text (and a lost commentary) of the Lombard; cf. B. Smalley, 'The Lombard's Commentary on Isaiah' (*The New Scholasticism* v, 1931, 131-134). The same applies to the Pauline Epistles, where the parallels have been collected by A. Landgraf, *Biblica* x, 1929, 470 ff., and *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* iii, 1931, 71-75.

contained in the Gloss. Yet Langton's criticism was as little systematical as that of his contemporaries.

Eclectic was also the *Summa in Bibliothecam* of Alexander Neckam, a Benedictine of St Albans, who had studied at Paris about 1180 and in 1186 became master at the school of Dunstable (d. 1217, as Abbot of Cirencester).¹ As this popular work, which bears many different titles in the MSS, has been fully analysed,² we must here content ourselves with saying that the first of the three parts of the *Summa* is a grammatical treatise; the second gives the explanation of difficult words throughout the Old Testament. The third part, dealing with the New Testament, is the most interesting and was obviously composed for use in the school at Dunstable; some extracts from the exposition of the gospels will be printed in Appendix F. Only such passages were treated which must have presented particular difficulties. The scientific inclinations of the author of *De rerum natura* are conspicuous in the New Testament exposition, too; but in spite of a certain originality shown in dealing with exegetical problems, Neckam largely relied on the Gloss, at least for his remarks on the gospels. In many cases he merely expanded the Ordinary or Inter-linear Glosses without quoting his source. In reading an exposition of this kind one is driven to the conclusion that not only the Gloss but also the text pertaining to it must have belonged to the indispensable stock by the help of which all further works of exegesis were constructed.

None of the later expositors was actually free from the influence of the Gloss; neither Alexander of Hales, who glossed Mark and Luke,³ nor Thomas Aquinas, whose *Catena Aurea* did not only purport to supplement the Gloss, but

¹ M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* iii, 1931, 784 ff.

² P. Meyer, 'Notice sur les Corrugationes Promethei d'Alexandre Neckam' (*Notices et Extraits* xxxv 641 ff.). Neckam wrote another exegetical work on the gospels, 'Moralia super Evangelia' (Lincoln Coll. Oxf., MS 79; see Bale's Index, ed. R. L. Poole, *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, 1902, p. 26); this I have not seen.

³ F. Pelster, 'Exegetische Schriften des Alexander von Hales', *Biblica* ii, 1921, 453 ff.

also quoted it frequently;¹ nor Bonaventura in his rather original interpretations of Luke and John. A perfect example of a commentary which professes to serve not only the text, but also the Gloss, is Robert Grosseteste's unpublished and little known *Postillae super Evangelium Marci*. This commentary (preserved in Pembroke Coll. Camb. MS 7, thirteenth century; see prologue and an extract printed in Appendix F) does not altogether fit into the picture of Grosseteste which seems to be the most popular at present; for it represents him as a typical scholastic who with pedantic prolixity carried to the extreme the principle of allegorical explanation in its three-fold sense. He expounded the Gloss as fully as the text itself, as if there were not the slightest difference between them. He treated the text and the glosses of the Lombard as one inseparable whole which has the two aspects of the mere word of the text, and of the mere meaning in the Gloss. Only the combination of both is the whole Bible. This point of view could of course only help to consolidate the scholastic readings.

Nor did the mendicant scholars bring about a change in this method of hermeneutics. William of Nottingham, one of the first Franciscans active at Oxford, wrote a commentary on the gospel harmony (usually called the *Unum ex quattuor*) of Clement of Llanthony. This work too, of which an extract is given in Appendix F, made ample use of the Glossa.²

The principles of thirteenth-century exegesis, therefore, were entirely in conformity with those practised by the Lombard, and they were the more rigidly adhered to the more the Lombard's method was taken to be exemplary. The allegorical relation between the two distinct spheres of the biblical word and the reality of its meaning was a never-questioned axiom in this period. Accordingly the

¹ On other gospel commentaries of Thomas Aquinas, see F. Pelster *Biblica* iii, 1922, 331; iv, 1923, 300.

² On William of Nottingham, see Eccleston, *Mon. Franc.* (R.S.) i 69 f.; A. G. Little, *The Grey Friars in Oxford*, p. 182.

scholastic readings of the Vulgate text were retained; their right of existence was even fortified, because it was realised that they were indicators of the corresponding compound of meaning.

TRUE MEANING OF ROGER BACON'S CRITICAL
REMARKS ON THE VULGATE OF HIS TIME

In a broad sense the subject-matter of the three foregoing chapters may be said to deal with the origins and the nature of the Vulgate text of Paris. If with a certain knowledge of the actual process and of the facts emerging from it, we examine Roger Bacon's opinion of the origins of that text, it will have to be admitted that the conclusions which have hitherto been drawn from his remarks must suffer considerable modification. Bacon knew well enough that the text current in his time was corrupt, that is to say, differed from ancient MSS to be found in the monastic libraries.¹ He also seems to have observed that the text of the glossed Bibles deviated more from what he considered to be the genuine text of the Vulgate, than the non-glossed Bibles. In trying to ascertain what exactly the *Exemplar Parisiense* was which Bacon so vehemently attacked in his three encyclopaedic works, scholars have been particularly attracted by one passage:²

Circa quadraginta annos multi theologi infiniti et stationarii Parisius parum videntes hoc proposuerunt exemplar. Qui cum illiterati fuerint et uxorati, non curantes nec scientes cogitare de veritate Textus Sacri proposuerunt exemplaria vitiosissima

¹ *Opus Maius*, ed. S. Jebb, London 1733, p. 49: 'Litera ubique in exemplari vulgato falsa est, et si litera falsa sit vel dubia, tunc sensus literalis et spiritualis falsitatem et dubitationem ineffabilem continebit, quod volo nunc ostendere sine contradictione possibili. . . . Omnes antiquae Bibliae quae iacent in monasteriis, quae non sunt adhuc glosatae nec tactae, habent veritatem translationis, quam sacrosancta a principio recepit Romana Ecclesia, et iussit per omnes Ecclesias divulgari. Sed hae in infinitum distant ab exemplari Parisiensi; igitur hoc exemplar magna indiget correctione per antiqua'. *Opus Tertium*, ed. Brewer, *Opera Inedita* (R.S. 1859), p. 92 f., *Opus Minus* (*ib.* p. 330). J. P. P. Martin, 'La Vulgate latine. . . ' (*Le Muséon* vii 88, 169, 278, 381).

² *Opus Minus*, ed. Brewer (*Opera Inedita*), p. 333.

et scriptores infiniti addiderunt ad corruptionem multas mutationes. Deinde novi theologi non habuerunt posse examinandi exemplaria, et crediderunt stationariis a principio.

This remark gave rise to the rash theory that forty years before Bacon wrote, i.e. in the fourth decade of the century, the University of Paris realised the necessity of having a uniform biblical text, and forthwith selected from the many divergent MSS one copy which became the official text.¹ Not a single statement in this supposition agrees with the facts as the investigation has presented them. The question may be raised, whether Bacon was mistaken, or whether the passage has been wrongly interpreted. As a general rule Bacon's statements about abuses in the learning of his time are more reliable than the explanations he can offer,² but in the present case it must be confessed that there is no compulsion to assume the expression *Exemplar Parisiense* to mean one particular MS of the Vulgate accepted by the University and transcribed by the stationers. The passage is not even meant to explain the origin of the Paris text; its purport is to give a reason why the Corrections were suddenly deemed necessary, for it occurs in Bacon's complaint of the unsatisfactory state of the Corrections. 'Stationarii hoc proposuerunt exemplar', probably means no more than that all the numerous stationers adopted one text as their original; with regard to the origin of that text Bacon makes no statement at all. He saw that the same text prevailed in all the small Bibles sold by the booksellers and tried to account for this fact.

What did Bacon's contemporaries know of the history of the text which they found in their small Bible copies? Many believed, Bacon tells us,³ that it was not the translation of St Jerome which they used, but one which had

¹ H. Denifle, *Arch. f. Lit.- u. Kirchengeschichte* iv, 1888, 282 f.; S. Berger, *Notitia linguae Hebraicae* . . ., 1893, p. 26 f.

² See above, p. 281, note 1, where he states that the Vulgate was ordered by the Church to be generally adopted.

³ *Opus Minus*, ed. cit. p. 342 f.

been published after the time of Isidore, and that it was a mixture of various versions, introduced by some pope. Others maintained that the masters of Paris University were responsible for the text. Bacon refused to accept these opinions. He argued that the text of his time was based on that of Jerome, which had gradually been corrupted by foreign readings taken over from the liturgical books or from the biblical quotations of the Fathers. The latter seemed to him particularly questionable, for the Fathers quoted a non-Jeromian version.¹

It will be granted that this sounds very different from the observations on the scholastic text usually imputed to Bacon. He is not very far from the mark, even though he was not aware of the complex history of the new readings, and the close connection between the text and the school of Notre Dame escaped him altogether. Yet, bating the reference to the glossed copies,² there is one note in which Bacon unconsciously touches upon the very root of the University text. In the *Opus Maius* he cites, among other cases, 1 Thess ii 17 in order to prove the corruption of the text, and he rightly assumes Petrus Lombardus to be the author of the false reading:³

De aspiratione nota exemplum primo ad Thessalonicenses, cum dicitur *ad tempus ore*, ut sit ablativus casus huius nominis os, oris, et non genitivus huius nominis hora, horae. Scribitur enim in ablativo casu, et glosatur, non a sancto [Patre], sed a Magistro Sententiarum, qui glosavit epistolas; sed sicut deficit multipliciter in expositione propter ignorantiam Graeci, ita fecit hic.

¹ *Ib.* p. 347: 'Translatio est Hieronymi, quam nos tenemus. Cum igitur vulgus theologorum hoc ignorat et contradicunt multi et alii dubitant, quae sit translatio quam sequi debeant, necesse est quemlibet unum recipere pro alio, et improprium pro proprio, et multiplex falsum pro vero'. The false readings come from the 'sancti [viz. Patres]'; for they quoted a non-Jeromian version: 'Et ideo cum sancti recitant verba Scripturae secundum illam translationem, putant quia una et eadem est, quam allegant sancti et quae debet esse nunc in Biblia Latinorum. Quod non est verum. Et ideo corrigunt et corrumpunt textum per hanc viam'.

² See p. 281, note 1.

³ *Opus Maius*, ed. cit. p. 51. Also *Opus Tertium*, ed. Brewer, p. 244.

The Vulgate actually has *ad tempus horae*, whereas the three Glosses of the Lombard recognise only *ad tempus ore*.¹ In this case Bacon has shown real insight into the true origin of a scholastic variant.

We hope to have contributed to the dispersal of the belief that by a decision of the University of Paris a certain form of the Vulgate text was made obligatory. It rests on very weak grounds indeed, and the abandonment of the fiction has to be considered. Seen in the light of our investigations Bacon's utterances contradict none of the facts which we have collected from a perusal of the MS materials.

THE 'CORRECTIONES BIBLIORUM'

As a matter of fact the subject of Bacon's criticism was not so much the Paris text as the Corrections. On them he laid all the blame for the deterioration of the text. The masters had intended them to improve the text which they believed not to be that of Jerome; but they only substituted bad readings for those of the Vulgate. In 1236 the General Chapter of the Dominicans promulgated the first statute to the effect that a Correction should be used in the Order.² Bacon was right in saying that most of the Corrections failed to improve the text.³ Denifle, on the other hand, was inclined to overestimate their value. Whatever the prologues of the various Corrections promised (and their

¹ Maior Glossa (Migne cxcii 295): '*Nos autem, o fratres desolati a vobis, id est causa vestra, non nostra. ad tempus, id est antequam sciremus constantiam vestram; nos, dico, remoti a vobis: ore, id est sermone*'.

The Glossa Interlinearis is, as we know, a mere abstract of the Maior Glossa: '*ad tempus. Antequam sciremus constantiam. Remoti ore. Sermone*'.

Glossa Ordinaria: '*Ore, aspectu, etc. Os et aspectus cessant, quia alloqui non possunt; sed cor et sollicitudo non quiescit*'. All three glosses were taken by the Lombard from Anselm of Laon's *Enarrationes* (Migne clxxi 1365 B).

² *Opus Minus*, p. 333; H. Denifle, *op. cit.*; S. Berger, *Not. Ling. Hebr.* p. 26.

³ *Opus Maius*, p. 49 f.; *Opus Minus*, pp. 330, 333; *Opus Tertium*, p. 93 f.: '*Praedicatorum correctio est pessima corruptio et destructio textus Dei; et longe minus malum est et sine comparatione uti exemplari Parisiensi non correcto, quam correctione eorum vel aliqua alia*'.

plans of procedure varied considerably),¹ the corrective annotations, such as they are in all the MSS of Corrections examined for the present essay, prove that no Correction was ever intended to conduce to the unconditional relinquishing of the modern variants in favour of the better readings in earlier MSS. The Corrections only collected the evidence for the variant readings. No reading was to be adopted which was not supported by some evidence; but it was an easy matter to find an authority (ancient MSS, the Greek, a Father, or a gloss) for any reading ancient or modern. The authors of the Corrections collected these authorities carefully enough, but they were unable to give a decision as to what readings were to be adopted. There was no fixed source of authority for the corrective notes, and as the most contradictory ones were admitted, the effect on the biblical text was nil. Moreover, which reading was a textual critic of the thirteenth century to adopt; one which was to be found in an ancient MS; or one which was demanded by a Father of the Church, or by the orthodox exposition of the Gloss? The first alternative was certainly not very attractive; and even the correctors could not escape the conception of the allegorical nature of biblical language.

As to the various groups of Corrections which were in existence, Denifle has made an exhaustive study of the subject, to which we have nothing to add.² We shall make

¹ *Opus Tertium*, p. 93 f.; Denifle, *l.c.* p. 298.

² There is only one formal point. Like I. C. Döderlein (*Literarisches Museum*, Bd. i, Altdorf 1778), R. Simon (*Histoire Critique du Nouveau Testament* ii 114), Rosenmüller, and Vercellone, Denifle adopted the name *Correctorium* for these corrective works of the thirteenth century. Even the most modern scholars have followed him, with very ill consequences. G. Prausnitz, 'Über einige Bibelkorrektoren des 13. Jahrhunderts' (*Theol. Studien und Kritiken* ciii, 1931, 460), still speaks as if the *Correctorium* and the *Correctio* were the same thing. Yet H. Hody, *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus* (p. 418), had already noted that *Correctorium* and *Correctio* were two different works. In fact all MSS strictly distinguish between *Correctio* (or *Correctiones*) and a work which is called *Correctorium* or *Correctorius*. Bacon always speaks of *Correctio* and *Correctiones* where he refers to the kind of work of which we are speaking here, and, in order to avoid confusion, it has seemed

brief mention of a few English MSS of the Corrections. Full collations cannot here be given. But it should be noted that most of the corrective notes are concerned with the scholastic variants.

Bodl. MS Auct. D. 3. 1, a Bible of the late fourteenth century, from Syon Monastery, near London. The last leaves contain the usual *Interpretatio hebraicorum nominum*, and at the very end of the book there is the *Correctorius*. Between these two works is written the Correction of the Dominican Hugh of St Cher, called A by Denifle.¹ Heading: 'Incipiunt correctiones bible'. Then follows the prologue, 'Quoniam super omnes scripturas verba sacri eloquii necesse est ut fundamento veritatis firmiter innitantur . . .', which has been edited by Denifle. Hugh's sources were the exegetical works of Jerome, Augustine, Rabanus, Bede, and the Glossa. His Hebrew quotations were

advisable to employ this term throughout where the 'Corrections' are meant.

The *Correctorius* is an anonymous work on spelling, prosody, and stressing, which from the thirteenth century onwards was much used in the schools. It treated all the difficult words, especially the loan-words, that occur in the Bible, from Genesis down to Apocalypse. A peculiar feature of the work are the rhymes by the aid of which certain rules were to be committed to memory. E.g. 'Salietur; per unum l. Versus:

Salio sale cibum si dixeris l sonat unum,
Non enim geminatum l de sale, salio, salo'.

Or: 'Alabastrum vel alabastrum. Versus:

Dicitur alabastrum,
Quia totum splendet in austrum'.

The selection of the words commented upon reminds one of the grammatical part of Neckam's *Corrugationes Promethei*. A sixteenth-century hand in C.C.C.C. MS 460 even calls Neckam the author of the work. The *Correctorius* became the main source of John Marchesino's *Mammotrectus* of ill repute, from which in the later Middle Ages boys sucked the first milk of Latin lore (T. G. Law, *Collected Essays and Reviews*, Edinburgh 1904, p. 22; S. Berger, *De glossariis et compendiis exegeticis mediæ ævi*, Paris 1879, p. 42 ff.).

MSS of the *Correctorius*:

B.M. Royal 1.A. viii, Bible of the late thirteenth century, fol. 411 ff.

Bodl. Fairfax 27.

C.C.C.C. 460, about 1300, from Thetford school.

Bodl. Auct. D. 3. 1, Bible of the fourteenth century, from Syon Monastery. On fol. 407 there is a short prologue in verse, then follows the heading: 'Finito prohemio incipit libellus qui dicitur correctorius'.

¹ H. Denifle, *l.c.* p. 264; S. Berger, *Not. ling. Hebr.* p. 28.

taken from Jerome, the Greek ones from Origen.¹ Some specimens of his notes are:

- Mt vi 11 vel *panem nostrum supersubstantialem*. in greco epiusion. (This is taken from Jerome's commentary. Hugh's text must have read *quotidianum*.)
- 13 *a malo amen*. greci et antiqui (sc. codices) non habent *amen*, sed Jeron(ymus) exponit.
- ix 38 *ut eiciat operarios*. ita habent Je(ronymus) et ra(banus) et greci et an(tiqui). (The alternative reading is *mittat*.)
- xviii 12 *·xc·ix· in montibus*. greci et antiqui. Jeron(ymus) et raba(nus) habent *in montibus*. glo(sa interlinearis) 'id est, in excelsis'. alia etiam glosa exponit *in montibus*. Greg(orius) etiam dicit super lucam, quod ubi lucas dicit *in deserto*, alius evangelista dicit *in montibus*. Quod nullus dicit nisi matheus, unde glosa que hic exponit *in deserto*, sumpta est super lucam et ibi debet esse, non hic.
- xix 21 *vende que habes*. Je(ronymus), ra(banus), et an(tiqui) non habent *omnia*, nisi forte in hoc intelligatur habere: Je(ronymus). 'quod dicit *vende* non partem, sed *omnia* que habes' [from Jerome's commentary].
- xxi 4 *hoc autem totum*. Je(ronymus) et an(tiqui) non habent *totum*, sed grecus habet et usus ecclesie.
- Lc ii 15 *quod fecit dominus et ostendit nobis*. greci et antiqui non habent *fecit*, sed glosa exponit. Etc.

It is worth noting that this Correction has not had the slightest effect on the text of the Bible to which it is appended. The book shows all the scholastic readings.

Ordinarily, however, the corrective notes were added in the margin of the text. This is also the arrangement of the Vatican Correction which is frequently quoted in Wordsworth's edition (cor. vat.; Vatican library MS 3466). The text of this Bible is the usual text of Paris. A correction of this kind, which belonged to an Italian Dominican convent, is B.M. Add. MS 37487, a small Bible of the thirteenth century with the ordinary Paris text. In the margin there are various short notes which give

¹ J. G. Rosenmüller, *Hist. Interpret. libr. sacr. in Eccl. Christ.* v, Leipzig 1814, 245.

the authorities for the reading in the text, or which cite the alternative reading. A few specimens are:

- Mt i 17 (Text) *omnes ergo.* (Margin) *vel itaque.*
 iv 13 *in civitate capharnaum.* G(recus).
 16 *sedebat.* G(recus). *alii ambulabat.*
 v 47 *facietis.* *facitis.* G(recus) *habet facitis,*
 et b(eda) super Cant(ica)
 ·xxvii· *idem videtur dicere.*
 viii 25 *accesserunt ad eum*
discipuli eius. a(ntiqui), J(eronimus), O(ri-
 genes?).
 xix 20 + *a iuventute mea.* R(abanus), J(eronimus), A(n-
 tiqui). *sed Grecum non.*
 xxi 37 *dicens verebuntur.* J(eronimus), G(reci), R(abanus),
 A(ntiqui) *non habent*
forsitan. Glosa autem que
 videtur exponere sumpta est
 de luca.
 Mc i 8 *baptizavi vos.* *vel baptizo.*
 Lc xii 35 + *in manibus vestris.* (non habet) G(recus) et multi
 alii libri, tamen Gregorius
 videtur exponere in omeliis.
 Jo xi 45 *ad mariam et martham.* Quidam non habent *et mar-*
tham. Etc.

The corrective notes are more specific in St John's Coll. Camb. MS 74, a large Bible written for Gisburne Priory (Yorks) about 1300. In this book, apart from the Fathers, the Greek, the Gloss, and the ancient MSS, also two Corrections are cited by the names of *una* and *altera*, *correctio* or *parisiensis* and *senonensis* respectively. But in spite of these careful notes the scholastic text of the book has not suffered any alteration at all, simply because the notes left the question undecided which variant in each case should be adopted. A few examples may here be quoted.

- Mt xviii 12 (Text:) *in montibus.* (Corrective gloss in margin:)
 'Vel *montibus* (!). Ieronimus,
 rabanus, antiqui habent *in*
montibus; glosa exponit *in de-*
serto, id est in celo. Sed sciendum
 est quod glosa illa sumpta

- est de omelia illa que facta est super lucam, quia Ieronimus, Rabanus, antiqui habent *in montibus*’.
- xix 20 *custodivi a iuventute mea.* ‘Ieronimus, Rabanus, Antiqui non habent *a iuventute mea.* sed Gregorius.’
- xxi 17 *ibique mansit et docebat eos de regno dei.* ‘Alii addunt hic *et docebat eos de regno dei* (!). sed Gregorius, Rabanus, Ieronimus, Antiqui non habent hoc.’
- 26 *omnes enim habebant iohannem.* ‘Gregorius, Rabanus, Antiqui. sic habent omnes, non *habent.*’ (See *habent* cor. vat.)
- 31 *precedent vos.* ‘Ieronimus habet *precedet* (!), Rabanus *-dunt.*’
- 37 *forsitan verebuntur.* ‘Alii habent *forsitan verebuntur* (!). sed Rabanus, Ieronimus, Antiqui non habent *forsitan*, sed est in aliis.’
- xxiii 14 (the verse is quoted as in Jerome and vg.) ‘Correccio parysiensis non habet hunc versum *ve vobis scribe et pharisei qui comeditis usque iudicium*, sed tamen exponitur.’
- xxv 24 *accedens . . . et ait.* ‘sic (i.e. without *et*) prior correccio.’
- xxviii 7 *discipulis suis.* ‘sine *et petro.* sed marcus ultimo’ (Mc xvi 7).
- Mc i 1 *Inicium.* ‘Correctio utraque *inicium*; sed in aliis *principium.*’
- ii 2 *ut non caperent neque ad ianuam.* ‘Hec est recta littera: *ut non caperent neque ad ianuam.* alii sic: *ut non caperet eos domus.*
- iv 8 *unum .xxx. et unum .lx. et unum .c.* ‘Quidam habent: *et unum .xxx^a. et unum 60^a et unum 100.* alii sic: *tricesimum et unum sexagesimum et unum centesimum.* sed neutra littera est de textu. sed glosa exponit.’

- 19 *suffocant verbum.* 'Secundum Glosam *suffocant* penultima debet acui. Unde glosa *suffocant*, i.e. transgulant guttur, etc. Ut suffocat guttura stringens.' (This note is taken from the *Correctorius*.)
- vii 22 *stultitia.* 'vel *tristicia*. parys. habet *tristicia*, senon. *stulticia*.'
- viii 38 *qui enim me confessus . . . confitebitur.* 'recta littera est *confusus*.—Alii tam in textu quam in expositione habent hic *confusus* pro *confessus* et infra *confundetur* pro *confitebitur*, quia enim idem est confundi et erubescere secundum Gregorium. Patet autem tam ex sensu quam ex greco quod hic debet esse *confusus*. et cum dicitur iste erubescit. hoc autem illud similiter exponitur *confusus me*, i.e. propter me, similiter confundetur, i.e. propter eum; eadem similia lucas g. Ita habet Augustinus contra adamantinum manichei discipulum, cap. 18. Iterum Augustinus contra adversarium legis et prophetarum libro 1^o. Vnde in greco idem verbum pro *confundetur*, Rom. ix (33), et pro erubuerit et erubescet, Lc ix (26); sed aliud pro *confitebitur*, Mt x (32). Vnde cum idem sit confundi et erubescere, patet tam ex sensu quam ex greco quoniam hic debet esse *confusus*, et sic exponit Augustinus in duobus libris predictis.' This learned note seems to be taken from Roger Bacon's *Opus Minus* (ed. Brewer, R.S., p. 331), or perhaps from William

- de la Mare's Correction (called E by Denifle).
- x 7 *adherebit uxori sue* 'paris. habent *ad uxorem suam.*
(an Irish reading). est textu.'
- Lc i 50 *a progenie in pro-* 'aliqui et parisiensis sic. sed
genies. plures *a progeniem (!) in pro-*
genies.'
- ii 15 *quod factum est quod* 'Sine *fecit et.* sed glosa ex-
fecit dominus et os- ponit.'
tendit nobis.
- iii 4 *ysaie prophete. Vox....* 'Grecum et parisiensis *dicentis.*
sed nunquam legi.'
- 16 *venit autem.* 'alii *veniet.* sed utraque cor-
reccio *venit.*'
- v 32 *non enim veni.* 'enim. prima correccio habet
enim. secunda non.'
- vii 30 *ab eo.* 'paris. non habet. nunquam
legi.'
- x 4 *per viam.* 'parys. habent *in via,* sed ubi-
que *per viam.*'
- xii 35 *ardentes in manibus* 'Gregorius in omelia exponit
vestris. *in manibus vestris.* sed Grecum,
parisiensis non habet.'
- xvii 35 *in unum.* 'Correccio parysiensis ponit
in pistrino pro *in unum.* Item
dicit quod hic versus *duo in*
agro non est textu hic, sed quia
glosa exponit. Sed alii omnes
habent sicut est hic.'
- Jo ii 22 *quia hoc dicebat.* 'Correccio. Sed secunda sine
de corpore suo (!).'
- iii 5 *ex aqua et spiritu* 'prima correccio habet *sancto.*
sancto. parisiensis sine.'
- xiv 13 *petieritis patrem.* 'parisiensis, antiqui sine *pa-*
trem. sed senonensis apponit.'
Etc.

CONCLUSION

These notes will suffice to demonstrate that the correctors very often knew the sources from which certain scholastic readings were derived; also that they quoted the Greek in accordance with the rules set up by the Decretum of Gratianus.¹ Yet they did not even approach to a solution of the fundamental problem: Which of the authorities for two alternative variants was to prevail over the others? Bacon alone had an unwavering answer: only the ancient MSS give the correct text. The Corrections, it is true, frequently quoted the 'antiqui (viz. codices)', and it appears that in single cases the text of the pre-scholastic Bibles must have been known to the authors and to other scholars. Even in 1311 the learned Franciscan Ubertino da Casale, who had to give witness in a heresy suit at the papal court, quoted Mt xxvii 49 with the characteristic addition to be found only in pre-scholastic MSS (*alius autem accepta lancea pupugit latus eius et exiit sanguis et aqua*).² Perhaps also a note in MS 328 of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, of the end of the fourteenth century may be believed, according to which Bishop John Grandison of Exeter (1327-1369) had corrected the gospels from a very old MS of King Offa, and sent copies of the corrected text to the churches of his diocese.³

Such cases, however, are mere curiosities. Theological thought in the thirteenth century and after was as yet incapable of freeing itself from the theory of biblical language which had grown up in the preceding centuries. On the contrary, as time went on, it became only the more familiar to scholars, and the consequences of the dualist conception of the verbal sound and the reality of meaning

¹ A. Landgraf, *Biblica* x, 1929, 446 ff.

² F. C. Burkitt, in *Journ. Theol. Stud.* xxiii, 1922, 186 ff.

³ Printed in Landgraf, *Biblica* x 473; C. H. Turner, *The Worcester Fragments* . . . ; M. R. James, *Catalogue of MSS in the Library of Gonville and Caius College* i, Cambridge 1907, 370 f. Like all similar references to wondrously old Bibles of King Offa, the truth of this statement is questionable.

can still be felt in the early editions. There will be no need to prove the essential identity of the edited text, as contained in ϵ , ζ , Θ , C , with that of the twelfth- and thirteenth-century MSS. At the point to which the history of the Vulgate has here been carried, all development of the text came to a close. The Sixtine Commission, which was charged with establishing the authentic Vulgate as received by the Church, naturally recommended a text which was in agreement with scholastic principles of logic and interpretation. Nor did it thereby fail to discharge its duty conscientiously. The scholastic text was indeed the text which had developed with the doctrines of the Church, it was truly the text used by the Catholic Church; it was bound up with the doctrinal tradition by means of the associations between the words of the text and the religious realities included in the Catholic Creed. Scholasticism was the philosophy ruling in the Church, and the Commission merely adopted a text which was in conformity with scholastic thought.

APPENDIX A

Notes on the Canterbury MSS X and O. Revised Collation of Codex X

(See chap. I, p. 17)

I. X (C.C.C.C. MS 286)

As it was found that the collation of X used in Wordsworth and White's edition of the Vulgate gospels is very inaccurate, a new collation of this book, and particularly of the tenth-century corrections therein, was made and used throughout in the MS quotations of the present work. A list of all passages where the new collation proved the Oxford editors' quotations to be incorrect will here be printed.

A full description of the MS was given by J. O. Westwood, *Palaeographia Sacra Pictoria*, London 1843-1845; also by M. R. James, *Catalogue of MSS in Corpus Christi Coll. Camb.* ii 52 f. A close examination of the gospel text of the codex has made it probable that three or, perhaps, four hands had a part in the writing as it appears to-day.

(a) X*, the original scribe, who arranged his text *per cola et commata*. He wrote half-uncials in an Italian hand of the late sixth or early seventh century.

(b) X¹, the first corrector, who added, in the margin, either passages of the text which X* had erroneously omitted, or other notes; e.g. in the margin opposite Mt ii 15: *In nosee (!) propheta*; iv 10: *in deuteronomium*; v 1: *de martyribus*; both v 27 and v 38: *in exodo*; xxvi 1: *incipit passio*; Mc ii 14 (Rustic Capitals, in red): ¶ *VIG(ILIA) S(ANCTI) MATHEI AP(OSTOLI)*; in the same verse, and above *praeteriret: t̄ transiret dñs ih̄c*; etc.

It is possible that X¹ and X* are identical, although X¹ employs small Italian minuscules in the majority of cases. At the least X* and X¹ are contemporaries, for they use exactly the same ink (a brownish yellow to-day).

(c) X^c, the chief corrector, who worked at the beginning of the tenth century. His ink varies from dark brown to black, and he generally attempts in his corrections to imitate the half-uncials of X*. But his natural insular hand appears in some places, e.g. in Mt viii 3, where he added *ih̄c* above the line; or in Lc xxii 1, where he added in the margin: *passio dñi n̄ri*.

(d) X⁰, a hand of uncertain date, but posterior to X^c. The activity of this corrector is confined to reintroducing such readings of X* as had been 'corrected' by X^c. He re-establishes the original reading. In doing so, his favourite method is to retrace the letters, or words, which had been erased by X^c, but could still be read in the vellum.

In Wordsworth and White's Vulgate Gospels the symbol X² appears rather frequently. Where this is the case, the hand denoted is always X^c, except in a few instances which have been specially mentioned in the following list of variants. Note that wherever X* alone is cited in the Apparatus Criticus of the Oxford Vulgate, X^c has the Vulgate reading, and vice versa.

We print the new collation in the form of a running commentary on the Apparatus Criticus of the Oxford Vulgate. Where no symbols are given, the reading *before* the colon is that of X*, the reading *after* the colon that of X^c.

Wordsworth and White's Vulgate Gospels, p. 18 ('Capitula desunt in . . . X'). The capitula are *not* wanting in X. The original first leaf of the codex is missing. To-day the MS begins (f. 1^r) in the middle of capitulum xii:

(. . .) *uitarum signum pharisaeis tradit . matrem . . .* (etc.),

to the end of the capitula, after which there is the rubric:

explicuerunt . Inc . ipse . liber.

The capitula generally agree with those of BH@JTaur Harl. 2797 (the relationship is particularly close between X and @).¹

Mt i 5 *booz ex rachab* : *booz de rachab* (this is to say, the non-Vulgate reading of X*, *booz ex rachab*, was changed into the Vulgate reading *booz de rachab* by X^c); *iesse genuit* : *iesse autem genuit*; 10 *manassen* : *manassem*; 18 the words *Xpi autem generatio* form a rubric in X; 22 in mg *in esaia* X^c; ii 1 *iudae* : *iudaeae*; 5 *prophetam* : *prophetam dicentem*; 8 *ite interrogate* X* : *ite et interrogate* X¹; 9 after *supra* a word of four or five letters (*domum*, or *locum*?) has been erased; 11 *maria matrem* X* : *maria matre* X¹; 16 *bethleem in omnibus finibus* : *bethleem et in omnibus finibus*; 22 *ammonitus* : *admonitus*; iii 2 *adpropinquavit* : *appropinquavit*; 3 *praedictus* : *dictus*; 6 *baptizabantur ab eo* : *baptizabantur in iordane ab eo*; 10 *mittitur* : *mittetur*; 13 om *ad iohannem* X*, + *ad iohanne* X¹, *ad iohannem* X^c; 16 *columbam et venientem* : *columbam venientem*; iv 4 *de ore eius* X* : *de ore dei* X* (!); 10 *vade retro satanas* : *vade satanas*, retro reintroduced by X⁰; *est enim* : *est*; 17 *adpropinquavit* : *appropinquavit*;

¹ For an explanation of this relationship, see H. Glunz, *Britannien und Bibeltext*, Leipzig 1930, p. 120 f.

21 *procedens* : *procidens*; *zebaedgo* X; 24 *obtulerunt* : *optulerunt*; 25 *et de hierosolymis* : *et hierosolymis*; *et iudaea* : *et de iudaea*; *iordannem* : *iordannen*; v 11 *persequuti* : *persecuti* (and similarly throughout the whole book *quu*, as in *loquutus* and *sequutus*, has been changed into *cu* by X^o); 12 *sunt et prophetas* : *sunt prophetas*; 13 *valebit* : *valet*; 15 *sub modium* X* : *sub modio* X* (!); 25 *es* vulg : here X* had *vadis*, which X^o erased and changed into *eis* (by mistake, instead of *es*); 26 Wordsworth and White's note regarding X* should be cancelled; 27 *moecaueris* : *moechaberis* X¹; 32 *fornicationis* : *fornicatione* (sic); 33 *peierabis* X; 39 *si quis percusserit te* : *si quis tē percusserit* (see Y); 40 *remitte ei* : *remitte*, later *ei* was added again by X^o; vi 6 Wordsworth's note, '*abscondit//X**', should be cancelled; 7 *multumloquio suo* (sic) : *multiloquio suo*; 9 *si* : *sic*; 12 *demittimus* : *dimittimus*; 13 *inducas nos* : *nos inducas*; 15 *demiseritis* : *dimiseritis* (and similar corrections were made throughout by X^o); 18 *ieiunasse* X*^o : *ieiunans* X^e; 19 *et ubi* : *ubi*; 22 *oculus + tuus* X*; 31 *quid (operiemur)* : *quo*; 32 *haec omnia* : *haec enim omnia*; 34 *sibi ipse* all hands of X; vii 10 *petierit* : *petit* (the alteration looks, however, as if X^o had meant to write *petet*); 12 *illis* : *eis*; 13 whether X* really had *lata est porta* is difficult to determine; possibly the scribe merely left a gap, as at the place the vellum was unfit to write upon; 17 *fructos bonos* X* : *fructus bonos* X* (!); 22 *in nomine tuo . . . , in tuo nomine . . . , in tuo nomine* : this X^o changed into *in nomine tuo* each time; 28 of the words *sermones hos*, supposed to precede *uerba haec*, no trace can be found in the MS; *doctrinam* : *doctrina*; viii 3 *iesus manum tetigit eum* : *manum tetigit eum iesus*; 7 *et ait* X*^o : *ait* X^e; 9 *su potestate* X* : *b* added above the line by X¹; *alii* : *alio*; *seruo meo dico fac* : *seruo meo fac*; 13 *vade sicut* : *vade et sicut*; 17 *aegrotationes nostras* : *aegrotationes*; 20 *dicit* : *et dicit*; *illi* X*^o : *ei* X^e; *tabernacula ubi requiescant* : *nidos* (sic); 26 *increpauit* X* : *imperauit* X^e in mg; 27 *quia venti* : *quia et venti*; 29 *tibi iesu fili* : *tibi fili*; 31 *eicis nos hinc* : *eras. hinc*; 33 *habuerant* : *habuerunt*; ix 2 *in lecto iacentem* : *iacentem in lecto*; *videns autem* : *et videns*; 5 Wordsworth's note, '*facilius sup. ras. X*' should be cancelled; *aut* vulg : X* had *an*, which was changed into *aut* by X^o; 7 after *surrexit* there is an erasure of about six letters; 12 *sanis* : *valentibus*; 18 *adorauit* : *adorauat* (sic); *dicens domine* : *dicens*; *manum tu* (sic) X*, but the second word erased; 19 *sequebatur* : *n* added between *a* and *t* by X^e; 33 *daemonio* : *daemone*; *paruit* : *apparuit*; 34 *daemonia* : *daemones*; x 1 *immundorum* : *inmundorum*; 2 *discipulorum* : *apostolorum*; 3 *thomas* : *ethomas* (sic); *publicanus* : *publicanus et*; 4 *scariotes* : *scariothes*; 7 *euntes autem ite* : *eras. ite*; *adpropinquavit* : *appropinquavit*; 8 *daemonia* : *daemones*; 11 *quacumque* : *quamicumque*; *est* : *sit*; 13 *domus illa* : *eras. illa*; 16 *in medium* X (all hands); *columbae* X (all hands); 18 *et reges* X* : *et ad reges* X^o; *ducemini* : *ducimini*; 21 *afficient* X; 22 *usque in* : *in*; 28 *qui potest animam* : *qui potest et animam*; 29 *non duo* : *nonne duo*; *veniunt* X^o; 34 *nolite ergo* : *eras. ergo*; 36 *hominis* : *homines*; 38 *accepit* : *accipit*; xi 3 *illi* : *illis*; 13 *iohannem* X^e; 14 *si vultis scire* : *si vultis recipere*; 20 *tunc iesus* : *eras. iesus*; 23 after

exaltaueris (sic) X* had the addition, *Et si exaltata fueris*, which was erased by X^c; xii 7 *si enim: si autem; sciritis*, then corrected to *sciretis* X* (!); 15 *recessit: secessit*; 24 *principem: principe*; 36 *rationem dō* (sic): *rationem de eo*; 39 *respondens: qui respondens*; 40 *coeti: ceti*; 45 *assumit* X^c; *adsumit sibi* X*, but *sibi* erased; the words *sic erit et generationi huic pessime* (sic) are added by X¹ (not X^c); xiii 5 *alia vero* X*: corrected to *alia autem* by X* (sic); 12 *qui autem vulg: ei autem qui* X*: *qui* (eras. *ei autem*) X^c; 14 *ut adimpleretur: et adimpleatur* (sic); *dicentis: dicens*; *auditu audietis et non au|||tis neque non intellegitis: auditu audietis et non intellegitis*; 15 *enim est: est enim*; 24 *similem* (by mistake): *simile*; 27 *zizaniam: zizania*; 30 *triticum: triticum*; 31 *Et aliam*: eras. *Et*; 35 *aperiam* (sic): *aperiam; eructuabo: eructabo*; 43 *patris eorum: patris eis* (sic); 47 *et ex omni genere*: eras. *et*; *congregati* X*: *congreganti* X¹; 48 *impleta esset vulg: here* X* had a word which has become partly illegible owing to the attempt of X^c to erase it; but the letters *com||e|||* can still be clearly read: *impleta esset* X^c; 54 *virtutes: virtus*; 55 the words *nonne hic est fabri filius*, omitted by X*, were added between the lines by X¹; xiv 1 *audiuit: audiit*; 11 *puellae et illa*: eras. *illa*; 13 *in locum secretum: in locum desertum; pedestris: pedestres*; 18 *afferte illos huc mihi: afferte illos mihi huc*; 19 *dedit discipulis discipuli autem: dedit discipulis panes discipuli autem*; 22 *statatim* (sic): *statim*; *discipulos suos*: eras. *suos*; 28 *ad te venire* X*: *venire ad te* X¹; xv 1 *sribae* (sic) X; 2 *traditiones: traditionem*; 6 *matrem suam*: eras. *suam*; 15 *parabolam* (om *istam*): *parabolam istam*; 23 *dicentes domine dimitte: dicentes dimitte*; 25 *venit et adoravit* X*: *et* has been erased; 29 *secus mare* (om *galilaeae*) X*: *secus mare galilee* X¹; 30 *multos clodos* X*: *multos clodos* X¹; xvi 3 *non potestis scire*: eras. *scire*; 5 *obli: oblit*; 6 *pharisaeorum* X*: *pharisaeorum et sadduceorum* X¹; 10 *septem panum et quattuor milia: septem panum quattuor milia*; 12 the verse had been omitted by X* and was added, in minuscules, by X¹; 13 *quem me dicunt: quem dicunt*; 14 *alii heliam autem* X*: *alii autem heliam* X¹; 15 *illis iesus*: eras. *iesus*; 17 *dixit ei*: eras. *ei*; 18 *adversum* X^c; xvii 5 *nubis: nubes* (sic); *complacuit: conplacuit*; 13 *dixisset eis*: eras. *eis*; 14 *provolutis: provolutus* (sic); 21 *eicietur: eicitur*; 25 *domum: in domum*; 26 *dicat ei petrus* X*: *et ille dixit* X^c; xviii 1 after *in illa hora* about three letters have been erased; *putas vulg: here* X* had a word of three or four letters, for which X^c substituted *putas*; 7 *vae homini illi*: eras. *illi*; 8 *bonum est tibi enim* X*: *bonum enim tibi est* X¹: eras. *enim* X^c; *claudum: clodum*; 9 *bonum enim tibi*: eras. *enim*; 13 *super eam* X (all hands); 15 *temet: te et*; 26 *orabat: rogabat*; 29 *patientia: patientiam*; 31 *facta fuerant: facta erant*; 32 *demisi: dimisi*; 35 *fratribus vestris: fratri suo*; xix 1 *iudaeae et trans*: eras. *et*; 8 *et ait*: eras. *et*; *fuit sic: sic fuit*; 10 *uxore* X*: X^c added *muliere* in the margin without cancelling the original reading; 14 *vero: autem; enim est: est enim*; 18 *autem dixit illi*: eras. *illi*; 19 *diligis: diliges*; xx 1 *homini patri* X*: *homini* has been erased; 2 *dinario: denario; vineam suam*: eras. *suam*; 7 *vineam meam*: eras. *meam*; 8 *sero autem: autem sero* (sic); 25 *earum: eorum; exercent eas: exercent in*

eas (!); 27 qui: quicumque; 29 sequutae sunt eum turbae multae: secuta est eum turba multa; 32 tunc stetit: et stetit; xxi 1 adpropinquasset: adpropinquassent; 3 dimittit X*: dimittet X¹; dimittit uos: dimittet eos; 4 adimpleretur: impleretur; 16 legistis ex ore: legistis quia ex ore; 19 et veniens ad eam nihil inuenit: venit ad eam et nihil inuenit; 25 de caelo (bis): e caelo; 27 dico vobis: vobis dico; 34 adpropinquasset X^o; 35 adprehensis: apprehensis; 41 vineam suam: eras. suam; 42 a domino factus est iste et est admirabilis: a domino factum est istud et est mirabile; 45 Wordsworth's note relating to X should be cancelled; xxii 4 alios servos suos: eras. suos; parata sunt: eras. sunt; 12 nubtiali: nubtialem; 37 diligis: dilegis (sic); ex tota anima X (all hands); ex tota mente: in tota mente; 39 diligis: diliges; 46 ei respondere: respondere ei; xxiii 3 observate: servate; 5 phylacteria: phylacteria; 9 est enim X*; 10 vocimini: vocemini; 19 caeci stulti: eras. stulti; 23 cuminum: cyminum; illa non omittere vulg: illa non praetermitti X*: illa non non (sic) omittere X^e; xxiv 3 discipuli eius: eras. eius; 17 descendant: descendat; 19 praegnantibus X (all hands); 30 fli: filii; 31 cum tubis: cum tuba; 42 assumetur X*: the whole verse erased by X^o; xxv 5 facientem: faciente; 8 lampadae: lampades; 9 et dixerunt dicentes; 14 homo proficiscens: homo peregre proficiscens; 15 statim profectus est: profectus est statim; 18 terram: terra; pecunia: pecuniam; 21 supra multa X*: super multa X¹; 23 serve bone: bone serve; supra pauca: super pauca; 24 es metis: es et metis; 29 omni autem: omni enim; 33 statuit: statuet; 35 colligistis X*; 36 the words nudus et operuistis me, omitted by X*, were added between the lines by X¹; in carcere eram: eras. eram; 43 colligistis: collextis (sic); nudum: nudus; 45 respondebit et ipsis: respondebit illis; xxvi 10 Wordsworth's note on X* should be cancelled; 24 hominis quidem X*: quidem hominis X¹; bonum erat illi: bonum erat ei; 27 accipiens iesus: iesus deleted by dots; 29 ex hoc genimine: de hoc genimine; diem illum quo: diem illum quum (sic); 39 procedit: procidit; pater mi X*^o: pater X^e; sicut tu vis: eras. vis; 40 discipulos suos X*^o: eras. suos X^o; 47 misi X*: missi X¹; 49 habe X (all hands); 50 iniecerunt: iniecerunt; 51 extens: extendens; sacerdotum et X*^o: eras. et X^o; 52 omnis: omnes; 54 oportuit: oportet; 56 factum est totum X*: totum factum est X¹; adimpleretur: adimplerentur; 57 duxerunt illum: eras. illum; 64 Wordsworth's note on X* should be cancelled (X* had written *virvirtutis*; afterwards the first syllable was erased); 67 caeciderunt: caederunt; 71 alia ancilla X*^o: eras. ancilla X^o; nazoreno X*: nazareno X¹; 73 qui ibi stabant X^e; xxvii 1 adversum: adversus; 8 acheldemach hoc est X*^o: eras. hoc est X^e; 9 tunc: Et tunc; 11 praesens: praeses; 14 praesens: praeses; 16 barabbas qui propter homicidium missus fuerat in carcerem X*^o: the relative clause erased by X^e; 25 sanguis huius: sanguis eius; 31 chlamydem: chlamide; 32 cyreneum venientem obviam sibi X*^o: eras. venientem obviam sibi X^e; 35 dividerunt sibi (prim.): eras. sibi; the addition to this verse, ut adimpleretur quod dictum est per prophetam dicentem dividerunt vestimenta mea sibi et super vestimentum meum miserunt sortem, is proper only to X* and X^o; it was cancelled by X^e;

37 *imposuerunt* X^c; 40 *dicentes ua* X (all hands); *destruit. . . reaedificat* X*;
 43 *confidit: confidet; nunc eum si vult eum* X (all hands); 46 *horam vero
 nonam* X^c; *quod est* X*⁰: *hoc est* X^c; *me dereliquisti: dereliquisti me*;
 48 *sphongiam* X¹; 55 *secutae fuerant: secutae erant*; 59 *in sindonem: in
 sindone*; 61 *erant: erat*; xxviii 11 *quaecumque* X*⁰: *quae* X^c; 20 *observare
 X*⁰: servare* X^c.

Mc i 5 *iudaea: iudaeae*; 21 *in capharnaum* X*⁰: *eras. in* X^c; 29 *symonis:
 simonis*; 31 *adpraehensa: appraehensa*; 32 *om et daemonia habentes* X*⁰: the
 clause was added by X¹; 36 *persequutus: secutus*; 43 *ieicit* X (all hands);
 45 *posset: possit*; ii 3 *ferebatur* X*⁰: *portabatur* X¹; 8 *in spiritu: spiritu*;
 11 *crabattum* X*⁰: *grabattum* X¹ (similarly in other cases); 14 *theloneum:
 teloneum*; 22 *novum* X*⁰: *novellum* X^c; *effundetur: effunditur*; 24 *faciunt
 discipuli tui* X*⁰: *eras. discipuli tui* X^c; 26 *introiuit: introiit; in domum:
 domum; principem: principe; licebat: licet*; iii 1 *introiuit: introiit; iterum in
 X*⁰: iterum* X^c; 5 *circuminspiciens: circumspiciens; manus illius: manus
 illi*; 8 *iordanen* X (all hands); 9 *in navicula: eras. in; deservirent:
 deserviret*; 10 *quodquod (!) autem: eras. autem*; 11 *immundis: immundi*; 12
comminabantur: comminabatur; 19 *qui et: qui*; 22 *daemoniorum: daemonum*;
 24 *regnum illius: regnum illud*; 25 *stare sed finem habet* X*⁰: *stare* X^c;
 28 *blasphemaverunt: blasphemaverint*; 29 *blasphemaverint: blasphemaverit*;
 31 *venerunt: veniunt*; 33 *mea et qui sunt: eras. qui sunt*; 34 *circuminspiciens:
 circumspiciens*; iv 1 *mari* X^c is written on an erasure; 8 *afferebat:
 adferebat*; 21 *condelabrum* X^c; 26 *dicebat eis: dicebat; quemammodum* X (all
 hands); 29 *cum sero: cum se*; 35 *in illa die: illa die*; v 7 *dicit ei: dicit*;
 13 *erant enim ad duo milia: om erant enim*; 14 *factum: facti*; 21 *navem:
 navi*; 22 *archisynagogis: archesynagogis*; vi 13 *sanabantur: sanabant*; 20
sanctum et ideo: om et ideo; 26 *contristare: contristari*; 31 the words, *et
 requiescite pusillum*, omitted by X*, were added by X¹; 35 *hora: mora*;
 36 *dimittite: dimitte*; 37 *eis vos manducare: eis manducare; ememus: emanus*;
 44 *manducaverant: manducaverunt*; 45 *coegit statim* X*⁰: *statim coegit* X¹;
 49 *illi viderunt: illi ut viderunt* X¹; vii 2 *panem: panes*; 4 *de publico
 redeuntes: a foro*; 8 *calicum et urceorum: orceorum et calicum*; 11 *patri aut
 matri: patri (om aut matri)*; 13 *vestram stultam: vestram*; 17 *parabola:
 parabolam*; 18 *in hominem: in homine*; 19 *introiit: introiit*; 25 *spiritum
 inmundum* X (all hands); *et introiuit: intravit*; 29 *illi iesus: illi (om
 iesus)*; 30 *exisse ab ea: om ab ea*; 33 *adprehendens: apprehendens*; 37 *am-
 mirabantur: admirabantur*; viii 11 *ab illum* X*⁰: *ab illo* X¹; 13 *ascendens
 iterum: ascendens iterum navem*; 17 *athuc* X; 19 *quinque milia et quot* X
 (all hands); *fragmentorum: om fragmentorum* X^c; 20 Wordsworth's
 note, 'om. *fragmentorum* X²', should be cancelled; 23 Wordsworth's
 note, '*adprehens manu* X*', should be cancelled; X* had *adprehensa
 manu*, which was changed into *apprehendens manu* by X^c; 27 *castella* X
 (all hands); *interrogavit: interrogauit (!)*; 32 *petrus coepit increpare eum*
 written twice over by X*: the redundant words erased by X^c; ix 15
accurrentesque: et accurrentes; 18 *adprehenderit: apprehenderit*; 19 *adferte* X^c;

22 *igne : ignem*; 24 *credo domine : credo (om domine)*; *adiuba X*; 26 *clamans et multum : clamans multum*; 36 *quem cum : quem ut*; x 7 *Et dixit propter hoc : propter hoc*; 15 *quisquis : quisque*; 16 *imponens X^e*; 20 *at : et*; 23 *circuminspiciens : circumspiciens*; 29 *patrem aut matrem : matrem aut patrem*; 32 *ascendentes hierosolymis : ascendentes in hierosolymam*; *ventura X^e*; 33 *morti : morte*; 34 *et interficient : interficient*; 40 *dexteram vel : dexteram meam vel*; *dare vobis : dare*; 43 *maior fieri X* : fieri maior X¹*; 46 *discipulis eius plurima : discipulis eius et plurima*; 47 *iesu : iesus*; 49 *vocant caecum : vocant eum*; 50 *exsiliens X*; 52 *in via : in viam*; xi 1 *appropinquarent X^e*; 2 *sedit adhuc hominum X* : adhuc hominum sedit X¹*; 5 *adstantibus : stantibus*; 7 *adduxerunt : duxerunt*; 13 *fici arborem habentem : ficum abentem habentem (sic)*; 15 *hierosolymam X (all hands)*; 20 *transiret X**, but corrected to *transiret* by X* himself; 23 *monti huic X^e*; 24 *petieritis : petitis*; *veniet : veniet*; 30 *respondite : respondete*; 33 *dixerunt ad iesum : dicunt iesu*; xii 1 *sepem circumdedit ei : circumdedit ei sepem*; 6 *reverbentur : verebuntur*; 8 *adprehendentes : apprehendentes*; 14 *vides vulg : the word used by X* has become illegible, but it seems to have begun with an a (aspicis, or accipis?)*; X^e substituted *vides* for it; 16 *tulerunt ei : tulerunt*; 22 *et mulier : mulier*; 30 *diligis : diliges*; 34 *audiens X* : videns X¹*; 43 *gazophilacium : gazophylacium*; xiii 1 *qualis structura X* : qualis (!) structurae X¹*; 15 *aliquid : quid*; 28 *ficu X^e*; 29 *et in ostiis : om et*; 36 *ne : et*; xiv 3 *in bethaniae (! erroneously) X^e*; 5 *unguentum : ungentum*; 7 *habebitis : habetis*; 8 *sepultura : sepulturam*; 16 *et venerunt in civitatem* written twice over by X*; the redundant words were then cancelled by X^e; 18 *ait illis : ait*; 21 *tradetur : traditur*; 32 *gethsemani : getsemani*; 36 *omnia tibi possibilia sunt X^e*; 51 *sequebatur illum : sequebatur eum*; *sindone nudus : sindone super nudo*; 60 *respondis : respondes*; 65 *dicere prophetiza : dicere ei prophetiza*; 69 *russum X* : rursus X¹*; xv 20 *exsuerunt (all hands)*; 39 *expirasset : expirasset*; 46 *sindonem deponens : sindonem et deponens*; xvi 2 *mane prima : mane una*; 3 *revolvit : revolvit*; 5 *in monumentum : in monumento*; 6 *ait : dicit*; 7 *ite et dicite : ite dicite*; 9 *autem iesus : autem*; 11 *illi audientes : et illi audientes*; 14 *incredulitati : incredulitatem*; 19 *quidem iesus : quidem*; the Explicit is not lacking; it runs: EXPL(ICIT) EUANGELIUM SECUND(UM) MARCUM.

Lc. The Incipit runs: INC(IPIT) EUANGELIUM SEC(UN)-D(UM) LUCA. i 3 *diligenter : diligenter*; 6 *quaerella : quaerela*; 41 *exsultavit : exultavit*; 45 *dicta sunt a domino : dicta sunt ei a domino*; 55 *usque in saecula : eras. usque*; 59 *zacharia : zachariam*; 68 *redemptionem X^e*; *plebi suae : plebi suae*; 69 *cornum : cornu*; ii 1 *universos urbis X**, but changed into *universus orbis* by X* himself; 2 *describitio X* : descriptio X¹*; 14 *in hominibus : om in*; 15 *usque in bethleem : om in*; 16 *praesepi : praesepio*; 18 *erant pastoribus : erant a pastoribus*; 22 *completi : impleti*; 25 *exspectans : expectans*; 36 *phanuhel : phanuel*; 48 *nobis sic : om sic*; iii 1 *ityrae : ituriae*; 7 *genemina : genimina*; 8 *potens est : potens (probably for potest)*; 13 *quam quod : om quod*; 14 *illum : eum*; 18 *populum : populo*;

19 *herodiadem: herodiade*; iv 1 Wordsworth's note, ' + ab X* ; + in X^e ', should be cancelled; *agebatur ab spiritu: agebatur in spiritu*; 4 *scriptum: scriptum*; 9 *mitte te hinc: om hinc X^e*; 10 *mandavit X*: mandabit X¹*; 38 *autem iesus: om iesus*; v 3 *rogavit autem eum X^e*; 4 *captura: capturam*; 10 *nolite: noli*; 12 *civitatum ecce: civitatum et ecce*; 16 *sedebat X^e*; 17 *ad sanandum eos: eras. eos*; 19 *eum cum lecto: illum cum lecto*; 31 *medicum: medico*; vi 6 *et erat ibi: eras. erat*; 7 *in sabbato: sabbato*; *unde accusarent eum X*: unde accusarent illum X¹: accusarent* (by mistake *nt* was not deleted) *illum X^e*; 11 *insipientiam: insipientia*; 18 *ab: a*; 27 *oderunt vos: vos oderunt*; 29 *et qui te: et ei qui te; praebe ei: eras. ei*; 33 *bene vobis faciunt X*: corrected to vobis bene faciunt by X* himself*; 48 *super* (alt.): *supra* (so corrected by X* himself); vii 1 *in capharnaum: om in*; 15 *et mox coepit: om mox*; 19 *duo (!) de discipulis suis: duos discipulos suos*; 36 *quidam de pharisaeis: de alone deleted* (probably X^e intended to write *quidam pharisaeus*); viii 15 *afferent: afferunt*; 26 *navigaverunt: enavigaverunt*; 32 *eos: eis; permisit illos: permisit illis*; 45 *quis me tetigit: quis est qui me tetigit*; 46 *nam et ego: nam ego*; 49 *filia tua mortua est: mortua est filia tua*; 51 *ad domum: domum*; ix 3 the words *neque virgam neque peram neque panem neque pecuniam* were omitted by X*, and afterwards added between the lines by X¹; 4 *quacumque: quancumque*; 12 *diuertant X^e*; 23 *cottidie: cotidie*; 25 *homo: homini*; 28 *petrum et iohannem et iacobum: petrum et iacobum et iohannem*; 33 the words *et factum est cum discederent ab illo*, omitted by X*, were added between the lines by X¹; *nos hic esse: nobis hic esse*; 34 *obumbravit: umbravit*; 47 *cogitationes eorum: cogitationes cordis illorum; adprehendens: apprehendens*; 61 Wordsworth's note, ' *mih i + me X^e* ', should be cancelled; X¹ has: *permitte mihi ire renuntiare* (*ire* added above the line, and not corrected by X^e); x 1 Wordsworth's note, ' *om. suam X* (+ cor.)* ', should be cancelled; 2 *messem: messem suam*; 15 *usque in caelo: usque in caelum; usque in infernum: usque ad infernum*; 20 *scribta: scripta*; 21 *exultavit: exsultavit; confitebor X*: confiteor X¹*; *quia abscondisti: quod abscondisti*; 32 *pertransiit: transiit*; xi 1 *sicut et: om et*; 18 *autem et: om et*; 30 *neniuitis: nineuitis*; 32 *paenitentiam: paenitentiam; plus quam iona: eras. quam*; 43 *pharisaei X* (all hands); xii 2 *nihil opertum: nihil autem opertum*; 10 *et omnis: eras. et*; 12 *spiritus sanctus enim X^e*; 14 *super: supra*; 19 *multa bona in annos: multa bona posita in annos*; 20 *hac nocte repetunt: hac nocte animam repetunt* (*tuam* is lacking altogether); 21 *thensaurizat: thesaurizat*; 36 *et cum X*: ut cum X¹*; 38 *om sunt X^e*; 48 *petunt X*: petent X¹*; 56 there is nothing amiss with the beginning of this verse; the scribe meant to write *hypocritae faciem terrae et caeli... (etc.)*, only he inadvertently made the colon in the wrong place, which caused some erasing and correction. Wordsworth's notes relating to X should therefore be cancelled; *terrae et caeli: caeli et terrae*; xiii 6 *fructum quaerens X^e*; 20 *similem: simile*; xiv 2 *quidam homo X^e*; 15 *illi: ei*; 27 *meus esse discipulus X*: esse meus discipulus X¹: meus discipulus esse X^e*; 33 *si ergo X*: sic ergo X¹*; xv 17 *ipse autem X*: in se autem X¹*; xvi 19 *cottidie: cotidie*;

xvii 6 *habueritis : haberitis*; 13 *miserere nostri : miserere nobis*; 26 *in diebus filii : in die filii*; 29 *de sodomis : a sodomis*; 33 *vivificavit X* : vivificabit X¹*; 34 *in tecto uno (sic) : in lecto uno*; xviii 11 *orabat dicens : eras. dicens*; 25 *introyre : intrare*; xix 13 *vocatis ergo decem : vocatis autem decem*; 16 *mina . . . minas : mna . . . mnas* (similarly in verses 18, 20, 24); 44 *om et (ad terram) X^c : xx 11 addit X* : addidit X¹*; 25 *sunt caesaris : caesaris sunt*; 35 *vero X* : autem X^c ; resurrectionem : resurrectione*; 43 *scabillum X* , but corrected to scabellum by X* himself*; xxi 28 *adpropinquat X^c*; 38 *populus diluculo veniebat : populus diluculo manicabat*; xxii 3 *cognominatur : vocatur*; 20 *effudetur (!) : fundetur*; 30 *regno meo : eras. meo*; 44 *et factus est in agonia prolixius orabat : et factus est in agonia et prolixius orabat*; 53 *in me manus : manus in me*; 68 the words *si autem et interrogavero non respondebitis mihi*, omitted by X*, were added by X¹ at the bottom of the page; xxiii 35 *christus dei dilectus : christus dei electus*; 44 *in horam nonam : in nonam horam*; 46 *expiravit : expiravit*; xxiv 41 *athuc X^c*; 49 *civitatem : civitate*; the Explicit runs: EXPLICIT EUANGELIUM SEC(UN)-D(UM) LUCA.

Jo. Wordsworth and White, *Euangelia*, p. 485. The Incipit of the 'Praefatio Iohannis' in X runs: ING(IPIT) SEC(UN)D(UM) IOHANNE . INC(IPIT) PROLOGUS EIUSDEM . D(E)O GRATIAS. The Explicit (*ib.* p. 487) is: EXPL(ICIT) PROLOGUS.

i 45 *in legem X* (all hands); iii 2 *deus : dominus*; 3 *renatus : natus*; 4 *rursus : iterato*; *intrare : intr(o)re* (the erasure was made by X^c, but the new letters were not filled in); 6 *caro est quia de carne natum est : caro est (quia de carne natum est erased)*; *spiritus est quia deus spiritus est : spiritus est* (the latter words erased); 10 *in israhel : israhel*; iv 1 *quia (prim.) X* (all hands); *quia (alt.) vulg : quod X* : quia X^c*; 7 *et venit : om et*; 9 *countuntur (!) X* (uncorrected); 33 *eis manducare : ei m.*; 34 *meus est cibus X^c*; 52 *deliquit : reliquit*; v 3 *expectantium X*; 4 X* had adopted form (2) of this verse but for some minor alterations: *angelus autem secundum tempus descendebat in piscinam et movebat aquam et qui prior descendisset in piscinam post motionem aquae sanus fiebat a quacumque detinebatur infirmitate*. X^c changed this into: *angelus autem domini secundum tempus descendebat in piscinam et movebat aquam qui ergo primus descendisset post motionem aquae sanus fiebat a quocumque languore tenebatur*, i.e. form (1), to be found in A Y and others, with the sole exception of *motionem* instead of *motum*; 9 *crabattum X* (all hands); similarly in verses 10, 11, 12; 20 *facit : faciet*; 35 *exsultare : exultare*; vi 40 *resuscitabo eum X* : resuscitabo ego eum X¹*; 71 *de iuda : iudam*; vii 29 the lengthy addition *et si dixerō . . .* (etc.) is peculiar only to X* and was deleted by X^c; 34 *om vos X^c*; 52 *scrutare scribituras : om scribituras*; viii 10 *sunt qui te accusant X* : the relative clause deleted by X^c*; 20 *est iesus : om iesus*; 28 *cognoscitis : cognoscetis*; 36 *vos filius X^c*; 38 *aput (twice) X*; *loquor apud patrem X* : apud patrem loquor X¹*; 47 *audistis X^c*; 50 *quaerat et iudicet : quaerat et iudicat (!)*; 58 *dixit ergo eis : dixit eis*; ix 2 *an parentes X* : aut*

parentes X¹; 3 *manifestetur opera* X* : *manifestetur opus* X¹; 13 *adducunt autem* : om *autem*; x 7 *eis ergo* X* : *ergo eis* X¹; 11 *ovibus suis* : om *suis*; 15 *ovibus meis* : om *meis*; 17 *ut* X* : *et* X¹; xi 20 *martha autem ut* X* : corrected to *martha ergo ut* by X* himself; 33 *semetipsum* : *se ipsum*; 54 *regione* : *regionem*; *discipulis suis* : om *suis*; xii 4 *scariothes* X* : 9 *esset* : *est*; 22 *dicit* : *dixit*; 27 *hac hora* X* : *hora hac* X¹; xiii 3 *ei dedit* : *dedit ei*; 18 *de omnibus vobis dico* (om non) X* : *non de omnibus v. d.* X¹; 20 *accipit me* X* : *me accipit* X¹; 22 *aspiciebant enim* : *aspiciebant ergo*; 29 *quod diceret* : *quia dicit*; 32 the words *si deus clarificatus est in eo*, omitted by X*, were added at the bottom of the page by X^o; 34 *in invicem* (alt.) X (all hands); xiv 11 *non credis* : *non creditis*; 17 *cognovistis* : *cognoscitis*; 28 *diligentis* : *diligeretis*; xv 2 *non facientem fructum* X* : *non ferentem fructum* X¹; 5 *affert* : *fert*; 6 *et ignem* X* : *et in ignem* X¹; *mittent* : *mittunt*; 7 *petitis* : *petetis*; 9 after *dilectione mea* there is an erasure of four lines, as X* had written verse 9 twice over; 14 *amici mei eritis* : *a. m. estis*; 25 *odio habuerunt me* X^o; xvi 3 *haec facient vobis* X* : *haec facient* (*vobis* has been cancelled by a line drawn through the word) X^o : afterwards the line cancelling *vobis* was carefully erased, whether by X^o or by somebody else is difficult to say; 12 *vobis habeo* X* : *habeo vobis* X¹; 16 *et iterum pusillum* : *et iterum modicum*; 18 *dicebant ei* : *dicebant ergo*; 21 *mundo* : *mundum*; 22 *tollit* : *tollet*; 23 *interrogabitis* X* ; 26 *petitis* : *petetis*; 27 *amastis* : *amatis*; xvii 8 the words omitted by X* were added at the bottom of the page by X^o; 14 *sicut ego* : *sicut et ego*; 15 *a malo* X*^o : *ex malo* X^o; 24 *ante constitutione* : *ante constitutionem*; xviii 2 *conveniebat* X* : *convenebat* X^o (X^o had intended to write *convenerat*); 3 *autem* X* : *ergo* X¹; 4 *autem* X* : *itaque* X¹; 7 *interrogavit eos* X^o; 10 *auriculam eius dextram* X^o; 18 *et petrus cum eis* : *cum eis et petrus*; 19 *discipulis suis* : *eras. suis*; 32 *morte esset* : *esset morte*; 33 Wordsworth's note, '*ei in ras. scr. X^o*', should be cancelled; 34 *haec* X* : *hoc* X¹; xix 4 *et exiit* : *eras. et; eum vobis* X^o; 16 *tradidit eis iesum* : *t. e. illum; eduxerunt* : *duxerunt*; 32 Wordsworth's note on X*^o should be cancelled; 33 *et* : *ut*; 35 *testimonium eius* X^o; xx 5 *linteamina posita* X^o; 8 *introiuit ergo* X* : *ergo introiuit* X¹; 10 *discipuli ad semet ipsos* X^o; 13 *dicit ei quia* X* : *dicit eis quia* X¹; 17 *dicit eis* X* : *dicit ei* X¹; 28 *dicit* : *dixit*; xxi 3 *coeperunt* : *prenderunt* (!); 7 *succinxit* : *cinxit*; 8 *a cubitis* : *eras. a*; 12 *esset* not on an erasure; 17 *tu domine* : *domine tu*; 18 *extendens* : *extendes*; 19 om *et* (*hoc cum*) X^o; 20 *super pectus eius qui dixit* : *s. p. e. et dixit*; 22 *veniam* X* : *venio* X^o; 23 the words *et non dixit ei iesus non moritur*, omitted by X*, were added between the lines by X¹.

This revised collation makes it clear that X^o, whilst most often agreeing with AY, introduced also a certain number of modern readings which were in accordance with the exegetical methods as practised in the schools of the time. Notice the following instances: Mt viii 26; Lc iv 9, vii 36; Jo viii 36, xv 25, xvi 3, xviii 7, 10, xix 35, xx 10. It would

seem, then, that the corrector X^c made his corrections on the authority of two MSS, one which greatly resembled Y, and another of considerably later date, which he consulted only occasionally. His correction in Jo xvi 3 might be an instance of his wavering between the two exemplars.

X* generally agrees with Z* and O*. Not infrequently, however, the text of this hand shows a close relation to other types. The striking combination X*D \mathcal{P} can be witnessed in such cases as Mc xiii 1, 29, xiv 3, 36, xvi 2, 11; Lc ii 40, vi 7, viii 49, ix 61, x 21, xviii 11, xx 25; Jo vi 50. The group X*L is represented by the following cases: Mc x 21, 35, 40, xi 20, xii 9, 11, xiii 15, 28, xiv 8, and others. There is also a very striking relation between X* and B, e.g. Mt x 16, 28, 34, 38, xi 14, 20, 23, xii 7, 36; Lc ix 33, x 15, etc. These and similar relations of X* seem to require further investigation.

2. O (Bodl. MS Auct. D.2.14)

The exterior of codex O, though in many respects resembling X (text and provenance; date: seventh century), scarcely recalls the Italian home of its type. It looks rather like an imitation of a prototype, and there can be little doubt that the book was written in England. The principle of writing *per cola et commata*, though still vaguely maintained, has been broken in many places.

Three hands can be distinguished:

(a) O*, the seventh-century scribe who wrote the large mass of the text in a half-uncial hand, which, however, is not so regular as that of X*.

(b) O¹, a contemporary of O*, who confined himself to the marking of the pericopes in the margins. He writes beautiful Italian minuscules. Examples of his marginal additions are: Mt xi 2: ✠ *de aduentu*; xiii 3: ✠ *in s̄i pauli*; xvi 13: ✠ *in nat(al)i s̄i petri*; xxviii 1: *In nocte s̄a* ✠. Dom J. Chapman, *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*, chap. x, called this hand O^a.

(c) O^c, also quoted as O^{sax, gl, mg} (Chapman: O^b), an Anglo-Saxon corrector of the late tenth century, who wrote corrections and additions of various kinds in the margin and between the lines, using ink of a dark brown or black colour. The demarcations of the pericopes added by this hand were discussed by Dom J. Chapman, *l.c.* Throughout the Passion according to Matthew, this hand added the usual signs f, c, ✠, denoting the words of the gospeller, of personages speaking in the story, and of Christ respectively. Lastly, this

corrector is the writer of the four gloss-like marginal notes which are to be found in the book, viz. on Mt vi 11 *panem nostrum supersubstantialiam*, a long extract from St Augustine (sic, according to the scribe; as a matter of fact, the extract is taken from St Jerome's commentary on Matthew) about *cotidie* and *supersubstantialis*; on Mt xx 28 (see Apparatus Criticus of the Oxford Vulgate); on Lc iii 4: 'propius ad superiora capit hic erat scriptum'; on Jo iii 34: 'Augustinus super hunc locum. Hominibus ad mensuram dat, unico filio non dat ad mensuram. De hominibus-namque dictum: (no)n datur per spiritum sermo sapientie'. These notes are traces of scholastic exegesis, and it is not surprising to find that the majority of readings introduced by O^e are of a type that may be called the predecessor of the Winchester text.

All the variants marked O^g, sax, mg, c in the Oxford Vulgate have to be attributed to O^e (of the late tenth century).

On the whole the variant readings of O are quoted correctly in Wordsworth and White's Vulgate. A few minor errors may here be rectified:

Mt xxvi 49 *habe* O (all hands); 61 *templum* O* : *templum hoc* O^e (in mg); xxvii 46 *hoc est* O* : *quod est* O^e (in mg); 52 *qui dormierant* O^e; Lc ix 54 *consumat illos* O* : (in mg) '*alias. sicut elias fecit hic additur*'; xiv 1 *intrasset* O* : *intraret* O^e (in mg).

APPENDIX B

On the Gospel Commentaries of John the Scot and Remigius of Auxerre

(See chap. III, p. 115)

I

As a contribution to the history of the Glossa (i.e. both the Ordinaria and the Interlinearis) we propose here to examine the sources of the Glossa on the beginning of the gospel of St John, and particularly those passages in that gloss which are taken from John the Scot's commentary on St John. Unfortunately, only some short fragments of this commentary have been preserved, but even so it can be seen that it had a great share in the building up of the Glossa. At all events the following list of sources will give a *terminus a quo* for the origin of the Glossa on St John: it cuts out Walafrid Strabo's claim for the authorship of that gloss.

We are first concerned with the *Glossa Ordinaria*, which will be quoted from the Lyons edition of 1545 (2°, six vols.). John the Scot's commentary is cited according to Migne's edition, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. cxxii.

Jo i 1-29

Glossa Ordinaria

Source

In principio erat verbum. Contra eos qui propter temporalem Christi nativitatem dicebant Christum non semper fuisse, incipit de aeternitate verbi dicens: *in princ. erat verbum.*

In princ. er. verb. Verbum dicit, vel quod profertur et transit, ut quando dicitur deus vel aliquid homini... (etc.).

Beda, *Homilia* no. vii (Migne xciv 39 B).

There follows a very long disquisition which seems to be borrowed partly from Augustine, and partly from Bede. But a considerable portion resembles Erigena's 'Homilia in Prologum evangelii secundum Ioannem', which may serve as a substitute for the lost beginning of Erigena's commentary. Notice the following parallels:

sed quia alii dicebant, quod idem deus aliquando est pater, aliquando filius, ut alter notetur in persona, subdit: *Et verbum erat apud deum*, ut alius apud alium. Sed quia alii concederent, et semper alium fuisse, sed non deum esse, subdit: *Et deus erat verbum.* Sed quia iterum alii etiam deum concederent, sed factum deum, ut ex hominibus fiunt dii, contra eos addit: *hoc*, i.e. verbum, *erat apud deum.*

Joh. Scotus, *Homilia* (Migne cxxii 286 c): Et ne quis existimaret, ita Verbum in principio subsistere, ut nulla substantiarum differentia subintelligatur inesse, continuo subiunxit: *Et verbum erat apud deum*, hoc est, et Filius subsistit cum Patre in unitate essentiae et substantiali distinctione. Et iterum, ne in quopiam talis serperet venenosa cogitatio, Verbum solummodo in Patre esse, et cum Deo esse, non autem ipsum Verbum substantialiter et coessentialiter Patri Deum subsistere... , protinus adiecit: *Et deus erat verbum.* Videns item, quo non defuturi essent, qui dicerent, non de uno eodemque Verbo evangelistam scripsisse... , sed aliud voluisse verbum... , haeticam opinionem destruens consequenter subnectit: *hoc erat in principio apud Deum.*

Erat. Sum verbum substantivum duplicem habet significationem: aliquando enim temporales motus

Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 286 B): *Sum*... duplicem continet intellectum. Aliquando quidem subsistentiam cuius-

Glossa Ordinaria

secundum analogiam aliorum verborum declarat; aliquando substantiam uniuscuiusque rei, de qua praedicatur, non ullo temporali motu designat: ideo et substantivum vocatur. Tale est quod dicitur, *In principio erat verbum*, quasi in patre subsistit filius. Non enim pro tempore, sed pro substantia ponitur *erat*.

Quare ponitur *erat* substantivum verbum? Ut intelligas omnia tempora praevenisse coaeternum patri verbum. (This sounds very much like question and answer put during a lesson at school.)

Et verbum erat. Alii subito inter homines apparuisse . . . (etc.).

Fuit homo missus. Postquam sublimi volatu ultra omnem naturam in altitudinem theologiae ascendit, quia verbum apud patrem semper fuisse contemplatus est . . . (etc.).

Et sui eum. Ab initio mundi nullum tempus erat, in quo receptores divini verbi non essent. Unde addit: *Quotquot autem*.

Filios dei. Mirabilis potestas . . . (etc.).

Et verbum caro. Ut autem secure credamus . . . (etc.).

Et verbum caro factum est. Quod superius erat, inferius descendit. Quid mirum, si quod erat inferius, in id quod superius est, ascendit? Nec mirum, si homines nascuntur ex deo: quia deus ex homine est natus.

Source

cunq̄ue rei, de qua praedicatur, absq̄ue ullo temporali motu significat, ideoq̄ue substantivum verbum vocitatur; aliquando temporales motus secundum aliorum verborum analogiam declarat. Tale ergo est quod ait: *In principio erat Verbum*. . . . Et notandum, quod in hoc loco non temporis, sed substantiae significationem beatus evangelista insinuat per hanc vocem, quae est *erat*.

Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 286 A): Angelus annuncians ipsum esse ante omnia in principio Verbum.

Beda, *Homilia* vii (Migne xciv 39 A, B): Alii inter homines eum subito apparuisse commemorant . . . (etc.); Alcuin, Commentary on John (Migne c 745 C).

Probably Erigena's commentary. Cf. his homily (*ib.* 291 B): Ecce aquila, de sublimissimo vertice montis theologiae leni volatu descendens in profundissimam vallem historiae, de caelo spiritualis mundi pennas altissimae contemplationis relaxat . . . (etc.).

Joh. Scot. *Comm. in Ioannem* (*ib.* 297 A): Et ne quis putaret omnes homines eum non recepisse, nam ab initio mundi nullum tempus erat, in quo receptores divini verbi non essent, propterea addit: *Quotquot autem*. . . .

Beda (*ib.* 42 D); Alcuin (*ib.* 748 C).

Beda (*ib.* 43 B, C); Alcuin (*ib.* 749 A).

Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 298 A): Nam si, quod superius est, ad inferius descendit, quid mirum, si, quod inferius est, in id, quod superius, superioris gratia agente, ascendat . . . ? Descendit enim Verbum in hominem, ut per ipsum ascenderet homo in Deum.

Glossa Ordinaria

Plenum gratiae. Homo Christus plenus fuit gratia. . . .

Hic erat. Per demonstrativum pronomen innuitur Christum affuisse in illo loco. Saepe enim ipse dominus adhuc ignotus antequam baptizaretur et praedicaret, ad iohannem solitus erat venire.

Qui post me. Qui post me natus, post me praedicaturus . . . (etc.).

Ante me factus est. Ex Graeco, *coram me factus est*, i.e. apparuit mihi quidem, scil. *quia prior me erat*.

Ei de plenitudine. Exposito testimonio praecursoris reddit evangelista ad testimonium suae assertionis. Quasi dicat: *verbum caro factum est, vidimus gloriam eius, plenum gratia et veritate, et de plenitudine eius nos omnes accepimus.* Gratiam, ut ipsum credamus, et veritatem, qua illum intelligimus.

Accepimus. Non solum gratiam, quae plane gratis datur, . . . (etc.).

Gratiam pro gratia. Gratia in conceptione boni . . . (etc.).

Per Moysen. Per moysen servum praenuntiatio . . . (etc.).

Deum nemo vidit unquam, i.e. nullus purus homo vivens . . . (etc.).

Unigenitus filius. Quae sit summa gratiae . . . (etc.).

Et hoc. Et haec et cetera sequentia . . . (etc.).

Tu quis es. Putabant Iudaei Iohannem esse Christum, qui in lege promittebatur. Alii putabant

Source

Beda (*ib.* 43 D); Alcuin (*ib.* 749 C).

Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 298 C): *Hic erat.* *Hic* pronomen est demonstrativum praesentis personae; ac per hoc datur intelligi, adfuisse Christum in illo loco, in quo Ioannes talem de eo demonstrationem aperte declaravit. Nec hoc mirum; saepe enim ipse Dominus, adhuc fere omnibus ignotus, priusquam baptizaretur et praedicare inchoaret, ad Ioannem solitus erat venire.

Beda, *Homilia* iv (*ib.* 26 C); Alcuin (*ib.* 749 D).

Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 299 B): Quod enim in Graeco scriptum est *ἐμπροσθέν μου*, proprie interpretatur: *coram me*, hoc est, ante oculos meos. Et quid in eo perspicio . . . ? Non aliud nisi *quia prior me erat*.

Beda (*ib.* 26 D-27 A); Alcuin (*ib.* 750 B): Exposito autem evangelista praecursoris Domini testimonio quod de illo perhibuerat, reddit statim suae quoque assertionis . . . illi testimonium dare . . . Superius namque dixit: *Quia Verbum caro factum est*, etc. . . ; Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 299 D): Gratiam accepimus, qua in eum credimus, et veritatem, qua ipsum intelligimus.

Augustinus in Iohannem (Migne xxxv 1400).

Beda (*ib.* 27 D-28 A); Alcuin (*ib.* 751 A).

Aug. (*ib.* 1402); Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 300 B).

Beda (*ib.* 29 B); Alcuin (*ib.* 752 A, B).

Beda (*ib.* 30); Aug. (*ib.* 1404).

Aug. (*ib.* 1406).

Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 303 B): *Quia non sum ego Christus.* Putabant enim Iudaei Ioannem Baptistam Christum fuisse,

Glossa Ordinaria

eum esse Eliam propter nimiam abstinentiam et castitatem et solitariam vitam et asperrimam delictorum reprehensionem et durissimum futurae vindictae terrorem. Alii dicebant eum esse unum de prophetis resuscitatum, propter prophetiae gratiam.

Confessus est. Confessus est, ut postea dicit... (etc.).

Ego vox clamantis. Ordo verborum: et confessus est et non negavit, quando miserunt.

Elias es tu. Cum omnes scirent nomen Christi... (etc.).

Non sum. Elias, i.e. non praeco... (etc.).

Ego vox. Non dicit: Ego sum homo, vel Iohannes, vel filius Zachariae. Non considerat humanam subsistentiam vel generationem, sed ultra haec omnia exaltatus praecursor (!) verbi deserit omnia quae intra mundum continentur. Ascendit in altum, factus vox verbi: nullam in se substantiam fatetur praeter abundantiam gratiae, qua excedit omnem creaturam, ut sit vox verbi.

¶ Vox est interpretis animi, animus autem, i.e. intellectus omnium, est filius dei. Iohannes ergo vox est et interpretis huius animi: quia primo mundo eum demonstravit: *Ecce agnus dei.*

Esaias. hoc de iohanne propheta... (etc.).

Source

quia in prophetis praedictum... Putabant quoque eum Heliam Thesbiten, propter nimiam sui abstinentiam, et castitatem, et solitariam vitam, et asperrimam dilectorum reprehensionem, et durissimum futurae vindictae terrorem. Et praeter hoc putabant eum, Ioannem dico, unum aliquem ex prophetis iterum surrexisse, videntes maximam prophetiae gratiam in eo profecisse.

Gregorius, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, lib. i, no. 7 (Migne lxxvi 1099 c); Alcuin (*ib.* 753 c).

Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 303 A): *Quando miserunt Iudaei ab Ierosolimis.* Et est ordo verborum: Et confessus est, et non negavit, quando miserunt Iudaei ab Ierosolimis...

Aug. (*ib.* 1408).

Aug. (*ib.* 1408 c, d).

Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 303 f.): *Ego sum vox clamantis in deserto.* Si quaeritis, inquit, ... Non dixit, 'quia ego sum homo', seu, 'ego sum Ioannes filius Zachariae', sed dixit: '*Ego sum vox*'. Non enim in se humanam substantiam consideravit, nec humanam generationem, siquidem ultra haec omnia exaltatus est praecursor Verbi. Deseruit omnia, quae intra mundum continentur, ascendit in altum, factus est vox Verbi, ita ut nullam in se substantiam fateretur, praeter id quod extra omnem creaturam ex abundantia gratiae accepit, esse videlicet vox Verbi.

Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 304 B, C): Estigitur vox interpretis animi... Animus itaque, i.e. intellectus omnium, Dei Filius est. Ipse est enim, ut ait sanctus Augustinus, intellectus omnium, imo omnia..., quia primo per ipsum demonstratus est mundo dicens: *Ecce agnus Dei.*

Aug. (*ib.* 1409 A).

Glossa Ordinaria

Ex pharisaeis. i.e. ex principibus Iudaeorum,

qui doctrinam non quaerunt, sed invident. Qui tamen ad Iohannem ideo veniunt, quia audiunt eum praedicasse communem omnium resurrectionem, quam et ipsi credebant. Unde et ipsi in multis Christo consentiunt, Paulum quoque apostolum in multis audierunt.

It is worth noting that this particular gloss is made up of material from three different sources. This is to say, it must be later in date than John the Scot's commentary on John.

Quid ergo baptizas. Audiebant Pharisaei in prophetis Christum venturum et baptizatum scientes Iordanem figuram baptismi gessisse, eumque Eliam et Elisaeum siccis pedibus transisse: figuramque baptismi in Elia et Elisaeo non dubitabant praecessisse. Unde et nunc eos surrexisse putabant et baptizasse, unde nec interrogant: 'es tu unus prophetarum'; sed solummodo: 'es tu propheta', ille viz. qui praefiguravit baptismum.

Ego baptizo in aqua. Non imputetur audaciae... (etc.).

Cuius ego non sum dignus. Non ait: 'non solvam'. Solvit enim, quoniam ipsum manifestavit et de divinitate et humanitate ipsius multa aperuit; sed: 'non sum dignus'; quia indignum ad hoc agendum se reputat, in quo simpliciter indicatur humilitas.

Source

Aug. (*ib.* 1409 B): i.e. ex principibus Iudaeorum. Greg. (*ib.* 1100 D); Alcuin (*ib.* 754 B): Illi Ioannem de suis actibus requirunt, qui doctrinam nesciunt quaerere, sed invidere.

Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 305 C): ...Ideo specialiter Pharisaei, audientes praedicationem Ioannis generalem omnium resurrectionem ex mortuis populo suasisse... in iudicio viz. post resurrectionem, desiderabant audire Ioannem; nam et ipsi resurrectionem mortuorum firmissime credebant et praedicabant, ac per hoc in multis consensisse Christo perhibentur, Paulum quoque apostolum frequenter adiuvisse.

Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 305 f.): Quaeritur cur... Audierant enim in prophetis Christum in mundum venturum et baptizatum. Scientes itaque Iordanem figuram baptismatis gessisse, eumque Heliam et Elisaeum siccis pedibus transiisse, figuram baptismatis in Helia et Elisaeo non dubitabant praecessisse, aut illos ipsos surrexisse ac baptizasse. Ac per hoc non interrogabant: 'Prophetarum unus es tu?' sed solummodo: 'Propheta es tu?' ipse viz., qui praefigurabat baptismum. Greg. (*ib.* 1101 A); Alcuin (*ib.* 754 B, C).

Joh. Scot. (*ib.* 307 A): Notandum tamen, quod non dixit, 'cuius corrigiam calceamenti non solvam', sed dixit, 'non sum dignus ut solvam corrigiam calceamenti'. Solvit enim ille mysteria incarnationis Christi, quando ipsum apertissime manifestavit mundo, multaque de divinitate et humanitate ipsius aperuit. Indignum tamen ad hoc agendum se comparat.

Aug. (*ib.* 1410 A): Ioannesc sic se humiliavit, ut diceret: *Non sum ego dignus.*

In this way it can be shown that the surviving portion of John the Scot's commentary on the Fourth Gospel (and, presumably, the original whole of that commentary) served the author of the *Glossa Ordinaria* as one of his sources.

Moreover, it must be said that the *Glossa Interlinearis* also, which is usually ascribed to Anselm of Laon, is founded on exactly the same sources as the *Ordinaria*. This explains the frequent similarity between the two glosses. We shall only quote a few examples to demonstrate the influence which John the Scot's commentary had on the *Glossa Interlinearis* on the Fourth Gospel.

<i>Glossa Interlinearis</i>	<i>Source</i>
(Jo i 15) <i>prior me. aeternitate deitatis.</i>	Joh. Scot., <i>Comm. in Ioannem</i> (l.c. 299 A): <i>prior me erat, non solum aeternitate divinitatis. . .</i> (etc.).
(16) <i>gratiam pro gratia. ut ipsum credamus, et veritatem, qua illum intelligamus.</i>	Id. (<i>ib.</i> 299 D): <i>gratiam accepimus, qua in eum credimus, et veritatem, qua ipsum intelligimus.</i>
(21) <i>non sum. Elias, quia non solum propheta sicut ille, sed etiam praecursor.</i>	Id. (<i>ib.</i> 303 C): <i>ego vero non solum propheta, sed et praecursor.</i>
(<i>Ib.</i>) <i>respondit, non. Non sum propheta, quia plus quam propheta. Non sum unus de illis prophetis, de quibus me esse putatis.</i>	Id. (<i>ib.</i>): <i>Non. quia plus quam propheta est, ideo se negat prophetam esse. . . Non sum unus ex ipsis prophetis, de quorum numero existimatis me surrexisse.</i>
(22) <i>quis es ut responsum demus. Dic, quis es, ne absque responso redeamus ad illos qui nos miserunt. Audivimus de Christo te praedicare, sed de teipso nihil manifeste asseris.</i>	Id. (<i>ib.</i> 303 D): <i>dic, quis es, ne absque responso atque ulla cognitione de te ad eos, qui nos miserunt, redeamus. . . Audivimus enim te de Christo praedicasse, de te autem ipso nil manifestum asseris.</i>
(23) <i>viam. per fidem, per opera, per quae dominus ingreditur.</i>	Id. (<i>ib.</i> 305 A): <i>Non enim per aliam viam Dominus corda hominum ingreditur nisi per fidem.</i>
(26) <i>medius. id est, praesens vobis apparet.</i>	Id. (<i>ib.</i> 306 A): <i>medius autem vestrum stat, hoc est, praesens vobis apparet.</i>
(27) <i>post me. ante tempora diffinitum est, quod post me veniret.</i>	Id. (<i>ib.</i>): <i>priusquam fieret mundus, diffinitus est, quod post me venturus esset in mundum.</i>
(29) <i>altera die. altera cognitione.</i>	Id. (<i>ib.</i> 309 D): <i>Alia, inquit, die, hoc est alia cognitione.</i>
(<i>Ib.</i>) <i>qui tollit peccata. non de loco ad locum, sed ut omnino non sint.</i>	Id. (<i>ib.</i> 310 B): <i>Tollit (peccatum) non de loco ad locum. . . , sed omnino tollit, ne omnino sit. Etc.</i>

It would fit very well into the picture which we have of Remigius of Auxerre and of his relation to John the Scot, if we could attribute to him the incorporation of these and similar passages from John the Scot's commentary in the Glossa. In favour of this view we might also mention the fact that the Council of Vercelli, in 1050, banned all the works of John the Scot, which might make plausible the assumption that the Irishman's commentary could not have been used after that date.

Yet there are several points contradicting this a priori evidence. (a) The passages in the Glossa which are taken from sources other than John the Scot have undergone a considerable change in form and expression, whereas the extracts from John the Scot's commentary are almost literally preserved in their original form. This can only mean that the writer who borrowed from John the Scot must have worked considerably later than the scholar who welded together into a rudimentary gloss extracts from various patristic commentaries on St John. (b) There exists an early twelfth-century commentary on St John (probably written by Anselm of Laon, see Appendix C) which is closely related to the Glossa, except that it lacks those very excerpts from John the Scot to which attention has here been drawn (and others which cannot be proved to be borrowed from John the Scot owing to the imperfect state of his commentary as it is known to-day). The extracts from John the Scot's work, therefore, must have been received into the Glossa after Anselm of Laon's time. (c) Both the *Ordinaria* and the *Interlinearis* borrow from Anselm of Laon's commentary on John just mentioned (Appendix C) to exactly the same degree as they borrow from John the Scot's commentary. Thus it seems probable that it was a twelfth-century writer who made the extracts from the commentaries of both Anselm and John the Scot, and so compiled the Glossa on the Fourth Gospel.

We may be allowed tentatively to assign the work of excerpting John the Scot's commentary, and of incorporating the extracts in the Glossa, to Peter the Lombard, the author of the Glossa.

2

There exists a commentary on the gospels of Matthew and Mark which is most probably the work of Remigius of Auxerre, or of his school.

The Harleian MS 3213 is a small book written in continental minuscules by an early eleventh-century hand. Besides a collection of miscellaneous extracts from patristic writings, it contains two not very long, but complete, and anonymous, commentaries on Matthew and Mark, each with a preface.

f. 1^r (rubric): *In hoc libello continentur excerpta de commentariis beati hieronimi super matheum et marcum et alia plura satis utilia de diversis opusculis sanctorum patrum.*

Then follow extracts on original sin; verses on the Virgin; excerpts on predestination, free will, divine omnipresence, resurrection of the flesh, fasting; then a sermon on St Blasius.

f. 19^r (rubric): *Incipiunt excerpta.*

Then follows the preface of the commentary on Matthew, beginning:

Quaeritur, quare cum multa euangelia ordinata fuisse legamus . . . ,
ending

f. 22^v: *de eius numero esse studuerunt.*

This is almost literally copied from the preface of Christian of Stavelot's commentary on Matthew printed in Migne (cvi 1264 C to 1267 B), but without the innumerable errors of Migne's edition.) It is significant that this preface of Christian parades the author's limited knowledge of Greek and etymology, and his talent for allegory, fields of medieval learning for which Remigius had a special predilection. The compiler (Remigius?) has only in one or two places made slight additions to the matter set forth by Christian. Christian's explanation (Migne cvi 1265 A):

Per Phison, qui insufflatio potest dici, (significatur) Ioannes,
has been extended in our MS to

Per phison, qui caterva vel inflatio dicitur, quia decem fluminibus magnis sibi adiunctis impletur et efficitur unus, (significatur) iohannes.
Where Christian speaks of Hilary's Greek gospel book, which he himself had seen, our MS speaks in the third person:

Invenitur tamen evangelii liber grece scriptus. . . Et cum interrogaretur eufemius grecus . . . (cf. Migne, *l.c.* 1266 A).

The commentary on Matthew itself (ff. 22^v to 66^v) begins by adhering closely to Christian (cf. f. 22^v: '*Liber duobus modis accipitur . . .*', with Migne, *l.c.* 1267 B), but after Mt i 18 it follows more and more Jerome's commentary on Matthew,

yet at the same time taking over passages from Christian, especially explanations of words, etymologies, and the like.

There can be no doubt that this compilation from the commentaries of Christian of Stavelot and Jerome represents a stage in the development of the *Glossa* on Matthew. It is one of the sources on which Anselm of Laon drew for his *Enarrationes in Matthaem* (and this explains why these *Enarrationes* often bear a resemblance to Christian of Stavelot's commentary). As Anselm borrowed from Remigius for some of his other *Enarrationes* (e.g. those on the Pauline Epistles), Remigius may reasonably be assumed to be the author of this compilation on Matthew also.

We may point out, in passing, the close connection which exists between Christian of Stavelot's commentary on Matthew and the short *Expositio Matthaei* that has often been printed among the works of St Jerome (e.g. Migne xxx 549 ff.). It seems that the *Expositio* is but a late ninth-century extract from Christian's work. It can be noticed that in the ninth and tenth centuries there emerge a number of secondary commentaries which are frequently attributed to one of the famous Fathers. Thus, for instance, we have the ninth-century abstracts from Rabanus on Matthew and from Alcuin on John, which are wrongly associated with the name of Bede.¹ Similarly, our MS Harl. 3213 ascribes to Jerome Remigius's compilation from various sources.

The commentary on Mark (MS Harl. 3213, f. 67^r to 94^v) cannot be the work of Christian of Stavelot or an abridgment of such a work.² It is, in fact, the pseudo-Jeromian commentary on Mark which was first edited by Martianay (reprinted in Migne xxx 609 ff.). Now there seems to be a connection between the two commentaries contained in our MS. Christian had refused to write an exposition of Mark: the author of the second work in our MS, however, declares his intention to expound Mark in spite of the practice usually followed by the expositors (cf. Migne, *l.c.* 609 B: 'Marcum evangelistam tractantes intactum, ut puto, praetereunt'). Again, Christian had written for the benefit of his *iuvenes* (see his preface, Migne cvi 1261 D): the author of the exposition of

¹ Cf. Schönbach, 'Über einige Evangelienkommentare des Mittelalters', *Wiener Sitzungsberichte*, 1903.

² In the preface of his commentary on Matthew, Christian declared (Migne cvi 1263): 'In Marco non est necessarium manum mittere post beatum Bedam'.

Mark emphasises this point particularly; he intends to write for 'discentes meos pauperulos'. Moreover, Christian had confined himself to an exposition 'secundum litteram': his emulator outdoes him even in this respect by boasting: 'pelles hyacinthinas de coelestibus, non de terrestribus offeram'.

These parallels make it highly probable that the author who made the abstract of Christian's commentary, and the author of the pseudo-Jeromian commentary on Mark, were one and the same person; furthermore, that this person must have worked after the publication of Christian's commentary, which was written between 850 and 870. This automatically rules out Martianay's assumption (Migne xxx 547) that Walafrid Strabo was the author of the pseudo-Jeromian work on Mark (Strabo died in 849). So far all the evidence points to Remigius of Auxerre as the real author. We have seen that Remigius's abridgment of Christian's work ultimately found entrance, through the medium of Anselm's *Enarrationes*, into the Glossa on Matthew. Similarly the exposition of Mark here discussed helped to build up the Glossa and even was, besides Bede's commentary, a main source of the Glossa on Mark (where, strangely enough, it is always cited under the headings 'Hieronymus' or 'Isidorus'!). This fact is in itself an argument in favour of Remigius's authorship, if it be granted that in Anselm of Laon's school the works of Remigius were regarded as particularly authoritative. Also it is noteworthy that the first words which the pseudo-Jeromian (or Remigius's) commentary on Mark sets out to expound, are *Cata Marcum*, which, instead of *Secundum Marcum*, did not become known in continental gospel MSS before 850, i.e. when the Irish monks brought with them to the Continent their own text, copies of which we possess in the MSS E and Royal 1. A. xviii (both these MSS have *cata* instead of *secundum*). And the centre of the Irish activity on the Continent in the second half of the ninth century was the region of Laon and Auxerre, where Remigius's schools were flourishing.

To sum up what the investigation of the sources has revealed with respect to the state in which the Glossa was in Remigius's school at the end of the ninth century, we may say that the Glossa (on the gospels), which has always been thought to be the work of Walafrid Strabo, did not yet in any sense exist. For instruction in the gospels Remigius had at his disposal but simple and individual commentaries, though most of them

probably secondary ones. Matthew was read with the help of a commentary which was compiled from the works of Jerome and of Christian of Stavelot. As to Mark, Remigius wrote his own commentary after the model of Christian's exposition of Matthew. For John, he made use of the commentary of St Augustine and, perhaps, that of Alcuin. As regards Luke we are as yet left in uncertainty; but it may be said with a certain degree of probability that Remigius availed himself of Bede's work on Luke. These commentaries are far different from what we know as the *Glossa* on the gospels. Only very much later did they come to form important parts of the *Glossa*. The exponents of the twelfth century found the early works of biblical exegesis useful for the building up of their own commentary, the *Glossa*, which was to become an essential factor in the structure of the scholastic method.

APPENDIX C

The Gospel Commentaries of Anselm of Laon

(See chap. v, pp. 205-207)

I

THE text of Anselm of Laon's *Enarrationes in Matthaeum*, as printed in Migne clxii 1227 ff., represents a later and somewhat interpolated form of Anselm's work, as can be shown by comparing that edition with the Brit. Mus. MS Royal 4. A. xvi. This book contains first Anselm's preface, hitherto unknown, to his commentary on Matthew, then this commentary itself in its original and genuine shape. The MS dates either from the last years of the eleventh, or from the first years of the twelfth, century. The writing, which is conspicuous by its richness in apices, has preserved much of the prickly appearance which is a characteristic of the script of Bec in Lanfranc's time.¹ It is not improbable that the book is an autograph of Anselm, for the text is full of erasures and corrections which might have been made by the author (and scribe) himself. In the margin the MS shows undoubtedly authentic statements of the patristic sources on which Anselm

¹ M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, Cambridge 1903, p. xxx.

drew (the most prominent names are: Hilary, Augustine, Gregory, Bede, Jerome, Origen, Leo). Unfortunately the MS is anonymous, as the original first three leaves are missing (an ancient pagination calls no. 4 what is at present the first leaf). In 1200 the book was in the possession of Rochester Library, and it is surely not too hazardous to suppose that Anselm's pupil Rodolphus (Ralph) brought it with him and presented it to the library of his cathedral, when in 1108 he became Bishop of Rochester.

It cannot be emphasised enough to what a high degree Peter the Lombard's Glossa was indebted to the exegetical works of Anselm of Laon, even though Anselm had written on a small part of the Bible only. The mere relation between the preface here printed, and the Lombard's preface to his own gospel commentary (edited by B. Smalley, *The New Scholasticism* v, 1930, 160 ff.), shows this clearly. The Lombard, it is true, combined Anselm's *Enarrationes* with other sources and made these compilations the basis for the Glossa Ordinaria and Interlinearis; but he learned from Anselm the method of exposition. Anselm's works, therefore, occupy an important place in the story of the development of the Glossa.

MS Royal 4.A.xvi, f. 1^r: *Liber de claustro Roffensi .G. Archidiaconi. Matheus glosatus.*

f. 1 to 3 (Preface):

Cum post ascensionem domini spiritus sanctus corda discipulorum illustrasset et illos ad predicandum que christus fecit et docuit, promovisset, quattuor ex omnibus specialiter segregati sunt, qui et predicaverunt et dominicam conversationem in terris simul, et predicationem suam que proprie evangelium vocatur, propriis voluminibus 5 conscripserunt; hac videlicet intentione, ut vita domini iesu et ipsius in terris conversatio, que morum nostrorum perfecta fuit instructio, in memoria et pre oculis nostris haberetur, et ne eiusdem doctrina et predicatio heretica pravitate distorqueretur. Illorum vero quattuor primus fuit matheus, qui cum primum in iudea predicasset, ad gentes 10 volens transire, evangelium scripsit hebraico sermone, ut fratribus, quos corporaliter deserebat, per hoc memoriale quod eis reliquit quasi presens esset, et maxime primitivorum fratrum fidem confirmaret, ne ulterius evangelice veritati legis umbra succederet. Dilatata autem deinceps ecclesia sancti patres curaverunt, ut idem 15 evangelium in grecum latinumque transferretur eloquium. Secundus fuit marcus, qui interpret sancti petri apostoli iesum, quem in carne non vidit, sed quem magistrum predicantem audierat, predicavit.

- Et cum secundum carnem in israel sacerdotio prius fungeretur, factus
 20 dei et petri in baptismo filius, scripsit evangelium in italia sub claudio
 cesare. Cumque iam floreret fides evangelica per matheum in iudea,
 per marcum in italia, instigante spiritu sancto lucas successit tercius
 in ordine, qui quedam altius repetens evangelium scripsit in partibus
 acaie et boetie. Cui etiam hec necessitas laboris fuit, ut grecis
 25 fidelibus humanitas christi manifestaretur, ne iudaicis fabulis legis
 desiderio adhererent. Quartus sequitur iohannes apostolus et evan-
 gelista. Is cum esset in asia, ubi cherinti et hebionis aliorumque
 humanitatem christi impugnantium pullulaverant heretica semina,
 postquam revocatus est ab exilio pathmos, coactus est ab omnibus
 30 episcopis asie et ab omnibus fidelibus asiane ecclesie, ut aliquid altius
 de divinitate scriberet, unde heretica rebellio convinci posset. Quia
 igitur precibus fratrum ita coarctabatur, respondit se illud facturum,
 si omnes indicto ieiunio domini implorarent auxilium. Quo expleto,
 Jo i i divina revelatione saturatus, quasi de celo veniens eructavit in illud
 35 prohemium dicens: *In principio erat verbum et cetera.*
- Cum itaque plures evangelia scripsissent, hi soli quattuor super
 omnes pondus auctoritatis habent. Tante quidem sunt dignitatis, ut
 utriusque testamenti scriptura eis testimonium conferat. Ezechiel
 Ezech i 5, namque multo tempore ante illorum exortum inter cetera ait: *Et in*
 10 *medio similitudo quattuor animalium et vultus eorum facies hominis et leonis*
 Ezech i 7, *et vituli et aquile.* Et alibi: *Crura eorum recta et pennati pedes et quocumque*
 12 *spiritus ibat, ibant,* et cetera. Iohannes etiam in apocalypsi de eisdem
 Apoc iv 9 ait: *Et cum darent quattuor animalia gloriam et honorem et benedictionem*
sedenti super thronum, et cetera. Quibus omnibus perpenditur manifeste,
 45 quante auctoritatis evangelica doctrina debeat esse. Quod etiam sub
 quaternario numero continetur, mistica ratione factum esse creditur.
 Hec enim veluti in quadriga christum per quattuor mundi partes
 erat portatura. Cuius quadrigae mentionem facit spiritus sanctus per
 Cantic vi salomonem: *Anima mea conturbavit me propter quadrigas aminadab.* Quia
 11 etiam genus humanum quadrafida morte corruptum per fidem trinitatis
 et unitatis, quam intimat, erat vivificandum, et quia eadem
 doctrina per omnia sibi consonans equalibus lateribus more quadra-
 torum firma subsistit, merito tali numero designari vel contineri
 debuit. Ipse vero predictorum animalium figure non sunt vane vel
 55 illusorie somniantium more, sed potius certi et iucundi misterii sunt
 conscie. Qui enim huiusmodi figuris figuratur, illum predicant et
 intimant; qui ad restituendum perditae beatitudinis statum nasci
 voluit ut homo, immolari ut vitulus, surgere ut leo, conscendere ut
 aquila.
- 60 Matheus igitur humana figura informatur, quia humanam christi
 generationem describendam aggreditur. Qui merito primus ponitur,

non naturali ordine, sed artificiali. Naturali quidem ordine iohannes, qui ultimus est et excellentius tractat de divinitate, primus deberet esse; divinitas enim prior est et dignior est humanitate. Sed consilio spiritus sancti factum esse credimus, ut qui de humanitate christi agit, ponatur primus. Conveniens enim erat, ut sensus noster paulatim a minori ad maiorem ascenderet et per fidem et sacramentum humanitatis assumpte promoveretur ad agnitionem eternitatis divine. Marcus figura leonis designatur, qui inducit vocem in deserto clamantem, iohannem scilicet, quasi quodam leonico rugitu bestialiter viventes per terre faciem. Cui sacramento illud etiam congruit, quod in die dominice resurrectionis eius evangelium recitatur in omnibus ecclesiis utpote diligentius et evidentius exponens ordinem resurrectionis eius, qui tanquam leo fortis excitatus est per gloriam patris. Fertur enim natura leonis esse, ut natus iaceat triduo tanquam mortuus, sed tercia die surgat ad vocem patris excitatus. Cum igitur matheus ab humanitate christi incepisset, marcus paulo altiozem gradum conscendit, qui librum suum ab initio evangelice predicationis inchoans filium dei dominum nostrum iesum christum appellare voluit. Quia nimirum et humane nature erat, de progenie patriarcharum sive regum carnem suscipere: quod prosequitur matheus; et divine fuit potentie evangelium predicare: quod intendit marcus. Lucas bene per vitulum figuratur, qui a sacrificio exorsus circa sacerdotalem eius personam versatur, qui corpus assumptum deo patri tanquam vitulum expiationis obtulit. Hic quoque quedam altius repetens altiozem gradum conscendit et aliquanto altius agens ad altiora nos provocavit. Quartum, scilicet iohannem, species aquile declarat, qui ceteris altius contemplans et in claritate superni solis interiores oculos figens de verbo dei subtiliter disputat, ut ad supremum gradum nos promoveat et ipsi deo tanquam patri filios tandem coniungat. Hec itaque quattuor animalia, licet illum specialiter designent qui factus est homo nascendo, vitulus moriendo, leo resurgendo, aquila celos ascendendo; universaliter tamen omnes comprehendunt fideles. Omnis namque fidelis dum ratione viget, homo est; quando vero voluptatem carnis in se mortificat, vitulus est; cum autem mortificata carne fortitudinem securitatis habet, ut nichil preter deum timeat, leo est; si sublimiter et subtiliter celestia contemplatur, aquila est. Notandum quoque quia, cum matheus primum locum habeat et iohannes ultimum obtineat, reliqui duo, qui ex illo numero non erant, sed tamen christum in illis loquentem audierant, tanquam filii amplectendi in medio loco constituuntur, ut quasi utroque latere ab eis muniantur.

Sciendum etiam, quod sancti evangeliste uno quidem spiritu accensi ad officium scribendi accesserunt, sed diversum narrationis sue primordium diversumque finem statuerunt. Matheus enim a nativi-

tate dominica exordium sumpsit et usque ad tempus dominice resurrectionis seriem sue narrationis perduxit. Marcus incipiens ab initio evangelice predicationis prosequitur usque ad tempus ascensionis et predicationem discipulorum exhibendam cunctis gentibus per mundum.

- 110 Lucas quidem a nativitate precursoris inchoans terminat in ascensionem dominicam. Iohannes ab eternitate verbi dei principium sumpsit et usque ad tempus dominice resurrectionis evangelizando pertingit. Sed licet, sicut prediximus, quodammodo tractandi ratione disconveniant, a predicatione christi tamen nullatenus discordant.
- 115 Que enim christus predicavit, predicant, et bona que deus pater humano generi per filium contulit, annuntiant. Vnde eorum predicatione evangelium vocatur, quamvis ipsa principalis christi annuntiatio proprie sibi hoc nomen sortiatur. Evangelium quippe bonum nuntium interpretatur. Quid enim melius potuit nuntiari quam quod
- 120 cum christo sumus glorificandi et deificandi, si veterem hominem exuentes sibi festinemus conformari?

Evangelium igitur septem modis principaliter dicitur, quia septem principalia bona nuntiat. Primum bonum incarnatio, mirabile quidem bonum et necessarium. Cum enim deus pater disposuisset ab eterno angelicum ordinem restaurare et hominem diabolice servituti mancipatum liberare, non iniuste, non violenter, sed sapienter contra diabolum agens filium sibi coequalem incarnavit; sciens quia, dum in eum, in quem nichil iuris habebat, manum mitteret, illos, quos ante quasi iure possidebat, diabolo perderet. Ecce bonum mirabile,

125 necessarium quidem fuit. Nisi enim homo taliter repararetur, omnia que propter hominem facta sunt, frustra esse facta viderentur; ordo etiam angelicus non restituto sociali numero remaneret imperfectus. In isto quoque tanto bono nobis celitus collato spiritum sapientie non incompetenter possumus notare. Que enim maior sapientia quam

135 diabolum superare et hominem perditum revocare et deificare? Secundum bonum nobis nuntiatum baptismus christi est. Christus nempe licet a peccato immunus esset, baptizari tamen voluit, ut nostrum baptismum sanctificaret et commendaret, et ut nobis a peccato iam purgatis spiritum intelligentie conferret, quo intelligeremus, quid

- 140 olim fuimus et quid modo per gratiam facti sumus, scil. ut intelligeremus nos per baptismum esse filios dei, cum ante essemus filii diaboli. Unde dum christus baptizaretur, vox patris insonuit super
- Mt iii 17 eum dicens: *Hic est filius meus dilectus in quo mihi bene complacuit.* Sed et spiritus in specie columbe apparuit, in quo et quod deus trinitas
- 145 esset aperte monstravit, et nos insuper intelligere voluit, quod dum baptizamur, spiritum sanctum recipimus et in filios dei adoptamur. Tercium bonum est christi passio, in qua tandem divinum patuit consilium de redemptione humani generis, quod etiam angelis antea absconditum fuit, etiam et ipsi diabolo; si enim cognovisset, nunquam

iude intimaret, ut eum traderet. Tunc vero tandem cognovit et 150
doluit, quare per mulierem, pilati scil. uxorem, ne crucifigeretur,
disturbare voluit. Ex illo itaque tanto dei consilio nostrum debet
informari consilium, ut scil. illi pro nobis passo compatiatur et
mortui mundo vivamus deo. Quartum bonum est, quod sepultus
infernum adivit et confregit, et suos, qui ibi erant, liberavit; quod sine 155
spiritu fortitudinis facere non potuit. In quo et nobis fortitudo donatur,
qua omnia adversa conculcando diabolus impugnemus. Quintum
est, quod victor surgens fidem apostolorum confirmavit et in terra
per quadraginta dies conversatus fuit; in quo spiritum scientie nobis
aperuit, cum resurgens speciem resurgendi nobis dedit, ut scil. pro 160
certo sciamus, quia, si a vicis resurgimus in presenti, tandem re-
surgentes donabimur vita interminabili. Sextum bonum est, quod
celum ascendens spiritum apostolis misit; in quo spiritus pietatis
manifestissime claruit. Pietas namque fuit, quod celum ascendens
viam nobis initiavit et terrenum hominem posse fieri celestem desig- 165
navit. Quod etiam spiritum paraclitum misit, pietas fuit, cum illos,
quos quodammodo deserebat corporaliter, consolari voluit spiritualiter.
Vnde et a nobis pietatem exigit, ut scil. pie serviamus illi, qui adeo
pie nos dilexit. Septimum bonum est, quod venturus est iudicare et
unicuique, prout gessit, reddere; in quo patenter spiritum timoris 170
possumus notare. *Dies enim illa, dies ire*, et cetera. Hec igitur septem
specialia bona, que pater per filium nunciavit et in filio complevit,
septem sunt sigilla, quibus in apocalipsi liber signatus est. In quo
libro mystice sunt scripta, quecunque in christo sunt completa; que
impletio libri est apertio. In eisdem etiam sigillis, ut diximus, septem
sunt dona spiritus sancti collata fidelibus, quibus quasi septem columnis
fulcitur ecclesia, quam fabricavit sapientia. Iste sunt etiam septem
mulieres que apprehenderunt unum virum, scil. christum. Isti sunt
septem filii veri iob qui pro nobis passus doluit, qui vocant tres
sorores ad convivia, quia fides, spes, caritas in nullo recte epulantur, 180
nisi in quo ista morantur.

Premissis igitur omnibus, que utiliter premittenda esse cognovimus,
quid quattuor evangeliste communiter intendant videamus. Omnium
communis intentio est unam commendare personam veri dei et
hominis, simulque nos instruere per ea que gessit in homine, ut 185
deposita imagine veteris hominis de cetero portemus imaginem
celestis, quatinus in eum credendo et firmiter bona promissa certa
spe expectando et illum salutis nostre auctorem diligendo conregnare
possimus in superno solio.

Dicitur tamen matheus iste ob eorum causam, qui ex circumcissione 190
crediderant, evangelium scripsisse. Nolebant enim, quamvis in christo
renati, a carnalibus observantiis ex toto revelli. Intendit ergo specialiter
eos a carnali legis et prophetarum sensu ad spirituales, qui christo

160 speciem] specie MS

193 qui] quid MS

est, erigere, quatinus sacramenta fidei christiane tanto securius perciperent, quanto hec non alia quam que prophete predixerant, impleta esse viderent. Cuius tale principium est.

Then begins immediately, and in the same line, the commentary itself. We confine ourselves to quoting the beginning, in order to demonstrate the fact that Migne's text is corrupt.

MS Royal 4. A. xvi

Liber generationis iesu christi. Hoc exordio satis ostendit se generationem christi carnalem velle narrare; secundum hanc enim christus hominis est filius. De alia vero nequaquam intendit, quia *generationem* illam *quis enarrabit?* Patet etiam, quia merito humana figura depingitur, cum ab humana generatione principium libri sui ordinatur. Et notandum, quia secundum materiam exordii libro suo nomen imposuit more hebreorum; sicuti liber genesis ab exordio nomen accepit. In exordio enim de genitura mundi agitur, etsi permodicus inde tractatus habeatur. Liber quoque exodi ab exitu.

Migne's Text

(reprinted from the Cologne edition, of 1573, of Anselm of Canterbury's works)

Liber generationis. In ipso exordio satis ostendit quod de humanitate Christi sit acturus, cum a carnali generatione incipiat. *Generationem enim eius divinam quis enarrabit?* (Is liii 8) Notandum quod secundum materiam exordii libro suo etiam nomen posuit, morem Hebraeorum secutus, quorum libri ex primordiis intitulantur, sicut liber primus Moysi Genesis vocatur, quia in exordio de genitura mundi agitur, et sicut Exodus, in cuius principio de exitu filiorum Israel de Aegypto tractatur.

It will be granted that the style of this passage in the Cologne edition is less rugged and more polished than it is in the MS. In fact, the former has a distinct humanistic savour about it, and we are probably not far from the truth if we suppose that the editor altered (and improved) the style of Anselm of Laon's work, either because the original did not conform to his own standard, or because he found that the alteration was necessary, if the work was to pass as one of the greater Anselm. However that may be, a critical edition of Anselm of Laon's *Enarrationes in Matthaeum*, based on the MS authority, is an urgent desideratum.

2

The *Enarrationes in Iohannem* are anonymous in both MSS of which we have knowledge (Durham A. iv. 15; Lincoln A. 5. 12 = no. 122; both of the first half of the twelfth century); so Anselm's authorship is doubtful. But there is the general resemblance to Anselm of Laon's other *Enarrationes*; further, the

commentary is obviously the augmented revision of some earlier work (by Remigius of Auxerre?); lastly there is the fact that it was one of the main sources of the Glossa (both Ordinaria and Interlinearis) on John. It is difficult to account for these facts except by assuming that Anselm of Laon is the author of the work. Again, is it too bold a suggestion to say that the Durham MS (the older of the two), or perhaps its exemplar, reached Durham through the sons of Bishop Ralph Flambard of Durham, who had been pupils of Anselm?

The Lincoln MS is incomplete; it breaks off at Jo xv 1, in the middle of the column and line. From this MS the following specimens are printed. In order to show the part this commentary played in the Glossa, the corresponding passages of the latter are printed in a parallel column.

Extracts from ENARRATIONES IN
IOHANNEM, according to Lin-
coln Cathedral MS 122

(Jo i) Verbum substantiale intelligitur, quod in ipso homine manet intus, quod de sono intelligitur; non ipse sonus, qui transit. Refer animum ad illud verbum, quod habes in corde tuo . . . (etc.).

In principio erat verbum. Ponit verbum, non christus, ne inusitato vocabulo error aliquis procederet. Filius verbum vocatur, quia per eum pater mundo innotuit . . . (etc.).

Verbum dicitur vel sonus, qui de ore loquentis emittitur et auditur . . . (etc.).

Et deus erat verbum, i.e. ipse filius erat deus. Alii hominem eum apud homines temporaliter conversatum; Iohannes in principio apud deum manentem ostendit.

Hoc erat in principio apud deum. Ita apud patrem erat unum cum ipso patre, ut omne principium creaturarum sua essentia preiret.

Alii dicunt, quomodo miracula fecit in mundo. Iste per ipsum facta esse testatur *omnia*:

omnis creatura visibilis et invisibilis.

Passages in the GLOSSA borrowed from the *Enarrationes in Iohannem* (from folio-edition of the Glossa, Lyons 1545, vol. v)

Gl. Ord. *Verbum*, vel quia per eum pater mundo innotuit, vel . . . (etc.).

Gl. Ord. Verbum dicitur vel quod profertur et transit . . . (etc.).

Gl. Int. *deus.* ipse filius erat deus.
Gl. Ord. *Et verbum.* Alii subito inter homines apparuisse; Iohannes dicit apud deum semper fuisse.

Gl. Int. *Hoc erat.* ita erat unum cum patre, ut omnium creaturarum principium sua praeciret essentia.

Gl. Ord. Alii dicunt miracula, quae fecit homo in mundo; Iohannes per ipsum omnia facta esse testatur.

Gl. Int. *omnia.* i.e. omnis creatura visibilis et invisibilis.

Enarrationes in Iohannem

Si nichil creaturarum subsistentium sine ipso factum est, nichil et ipso factum est, patet quia ipse creatura non est, per quem omnis creatura facta est.

et sine ipso factum est nihil. Subaudias: earum rerum quae subsistunt.

Malum autem, peccatum, et dolus per ipsum facta non sunt, quia nichil sunt. Nulla enim sua subsistunt natura.

Cuncta autem, quae pondus, mensuram, et numerum habere possunt, per verbum facta sunt, omnis compago, omnis concordia partium; deus omnia fecit et in gradibus collocavit. Hic facit finem theologie suae. Et cum aliquis audiat mutabilem creaturam per filium factam, ne credat eius mutabilem voluntatem, quasi subito vellet facere aliquid, quod ab eterno non fecerit.

Subponit: *Quod factum est*, in tempore sive vivum sive carens vita; in spirituali ratione scilicet idem semper vivit et vixit. Faber faciens archam primo habet in arte archam, deinde illam fabricando profert. Potest archa putrescere, et iterum ex illa quae est in arte, alia fabricari. Archa in opere non est vita; archa in arte vita est, quia vivit anima artificis ubi ista sunt, antequam proferuntur. Quod factum est transit; quod est in sapientia, transire non potest. Quod si aliquis non potest capere, qua ratione omnia, quae per verbum facta sunt, et uniformiter vixerunt et vivunt in artifice, alias: Christo lacte facto per carnem nutritur cor, ut ad solidum cibum, i.e. ad christum a patre natum verum deum, perveniat.

Unde subponit: *Et vita erat lux hominum*, i.e. illa dei sapientia, per quam facta sunt omnia, quae in natura suae divinitatis super omnia

Glossa

Gl. Int. nulla res subsistens sine ipso est facta.

Gl. Ord. Non est creatura, per quem omnis creatura facta est.

Gl. Int. nulla res subsistens sine ipso est facta.

Gl. Ord. Malum non est factum per ipsum, nec ipsum idolum, quia nihil sunt; nulla sua natura subsistunt.

Gl. Int. *omnia*. omnis forma, omnis compago, omnis concordia partium.

Gl. Ord. Augustinus. Si audis mutabilem creaturam per filium factam, non tamen credas mutabilem eius voluntatem: quia non subito aliquid voluit facere, sed omnia ab aeterno fecit.

Gl. Int. *factum*. in tempore. *in ipso*. in spirituali factoris ratione semper vivit et vixit.

Gl. Ord. Faber enim arcam prius facit in mente, post in opere. Quod in mente est, vivit cum artifice; quod fit, mutatur cum tempore.

Gl. Ord. Quod factum est in tempore, transit; quod in sapientia immutabili est, transire non potest.

Gl. Int. *vita*. haec, i.e. sapientia dei.

*Enarrationes in Iohannem**Glossa*

erat et incognita per assumptionem nature, in qua videri posset, in cognitionem angelice et humane nature descendit.

Ex ipsa vita non pecora, sed homines ad imaginem dei facti illuminantur, quia capaces rationis. Si mundi sunt a viciis, possunt comprehendere sapientiam dei. Vita autem illa lux mentium et super mentes est, et excidit omnes mentes. Sed stulti, qui propter peccata tenebre appellantur, illam lucem quasi absentem cogitant esse, quia non percipit homo animalis, que sunt spiritus dei. Unde subdit:

Lux in tenebris lucet et tenebrae eam non comprehenderunt. Sicut cecus in sole presentem habet solem, sed absens est ipse soli, sic christus corda impiorum hominum manifeste cognoscit, licet ipse ab illis ignoretur, quia qui per vicia ab humane conditionis honore recesserunt, comparabiles iumentis insipientibus, recte voluntatis luce privantur. Et tamen istis divina misericordia consuluit, ut possent pervenire ad illam veram lucem et fierent filii lucis, qui erant filii tenebrarum. Quia qui apparuit ut homo, in homine latebat secundum deitatem.

Missus ergo fuit quidam magnus homo a deo cui nomen erat iohannes. Poterat loqui de deo, quia missus erat a deo; homo, non angelus, ut heretici volunt. De deo ergo locuturus a deo premititur homo, ut per eius testimonium inveniretur plus quam homo.

Cui nomen iohannes, i.e. gratia dei, vel, in quo est gratia; qui gratiam novi testamenti, i.e. christum, suo testimonio primum mundo innotuit. Uel iohannes interpretatur 'cui donatum est', quia per gratiam dei donatum est ei regem regum non solum precurrere, sed etiam baptizare... (etc.). Unde sequitur:

Gl. Int. *hominum.* non aliarum rerum.

Gl. Int. *in tenebris.* Tamen a tenebris non cernebatur.

Gl. Int. *tenebrae.* ante incarnationem, sicut nec caecus comprehendit lucem super se lucentem.

Gl. Ord. *Homo missus.* Homo, non angelus, ut heretici volunt, a deo.

Gl. Int. *iohannes.* i.e. gratia; qui totum a gratia habet et gratiam praedicat.

Enarrationes in Iohannem

Non erat ille lux, sed missus est, ut testimonium perhiberet de lumine. Quare hoc? Vt omnes crederent per illum.

Sancti lux vocantur, sed magna distantia inter lucem que illuminat, et lucem que illuminatur et de lumine testimonium perhibet. . . .

(i 15) Ego non sum, quem me suspicamini esse, sed *hic* natus de virgine, conceptus de spiritu sancto, *erat* ab eterno,

quem dixi vobis querentibus, si ego essem christus.

Hoc

dixi vobis et hoc dico:

Iste, *qui post me venturus est*, quia sicut post me est natus, ita post me baptizaturus, predicaturus, signa facturus, per que omnia sublimitas humanitatis eius pre ceteris hominibus apparebit. . . .

(i 29) Ergo *altera die* christianus populus

videt redemptorem dicens: *ecce agnus dei*. Ecce innocens et ab omni peccato immunis, qui non habens traducem de adam carnem assumpsit, de adam peccatum non assumpsit.

Qui tollit peccatum mundi, qui mitis inter pios, quia peccatum de nobis non assumpsit. Potestatem habet peccata solvendi et impios iustificandi.

Hic est de quo. iam diu *dixi vobis*: post me natus, post me predicaturus michi est antepositus, utpote iudex preconis, sol lucifero.

Quia prior me erat. *Quia in principio erat verbum*. *Post me venit vir*, tempus humane conditionis, quo iohanne posterior est, intellige.

Qui ante me factus est. Primatus potestatis regie prior etiam angelis presidet, quia *prior me erat* eternitas maiestatis divine, qua patri equalis est.

Post me venit nativitate, qui precellit dignitate, quia prior divinitate.

Glossa

Gl. Int. *erat ille lux sed*. missus erat.
Gl. Int. *de lumine*. quare?

Gl. Int. *non erat*. magnus quidem erat iste, non tamen ex se lucens. Sunt tamen sancti lux illuminata.

Gl. Int. *Hic erat*. ab eterno.

Gl. Int. *quem dixi*. vobis querentibus, an essem christus.

Gl. Int. *venturus est*. et quod dixi, iterum dico.

Gl. Ord. *Qui post me*. Qui post me natus, post me praedicaturus, baptizaturus, moriturus.

Gl. Ord. *Altera die*. Typice. Iohannes, i.e. populus gratiae;

altera die, i.e. post legem cognoscit agnum, quo redimitur.

Gl. Int. *agnus*. innocens immolandus, quia non cum traduce carnis natus.

Gl. Int. *post me*. post preconem rex.

Gl. Ord. *Post me*. Christus. . . filius dei, in quo patri congruit.

Gl. Int. *post me*. nativitate et caeteris. *ante me*. dignitate. *prior me*. deitate.

Enarrationes in Iohannem

(iii 29) *Hoc ergo gaudium meum, i.e. quia sto et audio et gaudeo propter vocem eius.*

(v 1) *Post hec dies festus iudeorum et ascendit iesus hierosolymis.* Hic duo miracula recitantur, unum invisibiliter per angelicam administrationem, alterum per dominicam presentiam visibiliter exhibitum. Homo pro hominibus factus cum hominibus solennitates lege constitutas celebrat.

Est autem ierosolimis... Probatica grece, pecualis latine. Probato (!) quippe dicitur ovis. Ibi sacerdotes cadavera hostiarum abluebant. Mistic hec piscina que quinque porticibus cingitur, significat populum iudeorum legis custodia undique munitum, ne peccaret. Et bene per aquam piscine significatur populus ille, quia sicut aqua piscine modo stat placida, modo irruentibus ventis turbatur, ita ille populus in quibusdam vite mundiciam servare, in quibusdam inmundorum spirituum temptationibus agitari solebat. Et bene piscina probatica dicitur, quia erant in illo populo, qui merito simplicis et innocentis vite poterant dicere: *Nos autem populus tuus et oves pascue tue...* (etc.).

Multitudo languencium, que in porticibus iacebat aque motum expectans, significat eorum catervas, qui verba legis audientes, ac se suis viribus implere non posse dolebant, et ideo dominice gratie auxilium totis anime affectibus optabant. *Ceci* erant, qui nondum fidei lumen habebant. *Claudi,* qui bona, que agenda essent, noverant, sed ad implenda boni operis gressibus surgere nequibant. *Aridi,* qui oculum quidem sciencie habent, sed spei et dilectionis pinguedine egent. Tales in quinque porti-

Glossa

Gl. Ord. *Hoc ergo.* In hoc gaudium meum est plenum, quia factus sum amicus sponsi, et quia sto et audio. Gl. Int. Ita ergo et ego gaudeo ad vocem sponsi, quia ipse me illuminavit.

Gl. Ord. *Angelus autem.* Ecce duo miracula. Unum invisibiliter per angelum in piscina, alterum visibiliter a domino... (etc.).

Gl. Int. *ascendit.* solennitatem celebrat cum hominibus homo.

Gl. Ord. Ieronimus. *Est autem.* Probato grece, dicitur ovis latine. Probatica ergo pecualis, quia ibi abluebantur cadavera hostiarum. Significat autem aqua illa populum Iudaeorum, qui modo stat quietus, modo ventis tentationum turbatur; qui dicunt domino: *Nos populus tuus sumus et oves pascue tue* (Ps xcix 3).

Gl. Ord. [Populus Iudaeorum] quinque porticibus, i.e. lege quae in quinque libris est, innuitur. Ibi multi infirmi, quia lex non sanat, sed prodit infirmos, ut aliquando querant medicum. Ceci ibi sunt, qui non habent lumen fidei. *Claudi,* qui quod vident, non possunt operari. *Aridi,* qui quodquod agunt, sunt sine pinguedine charitatis. Expectabant aquae motum, in quo sanitas fiebat per angelum, quia lege coniuncti gratiam redemptionis desiderabant.

*Enarrationes in Iohannem**Glossa*

cibus iacebant, sed nonnisi angelo descendente in piscinam sanari poterant, quia per legem cognitio peccati, sed gratia remissionis etiam nisi per christum.

(vi 22) *Altera die.* Turbis, quae erant trans mare, unde venerunt, insinuatum est tam magnum miraculum. Viderunt enim, quod discipuli soli ascendissent in navim, et quia navis non erat ibi nisi illa, in qua intraverunt discipuli, in quam ipse non introivit. . . (etc.).

Ecce presentat se turbis, qui timens rapi ab illis fugerat in montem, ut qui dedit exemplum fugiende laudis, fugiendi terreni imperii det exemplum doctoribus, qualiter debeant insistere predicationi.

Gl. Ord. *Altera die.* Insinuatum est turbae hoc miraculum, quod super aquas Iesus ambulasset, quia non fuerit ibi nisi navis una, et in eam non intravit Iesus cum discipulis. . . (etc.).

Gl. Ord. *Et cum invenissent.* Ecce praesens est eis, quos fugerat, ne eum regem facerent. . . [Docet] eos quos doctores instituit, fugere laudem et terrenum imperium, sed tamen insistere predicationi.

These and similar passages admit only of one interpretation: that these *Enarrationes* were a main source of the *Glossa* on St John's gospel. There were others besides, one of the most important being John the Scot's commentary on the Fourth Gospel (see Appendix B). If these *Enarrationes* are really Anselm's (and there is no reason to suppose that they are not), we can make one statement with full certainty: At Anselm of Laon's death (in 1117) the *Glossa* did not yet exist.

APPENDIX D

The Gospel Glosses in the Harleian MS 1802
(about 1140, from Armagh)

(See chap. v, p. 211 f.)

THIS MS is a very small book ($6\frac{1}{2}$ by $4\frac{3}{16}$ in.; the space covered by the writing of the gospel text proper measures only $4\frac{7}{20}$ by $2\frac{3}{10}$ in.) written in the pointed angular hand which is characteristic of the later Irish script.

The book begins (f. 1^r) with Jerome's letter to Damasus. Then follows: *Incipit argumentum evangelii(i) matthei. Matheus ex iudeis* . . . (etc.). This is followed, as if it were another preface,

by the genealogy of Matthew (Mt i 1-17), with the Old Latin addition at the end: *Omnes itaque generationes ab abraham usque ad christum generationes sunt .xlii. finit.* The next paragraph bears the heading: *De interpretatione eb(raicorum) n(ominum)*, and begins: *bartholomeus syrum, id est filius suspendentis aquas. . .* (etc.). Then follow the customary prefaces to Mark, Luke, and John. After these (f. 9^r) there is a general introduction to the gospels, which runs as follows: -

Evangelia .iiii. ideo sunt: quia unam ecclesiam per .iiii. partes mundi dilatandam describunt; sunt, quia quadrangulum verbum immutabile est, ut lapis quadrangulus non vacillet; ut hieronimus dicit: 'Per hoc stabilitas indicatur evangeli(c)a omnibus her(e)sibus resistens'. Sunt, quia duorum vel trium testium numerus in lege 5 commendatus est, unusquisque eorum omnibus reliquis utitur.

Evangelia .iiii. liquoribus comparantur: Matheus melli, propter perfectorum dulcedinem praeceptorum comparatur; Marcus vino, propter austeritatem penitentiae in primordio sui sermonis intimatam; Lucas lacti, propter sinceræ et mistice candorem doctrinae. Iohannis 10 oleo, propter eminentem et omnia superantem divinitatis lucem, quae ipsius voluminis exordium corruscat. Elementis quoque .iiii.^{or} principalibus evangelia comparantur. Matheus terre, quia omnium elementorum quasi fundamentum est, comparatur. Marcus aquae 15 baptismatis, qui inprimis loquitur sacramentum. Lucas (a)eri, qui interpretatur: ipse elevatur; qui ab inferioribus nascituri hominis 15 misteriis usque ad ascensionem domini in caelum continuato sermone pertingit, sicut aer a terra ad caelum porrigitur. Iohannis igni, qui divinitatis ignem omnia penetrantem suo protendit volumine, dicente moysse: *Deus noster ignis consumens est.*

Deut iv 24
Hebr xii

29

Matheus arat, marcus seminat, lucas irrigat, iohannes incrementum dat, ut messis multa fidelium sit perfecta atque matura. .Iiii.^{or} quoque 29 temporibus anni comparantur. Matheus hiemi initia per pampinos omnium fructuum coalenti; unde arare dicitur. Marcus veri post hiemem in flores et ge(r)mina erumpenti; unde seminare dicitur. 25 Lucas estati post vernum tempus crescentia terre germina pluvialibus aquis irriganti ac solis claritate, eo quod ipse ut matheus preceptis abundet divinis et divinitatem virtutibus plurimis contestatur; unde irrigare dicitur. Iohannes autumnum post estatis calorem et irrigationem cuncta ad maturitatis perfectionem provehenti, cui narrande 30 christi divinitatis et consummandi canonis perfectio data est a domino; unde incrementum dare dicitur. His .iiii. temporibus annus domini acceptabilis cum duodeno apostolorum numero quasi .xii. mensibus completur.

(Cf. pseudo-Augustine, Migne xxxv 2391; Christian of Stavelot, Migne cvi 1264.)

f. 9^v is covered by a poem in Irish. The gospel text proper (from Mt i 18 onwards) extends from f. 10^r to the end of the book, the only extraneous material being short subscriptions and verses in Latin and Irish at the end of each gospel, of which more will be said later.

The interest of the book lies in the numerous marginal and interlinear glosses which extend over the whole of Matthew and the beginnings of the other gospels. We propose to print a selection, first of the marginal glosses, stating in the second column the source from which the particular gloss was borrowed, and giving the corresponding passage from the Glossa. Two important facts will emerge from the comparison: (1) that there is an undeniable connection between the glosses of MS Harl. 1802 and the Glossa; (2) that the Glossa is posterior to our MS; for the glosses of this book obviously are jottings taken during lectures on exegesis, and surely no student would have troubled to take such notes, if the same material, in a more balanced and complete form, had been available in the Glossa.

Marginal Glosses in MS Harl. 1802 Sources of the Glosses in MS Harl. 1802, and Final Form in the Glossa

(Mt i 16) *Quaestio famosa hic oritur: quare lucas ioseph filium heli dicit, Mathius vero filium esse iacob testatur. Quomodo enim est, ut unum habes quaestionis nodum. Africanus de consonantia euangeliorum scribens apertissime solvit. Mathan, inquit, et mathat diuersis temporibus de una eademque uxore estha nomine singulos filios procreauerunt, quia mathan, qui per salimonem descendit, uxorem eam prius acceperat, et relicto uno filio iacob defunctus est. Post cuius obitum mathat, qui et melchi dicitur, qui per nathan genus ducit, cum esset ex eadem tribu, sed non eodem genere, relictam accepit uxorem et ex ea ipse filium nomine heli accepit. Per quod ex diverso genere patrum efficiuntur iacob et eli uterini fratres, quorum alter, i.e. iacob, fratris heli sine liberis defuncti uxorem ex mandato legis accipiens genuit ioseph, natura*

The gloss was probably taken from Anselm of Laon's *Enarrationes in Matthaeum* (Migne clxii 1246). Together with this a pseudo-Augustinian *Quaestio* may have been used (namely: Migne xxxv 2253); cf. also Augustine's *Sermons* (Migne xxxviii 348 f.); *De consensu* (Migne xxxiv 1073 f.). The gloss was obviously taken down during a lecture. The corresponding passage in the Glossa Ordinaria runs as follows: *Mattheus dicit Ioseph filium Iacob, et Iacob filium Mathan. Lucas Ioseph filium Heli, et Heli filium Mathat. Sed Mathan et Mathat de eadem uxore Hesta nomine singulos genuerunt. Mathan, qui per Salomonem descendit, eam prius duxit, et relicto uno filio, Iacob, obiit et postea Mathat; qui per Nathan descendit de David, eandem duxit et genuit Heli. Sic Iacob et Heli fratres sunt uterini. Iacob autem uxorem Heli fratris sui sine liberis defuncti ad*

Marginal Glosses

filium sui quidem germinis. Per quod et scribitur, *iacob autem genuit ioseph*. Secundum vero praeceptum legis heli filius fuit, cuius iacob, quia frater erat, uxorem ad suscitandam fratri prolem acceperat. Et sic concordant matheus et lucas in hoc quoque. Consentit eusebius cesariensis.

(ii 2) .gḡ. Quaeritur, cur per stellam ostensus est christus magis, et per angelum ostensus est pastoribus. Congruenter quidem ostensus est per creaturam rationabilem, i.e. per angelum, iudeis manentibus sub ratione legis moysi. Congruenter autem ostensus est per mutum sidus gentibus mutis, infidelitate positus, et quia gentes creaturas adorabant.

(iii 10) .āḡ. Quatuor genera arborum sunt: unum inar(e)scibile sine foliis et fructibus et nihil prodest nisi ad ignem, i.e. iudeus, qui idola colit. Secundum viride cum foliis et sine fructibus et non prodest nisi ad ignem, i.e. iudeus cum viriditate scientiae et verborum sine fructu bonorum operum. Tertium viride cum foliis et fructibus non bonis, i.e. qui declinat in heresim. Quartum viride cum foliis et fructibus bonis. Ipsa est arbor quae non traditur igni.

(11) .bēā. *fortior* etc.). Qui ab adam usque ad christum per .lxxiii. generationes misericordiam, et qui peccata septies et septuagies dimittit, qui semel abluit peccata per baptismum.

(*Ib.*) .āḡ. Ignis quatuor continet: urit, calescit, illuminat, et sanctificat. Ita spiritus sanctus urit vitia, calescit mentes, illuminat corda, purgat et sanctificat corpora in praesenti vel in futuro.

Source, and Glossa

suscitandum semen eius accipiens genuit ioseph, natura suum, sed secundum legem Heli filium.

Cf. Anselm of Laon (*ib.* 1254; Anselm drew on Gregory's Homilies, Migne lxxvi 1110). Gl. Ord.: Christum nondum loquentem muta stella praedicat, postea loquentem apostoli nunciaverunt. Iudeis tanquam ratione utentibus substantia rationalis, i.e. angelus, ortum Christi nunciavit. Magos vero, primitias gentium nondum ratione utentium, irrationalis, i.e. stella, perduxit. Gl. Int.: signa non fidelibus, sed infidelibus data sunt.

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1264 D); Rabanus (Migne cvii 771). Gl. Ord.: Arbor humanum genus. Huius rami alii sunt aridi, i.e. pagani incendio apti. Alii virides, sed sine fructu, ut hypocritae, qui speciem sanctitatis praetendunt, sed intus vacui. Alii fructuosi, sed venenosi, i.e. haeretici, qui praedicando fructum pariunt, sed mortalem. Alii, i.e. catholici, qui bonum fructum ferunt.

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1265 B); Beda (Migne xcii 16 and 355); Rabanus (*ib.* 772). Gl. Ord.: *Fortior me est*. Quia ego baptizo in penitentiam, ille in remissionem; ego spiritum habeo, ille dat; ego regnum caelorum praedico, ille dat.

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1266); Rabanus (*ib.* 773). The Glossa contains no similar gloss.

Marginal Glosses

(15) .hīr. Cur christus baptizatus est ab iohanne? Ideo pro his causis: Ut esset exemplum ceteris, ne se aliquis putaret esse sanctum, cui opus non esset baptizari; ut exemplum daret sublimibus humilitatis; cum dominus a servo et deus ab homine accepit baptismum, nemo a conseruo suo accipere dedignetur; et ut aquas iordanis sanctificaret.

(iv 1) *ductus est.* Cur in desertum specialiter perrexit? Ideo quia de paradiso in desertum adam primus eiectus est. In desertum autem adam secundus reversus est, ut, ubi vicit diabolus, ibi vinceretur, et ubi cecidit homo, ibi vinceret homo.

(2) .hīr. Cur non .xl. diebus tantum dixit vel .xl. noctibus? Ideo scilicet, ut ne (!) putaretur, quod in diebus tantum vel noctibus ieiunasset. Ideo .xl. in abstinentia custodivit, quia numero legis, i.e. x, et evangelio, i.e. .iiii., convenit. Hoc numero totum tempus seculi huius significatur, quia mundus quadripartitus est, in quo famulatur deo. Et x sunt praecepta quibus deo servimus, et per totum hoc tempus adversarius nos temptat, sicut dominus noster temptatus est.

(10) *vade retro satanas.* In ignem eternum, qui preparatus est et tibi et angelis tuis.

Source, and Glossa

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1267): Plures causae sunt quare Christus ad baptismum accessit. Primo ut exemplo nos invitaret, ne aliquis forte ab inferiori... baptizari erubesceret, et ita perfectionem totius iustitiae, scil. baptismum, devitaret. Secundo, ut baptismo suo baptismum Ioannis confirmaret. Tertio, ut aquas confirmaret. Cf. also Beda (*ib.* 17); Rabanus (*ib.* 775); Hieronymus (Migne xxvi 31). Gl. Ord.: Venit Iesus his de causis, ut baptismum Iohannis comprobaret et ut, quia homo erat, omnem impleeret iustitiam et legis humilitatem; et ut aquas sanctificans... adventum spiritus sancti ostenderet.

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1270); Hilarius (Migne ix 928). Gl. Ord.: In deserto pugnatur asperis, quia Adam in paradiso delitiis affluens victus est oblectamentis. Historialiter: In illo deserto, quod est inter ierusalem et iericho, Christus diabolum vicit, ubi figuraliter dixerat Adam incidisse in latrones et eum vicisse.

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1271); Rabanus (*ib.* 779 f.). Gl. Ord.: Quadraginta diebus quattuor partes sunt mundi, de quibus christus suos congregat, et decem precepta legis, quibus suos contra mundi oblectamenta armat. . . . Quadraginta: hic numerus totum tempus designat, quo christus cum suis dimicat. In hoc numero duo leges per abstinentiam complentur: quia in quadraginta decalogus mandatorum et quattuor evangelia resonant. Unde institutum est nos hoc numero acrius dimicare ad diluenda peccata quae fiunt, dum motu carnis violatur charitas. Et sic, quamdiu hic sumus, semper peccata ploremus, quia hoc numero praesens vita ostenditur.

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1275); Hieron. (*ib.* 33); Rabanus (*ib.* 785). Gl. Int.: *Vade.* in ignem aeternum.

Marginal Glosses

(Ib.) *servies*. I.e. secundum servitutem quae latres dicitur. Secundum vero servitutem quae dules, et omnes [debent] servire, quia communis deo et homini et cuilibet creaturae.

(18) .hīr. Quaestio hic oritur, quia hos fratres electos esse secundum mattheum post iohannem traditum in carcerem, secundum vero iohannem constat electos ante traditionem eius in carcerem. Sic solvitur: in electione quam iohannes memorat, quamvis electi et per fidem secuti sunt eum, non tamen penitus naves et totam conversationem secularem reliquerunt; in hac vero secundum mattheum omnia reliquerunt et christum secuti sunt.

(23) *sanans*. Cur sanavit corpora, si ad sanandas animas venit? Forsan venit ad utraque, vel predicatio magis crescit.

(24) *lunaticos*. Non lunaticos, sed qui putabantur lunatici ob demonum fallaciam, quia demones lunaria tempora observabant creaturam infamare, ut in creatorem inducerent blasphemiam.

(v 23) .g̃g. *Si ergo offeres* etc. Quod si accipiatur ad litteram, fortassis aliquis credat ita fieri oportere, si presens frater est. Si autem absens ille est trans mare constitutus, absurdum est credere, ante altare munus relinquendum, quia post terras et maria pererrata offeras deo. Itaque spiritualiter interiore dei templo ipsam fidem accipere possumus. *Altare*, i.e. mens fidelis, si in mentem venerit, quod aliquid adversum suos habeat. *Frater* ille

Source, and Glossa

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1275, probably from Remigius); Rabanus (*ib.* 786). Gl. Ord.: *Servies*. Grece latreosis; later servitus dicitur. Servitus communis deo et homini et cuicumque, grece dulia dicitur.

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1279 f.); August., *De consensu* (*ib.* 1094 f.); Rabanus (*ib.* 790). Gl. Ord.: Matthaues dicit. . . , Iohannes dicit. . . Sed incertum est, utrum illi iam adhaesissent [discipuli], ut hic recapitulando dicatur quasi prius factum, an descendisse cum eo dicantur discipuli. Non quia tunc discipuli, sed quia futuri.

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1281 D); Rabanus (*ib.* 792). Gl. Ord.: Curare languorem et infirmitatem non fuit magnum, cum postea morituri. Sed ideo factum, ut sic erigerentur ad regnum, moraliter instruens predicatores etiam terrena subsidia subditis ministrare et sic ad regnum trahere.

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1282); Hieron. (*ib.* 34). Gl. Ord.: Lunaticos dicit illos, quorum morbus in ascensione crescit lunae. Non quia haec insania sit per lunam, sed diabolus, qui insaniam facit, lunaria tempora servat, ut infamet creaturam in creatoris blasphemiam.

Rabanus (*ib.* 808); the original source was August., *De Sermone Domini in Monte* (Migne xxxiv 1242), which has been copied rather literally. The Glossa Ordin. has the passage in a somewhat condensed form: *Si ergo* etc. Secundum litteram hoc absurdum est. Est ergo in interiore templo *altare*, i.e. fides; cui quodlibet *munus*, i.e. psalmus, hymnus, oratio; et homini nisi sit innixum, non est deo placitum. *Et ibi*, i.e. cum in corde (quod est

Marginal Glosses

est, si nos eum in aliquo lesimus. Tunc enim ipse habet, nam nos adversum illum habemus. Si ille nos leserit, ubi non pergere opus est, ad reconciliationem pergendum est, non pedibus corporis, sed motibus anime.

(32) *Ego autem* etc. Videri potest contrarium, quod hic vetat dimitti uxorem *excepta causa* (etc.), et discipulum suum negat posse, quamquam non qui oderit uxorem. Bonus christianus potest diligere in una femina creaturam dei, scilicet quasi homo est, et odisse coniunctionem copulationemque corruptibilem, quod est uxor. Hoc de patre et matre et ceteris intelligendum.

(vi 2) *hipocrita*. .ḡ. Simulator vel falsus iudex vel false iudicans.

(viii 29) .hī. *Quid nobis*. Quomodo hic agnoscunt demones deum, cum in eremo adversarius eum non potuit agnoscere? Alii dicunt, non quod celatum ab his, qui in more malitiae sunt. Quod ridiculum est. Sed suspicari magis quam nosse filium dei intelligendi sunt. *Filii dei*. Non voluntatis ista confessio, sed necessitatis, veluti servi fugitivi post multum temporis videant... (etc.).

(31) *Mitte nos*. Quaeritur cur porcos specialiter petunt et non homines. Prima causa, quia non audent adire formam in qua christum viderant. Secunda, quia animalia in lege

Source, and Glossa

templum interius) tale munus oblaturus es, si in mente venerit, quod *frater tuus habet aliquid adversum te*, quem tu lesisti. Si enim ipse te lesit, non ipse, sed tu habes adversum eum, nec tunc oportet te veniam petere, sed dare sicut vis tibi dimitti.

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1298); August. *De Sermone* (*ib.* 1249 f.). Gl. Ord.: Hic iubet uxorem non dimitti, qui alibi dicit: *Qui non oderit patrem et matrem et filium etc. non potest esse meus discipulus*. Ideo dictum est, quia in regno dei nulla est conditio vite presentis quam qui non oderit et ut finiatur optaverit, nondum diligit regnum dei. Odit ergo non homines, quos potius vult secum manere, sed corruptibilem coniunctionem in uxore, legem miseram nascendi et moriendi in parentibus.

August. (*ib.* 1271). Gl. Int.: Hypocrita est, qui simulat quod non est; representator aliae personae.

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1326) must have been the only source of this gloss; cf.: ...Sed credendum est illos nequaquam Christum Deum esse cognovisse, sed suspicari tantum pro signorum magnitudine... Hilarius tamen dicit demones cognovisse Christum his verbis: 'Non voluntatis ista confessio est, sed necessitatis extorsio, quae cogit invitos. Velut servi fugitivi post multum temporis dominum suum videntes...'. Ambrosius dicit: 'Tantum eis innotuit...'. Gl. Ord.: Hylarius. Magis suspicari quam nosse credendi sunt. Ambrosius... Non sicut angelis per hoc quod est vita et lux, sed eis terrendis per quaedam virtutis effecta potentiam eius timent ad poenam... .

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1326): Quaeritur, quare demones petant intrare porcos; scilicet ex iniquitate sua, ut, cum non possunt hominum nocere corporibus, noceant rebus exteri-

Marginal Glosses

sanctificata intrare non audent. Tertia, talis domus immunda immundis hospitibus conveniebat. Cur non in aerem voluerunt ire? i.e. pro nimio desiderio nocendi hominibus. Cur non audent nisi iubentur? i.e. ut ostendant nihil posse facere nisi iussu dei.

(x 25) .hiF. Hic est sensus: Nolite timere persecutionum sevitiā et blasphemantium rabiem, quia adveniet dies iudicii, in quo nostra virtus et eorum nequitia demonstrabitur.

And similarly throughout the glosses on Matthew. Of the other gospels only the beginnings have been glossed. We quote a few cases from the beginnings of Luke and John respectively.

(Lc i 5) *Herodis regis*. Tempus quoque herodis alienigene videlicet regis et ipsum dominico adtestatur adventui. Predictum namque fuerat, quod non deficiat princeps ex iuda neque dux de femoribus eius, donec veniat qui mittendus est.

(6) .b. *iusti ante deum*. Non enim omnis qui iustus est ante hominem, iustus est ante deum. Aliter vident homines, aliter videt deus: homines in facie, deus in corde.

(Ib.) *Sine querela*. Apostolus ait: *providentes bona, non tantum coram deo, sed etiam coram hominibus* (Rom xii 17).

(11) *angelus domini*. Bene angelus et in templo iuxta altare et a dextris apparet, quod viz. et veri sacerdotis adventus et misterium sacrificii universalis et celestis doni gaudium predicat. Nam sicut per sinistram presentia, sic per dexteram sepe bona pronuntiantur; iuxta quod sapientia canitur: *Longitudo dierum in dextera eius, in sinistra illius divitiæ et gloria* (Prov iii 16).

Source, and Glossa

oribus. Petunt autem ideo licentiam a Deo, quia nec rebus hominum nocere possunt nisi permissione Dei. Gl. Ord.: Nota multo minus eos sine potestate nocere hominibus, qui nec pecoribus possunt.

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1345); pseudo-Beda (*ib.* 54). Gl. Ord.: *Ne ergo timete* etc. eorum sevitiā vel blasphemias, quia veniet dies, cum deus iudicabit occulta hominum, ubi et nequitia discooperietur.

The immediate source has not yet come to light (see above, p. 206). In the last instance Bede's commentary on Luke must have been the source (Migne xcii 309). Gl. Int.: *Herodis regis*. Iam alienigena regnabat.

Beda (*ib.* 310 A); Ambrosius, *Comm. in Lucam* (Migne xv 1620). Gl. Ord.: *Iusti ante Deum*. Ambrosius. Non enim omnis qui iustus est ante homines, iustus est ante deum. Aliter enim vident homines, aliter deus. Homines in facie, deus in corde.

Beda (*ib.* 310 B). Gl. Ord.: . . . unde Apostolus, *Providentes bona, non tantum coram deo, sed etiam coram hominibus*.

Beda (*ib.* 311 B): Bene angelus et in templo, et iuxta altare, et a dextris apparet, quia viz. et veri sacerdotis adventum, et misterium sacrificii universalis, et coelestis doni gaudium praedicat. Nam sicut per sinistram praesentia, sic per dexteram saepe bona praenuntiantur aeterna. Iuxta quod in sapientiae laude canitur: *Longitudo dierum in dextera eius, in sinistra illius divitiæ et gloria*. The Gl. Ord. reads similarly.

Marginal Glosses

(Jo i 48) *unde me nosti*. Lingua, locus, tempus, habitus, caro, cultus, et esus gentibus a reliquis disting[u]nt israelitas.

(ii 8) *architriclinus*. Gennadius: *Architriclinus*, i.e. princeps triclinii.

(iii 3) *denuo*. Gennadius: *denuo*, 'iterum', ex greco 'rursus'.

Source, and Glossa

Perhaps the source was John the Scot's commentary, which on this passage is missing.

Source? Gl. Int.: *architriclinus*. princeps triclinii. Est enim in medium spacium domus a parietibus, ubi sedebant convivantes.

Augustinus, *Comm. in Iohannem* (Migne xxxv 1478); Joh. Scot. (Migne cxxii 315). Gl. Int.: *denuo*. ex greco rursus.

It is to be regretted that the glosses on John in the Harl. MS are so few in number. For it seems from the three specimens here quoted that John the Scot's commentary on St John's gospel was known in the school where the glosses in MS Harl. 1802 were written.¹ In that case our MS would show the first trace of John the Scot's commentary on the Fourth Gospel in use in that exegetical movement of the twelfth century which finally resulted in the Glossa. We have seen (Appendix B) that John the Scot's commentary was to a large extent incorporated in the Glossa, whereas it was not yet known to Anselm of Laon when he wrote his *Enarrationes in Iohannem* (Appendix C). MS Harl. 1802, then, would seem to have originated in the school where John the Scot's work was inserted in that series of commentaries which culminated in the Glossa.

Next we shall give a selection of the interlinear glosses in MS Harl. 1802. These consist partly of variant readings, partly of genuine glosses.

¹ If this is so, it is strange that John the Scot's commentary should have passed as the work of Gennadius. This may be explained by the assumption that that commentary had fallen into oblivion for a long period, until it was rediscovered by the lecturer in whose class the notes in MS Harl. 1802 were written. This lecturer (Peter the Lombard; see below) either was ignorant of the real author of the work and wrongly attributed it to Gennadius; or else he knew that the real author had been declared a heretic in 1050, and he wished to disguise, under the name of an unsuspect author, the commentary which he found very useful for his purpose of expounding the Fourth Gospel. It is significant that Vincent of Beauvais, too, mentions a ninth-century exponent whom he calls Gennadius, and whom we strongly suspect to be John the Scot (*Speculum Doctrinale*, lib. xix, c. 59: 'De Alcuino et Gennadio et Rabbano et Strabo').

*Interlinear Variants in the Gospel
Text of MS Harl. 1802*

(Mt ii 5) *iude. non iudeae, sicut in aliis exemplaribus male legitur.*

(iii 9) *potest. † potens est deus suscitare.*

(iv 10) *vade retro satanas* first hand; then *retro* was deleted by dots.

(vi 13) *nos inducas. ne patiaris nos induci.*

(ix 6) *gravatum* (instead of the Vulgate reading *lectum*). *gravatum* graecum est, *lectum* latine.

(xi 14) *venturus est. Lucas addidit, et restituet omnia; † eos quos persecutio ante christum conturbaverit; † ipse restituet debita mortis quae debentur omni homini.*

(19) *a filiis suis. † operibus suis.*

(20) *tunc coepit. .hīf. Transivit a civitate † circumibat iesus civitates et omnes vicos.*

(xxi 31) *primus. † novissimus. Sciendum est in veris exemplaribus. . . (etc.).*

*Interlinear Glosses in
MS Harl. 1802*

(Mt iii 11) *fortior. i.e. qui donat regna caelorum quam qui dimittit peccata.*

(12) *ventilabrum. i.e. iudicium.*

*Source ('auctoritas') of the
Variant Reading*

Hieron., *In Matthaeum* (Migne xxvi 26): Librarium hic error est. Putamus enim ab evangelista primum editum, sicut in ipso hebraico legimus, *Iudae, non Iudaeae.*

The alternative reading is the modern one (alc W vg), which is also advocated by Ans. Laud. (Migne clxii 1264).

Both Hieron. (*ib.* 33) and Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1275) refute the reading *vade retro.*

The interlinear reading is representative of the Irish type of text.

The reading *grabatum* is represented in Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1329).

Hieron. (*ib.* 76); Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1352): *a filiis suis, i.e. ab operibus suis.*

Cf. Gl. Ord. (which, however, is later than the Harl. MS): Supra ubi legitur, *quia circumibat iesus civitates et omnes vicos. . . .*

Hieron. (*ib.* 162), and thence in the Glossa.

*Source, and Final Form
in the Glossa*

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1265): *Fortior me est. Ego enim sum fortis ad poenitentiam invitando, ille fortior peccata remittendo; ego regnum caelorum praedicando, ille fortior dando. This passage from Anselm forms also the base of the Glossa (Ord. and Int.) on this verse.*

Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1266): *Ventilabrum significat discretionem ultimi iudicii (and similarly the Gl. Int.).*

- (17) *vox*. non de christo dicebatur haec vox, sed his qui aderant. Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1268), and through Anselm also the Gl. Int.
- (iv 1) *in desertum*. i.e. iuxta hericho, Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1270): Hoc desertum est inter Ierusalem et Iericho. Similarly the Gl. Ord.
- (10) *retro*. i.e. in infernum; vel ad tempus passionis. *satana*. i.e. adversarius. Ans. Laud. (*ib.* 1274); Rabanus (Migne cvii 785); afterwards the same interpretations in the Gl. Int.
- (xiv 6) *die natali*. Nullum alium in scriptura invenimus diem natalem sui commemorasse. . . (etc.). Hieron. (*ib.* 101); Rabanus (*ib.* 959); Beda, *Comm. in Marcum* (*l.c.* 189); and later also the Gl. Ord. on Mc vi 21.
- (xix 21) *vende*. scil. omnia. Hieron. (*ib.* 142), and later also Gl. Int.
- (Lc i 5) *herodis regis*. i.e. tempus ostendit. Beda, *Comm. in Lucam* (Migne xcii 309).
- (*Ib.*) *abiae*. de filiis elizar. Beda (*ib.*) and, afterwards, the Glossa.
- (7) *sterilis*. i.e. etate sua. Beda (*ib.* 310) and Gl. Ord.

It appears from the similarity between the glosses in MS Harl. 1802 and the Glossa (Ordinaria and Interlinearis), that the latter cannot yet have existed when the former were first written down (MS Harl. 1802 probably is a fair copy of an original draft taken during the lectures). But apparently the Glossa was in the course of being compiled, and we will assume for the present that the original draft of the glosses in MS Harl. 1802 was written in a school at Paris (see below). This enables us to say that shortly before 1139 or 1140 the material was already used, and lectured upon, from which the Glossa was to be compiled about a decade later (about 1150). For Matthew the master of the school in question relied mainly on Anselm of Laon's *Enarrationes*, although he also used extracts taken directly from the patristic writings.¹ For Luke his chief source was the commentary of Bede; for John the authority seems to have been St Augustine (and Alcuin) and, perhaps, John the Scot. But these are precisely the works which were used for his own compilation on the gospels by the author of the Glossa, as the marked similarity between the glosses in MS Harl. 1802 and the Glossa has shown.

¹ It is peculiar, however, that in stating the Father from whom a particular passage is taken, the marginal gloss in MS Harl. 1802 is so often mistaken. Perhaps this can be accounted for by assuming that in taking down his glosses during the lecture the writer was rather rushed. Cf. also Herbert of Bosham's remarks, below, p. 343, ll. 44-53; p. 349, ll. 60-62.

We are justified, therefore, in supposing that in the glosses of MS Harl. 1802 we actually possess notes from lectures on the gospels given by Peter the Lombard at an early stage of his career. Complete commentaries of the Lombard are first mentioned in 1142 or 1143 (the *Maior Glossatura*), and it is quite natural to suppose that several years before this date he should have begun to lecture on the material which he gradually collected with the intention of compiling his glosses. MS Harl. 1802 affords us a look into the workshop of the Master of the Sentences during that period.

This much may be gathered from the contents of MS Harl. 1802. What we can reconstruct of the outward history of the MS (or, of its exemplar) only confirms what has been said so far. The learned author of the *Catalogue of Harleian MSS* has devoted a long dissertation to the question of the date and the place of origin of our MS. Briefly his line of argument is as follows. At the end of Matthew the book bears the subscription:

Orate pro mælbrigte qui scripsit hunc librum,

and similarly after the gospel of St Mark. Luke ends up with the words:

Orate pro mælbrigte qui scripsit hunc librum in .xxviii. anno etatis sue,

after which there is a line in Irish to the effect that this was 'in the second year after the building of the big house'. At the end of John there is a short Irish poem which points to Armagh as the place where the scribe Maelbrigte was working; and from various historical incidents to which reference is made, the author of the *Catalogue* has deduced, with great learning and sagacity, that the book was finished about 1139 or 1140.

Let us consider these data. The year 1140 was of some importance in the development of the Irish Church, because about that time Malachias O'Morgair, the intimate friend of St Bernard, introduced into Ireland the Cistercian Rule of Clairvaux. St Malachy (b. 1091, d. 1148) did for the Irish Church much the same as Lanfranc had done for the Ecclesia Anglicana. He brought Ireland into closer contact with the General Church by conforming its constitution, administration, liturgy, and law, to the standard of the Church of Rome. In his *Vita S. Malachiae*, St Bernard praises the fervent zeal

with which St Malachy worked for the reform of the Irish Church (Migne clxxxii 1079):

He caused all the churches [of Ireland] to receive and observe the rulings of the Apostles, the decretals of the holy Fathers, and above all, the customs of the Holy Roman Church. Hence it is that even to-day at the canonical hours they chant and sing the Psalms according to the universal custom. Before that time they hardly used to sing anywhere in this fashion, not even in the towns.

But St Malachy found his proper sphere of activity when in 1129 he became Archbishop of Armagh, and thus Primate of Ireland. In 1137 he resigned this office and henceforward contented himself with the bishopric of Down. Nevertheless, he continued to lend his talents to the Irish Church in general (Migne, *l.c.* 1092):

He eagerly devoted himself to the rigour of monastic discipline, to the contemplative life, and to assiduous prayer . . . , at the same time fulfilling his ecclesiastical duties with great competence and authority.

In 1137 he completed the rebuilding of Down Cathedral (J. Ware, *Antiquitates Hibernenses*, p. 195; this obviously was the 'building of the big house', of which the scribe Maelbrigte speaks), and afterwards made a journey to Rome, in order to fetch the pall for his successor at Armagh, and also to receive the Pope's formal recognition of the ecclesiastical reforms which had been carried out in Ireland. On this journey he was accompanied by many of his countrymen ('multi socii', Migne, *l.c.* 1094), who were probably actuated by their desire to become acquainted with the organisation and the customs of the continental Church. Of the places on the Continent where the Irish pilgrims stayed, St Bernard mentions only his own monastery of Clairvaux (Migne, *l.c.* 1094 f.). There Malachy left some of his companions in order that they might learn the Cistercian Rule and introduce it into Ireland. But it may be safely assumed that the saintly bishop, who was so eager to learn, showed the same amount of interest for the schools at Paris, and that he sent one or two of his disciples to the lectures of Peter the Lombard. Perhaps Maelbrigte (Brigidianus) was one of them; in 1137 he was twenty-five years of age. After St Malachy's and his companions' return (in 1140), Maelbrigte wrote the gospel book MS Harl. 1802 and added to the text his (or somebody else's) notes from the Lombard's lectures. We know from St Bernard that after

St Malachy's return to Ireland religion in that country 'ubique plantatur, propagatur, fovetur' (Migne, *l.c.* 1097), and in this revival the new method of scholastic theology, with which the Glossa is intimately associated, may well have had a share.

Much of the foregoing discussion admittedly is conjecture. However it may be judged, one thing the discovery of MS Harl. 1802 has made absolutely certain, namely that Walafrid Strabo and Anselm of Laon can in no case be considered to be the authors of the Glossa Ordinaria and Glossa Interlinearis respectively. The Glossa is posterior to both these writers. Not till 1140 do we find the first signs indicating that the Glossa was in the making.

APPENDIX E

Herbert of Bosham's Prefaces to his Revision of
the Great Gloss of Peter the Lombard

(See chap. v, p. 219)

THE four MS volumes:

- Trin. Coll. Camb. B. 5. 4,
- Bodl. Auct. E. infra 6,
- Trin. Coll. Camb. B. 5. 6,
- Trin. Coll. Camb. B. 5. 7,

form a complete set of Peter the Lombard's Great Glosses written by order of, and for, Herbert of Bosham, at Christ Church, Canterbury. The two former volumes contain the Great Gloss on the Psalter, the two latter that on the Pauline Epistles. Herbert of Bosham had rearranged and marked the Great Gloss in the way explained above (p. 226), and he added prefaces to his own copies, giving a short account of the nature of his work. The prefaces in the Trinity College MSS were first, but not very accurately, printed by L. Delisle in the *Journal des Savants* for 1900 (p. 722 f.). The short preface in the Bodleian MS was first edited by J. A. Giles, in his edition of Herbert of Bosham's works (Oxford and London 1845, two vols.; reprinted in Migne's *Patrologia Latina* cxc 1475). Giles had no knowledge of the Trinity College volumes. The following purports to be a critical edition of these prefaces.

(a) Trin. Coll. MS B. 5.4, first volume of the glossed Psalter

f. 1^r (rubric): *Prefatio herberti de boseham beati martiris et pontificis thome in exilio comitis indiuidui ad Guillelmum senonensem archipresulem super nouo quod condidit opere super psalmos.*

(text): Dum ego cum dimicante domini prelia prius exule, nunc
 5 vero glorioso christi martyre, sancto videlicet thoma cantuariorum
 antistite, dura exilii aspera in exemplum iusti iudicii dei sustinerem,
 eiectum et proscriptum in loco pascue (Pontiniaci scilicet, ubi locuples
 scripturarum armarium) collocavit me dominus, eo ipso in ira sua
 miserationes suas non continens. Nam qui de persecutione principis
 10 videri posset contristatus, in eloquiis dominicis letabatur spiritus meus,
 videns etiam in his diebus nubis et caliginis te, presulum beatissime,
 sanctorum irradiare virtutibus et celesti quodam ardore que iam
 refrixerant israelitarum corda accendere: concaluit cor meum et intra
 me et in tui meditatione ignis exardescibat. Ignis certe non alienus,
 15 sed divinus, non lioris, sed amoris; ita ut sepius dicerem intra me:
 Canticiv9 *Vulnerasti caritate cor meum.* Nam qui te a parvulo christi diligebam
 in christo, eo amplius inflammavit me zelus tuus, quod cernebam te
 in dies evacuare que parvuli erant, crescere in augmentum christi,
 et proficere in virum perfectum. Cumque in brevi, dulci quidem
 20 etate, sed seducibili (nec enim tricenarius erat, quando iam episcopus),
 humeros teneros virorum supposuisses oneribus et pontificalem
 cathedram ascendisses, ex tunc maxime captivus videbaris ducere
 universas delicias iuventutis et maturi moderaminis habenis distric-
 tioribus fluxam regebas etatem, ita ut, si propheta adiuveret uiginti
 25 annorum, senem prophetico efferret eloquio et, ni fallor, sue bene-
 dictionis dulcedine non fraudaret. Cumque hec cunctis et mihi inter
 ceteros reuerencie essent et stupori, optabam pariter et orabam, ut
 tam generosa et novella christi plantatio celestibus crebro stillicidiis
 rigaretur. Novellarum quippe plantationum ariditassemper metuenda
 30 est, unde et ego tempus ad id sortitus feriatum, nonnulla hausi
 aquarum stillicidia de magnis illis et indeficientibus fontibus salva-
 toris. Hausi quidem | mea dumtaxat manu, sed pio patrefamilias
 mihi una cum ceteris mendico et sitibundo vires ministrante. Quas
 profecto aquas salubres, utpote que de medio montium fluxerint, tibi,
 35 sacerdos magne, in domino libo, ut ipsis semen cui benedixit dominus
 aliquantisper perfundatur.

Nec ob id dico quod novum aliquid cuderim, sed preter morem
 laboravi in veteri. Concordantias enim psalmorum inter se et ad

1 Prefatio] Prefacio Delisle 5 christi] om. Delisle 6 aspera] cancelled
 in MS by later hand; om. Delisle 7 the words in brackets are written in small
 characters between the lines 18 dies] die Delisle 20 the words in brackets are
 written between the lines 32 the words mea dumtaxat . . . cum ceteris are
 written on an erasure mea] Delisle's conjecture; MS reads me manu, sed
 pio] manus pio Delisle

epistolas, et rursus epistolarum inter se et ad psalmos hinc inde sedulo et laboriose conquisitas, foris in librorum marginibus studui annotare. 40 In quo profecto laboris plurimum fuit, sed artificii minus, nisi quod in omni opere accedit artificio, si operis non prehabeatur exemplar. Funambuli quippe sequax bene pergit, sed artificiose minus quam is qui exemplum prebens prior rectus incesserit. Preterea glosatoris uerbula que frequenter authenticis doctorum dictis interserit, exponendo 45 ea vel addendo, et presertim que exponendo interserit, notavi attente et a serie seposita et vel inter lineas seu extra signavi in margine, ne lector, ut sepe fit, errore expositorum alicui glosatoris verba ascribat. Unde etiam et linea mineo colore ducta, quantum potui diligentius solito verba expositorum inter se et etiam a verbis glosatoris 50 distinxit, ne cassiodorum pro augustino sive ieronimo, vel glosatorem inducas pro expositore; in quo interdum non simplices, sed eruditiores etiam risimus lectores errasse. Preterea ubi inter glosatorem et expositores questionis aliquid suboriri posse videbatur, notulas quasdam de ipsis expositoribus absque ulla verborum innovatione sumptas, 55 una cum paragrafis nostris apposuimus, ut ita lectori et glosatoris et expositoris verba de prope posita cernenti facilius tribuatur iudicium.

Nichil tamen in illustris doctoris illius preiudicium qui horum fuit glosator, et meus in hac doctrina institutor precipuus, asseritur, sed omnia in lectorum prudentium et studi|osiorum arbitrium conferuntur, 60 sicut inferius positi paragrafi docent. Qui tamen, si quid forte non ita ad unguem resecatum in suis operibus reliquerit, non arguendus ob id, sed excusandus omnino. Nam cum hec opera scriberet, nequaquam, sicut ipsomet referente didici, ipsi venit in mentem, quod in scolis publicis legerentur; solum ob id facta, ut antiquioris glosatoris, 65 magistri videlicet anselmi laudunensis, brevitatem elucidarent obscuram. Unde et in expositorum deflorationibus et eorundem interpretationibus quas ipse aliquotiens facit, satis quidem ut tunc, sed pro euentu minus diligens fuit, et plerumque glosatoris illius prefati potius quam expositoris verba interpretatur. Istius quod dicimus fac 70 in legendo periculum. Cum vero postea ad multorum instanciam a magistro preter spem iam dicta opera publice legerentur, necdum plene correctionis sarculo putatis omnibus, in parisiorum antistitem promotus est et post in brevi humanis rebus exemptus. Nec igitur parvitatibus mee intentio est tanto doctori, et qui me precipue in hac 75 doctrina instituit, ullam ignorantie vel negligencie inurere notam seu tanti luminis ecclesie vel in modico obscurare splendorem; sed potius omne id, si quid forte est quod legentium oculis caliginem ullam videri posset ingerere, sollicita studui discretionis manu abstergere,

f. 2^r

40 in librorum] librorum (om. in) *Delisle* 44 rectus] om. *Delisle* 58 doctoris illius] illius doctoris *Delisle* 61 paragrafi] paragraphi *Delisle* 66 elucidarent] elucidaret *Delisle* 70 fac] the word is followed by an erasure of about two letters; *Delisle* unnecessarily conjectured facit

80 ut in templo lucis non nisi lux luceat. Quod si hydra multorum
 capitum necdum sibilare cessaverit, preter ea que iam diximus, contra
 ipsius venenatos aculeos duplex mihi consolationis antidotum est,
 quod christus domini, summus sacerdos christi, neomartyr noster
 sanctus thomas, ita fieri voluit, et etiam quia aliqua eorum corrigenda
 85 esse que notavimus, ipsorum maledicorum testimonio comprobabitur;
 velint solum prius legere et postea secundum experientie librum
 iudicare, ut ita christiani theologi saltem poete ethnici ammonitionem
 sequantur, qui in nullius magistri verba nos vult esse addictos. Et
 f. 2^v preterea quia te, qui summus | sacerdos es, operam elaboratam
 90 accepturum sperabam, post iam dicti doctoris studia in ipsius opere
 quod potuimus corrigendo elaboravimus et elaborando correcti sumus.
 Igitur si solius veritatis indagine ducimur, ut absque lesione alterius
 in alieno opere non meam gloriam, sed aliorum queram profectum,
 quid adhuc scillei latrant adversum me canes? Quid dentibus suis
 95 et linguis una et brevi hora annorum dilaniant opus? Certe dico,
 et si non semel dixisse sufficit, dicam iterum, quia absque suggillatione
 veterum elaboravi in veteri, eo ipso etiam indicans, quantam habeam
 ad auctorem operis gratiam, et ad opus auctoris. Quod si adhuc
 scillei in me severint canes et latrare non cessaverint, quod solum
 100 superest contra ignitos ipsorum morsus: crebra me illius armabo
 Ps cxvii recordatione versiculi, *Redime me a calumpniis hominum, ut custodiam*
 134 *mandata tua.* Hunc quippe versiculum dominus meus neomartyr
 noster, sanctus thomas, post gloriosum transitum suum in visione
 mihi apparens pre ceteris psalmodum versiculis commendavit, et quasi
 105 in testamento relinquens iniunxit memoriam iugem. Nunc vero
 ceptum propositi negotii ordinem retexamus.

Igitur preter ea que supra posita sunt, quoniam de veritate istius
 editionis qua super psalterium utimur inter nos et iudeos concertatio
 multa plerumque est, in veritate hebraica longe aliter in multis esse
 110 quam psallat ecclesia contententes, huic psalterio nostro patris nostri
 beati ieronimi copulavi psalterium a nobis qua potuimus diligencia
 secundum varia exemplaria emendatum, versum ad versum ponendo,
 ut in quo due iste editiones discrepent, apertius clareat et ora gar-
 rientium psallantes christianos hymnizare mendacia promptius ob-
 115 struantur. Siquidem ipso doctore nostro ieronimo transferente eius
 psalterium de hebraice veritatis fonte pure noscitur emanasse. Quantus
 vero in concordanc|ciis sic digestis eruditionis sit fructus, nec etiam
 effugit rudem. Hinc enim efficietur quis in inveniendi promptus, in
 edificando copiosus, in intelligendo manifestus. Siquidem de una re
 120 quis volens sermonem texere, si unum eius testimonium reperit,
 occurrent mox plurima et pleraque loca ob dictorum brevitatem
 obscura, eadem declarat alias sermo diffusior ad quem concordantie

97 veterum] veterem *Delisle* 113 iste editiones] iste distinctiones edi-
 tiones *first hand of MS*, distinctiones *then deleted*

digeste bene confestim mittunt lectorem. Contrarietates (Gregorius: 'Nonnunquam sibi littere verba contradicunt. Sed dum a semetipsis per contrarietatem dissident, lectorem ad intelligentiam veritatis mittunt'. In iob .iiii., Moralium .viii., super *Pereat dies in quo natus*) etiam per concordancias signate, sicut primo cogitare cogunt, sic demum a dubitatione absolvunt et verum tribuunt intellectum. Nam mota hinc inde contraria urgent, ut iuxta scripture eloquium intellectus queratur. 125 130

Preterea breves quasdam concordancias, figuras videlicet quasdam, non quidem autenticas, sed iuxta proprie mentis fictionem formatas, apposimus, ne quid legi vel diligencie concordantium deperiret. Solent autem huiuscemodi concordantie breves per figuras apponi, cum inter loca scripture consona seu contraria modica est distantia. 135

Librorum etiam, horum videlicet psalterii et epistolarum, introitus concordanciarum causa capitulatim distinximus, et in isto psalterii libro quem tenemus in manibus novem in eius introitu posuimus distinctiones, ita ut quod queritur citius possit occurrere. Introitum similiter super epistolas pari modo, etsi sub alio capitulorum numero, distinximus. Epistole etiam singule suas habent et proprias distinctiones, sicut in nostra quam et in epistolis domino premisimus favente prefacione continetur. Alioquin, nisi omnia suis essent partita distinctionibus, ob nimiam sui prolixitatem etiam studiosis in his non modicum fastidium generarent et concordancias sese mutuo respicientes invenire tardissimum. 140 145

Quod vero in duobus his voluminibus cepimus, in aliis itidem per varia scripture | loca fieri potest, ut ubique et in omnibus concordantie seu contrarietates digerantur, iuxta quod ipsius scripture loca sibi invicem consona seu dissona sunt. Verum nos, quoniam in his totius theologice pagine consummatio est, sicut primo et precipue ad hec apposimus manum, quorum etiam in spiritualibus canticis usus frequentior et celebrior est, utpote in quibus edificationis totius fructus longe uberior. Unde et eorum doctrina ceteris omnibus longe preminentior est. 150 155

Preterea quia in multis psalmodiarum versibus diverse littere sunt, ita ut alique ecclesie hac, alie vero alia in psalmodia utantur, que pariter etiam inter psallendum in ipsis versibus variis utuntur metrorum distinctionibus, et hoc annotare studuimus, litterarum diversitates super ipsos textus versuum seu prope in margine et diversas versuum in metris distinctiones, adhibita quam potuimus diligencia ponendo in hoc diversam diversorum auctoritatem secuti. 160

Adhuc etiam, ne quid diligencie deperiret, distinctiones seu capitula principalem psalmodiarum intentionem continentis huic psalmodiarum

f. 3^v

123 the words in brackets were added in the margin 142 domino . . . favente] sic first hand; afterwards the words were cancelled 151 sicut primo et] above the line

- 165 operi premittere non omisimus. Tres etiam prologos et epistolam
 ieronimi quartam preter morem quidem, sed non preter utilitatem,
 antepontes, que nonnulla ad psalmorum doctrinam necessaria
 fructuose nos edocent. Quorum primus est: *Dauid filius iesse cum* etc.
 Secundus: *In hebreo libro psalmorum* etc. Tercius: *Psalterium rome* etc.
 170 Quarta etiam ieronimi epistola: *Scio quosdam putare* etc.

(b) Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Auct. E. infra 6,
 second volume of the glossed Psalter¹

f. ii^v (rubric): *Item prefatio herberti ad Guillelmum senonensem archiepis-*
copum.

(text): Cum liber psalmorum unus sit et non plures, ipsum tamen
 preter morem quidem, set non preter causam, in duos secauimus
 5 thomos. Idipsum etiam in libro fecimus epistolarum, quem, cum
 nonnisi unus sit, partiti sumus in duos: hoc facientes in libris, quod
 in oneribus fieri solet. Ad continendum quippe et contractandum
 habiliora et apciora fiunt singula, quam si simul omnia uno sint
 pressa uolumine; et etiam quia simul et sepe plus plurium poterit
 10 lectioni prodesse, huiuscemodi in libris parcialis diuisio. Tu igitur,
 beatissime presul, sectiones has quatuor simul suscipe, diuisim lege.
 Et si forte ad transcribendas has librarii uestri apposuerint manum,
 ut concordancie et notule extra uagantes suis decenter aptentur locis,
 curiose obseruetur: ne, ut sepe fit per librariorum inpericiam seu
 f. 1^r 15 negligenciam, opus emendare quam scribere sit | difficilius, presertim
 cum noui corruptor operis non alius quam frater sit destruentis.

1 Item] *om. Giles archiepiscopum*] *archep(iscopu)m MS 16 de*
struentis] *destructoris Giles*

(c) Trin. Coll. MS B. 5. 6, first volume of the
 glossed Pauline Epistles

f. 1^r (rubric): *Epistola Guillelmi Medici abbatis ad herbertum de Boseham*
super ypotesibus .viij. epistolarum pauli.

(text): Magistro herberto dilecto suo Guillelmus Monachorum
 Beati Dionisii minimus in amplexibus Abysac Sunamitis feliciter
 5 caleferi. Naturalis iuris equitate decernitur, ut honestis amicorum
 petitionibus serenas facies, promptos assensus, atque celeres accom-
 modemus effectus. Amplius uero, si facultas assit et expediat postu-
 lantibus, non contenti petitionum finibus earumdem mensuras pluribus

1 Medici] *Mediolanensis MS; the emendation is Delisle's*

¹ Printed from a photograph, by kind permission of Bodley's Librarian

ac potioribus beneficiis cumulemus. Hinc est, Magister in christo dilecte, quod honesto desiderio tuo plura satis et ampliora quam 10 postulaveris de promptuario karitatis exhibere curavi. Poposcerat namque sollicitudo tua, quatinus yponima temporis predicationis beati pauli, quod me legente nuper audieras, de greco sermone verterem in latinum. Rem fateor honestam, nec multum difficilem postulasti. Unde magis incivile foret ac inofficiosum, si tam modestè 15 non obsequer voluntati, cum, etsi difficillima flagitares, executionis officium honeste detrectare non possem. Igitur parui voto tuo, et quia verus amor plus semper paratus est offerre quam petitur, alias ypotheses .xv., quas epistolis apostolicis sub certis titulis pre-scriptas inveni, sedulitati tue transferendas decrevi. In quibus si quid 20 forte fructus repperies, id queso quantulumcunque gratiam comparet transferenti. Si quominus gratie saltem meritum sit, voluisse prodesse necnon opere voluntatis his experimentis quasi quibusdam preludiis tyrocini mei rudimenta probasse. Nec obhorreas, obsecro, stili deformitatem, quia omnis editio, que verbum reddit ex verbo, dum 25 similem sequitur dictionum congeriem inequalibus inequales instaurans orationis cursus et gressus pronuntiantis impeditos et claudicantes facit. Dumque figuris servit et casibus eloquentie venustatem prorsus absumens totius orationis speciem decolorat. Interdum quoque resectis articulis, qui non modicum luminis intellectui prestant, 30 quia nichil est in latino quod eis proprie compensari possit, sensus aut obscurus aut imperfectus relinquitur. Et qui plerumque brevi sermone poterat explicari, vix longo circuitu revolutus exprimitur.

Miror tamen super fervore concupiscentie tue, quod Sunamitis illius tue familiaris sapientiam loquor, que die noctuque dormit in 35 sinu tuo, cum tu prope modum senex et illa iuvencula sit, ac inter eius ubera iugiter commoreris, nec cotidianis alloquiis, nec crebris osculis, nec assiduvis saciaris amplexibus, sed quo magis eius amore frueris, eo magis et amor concipit desiderium, et desiderium parturit in amorem. Assecutus es, ut video, consilium salomonis: *Inebriaverunt* Prov v 19 *te ubera sapientie, ut in eius amore iugiter delegeris.* Aqua, ni fallor, eiusdem sapientie qua precordia tua plena redundant, huius insaciabilis sitis nutrit ardorem, ut instar ydropici quanto plus hauris, eo plus haurire desideres. Audi denique, quid eadem sapientia dicat: *Qui edunt me, adhuc esurient, et qui bibunt me, adhuc sitient.* Inde est, quod [Jo vi 35] queris eam quasi pecuniam et quasi thesauros effodere non desistis; nec iam latina suffitunt, greca quoque scrutari desideras. De cetero, frater, si quid est in paupere suppellectile mee tenuis facultatis quod tibi placeat, fidenter accipe et quod meum est, tuum reputa. Nec enim par est, ut quibus communis est possessio caritatis substantie ratio quibus- 50 libet privatis commodis aut compendiis singularibus in diversa trahatur.

Then the said work, called 'Yponima scolasticum temporis, quo beatus paulus predicauit euangelium', follows (down to f. 3^r). It is a series of short introductions to the various Epistles.

f. 3^v (rubric): *Incipit prefatio herberti ad Willelmum senonensem archiepiscopum super nouo quod condidit opere super epistolas.*

- (text): Quod pridem super epistolas opus intenderam et presulatu tuo necdum factum dedicaram, inter eiulatus et lacrimarum sordes
 5 vix tandem consummare iam potui. Scribendi enim simul et lugendi nulla prorsus convenientia est. Nam quemadmodum iuxta illud dictu antiquum, 'Musica in luctu importuna narratio', ita et inter festivas epulas lacrimarum sordes ingerere importunum. Michi vero persepe
 10 querulas et gemebundas lacrimas commiscerem, quamtotiens inter lugendum scribens et inter scribendum lugens adeo, ut pagina subiecta lacrimis non minus quam notis interdum appareret suffusa. Me silente novit mundus, unde mea querimonia hec. Ecce enim
 15 michi puero suo nec mavortem dimisit, quin potius ascendens me post eum clamantem et eiulantem in mediis ignibus et fluctibus dereliquit nec periclitanti adhuc porrigit manum. Nec certe ob id dico, quia inhumanus sit ille, sed quia indignus sum ego. Et ut adhuc eo certius quo expressius loquar, magnus ille cantuarie pontifex
 [Mt xi 14] thomas quidem in persona, sed, si vultis recipere, in spiritu et virtute
 f. 4^r helias fuit. | Cui etiam nec camelorum defuerant pili. Quo post multa exilii dura et longe contradictionis aspera violento utique demum martyrii predone effecto et per martyrii palmam triumphante,
 25 nichilominus confratribus meis, prophete filii, in pace solus ego ipsius dumtaxat erumpnam et erumpne locum cum fortioris contradictione heredito, ipsis etiam mihi in presentiarum officiis humanitatis sub-
 tractis, adeo elongatis amicis et proximis et notis meis a miseria. Uerum etsi a dulci neomartyris nostri preconio ego invitus avellar, non tamen nunc ulterius pergo ipsius depingere vel passionis modum
 30 seu patientis exaltare triumphum. Supersedeo pariter proprii exponere exilii causam vel exulantis cumulare pressuram. Solum hec inpresentiarum tetigisse sufficiat ob id solum, ne causari possis de consummati tam sero operis mora, ne alterutrius videar vel desidie vel negligentie reus.
 35 Super hoc vero epistolare opus, quemadmodum et supra psalmos david, epistolarum ad psalmos consona seu contraria et epistolarum inter se, quantum preacta temporis permittebat mesticia, studiose quidem et attente digessi. Verum unum precari desidero, unde et

13 unde mea] unde in mea *Delisle* 15 mavortem] mafortem *MS*
 20 thomas quidem] thomas non quidem *Delisle* 30 pastientis] *MS*;
 patientis *Delisle* 38 precari] precaveri *MS*

lectorem premono: ne forte ubi super epistolare eloquium hoc vel etiam super psalmos consona repperiret annotata sive contraria, 40 omnia sic de plano consona vel contraria esse intelligat. Multa enim similia seu opposita et super psalmos et presertim super epistolarem hunc librum sic digesta sunt, quod nequaquam adeo de plano, sed per argumentum aliquid similis | vel oppositi, varie dictorum nunc convenientia, nunc vero contrarietas deprehenditur. Quod tamen 45 lectori simplici interdum minime patet. Ne igitur calumniatur, sed querat et ad eum qui aperiât pulset et non accuset obscurâ, et tamen, ut lectori facilius tribuatur intelligentia, in talium concordantiarum fine argumenti nomen breviter annotatum reperiet.

f. 4^v

Singulis vero epistolis propria capitula sua premisi, que sigillatim 50 et summatis epistolarum, quarum ipsa capitula sunt, totam prelibant continentiam. Secundum numerum quorum et totum epistolare volumen totidem respersimus mineo colore signatis distinctionibus, ita ut iuxta morem tam numero quam sententia et capitula distinctionibus et distinctiones capitulis mutuo sibi respondeant. 55

Preterea quemadmodum super psalmos, ita et hic nonnulla verbula glosatoris interserta, etsi non ad plenum, quantum tamen diligentius potuimus, a generalibus et necessariis doctorum interpretationibus eliminavimus et ipsa nunc inter lineas, nunc vero extra in margine seposuimus. Et totum ob id, ne simplicem seu etiam proveciorem 60 lectorem facile error involvat, ut videlicet glosatoris velut expositoris, vel e diverso expositoris velut glosatoris verba recipiat. Que profecto glosator intermiscet frequentius, interdum addens, interdum vero, ubi de expositorum verbis ulla se subobscuritas ingerit, ipsos interpretatur interpretes et in his aliquotiens ut loquar, salva que magistro 65 debetur reverentia, supra quam deceret diligens ea exponit, que exponentia sunt et liquerent optalmis. Quasdam etiam infantiles nonnunquam expositiones interserit, ut cum *enim* per *quia* exponit, a qua si supersedisset, arbitror quia parum eruditionis nostre intelligentie deperisset. Et ut adhuc per non leve concordantiarum adiu- 70 mentum inveniri certius et expeditius possit quod queritur, singulas epistolas propriis versibus suis distinximus ipsorum sicut solet fieri capita, nunc mineo, nunc azorio colore signantes. Et quemadmodum psalmodum versus metris et subdistinctionibus, ita et hos metris, distinctionibus, subdistinctionibus, colis videlicet, comatibus et periodis, 75 limitavimus. Quod tamen operosa illorum, qui precesserunt nos, diligentia penitus non omisit, qui universum divini iuris corpus non solum versibus, verum etiam capitulis et distinctionibus ordinate satis et distincte perspererunt. Unde nequaquam elaboratam operam reprobo vel contempno, sed amplector; verum compulit nos in veteri 80 opere formam supercudere novam, id quod proxime superinduximus novum. Unde nec causandum, si in hoc opere quod in manibus est, et versuum et capitulorum seu distinctionum novus numerus sit; docente nos ut illos uno et eodem multiplici spiritu, qui novit et

f. 5^f

85 multis numerum subtrahere et pauca, cum expedit, augmentare. Et tamen, ne auctoritati seu doctrine veterum in hoc ipso derogare videamur, etiam in presentis libri distinctionibus ex numero distinctionum ipsos sequimur. Quippe in vetustissimo quodam bibliothecae volumine easdem distinctiones et sub eodem fere digestas numero
90 repperi, facta tamen per loca innovatione permodica.

f. 5^v Totius etiam libri huius introitum distinctionibus quinque velut certis quibusdam finibus limitando terminavimus totidem ante ipsum sicut fit, ipsarum capitula premitentes, ut ita introitus prolixitas non obsistat, quominus expedite id occurrat et propere, ad quod nos
95 concordantiarum documenta transmiserint.

Et quoniam optamus, ut in ceteris sacre scripture libris consimilis nos exerceat labor, necesse erit in aliquibus ipsorum, presertim ubi nec vetera sunt, capitula preponere nova et eorundem numerum itidem interserere novum, prout desiderati exercitii et propositae
100 instructionis ecclesiasticae exegerit opus. Et hoc semel hic dixisse sufficiat, ne, cum crebro audierit nova, iudicet inimicus homo vetera nos fastuose proiecisisse et inolosum naribus ad veterum nauseare sentinam. Et ut in summa dicatur, universis totius sacre scripture libris preposuimus distinctiones aut veteres, aut a veteribus mutuatas
105 et correctione novatas, aut instar veterum de nostra proditas tenuitate.

Itaque in hac parte prepositi, et presertim super epistolarem hunc librum, mee nichil video diligentie deperisse, nisi forte causetur quis me totius libri et singularum epistolarum singulos prologos seu potius argumenta omisisse. Sed quisquis sic causatus fuerit, industrie sic
110 factum noverit, videlicet ne volumen voluminis excederet modum, et item, quia libri et singuli singularum epistolarum introitus totam dictorum argumentorum eruditionem breviter et summatim prelibant.

Verum tue erit prudentie, beatissime presul, prout iustum noverit, operam elaboratam acceptare, meum vero apostolice ecclesie invocare
115 suffragium, ut in reliquis sacre scripture libris valeam ad optatum ipsius adhuc elaborare profectum. Et quia domino ad patriam suam translato servus peregrinatur adhuc, tu qui legis hec, semper peregrini memento.

107 mee] inesse *Delisle*

(d) Trin. Coll. MS B. 5. 7, second volume of the
glossed Pauline Epistles

No preface.

APPENDIX F

Specimens of Three English Gospel Commentaries
of the Thirteenth Century

(See chap. VI, p. 279 f.)

1. Alexander Neckam, *Summa super Bibliothecam*

THIS is the title of the work in MS Kk. 5. 10 of the Cambridge University Library, though it is better known under the name of *Corrugationes Promethei*. The commentary is to be found on the last leaves of the MS, a fourteenth-century Bible, but the usual first part dealing with grammatical questions (Incipit: *Ferrum situ rubiginem ducit* . . .) is absent. The work begins at once with the exposition of the Old Testament.

f. 317^r: *Incipit Summa magistri A. Nequam super Bibliothecam. De singulis libris bibliotece aliquas dictiones proferre libet in medium, ut quantum de accentu diiudicemus, quantum de significatione. De propriis autem nominibus raro mentionem faciemus, quia ipsa certam doctrinam fugiunt. Et prima occurrit Genesis, in qua reperiuntur abyssi* . . . (etc.).

The gospels are treated f. 332^v to 347^v. There is a short prefatory passage, viz.:

f. 332^v: *Ad Novi Testamenti seriem me verto, paucula excerpturus pro simplicitate opusculi huius. Inter libros autem Novi Testamenti primus est Matheus, de quo paucula excipiam, predicta a me minime repetiturus. Que autem communiter proponunt evangeliste, non nisi semel scripto mandare decerno.*

We confine ourselves to quoting a few extracts from Neckam's notes on the gospels:

(Mt iv 15) *Terra zabulon etc. In ysaia habetur sic: Primo tempore* Is ix 1
alleviata est terra zabulon et terra neptalim; novissimo aggravata est via maris trans iordanem galilee gencium. Ad litteram autem prophetia est de captivitate decem tribuum, et est sensus: primo tempore, scil. principium captivitatis facte per salmanassar, terra zabulon et terra neptalim alleviata est, i.e. habitatoribus suis spoliata. Novissimo autem, i.e. in fine illius captivitatis, aggravata est, i.e. repleta est novis habitatoribus illa eadem terra, ut eam colerent. Aggravata est, inquam, via maris, i.e. terra illa que est iuxta mare itinerantibus; non quod ibi sit mare, sed propter magnam aquarum copiam hoc dicit, que quidem via vel terra est trans iordanem. Et est dicta terra illa terra galilee

gencium populus ad differentiam alterius galilee secundum bedam (in) Josephum. Quidam tamen sic disting[ue]unt: *Gencium populus qui* etc. Matheus autem litteralem intellectum historie non (at)tendit, hic scil.; sed quia prophetia dicta extendit se ad initium dominice predicationis et ad vocationem gencium (quod quidem competeat intencioni mathei), ideo Matheus excipit de illa prophetia id solum, quod ad propositum suum congruere videbatur. Ad initium dominice predicationis refertur illud, (*terra*) *zabulon* etc., ut dictum est. *Terra*, inquam, per methonomiam. *Populus qui prius ambulabat in tenebris* ignorancie et viciorum, *vidit lucem magnam*, scil. christum in corde; et etiam *vidit*, i.e. intelligens, *lucem magnam* venisse que illustrat mundum doctrina et miraculis. Sequitur de vocatione gencium. Et gentilibus *sedentibus in regione umbre mortis lux orta est eis*, pleonasmus est et superhabundat litteris. . . . ¶ *Alleviata est primo tempore*, i.e. initio dominice predicationis. *Alleviata est* ab onere peccatorum; *terra*, dico, *uia maris* etc. De vocatione vero gencium sequitur, *Populus qui ambulabat in tenebris* etc., scil. *populus gentilis vidit lucem magnam* intelligendo doctrinam christi, et *eis sedentibus in regione umbre mortis lux fidei est orta*; et secundum hoc non superhabundat hoc pronomen *eis*, sed refertur ad hoc nomen *populus*. Mors dicitur gehenna, umbra igitur dicuntur peccata, quia ducunt ad gehennam, sicut umbra ad corpus, cuius est umbra. Qui est igitur in mortali peccato, est in regione umbre mortis. Vera itaque mors est gehenna, sed umbratilis mors peccatum mortale.¹ . . . (vii 6) *Nolite dare sanctum verbum predicationis canibus* hereticis oblatrantibus. Porci sunt fideles, sed vilipendentes predicationem. Hoc intelligo in eo casu, nisi omnes auditores sunt tales vel maior pars est talis. Ubi enim inter porcos sunt nonnulli esurientes verbum consolationis, non sunt negligendi propter porcos; qui *pedibus*, i.e. mentis affectibus, *conculcant margaritas*, quia preciosa verba et dilucida, que eis proponuntur, contempnunt. *Nolite*, inquam, *canibus dare sanctum*, ne canes *conversi* contra vos in pugnant veritatem *dirumpendo vos*, i.e. fidei vestre simplicitatem. . . . (viii 22) *Dimitte mortuos in culpa sepelire mortuos naturali morte suos*; i.e. qui eiusdem nature fuerunt, cuius et ipsi sunt. Quasi dicat, Illi officio ad presens eos relinque, tu vero meliori indulge, scil. sequens me. Bonum quidem fuit huic sepelire mortuum, sed melius proponendum erat. Sed nuncquid peccat, quicumque sciens et prudens quod est melius non eligit? Absit; multi enim sunt clerici, quibus potius expediret esse in ordine cartusiensi, quam in statu in quo sunt, et bene hoc sciunt. Nuncquid igitur peccant, quia non statim ad illum ordinem se transferunt? . . . (xv 26) *Non est bonum sumere panem*, i.e. miraculosam operationem, *filiorum*, i.e. debitam iudeis. . . . Sed quid est, quod Glose [i.e. Ordinaria and Interlinearis] hic vocant

¹ The tiresome diffuseness of this passage is typical of thirteenth-century school-books of exegesis.

panem: Verbum salutis, et *mensam*: sacram scripturam? Ista enim mulier non petiit nisi ut filia eius sanaretur. Responsio: Glose respiciunt misterium, quia ecclesia de gentibus, cuius typum gerit hec mulier, filiis suis petit dari verbum salutis, quod quidem, ut dicit dominus, primum oportuit dari ecclesie de iudeis. . . . (xvii 2) *Transfiguratus est*, quia claritas non solum erat in aere vicino corporis christi, sed et in corpore ipso miraculose secundum quosdam. Sed nonne, quando, ut supra habuistis in Matheo, dominus super aquas Mt xiv 25 ambulavit, corpus eius erat ponderosum; an non? Quod si de corpore christi negaveris, certe de corpore petri incedentis super aquas hoc negare non poteris. Nisi enim ponderosum corpus ita super aquas incessisset, non esset miraculum. Fuerunt qui dixerunt dominum quatuor proprietates corporis glorificatum assumpsisse ante resurrectionem, sed successive: subtilitatem, cum super aquas ambulavit; agilitatem, quando medius inter manus transivit iudeorum et aufugit; claritatem, in transfiguratione; impassibilitatem, in cena, quando corpus eius sub sacramento datum est discipulis (et secundum hoc dedit corpus suum discipulis tale, quale non erat sedens inter discipulos; et etiam secundum hoc prius erat corpus christi impassibile quam anima eius). Inspiciatur autem [Glossa] marginalis super marcum, ubi dicitur in textu, *At illi ubi viderunt eum ambulantem super mare putaverunt fantasma esse* (Mc vi 49). Ibi plane Glosa dicit, quod cum pondere et onere corporali incessit super aquas. Et etiam ponitur ibi auctoritas dionisii [idem] dicentis. Subterfugiat autem quilibet quandam opinionem dicentium, quod christi corpus in ipsa conceptione et post fuit semper impassibile, clarum, agile et subtile in se, sed passibilitatem assumpsit quando voluit. Unde dicunt miraculosius fuisse quod passus est, quam quod resurrexit. Similiter pallio quodam obscuritatis, ut aiunt, claritatem suam textit. Set nunquid simul erat corpus eius passibile et impassibile, clarum et obscurum, aut nunquid passum est et non erat passibile? Nonne passio vera fuit ei? Hanc opinionem videtur commendare quedam [Glossa] marginalis que solet hic esse, sed debet apunctuari. Dicunt alii in aere hanc claritatem fuisse. Sed cum de vestimentis apparet, que dicuntur alba fuisse, i.e. apparuisse, nunquid [erant] vestimenta alterius modi quam prius? Sed quid est quod dicitur, *transfiguratus*, nisi aliam figuram, i.e. qualitatem, tunc habuit quam prius, vel quam habuit, detexerit? Audi marginalem: 'Non substantiam carnis amisit, sed gloriam future stationis ostendit, non quod talem gloriam tunc habuit, sed qualis sit futura ostendit'. *Et ecce apparuerunt illis moyses et helyas*. Quid? Nunquid moyses ibi fuit in corpore et anima? Nunquid igitur resuscitatus est? Nunquid igitur corpus eius iterum rediit in materiam suam? Glose super lucam videntur velle, quod angeli eorum ibi fuerant; sed eos ibi fuisse credendum est. . . . (xvii 24) *Qui didragmam (!) accipiebant*. Dragma medium est denarii. Similiter et dragma-tis, quod nomen est, et equivocum ad genus

ponderis, et ad interrogationem. Unde tria sunt genera scribendi: dragmaticum, quod ad interrogationem, quod bucolicum carmen scribentibus convenit, ut

Ecl. iii 1

Dic michi dameta, cuium pecus, an melibei,

et item

Ecl. ix 1

Quo te meri, pedes? an, quo via ducit?

Ermeneuticum dicitur, quod (ad) interpretationem vel significationem (refert). Unde dicitur liber *Per ieremias*, i.e. de interpretatione vel significatione. Didascalium, quod inter magistrum et discipulum vertitur. Hoc drama-tis, sine .g., est dulcis melodia. Unde cum cantatur de virginibus,

Dulcia cantica dramis,

sincopa est vel vicium scribentis; in originali enim habetur, *dramatis*. . . .

f. 337^v: Super Marcum. In Marco pauca reperiuntur, que in Matheo non leguntur, et ideo pauca de Marco excipiemus. . . .

f. 338^r: Super Lucam. De luca pauca excipiemus, tum quia que execuntur Glose nolumus apponere, tum quia que dicta sunt in Matheo a nobis non est opus repetere, tum quia non expositoris, sed excerptoris sumpsimus officium. . . . (xxii 20) *Hic est calix novi testamenti*, scil. confirmator, ut docet marginalis super hunc locum emphatice; quia sanguis domini confirmat novum testamentum. . . .

f. 339^v: Super Iohannem. Iohannes tante difficultatis tanteque sublimitatis est, ut vix luculentam admittere dignetur expositionem, etsi expositio sit exactissime diligencie. Consultius tamen est aliqua exponere, quam perfunctorie singula intacta relinquere. . . . (v 2) *Erat autem ierosolimis probatica*. Probaton grece, ovis latine. Est igitur sensus: *probatica* pecualis, quia ibi abluebantur cadavera bestiarum, hostiarum. Quidam codices mendosi habent, *probatica piscina*, ut is sit sensus: *super*, i.e. in superiori parte civitatis. Et hec mendositas, scil. qua apponitur hec dicio *super*, processit ex textu ysaie. . . . (xi 4) *Infirmas hec non est ad mortem*. Hic emergunt multe obiectiones. Quero enim, utrum ex defectu nature mors prima lazari processit. Dicit enim marginalis, quod nec ipsa mors, quam intimabat, ad mortem fuit, sed postea ad miraculum, quo homines crederent in christum. Hec Glosa videtur velle, quod prima mors lazari miraculosa fuerit. Nunquid igitur secunda mors lazari fuit miraculosa? (In mg.: Fuit naturalis, et prima tantum miraculosa.) Certe multis visum est. Sed nonne secunda vita lazari, ut ita dicam, hoc est vita quam habuit post primam mortem, fuit miraculosa? Nonne ergo secunda mors miraculosa? Sed dicunt quoniam, quod vita reddita est vel rediit post mortem, miraculosum fuit. Ipsa tamen vita post mortem naturalis fuit. Sed nunquid mortem primam sustinisset lazarus ex defectu vite, nisi quod dominus voluit per tantum miraculum glorificari? Possetne Galienus (!) primam exclusisse? Sine preiuditio

mellioris sentencie credo, quod prima mors lazari fuit ex defectu nature succumbentis, et fuit naturalis (in mg.: eo modo quo mors ade fuit naturalis vel cuiuscunque alterius). Et sicut ezechie egrotanti non Galienus potuit succurrisse (quin tunc decessisset nisi miraculose vita eius protelata esset, ita nec lazaro potuit succurrisse), quin morte detentus esset usque ad diem iudicii, nisi miraculose suscitatus esset. Legimus igitur literam sic: *Infirmitas hec non est ad mortem*, hoc est, mihi non est ad mortem, qui *sum resurrectio et vita*. Et tunc: *Non est ad mortem*, hoc est, non tenebitur infirmus iste in morte. Unde Glosa: 'Augustinus dicit, quia ipsa nec mors, que innuebat, ad mortem fuit, hoc est ipsa mors que innuebat, non erat detentura animam lazari quasi speciali precepto dei evocatam a corpore, ut sequeretur illud miraculum insigne. Vel et morbus ipse ex speciali precepto domini corpus lazari ita peremit ut moriretur'. Et cum istis videtur [congruere] hoc quod sequitur in Glosa: 'Sed potius ad miraculum quo homines', etc. Sed non facit cum eis; est enim sensus: mors illa non fuit ad mortem, sed potius ad miraculum, hoc est, mors illa non erat detentura lazarum in morte, sed potius christo, qui est vita, cessura in laudem et nobis in miraculum. . . . (xiii 10) *Set est mundus totus*. Glosa suplet: 'Preter pedes quibus tangit terram'. Si tamen de effectibus mentis legis hoc, non est opus aliqua suplezione. Qui enim in innocencia data in baptismo manet et in caritate, totus est mundus. . . . (xiv 12) *Et maiora horum faciet*, i.e. maiora hiis que facio, quia ponitur genitivus pro ablativo quo carent greci: Grecismus. Constat autem quod iohannes scripsit hoc euuangelium grece. . . .

2. Robert Grosseteste, Postillae super Evangelium Marci

From MS 7 of Pembroke College, Cambridge; thirteenth century.

f. 1^v: Memoriale Magistri Roberti grossetestis pro exameron basilii. Liber monachorum sancti edmundi, in quo continentur

- Postille super psalterium.
- Super ysaïam.
- Super ieremiam.
- Super daniellem.
- Super .xii. prophetas.
- Super euuangelium marci.

Thus the book was Grosseteste's own copy which he had left with the monks of St Edmundsbury as security for a volume of Basilius borrowed by him. The exposition of Mark begins f. 228^r and extends to the end of the volume, breaking off at Mc xv 36, as some leaves are missing at the end.

We print the prologue of the work, and a short specimen

of the exegetical part showing how Grosseteste commented both text and Glossa in the same profuse manner.

- Zach vi 1 *Vidi et ecce quatuor quadrigae egrediebantur de medio duorum montium et montes illi montes enei.* Huiusmodi visionem revelavit dominus zacharie et fuit visio ymaginaria congruens temporibus illis, iuxta quod exposuit zacharie angelus latens inter fructecta (vel mirteta) inquiring: *Per quatuor quadrigas significari quatuor regna*, a quibus passus est populus dei, scil. regnum assyriorum, medorum, grecorum, romanorum, quia, ut habes in .G. super duodecim prophetas, coloribus equorum congruunt ydiomata populorum. Sed quoniam angelus quasi ystorice pretaxatam exposuit visionem, restat ut prosequamur mysticam expositionem. Nam cum iuxta litteralem sensum que populo suo erant eventura, revelavit dominus prophete sub ymaginaria quadam visione, eadem tamen visio temporis gratie congruebat sub mystica interpretatione. Duo igitur montes sunt duo testamenta proeminentia spiritualis intelligentie montibus comparata, iuxta verbum ysaie dicentis: *Super montem excelsum ascende tu qui evangelizas.* Qui pulcre dicuntur enei, propter duorum testamentorum consonantiam, es enim vocale metallum est; vel propter soliditatem, es enim solidum metallum est. Propter doctrinam siquidem duorum testamentorum in lubrico huius vite solidamur vel roboramur. Ecce quid per montes. Quatuor autem quadrigae egredientes de medio duorum montium pulcre intelliguntur quatuor evangeliste, quorum doctrina emanat quasi de medio duorum testamentorum. Cui etiam illud congruit, quia iuxta zacharie visionem prima quadriga trahebatur equis nigris, secunda trahebatur equis rubeis, tertia trahebatur equis albis, quarta trahebatur equis variis. Per obscuritatem quippe nigredinis exprimitur secretum latentis in carne deitatis, quod pro sui obscuritate pulcre per nigredinem designatur, quam comitatur obscuritas. Quia ergo iohannes agit principaliter de deitate christi, quam non nisi obscure et enigmaticae contemplamur, eleganter per primam quadrigam figuratus est, que trahebatur equis nigris. Quia vero lucas principaliter agit de passione, in qua rubricata est sanguine christi caro, eleganter per secundam prefiguratus est, que trahebatur equis rubeis. Marcus vero, quia principaliter de resurrectione, per tertiam prefiguratus est, que trahebatur equis albis; per claritatem namque albedinis fulgor exprimitur resurrectionis, unde et in resurrectione angeli albis induti vestibus apparuerunt. Matheus quoque, quia duas in christo asserit naturas, per quartam eleganter prefiguratus est, que trahebatur equis variis; nam varietas equorum varietatem exprimit duarum in christo naturarum, quia varius color de diversis conficitur coloribus. Sic itaque, quia numerus quadrigarum et color equorum congruit significationi quatuor evangelistarum, merito per quadrigas prefigurati sunt, quia per eorum doctrinam quasi per quandam quadrigam per quatuor partes orbis vehitur fama christi. Et idem
- Zach i 8
seq., vi 5
- Is xl 9
- Zach vi
2, 3

etiam sunt rote in quadriga domini, quia per ipsos quasi per quatuor rotas volvitur et vehitur doctrina evangelii. Ideo et per quadrigas, quia in quadriga et quadratura est et rotunditas. Quadratura soliditatem, rotunditas designat eternitatem. Quadratum enim stabile est quocunque vertatur, et rotundo nec principium nec finis assignatur. Quadrata convenit luctantibus, rotunda congruit triumphantibus. Nobis siquidem in lubrico huius vite contra carnem et sanguinem, pariterque adversus aeras potestates collectantibus, necessarium est robor soliditatis, precipue contra quatuor affectiones, que mentem hominis concutiunt et deiciunt. In hac vita scilicet, spes de adipiscendis, gaudium de adeptis, timor de admittendis, dolor de amissis. Pulcre ergo per quadrigas figurati sunt, per quorum quadratam doctrinam quadramur, ut iucundi efficiamur, i.e. in presenti virtutibus roboramur, ut demum eternitate perfruamur.

In prefata autem visione secundum dignitatis ordinem evangeliste sunt prefigurati, prout scilicet in aliquo sunt privilegiati. Nam licet communem habeant materiam, tamen capitulis disting[u]untur propriis, et singularibus sibi preminent privilegiis. Iohannes singularem habet preminentiam in arduitate materie, lucas in prosecutione historie, Marcus in excellentia miraculorum, quia potiores flores carpit, i.e. excellentiora miracula colligit. Propter huiusmodi privilegia ordine pretaxato prefigurati sunt in pretaxata visione. Iohannes per primam quadrigam tanquam primum ratione dignitatis obtinens locum; lucas per secundam tanquam secundum post iohannem obtinens locum. Marcus per tertiam tertium in dignitate obtinet locum prepositus matheo per excellentiam miraculorum, vel potius quia agit de resurrectione, in qua virtus deitatis manifestatur. Mathei vero intentio circa humanitatem precipue versatur tanquam quartum et ultimum locum obtinens. Qui tamen ratione temporis obtinet primum, quia primus evangelium scripsit. Marcus secundum, quia tempore claudii cesaris evangelium scripsit in ytalia, precipue ut romanos instrueret. Scripsit autem senescente petro, cuius fuit discipulus. Cuius opus videns et approbans petrus appellavit illud 'furtum laudabile'. Lucas tertium, qui scripsit in achaia; Iohannes ultimum, qui in asia.

Prefigurati sunt etiam quatuor evangeliste in figuris quatuor animalium in visione iohannis et ezechielis, in quibus marcus figuram leonis sortitur. Nec immerito, nam et quasi a rugitu inchoat, i.e. a voce clamantis, et in fine agit de morte catuli leonis et de suscitatione ad rugitum patris, i.e. de christi morte, qui tanquam catulus leonis occubuit ad vocem patris; immo occubuit et die tertia ad eius vocem surrexit (sic ieronimus). Secundum alios tamen (in mg.: Alie opiniones obliterande sunt et ab aula recesserunt) marcus figuram aquile sortitur, Iohannes leonis. Unde iuvenus:

Marcus amat terras inter celumque volare.

Iohannes fremit ore leo, similis rugienti.

(Iuvenus, *Evangelica Historia*, lines 3, 7.)

Apoc iv 7
Ezech i 5-
12

Augustinus quoque dicit matheum prefiguratum in leone, quia ostendit christum esse de regia tribu. Et varie sunt opiniones de prefiguratione evangelistarum, sed nos sequimur ieronimum. Prefigurati sunt quoque evangeliste per quatuor anulos arche, duos a dextris et duos a sinistris. Erat autem in tabernaculo domini archa quadrangula, et super archam corona aurea interrasilis, alta digitis quatuor. In quatuor autem arche lateribus erant quatuor anuli aurei, duo a dextris et duo a sinistris, quibus affixi erant intrinsecus duo vectes de lignis sethim deauratis. Corona arche quadrangula mystice intelligitur quatuor evangelistarum doctrina. Corona super faciem arche quadrangula altitudinis quatuor digitorum intelligitur vita eterna, ad cuius altitudinem pervenitur per doctrinam quatuor evangelistarum; et sic corona super archam vita eterna super doctrinam evangelicam. Pulcre autem corona dicitur interrasilis, id est interpolate: distincta celaturis. Per eiusmodi distinctionem mystice significata est inter electos differentia claritatis. Quatuor anuli aurei et rotundi quatuor evangeliste, qui eternam claritatem et claram eternitatem verbis annuocierunt. In auro siquidem fulgor, in rotunditate perfectio. Duo anuli a dextris duo evangeliste, qui cum domino corporaliter conversati sunt, et eius doctrinam audierunt. Duo a sinistris, marcus et lucas, qui nec forte dominum in carne viderunt. Alii econtra per duos a sinistris volunt intelligi duos, qui doctrinam evangelicam addidicerunt, dum adhuc christus mortalis; per duos a dextris illos duos, qui post resurrectionem, postquam factus est immortalis; quia per sinistram mortalitas, per dexteram immortalitas solet intelligi. Quibus videntur consonare picture ecclesiarum, ubi enim depinguntur petrus et paulus domino collaterales: paulus depingitur a dextris, petrus a sinistris. Unde a simili per duos anulos a dextris significari videntur duo evangeliste qui dominum in carne non viderunt, sicut nec vidit paulus (in mg.: Istud observatur in bulla domini pape), marcus scil. et lucas, quorum alter fuit discipulus petri, alter pauli.

Marcus enim iste, quem habemus pre manibus, petri fuit in baptismate filius et eiusdem in divino servitio discipulus. Qui ut sacerdotio videtur reprobus, fertur pollicem sibi abscidisse et, ut ieronimus tradit, fuit colobodactilis, i.e. modicam habens quantitatem articulorum iuxta proportionalem quantitatem aliorum membrorum. Colon enim membrum, dactilon digitus. Eius materia sunt precepta, mandata, testimonia, exempla. Eius intentio est utramque in christo asserere naturam. Modus: antequam ad seriem narrationis descendat, ad commendationem generis sui, scil. levitici, de quo omnes prophete fuerunt, premittit testimonia prophetarum, scil. ysaie et malachie. Postea descendit ad narrationem incipiens a paranimpho sponsi, i.e. a iohanne, ibi scil. *fuit iohannes* etc. Consequenter agit de baptismo iohannis et christi ieiunio et temptatione deserti. Deinde prosequitur excellentiora miracula, quousque perveniat ad passionem. Deinde

agit de resurrectione, de qua plenius quam alii. Tandem de ascensione, terminans evangelium in predicatione apostolorum.

(Then the commentary itself follows.)

Quatuor sunt qualitates etc. (This preface to a pseudo-Jeromian commentary on Mark precedes the text of Mark in all copies of the Glossa. Grosseteste begins by expounding it at length:) *Expositurus evangelium marci ieronimus ostendit, que sit eius immo materia. Ostendit quoque, cur predecessores sui marcum intactum reliquerunt, scil. tum pro difficultate, tum quia pedissequus est mathei; et quare ipse apposuerit manum, quia licet in plerisque mathei insistat vestigiis. Propriis tamen gaudet privilegiis, quia sunt capitula propria marci. Addit etiam ad eius commendationem, quia fuit leviticus genere, et ubi scripsit evangelium. Ait itaque: Quatuor sunt qualitates...* (then follows a long exposition of both this preface, and the gloss accompanying it in the copies of the Glossa).

Inicium evangelii etc. Marcus ut operi et generi suo auctoritate prebeat, premitit testimonia prophetarum, ut ita basem columpne supponat, i.e. veritati evangelice testimonium propheticum, quia testimonium propheticum vel legis est quasi fulcimentum evangelice veritatis. Et sicut a prophetis suum inicium, ita sequitur in inicio ydium prophetarum, et premittens ellipticam orationem, quod solent facere prophete; ut: *Visio ysaie filii amos*. Deficit enim *hoc est*. Ita etiam dicitur, *Inicium evangelii iesu christi*. *Iesu christi* dico, *filii dei sicut scriptum est in ysaia*, i.e. sicut probatur scriptura ysaie. Que statim subditur, sunt enim verba spiritus ad patrem: *Mitto angelum meum*, i.e. nuntium mitto iohannem, qui nuntius gratie (scil. a spiritu date). *Ante faciem tuam*, i.e. filium tuum iesum christum, et in his verbis ostenditur esse filium dei. A quibusdam sic: *Inicium evangelii iesu christi*. Iohannes dicitur predicans et baptizans. *Sicut scriptum est in ysaia*, i.e. sicut probatur eodem testimonio ysaie; ex eo scil. quod subditur, *Qui preparabit viam tuam*. *Preparabit* scil. predicando, baptizando, quia precessit iohannes christum nascendo, predicando, baptizando, moriendo, sed non resurgendo. Hanc distinctionem videtur probare beda. Tertio sic, *In. ev. i. x. s. scr. e. in ys*. Acsi diceret marcus: ego inicio librum meum confirmo a prophetia ysaie. Et est hic inicium libri, non evangelice narrationis. Quidam sic, *Inicium evangelii*, i.e. evangelice narrationis.

Nunc expositioni glosularum [i.e. of the Glossa] insistamus. *Inicium evangelii*. '*Evangelium bona annuntiatio, i.e. bona res nunciata, vel bona nuntians. Quod proprie*' etc. I.e. ad bona vite et ad bona patrie, quia hec duo proprie nunciat. '*Penitemini et credite*', quod per bona vie venit ad bona patrie... (etc.).

3. William of Nottingham, Super Evangelia

MS 305 of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, of the late fourteenth century, contains an abridged form of this commentary on Clement of Llanthony's gospel harmony, only those parts of the gospels being given, together with the corresponding passages of the commentary, which were read as lessons throughout the year.

The abridgment opens with a short prologue:

Incipit quedam extractio extracta ab illa magna compilacione que appellatur *Notyngham super evangelia*. In hac extractioe non exponuntur omnia evangelia, sed aliqua que videbantur extractori fore magis proficua minus litteratis. Plura eciam evangelia hic solum exponuntur, ubi sensus litteralis vel mysticus posset videri difficilis . . . (etc.).

The writer proceeds to explain in what way he has arranged the gospel passages figuring in his selection.

We quote a passage at random, the gospel pericope of the prodigal son ('Sabbato post Dominicam iij^{am} lentis'; Lc xv 11), f. 111v:

In illo tempore, dixit iesus discipulis suis, *Homo quidam habuit . . .* (etc., down to) *vivendo luxuriose*. Sequitur inferius in hoc evangelio, *Surgam et ibo ad patrem meum et dicam illi, pater*, scil. ex natura, quam dedisti mihi, *peccavi*, male scil. vivendo, *in celum*, i.e. coram celestibus seu angelicis spiritibus sanctisque animabus, in quibus est sedes dei super gloriam. Vel *in celum*, quod scil. per culpam meam amisi et per meam negligenciam non quesivi; *et coram te*, i.e. in ipso consciencie tabernaculo me conclavi, ubi tui solius oculi penetrant. Et ideo significanter in Psalmo dicitur, *Tibi soli peccavi*. Dicit ergo, *Fac me sicut unum de mercennariis tuis*. Glossa: 'Ad filii affectum aspirare non presumit, sed mercennarii statum iam pro mercede serviturus desiderat et prudenter dicit, *Fac me*. Quasi dicat, Non possum ex me hoc facere'. Et hoc est quod addit predicta Glosa: 'Sed nec hoc, i.e. statum mercennarii, nisi priva dignatione poterit promereri'. Sequitur, *Et surgens*. Actum est prius de salubris propositi conceptione: hic agitur de efficaci rei concepte impletione. Dicit ergo, *Et surgens*, implendo scil. quod prius deliberaverat. Non enim sufficit bonum proponere, nisi etiam opere impleatur. *Surgens* inquam *venit*, i.e. venire cepit ad penitentiam disponendo et bona opera exercendo. *Venit* inquam *ad patrem suum* eius gratiam requirendo secundum illud Mathei .xi., *Venite ad me omnes qui*, etc. *Cum autem adhuc longe esset*, scil. filius ad redeundum et ad penitendum motus, nondum tamen a peccato mundatus et ideo longe a deo. . . *Vidit illum pater ipsius*, oculo scil.

Ps 16

Mt xi 28

predestinacionis sibi gratiam et gloriam preparando. . . , *et misericordia motus*, scil. pater super filium suum quem vidit miserum, attenuatum, debilitatum et denudatum. Miserum per culpe infectionem, attenuatum per gratie amissionem, debilitatum per virium depressionem, denudatum per omnimodam virtutum privacionem. *Misericordia* inquam *motus et accurrens* ipsum, scil. filium, preveniendo per misericordiam inchoantem. . . . *Cecidit super collum eius* eum amoris amplexibus constringendo, et hoc per misericordiam concomitantem. Per collum autem, quia mediat inter corpus et caput ea invicem copulando, intelligi potest penitentia peccatoris, que inter deum et hominem mediat. . . . *Cecidit ergo super collum eius et osculatus est eum*, ipsum perfecte reconciliando per gratiam subsequentem. Sciendum est hic quod communis littera est *accurrens* et sic habent Beda et Clemens. Ambrosius tamen habet *occurrens*; Ieronimus autem in epistola de filio prodigo habet *occurrens*. Item communiter habetur *super collum eius*. Clemens tamen habet, *Supra collum eius*. Sequitur: *Dixitque illi filius*. Post patris condolentis miserationem hic subdit filii confitentis humiliationem. . . . *Dixit autem pater ad servos suos*, i.e. deus ipse ad coadiutores suos in excolendo vineam ecclesie, cuiusmodi fuerint apostoli et nunc sunt viri apostolici et prelati, qui deo serviunt, non ex timore servili, sed ex timore filiali. *Dixit inquam pater, Cito proferte stolam primam* etc. Per stolam primam, que ad litteram est genus longe vestis, intelligitur vestis sancti spiritus secundum Interlinearem. Secundum vero Glosam Marginalem per stolam illam intelligitur vestis innocencie, in qua primus homo fuit conditus. Secundam primam Glosam sensus talis est: *Cito proferte stolam primam*, i.e. ministrare sacramentum baptismatis, mediante quo stola prima, i.e. gracia spiritus sancti, profertur, *et induite illum*, scil. ministerio vestro. Secundum vero Glosam secundam sensus talis est: Promittite innocenciam anime et immortalitatem corporis, qua duplici stola primus homo indutus erat ante culpam cito proferendam seu restituendam. . . . *Et date anulum in manum eius*, i.e. signaculum fidei in operatione, ut per opera fides clarescat, secundum unam Glosam Marginalem. Et sumitur tam a Beda, sive ab Ambrosio, qui dicit quod anulus est signaculum fidei et expressio veritatis. . . (etc.).

INDEX OF MSS

	PAGE		PAGE
<i>Boulogne-sur-Mer</i>		<i>Dublin</i>	
20	105 ^a	Trinity College	
<i>Cambridge</i>		A. 2. 2	177
Corpus Christi College		<i>Durham Cathedral</i>	
2	187	A. ii. 1	194
3 and 4	180	A. ii. 2	193
48	177f.	A. ii. 4	191-194
72	174, 188	A. ii. 17	18, 32
286	15, 17, 19ff., 294ff.	A. iv. 15	207, 322
305	360f.	B. iv. 24	191
460	285 ^a	<i>Eton College</i>	
463	273	26	177
Gonville and Caius College		<i>St Gall</i>	
328	292	41	103
St John's College		<i>Hereford Cathedral</i>	
73	140ff.	O. 1. viii	188f.
74	288ff.	O. 1. xiii	274 ^a
183	177, 178f.	O. 2. ii	228, 229 ^a
Pembroke College		O. 5. vii	228 ^a
7	206 ³ , 280, 355ff.	O. 6. iv	228
120	187	O. 6. xii	228 ³
301	140ff.	P. 1. ii	66
302	67, 154	P. 2. ix	18
Trinity College		<i>Karlsruhe</i>	
B. 1. 6	217 ^a	Aug. 135	103
B. 5. 1	174	<i>Lincoln Cathedral</i>	
B. 5. 3	178 ^a , 236ff.	1	230 ^a
B. 5. 4	214 ^a , 218, 219ff., 225 ^a , 341 ff.	122	207, 322 ff.
B. 5. 5	218, 227, 228, 236ff.	<i>London</i>	
B. 5. 6	214 ^a , 218, 219ff., 341 ff.	British Museum	
B. 5. 7	214 ^a , 218, 341 ff.	Additional 9381	69, 112f., 119
B. 10. 4	140ff.	11849	50
B. 10. 21	277	11850	70, 154
B. 16. 44	170 ^a	17739	154, 159
R. 17. 1	172	34890	140ff.
University Library		37487	287f.
Kk. 5. 10	351 ff.	40000	137 ff.
<i>Cheltenham</i>		Burney 26	230 ^a
Phillipps Collection		36	230 ^a
The Gundulf Bible	182	Cotton Domitianus A. vii	265f.
<i>Copenhagen</i>		Nero D. iv	32
Royal Library		Tiberius A. ii	55, 70, 116, 123f.
Gl. kgl. S. 10. fol.	133, 135	Egerton 608	53, 94ff., 117

	PAGE		PAGE
<i>London (cont.)</i>		Douce 292	54
British Museum (<i>cont.</i>)		Fairfax 27	285 ¹
Egerton 609	65, 89ff., 111, 112, 113, 245	Rawlinson G. 169	233ff.
Harley 76	140ff.	Brasenose College	
1023	66	v	270
1775	19ff.	Corpus Christi College	
1802	211ff., 328ff.	122	65
2788	30, 87, 102	St John's College	
2790	54	111	263
2797	51	129	264
2823	49, 50, 52, 116, 123f.	194	68
2830	51, 117, 123f., 159	Lincoln College	
3213	266 ¹ , 313ff.	79	279 ²
4747	266	Queen's College	
Royal 1. A. viii	285 ²	52	272
1. A. xviii	63ff., 90, 111, 112, 119	317	264
1. B. vii	31	389	252
1. B. xi	159ff., 164ff.	Wadham College	
1. B. xii	4, 119, 140f., 184ff., 235, 245	i (A. 5. 2)	277
1. D. iii	63, 112 ¹	ii (A. 10. 22)	159, 166ff.
1. D. ix	140ff.	ix (A. 10. 24)	272
1. E. vi	29	<i>Paris</i>	
4. A. xvi	205f., 316ff.	Bibliothèque Nationale	
5. B. xii	182 ¹	lat. 10438	53
Lambeth Palace		15554	261 ¹
4	174 ¹	16722	261 ¹
<i>Madrid</i>		nouv. acquis. franç. 1587	65, 111
National Library		<i>Rome</i>	
Codex Toletanus	245 ²	Vatican Library	
<i>Maidstone Museum</i>		3466	287
The Great Bible	174 ¹	<i>Salisbury Cathedral</i>	
<i>Monte Casino</i>		41	229 ¹ , 265
cxcvii	115 ³	77	70
ccxxxv	210 ⁵	148	184ff.
<i>Orléans</i>		<i>Tours</i>	
87	130 ¹	Public Library	
<i>Oxford</i>		22	245 ¹
Bodleian Library		<i>Winchester Cathedral</i>	
Auct. D. 2. 16	54, 68	The Great Bible	183
D. 3. 1	285 ¹ , 286f.	<i>Worcester Cathedral</i>	
D. 12. 14	15, 17, 19ff., 304f.	Gospel fragments, eighth century	18
E. infra 1. 2	174 ¹	<i>Würzburg</i>	
E. infra 6	214 ⁴ , 218, 341ff.	MSS th. f. 61	105
Bodley 155	68	<i>York Minster</i>	
		The Anglo-Saxon Gospels	134 f.
		xvi. D. 3	272
		xvi. M. 9	229 ¹
		xvi. N. 6	267

INDEX OF GOSPEL PASSAGES¹

	Mt		PAGE	
			PAGE	
	2		63, 65, 67, 89 ¹ , 134, 143, 174, 192, 193	iii 6 30, 138, 236
	3		63	7 145, 154, 168, 178, 185, 194, 234, 236, 263
	5		236	9 54, 55, 64, 69, 141, 154, 160, 212 ¹ , 234, 337
	17		65, 67, 145, 174, 180, 185, 192, 193, 236, 263, 264, 267, 288	10 30, 69, 143, 166, 186, 234, 236, 263, 264
	18		174, 234, 236, 263	11 124
	20		68	12 54, 68, 138, 168, 186, 236
	22		65	14 236, 263
	23		65, 90, 145, 174, 234, 236, 264	16 31, 49, 53, 64, 66, 69, 70, 138, 192, 193, 266
	24		145	17 66, 69, 143, 166, 174, 186, 212 ¹ , 234, 236
	25		65	iv 3 64, 66, 67 (twice), 70
ii	1		141, 266	4 51, 53, 64, 70, 145, 160, 168, 174, 180, 183, 186, 192, 194, 266
	2		90	5 49, 50
	3		212 ¹	6 49, 50, 54, 67, 178, 212
	4		31	7 174
	5		212 ¹ , 337	8 111 ³
	6		50	9 19, 30, 31, 123, 135, 143, 192
	7		63	10 30, 31, 50, 64, 66, 67 (twice), 134, 337
	8		19, 63, 65, 69	12 31, 49, 50, 52, 64, 68, 111 ³ , 141, 263
	9		65, 271	13 50, 123, 194, 234, 236, 264, 288
	10		65, 67, 155, 236, 264, 271	14 64, 66
	11		63	15 31, 35 ¹
	12		63	16 49, 50, 52, 54, 64, 68, 123, 135, 154, 164, 174, 183, 186, 192, 234, 236, 263, 264, 267, 288, 352
	13		31, 63, 65, 67	18 64, 66, 67 (twice), 69, 145, 192, 194
	15		63, 66, 67, 270	19 69
	16		30, 67	20 64
	17		236	24 186
	19		124, 143, 183, 185, 189, 236	25 64, 70, 141
	21		234	v 1 64, 187, 192
	22		31, 155	2 64
	23		30, 54, 63, 66, 68	
iii	2		50, 52, 54 (twice), 55, 63, 68, 134, 141, 154, 160, 174, 234	
	3		53, 54, 63, 66, 67, 111 ³ , 189, 234, 236	
	4		64	
	5		30, 67, 236	

¹ Not including those discussed in Appendix A.

Mt	PAGE		PAGE
v 5	64, 69	vi 21	69, 212 ¹
9	53	22	31, 237
11	234	23	49, 69
12	70, 192, 266	25	49, 141
13	64, 69	26	69
14	31	28	69
16	69, 124, 143	30	167
17	234	31	69
18	145	32	69, 138, 234
19	69	33	49, 52, 141, 212 ¹
20	49, 68, 234	34	52, 54, 116, 120
22	69	vii 1	155, 234
23	49, 135, 174, 178	3	67, 192
24	49, 64, 141	4	52, 67, 154, 180, 194, 237, 263
25	145, 186, 187	5	263
28	54, 70 (twice), 160, 174	9	67
29	69	10	49, 69, 141, 234
30	64, 70, 117, 120, 178, 236	11	117, 120, 135, 143, 154, 160, 167, 174, 178, 180, 189, 192, 234, 237, 264
32	64, 168, 189	12	69, 234, 256
33	31	13	31, 167, 193
35	155	14	167
36	51, 54, 69, 138	22	49, 138
37	67	23	183, 266
38	54, 64	24	234
39	49, 53, 234	25	69 (twice), 138, 180, 234, 237, 264, 266
40	51, 53, 54, 135, 143, 234	28	49
41	31, 64, 70	29	237
42	64	viii 1	237
43	51, 54, 134, 143	3	18, 30, 50, 69, 138, 234
44	64, 186	4	237
46	145	5	18, 212 ¹
47	135, 141, 288	7	18
48	236	9	168, 183, 234, 237
vi 2	53, 64, 236	12	174
3	31	13	18, 143
4	50, 51, 53, 69	15	167
5	64	18	31
6	53, 117, 155, 166, 183, 189, 193, 194, 234, 237	20	53, 55, 168, 183, 234, 237
8	69, 70, 141	24	69
10	51, 52, 53	25	69, 288
11	287	26	234
13	64, 69, 145, 167, 192, 234, 237, 266, 287, 337	27	49
15	145, 160, 186, 188, 192, 194, 234	28	141, 234
16	50	29	49, 50, 52, 237
18	53, 64, 70	30	64, 69
20	70	31	234, 237

INDEX OF GOSPEL PASSAGES

367

Mt	PAGE
viii 32	183, 187, 192, 234, 237, 266, 271
33	90, 234
34	234
ix 1	174, 234, 237
2	49, 50, 53, 69, 138, 234
3	212 ^f
5	53, 237
6	234, 337
10	31
11	167
12	49, 138, 141
13	154
15	167
16	70, 113 ^t
17	141
18	30, 51, 53, 55, 142, 174, 189, 234, 266
23	113 ^t
30	52
31	30
35	237
38	143, 234, 287
x 2	55, 68, 138, 145, 167, 189
3	237
5	271
6	145
10	52, 174, 187, 237, 266
11	116, 120, 145, 154, 174, 180, 183, 237
12	142, 234
13	53, 55, 69, 138, 142, 154
14	116, 120, 145, 154, 174, 180, 237
18	53, 237
22	53, 55, 193, 234
23	64
26	30
27	138
30	189
34	55, 68, 113 ^t , 234, 237
36	52, 142
38	143
xi 1	64, 116, 120
3	64
8	237
10	53
12	53, 138
14	337

	PAGE
xi 18	145
19	337
20	337
23	145, 183, 187
25	237
xii 8	189, 237
11	142
18	234, 237
25	142, 266
27	189
29	142
30	145, 180, 237
31	189
32	237
36	113 ^t , 272
44	49, 53
45	113 ^t , 167, 237, 264
49	69
xiii 1	145, 167, 234
3	64, 234, 237
4	235, 237
11	64, 189, 237
14	30, 53, 55, 68, 69, 138, 160, 174, 235
15	189
16	237
20	180
22	183
23	116, 120, 145, 154, 160
24	237
29	235
32	138, 143
36	145, 180, 235, 237
43	143
48	237
55	145
57	237, 264 (twice)
xiv 1	235, 237
2	167, 174, 180
3	235
6	266
9	53, 143
12	90, 142
14	237
15	167
19	69, 180, 188, 235, 237, 264 (twice), 271
22	164, 178, 237, 271
34	55

Mt	PAGE		PAGE		
xv	2	53, 68, 142	xviii	22	186
	6	51		24	64
	7	235		25	238
	9	52		26	49, 142
	12	68, 143, 174, 180, 237		30	183, 238, 264
	13	180		33	144
	14	237	xix	1	180, 238
	28	237		7	64, 145
	30	237		9	235, 238
	31	145		12	238
	33	91, 145, 164, 235, 237, 266		20	144, 164, 235, 238, 288, 289
	35	143		21	67, 144, 180, 187, 235, 238, 287
	36	143		22	67, 188, 235, 238
	38	138		28	67
	39	194		29	67
xvi	2	143, 188, 194	xx	1	51, 67, 144, 238, 271
	3	30, 68, 142, 187		7	235
	4	266		16	144, 180
	8	138		19	238
	9	53, 64, 68, 116, 120, 145, 154, 178, 180, 183, 194		23	235
	13	31, 145		27	271
	15	52		28	64
	18	31, 264		29	31
	20	168, 270		31	145
	21	53		32	235
	23	138, 188, 264	xxi	4	145, 174, 180, 187, 235, 266, 287
	26	53		5	116, 121, 145, 180, 186, 235, 238, 264
	27	64, 144		9	51, 52
xvii	1	49, 50, 51, 53		17	91, 145, 238, 264, 289
	3	68, 138, 142, 174		21	174
	7	53		25	235, 238, 264
	11	144		26	289
	17	178, 235, 237, 264		27	238
	18	32		29	235, 238, 270
	19	64, 145, 180, 237		31	168, 289, 337
	24	138		32	146, 187
	26	145, 180		33	92, 264, 270, 271
xviii	7	235, 237		34	138
	8	271		37	92, 238, 288, 289
	9	138, 145, 154, 235, 237		41	49
	10	178, 189, 235, 237, 256, 264 (twice), 267, 272 (twice)	xxii	4	138
	12	91, 145, 168, 235, 237, 264 (twice), 271, 287, 288		5	70
	13	116, 120, 154, 180, 186, 266		10	19
	16	138, 180		13	144
	17	52, 144		14	146
	21	180			

INDEX OF GOSPEL PASSAGES

369

Mt	PAGE
xxii 17	49
25	146
30	146
40	235
45	144, 180
xxiii 3	146
13	49
14	154, 168, 174, 180, 235, 238, 289
15	168, 272
16	31, 144
20	168
21	146, 180
23	142, 146
25	31, 238
28	66
31	66
35	66
37	66
xxiv 1	51, 66, 144, 235, 238
3	66, 238, 266
4	66
10	66
14	66
15	66
17	66
23	31
27	66, 138
28	187
29	235
30	66, 144, 235
31	146
33	146
34	142, 146
35	235, 272
36	31
37	235
38	66, 235, 270
42	32
43	66, 138
49	66
51	66
52	146
xxv 9	66
11	66, 116, 121, 146, 175, 180, 235, 238
12	66
13	271
14	146, 235
22	235

	PAGE
xxv 24	32, 146, 289
27	154
30	180
34	235
36	67
37	67
41	51, 117, 121
42	144
44	117, 121, 155
xxvi 3	67
10	49, 53, 142, 155, 235, 238
33	67, 146
39	51, 144, 238
50	66
51	146
53	51, 144
54	144
61	144
64	155
72	53
75	178, 194
xxvii 16	53, 144, 175
20	144
32	144
33	238
35	142, 144
39	64
40	238
44	31
49	292
52	64, 66
xxviii 3	64
5	64
6	18
7	52, 144, 238, 271, 289
8	18
12	18
13	183
15	18, 238
	Mc
i 1	289
2	52
5	30
7	146, 155, 160, 168, 180
8	144, 288
10	89 ^r , 266
11	160
12	64
15	51, 142

	PAGE		PAGE
Mc		v	
i		19	52, 54, 55, 68 (twice), 138, 168
18	178, 266	21	189, 238
24	168, 266	23	116, 121, 135, 146, 180, 183, 187, 189, 192, 238
27	53	24	146
43	174, 238	35	70, 135, 146, 175, 178, 183, 187, 189, 192, 195, 238
ii		38	52, 192
1	64, 175, 178, 187, 271	39	238
2	64, 69, 135, 144, 180, 187, 189, 192, 193, 194, 238, 264, 270, 289	40	52, 187
5	266	42	92
8	195, 264	43	146, 168, 189, 195, 238
9	238	vi	
10	272	1	187
12	146, 238	3	134
13	195	5	195
15	69	6	183
16	146, 168, 238	9	134
20	142	13	117, 121, 135, 146, 239
21	64	14	239
22	31, 146, 195	15	52, 135
23	64	21	50, 51, 52, 70, 239, 271
24	53	30	239
iii		31	124, 146, 239
6	138, 146	32	49, 50, 51, 52, 135, 142, 154
9	31, 64, 142	34	51, 146
11	53	37	144
16	144	41	239
21	142, 238	56	52
25	238	vii	
26	51, 142	3	51, 54, 55, 68 (twice), 138, 142, 154, 160, 174, 183, 192
32	195	4	52, 68, 135
iv		8	239
4	238	19	194, 195
6	144	22	290
8	289	24	52
10	135, 146, 238	27	239
15	51, 52, 70, 142, 154	28	187
19	290	viii	
26	70	1	116, 121, 123, 146, 154, 175, 178, 180, 183, 187, 192, 239
28	238	13	51, 52, 135, 154
29	238, 271	14	168
34	183	23	51, 52, 142, 154, 160
35	70, 183	28	192, 195
36	70	29	135, 192
v		33	54, 135, 144, 239
2	70, 134, 135, 142, 183, 189, 192, 195		
4	146		
7	135, 238		
9	144, 189		
11	238, 271		
14	189		
17	52		

INDEX OF GOSPEL PASSAGES

371

	PAGE		PAGE
Mc			
viii 34	52, 68, 135, 138, 174, 180	xi 32	168, 239
37	49, 50, 51, 52, 54 (twice), 55, 68 (twice), 135, 138, 142, 174	33	142
38	52, 135, 142, 146, 174, 187, 239, 290	xii 6	271
ix 1	195, 239, 266	8	271
2	52	16	146
3	146, 168, 239	29	52, 239
5	146, 239	33	239
15	138, 146, 168, 174, 239	34	54, 138
19	239	38	52
30	144	xiii 1	69, 144
37	192, 194	3	239
41	239	7	239, 266
45	68	11	52, 144
48	52	13	146
49	116, 121, 146, 154, 178, 195	15	52
x 7	291	26	239
9	142	32	52
10	239	xiv 2	52
11	52, 68, 239	3	52, 144
17	49, 50, 52, 142, 154, 174	9	52
18	239	12	239
20	68	13	138
24	52	14	52, 144
25	272	21	52, 146, 154, 239
26	144, 239	27	52 (twice), 68, 142, 146, 239
28	146, 180	29	266
29	239	37	239
32	18	38	52
34	18	44	239
38	239	46	266
39	18, 239	xv 15	64, 69, 142
40	18, 52	27	142, 239
41	146, 180, 271	29	239
46	52	33	64, 146
49	271	36	64
51	146, 180	xvi 1	146, 239, 266
52	52	12	239
xi 1	239	14	175, 239
2	52	15	142
6	239		
7	69, 239	Lc	
10	144	i 1	64
13	144	3	240
15	239	5	146, 240
24	154, 174	9	64
		10	65, 240

Lc	PAGE		PAGE
i 11	65	ii 41	70
13	65	46	146, 155, 168, 175, 240
21	65	48	240
22	65	51	111 ³ , 135, 155, 164, 240, 266
26	65		
29	135	iii 4	271, 291
30	67	8	30, 142, 187
35	117, 121, 144	9	20, 138, 142, 187, 192, 240, 266
39	155	13	138, 144
42	67, 146	14	135
45	135, 144, 175, 240	16	291
50	135, 146, 155, 192, 195, 240, 266 (twice), 291	18	135
54	111 ³ , 117, 146, 154, 155, 164, 178 (twice), 183, 187, 192, 194, 195, 240, 266	iv 2	240
56	65	4	175
59	67	5	111 ³ , 175, 240, 271
64	65	7	240, 271
66	65, 180, 240	9	146, 180, 240
67	65	10	271
71	134	14	165
74	67, 134	18	135, 146, 165, 178, 180, 187, 189, 192, 195, 240
77	135, 146	20	138
80	65, 271	23	266
		27	146, 240
ii 2	65	33	144
5	65	34	165, 240
6	65, 271	35	142
7	116, 121, 144, 154, 175, 178 (twice), 183, 192, 240	38	142
8	65	v 1	146
9	65	3	65
10	65	7	54, 117, 121, 135 (twice), 146, 154, 165, 178, 180, 183, 187, 189, 192, 195, 240, 267 (twice)
11	20, 240	8	188
13	271	13	142, 183, 240
14	67	22	175, 240
15	65, 135, 164, 178, 183, 187, 189, 192, 240, 266, 267, 287, 291	24	240
18	240	25	165, 240, 271
21	144, 183, 192	32	138, 154, 291
22	240	34	138, 142
23	271	vi 1	144
24	65	9	146
25	65	10	240, 271
29	52, 65	11	144, 240
34	135, 164, 240	14	183
37	65, 240	15	55, 68 (twice), 142
38	178, 240, 266, 271	17	271
40	144		

INDEX OF GOSPEL PASSAGES

373

Lc	PAGE		PAGE
vi	20	188	ix 15
	24	240	16
	26	54, 142, 168, 187, 240	25
	27	146	29
	28	138, 192, 195	37
	29	240	39
	35	30	45
	37	138, 155, 195, 240	47
	38	146, 240	49
	39	138	54
	42	240	55f.
	46	138	56
	48	241	58
	49	138, 144	62
vii	3	165, 187, 241	x 4
	11	175	6
	23	241	7
	30	291	11
	32	54, 138, 192, 193, 194	21
	34	65, 175, 241	33
	36	117, 241	xi 14
	37	30, 92, 142, 241	17
	39	144	24
	41	146	25
	45	146, 241	28
	48	144, 241	29
viii	1	66	32
	2	146	42
	4	241	44
	12	66, 144	52
	13	66	xii 2
	14	66	3
	16	241	22
	17	66	27
	18	117	28
	23	66, 89 ¹ , 134, 178 (twice), 183, 189, 241, 267	35
	26	144, 168	47
	27	117	49
	29	241	51
	36	241	52
	49	144, 174, 178, 180, 187, 241	xiii 4
	51	241	5
	52	55	12
	53	66	14
ix	9	142, 192	27
	10	144	34
	13	241	35
	14	92	
			ix 15
			16
			25
			29
			37
			39
			45
			47
			49
			54
			55f.
			56
			58
			62
			x 4
			6
			7
			11
			21
			33
			xi 14
			17
			24
			25
			28
			29
			32
			42
			44
			52
			xii 2
			3
			22
			27
			28
			35
			47
			49
			51
			52
			xiii 4
			5
			12
			14
			27
			34
			35

Lc	PAGE	xix	PAGE
xiv 12	241	30	55, 68
14	138, 143, 145	35	69
24	138	37	49, 50, 69, 135, 195
28	69	39	242
35	242	44	69
xv 7	20, 143, 195	xx 10	242
10	242	14	55, 69, 139
14	242, 271	17	242
17	87f., 102, 135 (twice), 139, 147, 154, 160, 175, 178, 179, 180, 183, 188, 189, 192, 195, 242, 267 (twice)	24	55, 69
19	147, 242	32	30
20	67, 301	33	139
32	242	34	192
xvi 8	242	35	30
11	65, 242	40	54
18	188	47	55, 69
21	55, 68, 135, 178, 179, 180, 183, 188, 192, 195, 242	xxi 9	116, 122, 147, 175, 242
24	271	38	139, 147, 271
26	242	xxii 1	117, 122
xvii 1	67	13	242
2	67	20	242
3	242	37	30, 143
5	138	51	243
6	242	64	271
7	179, 180, 183, 192	xxiii 8	243
8	30	15	188, 243
11	147, 175	33	243
28	139, 178, 179, 188, 242	xxiv 4	65, 143
31	139, 192, 194	5	30, 143
33	55, 68, 139, 242	6	143
35	291	24	154
37	242	28	54, 143
xviii 3	143	29	243
8	147	32	243
14	67	36	243
15	139	47	243
16	188	48	65
31	147, 186	49	30, 65
34	21, 55, 68	51	65
36	117		
xix 8	143, 242		Jo
23	69	i 5	110
26	147, 165, 180, 188, 192, 195, 242	9	67, 110, 145
29	192	12	110
		15	110, 135, 139, 145
		18	145
		19	243
		21	110
		23	110
		26	110, 111 ¹ , 243

Jo		PAGE			PAGE
i	27	21	iv	10	110
	29	94, 135, 147, 155, 178, 179, 180, 183, 188, 192, 243, 257, 267		11	110
	31	67		14	110
	32	66, 67		17	110
	33	67		24	110
	39	243		25	110
	43	67, 243		26	110
	48	67		30	243, 265
ii	2	243		31	243
	9	145, 243		45	160
	10	30		52	243
	12	243	v	1	143
	13	30, 243		2	50, 135, 147, 175
	14	265		3	67
	20	192		4	30, 66, 112, 143
	22	165, 243, 291		6	67
	23	188 (twice)		10	30, 54, 243
iii	1	65		11	189
	2	65, 110, 111 ¹ , 147, 243, 264, 265		13	67
	3	67, 265		16	264
	4	54, 65, 110, 117, 122, 192, 243, 265		19	67, 139
	5	67, 243, 257, 265, 291		24	30, 49, 50, 51, 52, 143, 160, 174, 180, 265
	6	65		27	243
	8	110, 117, 122, 180, 243, 265, 271		28	116, 122, 179, 189, 243, 264, 265
	10	110		30	243, 264
	11	271		31	189, 244
	12	110 ²		32	244
	13	110, 111 ¹		35	189, 264
	14	110 ²		36	265
	15	110, 116, 122, 175, 243		38	265
	16	67, 110, 243, 265		39	179, 188, 189, 195, 244
	18	67, 145	vi	5	244
	20	110 ²		9	110
	23	110, 111 ¹		10	110, 244
	24	110 ² , 111 ³		11	110
	27	110 ² , 111 ¹		12	110
	29	243, 265		13	244
	31	95, 110, 145		14	110
	33	95, 147, 166, 243		21	143, 145
	34	110 ²		23	49, 51, 65, 174, 189
	36	110, 243		25	93, 244, 265, 267, 271
iv	2	110 ²		26	189, 244, 271
	3	243		28	271
	5	110		32f.	264, 265
	9	110, 111 ¹		33	188, 194, 244, 271
				35	271
				36	188, 244, 264
				39	244, 264, 265

Jo		PAGE			PAGE	
vi	41	265, 271	xii	5	139	
	49	188		7	65, 145	
	51	244		9	244	
	64	49, 51, 69		29	192, 194, 244	
	66	145		50	139	
	71	30, 65, 143, 166	xiii	2	143, 271	
vii	1	65		12	117, 122	
	6	54		18	147, 188, 244	
	8	50, 51, 145, 147, 180, 188, 195, 244, 265		27	271	
	12	271		29	50	
	23	168	xiv	1	147, 166, 244, 264	
	25	166		3	139	
	29	143		4	244	
	46	244		13	244, 291	
	47	145		19	166	
viii	9	166, 244, 271		22	67	
	10	51		24	50, 54	
	12	30, 65, 145, 181, 188, 244		29	67	
	15	244	xv	4	67	
	21	181, 244, 265		6	31, 50 (twice), 69, 143	
	25	69, 244		15	117, 122, 175, 244	
	27	69, 143, 188, 244, 265		27	244	
	29	188, 244	xvi	3	31, 116, 122, 147, 175, 188, 244, 264, 265	
	33	145		7	117, 123, 244	
	35	188, 244		15	264	
	38	147, 188, 244, 265	xvii	4	166	
	45	244		5	244	
	46	244		6	94, 244, 264	
	50	31, 244		22	245	
	54	244		23	51	
ix	1	244	xviii	11	188, 192, 193, 194, 195, 245, 264, 265	
	9	145, 244		14	155	
	11	244, 271		18	145, 245	
	16	143		25	245	
	28	147		28	95, 135 (twice), 143, 179, 188, 245, 264	
x	11	21		35	166	
	12	168, 244	xix	5	245	
	32	244		6	95, 116, 147, 175, 179, 245, 264	
xi	1	145, 181, 183, 188, 192, 244, 264, 265		18	50, 51	
	11	244		27	245	
	27	192, 244, 271		38	188	
	29	194		40	245	
	37	166	xx	1	245	
	45	166, 188, 244, 271, 288		8	67	
	49	166, 183, 188, 192, 244, 264				
	50	93, 95, 188, 264				

INDEX OF GOSPEL PASSAGES

377

	PAGE
Jo	
xx 9	147, 175, 245
13	95
14	245
15	21, 54
19	147, 245
29	245
xxi 1	67

	PAGE
xxi 2	245
3	21
4	245
6	143, 245
7	245
18	147, 245
23	175

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

- Abbo of Fleury, 48, 128, 130ff., 153
 Abelard (Abailard), 156, 207f., 209,
 220, 227, 233
 Abingdon, 61, 136
 Adalbero, bp of Metz, 39
 Adam de Marisco, 276
 Ademar of Angoulêmes, 150
 Æthelbert, abp of Canterbury, 27
 Æthelbert, abp of York, 26
 Æthelred, 61^s
 Æthelstan, 55, 61, 112^r
 Æthelstan of Mercia, 59^r
 Æthelwold, 55, 133^r, 136ff.
 Agobard, abp of Lyons, 74ff.
 Aimard, abb of Cluny, 47
 Aimoinus, mk of Fleury, 131
 Aix-la-Chapelle, 188
 Alberic of Rheims, 207
 St Albert the Great, 275
 Alcuin, 1, 2, 3, 22f., 24ff., 28^r, 33,
 49ff., 57f., 72, 74, 81ff., 84ff.,
 96f., 101f., 107, 113, 200, 314,
 316, 338
 his commentaries quoted, 93, and
 passim
 Alexander, pope, 223, 224^r
 Alexander of Hales, 259, 275, 279
 Alexander, bp of Lincoln, 230
 Alexander Neckam, 279, 285^s, 351ff.
 Alfred, 57, 59ff.
 Allgeier, A., 3, 4
 Almannus, abb of Moyeuimoutier,
 40^r
 St Ambrose, 39, 152
 his commentaries quoted, 87, and
 passim
 Angelomus of Luxeuil, 83
 Angers, 191^r
 Aniane, 35
 Anselm of Canterbury, 172, 197ff.,
 204, 210
 Anselm, abb of St Edmundsbury,
 187
 Anselm of Laon, 103^s, 201ff., 208ff.,
 212, 213ff., 220f., 228^s, 231,
 311, 312, 314f., 316ff., 336,
 338, 341, 343
 his commentaries quoted, 330, and
 passim
 Ardo, mk, 33
 Aristotle, 74, 86, 100, 150, 209, 223,
 249, 259
 Armagh, 211, 339f.
 Arnulf, count of Flanders, 37
 St Arnulf, 39
 Asser, 59^r, 60
 Athelney, 60f.
 St Augustine of Canterbury, 17, 25,
 29
 St Augustine of Hippo, 5ff., 12,
 15ff., 22, 24, 39, 70f., 75f., 94^r,
 96, 100^s, 106, 118, 124ff., 131^s,
 156, 199, 217^r, 229, 246f., 249,
 262, 286, 316, 317, 338
 his commentaries quoted, 87, and
 passim
 Aurillac, 43^r
 Auxerre, 104, 107, 111^s, 112ff., 124,
 129, 137, 141, 149, 163, 315
 Baldwin, abp of Canterbury, 172
 Baldwin, abb of St Edmundsbury,
 186
 Bandini, 217^r
 Barking, 68
 Beaume, 43, 44f., 126
 Bec, 160, 163^r, 164, 168^r, 169f., 171,
 173, 176, 182, 192, 197, 202f., 316
 Bede, 11, 12, 15, 25, 29^s, 58, 79f.,
 96, 105, 191, 206^s, 230, 286,
 314, 316, 317, 338
 his commentaries quoted, 87, and
 passim
 Benedict of Aniane, 33, 35f., 42, 55,
 57, 60, 72
 Benedict Biscop, 25
 Benedict of Nursia, 33, 36, 37
 Benedict, abb of Peterborough, 229
 Berengar, 97, 152, 155ff.
 Berger, S., 103, 261
 St Bernard, 71, 210, 222, 253f.,
 339f.
 Berno, abb of Cluny, 43, 45
 Blandinium, 37

- Blidulfus, 41
 Bodmin, St Petroc's, 69, 112
 Boehmer, H., 170²
 Boethius, 86, 96, 100², 115, 125
 Bologna, 222², 273
 Bonaventura, 280
 Bossuet, 10
 Bourg-Dieu, 43
 Brittany, 35
 Brogne, 37
 Brooke, Z. N., 170², 196
 Bruun Candidus, 34
 Bruyne, Dom de, 2, 261³
 Bury St Edmunds, 186f., 191², 232, 355

 Caen, 160, 164, 169, 173, 175, 181, 191², 192
 Canterbury, 18, 56, 139, 159, 175, 185
 Christ Church, 55, 58, 68, 171ff., 179f., 191³, 201, 214⁴, 218f., 224ff., 229, 236, 341
 St Augustine's, 29, 63, 112²
 Canute, 153f., 186
 Cassiodorus, 12, 78, 96, 100³, 249
 Châlons-sur-Seine, 73
 Charlemagne, 4, 24ff., 32, 73, 81, 96, 104
 Charles the Bald, 81¹, 107
 Chartres, 153f., 233
 Chester, 191²
 Chester-le-Street, 56
 Christian of Stavelot, 206, 313ff.
 his commentary quoted, 90, and *passim*
 Chrodegang of Metz, 57, 58f.
 Cirencester, 279
 Clairvaux, 339f.
 Claudius of Turino, 83
 his commentary quoted, 168
 Clement of Llanthony, 280, 360
 Cluny, 42ff., 48², 72, 126f.
 Coelestin III, 186
 Conrad of Hirschau, 251
 Cornelimünster (Inden), 35, 36²
 Corvey, 60
 Coventry, 186
 Croyland, 173, 191²
 St Cuthbert, 25, 56

 Danes, 55ff., 60, 153
 Delisle, L., 219², 341

 Denifle, H., 204², 221¹, 260f., 284ff.
 Dominicans, 273, 275¹, 284
 Donatus, 114, 123
 Dover, St Martin's, 179f.
 Down, 340
 Druthmarus, *see* Christian
 Dublin, 65
 Dunchad, 114, 123
 Dunfermline, 191²
 Duns Scotus, 273
 Dunstable, 279
 Dunstan, 55, 61f., 133, 136, 139f., 159¹
 Durham, 170, 182, 190ff., 207, 231, 323

 Eadgar, 140
 Eadred, 136
 Eanbald of York, 26
 Eastry, prior of Christ Church, 201, 218
 Ecgbert of York, 25
 Edward the Confessor, 155
 Edward the Elder, 61, 63²
 Einhard, 72
 Einold, abb of Gorze, 39f., 41
 Elias, Irishman, 113f.
 Ely, 136
 England, 2, 15, 17, 25ff., 55ff., 66, 112, 127, 132ff., 147f., 153ff., 169ff., 195f., 217ff., 224ff., 263ff.
 Ercambold, abb of Fleury, 127
 Ernest, bp of Rochester, 181
 Ernulfus, bp of Rochester, 182
 Essex, 56
 Ethelnoth, abp of Canterbury, 154
 Ethelred, 153
 Eustachius, count of Boulogne, 63²
 Evesham, 190
 Exeter, 54

 Fécamp, 191²
 Ferrières, 73, 104
 Flanders, 36ff., 60f., 140
 Fleury, 43², 45, 55, 126ff., 136f., 147
 Formosus, pope, 59³
 France, 35, 41, 53, 61, 63, 68, 125f., 149, 154, 159, 173, 191, 200ff., 223
 Franciscans, 273ff.
 Freulfus of Lisieux, 99

- Fredegis, abb of St Martin's, Tours,
 74ff., 81, 83, 85, 97
 Fulbert of Chartres, 48, 153f., 155
 Fulco, abp of Rheims, 59, 127
 Fulda, 34, 35², 98, 104f., 115, 124, 147

 Gasquet, A., 196
 Gaul, 2
 Gelasius, 76, 156
 'Gennadius', 336¹
 Geoffrey, abb of St Albans, 177
 Geoffrey Rufus, bp of Durham, 193
 Gerbert, 150f., 153
 Gerhard of Brogne, 37f.
 Gerhoh of Reichersperg, 214²
 Germanus, prior of Ramsey, 133
 Germany, 35, 55
 Gerolfus, mk of Fulda, 106
 Ghent, 37
 Gigni, 43
 Gilbert Foliot, 227
 Gilbert de la Porrée, 207, 210, 213f.,
 220, 227, 230, 233, 262
 Gilbert the Universal, 211¹
 Giles, J. A., 341
 Gisburne, 288
 Giselbert, duke of Lorraine, 37
 Glastonbury, 61f., 136, 140, 191²,
 232³
 Gloucester, 189
 Goda, countess of Boulogne, 63
 Godescalc, 77²
 Godfrey of Cambrai, 182
 Gorze, 39ff., 72
 Grabmann, M., 198¹
 Gratian, 77³, 170¹, 262, 292
 St Gregory the Great, 15ff., 18ff.,
 25, 34, 39, 44, 47, 75, 170¹, 230,
 317
 his commentaries quoted, 19, and
 passim
 Gregory VII, 190
 Gregory of Tours, 10
 Grimbald, 60
 Guimund of Aversa, 157
 Gundulf, bp of Rochester, 181f.

 Hadrian of Canterbury, 25
 Hadrian IV, 177
 Hauréau, 114¹
 Haymo of Halberstadt, 97, 102
 Heiric of Auxerre, 106f., 113

 Henry of Blois, 183
 Henry I, 172, 179, 197
 Henry II, 172, 223
 Herbert of Bosham, 219ff., 223,
 225ff., 229, 231, 341ff.
 Hereford, 18, 66f., 188f., 227f.
 Heribrand, abb of St Laurence,
 Liège, 202
 Herveus of Bourg-Dieu, 204
 Herveus, sacrist of St Edmundsbury,
 187
 St Hilary, 156, 170¹, 317
 his commentaries quoted, 91, and
 passim
 Hildebold, 42
 Hincmar, abp of Rheims, 60
 Hody, H., 259, 285²
 Hornbach, 39
 Hugh of Laci, 189
 St Hugh of Lincoln, 183, 186, 230
 Hugh of Pudsey, 193f., 231
 Hugh of St Cher, 286
 Hugh of St Victor, 207, 212, 249f.,
 254
 Hugo, mk of St Edmundsbury, 187

 Ireland, 2, 65ff., 106ff., 113f., 123,
 211ff., 328ff.
 Isidore of Seville, 74, 78, 96, 125,
 249, 283
 Italy, 1, 11, 26, 154

 James, M. R., 170²
 Jarrow, 25¹, 190
 St Jerome, 1ff., 13, 19, 32, 39, 71,
 77, 94³, 105², 156, 159, 212f.,
 258, 262, 282ff., 286f., 313ff., 317
 his commentaries quoted, 90, and
 passim
 Joachim of Floris, 222
 John, mk of Cluny, 43
 John of Cornwall, 222
 John of Gorze, 40ff.
 John Grandison, 292
 John Marchesino, 285²
 John the Old Saxon, 60f.
 John of Salisbury, 207, 211, 223²,
 250f.
 John the Scot, called Erigena
 (Eriugena), 107ff., 112, 113f.,
 114, 117f., 119, 129, 168¹, 216,
 305ff., 336, 338

- Jonas of Orleans, 83²
 Justinianus, 43, 170¹, 349
- Kelso, 191²
 Kent, 56, 57
- Lacombe, G., 278¹
 Lambeth, 172
 Landévennec, 54, 68
 Landgraf, A., 261 f.
 Lanfranc, 152, 156 ff., 169 ff., 195 f.,
 197, 200 ff., 316, 339
 Laon, 54, 104, 106 f., 111³, 112 ff.,
 149, 203, 205, 210, 315
 Laurence, prior of Durham, 231
 Leo, 317
 Leofric, bp of Exeter, 54, 68
 Leominster, 232³
 Liège, 39
 Lincoln, 177, 229 f.
 Lindisfarne, 56
 Little, A. G., 276
 London, 56
 Syon Monastery, 286
 Longeville, 39
 Lorraine, 36 ff., 61
 Lothar, 83, 100¹
 Louis the Pious, 33, 73, 107
 Louvain, St Martin's, 51
 Lupus, Servatus, of Ferrières, 34,
 72 f., 105 f.
- Maelbrigte, 339 f.
 Maiolus, abb of Cluny, 47
 St Malachias O'Morgair, 339 ff.
 Malmédy, 36¹, 39
 Marmoutier, 89
 Martianus Capella, 114, 123
 Martin, J. P. P., 260, 267
 Massay, 43
 Matthew Paris, 176
 Meginhard, mk of Fulda, 73
 Migne, 19², 206, 316, 322
 Milo Crispinus, 158, 163, 169
 Montreuil, 68
 Moyenmoutier, 39, 40^{1,3}
- Newcastle-on-Tyne, 190
 Northumbria, 25 ff., 29, 170, 189 f.
 Norwich, 191²
 Notker Balbulus, 81¹, 97¹, 98³, 103 f.,
 129
- Ockham, 273
 Oda, abp of Canterbury, 132 f.
 Odilo, abb of Cluny, 45¹, 47, 48, 131
 Odo, abb of Cluny, 43, 126 ff.
 Offa, 28, 178², 292
 Origen, 287, 317
 his commentaries quoted, 91, and
passim
 Orosius, 9 f.
 Osbern, 62
 Osgar of Abingdon, 136
 St Osmund of Salisbury, 184 f.
 Oswald, abp of York, 132 f.
 Otto of Freising, 210
 Otto the Great, 55
 Oxford University, 185, 268 ff.,
 273 ff.
- Paris, 43, 104, 126 f., 148, 149, 203,
 221, 223, 230, 263, 338
 Notre Dame, 211, 213 ff., 221 f.,
 223 f., 227, 231, 283, 340
 St Geneviève, 51
 University, 150, 200, 213, 222 ff.,
 228³, 231, 258, 260 f., 262 f.,
 265 ff., 273 ff., 278, 282 ff.
- Paucapalea, 262²
 Paul, abb of St Albans, 175 f.
 Peter of Blois, 222¹
 Peter Cellensis, abb of St Remy, 223²
 Peter Comestor, 231
 Peter the Lombard, 209, 213 ff.,
 218 ff., 224 ff., 227 ff., 232 ff.,
 236 ff., 246, 255 ff., 259, 262 f.,
 268, 276, 277, 278, 280, 283 f., 312,
 317, 336², 339, 340, 341, 343 f.
- Peterborough, 136 f., 173, 229
 Petrus Damiani, 153, 159
 Plegmund, abp of Canterbury, 59
 Pontigny, 225
 Porphyrius, 96
 Priscianus, 43, 114, 123
 Prüm, 36³
 Pseudo-Dionysius, 168
- Quentin, H., 1¹, 2, 3¹, 261³
- Rabanus Maurus, 72, 97 ff., 102 ff.,
 107, 111, 114, 118, 126, 129,
 191, 212, 249, 286, 314
 his commentaries quoted, 92, and
passim

- Radulfus Ardens, 209^t
 Ralph Foliot, 227f.
 Ralph of Laon, 206³, 207
 Ralph, bp of Rochester, 205, 317
 Ramsey, 133
 Ramwold, abb of St Emmeram's,
 41^t
 Ranulfus (Ralph) Flambard, 193,
 207, 323
 Reginald of Denham, 187³
 Reichenau, 35^t, 103f., 147
 Remigius of Auxerre, 41f., 43, 44,
 45, 102³, 111³, 114ff., 118ff.,
 126ff., 141, 153, 163, 168^t, 192^t,
 204, 206, 212, 216, 312ff., 323
 his commentaries quoted, 92, and
 passim
 Revesby, 191²
 Rheims, 42, 60, 126f., 129, 137, 140f.,
 149, 150f., 163, 210, 227
 Richard I, 183
 Richard, abp of Canterbury, 229
 Richard, abb of St Albans, 176f.
 Richerus, 150
 Robert Bethune, 189
 Robert Foliot, 228³
 Robert Grosseteste, 206, 275f., 280,
 355ff.
 Robert Losinga, 188
 Robert of Melun, 227
 Robert Pullus, 207
 Rochester, 63, 181f., 205, 232, 317
 Roger Bacon, 14, 259ff., 275^t, 281ff.,
 285², 292
 Romainmoutier, 43²
 Rome, 73, 230, 340
 Russerie, 169

 St Albans, 175ff., 191², 232, 236,
 252^t, 273, 279
 St Aper, 39
 St Bertin, 37, 60, 105^t
 St Carilef, 190
 St Denis, 60
 St Èvre, 39
 St Evroult, 169
 St Felix, 39
 St Ghislain, 37
 St Mansuet, 39
 St Mihiel, 39, 42
 St Remy, 127, 223²
 St Vincent, 190

 Salisbury (Sarum), 184f.
 Samson, abb of St Edmundsbury,
 186
 Selby, 191²
 Senatus of Worcester, 178
 Senones, 39
 Sens, 223, 224
 Sigebert of Gembloux, 103^t
 Simon, abb of St Albans, 177, 232
 Siward, bp of Rochester, 181
 Smaragdus of St Mihiel, 102
 Spain, 1, 26
 Stavelot, 36³, 39
 Stephen, 183
 Stephen Langton, 260, 262, 267,
 278f.
 Symeon of Durham, 56

 Talbot, prior of St Edmundsbury,
 187
 Theobald, abp of Canterbury, 179
 Theodore, abp of Canterbury, 25
 Theodulf of Orleans, 2, 127
 St Thomas Aquinas, 209f., 259, 275,
 279
 St Thomas Becket, 172, 218ff., 223,
 225ff., 227^t, 228³, 229, 232
 Thomas of Eccleston, 275, 277^t
 Thomas of Elmham, 17^t
 Thomas of Wales, 276
 Thomas of York, 277^t
 Thorney, 136ff.
 Toul, 36³, 39
 Tours, 30, 32, 44, 50, 112, 115, 124,
 126, 151, 223
 St Martin's, 23, 74ff., 81ff., 89f.,
 97f., 147, 191², 245^t
 Traube, G., 105
 Trèves, 39
 St Maximin, 36³, 39, 41
 Tulle, 43²
 Turner, C. H., 18, 32

 Ubertino da Casale, 292

 Vercelli, 312
 Vercellone, C., 217³, 260
 Verdun, 39
 Vincent of Beauvais, 103², 336^t
 Virgil, 43

 Walafrid Strabo, 73, 103f., 305, 341^t

- Walcher, bp of Durham, 190
 Walkelin, bp of Winchester, 171, 182
 Walter, bp of Hereford, 155
 Walter of St Victor, 222
 Walram, bp of Rochester, 232
 Warin, abb of St Albans, 177
 Warin, prior of St Albans, 177
 Waulsort, 39
 Wearmouth, 25¹, 190
 Werfrid, bp of Worcester, 59²
 Werwulf of Mercia, 59³
 Westminster, 191²
 Whitby, 173, 190, 191²
 William, abp of Canterbury, 179
 William Carilef, 182, 190ff.
 William of Champeaux, 207, 209
 William of Conches, 233
 William the Conqueror, 169, 190
 William of Gap (le Mire), 223³, 226¹,
 346
 William of Longueville, 179
 William of Nottingham, 280, 360
 William the Pious of Aquitania, 43¹
 William Rufus, 172, 197
 William of St Amour, 274, 277¹
 William, abp of Sens and Rheims,
 219, 225, 226¹, 342ff.
 Winchcombe, 190, 191²
 Winchester, 131, 132ff., 136ff., 139f.,
 147, 182f., 191²
 New Minster, 61
 St Swithin's, 182
 Worcester, 18
 Wordsworth and White's edition of
 the Vulgate N.T., 94, 140f.,
 178², 184, 186², 294ff.
 Wulfald, abb of Fleury, 127
 Wulfred, abp of Canterbury, 58
 York, 26f., 29ff., 56, 134, 170, 190,
 191², 267