CH 310 (REL 247, 399): READINGS IN LATIN ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE
Topic for Spring, 2011: The *Glossa ordinaria* on the Gospel of
Matthew
Time: Mondays, 6-8:30 PM
Place: 110 Gray Building (Old Divinity School)
Instructor: Keefe
Office: 316 Old Divinity, 660-3469 or skeefe@div.duke.edu

Description

The primary purpose of the course is to read medieval Latin in
order to increase your skill at it, whether you wish to do this
for pleasure, or for your research and thesis work. I am assuming
the class will have different levels of skill. The goal is each
person's improvement, not impeccability. The material selected for
translation is a commentary on the Bible, known as the *Glossa
ordinaria,* or "ordinary gloss", the standard interpretation of the
Bible from the 12th to the 16th century. The entire work has never
been translated into English, yet for students studying the
history of Scriptural exegesis, or later medieval theology and
philosophy, it is a fundamental source for entering into the
intellectual life of all the Schoolmasters and students of the
later Middle Ages. Thus, the content of the material may be
valuable for your studies, as well as the Latinity.

Requirements

1. Weekly preparation of assigned amount of Latin, which we will
then read together in translation in class. You may wish to write
out your translation. If you run into areas of difficulty, you are
expected to attempt to solve the difficulty by recourse to Latin
grammar books and medieval Latin dictionaries. Raise any unsolved
questions in class.

2. Keeping a Record Chart. Each week record the number of lines
you were able to translate in the amount of hours you spent.

3. A final 2-hour exam in which you will be asked to translate a
previously unseen passage.

Your final grade will be determined by your weekly performance and
effort, and by your improvement.

Schedule

1/12 (Substitute day for MLK day 1/18) Introduction

1/17 (no class- MLK Day)

1/24 Prologue and Chapter 1, vv. 1-4 (along with the Vulgate, Mt. 1, 1-4)

1/31

2/7

2/14

2/21

2/28

3/7 (no class- reading week)

3/14

3/21

3/28

4/4

4/11

4/18 (last day of class — exam)

Record Chart

```
week          no. of lines translated    no. of hours spent

1/24_____

1/31_____

2/7_____

2/14_____

2/21_____

2/28_____

3/14_____

3/21_____

3/28_____

4/4_____

4/11_____
```

Latin Dictionaries

E. A. Andrews, *A Latin Dictionary Founded on Andrews' Edition of*

Freund's Latin Dictionary, Revised, Enlarged, and in Great Part Rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, Oxford (1st ed., 1879; reprinted 1993). (Often referred to as "Lewis & Short"-unabridged).

C. Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, 10 vols., Graz, 1954 (unchanged reprint of 1883-7 ed.) Perkins Ref. PA 2889.D8y/ 1954. (Often referred to as "Du Cange".)

R. E. Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List From British and Irish Sources*, London, 1965 (repr. 1973). (Often referred to as "Latham".)

If you are trying some paleography:

A. Cappelli, *Dizionario di Abbreviature Latine ed Italiane*, 6th ed., Milan, 1973. (Often referred to as "Cappelli".)
Capelli is online at http://inkunabeln.ub.uni-koeln.de/vdibproduction/handapparat/nachs_w/cappelli/cappelli.html

Background (Wrote before I read Lesley Smith's book; see below)

"Glossa ordinaria" is a term that was given during the Middle Ages, starting in the 12th century, to certain compilations of

glosses on a given text: there was a "Glossa ordinaria" on the Bible, there was a "Glossa ordinaria" on a number of canon law collections (like the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX), there was also a "glossa ordinaria" on the basic text of Roman law, the Corpus Iuris ciuilis. Why were these collections of glosses called "ordinaria"? "Ordinarius" means regular, customary, usual, or orderly. The "glossa ordinaria" was the usual or customary interpretation of a word or phrase. "Glossa, -ae, f. (from the Greek glwssa = tongue, mouth, speech, dialect) means an obsolete or foreign word that requires explanation. OCC: "A biblical gloss may be defined as one or more words, usually only a few, added in the margin or between the lines of a text, in explanation of an obscure word. It was not always helpful or even correct. These glosses grew in length as glossators enlarged them with their own comments and quotations from the Fathers. Thus the tiny gloss developed into a running commentary of an entire book. The best known example is Anselm's gloss, which became known as the GO. So great was the influence of the GO on biblical and philosophical studies in the MA (people like Thomas Aquinas) that it was called "the tongue of Scripture" and "the Bible of Scholasticism"".

The *Glossa ordinaria* (GO) is a gloss (commentary, explanation, interpretation, exegesis) on the entire Vulgate Bible. It consists largely of a collection of patristic and medieval church writers' words (people like Augustine and Jerome and Hilary and Ambrose) that were excerpted from their works and brought together in this collection. Who made the collection? It used to be thought that a ninth-century writer named Walafrid Strabo composed the GO (and that is why the GO is printed under his name in PL 114), but now it is known that the GO was compiled by different authors of the 12th century, the principle compiler being Anselm of Laon (d. 1117)(not to be confused with his contemporary, Anselm of Canterbury, who may be known to you for his ontological proof for the existence of God, or his work, *Cur Deus homo?*)Beryl Smalley, a famous modern historian of the GO, believes Anselm and his brother Raoul and maybe other aids compiled the gloss on the Psalms, St. Paul, and the gospels of Matthew, Luke and John, while Gilbert the Universal (d. 1134) completed the gloss on the Pentateuch and the Prophets.

But this does not mean that a prototype of the GO did not exist before the 12th century, on which Anselm and his collaborators based their work. That some form of the GO was already in use is strengthened by the fact that Anselm's GO obtained immediate success. It was being cited and people were writing glosses on

the Gloss in the 12th century. When I say it obtained "success" I mean that the GO has its own character, different than other glosses on the Bible. A gloss, or interpretation, could give an historical, allegorical, moral and/or mystical interpretation of the biblical passage. We will see what the GO does with the long geneology at the beginning of Matthew's Gospel. Any given gloss on the Bible could keep changing as each reader felt it was insufficient and added more, or too excessive and eliminated parts.

At first the GO was cited as one aide among many others for the study of the Bible. At Paris it seems to have shown itself to be so practical that it became a classic text. It is then that professors began to gloss the GO. Smalley is convinced that Anselm made use of existing collections of glosses and that they included excerpts from Lanfranc and Berenger as well as patristic material.

OCC: "Commentaries on Scripture were produced in great number by Carolingian theologians (8th-9th century, all of them depending on patristic writers and almost all of them giving allegorical (as opposed to historical) interpretations. Rabanus Maurus and Claudius of Turin were the most prolific exegetes. Rabanus used long excerpts from the fathers and made small additions of his own. Claudius's commentaries on Scripture were really Scriptural glosses, the first of that genre in the western church, in imitation of the Greek *catenae*. That is, glosses were mere citations from one or more early authors strung together in a "chain". They were used by theologians as a ready source for citations. The most famous was the GO, which cannot be attributed to Walafrid Strabo as such, but was apparently started in his period of the 9th century. It was developed by Anselm of Laon and was given its name, "GO" by Stephen Lombard (check Smalley: is this an error for Peter Lombard, d. 1160?). In the 12th c. glosses ceased being mere citations (and we will see when reading the GO that the compiler has added his own comments in addition to the citations of others).

OCC: "The authority that the GO enjoyed from the 12th to the 16th century in Scriptural exegesis has been compared to Lombard's Sentences in theology, Gatian's Decretum in canon law, and Aristotle in philosophy."

It may seem surprising then, that there has been no translation into English of the entire GO (only the Song of Songs and one letter of Paul I think). Perhaps this is because it would be a mammoth job, given the 100s of mss one would have to employ for a critical edition; because it is largely patristic citations,

which are translated; and because modern scholars who read the GO for late medieval research in literature, theology, philosophy, etc, know Latin.

Part of the GO's importance is that, as the common reference for so many, it caused or kept a common bond of thinking across late medieval fields of study that all use the Bible.

How to read the GO: First, you will need to read it alongside the Vulgate of Matthew's Gospel, to see the context of the glossed word or phrase. So, in class we will first read the Vulgate in Latin and translate it, before moving over and reading and translating the gloss. Second, keep in mind that the GO is largely quotations of early authorities. The authorities' names are sometimes given, often in abbreviated form (HIER = Hieronymus = Jerome, or AUG = Augustinus). Be prepared for other ways Anselm abbreviates (like omitting the verb esse) and watch for "usque ad", referring to how far a source is quoted.

You will need two texts for the course: the GO and a copy of the Vulgate of Matthew' Gospel. Both are available online. I have copied the whole of the GO from the online PL edition and will send the copy to your email. Then you can print out as much of it as we decide to do each week. For this first week I am passing out to you know in hard copy the Prologue and Chapter 1 of the GO of Matthew' Gospel. I do not expect you to finish it, but see if you can get through verse 4. If not, that is OK, if you can go further, that's great. I would assume you would be spending 7-10 hours a week working on your translation. As for the Vulgate text of Matthew, which you should read first, before the GO (this, of course, is translated, but try to read it without looking at a translation)you may wish to buy a Vulgate Bible (second hand) or use a library copy. (One can download it at http://www.latinvulgate.com. With the English right beside it, but that is too tempting, so I will hand out a hard copy of just the Vulgate.

Notes after reading Lesley Smith, *The Glossa ordinaria: The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary*, Leiden/Boston, Brill, 2009.

What I would say to students:

Imagine the GO as a Bible study tool. Just as when you do a

Bible study, you gather various reference works, such as a map, a concordance, a dictionary, and a biblical commentary, like *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*. All these tools help you understand the biblical text better. With the GO you have the text of the Bible and commentary together, instead of the commentary in a separate book. In the GO, the commentary is written beside the text, in the left and right margins, and also sometimes in between the lines (called interlinear). The Bible text is in bigger letters so that it is not confused with the commentary. So useful was this for studying the Bible that this glossed Bible was the favorite type of Bible for all students and masters who taught the Bible, from ca. 1120–ca. 1220, especially in Paris, the great intellectual hub of western Europe in the 12th and 13th centuries. The interpretation that the glosses provided gave Scripture its "voice". That is, people could really hear the Scriptures speak to them, when they understood what any passage meant, or could mean, in its historical or allegorical, or tropological, or anagogical sense.

If we need help to understand any particular word ("virgin") or phrase ("Son of man"), or passage ("Blessed are the poor in spirit…"), the question becomes: whose interpretation is the right one? Or, if several interpretations can all be right, is this by their authority (Augustine, Jerome), or by their rationality (argument from logic; what makes the most sense), or by their long tradition (from the liturgy or patristic writings)?

(One thing that Smith's book is completely devoid of is any talk about the content of the glosses themselves, as to their commonality.)

The origins of the GO lie in the classroom of Anselm of Laon (d. 1117) and his brother Ralph. Teaching consisted of a Master reading a text, which the students copied down, and then going back and explaining what he had dictated, helping the students understand any ambiguous words or the literal or spiritual sense in which the text could be understood. Anselm started the method of writing down his notes, or glosses, that he had taken from earlier biblical commentaries and patristic florilegia, in the margins of the biblical text. Masters had followed this system when lecturing on the liberal arts subjects (grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy), but not the advanced and sacred subject of theology, that is, the Bible. Anselm was seen as doing something new and exciting with his annotated Bible. (He and his brother did not cover the whole Bible, but glossed the Psalms, the Pauline letters, and the Gospels of Mt., Lk., and Jn.)Over the next decades after 1117

Anselm's "small-scale teacher's aid" became the GO. Bibles started to be copied that were intended from the start of their production to be glossed, and the lines were pricked to make room for the gloss. You can immediately recognize the distinct format of a glossed Bible if you go to the rare book room (show them a photo from Lesley Smith's book). By the end of the 12th century, the GO had become very popular (partly due to Peter Lombard's use of it: everybody knew his *Sentences* and wrote commentaries on it before graduating).

However, the use of the word "ordinaria" did not become common until the beginning of the 14th century. (It refers to the "ordinary" or "customary" or "usual" Gloss, not to the fact that the glosses are "ordered" (ordinare = to compile, arrange, regulate, set in order). Even though the GO refers to one work, every ms copy and every printed edition of the GO has slight variations.

There were hundreds of commentaries on the books of Scripture since the patristic period. Why did it take so long for anyone to gloss the Scripture text on the same page with the Scriptural text itself? Smith thinks maybe it was seen as too presumptuous a thing to do to the sacred text. Even when Anselm started doing it, he kept a very clear visible distinction between the Scripture and its exegesis. See the photos in Smith. You can always immediately tell what is Scripture and what is gloss by the different size of the letters, even if you can't read the Latin.

But Smith says there was a "shift" in the study of the Bible from the monastery, where it was done for contemplation and conversion, to schoolrooms, where it was done to study theology.

Some 1000s of mss of the GO survive, which explains why there is no critical edition of the entire GO to date. What people today use for the text is the *edition princeps* of the GO printed by Adolph Rusch of Strassburg ca. 1480/1. (This has been reprinted in facsimile with an intro by K. Froehlich and M. Gibson, *Biblia Latina cum glossa ordinaria*, Turnhout, 1992, 4 vols.) There is only one modern critical edition of one book of the GO, the Song of Songs, by Mary Dove, *Glossa Ordinaria Pars 22 In Canticum Canticorum, CCCM* 170, Turnhout, 1997; and A. Andrée has made a partial edition of the GO on Lamentations, *Gilbertus Vniuersalis: Glossa ordinaria in Lamentationes…*, Stockholm, 2005.

Even in medieval times some scholars found they couldn't understand what the gloss was trying to say, so we should not

get too frustrated if we can't understand the sense of the gloss sometimes, because it is too cryptic, or could be translated a number of ways, or doesn't supply the subject or the verb.

"The primary intention of the GO is to make available in one place the results of some excellent scholarship on particular aspects of the GO by other writers". I take this to mean that the GO is in fact a florilegium.

My question is whether the GO was meant to send its readers back to the original texts of the fathers when it has sentences with "etc" and "usque ad".

As to the GO being attributed to Walafrid Strabo, this was done by Johannes Trithemius in the 1494 edition of his *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* on the basis that the first gloss of the GO on Gen. 1, 1 was taken from Walafrid's own commentary on Gen, and the gloss was prefaced with his name. The attribution stuck and was taken up by Migne in his 1852 PL edition of the text. Migne thought Walafrid was the author only of the marginal glosses (and then only of some of the books), and not the interlinear glosses, which he attributed to Anselm of Laon. Since he printed the GO in the PL series (PL 113-114) under Walafrid's name, he did not include the interlinear glosses at all. Also, Migne omitted Ezekiel, Daniel, Lamentations, the Minor Prophets, Baruch, and Maccabees, because these were thought not to be by Walafrid. Because Migne's edition was the only easily available one, his omissions confused modern scholars, who thought the interlinear commentary was a separate work by Anselm of Laon. In the PL edition the text is laid out as a continuous commentary with the biblical phrases interspersed and not given in full always. So, what we are reading in class is not the whole GO on Matthew, with the full Vulgate and all the glossing it was given.

As for attributing the individual glosses to an author, the GO sometimes does and sometimes does not. There was a sense in the opinion of all that the interpretations were of the greatest authority and wonderful, as "being the opinions which have passed through the hands of all the doctors of the church for so many years in succession" (intro to 1495 edition). (I wonder, because in the Carolingian period, there were different interpretations of the faith.)

Regarding the use of "dixit" vs "dicit", some say Stephen Langton used dixit for dead authors and dicit for living, but this doesn't always work. Anyway, it was recognized as a problem in the 12th c., too, as well as for us.

It is hard to know how much of the GO is additional words added to the compiled glosses, because of the way the extracts were gathered, and their frequent lack of attribution.

Usually the authors of the GO are said to compile (compilare) or order (ordinare) the work, not compose (scribere) it. But nobody writing any kind of commentary is entirely "original", but might add to the traditional interpretation.

Bonaventure said (in his commentary on Peter Lombard's Sentences): A person who just copies the material of others, changing nothing, is called "the scribe". A person who collects the materials of others, but writes nothing of his own, is called "the compiler". A person who collects the materials of others but also adds some clarifying remarks of his own to the principal materials, is called "the commentator". A person who collects the materials of others only to confirm his own writings, which are the principal material, is called "the author".

The version of the Vulgate used in the GO: Stephen Langton (d. 1228, Archbp. Of Canterbury, an Englishman, but did his theological work at Paris) at end of 12th c. is credited with the invention (or rather refinement of existing systems) of the division into chapter and verse still used today. However, it was uncommon to cite the Bible by chapter and verse until ca. 1225-1230 when it was popularized by the Paris Master Philip the Chancellor.

The GO's sources: the GO prefers to use Carolingian re-workings of the patristic sources rather than go directly back to the original patristic author. Why? Smith wonders if the Carolingian commentaries were seen as the "latest edition" of the patristic material, or just more easily available. She thinks "the Carolingian compilations of the fathers offered an excellent re-working of the patristic material, in somewhat briefer form than the originals" (p. 43) Ann Matter has done the best on what little has been done on the GO's sources. See her article, "The Church Fathers and the GO" in *the Reception of the Church Fathers in the West. From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. I. Blackus, 2 vols (Leiden, 1993-1997), vol. 1, p. 83-111. Smith briefly names the fathers that have been used for each biblical book in the GO (For Genesis, mostly Augustine, but also Isidore, Bede, Jerome, Gregory, Walafrid, Alcuin, Rabanus; for Exodus, Origen, Bede, Augustine, Isidore, etc). For the Gospel of Matthew, Ann Matter says the GO is a reworking of Jerome and Origen (translated by Jerome) employed via the commentary by

Paschasius Radbertus. But Smith says the GO never mentions Paschasius and "his very full commentary must be highly abbreviated, if it has been used. Rather, the mss suggest that the sources are Jerome himself, with some additions from Bede, and occasional glosses from Rabanus, Ambrose, Isidore, and Gregory, which look as though they have been used directly". (p. 52).

A common pattern for a gloss might be: a basic source (perhaps drawn directly from Jerome or from an intermediary such as Bede), with notes from Gregory (via Paterius) or Isidore, and additional material from the fathers culled from Rabanus. The GO sometimes gives direct attributions to the fathers ("HIER" or "HILAR"), but many of the names are quoted from a later commentary or compilation. Me tell class: So if you went to look up a gloss that had been labeled "HIER" in the works of Jerome, you might not find the text, either because it is Jerome but through an intermediary source and the later compiler has somewhat altered the original words of Jerome, or because it is only a quasi-verbatim extract, maybe abbreviated and the sentences shaped to fit the syntax of the glosses. In other words, an "extract" may be more like a paraphrase than cut and paste work.

As you have probably discovered by now, each gloss simply begins—sometimes without even quoting the biblical passage it is glossing and without any attribution. (So don't feel it is your poor Latin necessarily, if you are confused!)

Even the Rusch edition of 1480 is not a completely accurate reflection of what might be found in the mss of the GO (Rusch has more attributions, probably taken from later annotated copies of the GO).

Were readers expected to go to the original source when they read "usque ad" or "etc"? Some modern historians think the GO is a reference book that is meant to send the reader back to the original material. But big objection is that the glosses are not always attributed, and the name of the work of the author is rarely given. Smith doesn't know why some glosses were labeled and others not.

Note! No same attribution form—right next to each other you can find HIER, HEIRO, JER, HIERONYMUS. Idem (ID) is easy to confuse with "id est" or "ISIDORE". Answer: it is because of the source they are quoting.

Another kind of attribution in the GO is one of the four senses

of reading the Scriptures, given the names in the GO of: literal, historical, allegorical, moral, mystical, anagogical, or tropological. These are sometimes given without any author's name, just: "Tropologice: In anima uirgine…"; "Anagoge: Hereticus qui iungit…" These "typings" are not editorial but are taken from the extracts themselves, as is clear when on a single page we find glosses labeled both "literal" and "historical" or both "Tropological" and "moral" (moralia) (considered interchangeable).

Also, some glosses start with a quote from another part of Scripture. These are not added by the Glosser, but are part of the extract. The biblical text used is not always the same as the Vulgate. If they used the Septuagint instead of the Vulgate, they usually reference it as "LXX". Rabanus references it as "alia editio".

Smith is still puzzled why Anselm seems less interested in recording the authors of his extracts, but more interested in identifying the type of commentary it is (moral, historical, etc). It is as if he is interested in the structure of the GO more than the content, like when teaching Rhetoric, you teach the structure of an oration, not the content.

The GO never became a single standardized text, but it does stabilize after 1200. This was due to the fact that it was superseded by other works (like Hugh of St.-Cher's Postilla)and so began to fossilize. The reason why Anselm's GO took off at all ca. 1130 was because of its use by his pupil, Gilbert de la Porée (d. 1154) and Peter Lombard (d. 1160).

Content: What makes the GO difficult to understand and translate is that the Glosser abbreviates his source. For example (and these are things we will have to struggle with!):
The GO removes verbs where the meaning can do without them
The GO cuts out powerful but inessential phrases like "iuuante Domino" or "proculdubio", or phrases where the author is talking to his audience, or added examples.
The GO may substitute one clear word (Christ) for a phrase (Mediator dei et hominum) or rephrase a line more simply (syntax = sentence arrangement or sentence structure; syn = together + tassein = to arrange).

Why is some of the glossing interlinear and some marginal? Perhaps this depended on where an earlier compiler on which the GO is dependent: if the text was meant to be preached, interlinear would be seen and read more quickly by the preacher. It doesn't seem to have to do with the length of the gloss.

Smith has a whole chapter on the "layout" of the GO on the ms page. Some mss follow the 1) simple model of 3 columns with the central text in the middle; 2)complex format, clearly for academic exegesis: sometimes there is so much gloss that the biblical text is suspended for a few lines and the gloss takes over the entire space.

Rusch's first printed edition of the GO in 1480 was also the last printed edition (prob. 330 copies) of it on its own and not with added material—usually Nicholas of Lyra's *Postilla litteralis et moralis super totam bibliam* (= the first printed biblical commentary, printed 1471/2.(Latin postilla = afterwards).

<u>In sum</u>

Anselm and the beginning of the GO:

When Anselm taught the Scriptures, he started with the Psalms and the letters of St. Paul, "the twinned sections of Old Testament and NT Christology" (p. 193) That is quite a statement! But if you have ever seen the Utrecht Psalter, nothing is clearer than that the Psalms, in the eyes of its 9th century illustrators, were describing Christ: Christ, with his cross-halo, victory staff, wounds and cross is depicted in the illustrations of the OT Psalms.

Putting text of the Bible and its glosses on the same page was Anselm's idea. He did it for himself: it is much easier teaching on a text with the glosses gathered together, than having to read them in isolation. He wrote enough of the gloss to remember the substance of it (that is why we find "usque ad"???) No mss of his work come for 20 years after his death in 1117. Ca. 1130 the GO begins to take off, and its use peaks in mid and later 12th c. Still, after 1200 when other commentaries superseded it, it was still used.

Smith asks: "What did the GO provide for these 12th and 13th c. Masters? It had many practical uses". 1) provided the most basic Bible lectures for beginners; 2) provided a convenient crib for those who wanted it; 3)it was a common starting point, a body of standard material, which all masters could consult; 4) it allowed a lot of past commentary to be got out of the way quickly, so Masters could take it for granted and move on to new perspectives; 5) debate could begin from a common and agreed point.

B. Smalley concludes that Thomas Aquinas worked from a glossed

Bible and used the GO as one source, but had many others and did not regard the GO as authoritative; at least, he is sometimes sharply critical of the GO's use of its material. Also, Smalley says Thomas' preference for one interpretation over another has nothing to do with authority, but what makes the best sense, to him, of the text.

Martin Luther, in 1513, began his first set of lectures on the Bible for his students at the U. of Wittenberg. Like Anselm, he chose the Psalms, and like Anselm, he made a gloss. He wanted his students to have the text before their eyes, so he told the printer at the U. to produce an edition of the Psalter with the text in the center and space between the lines and wide empty margins, in which the students could add commentary of their own. He did not start with any glossed texts of the Psalms. He wiped the sacred page clean, as if to begin biblical interpretation all over again. Actually, Luther couldn't proceed without his knowledge of his past masters (he was an Augustinian monk), but he chose his sources carefully.

I want to explain better the version of the GO we are reading in class, and some of the reasons for the difficulties of making sense of the text in this PL version.

When Migne edited the GO for his PL series, he did two things that make it look very different than any text of the GO in the Middle Ages. First, he thought Walafrid Strabo (9th c.) was the author only of the marginal glosses, and not the interlinear glosses, which he attributed to Anselm of Laon (12th c.). Since he printed the GO in the PL series (PL 113-114) under Walafrid's name, he did not include the interlinear glosses at all. Also, Migne omitted Ezekiel, Daniel, Lamentations, the Minor Prophets, Baruch, and Maccabees, because these were thought not to be by Walafrid Strabo. Second, you have noticed that our text does not give the full text of the Gospel of Matthew; it just gives

phrases from the Gospel (called lemmata) followed by a gloss, or interpretation, laid out as a continuous commentary. This is exactly CONTRARY to the medieval GO. The whole idea of the GO was to provide the entire text of the Bible and its interpretation on the same page. So, what we are reading in class is not the whole GO on Matthew, with the full Vulgate and the interlinear glossing it was given.

Now, to explain why it is difficult to translate the GO, if you are expecting logical continuity of thought from one sentence to the next, and expecting any particular gloss to pertain to the last-mentioned lemma.

The origin of the GO lies in the classroom of Anselm of Laon (d. 1117) and his brother Ralph. Teaching consisted of a Master reading a text, which the students copied down, and then going back and explaining what he had dictated, helping the students understand any ambiguous words or the literal or spiritual sense in which the text could be understood. When it came to the study of the Bible, Anselm started the method of writing down his notes, or glosses, that he had taken from earlier biblical commentaries and patristic florilegia, in the margins of the biblical text. Masters had followed this system when lecturing on the liberal arts subjects (grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy).

Putting the text of the Bible and its glosses on the same page was not new with Anselm (there are Carolingian glossed psalters). He did it for himself: it is much easier teaching on a text with the glosses gathered together, than having to read them in isolation. Perhaps in his original glossed version of the Bible (actually he only did the Psalms and the letters of St. Paul) he wrote only enough of the gloss to remember the substance of it (that is why we find "usque ad"???) The earliest extant mss we have of the GO are 20 years after Anselm's death in 1117, and by then scholars found Anselm's system of putting gloss and Bible text together on the same page so convenient, that they copied out the glosses in full, and added more glosses.

Over the next decades after 1117 Anselm's "small-scale teacher's aid" became the GO. Bibles started to be copied that were intended from the start of their production to be glossed, and the lines were pricked to make room for the gloss. You can immediately recognize the distinct format of a glossed Bible.

Each page is divided into three columns, with the Bible text in the center column. The commentary is written beside the text, in

the left and right margins, and also sometimes in between the lines (called interlinear). The Bible text is in bigger letters so that it is not confused with the commentary. So useful was this for studying the Bible that this glossed Bible was the favorite type of Bible for all students and masters who taught the Bible, from ca. 1120-ca. 1220, especially in Paris, the great intellectual hub of western Europe in the 12th and 13th centuries. The interpretation that the glosses provided gave Scripture its "voice". That is, people could really hear the Scriptures speak to them, when they understood what any passage meant, or could mean, in its historical or allegorical, or tropological, or anagogical sense.

The use of the word "ordinaria" for this glossed Bible did not become common until the beginning of the 14th century. (It refers to the "ordinary" or "customary" or "usual" Gloss, not to the fact that the glosses are "ordered" (ordinare = to compile, arrange, regulate, set in order). Even though the GO refers to one work, every ms copy and every printed edition of the GO has slight variations.

Some 1000s of mss of the GO survive, which explains why there is no critical edition of the entire GO to date. What people today use for the text is the *edition princeps* of the GO printed by Adolph Rusch of Strassburg ca. 1480/1. (This has been reprinted in facsimile with an intro by K. Froehlich and M. Gibson, *Biblia Latina cum glossa ordinaria*, Turnhout, 1992, 4 vols.) There is only one modern critical edition of one book of the GO, the Song of Songs, by Mary Dove, *Glossa Ordinaria Pars 22 In Canticum Canticorum, CCCM* 170, Turnhout, 1997; and A. Andrée has made a partial edition of the GO on Lamentations, *Gilbertus Vniuersalis: Glossa ordinaria in Lamentationes…*, Stockholm, 2005.

A couple of more comments about what we'll meet in the GO:

Regarding its sources: First of all, the text of the Bible is Jerome's Latin translation of the Hebrew OT and the Greek NT, but you will notice that there are no references to chapter and verse in the GO. This is because this arbitrary system of referencing the Bible didn't begin until the end of the 12th c. Stephen Langton (d. 1228, Archbp. Of Canterbury, an Englishman, but did his theological work at Paris) is credited with the invention (or rather refinement of existing systems) of the division into chapter and verse still used today. However, it was uncommon to cite the Bible by chapter and verse until ca. 1225-1230 when it was popularized by the Paris Master Philip the Chancellor.

Second, regarding the author of the source, such as Augustine, or Jerome, these references are not very useful. If you went to look up a gloss that had been labeled "HIER" in the works of Jerome, you might not find the text, either because it is Jerome but through an intermediary source and the later compiler has somewhat altered the original words of Jerome, or because it is only a quasi-verbatim extract, maybe abbreviated and the sentences shaped to fit the syntax of the glosses. In other words, an "extract" may be more like a paraphrase than cut and paste work.

As you may have discovered by now, often a gloss begins without any attribution. Were readers expected to go to the original source when they read "usque ad" or "etc"? Some modern historians think the GO is a reference book that is meant to send the reader back to the original material. But a big objection is that the glosses are not always attributed, and the name of the work of the author is rarely given. Smith doesn't know why some glosses were labeled and others not.

Another kind of attribution in the GO is one of the four senses of reading the Scriptures, given the names in the GO of: literal, historical, allegorical, moral, mystical, anagogical, or tropological. These are sometimes given without any author's name, just: "Tropologice: In anima uirgine…"; "Anagoge: Hereticus qui iungit…" These "typings" are not editorial but are taken from the extracts themselves, as is clear when on a single page we find glosses labeled both "literal" and "historical" or both "Tropological" and "moral" (moralia) (considered interchangeable).

Smith is still puzzled why Anselm seems less interested in recording the authors of his extracts, but more interested in identifying the type of commentary it is (moral, historical, etc). It is as if he is interested in the structure of the GO more than the content, like when teaching Rhetoric, you teach the structure of an oration, not the content.

The GO never became a single standardized text, but it does stabilize after 1200. This was due to the fact that it was superseded by other works (like Hugh of St.-Cher's Postilla)and so began to fossilize. The reason why Anselm's GO took off at all ca. 1130 was because of its use by his pupil, Gilbert de la Porée (d. 1154) and Peter Lombard (d. 1160). (Postillae are commentaries on the Bible without the complete biblical text, but just the lemma being commented upon.)

Smith asks: "What did the GO provide for these 12th and 13th c. Masters? It had many practical uses". 1) provided the most basic Bible lectures for beginners; 2) provided a convenient crib for those who wanted it; 3)it was a common starting point, a body of standard material, which all masters could consult; 4) it allowed a lot of past commentary to be got out of the way quickly, so Masters could take it for granted and move on to new perspectives; 5) debate could begin from a common and agreed point.

B. Smalley concludes that Thomas Aquinas worked from a glossed Bible and used the GO as one source, but had many others and did not regard the GO as authoritative; at least, he is sometimes sharply critical of the GO's use of its material. Also, Smalley says Thomas' preference for one interpretation over another has nothing to do with authority, but what makes the best sense, to him, of the text.

Martin Luther, in 1513, began his first set of lectures on the Bible for his students at the U. of Wittenberg. Like Anselm, he chose the Psalms, and like Anselm, he made a gloss. He wanted his students to have the text before their eyes, so he told the printer at the U. to produce an edition of the Psalter with the text in the center and space between the lines and wide empty margins, in which the students could add commentary of their own. He did not start with any glossed texts of the Psalms. He wiped the sacred page clean, as if to begin biblical interpretation all over again. Actually, Luther couldn't proceed without his knowledge of his past masters (he was an Augustinian monk), but he chose his sources carefully.

<u>Corrections to What I have Said Above, after reading M. Gibson's introduction to the facsimile reprint of Rusch's 1480 edition</u>

1) "A complete Glossed Bible, in which all the volumes match in script and decoration, was a treasure for the connoisseur, one that nowhere survives intact."

2) "The Gloss is never found in s single mighty pandect" (i.e., one volume; there is one 2-vol. 13th c. glossed Bible that now survives in part). The Bible was usually divided into 9 vols consisting of a)Gen.-Ruth; b) 6 books of Kings; c)4 major andn 12 minor prophets; d)the Psalter; e)Wisdom literature; f)Job, Tobit, Esther, Judith, Maccabees, Ezra-Nehemiah; g) 4 gospels; h)Pauline and canonical epistles; i)Acts and Apocalypse.

3) "The Gloss was always a library text, rather than in any

sense classroom notes perpetually revised by students and masters alike. For all its complexity, it is surprisingly stable."

4) The distinct layout on the page (the pre-ruling, larger letters for text, marginal glossing) we can find already in Carolingian mss. "Thus the Glossed Bible belongs to a tradition of book-production that had been operating for a long time on a numerically small scale. In the 12th century what had been a specialized technique became commonplace."

5)"Technically, the sole innovation was to treat <u>interlinear</u> notes as a serious element in the apparatus. In the formally glossed mss of the Carolingian era interlinear glossing is not part of the original plan…they are added later…I mean interlinear notes in conjunction with the marginal notes; interlinear glossing is common in Carolingian mss."

6)the biggest source for the Gloss is Jerome (and Origen via Jerome), For various Books of the Bible the sources include Augustine, Ambrose, Cassiodorus, Gregory, Bede. "All this basic material was edited in the 9th century by Rabanus Maurus, who commented on the entire OT and much of the NT. Paschasius Radbertus commented on Lamentations and revised Jerome on Mt. All these patristic and Carolingian scholars cast their work in the form of a <u>continuous commentary</u>…they never adopted the formant of text and gloss." That made them more flexible: any lemma could be easily added to. But with the 12th c. editors of the Gloss, their choice of material is final. Whereas the continuous-format is flexible, the Gloss format is rigid. They adapted their sources to the glossed page by abridgement, by the intercalculation of new material, and by importing "named" quotations whom the original commentators had not quoted in that form or referred to by name."

7) We have to see Anselm of Laon and his brother and Gilbert of Auxerre simply as contributors to the start of the GO. We just don't know all the authors who contributed to commentating on various books of the bible and which institution had a complete set of glossed books of the bible. 1160s-90s the Paris masters are using it as a reference work. "For these masters and their students the Gloss is an indispensable exegetical tool…it is not in itself the subject of exposition', like Lombard's *Sentences*."Rather, the Gloss was the definitive reference edition of the Bible. It could be found in every good institutional library, secular or monastic. There it remained, and there it was consulted through the generations: by Aquinas, by Wycliff, by Martin Luther". (Now I see that "usque ad" or

"etc" makes more sense, if you could just go to your
institutional library and get the full gloss.)

(PL, 217, 605B-C, Innocent III, Sermo 3; I used as a Latin exam for Cullen McKenney)

Fluvius egrediebatur de loco voluptatis ad irrigandum paradisum. Qui dividitur in quatuor capita, Phison et Geon, Tigrin et Euphratem (**Gen. II**).

Quadruplex in sacra Scriptura legitur paradisus. Superior et inferior, interior et exterior. Superior est coelestis, inferior est terrestris, interior spiritualis, exterior corporalis; coelestis in patria, terrestris in via, spiritualis in mente, corporalis in oriente. De superiori paradiso dicitur ad Luciferum: «Tu signaculum similitudinis, plenus sapientia et perfectus decore, in deliciis paradisi Dei fuisti (**Ezech. XXVIII**);» de inferiori dicitur ad

angelum Ephesi: «Vincenti dabo edere de ligno vitae, quod est in paradiso Dei mei **(Apoc. II)**;» de spirituali scriptum reperitur in Evangelio: «Amen dico tibi, hodie mecum eris in paradiso **(Luc. XXIII)**;» de corporali scriptum reperitur in Genesi: *Plantaverat Dominus Deus paradisum voluptatis a principio.* Secundum hanc quadripartitam acceptionem nominis paradisi, quatuor modis proposita verba possunt exponi; historialiter et allegorice, moraliter et anagogice. Historialiter enim fons quidam erumpit de medio paradisi ad irrigandum herbas et arbores paradisi. Qui de paradiso progrediens in quatuor capita derivatur, quae sunt quatuor flumina paradisi. Allegorice vero fluvius, qui de loco voluptatis egreditur, est evangelica praedicatio, quae de Domino Jesu Christo procedit, qui est fons vitae.

Tunc dicit ei Iesus: `Vade Satana: Scriptum est enim: Dominum Deum tuum adorabis, et illi soli servies (Mt. 4, 10)

VERS. 10.---*Scriptum est.* David Goliam tribus lapidibus de torrente prostravit, et Christus diabolum tribus testimoniis de lege. *Dominum Deum tuum.* Hoc vel ad diabolum dicitur: non quia ex devotione sit impleturus sed ut, econtra, quam ipse moliebatur scriptum ostendatur quod non ipse, sed Deus sit adorandus: vel, non diabolo, sed sibi secundum humanitatem et cuilibet homini hoc praeceptum esse insinuat. Similiter, et illud: *Non tentabis Dominum Deum tuum,* scilicet Filium et Patrem et Spiritum sanctum, qui est unus Deus. Deus adoratur, et specialiter ei propter se servitur.

Hic ostenditur, quod homo Christus, ut Deus et Dominus sit adorandus ex debito.

Servies. Graece λατρεύσεις: λατρεία enim servitus dicitur. Servitus communis Deo et homini et cuicunque, Graece δουλεία dicitur. Illa vero quae soli Deo debetur, latria dicitur: unde idololatria, quae quod soli Deo debet, idolis dat.

Nota diabolum in his vinci in quibus Adam vicit. Quem de gula tentavit, dum de ligno vetito gustare rogavit. De vana gloria, cum dixit **(Gen. III)**: *Eritis sicut dii.* De avaritia, cum ait: *Scientes bonum et malum.*