

TEXTUAL FORMAT AND THE
DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARLY
GLOSSA ON GENESIS

Alice Hutton Sharp

WHEN they reached the height of their popularity in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the commentaries that made up the *Glossa* on the Bible compiled seven hundred years of Latin Christian exegesis in the marginal and interlinear spaces around the sacred text.¹ The *Glossa*, with its origins in the northern French cathedral schools—principally Laon—is the chief witness to the teaching of the *sacra pagina* in the first decades of the twelfth century. It was further developed and expanded by scholars in the early University of Paris.

At times, the *Glossa*'s depiction of the changing intellectual culture is thrown into relief by the survival of more than one distinct versions of a commentary on a book of the Bible. This is true of the *Glossa* on Genesis, which survives in both a cathedral school version that dates to before 1140 and may have originated in Laon (referred to here as the *Glossa primitiva*), and a later Parisian text (referred to here as the *Glossa reformata*).² The

¹ On the patristic sources of the gloss, see E. Ann Matter, "Gregory the Great in the Twelfth Century: The *Glossa ordinaria*," in *Gregory the Great: A Symposium*, ed. John C. Cavadini, Notre Dame Studies in Theology 2 (Notre Dame, Ind., 1994), 216–22, and "The Church Fathers and the *Glossa ordinaria*," in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: from the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. Irina Backus (Leiden, 1997), 1:83–112; René Wasselynck, "L'influence de l'exégèse de S. Grégoire le Grand sur les commentaires bibliques médiévaux (VII^e–XII^e s.)," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 32 (1965): 157–204; Karlfried Froehlich, "Makers and Takers: The Shaping of the Biblical *Glossa ordinaria*," in *Biblical Interpretation from the Church Fathers to the Reformation* (Burlington, Vt., 2010), III, 1–19.

² The two recensions of the *Glossa* on Genesis were first discussed in Philippe Buc, *L'ambiguïté du livre: prince, pouvoir, et peuple dans les commentaires de la Bible au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1994). Buc called these two versions the *glose primitive* and the *glose remanée*; I have Latinized Buc's terminology to the more consistent *Glossa primitiva* and *Glossa reformata*: see *L'ambiguïté du livre*, 72–74. For books of the *Glossa* surviving in multiple versions, see Alexander Andrée, ed., *Gilbertus Universalis: Glossa ordinaria in*

Glossa primitiva survives in only two manuscripts: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14398—a complete glossed Genesis from before 1140—and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 64, a mid-twelfth-century manuscript which is missing several quires and not fully glossed. Lat. 14398 belonged to the library of St. Victor in Paris but was likely copied in Laon. Lat. 64's origins are unknown. It was held at the Cistercian monastery of Fontenay before it entered the Bibliothèque royale.³

The *Glossa reformata* clearly depends upon the *Glossa primitiva*. In the margins, individual glosses from the *primitiva* were abbreviated for the *reformata*, while the commentary as a whole was expanded through the addition of new extracts, some from sources not used for the *primitiva*. The interlinear glosses of the *primitiva* provide the foundation for those found in the *reformata*. These were further expanded with new extracts—frequently allegories taken from the commentaries of Isidore.⁴

The dependence of the *Glossa reformata* on the *Glossa primitiva*—with the evidence that lat. 14398 was copied in Laon, the very location of Anselm's school and the origins of the *Glossa*—indicates that the text of the *primitiva* is not that of an abandoned early Gloss but instead represents an important stage

Lamentationes Ieremie Prophete: Prothemata et Liber I. A Critical Edition with an Introduction and a Translation, Studia Latina Stockholmiensia (Stockholm, 2005), 92–93; Guy Lobrichon, “Une nouveauté: les gloses de la Bible,” in *Le Moyen Âge et la Bible*, ed. Pierre Riché and Guy Lobrichon, Bible de tous les temps 4 (Paris, 1984) 109; Alexander Andrée, “Le Pater (Matth. 6,9–13 et Luc. 11,2–4) dans l'exégèse de l'école de Laon: la *Glossa ordinaria* et autres commentaires,” in *Le Pater noster au XII^e siècle: Lectures et usages*, ed. Francesco Siri (Turnhout, 2015), 46–48.

³ Putting aside the dating of the manuscripts, the *primitiva* version of the text is known to have been completed by 1147, as it was used by Andrew of St. Victor when he compiled his own commentary on Genesis. Discussion of this is found in Buc, *L'ambiguïté du livre*, 72. On the date of Andrew's commentary, see Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3d ed. (Notre Dame, Ind., 1982), 112. On the dating and origins of lat. 14398, see Patricia Stirnemann, “Où ont été fabriqués les livres de la glose ordinaire dans la première moitié du XII^e siècle?” in *Le XII^e siècle. Mutations et renouveau en France dans la première moitié du XII^e siècle*, ed. Françoise Gasparri, Cahiers du léopard d'or 3 (Paris, 1994), 261–62; Léopold Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits latins de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor conservés à la Bibliothèque Impériale sous les numéros 14232–15175 du fonds latin* (Paris, 1869), 12. On lat. 64, see Philippe Lauer, *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, vol. 1: 1–1438 (Paris, 1938), 28; Dominique Stutzmann, “La bibliothèque de l'abbaye cistercienne de Fontenay (Côte-d'Or): constitution, organisation, dissolution (XII^e–XVII^e s.) (thesis., 4 vols., École Nationale des Chartes, 2002), 2:213–15.

⁴ Noted in Buc, *L'ambiguïté du livre*, 86–87.

in the development of twelfth-century commentaries on Genesis and the history of the *Glossa* as a whole.⁵ The history of the *Glossa* on Genesis begins with the *Glossa primitiva*.

With whom does this history begin? Beryl Smalley attributed the *Glossa* on Genesis to Gilbert the Universal († 1134), a canon of the Cathedral of Auxerre with connections to Laon,⁶ but the evidence we have for Gilbert's glossing of Genesis dates to the thirteenth century, and it refers to the later *Glossa reformata* on Genesis—not the *primitiva*.⁷ With the evidence for the authorship of the *Glossa* on Genesis shadowy and circumstantial, this article looks at the two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* in order to investigate the working methods of its compilers, the scribal techniques used in the compilation of the glosses, and the form of their immediate source commentaries.

The manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* raise a number of questions about the development of the text and the methods that were used during its evolution. How did the text develop? What scribal techniques were used in formatting and arranging the glosses on the page? Investigating the manner in which scribes of the gloss distilled the extensive Patristic tradition on the creation narrative—given the restrictions of the gloss format, which constrains the amount of space available to two narrow columns—led to a previously unstudied question. Why were both manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* copied in two distinct styles or formats, with the change occurring near the end of the third chapter?⁸ If the change in formatting were found in only one of the

⁵ On abandoned, pre-*Glossa* glosses, see Beryl Smalley, “Les commentaires bibliques de l'époque romane: glose ordinaire et gloses périmées,” *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 4 (1961): 15–22.

⁶ Medieval obituaries credit Gilbert with the composition of glosses on both the Old and New Testaments. The textual tradition of the *Glossa* on Lamentations, through an attribution in a colophon, strongly supports his authorship of that book, and medieval attributions suggest he may have had a hand in the commentaries on Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, and the Major and Minor Prophets. Smalley's evidence for Gilbert's authorship of the *Glossa* on Genesis comes from a thirteenth-century gloss on the *Glossa* itself, titled *Notule super Genesim* and found in Eton College MS 48. Smalley's discussion of the *Notule super Genesim* is found in “Gilbertus Universalis Bishop of London (1128–1134) and the Problem of the ‘Glossa Ordinaria,’” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 7 (1935): 251–59.

⁷ On the problems with Smalley's attribution, see Alice Hutton Sharp, “‘Gilbertus Universalis’ Reevaluated and the Authorship of the *Glossa* on *Genesis*,” *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* 83.2 (2016): 225–43.

⁸ Dominique Stutzmann described lat. 64 briefly in “La bibliothèque de l'abbaye cistercienne de Fontenay,” 2:213–15. Patricia Stirnemann argues for the early date and

manuscripts it might be explained as an accident or a concession to convenience. Lat. 64, with its many formats and empty columns, does in fact look remarkably *ad hoc* at first glance. These changes, however, coincide with a change in the relationship between the text of the two manuscripts, and the evidence indicates that the formatting offers significant insights into the history of the text.

Recent research on eleventh- and twelfth-century glosses shows that the distinction between gloss-format commentaries and their continuous counterparts (that is, commentaries copied as continuous independent texts, with lemmata to indicate the passages under discussion) was less firm than previously assumed.⁹ In keeping with this body of research, comparison of both the codicology and texts of lat. 14398 and lat. 64 shows that the disjunctures found in the two manuscripts reflects both the history of the *Glossa* on Genesis and its origins in the interweaving of multiple commentaries, both continuous and gloss-format.

With only two surviving manuscripts, one of which is missing sections of both text and commentary, establishing the text of the *Glossa primitiva* is a challenge. Some evidence of its origins and content, however, can be found by studying closely related glosses on Genesis. One such related gloss-format commentary is found in London, Lambeth Palace 349, an early twelfth-century French manuscript that belonged to Lanthony Secunda, in Gloucestershire.¹⁰ As will be shown, comparing the Lambeth Gloss to the manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* suggests that the commentary on the account of Creation and the Fall had a stable textual tradition before the commentary on the remaining chapters of Genesis, and that the *primitiva* text on the later chapters of Genesis represents a later stage of expansion.

Laon origins of lat. 14398 in “Où ont été fabriqués les livres de la glose ordinaire,” 260 and 262.

⁹ James E. G. Zetzel, *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance: The Commentarium Cornuti and the Early Scholia on Persius* (London, 2005), 5–6; Mariken Teeuwen, “The Pursuit of Secular Learning: The Oldest Commentary Tradition on Martianus Capella,” *Journal of Medieval Latin* 18 (2009): 14; Alexander Andrée, “The *Glossa ordinaria* on the Gospel of John: A Preliminary Survey of the Manuscripts with a Presentation of the Text and Its Sources,” *Revue Bénédictine* 118 (2008): 304, and “Anselm of Laon Unveiled: The *Glosae super Iohannem* and the Origins of the *Glossa Ordinaria* on the Bible,” *Mediaeval Studies* 73 (2011): 233–34.

¹⁰ Montague Rhodes James and Claude Jenkins, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Lambeth Palace*, vol 1: *Parts I–II (Nos. 1–357)* (Cambridge, 1930; rpt. 2011), 461–62.

This article addresses the textual history of the *Glossa*, but rather than seeking to establish the text it examines the working methods of the *Glossa*'s compilers and analyzes the work of the anonymous scribes and contributors who shaped the commentary. By comparing the formatting and contents of the manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth Gloss, this article unravels the complex history of the development of the *Glossa primitiva* and offers a picture of gloss compilation in the early twelfth-century schools, arguing that the *Glossa primitiva* developed in a series of partially glossed and disjointed stages which were later effaced in the development of the *Glossa reformata*.

I. THE MATERIAL EVIDENCE OF THE MANUSCRIPT WITNESSES

Late twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts of the *Glossa* offer a compelling depiction of scribal ingenuity. The biblical text is framed by nested passages of marginal commentary, while glosses copied between the lines break the visual barrier between subject and commentary. In the most skilled examples, the columns of biblical text and commentary are woven together, filling the writing frame with an artfully designed *mise-en-page*. This sophisticated design was the result of a long process of development and innovation on the part of scribes and compilers alike. The *Glossa* is not a haphazard collection of notes, as is seen in many earlier glosses on classical texts, but an integral part of the manuscript.¹¹

The earliest manuscripts of the biblical *Glossae* were copied in much the same way as secular classroom glosses of previous centuries. The parchment was ruled for the biblical text, which was copied in a central column of an unchanging width. With the main text complete, the scribe returned to the beginning of the manuscript and copied the glosses beside the appropriate

¹¹ On some antecedents of the *Glossa*, see Louis Holtz, "Les manuscrits latins à gloses et à commentaires de l'antiquité à l'époque carolingienne," in *Il libro e il testo. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Urbino, 20-23 settembre 1982*, ed. Cesare Questa and Renato Raffaelli (Urbino, 1984), 154; Margaret Gibson, "Carolingian Glossed Psalters," in *The Early Medieval Bible: Its Production, Decoration, and Use*, ed. Richard Gameson (Cambridge, 1994), 78–100; and Michele Camillo Ferrari, "Before the *Glossa Ordinaria*. The Ezekiel Fragment in Irish Minuscule Zürich, Staatsarchiv W 3.19.XII, and Other Experiments towards a *Bible Commentée* in the Early Middle Ages," in *Biblical Studies in the Early Middle Ages: Proceedings of the Conference on Biblical Studies in the Early Middle Ages, . . . 24-27 June 2001*, ed. Claudio Leonardi and Giovanni Orlandi, *Millennio Medievale* 52 (Florence, 2005), 283–307.

passages, ruling the outer columns as necessary. This format was simple to execute, but it restricted the space available for the gloss text while leaving blank parchment beside passages that had less commentary. The inefficiency of this method is likely why the so-called simple format is never seen for a complete manuscript of the *Glossa* on Genesis, either *primitiva* or *reformatata*—it was simply not possible to copy the the *Glossa*'s commentary on the creation account with the simple format.¹²

Simple-format manuscripts of Genesis glosses are not entirely unknown. The Lambeth Gloss contains substantially less glossing (particularly when compared to the *primitiva* commentary on Creation and the Fall) and could therefore be copied in the simple format. The first folios of lat. 14398, however, are copied in a version of what Lesley Smith has referred to as the transitional format, in which scribes altered the width of the columns according to the amount of glossing on a given section of the text, allowing for a more efficient use of parchment.¹³ A crucial development in the transitional format was a movement towards seeing each page as an individual unit made up of text and gloss, rather than two distinct texts copied side-by-side.¹⁴ Viewing the *Glossa* as a series of distinct, individually formatted pages made possible one of lat. 14398's most notable features, namely, the interruption of the biblical text by two-column pages carrying only the gloss text. In the previous method, in which the biblical text was copied first, blank pages were not left for extra gloss, and it would have been a challenge to know where such pages should be located.¹⁵

¹² I have chosen Lesley Smith's system (simple, transitional, advanced) for describing these formats over the terms offered by Christopher de Hamel, who first described the development of the Gloss format (Lesley Smith, *The "Glossa Ordinaria": The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary* [Leiden, 2009], 94–114; C. F. R. de Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1984), 15–25). Smith's phrasing is clearer and more accurately reflects the fact that one format did not always follow upon another in a clear chronological succession. An earlier and influential approach to describing the different ways of copying a text with its commentary is Gerhardt Powitz, "Textus cum commento," *Codices manuscripti* 5.3 (1979): 80–89.

¹³ De Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible*, 16–17; Smith, "*Glossa Ordinaria*," 115–16.

¹⁴ De Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible*, 17; Smith, "*Glossa Ordinaria*," 114.

¹⁵ In theory, the all-gloss pages could have been first written on single, inserted folios, but the text shows none of the errors or duplications we might expect to see in such a situation. Furthermore, as each page would have a slightly different format because of changes in the size of the page and the size of the scribal hand, they would have to be added anew for each manuscript.

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

Lat. 14398's 133 folios measure 260 × 166 mm.¹⁶ It has been rebound in an early modern binding covered in white leather stamped with the crest of the

¹⁶ This manuscript is noted briefly ("Genèse avec glose. xii s.") in Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits latins de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor*, 12. The description in this article is from my own examination of the manuscript.

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

Abbey of St. Victor.¹⁷ The height of the central columns also varies, making yet more space available for the gloss. In its commentary on Genesis 1–3, the

¹⁷ It is not clear when the manuscript entered the library of St. Victor; it is not included on the 1514 catalog of Claude de Grandrue, but its omission may reflect a disuse after the spread of the *Glossa ordinaria*. See Gilbert Ouy, *Les manuscrits de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor. Catalogue établi sur la base du répertoire de Claude de Grandrue (1514)*

biblical text is interrupted three times by all-gloss, two-column folios.¹⁸ While two-column folios appear in the manuscripts of the *Glossa reformata*, they are restricted to the prothemata copied on the first folios before the beginning of the biblical text. The appearance of all-gloss folios within the text, as in lat. 14398, is more unusual.¹⁹ These folios are part of the original quires, not insertions, and must have been planned in advance.

In fact, a close inspection of the column ruling shows that two columns—not three—were the foundation for formatting the first section of the manuscript. While the earliest folios of lat. 14398 do resemble a transitional format manuscript, the boundaries for the columns were not drawn with the method de Hamel describes for this format, in which multiple prickings were made along the top and bottom and scribes chose which holes to use for the column boundaries on the basis of the required space.²⁰ Rather, each folio of the first section was pricked for a single central division in the middle of the writing frame. For the three-column folios, the biblical text was copied to one side of this central boundary, inserting itself into the space of one of the outer columns. This is why these early folios depend more on the variation of height than of width to alter the proportions of writing space available to text and gloss. Altering the proportions of the three columns, these methods made it possible to include far more commentary than would have been possible in the simple format (see plates 1 and 2).

Fol. 22r–v represents a transition in the formatting of the manuscript. While it is still divided down the middle of the page, the width of the central column is distinctly wider than previous folios. Fol. 22r ends with Genesis 3:19; correspondingly, fol. 22v begins with Genesis 3:20, the point at which the formatting changes in lat. 64, the other manuscript of the *primitiva*.

From fol. 23r of lat. 14398, which corresponds to the beginning of Genesis 4, the all-gloss pages no longer occur. At this point, the gloss becomes more sparing, the folios are pricked and ruled for three columns, and the width of the columns does not vary. This is not coincidence. In fact, examination of the

(Turnhout, 1999); and Buc, *L'ambiguïté du livre*, 97. Buc believes a manuscript of the *Glossa primitiva* was used by Andrew of St. Victor in the late 1140s.

¹⁸ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14398, fols. 12r–12v, 14r–14v, and 19v–20r. Plate 2 offers an example from fol. 20r.

¹⁹ Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale 19, fols. 1v–2r; Amiens, Bibliothèque Louis Aragon (Bibliothèque municipale) 34, fols. 1r–3r. The appearance of a prothemata in a Gloss is also seen in the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Gospel of John and the *Glossa ordinaria* on Lamentations; see Andrée, “*Glossa ordinaria* on the Gospel of John,” 289, and *Gilbertus Universalis: Glossa ordinaria in Lamentationes Ieremie Prophete*, 57.

²⁰ De Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible*, 16–17.

paleography and codicology of lat. 14398 shows that the two methods of column ruling reflect two separate stages of manuscript production. These stages can be distinguished by two subtly different hands in the biblical text, two methods of decoration, and two sets of quires.

The first section runs from fol. 5r to fol. 22v and contains Genesis 1–3, with a writing area of around 185 × 140 mm. The second part runs from fol. 23r to fol. 133v and contains Genesis 4–50, in a writing area of up to 210 × 140 mm. The first section, with the central column division and varying column proportions, comprises three quires, of ten, six, and two folios. These are not numbered. There is a large initial *I* on fol. 6r, decorated in a knot-work pattern in red, green, yellow, and blue. The letters “n principio creavit Deus celum et” are written in display uncials in alternating red and blue, and “terram” is in red display capitals which are much smaller and simpler than the following text and may be a later correction. The remaining three lines of fol. 6r, and the rest of the biblical text from fol. 6v through fol. 8r (that is, until the words of Genesis 1:11, “germinet terra herbam virentem”) is copied in display uncials with red highlights and red capitals (plate 1). The complex scheme of initials and decorative script is the characteristic aesthetic Stirnemann identified as coming from Laon.²¹

From fol. 8v, the biblical text is copied in a protogothic hand. From this point until the end of the first section of the manuscript, the decoration scheme is inconsistent. On fols. 8v and 9r, higher-level *litterae notabiliores* are in red, while those of a lower level have red highlights. Fols. 9v and 10r, exceptionally, have green *litterae notabiliores* (with one straight-backed *D* and one uncial *D*), and there are no highlighted capitals. Similarly, there is no highlighting from fol. 10v to fol. 22v (except on fol. 13v), and capitals have been omitted on fols. 11v, 16r, and 17r. The diversity of approaches to the decoration and capitals is insignificant in itself, but is accentuated by the regularity of the decoration scheme in the remainder of the manuscript.

The second section of the manuscript (plate 3) comprises fourteen quires of eight, the last incomplete by one folio. The first thirteen are numbered, I–XIII, in the bottom margin of the verso side of the last folio (although some quire numbers have been cut off).²² These quire numbers are perhaps the greatest mystery of this manuscript. Beginning the quire numeration with “I” in the

²¹ Stirnemann, “Où ont été fabriqués les livres de la glose ordinaire,” 259–60.

²² The collation of the manuscript can be described as follows: iv + 1¹⁰ + 2⁶ + 3² + I–XIII⁸ + XIV⁸ (lacking one) + iii. The penciled foliation begins at the first flyleaf (including flyleaves ii and iii, both paper insertions), so the first folio of the first quire is counted as fol. 5. The final three flyleaves, all paper, are not foliated.

3. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14398, fol. 23r.

middle of the text suggests a distinct stage or location of production. The hand that copied the biblical text for this section is distinguished from that of the first by its thicker lines, a forked top to the letter *a*, and the style of the majuscule *D*, which is pinched at the top. These fourteen quires contain no gloss-only pages. Unlike the first section, with its varied and incomplete system of decoration, the second section has a single, coherent system of decoration in

which higher-level *litterae notabiliores* are consistently painted in red, and lower-level capitals are highlighted.

This two-stage (or at least two-scribe) copying of lat. 14398 is even more intriguing when the manuscript is compared to lat. 64, a manuscript copied in two completely distinct formats which change at the end of the account of the Fall—in this case, at Genesis 3:20. As only these two manuscripts of the *primitiva* are known to survive, the fact that both show changes in style and formatting at roughly the same location is, to say the least, striking.

It is not clear where lat. 64 was copied. Its 110 folios measure 250 × 165 mm. and are now bound in a red leather eighteenth-century binding stamped with the arms of Louis XV, with parchment endpapers taken from a manuscript of Gratian's *Decretum*.²³ Lat. 64 is missing several quires. On those that remain, the later gloss text is incomplete. While this might suggest that the formatting of the manuscript can be attributed to a haphazard production, it can be shown to reflect the history of the text and conscious choices made by its three scribes.

From Genesis 1:1 to Genesis 3:19 (fols. 3r–23r), the manuscript is copied in what I refer to as the *textus intercisus* format, a method de Hamel has associated with the development of Peter Lombard's *Magna glosatura* on the Psalms.²⁴ In a manuscript copied in this format, the text and its commentary were copied in the same column, with verses of the primary text and applicable commentary alternating throughout the manuscript. The primary (in

²³ This manuscript is described in Lauer, *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins* 1:28, and Stutzmann, “La bibliothèque de l’abbaye cistercienne de Fontenay (Côte-d’Or),” 2:213–15.

²⁴ “The alternate-line form of layout evolved from that devised for the Peter Lombard manuscripts” (de Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible*, 25). Hamel notes that the text of such manuscripts is described as *intercisum* on a flyleaf of Admont, Stifstbibliothek 233, now lost. For critiques of de Hamel’s discussion of the alternate-line form and advanced-format layouts, see Margaret Gibson, “Review of C. F. R. de Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade*,” *The Library: The Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 8.2 (1986): 167; Patricia Stirnemann, “Review of Christopher de Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade*,” *Bulletin Monumental* 143 (1985): 366; and Teresa Gross-Diaz, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers: From Lectio Divina to the Lecture Room* (Leiden, 1996), 39–40 n. 55. Since de Hamel’s work was published, earlier manuscripts have been found, including Carolingian examples of the *textus intercisus* format: see Gibson, “Carolingian Glossed Psalters,” 99; and Ferrari, “Before the *Glossa Ordinaria*,” 302–3. Powitz described this type of commentary format as *alternierende* (“Textus cum commento,” 85–86).

4. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 64, fol. 3r.

this case, biblical) text was copied in a larger hand using every other line of the ruling; for the *Glossa*, this had the added benefit of leaving some room for interlinear glosses. The subsequent commentary—corresponding to that found in the margins in the three-column format—was copied in a smaller hand written on every line of the ruling. In the first section of lat. 64, the pages were pricked for two columns and then ruled across the page, at the size needed for the commentary, in dry point. On fols. 3r–6v the text and gloss are copied in a single column (plate 4); on fols. 7r–23r they are copied in two col-

umns. Fol. 23r is mostly blank, with the end of a gloss begun on the previous page occupying only one of the two columns; it contains no biblical text.

On fol. 23v, the scribe had drawn dry-point borders for the two-column format. Rather than continuing to copy the text in a two-column *textus intercisus* format, however, he drew new borders in ink, re-dividing the page into three columns. The original dry-point borders are still visible below the new format. The manuscript continues in the simple three-column gloss format for the remainder of the included text (plate 5). The first three quires of text (2–4 in the collation) include both the *textus intercisus* and three-column formats and were copied by the first scribe in a classic Parisian protogothic hand. This scribe appears to have prepared three quires for the text of Genesis 1–3:19. Apparently, the account of the Creation and Fall required fewer folios than planned, as the scribe ran out of gloss and text only part way into fol. 23r. Rather than continuing with Genesis 3:20 in the same *intercisus* format in the amply available space, however, he turned the folio over and drew new boundaries in ink over the previously marked dry-point borders, re-dividing the page into three columns and continuing the rest of the text in the simple three-column layout. Thus, although this manuscript may seem to suffer from a lack of planning, the redrawing of the columns and strange empty space on fol. 23r suggest that the change in format was both intentional and tied to the text itself.

From fol. 24r, three scribes share the work of copying the text. The second scribe, who first appears as the copyist of the biblical text on fol. 24r, writes with a more contemporary and more gothic-influenced hand. The third scribe's hand is notably old-fashioned, almost Caroline, with an upright aspect to the letters. At fol. 97r, the text ends at Genesis 31:43 and several quires are missing. On fol. 98r the text picks up at Genesis 47:7, copied by the second scribe, but the glosses are missing. The fact that the manuscript is incomplete was noted by a medieval reader in the margins.²⁵

As with lat. 14398's use of all-gloss folios, the use of the *textus intercisus* in lat. 64 allowed scribes to copy the extensive glossing on the accounts of the Creation and Fall efficiently. The divergent formats of lat. 64, however, are hard to explain: once one had begun in the *textus intercisus* format, why return to a simple three-column format, which has no advantages for parchment use or copying? The answer, it will be argued, is that the use of these two formats reflects the history and the development of the text itself, particularly the commentary on Creation and the Fall of Man.

²⁵ This note is found in pencil on fol. 98r. The collation of this manuscript can be described as follows: i + 1² + 2–14⁸+15³ + ii.

5. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 64, fol. 24r.

The importance of the formatting for the *Glossa primitiva*, and especially its treatment of Creation and the Fall, is emphasized by London, Lambeth Palace 349, which contains an early gloss on Genesis related to the *Glossa primitiva* but copied in the simple format. The Lambeth manuscript's 128 folios measure 260 × 170 mm., with a writing area that varies slightly but

never exceeds 225 × 170 mm. The binding is medieval and possibly original. The wooden boards are covered in white leather, although the spine was reinforced with brown leather at a later date. A strap, a pin, and long rectangular clasps are missing. Likely copied in northern France, it belonged to Lanthony Secunda, and the back cover bears a medieval pressmark which reads “de tercio gr[adu] pri[ma] armaria.” The quires, as well as the folios, have been numbered with pencil in a modern hand. This manuscript, whose columns vary only slightly in their width, is an example of an unusual mid-point in ruling methods. Rulings for the biblical text were drawn across the width of the page, but the narrower rulings for the gloss were added as necessary in the margins, between the existing lines.²⁶

The text of the Lambeth manuscript is closely related to the most immediate source of the *Glossa primitiva*. The interlinear glosses of the Lambeth Gloss and the *Glossa primitiva* are almost identical, and they share many marginal glosses. Overall, the commentary in the Lambeth manuscript is shorter and less dense than that of the *Glossa*, although the margins of several folios are entirely filled with commentary and the glosses on the final verses continue as a single column of gloss on the verso of the final folio. When its contents are compared to the manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva*, Lambeth 349 makes clear the limitations of the simple format.

The study of the Bible alongside the liberal arts was an innovation of the eleventh century, and the *Glossa* owes much in its formatting to early medieval glosses on classical texts.²⁷ Scholarship on eleventh-century secular glosses has raised questions about how the commentaries were compiled, offering new ways of thinking about how glossators went about their task. Although gloss-format commentaries are frequently thought of as products of a slow process of accumulation, in which glosses were added in response to specific inquiries or interests, recent research has found that many secular glosses began as continuous commentaries that were later copied in the margins of the main text. This phenomenon has also been identified in recent

²⁶ The ruling of this manuscript should make it evident that the progression in formatting techniques was not always as clear as de Hamel implies. This manuscript is described in James and Jenkins, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Lambeth Palace* 1:461–62. The collation is ii + 1–16⁸ + 17².

²⁷ Margaret Gibson, “The Place of the *Glossa ordinaria* in Medieval Exegesis,” in *Ad Litteram: Authoritative Texts and Their Medieval Readers*, ed. Mark D. Jordan and Kent Emery, Jr. (Notre Dame, Ind., 1992), 13–14.

work on the biblical *Glossa*.²⁸ Its extensive commentary and dependence on particular formats to accommodate that commentary suggests that the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis could not have developed through the slow accumulation of marginalia. How, then, was it compiled?

The answer may be found by studying the working methods of those who compiled the glosses and the relationship between gloss-format and continuous commentaries. The use of the *textus intercisus* format is instructive. One reason de Hamel emphasized the use of this format for Peter Lombard's *Magna glosatura* on the Psalms is that the Lombard's text was first written as a continuous commentary—but a continuous commentary based on a gloss. Scribes later re-introduced the biblical text to the manuscripts by copying the *Magna glosatura* in a *textus intercisus* format.²⁹ The manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* reflect a similar pattern: a gloss-format commentary was modified in a way that required the use of the *textus intercisus* format—specifically, through the incorporation of material from a continuous commentary. Although not indicated by the scribe, this combination of sources can be identified through an examination of the texts in the light of the changes in formatting seen in the manuscripts. The alteration of a gloss-format source text with new material is further demonstrated through a comparison of the contents of the *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth manuscript, which suggests the existence of a shared source. I shall refer to this source as the proto-*Glossa*.

Sifting out the contents of the proto-*Glossa* alongside the study of the manuscripts suggests that the development of the *Glossa primitiva* from the proto-*Glossa* was made possible by the *textus intercisus* format. Comparison of the texts of the two *Glossa primitiva* manuscripts reveals that the commentary on Creation and the Fall, as developed from the proto-*Glossa*, stabilized before the commentary on the rest of Genesis. This history of partial or piecemeal composition has not been demonstrated for other books of the *Glossa*. By identifying the relationship between the two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* and the two sections of the commentary, it is possible to see how the text was compiled, revealing some of the scribal techniques that supported gloss composition in the twelfth-century cathedral schools.

²⁸ For example, Andrée, “*Glossa ordinaria* on the Gospel of John,” 304, and “Anselm of Laon Unveiled,” 233–34. On the role of formatting in defining and popularizing the *Glossa*, see Smith, “*Glossa Ordinaria*,” 91.

²⁹ De Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible*, 20–21.

II. THE DIVERGENT TEXTS OF THE *GLOSSA PRIMITIVA*

Comparing the texts of lat. 14398 and lat. 64 shows that the change in formatting (and, in lat. 14398, the change in collation) at the end of Genesis 3 is not incidental but reflects the history and origins of the *Glossa primitiva*. Beginning with the glosses on Genesis 3:20—the point at which the formatting changes to the three-column layout in lat. 64—the two surviving manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* also begin to show a textual divergence, after presenting nearly identical contents throughout the first part of the text.

Lat. 14398 is the only complete witness to the *Glossa primitiva* and may have been copied at Laon. As such, it is often used as the sole source of the *primitiva* text. It is in fact the better text of the *primitiva* for grammar and orthography. The text of lat. 64 was frequently corrected, and these corrections do not always improve its accuracy when compared to the patristic sources.³⁰ It can be shown, however, that even though lat. 14398 was copied at Laon in the early twelfth century, it was not the original exemplar of the *Glossa primitiva*. There are a few notable omissions—specifically, it is missing the interlinear glosses on Genesis 1:1, likely because the first verse was copied in a display script. Interlinear glosses on this verse do appear in lat. 64, the *Glossa reformata*, and the Lambeth Gloss.³¹

With the exception of these first interlinear glosses and the occasional expected difference in orthography, word choice, or word order (occasionally introduced as corrections to lat. 64), the two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* present the same text for both the marginal and interlinear commentary on Genesis 1–3:19, even down to the order in which the glosses appear.³² From Genesis 3:20, however, the interlinear glosses remain the same but the marginal glosses begin to differ. Lat. 64 omits marginal glosses that

³⁰ One notable example of such a correction is in a gloss citing Augustine on the Fall. Lat. 14398 reads “Cum ergo etiam per iniustos iusti ac per impios pii proficiunt [in Augustine, “proficiant”], frustra dicitur non crearet Deus quos presciebat malos futuros.” (fol. 19r); cf. Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram* 11.6 (ed. Joseph Zycha, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 28.3.1 [Vienna, 1894], 339). In lat. 64 “non crearet” has been corrected to “non creare deberet” (fol. 19v–20r). A similar tendency to edit the text of the patristic sources is seen in the *Glossa* on Lamentations; see Andrée, *Gilbertus Universalis: Glossa ordinaria in Lamentationes Ieremie Prophete*, 94–96.

³¹ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14398, fol. 6r; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 64, fol. 3r; London, Lambeth Palace Library 349, fol. 1v.

³² This consistency in the order is not found in the *Glossa reformata*, in which glosses were frequently moved about on the page in order to accommodate the more complex formatting.

can be found in lat. 14398, while lat. 14398 occasionally omits glosses found in lat. 64.³³ By comparing these patterns of inclusion and omission with the text of the Lambeth Gloss, it is possible to uncover the process of expansion and development that led to the disjointed formatting of the manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva*.

In the *primitiva* commentary on Genesis 1–3:19, three main sources can be identified: Augustine’s *De Genesi ad litteram* and *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, and Bede’s *In Genesim*. Some glosses are medieval, a few come from Ambrose, and one is found in a commentary attributed to Walahfrid Strabo.³⁴ From Genesis 3:20, the sources used for the commentary become more diverse, and the margins include glosses taken from Jerome, Isidore, Gregory the Great, and Rabanus Maurus.³⁵ From this point, marginal glosses are occasionally marked with attributions, a feature not seen in the glosses on Genesis 1–3.

Indeed, glosses on Genesis 1–3:19 even appear to be ordered according to their source, and this pattern is preserved in both manuscripts. This order appears to follow a set exegetical program: glosses from Augustine’s *De Genesi ad litteram* are usually listed first (under the title “historice”); these are followed by historical analysis from Bede’s *In Genesim*. The commentary on the passage is then concluded with excerpts from Augustine’s *De Genesi contra Manicheos* and applicable spiritual interpretations from Bede’s commentary. This can be seen in table 1. It is important to note that this table lists passages from distinct sources; throughout the commentary on Genesis 1–3:19, the marginal glosses include some which incorporate a number of patristic authorities into the same gloss, under a single paragraph mark.³⁶

³³ The quires do not change to the second set in lat. 14398 until the beginning of Genesis 4. As I will argue below, this indicates that lat. 64 is closer to the original formatting of the *Glossa primitiva*.

³⁴ Burton Van Name Edwards has argued that the source commentary for this gloss, generally credited to Strabo, is actually a second commentary by Rabanus Maurus (“The Commentary on Genesis Attributed to Walahfrid Strabo: A Preliminary Report from the Manuscripts,” in *Proceedings of the Patristic, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies Conference*, ed. Phillip Pulsiano [Villanova, Pa., 1991], 76–77). The gloss, beginning, “Plato tria principia omnium . . .,” is found in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14398, fol. 6r, and lat 64, fol. 3r. Its apparent source is the text referred to as *Abbreviatio commentariorum in Genesim* (St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 283, p. 1).

³⁵ These are the same sources later added to the commentary on Genesis 1:1–3:19 in the *Glossa reformata*.

³⁶ For example, in the marginal commentary on Genesis 1:1, a single gloss begins with the extract discussed above with the incipit “Plato tria principia omnium . . .,” con-

When one compares the *Glossa primitiva* to the Lambeth Gloss, one can see that the Lambeth Gloss contains the same interlinear glosses as the *Glossa primitiva*, but there are significant differences in the marginal glosses. Many glosses found in the *Glossa primitiva* are not found in the Lambeth Gloss; those which are shared are principally taken from Augustine (although not all Augustinian material is shared). The glosses on Bede are missing, as are the glosses incorporating multiple sources.

In the following four tables, I have collated the texts found in lat. 14398 and lat. 64, noting significant differences. Lemmata change frequently in glosses. Where there are slight differences between the lemmata of the two texts, I have preserved the reading in lat. 14398. Because the Lambeth Gloss often presents more substantial differences than those found when comparing lat. 14398 and lat. 64, I have not collated its variant readings in the tables but have recorded them in the notes. The divisions of the extracts in lat. 14398 have been retained; differences in order in lat. 64 or Lambeth are noted.

Table 1
The Primitive Gloss on Genesis 1:14–17 and the Lambeth Gloss³⁷

Gloss incipit and explicit	Lat. 14398	Lat. 64	Lam- beth
<i>Et dixit Deus, fiant luminaria in firmamento caeli. . . .</i> Quia uisibili mundo duo sunt attributi dies, id est supremae et infimae parti mundi . . . per estatem, per hiemem, per autumnalem uernalemque temperiem. [Augustine, <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i> 2.13–14]	8v	6v	2v
De sole quippe certum est, quia cum compleuerit circuitum suum, ccc lxvi ³⁸ diebus et quadrante, tunc completus est annus solaris. [Augustine, <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i> 2.14]	8v	6v	2v–3r

tinues to an extract from Bede's *In Genesim* 1.1 with the incipit "Creationem enim mundi insinuans Divina scriptura . . .," and concludes with an extract from Augustines *De Genesi ad litteram* 1.2–3 with the incipit "Ait igitur in principio creauit . . .," id est in principio temporis."

³⁷ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat.14398, fols. 8v–9v; lat. 64, fols. 6v–7r; London, Lambeth Palace 346, fols. 2v–3r.

³⁸ The Lambeth Gloss has the correct "ccc lxv."

Sic et reliqui planetae suo circuitu completo suos complent annos . . . respondendum est Deum eam quotacumque fuerit, fecisse perfectam.	8v	6v	3r
Dicunt enim ideo plenam factam, quia non decebat Deum illo die aliquid imperfectum facere . . . cum plena est. [Augustine, <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i> 2.15]	8v–9r	6v	
Solet etiam queri utrum ista caeli luminaria corpora sola sint . . . nichil tamen de re tam obscura temere credendum est. [Augustine, <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i> 2.18]	9r	6v	
<i>Dixit autem Deus, fiant luminaria in firmamento caeli.</i> . . . Ea uidelicet diuisione, ut sol quidem diem, luna uero et stellae noctem illustrent . . . semper ob siderum circumeuntium redduntur lucida fulgorem. [Bede, <i>In Genesim</i> 1.1.14]	9r	6v	
<i>Et sint in signa, et cetera.</i> Quia nimirum priusquam sydera fierent . . . nullam penitus dimensionem habens horarum utpote lumine primario adhuc generaliter omnia replente. [Bede, <i>In Genesim</i> , 1.1.14]	9r	6v–7r	
<i>Et luceant in firmamento caeli, et cetera.</i> Semper quidem luminaria in firmamento caeli lucent . . . unde et nomen latine accepit, ideo quod solus obtusa luna cum ceteris stellis per diem terris fulgeat. [Bede, <i>In Genesim</i> 1.1.15]	9r	7r	
<i>Fecit Deus duo magna luminaria.</i> Luminaria magna possumus accipere non tam aliorum comparatione. . . . Nam si longe positus minor uideretur et proprius constitutis maior refulgeret, proderet exiguitatis indicium. [Bede, <i>In Genesim</i> 1.1.16]	9r	7r	
<i>Luminare maius, et cetera.</i> Luminare maius est sol non solum forma sui corporis sed etiam magnitudine luminis . . . solum modo lucis solatium aliquid afferre certissimum est. [Bede, <i>In Genesim</i> , 1.1.16–17]	9r	7r	

<i>Vt lucerent super terram, et cetera. Haec et de luminaribus magnis et de stellis intelligi possunt . . . quando lucet obtusis stellarum radiis dies, sed minime adhuc sol ortus refulget.</i> [Bede, <i>In Genesisim</i> 1.1.17–18]	9r	7r	
Mistice. Deinde fit [lat. 64: “Deinde mistice fit”] mane regnum Daud. Haec aetas similis iuuentuti est . . . et fulgeant quarum rerum noticia fortior effectus. [Augustine, <i>De Genesi contra Manichaeos</i> 1.38; 1.43]	9r	7r	3r

A preliminary glance at the contents of the two commentaries, as represented in the table above, might suggest that the Lambeth Gloss is an abbreviation of the *Glossa primitiva*. A comparison of the individual glosses, however, shows that this cannot be the case—rather, the Lambeth Gloss must be a related commentary, based on a lost source it shares with the *Glossa primitiva*.

Genesis 2 is the most densely glossed chapter of the Lambeth Gloss, and comparing the text of its marginal glosses shows the relationship between the Lambeth Gloss and the *Glossa primitiva*. In the commentary on Genesis 1 and 3, the shared glosses in the *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth Gloss are textually similar, if not necessarily identical. This can be seen in the following glosses from *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*.

Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*³⁹

Serpens autem significat Diabolum, qui sane non erat simplex. Quod enim dicitur sapientior omnibus bestiis, figurate insinuat eus uersutia. Non autem dictum est quod in paradiso erat serpens, sed

*Glossa primitiva*⁴⁰

Serpens significat Diabolum qui non est simplex. Vnde sequitur, *Serpens erat callidior cunctis animantibus* quo figurate significatur eius uersutia.

Lambeth Gloss⁴¹

Serpens significat Diabolum qui non est simplex. Vnde sequitur, *serpens erat callidior cunctis animantibus* quo figurate significatur eius uersutia.

³⁹ Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 2.20 (ed. Dorothea Weber, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 91 [Vienna, 1998], 141).

⁴⁰ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14398, fol. 20r; lat. 64, fol. 21r.

⁴¹ London, Lambeth Palace 349, fol. 7v.

<p>erat serpens inter bestias quas fecit deus. Paradisus namque beatam uitam, ut superius dixi, significat, in qua iam non erat serpens, quia iam Diabolus erat et de sua beatitudine ceciderat, quia <i>in ueritate non stetit</i> . . . custodiat.</p>	<p>Paradisus ut supra beatam uitam significat in qua iam serpens non erat, quia iam Diabolus erat et de sua beatitudine ceciderat.</p>	<p>Paradisus uero supra beatam uitam signat in qua iam serpens non erat qui iam Diabolus erat et de sua beatitudine ceciderat.</p>
--	--	--

In the marginal glosses of Genesis 2, however, the two commentaries diverge in their treatment of the source material. At points the *Glossa primitiva* stays closer to Augustine's text, while at others the Lambeth manuscript preserves the better reading. Thus, while the overall number of individual glosses may appear abbreviated in the Lambeth Gloss, the text of each gloss can be longer and closer to the source text than those in the *Glossa primitiva*. The different versions of the following extract on Genesis 2:10 offer a useful example of a point at which the Lambeth Gloss is closer to the source than the *Glossa primitiva*.

Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram*⁴²

... ut sic intelligamus fontes multos per uniuersam terram loca uel regiones proprias irrigantes, sicut dicitur miles, et multi intelliguntur, sicut dicta est locusta et rana in plagis quibus Aegyptii percussi sunt, cum esset innumerabilis locustarum numerus et ranarum: iam non diutius laboremus.

*Glossa primitiva*⁴³

... ut sic per unum fontem intelligamus multos
sicut cum dicitur miles et intelliguntur multi.

Lambeth Gloss⁴⁴

... ut sic intelligamus multos fontes per uniuersam terram, loca, uel regiones proprias irrigantes: sicut dicitur miles et multi sunt, sicut dicitur locusta et rana in plagis Egipti cum esset innumerabilis numerus locustarum et ranarum.

⁴² Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram* 5.10 (CSEL 28.3.1:154).

⁴³ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14398, fol. 13v.

⁴⁴ London, Lambeth Palace 349, fol. 5v.

Further evidence that the *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth Gloss are based upon the same text is found in a gloss from *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* that gives a spiritual reading of the fourth day of Creation. In both manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva*, the glossator erroneously divided the extract in the middle of a sentence, as shown below:

Augustine, *De Genesi contra
Manichaeos*⁴⁵

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

*Glossa primitiva*⁴⁶

Quarto die, quo iam in illo firmamento disciplinae mens spirituales intelligentias operatur atque distinguit, uidet quae sit incommutabilis ueritas quae tanquam sol fulget in anima, et quemadmodum anima ipsius ueritatis particeps fiat, et corpori ordinem et pulchritudinem praestet tanquam luna illuminans noctem, et quemadmodum stellae omnes, intelligentiae spirituales, in huius uitae obscuritate tanquam in nocte micent et fulgeant, **quarum rerum notitia fortior effectus.**

When we compare Augustine's text to that found in the *Glossa primitiva*, it is clear that the final clause, "quarum rerum notitia fortior effectus," introduces the discussion of the fifth day rather than completing the discussion of the fourth. The text of the *Glossa primitiva* that gives the moral interpretation of the fifth day begins,

Incipit etiam prouecta mens quinto die in actionibus turbulentissimi saeculi tanquam in aquis maris operari, propter utilitatem fraterne societatis et de corporalibus agnitionibus quae ad ipsum mare pertinent. . . .⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 1.43 (CSEL 91:112–13).

⁴⁶ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14398, fol. 9r; lat. 64, fol. 7r.

⁴⁷ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14398, fol. 10r; lat. 64, fol. 8r.

The Lambeth Gloss, which retains the sentence as it is found in the *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, makes clear how this error might have occurred. This gloss is one of the few in the Lambeth manuscript divided across two folios, with a tie-mark to denote the continuation of the text. (The interpretation of the two days is presented as a single gloss.) This break in the text happens at precisely the place where the sentence breaks off in the *Glossa primitiva*. It is likely that the placement of the text in the Lambeth manuscript is similar to that of the source, and that the compiler of the *Glossa primitiva* either ignored or missed the tie-mark, taking the second half of the extract as a new gloss and thus preserving the inaccurate break in the sentence.⁴⁸ From the end of Genesis 2, these textual differences come to an end, and almost every gloss in the Lambeth manuscript is found in the *Glossa primitiva*, albeit occasionally with slightly different wording, in a different order, or with a different division between glosses. These are all phenomena one would expect to see in two texts based upon a shared source.

It is the glosses found in the *primitiva* but not in the Lambeth gloss, however, that are of greatest interest. In table 1, the glosses that are missing from the Lambeth Gloss are all from the same source: Bede's *In Genesim*.⁴⁹ Other glosses that are absent are those that combine multiple sources, including Augustine and Bede. The omission of such glosses remains consistent throughout the commentary on Creation and the Fall. The apparent pattern of omissions indicates that the Lambeth Gloss is not an abbreviation of a shared source—if it were, it would be a remarkably consistent abbreviation—but that, rather, the *Glossa primitiva* is a commentary that has been expanded with new material.

Thus far, this article has discussed the text of the commentary on Creation and the Fall, found in the first section of both manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva*. What of the remainder of the commentary on Genesis? Until Genesis 3:20, the point at which the formatting of lat. 64 changes, the marginal glosses of lat. 14398 and lat. 64 present identical contents of the *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis, including the arrangement of the excerpted sources into a set order. At Genesis 3:20, however, the marginal glosses in the two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* begin to differ as glosses appear in lat. 14398 that are not found in lat. 64. Occasionally, one sees the reverse. The point of transition is shown in table 2, which lists the appearance of glosses on Genesis 3:14–4:1 in lat. 14398, lat. 64, and the Lambeth manuscript. Comparing the Lambeth Gloss to the two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* at this point

⁴⁸ London, Lambeth Palace Library, 349, fol. 3r–v.

⁴⁹ For example, the glosses on Genesis 1:1, found in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14398, fol. 6r; lat. 64, fol. 3r–v; London, Lambeth Palace Library, 349, fol. 1v.

reveals that a pair of glosses treating Genesis 3:20, beginning “Mistice. *Et uocauit Adam*. Notandum quod . . .” and “Historice. *Et uocauit Adam nomen uxoris . . .*” are omitted from lat. 14398 but found in both lat. 64 and the Lambeth manuscript. Similarly, a number of glosses found in lat. 14398 are not found in either the Lambeth manuscript or lat. 64. The interlinear glosses remain the same across the three manuscripts until the glossing disappears from lat. 64.

Table 2
Glosses on Genesis 3:14–4:1⁵⁰

Gloss incipit and explicit	Lat. 14398	Lat. 64	Lam- beth
<i>Et ait Deus ad serpentem, quia hoc fecisti. . . . Tota ista sententia figurata est nec aliud ei debet scriptoris fides . . . humano generi futurus sit ille temptator ostenditur.</i> ⁵¹ [Augustine, <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i> 11.36]	21v	22v	9r
Mistice. Iam serpens non interrogatur sed prior excepit penam qui nec confiteri potest nec habet omnino . . . ut si quando in illicita elabatur delectatio tunc illam capiat et illa obseruet eius caput, ut illud in ipso initio male suasionis excludat. ⁵² [Augustine, <i>De Genesi contra Manichaeos</i> 2.17]	22v–22r	22v	9r
<i>Mulieri quoque dixit, multiplicabo erumpnas tuas, et cetera. Haec quoque uerba Dei in mulierem figurate et propheticè melius intelliguntur. . . . Seruanda tamen est significatio prophetie quam maxime hic intuetur Dei lo-</i>	22r	22v–23r	9r and 9v ⁵³

⁵⁰ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14398, fols. 22r–23r; lat. 64, fols. 22r–24r; London, Lambeth Palace 346, fols. 9r–10v.

⁵¹ In the Lambeth Gloss, this reads “et ait dominus.”

⁵² In the Lambeth Gloss, this occurs after the gloss “Historice. *Et uocavit Adam*” and begins “Mistice. Et mulier interrogata refert culpam in serpentem, quasi aut ille sic accepit uxorem ut ei obtemperare faceret, aut illa non potuerit Dei preceptum potius custodire quam uerba serpentis admittere.” It then continues to the gloss as found in lat. 64.

⁵³ This gloss is duplicated in the Lambeth manuscript; the gloss on fol. 9r is written in a second hand, and likely reflects a desire to copy the gloss closer to the text it discusses.

quentis intentio. [Augustine, <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i> 11.37]			
Mistice. Iam de poena mulieris ⁵⁴ nulla questio est. Manifeste enim multiplicatos dolores habet atque suspiria in huius uitae calamitatibus . . . et hoc illi dictum est qui coluerit agrum suum, quia ista patietur donec reuertatur in terram de qua sumptus est, id est donec finiat hanc uitam. [Augustine, <i>De Genesi contra Manichaeos</i> 2.19]	22r	23r	9v
[At this point, lat. 64 changes to the three-column gloss format.]			
Mistice. <i>Et uocauit Adam</i> . ⁵⁵ Notandum quod post ⁵⁶ peccatum et sententiam iudicis Dei uocat Adam mulierem. . . . Non enim potuit ⁵⁷ melius indicari mors quam sentimus in corpore quam pellibus quae mortuis peccoribus detrahi solet. [Augustine, <i>De Genesi contra Manichaeos</i> 2.21]		23v	9v
Historice. <i>Et uocauit Adam nomen uxoris suae Aeuu</i> . Haec ipsius primi hominis uerba intelligenda sunt . . . quia sicut in factis quaeritur quid factum sit et quid significet, sic in dictis quid dictum sit. [Augustine, <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i> 11.38–39]		23v	9v
Historice. <i>Ecce Adam factus est quasi unus ex nobis</i> Non aliter intelligendum est quod ait <i>unus ex nobis</i> nisi propter Trinitatem numerus pluralis . . . id est quod Deus ideo lignum illud tangere prohibuerit quod sciebat eos si tetigissent uelut deos futuros	22v	23v	10r

⁵⁴ Lat. 14389 reads “de prima mulieris.”

⁵⁵ Omitted from the Lambeth Gloss.

⁵⁶ Omitted from lat. 64

⁵⁷ The Lambeth Gloss reads “non potuit autem.”

quam eis diuinitatem inuideret qui eos homines fecerat. [Augustine, <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i> 11.39]			
Mistice. <i>Ecce Adam factus quasi ex nobis, sciens bonum et malum.</i> Factus est tanquam unus ex nobis dupliciter intelligi potest . . . et per plenitudinem scientiae id est caritatem quia <i>si caritatem inquit non habeam, nichil sum.</i> [Augustine, <i>De Genesi contra Manichaeos</i> 2.22]	22v	23v–24r	9v–10r
<i>Adam uero cognouit Euam uxorem suam.</i> In paradiso seruata est uirginitas, extra paradysum facte sunt nuptiae. . . . In nullo opere suo quantacumque laude humana cumuletur Deo placitura.	23r	24r	10r–v
Allegorice. Isti duo filii Adae figuram duorum expriment populorum: Iudaici uidelicet maioris natu. . . . <i>Sub te erit appetitus eius,</i> id est non permittat ratio prauum motum ad affectum preualere sed suo eum studeat dominio subiungere. [Perhaps based on Isidore, <i>Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum: In Genesim</i> 6]	23r	24r	10v
B. Hoc dicto mater nostra catholica discretionem nos docet. . . . At uero electorum uita proprie est futura uita, ad quam ut perueniant mortificantur in hac cotidie. [Bede, <i>In Genesim</i> 2.4.1–2]	23r		
B. Ambo fratres fidem in Deum habentes uel naturaliter admoniti uel a parentibus edociti. . . . Sed quia non equali mente obtulerunt non equaliter utriusque uota accepta sunt. [Bede, <i>In Genesim</i> 2.4.3–4]	23r		
B. Nota ordinem primo personam offerentis acceptam Deo uel non acceptam . . . qui probata mente consequenter etiam uota orationum uel actuum suscipit. [Bede, <i>In Genesim</i> 2.4.4–5]	23r		

As shown in table 2, the marginal glosses in the two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* correspond until Genesis 3:19, and a clear pattern indicating a shared source can be seen across lat. 14398, lat. 64, and the Lambeth Gloss. After the change in formatting towards the end of Genesis 3, however, the textual relationship between the manuscripts becomes more complicated. In the second part of table 2, it is lat. 14398 that differs more from the shared source, as seen in its omission of two marginal glosses and the addition of three new excerpts, compared to lat. 64 and the Lambeth Gloss. In table 3, similarly, one can see that there are two glosses on Genesis 8:6–9:3 which are found in lat. 14398 but not in the other two manuscripts. (There is one gloss only found in lat. 64, but it is a partial repetition of an earlier gloss and is likely an error.) Every gloss in the Lambeth manuscript is found in lat. 14398, including the gloss beginning “Quia ergo sensus,” the only passage in these tables found in the Lambeth Gloss but omitted from lat. 64.

Table 3
Glosses on Genesis 8:6–9:3⁵⁸

Gloss incipit and explicit	Lat. 14398	Lat. 64	Lam- beth
Quod post dies xl emissus coruus non est reuersus, aut aquis utique interceptus aut aliquo supernatanti cadauere est illectus . . . in ore columbae tanquam in osculo pacis ad unitatis societatem posse perduci. [Augustine, <i>Contra Faustum</i> 12.20; Isidore, <i>Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum: In Genesim</i> 7; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 2.8]	30v	35r ⁵⁹	21r
Quod post alios vii dies dimissa non est reuersa significat finem seculi . . . in illa perspicua contemplatione incommutabilis ueritatis nullis misteriis corporalibus egeamus. [Augustine, <i>Contra Faustum</i> 12.20; Isidore, <i>Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum: In Genesim</i> 7; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 2.8]	30v	35r	21v

⁵⁸ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14398, fols. 30v–32r; lat. 64, fols. 35v–37v; London, Lambeth Palace 346, fols. 21r–23r.

⁵⁹ This is broken into two glosses, the latter of which is combined with the one below.

<p>Questio est quomodo columba non inuenerit ubi resideret. Si iam sicut narrationis ordo contextitur . . . aut potius aquae nondum siccatae fuerant.</p> <p>[Augustine, <i>Quaestiones in Heptateuchum</i> 1.14; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 2.8]</p>	30v	35r	21r
<p><i>Sexcentesimo et primo anno uitae Noe</i> id est, peractis sexcentis aperitur archae tectum . . . qui numerus ex illa coniunctione spiritus et corporis septies octonos habet uno addito propter unitatis uinculum.</p> <p>[Augustine, <i>Contra Faustum</i> 12.21; Isidore, <i>Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum: In Genesim</i> 7; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 2.8]</p>	30v	35v	21v
<p>De archa iuncti exeunt qui disiuncti intraerunt sicut seorsum uiri seorsum feminae commemoratae sunt quia in hoc tempore <i>caro concupiscit aduersus spiritum</i> . . . perfecta pace spiritui corpus adhaerebit nulla mutabilitatis indigentia uel concupiscentia resistente.</p> <p>[Augustine, <i>Contra Faustum</i> 12.21; Isidore, <i>Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum: In Genesim</i> 7; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 2.8]</p>	30v	35v	21v
<p><i>Donec sicarentur</i>. Non quod postea sit reuersus quo genere locutionis dicitur, <i>non cognouit Ioseph Mariam uxorem suam donec peperit filium suum primogenitum</i>, id est numquam.</p>	30v		
<p>Quod scriptum est dimissum esse coruum nec redisse et dimissam columbam post eum. . . . Unde conicitur quod cadaueri potuit coruus insidere quod columba naturaliter refugere.</p> <p>[Augustine, <i>Quaestiones in Heptateuchum</i> 1.13; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 2.8]</p>	30v		

Sicut dictum est superius, septimadecima die sexcentesimo anni aquis diluuii terra madefacta est . . . et de archa exiens, id est de spe ad speciem perueniens, requiem quam illa sacramenta promittebant inuenias.	31r	35v	22r
Cum ⁶⁰ animalia quamuis munda et immunda in archa fuerint, tamen post egressionem de archa non offeruntur Deo in sacrificio nisi munda . . . ut preterita ultio ad uetus pertineat testamentum, id est illud ad legis seueritatem, hoc ad gratiae bonitatem. [Augustine, <i>Contra Faustum</i> 12.21; <i>Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum: In Genesim</i> 7; Augustine, <i>Quaestiones in Genesim</i> 1.15; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 2.8]	31r	36v	22v
Quia ergo sensus et cogitatio humani cordis ad mala prona sunt. . . <i>Non enim iuxta apostolum qui plantat est aliquid nec qui rigat, sed qui incrementum dat Deus.</i> [Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 2.8]	31r		22v ⁶¹
Dignum fuit ut uir sanctus et futurorum prouidus inuicium secundae mundi aetatis . . . sexta etatem hostia sui corporis et sanguinis in altari crucis Deo dedicaret. [Bede, <i>In Genesim</i> 2.8.21]	31v	36v	
Quid deinde sibi uelit Deo loquente ad Noe tamquam rursus ab exordio, quia multis modis eandem representari oportebat figuram aeccliesie commendare quod progenies eius benedicitur ad implendam terram. [Augustine, <i>Contra Faustum</i> 12.22; Isidore, <i>Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum: In Genesim</i> 7]	31v	36v	23r

⁶⁰ This should be “cur,” but all manuscripts read “cum.”

⁶¹ This gloss follows “Cum animalia quamuis . . . hoc ad Grece bonitatem” in Lambeth.

Cum animalia quamuis munda et immunda in archa fuerint tamen post egressionem de archa non offeruntur Deo in sacrificio. [A repetition of part of the Augustinian gloss above, found on the same folio.]		36v	
Homo ergo animalibus irrationabilibus non autem caeteris hominibus natura prelatus est. . . . Si enim apud semetipsam mens descendit de uertice culminis citius planitiem inueniet naturalis equitatis ut non preesse gaudeat ⁶² sed prodesse. [Gregory, <i>Moralia in Job</i> 21.15; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 2.8]	32r	37r	23r ⁶³
<i>Omne quod mouetur et uiuit erit uobis in cibum</i> et reliqua. Esus carniū post diluuiū concessus estimatur propter infecunditatem terrae et hominis fragilitatem. [Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 2.8]	32r	37r	23r ⁶⁴

Later in the text, the differences between lat. 14398 and lat. 64 increase—although the other, more obvious faults in the text of lat. 64 make it possible that these differences are more the fault of the scribes than the textual tradition. Table 4 presents one of the last sections that can be compared, the marginal glosses on the story of the division of Jacob’s and Laban’s flocks, found in Genesis 30:31–31:4. In this section, lat. 64 contains no glosses that are not found in the other manuscripts. It is, however, missing five glosses seen in lat. 14398, only two of which (“Item aliter, *Tollens Iacob . . .*” and “Dilatatusque est homo . . .”) are not found in the Lambeth Gloss.

Adding further complexity is the fact that lat. 64 and the Lambeth Gloss are alike in presenting two short glosses as interlinear commentary (“*Populus quia in fluuiū . . .*” and “*Quia de nucibus amigdalinis . . .*”), while lat. 14398 has them as marginal glosses. Glosses certainly did move between the marginal and interlinear spaces in gloss-format manuscripts, but the extremely

⁶² The Lambeth Gloss reads “valeat.”

⁶³ In the Lambeth Gloss, this follows directly on “*Quid deinde sibi uelit. . .*”

⁶⁴ In the Lambeth Gloss, this follows directly on “*Homo ergo animalibus. . .*”

brief nature of these glosses—and the fact that they appear this way in two quite different manuscripts—suggests that they were interlinear in the shared source.

Table 4
Glosses on Genesis 30:31–31:4⁶⁵

Gloss incipit and explicit	Lat. 14398	Lat. 64	Lambeth
<i>Dixitque, quid dabo? at ille respondit, Nichil uolo usque respondebitque mihi oras iustitia mea, et cetera. Multum apud Septuaginta interpretes confusus est sensus . . . mecum iustitia mea dum Deus humilitatem meam respicit et laborem.</i> [Jerome, <i>Liber Hebraicarum Quaestionum in Genesim</i> ; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 3.18]	80r	93r	83r
Optionem Laban datam libenter arripuit, et ita ut Iacob postulabat faciens trium dierum iter inter Iacob et suos filios separauit . . . ubi uero tulisset corticem, color candidus panderetur. ⁶⁶ [Jerome, <i>Liber Hebraicarum Quaestionum in Genesim</i> ; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 3.18]	80r	93v (partial)	83v
Obseruabat ergo Iacob et tempus quo ascende- bantur pecora, et post calorem diei ad potandum auida pergebant. . . . Et Quintilia- nus in ea controuersia qua accusatur matro- na quod ethyopem peperet, pro defensione illius argumentetur hanc conceptus esse na- turam, quam supra diximus. [Jerome, <i>Liber Hebraicarum Quaestio-</i>	80v		84r

⁶⁵ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14398, fols. 80r–81v; lat. 64, fols. 93r–94r; London, Lambeth Palace 346, fols. 83r–84r.

⁶⁶ Lat. 64 is missing the second half of this gloss and ends “et contra naturam albi et nigri pecoris naturale arte pugnauit.”

<i>num in Genesim; Rabanus Maurus, Commentariorum in Genesim 3.18]</i>			
Et scriptum reperitur in libris antiquissimi atque peritissimi Hypocratis . . . qua inuenta mulier a suspitione liberata est. [Augustine, <i>In Heptateuchum</i> , 1.93; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim 3.18]</i>	80v		84r
Item aliter. <i>Tollens Iacob uirgas populeas uirides, et ex amigdalinas et ex platanis ex parte decorticauit . . . illa uero qui integra erant . . . et reseruato non umquam hystoriae tegmine bene se interioribus format.</i> [Gregory, <i>Moralia in Job</i> , 21.1; Paterius, <i>Liber de Expositione Veteris ac Novi Testamenti</i> , 1.64]	80v–81r		
Populus quia in fluuio nascitur fidem significat quam in baptismo profitemur.	80v	93v (int.)	83v–84r (int.)
Quia de nucibus amigdalinis suauissimum fit oleum, per amigdalum figurari caritas potest	80v	93v (int.)	84r (int.)
Iacob prudens et callidus iustitiam et equitatem etiam in noua arte seruabat . . . quo corpus omne concutitur et imperanti uoluptati uicinus est finis. [Jerome, <i>Liber Hebraicarum Quaestionum in Genesim</i> ; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim 3.18]</i>	81v		84r
<i>Dilatatusque est homo ultra modo . . . usque et misit et uocauit Rachel et Liam in agrum et reliqua.</i> Pro eo quod nos posuimus, <i>mutauit mercedem . . . lege Virgilium</i> in quo dicitur, bis grauidae pecudes natura autem italicarum ouuium et Mesopotamiae una esse traditur. [Jerome, <i>Liber Hebraicarum Quaestionum in Genesim</i> ; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim 3.18–19]</i>	81v		

<i>Dixitque, quid dabo? at ille respondit, Nichil uolo usque respondebitque mihi oras iustitia mea, et cetera. Multum apud Septuaginta interpretes confusus est sensus... mecum iustitia mea dum Deus humilitatem meam respicit et laborem</i> [Jerome, <i>Liber Hebraicarum Quaestionum in Genesim</i> ; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 3.18]	80r	93r	83r
Optionem Laban datam libenter arripuit, et ita ut Iacob postulabat faciens trium dierum iter inter Iacob et suos filios separavit... ubi uero tulisset corticem, color candidus panderetur. ⁶⁷ [Jerome, <i>Liber Hebraicarum Quaestionum in Genesim</i> ; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 3.18]	80r	93v (partial)	83v
Obseruabat ergo Iacob et tempus quo ascendebantur pecora, et post calorem diei ad potandum auida pergebant... Et Quintilianus in ea controuersia qua accusatur matrona quod ethyopem peperet, pro defensione illius argumentetur hanc conceptus esse naturam, quam supra diximus. [Jerome, <i>Liber Hebraicarum Quaestionum in Genesim</i> ; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 3.18]	80v		84r
Et scriptum reperitur in libris antiquissimi atque peritissimi Hypocratis... qua inuenta mulier a suspicione liberata est [Augustine, <i>In Heptateuchum</i> 1.93; Rabanus Maurus, <i>Commentariorum in Genesim</i> 3.18]	80v		84r

⁶⁷ Lat. 64 is missing the second half of this gloss and ends “et contra naturam albi et nigri pecoris naturale arte pugnauit.”

Item aliter. <i>Tollens Iacob uirgas populeas uirides, et ex amigdalinas et ex platanis ex parte decorticauit . . . illa uero qui integra erant . . . et reseruato non umquam hystoriae tegmine bene se interioribus format.</i> [Gregory, <i>Moralia in Job</i> , 21.1; Paterius, <i>Liber de Expositione Veteris ac Novi Testamenti</i> 1.64]	80v–81r		
Populus quia in fluuio nascitur fidem significat quam in baptismo profitemur.	80v	93v (int.)	83v–84r (int.)

As seen in the above charts, the change in the formatting of lat. 14398 and lat. 64 reflects a shift in how the texts of the two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* relate to one another and to the Lambeth Gloss. Before Genesis 3:20, the two manuscripts of the *primitiva* contain near-identical glosses, and their relationship with the Lambeth Gloss through a shared source can be clearly seen. At Genesis 3:20, however, the texts of lat. 14398 and lat. 64 begin to diverge so dramatically that it becomes necessary to ask whether we can truly speak of a text of the *Glossa primitiva*.

At first, the number of glosses which are found only in lat. 14398 suggests a program of expansion not shared by the scribes of lat. 64 or the Lambeth Gloss; we can also see that lat. 14398 omits some glosses found in the other two (table 2)⁶⁸. As the text continues, the differences become more complicated (tables 3 and 4); the glosses themselves also become more sparse (as can be seen by comparing the number of folios covered by the tables). By the end of the glossed text of lat. 64 (table 4) the scribes have omitted glosses which, previous patterns would suggest should appear, since they appear in the Lambeth Gloss and lat. 14398. Since lat. 64 is incomplete, it is hard to say if this is related to the total disappearance of the gloss in later folios. Lat. 64 and the Lambeth Gloss do agree in their representation of certain glosses as interlinear, rather than marginal, demonstrating a continued connection between these texts (table 4). Whatever the reason for the omissions from lat. 64, there is a clear connection between the change in the formatting of the

⁶⁸ Because lat. 14398 and lat. 64 share numerous alterations or emendations to source material not seen in Lambeth, such as in the glosses on chapter 2, it is much less likely that lat. 64 and Lambeth share a program of emendation represented by the addition of those glosses omitted from lat. 14398.

manuscripts at the end of the account of the Fall and the divergence of the gloss texts.

These patterns of divergence suggest that the only part of Genesis for which there was in some sense a stable *Glossa primitiva* was the account of Creation and the Fall. The commentary text on Genesis 1–3:19, as a result, was transmitted in almost identical forms (although not identical formats) in two manuscripts not directly related to one another. In contrast, the commentary on the remaining chapters is marked by difference, expansion, and omission. The confluence of these textual changes and the changes to the formatting of the *primitiva* manuscripts suggests that the two are related. By reading these two types of evidence in concert, it is possible to theorize the working methods of the compilers and scribes responsible for the development of the *Glossa primitiva*, including the apparent role of the *textus intercisus* format in its development.

III. THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE *GLOSSA PRIMITIVA*

By combining the evidence offered by the texts and the manuscripts, we can develop an account of how the *Glossa primitiva* was constructed from multiple sources and the methods used by compilers to do so; in the process, the disjunctures of formatting and codicology in the two surviving manuscripts can be shown to reflect the history of the text itself.

The history of the *Glossa* begins with the commentary on Creation and the Fall and the shared source of the *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth Gloss. The textual differences between the marginal glosses of the *Glossa primitiva* and the Lambeth Gloss suggest that for the commentary on the first three chapters, the Lambeth manuscript and the *Glossa primitiva* are distinct developments from a single source, which was copied as a three-column gloss-format commentary—the hypothetical source designated here as the proto-*Glossa*. The Lambeth manuscript is not itself the proto-*Glossa*, but a distinct development from it, and one may develop a sense of the proto-*Glossa*'s contents by comparing the shared material of the Lambeth Gloss and the *Glossa primitiva*.

The proto-*Glossa*, at least on Creation and the Fall, appears to have been significantly influenced by Augustinian material, and the extracts were copied as individual glosses. Glosses from Bede, and those made of multiple sources, are notably absent—these glosses are also missing from the Lambeth Gloss. While the marginal glosses are the principal subject of this study, the fact that it was copied in the gloss format is indicated by the fact that the Lambeth and

primitiva manuscripts share identical interlinear glosses, which were preserved in both traditions influenced by the proto-*Glossa*.

It appears that at some point in the early twelfth century, the *Glossa primitiva* commentary on Genesis 1–3:19 was created by adding new extracts to the marginal commentary of the proto-*Glossa*. The added passages may have been taken from the original sources, but it is likely that they came from a distinct continuous commentary on Creation and the Fall. The interlinear glosses did not change, which offers evidence that the new source was not a second gloss-format commentary. Thus, while a number of glosses have been shown to originate in a single, continuous commentary, the first three chapters of the *Glossa primitiva* offer an example of transforming a continuous commentary—whether the source texts or an intermediary—into a Gloss when there was already a preexisting marginal commentary. These new passages increased the amount of marginal text and so introduced new formatting challenges, namely, fitting the commentary around the biblical text.

How did the scribes or compiler work when adding new material to the margins? The contents of the *Glossa primitiva* do not show evidence of having been constrained by the space available—indeed, as the all-gloss folios show, quite the reverse. Here, the benefit of the *textus intercisus* format, which was used for the first three chapters (and only the first three chapters) in lat. 64, becomes clear. It would be simple to weave together a gloss and a continuous commentary in the *textus intercisus* format. First, one would copy a biblical verse with its interlinear commentary. Next, one could copy all the glosses on that verse, adding the new material below the old. This is, in fact, what we see with the glosses of the *Glossa primitiva* on Creation and the Fall, in which extracts from different sources always appear in the same order.

The unusual three-column ruling seen in the first three quires of lat. 14398 is also revealing. In the first section of this manuscript, as described above, boundaries were drawn for two columns with the division down the middle of the writing frame. The apparently central (but, in fact, always off-center) column of biblical text was copied off the central division as an insertion into one of the two columns of the gloss text. While the resulting formatting looks like a three-column gloss format, its concept and execution is not dissimilar to the *textus intercisus* format, even though the commentary is interrupted vertically rather than horizontally. This format has parallels in later manuscripts of Peter Lombard's *Magna glosatura*, in which the horizontal space allotted to biblical passages was shortened, so that they were copied across only a section of one of the two columns, with the gloss text wrapping around them.⁶⁹

⁶⁹ De Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible*, 25.

The importance of the *textus intercisus* format seen in lat. 64 is supported by the fact that this manuscript returns to the simple format at precisely the point at which the textual relationship between the two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* changes. At this point, the compiler developing the *Glossa primitiva* from the proto-*Glossa* stopped. The number of glosses shared by the two manuscripts of the *Glossa primitiva* drops precipitously, while their relationship to the Lambeth Gloss remains much (if not exactly) the same. The overall density of glossing also diminishes. It makes sense that the change in format would be slightly different in lat. 14398, which appears to have been copied with the goal of erasing the more obvious disjunctures in formatting; fols. 22r and 22v also show a transition in the formatting of lat. 14398 that marks the change.

At the point at which scribes were no longer adding new material, there was no reason to retain the *textus intercisus* format. The production of the *Glossa primitiva*—at least the text shared by lat. 14398 and lat. 64—thus appears to have focused on the account of Creation and the Fall. Only after the commentary tradition stabilized into the text shared by lat. 14398 and lat. 64 did the compilers turn their attention to the remainder of the text. In this later stage of development, the commentaries on the later chapters of Genesis found in lat. 14398 and lat. 64 were independently altered, although the faults in lat. 64 make it difficult to speak of some differences with certainty. This distinct stage of development made the differences between the Lambeth manuscript and the *Glossa primitiva* on the later chapters both less frequent and less predictable. Most notable in the above tables, perhaps, is that there are no glosses on the later chapters of Genesis that are shared by lat. 14398 and lat. 64 but not by the Lambeth Gloss. The evidence suggests an independent expansion of lat. 14398, representing a process of adding new, individual marginal glosses that was similar to, but distinct from, the later redaction of the *Glossa reformata*; whether or not lat. 64 was separately developed is less clear on account of other problems with the manuscript.

As for the text, it should be clear that while lat. 14398 is both older and more complete, it may not always be the best representation of the *Glossa primitiva*. We must rely on comparisons—including comparisons with related glosses—in order to understand how the text was formed as it was compiled in the first decades of the twelfth century. For the commentary on the creation account, where lat. 14398 and lat. 64 are in agreement, we stand on firm ground in discussing the text of the *Glossa primitiva*. For the remaining commentary on Genesis, however, the comparison of lat. 14398 to lat. 64 and the Lambeth manuscript suggests that there was a period of experimentation with the content of the *Glossa* that began earlier and ran longer than depicted in

previous studies of the differences between the *primitiva* and the *reformata*.⁷⁰ Once the commentary on Genesis 1–3 had been expanded with the integration of a distinct continuous commentary, the compilers moved their attention to emending the *Glossa* on the rest of Genesis, working new sources into the margins of the text. Although only two manuscripts of the *primitiva* survive, comparing the exegetical approaches of the two stages of its composition could provide a wealth of information about how exegetical methods changed over the period encompassed by the development of the *Glossa*.

In addition, reading the text of the *Glossa reformata* in the light of the multi-stage development of the *Glossa primitiva* demonstrates the extent to which the history of the *Glossa primitiva* affected the later recension. Lat. 14398, although it differs from lat. 64 and the Lambeth Gloss in its inclusion of a number of new glosses, is not an intermediary between the *primitiva* and the *reformata*. That is to say, the glosses unique to lat. 14398 do not correspond to the glosses that characterize the *Glossa reformata*. However, lat. 14398 and lat. 64 show the kind of experimentation with the text that would lead to the second recension was both early and ongoing. For example, a number of patristic sources, like Jerome and Isidore, are used in the *Glossa primitiva* on the later chapters of Genesis, but appear in the commentary on Creation and the Fall only in the *Glossa reformata*.

This may be why the *primitiva* was eventually replaced. The *Glossa* was at first a lecture book, and only later came to be used as a comprehensive Biblical reference; its new use was preceded by a period of emendation, revision, and expansion. The production of the *Glossa reformata* from the *Glossa primitiva* shows the changes made to the text as it was changed from a classroom text to a widely used and flexible reference work. However, the expansion of the proto-*Glossa* and experimentation with the commentary seen in the manuscripts of the *primitiva* shows that the editing process, which one might think was characteristic of Paris, had its roots much earlier, in the intellectual milieu of the cathedral schools.

The *Glossa primitiva* on Genesis is characterized by division and disparity across sections of the biblical text. In the *Glossa reformata*, these divisions have been erased. All-gloss pages were moved to the beginning of the manuscript so that they no longer interrupted the text, resulting in a prothemata to the commentary. The abbreviation and editing of the extended glosses found in the *primitiva* allowed extracts from new sources to be incorporated throughout the commentary, increasing the overall number of sources and producing a unified aesthetic throughout the manuscripts. The disjunctures

⁷⁰ E.g., Buc, *L'ambiguïté du livre*.

clear in the *primitiva* are absent from the *reformata*, which is marked by a unity that may well have been a motivating factor in its development.

Having begun as a three-column gloss-format commentary, convenient for classroom use, the *Glossa* on Genesis was steadily expanded through a number of stages to incorporate new material and sources. After the commentary on Genesis 1:1–3:19 was interwoven with new passages, the treatment of the remaining chapters of Genesis were emended with new glosses. Lat. 14398 appears, at first glance, to be a unified and coherent manuscript, but close inspection reveals the seams that lie between the distinct stages; lat. 64 leaves them bare, revealing the history of the text in its codicology. The production of a truly unified, comprehensive *Glossa* on Genesis, which would hide the many strands that went into its production, remained for a later stage.

McGill University.

