Introduction

Theology is wisdom, said Bonaventure. Theology is science, countered Thomas Aquinas, drawing the lines of a fundamental debate in medieval schools.[1] Bonaventure hoped to preserve divine truth from unfettered rationalism, but in the late Middle Ages, it was Aquinas' *scientia* that appealed to most theologians. The term "science" sufficed. It preserved the spiritual benefits of Bonaventure's *sapientia*. It still allowed theologians to debate the power of the mind, the relation of a rational conclusion to faith, and the need for extraordinary revelations from God, such as occurred when God became flesh. But whether theology was wisdom or science, all scholastic theologians agreed that theology arose from the literature of the Bible.

They were also agreed that theology is not poetry. It could have been. Cicero and Varro, remembering the Platonic exegesis of Homer and adapting Aristotle's distinction between philosophy and fable, accepted poets as theologians of myths – teachers, by way of *fabulae*, of metaphysics.[2] There are three kinds of theology, said Varro: poetic, natural, and civil. Sure, poets "tell lies," writing absurd things in their fables, but such poetic theology could be controlled by the traditions of the state, by civil theology. Far more reliable than both was natural theology, which was metaphysics – straightforward, rational, and true. Poetry was good if you could find natural theology in it. As Plutarch warned, care must be taken not to enjoy the "gravy" of fabulous stories too much while

---

[1] Marie-Dominique Chenu, *La théologie comme science au xiiie siècle*, 3rd enlarged edition (Paris: J. Vrin, 1969), pp. 53–92. Albert Lang, *Die theologische Prinzipienlehre der mittelalterlichen Scholastik* (Frieburg im Briesgau, 1964), *passim*. See also A. J. Minnis and A. B. Scott (eds.), *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism, c. 1100–1375* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1988), pp. 200–3.

[2] Varro, *Antiquities*, iv.27. Augustine, *On the City of God*, v.6. Lactantius, *De ira Dei*, xi.8. Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. W. R. Trask (Princeton University Press, 1953), pp. 203–27. For early Greek and Jewish allegory, see Jon Whitman "Present Perspectives," *Interpretation and Allegory. Antiquity to the Modern Period*, ed. Jon Whitman, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000), pp. 33–70, here 34–40 and the literature cited there.

1

neglecting the nutritious element in what you read. Poetry is like the
delicious Polypus fish, whose head is a delicacy that will give you bad
dreams. It upsets as much as nourishes, for poets mingle their truth with
lies. Even so, "the fables of the poets are not without philosophy," if one
only knows how to read them.[3]

Medieval theologians knew the tradition of poetic theology and re-
jected it. Lactantius and Augustine recorded Varro's three-fold division,
even while ridiculing pagan writers for thinking they could squeeze ulti-
mate truth from fables: superstitions make for bad theology, they said.[4]
Isidore of Seville copied out the division in his *Etymologies*. So too did the
encyclopedists Rabanus Maurus and Vincent of Beauvais. But scholas-
tic theologians followed Augustine and eventually adapted Aristotle.
Aristotle thought poets were no better than theologians – they lie.[5] It
was a stinging rebuke. So the theologians put their writing and teaching
in Varro's philosophical middle category. They set their work beside the
philosophers and pretty much banished the poets from their discussions.
They insisted they were not poets.

The poetic theologian was rescued from neglect and hostility only in
the fourteenth century. He was promoted by the early Paduan humanist
Albertino Musato and, more famously, by Dante and Petrarch.[6] How
did theologians respond? They resisted the humanists' overtures. Even
the classicizing friars of early fourteenth-century England, made famous
by Beryl Smalley, tried to avoid the remarriage of Christian and pagan
learning, while they insinuated it. They used classical sources as they
used natural philosophy, to expand their moral tropes. But in the end,
"their modest little diversions were subsidiary to the real business of aca-
demic life," and that was ruled by philosophy.[7] When Dante attributed

---

3 Plutarch, "How a Young Man Ought to Hear Poems," *Plutarch's Complete Works*, 6 vols. (New York: Wheeler Publishing Company, 1909), 6:648–95, and quoted by Heinrich Bullinger (as in the epigram to this book), *Ratio studiorum* (Zürich: Johann Wolf, 1594), f. 10v.
4 Curtius, *European Literature*, pp. 203–27; see Lactantius and Augustine references in note 2, above.
5 Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 983 a 3, 983 b 29, *The Works of Aristotle*, trans. W. D. Ross, 12 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908–52), 8:983 a 3, 8:983 b 29.
6 Curtius, *European Literature*, pp. 203–27, who overstates the acceptance of poetic theology among medieval intellectuals. For Petrarch, Carol E. Quillen, "Plundering the Egyptians: Petrarch and Augustine's *De doctrina christiana*," *Reading and Wisdom. The* De doctrina Christiana *of Augustine in the Middle Ages*, ed. E. D. English (University of Notre Dame, 1995), pp. 153–71. For Musato, Ronald G. Witt, *'In the Footsteps of the Ancients.' The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000), pp. 156–61. For the novelty of Petrarch's Christian humanism among early humanists, ibid., p. 497.
7 Beryl Smalley, *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1960), p. 301.

philosophy to his poems, he distanced himself from the theologians of
his day.

How could the theologians take their position, when their most sacred
and authoritative book is full of legend and myth? The question had
confronted Christians in antiquity, as soon as learned people joined their
ranks, so the scholastics had an old tradition on which to draw. Medieval
theologians learned their definition of Christian literature from Jerome
and Augustine, who taught that the primal writing of their religion,
the Bible, is utterly distinct from the myths of the poets. Its stories are
not fictions but a form of speech invested with a peculiar power that
helps accomplish God's redeeming purposes in the world. The "obscure"
speech of the Bible, they said, reveals mysteries to those who believe and
hides them from the unworthy.

This was the substance of what we might call a classical Christian
point of view. Biblical language is mystical. We may also call this a textual
attitude. The text is not myth but mysteriously conveys spiritual truth.
Ironically enough, to defend it, Christians of late antiquity adapted the
allegorical methods of the philosophical readers of pagan verse. They
borrowed from Platonists of the second and third centuries the distinc-
tion between the few who know how to read with insight, spiritually,
and the many who take pleasure in silly stories, literally. They believed
in the privileged knowledge of the few who were initiated by education,
baptism, or both. Later, this textual attitude belonged to the educated
of Europe, when the culture of learning was predominantly aristocratic
and monastic, from the ninth to the twelfth centuries – before and while
the schools of Paris formed a university.[8] This attitude was esoteric; it
belonged to godlike men.[9] It belonged only to spiritually heroic individ-
uals who through a rigorous discipline achieved divine knowledge. Bible
commentators and poets, for example Bernard Silvestris and Alan of
Lille, required the esoteric view of texts. It was a prerequisite of their view
of education as internal formation. The search for metaphysical secrets
in the text finally received its most concise justification in the theory of
allegory taught by theologians of the monastery of St. Victor at Paris
in the twelfth century, who asserted the habits and desires of monastic
reading in the face of the new rationalism of the schools.[10] In the twelfth
century, the search for privileged knowledge would only survive when
and where it was reconciled to a thorough study of the letter.

[8] C. Stephen Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950–1200*
(Princeton University Press, 1994).
[9] Ibid., p. 280.   [10] Ibid., p. 278. See also pp. 15–16, 34–7 below.

It is, perhaps, the twelfth-century study of the letter and its thirteenth-century outcomes that have most impressed English-speaking scholars today.[11] Continental scholars, especially Friedrich Ohly and his students, emphasized instead the medieval preoccupation with both the textuality of the literal sense (the philology and history of documents) and the metaphysics of the spiritual sense (the internal meaning).[12] For my purpose, which is to understand late medieval exegesis, it is important to focus on two convictions belonging to the esoteric view of texts, one about the object of knowledge and the other about the knower.[13] With respect to the object of knowledge, a reader does not really know a text but the natural world standing behind it. With respect to the knower, the one who knows the inner truth of the natural world has a natural affinity with that truth: his or her nature approaches it. Poetry is for pleasure, taught Aristotle, whose *Metaphysics* ranks it among the pleasurable arts. As such, it posed a problem to the reader of sacred literature, who could not enjoy the text like the reader of poetry. The reader had, as Augustine suggested, a religious investment in reading.[14] Only God could be enjoyed, who was the truth depicted by nature and to whose purposes the monastic reader aspired. The text was to be a vital *instrument* of the reader's ambitions. One's ambition had to go beyond the text toward God. Theology was not poetry because true knowledge was ultimately not textual.

Scholastic theologians – the late medieval critics of poetry in theology and theology in poetry – accepted these arguments. They accepted them and fell under the spell of a new philosophy and logic, inspired by the rediscovery of Aristotle. With philosophy and logic, they laid the groundwork for an entirely different textual attitude. That is the subject of this book.

The new textual attitude of late medieval interpreters of the Bible was not esoteric. It was in a sense rhetorical and poetic. They anticipated what Benoît Girardin, Susi Hausamann, Charles Trinkaus, William Bouwsma, Manfred Hoffmann, Quirinus Breen, and most recently Olivier Millet have uncovered in Christian humanism and the

---

[11] See the comments of Alastair Minnis and Robert Lerner: Minnis, "Fifteenth-Century Versions of Thomistic Literalism," *Neue Richtungen in der hoch- und spätmittelalterlichen Bibelexegese*, ed. R. E. Lerner (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1996), pp. 178–9; Lerner, "Afterword," ibid., pp. 181–8. Consider also Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale. Les quatre sens de l'Ecriture*, 2 parts (Paris: Aubier, 1959–1964), 2/2:263–367 and Marie-Dominique Chenu, "Lecture de la Bible et philosophie," *Mélanges offerts à Etienne Gilson* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1959), pp. 161–71.

[12] See works by Ohly, Christel Meier, and Heinz Meyer and Rudolf Suntrup in the bibliography.

[13] This is discussed further in chapter 2, below.

[14] Margaret Gibson, "The *De doctrina christiana* in the School of St. Victor," English (ed.), *Reading and Wisdom. The* De doctrina christiana *of Augustine in the Middle Ages*, pp. 41–7.

early Protestant movement: the adaptation of classical rhetoric to bibli-
cal exegesis, which allowed them to read the Bible as they read poetry.[15]
But scarcely any rhetoric was studied or taught in late medieval scholasti-
cism. Its absence is evidence of the ongoing contest over "the disciplinary
status and cultural privilege of rhetoric," to which Rita Copeland has
called our attention.[16] Copeland and others have noted that grammar
absorbed the functions of rhetoric in the twelfth century, becoming the
field that provided intellectuals with theories of reading, understanding,
and translating literature.[17] I am considering the subsequent history of
the contest in scholasticism, where logic infiltrated the teaching of gram-
mar after the middle of the thirteenth century, with the rising popularity
of "speculative grammar."[18] In the universities, rhetoric as a discipline
was then lost. Soon after came the rise of terminist logic. Both provided
new tools for the analysis of texts. Just as grammar supplanted rhetoric
in the twelfth century, so logic took the place of rhetoric in the thirteenth
and fourteenth centuries.

For a long time, it has been suspected that late medieval logic car-
ried out, to some extent, the functions of rhetoric in intellectual life.
Nikolaus Häring and William Courtenay have pointed out that specu-
lative grammar and terminist logic were really exegetical methods, but
Courtenay noted a curious fact: the methods were not applied in biblical
commentaries.[19] This is perplexing. With the decline of rhetorical study
in the thirteenth century, logic alone provided theologians with a theo-
retical approach to language and its relation to thought. How could logic
not affect biblical exegesis? I will argue that it did so indirectly by helping
scholars form basic attitudes toward language as the site of meaning, and
these attitudes were at odds with the best rationale for spiritual exegesis.
This was, for theologians, a first step toward the equalization of Bible and
poetry, even though it happened in the predominantly logical culture of
late medieval scholasticism.

Late medieval scholars held two convictions about the text of the
Bible. These contrast sharply with twelfth-century sensibilities. First,

---

[15] See their works listed in the bibliography.
[16] Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 2.
[17] See especially Suzanne Reynolds, *Medieval Reading: Grammar, Rhetoric and the Classical Text* (Cambridge University Press, 1996).
[18] This is discussed in chapter 2.
[19] William J. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England* (Priceton University Press, 1987), p. 261; Nikolaus Häring, "Commentary and Hermeneutics," *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982), p. 195. See also pp. 69–70, below.

whatever a reader learns of the world in a text may be known in its literal sense. It is not necessary to go beyond the letter. And secondly, insight depends not on the affinity of the nature of the knower with the nature of internal truth; rather, insight occurs in a kind of inter-subjectivity, a communion of readers and writers. The text itself, in its literal sense, becomes a meeting place – in the words of the sixteenth-century Augsburg reformer Wolfgang Musculus, a garden of pleasure. I don't doubt that these convictions owe a great deal to the advances in literal interpretation that began in the twelfth century and that are so well known to students of the medieval Bible. It is not my intent to document the late medieval history of those methods. Instead, I am interested in a new kind of biblical textuality, a textuality that emerged in the late Middle Ages, and in the ways it may have played a role in the Reformation.

My argument adapts an insight of two scholars. In his study of the interpretation of the Song of Songs in the high and late Middle Ages, Denys Turner emphasized Thomas Aquinas' biblical semantics as an innovative basis for the literary analysis of biblical texts.[20] Although my nomenclature differs from his, my point will be the same, except for this: I think Aquinas was more representative of late medieval inter-pretation than Turner does. In the context of Song of Songs commen-taries, Turner found that Aquinas' literary explanation of metaphor, taken up again by Nicholas of Lyra in his interpretation of the Song of Songs as an historical allegory (which Turner calls typology), was unique and unrepresentative.[21] I intend to show in this book that a lin-guistic framework for literary explanation of biblical imagery is present in many late medieval commentaries, including the commentaries of Denys the Carthusian (who represents, in Turner's study, resistance to Thomas' hermeneutic). Furthermore, I intend to show that it weakened the distinction between literal and spiritual meanings, precisely as Turner found it so weakened in Denys the Carthusian's exegesis of the Song of Songs. The second scholar, Yves Delègue, has also drawn attention to the importance of Aquinas' theory of biblical signification.[22] Like Turner, Delègue points out its importance in the work of Nicholas of Lyra.[23] By

---

[20] Denys Turner, *Eros and Allegory: Medieval Exegesis of the Song of Songs*: (Kalamazoo Cistercian Publications, 1995).

[21] "Typology" can be a confusing term, so I avoid it. See p. 18, below.

[22] See pp. 38–40, below.

[23] Lyra was a well-established theologian when he composed his *Postilla litteralis*, a literal exposition of the entire Bible, between 1322 or early 1323 and 1331. Parts of it began circulating before the *Postilla's* completion. He later prepared a resume of the *Postilla* under the title *On the Difference of Our Translation from the Hebrew Letter of the Old Testament*, or *The Book of Differences*, and produced a moral

drawing on a larger number of commentaries, I will show that Turner and Delègue have uncovered the theoretical basis for the common view of the text in the late Middle Ages – a new textual attitude. Aquinas is often credited with solving the problem of the relation of literal and spiritual senses by strictly separating them.[24] I will argue that he made it extremely difficult to distinguish spiritual from literal, and interpreters were glad for it.

I begin with a survey of the history of exegetical literature and an introduction to medieval hermeneutics (chapter 1). I make my case in chapters 2, 3, and 4. My argument progresses from theories of biblical signification (chapter 2) to the problems of figurative language (chapter 3) to the religious conceptualization of biblical literature (chapter 4). I try to show that changing notions of biblical signification, experiments in rhetorical analysis, and a concept of divine speech reveal a new textual attitude that unites biblical narrative and philosophical and theological subject matter. The significance of this new textual attitude is obvious not only in comparison with the principles enunciated at the school of St. Victor in the twelfth century, but also in comparison with interpretation in the Reformation (chapter 5). Scholars like Susan Schreiner and David Steinmetz have observed the similarities to and dependencies of Reformation scholars on medieval exegetical traditions.[25] This book suggests a reason for it: a fundamental continuity between late medieval and Reformation conceptions of the Bible as a text, forming one aspect of early modern Protestant religiosity and its well-known biblicism.

exposition of the entire Bible, the *Postilla moralis*, among other things. Charles-Victor Langlois, "Nicolas de Lyre, Frère Mineur," *Histoire Littéraire de la France* 36 (1924): 372–74. Franz Pelster, "Quodlibeta und Quaestiones des Nikolaus von Lyra O.F.M. († 1349)," *Mélanges de Ghellinck* (Gembloux, 1951), pp. 951–73. See also C. L. Patton, "Nicholas of Lyra," *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Mckim, pp. 116–22.

[24] Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964), p. 300. A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, 2nd edition (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), p. 91.

[25] See, for example, Susan E. Schreiner, *Where Shall Wisdom Be Found? Calvin's Exegesis of Job from Medieval and Modern Perspectives* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994) and the bibliographical essay by Richard Muller, "Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: The view from the Middle Ages," *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation*, ed. R. A. Muller and J. L. Thompson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), pp. 3–22.

CHAPTER I

Medieval exegesis

Bible commentary was a genre of scholastic literature. It represents a sig-
nificant part of the work of theologians in schools. This chapter surveys
medieval commentary literature, introduces the basic principles of me-
dieval interpretation, and notes the difficulty late medieval scholars had
in maintaining a basic hermeneutical conviction, namely the separation
of literal and spiritual meanings.

I. BOOKS AND COMMENTARIES

Whereas ancient Jewish scripture, written on leather or papyrus, was
usually bound in scrolls, Christians, beginning in the second century,
abandoned scrolls for another structure, the codex, a book of leaves of
papyrus, then parchment and later, beginning in the fourteenth century
in Europe, paper, folded into sections and sewn together between two
boards.[1] By the end of the fourth century in western Christianity,
sixty-six books with an additional eight of less certain authenticity
("apocrypha") were accepted as scripture, yet the border distinguishing
these books from other kinds of sacred literature was neither frozen nor
fluid, but somewhere in between, and this can be seen in the codices
themselves.[2] Jerome's Bible translation, the Vulgate, which became the
only translation recognized in the medieval west, was usually copied
with "prologues" – brief texts that served to introduce the sections and
books of scripture.[3] Jerome authored the prologue to the entire Bible,

[1] Medieval Hebrew Bibles were also usually bound in codices. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), pp. 201–7. Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), pp. 75–7.

[2] The same sixty-six books of modern Bibles, the seven apocryphal books, and an additional letter of Paul to the Laodiceans included in a number of Vulgate manuscripts. Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), pp. 229–47.

[3] In fact, some Latin prologues circulated before Jerome and were carried over into fourteen of the twenty earliest manuscripts of the Vulgate. Maurice Schild, *Abendländische Bibelvorreden bis zur Lutherbibel* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1970), pp. 71–2.

the prologue to the Pentateuch, and various others wholly or in part, but the rest were drawn from a surprising variety of sources. They even include material composed by heretics, like the Pelagian prologue to the Pauline Epistles that circulated with most Vulgate manuscripts, or the Monarchian material hidden beneath a first sentence taken from a letter of Jerome in the prologue to the Catholic Epistles, the Book of Acts, and the Apocalypse (the last section of the medieval New Testament).[4] Medieval scholars knew that these texts were not scripture, even if they did not know the unorthodox origins of some of them, and they took this material critically. But the physical form of the Bibles they used neverthe-less displays well the intimate connection of scripture and interpretation in their minds. For the Bible itself was a library of documents that gave the record of salvation from the past to the future, and reflection upon the same was expected to be taken up into its world of thought. Even the monastic library, according to Hugh of Saint Victor, ought to be organized according to biblical categories: the Old Testament section should include pseudepigrapha – together with law, prophets, and hagiography – and the New Testament section should include "decrees" and the writings of the "fathers and doctors of the church."[5]

The codices included non-canonical prologues. In addition, those Bibles designed for study often combined scripture and exegesis by adding glosses to the page.[6] Bible glosses were brief explanatory notes added between the lines (interlinear glosses) and longer expla-nations mostly culled from patristic literature and placed in the margins (marginal glosses, a technique also found in Jewish commentaries on the Talmud).[7] The earliest biblical glosses known in the west were probably

---

[4] Ibid., pp. 69–102. See also the comments of Karlfried Froehlich in the introduction to the *Biblia Latina cum Glossa Ordinaria: Facsimile Reprint of the Editio Princeps, Adolph Rusch of Strassburg 1480/81*, 4 vols. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1992), 1:xv.

[5] "Decrees" refers to the authoritative pronouncements of popes, bishops, councils, and church fathers in the canon law. *Didascalicon*, iv.2 "De ordine et numero librorum." Pierre Petitmengin, "La Bible à travers les inventaires de bibliothèques médiévales," *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, p. 42.

[6] This was true only of those copies designed for study, which did not comprise the largest number of biblical manuscripts. Other forms and uses: divided for liturgical reading in the mass, in the form of epistolaries or evangelaries, as codices used for the daily readings in a monastery's refectory, less frequently in vernacular translation for private use. Ibid., p. 35 (which does not mention the last use).

[7] Guy Lobrichon, "Une nouveauté: les gloses de la Bible," *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, ed. P. Riché and G. Lobrichon (Paris: Beauchesne, 1984), p. 98. Commentaries on the Talmud were first written in Mesopatamia (the Abbasid Caliphate) in the ninth century, and in North Africa, Iberia, Italy, France, and Germany from about the beginning of the eleventh century. Meyer Waxman, *A History of Jewish Literature*, 4 vols. (New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1960), 1:250–80. Rabbinical commentaries on the Bible, a literary genre that followed a long tradition of oral commentary and halakic interpretation of scripture, were written from the tenth century in Mesopatamia and

written in Northumbria and Ireland by the turn of the eighth to ninth centuries,[8] but the technique did not catch on until the third quarter of the eleventh century, in the monastic and cathedral schools that spawned the beginnings of scholasticism in the north of France.[9] This form of commentary was first applied to single books that were interpreted by a school's master. Glosses gradually assumed a more uniform design, while striving (especially under the influence of Anselm of Laon [d. 1117]) to encompass patristic exegetical opinion for the whole Bible. By the middle of the twelfth century glossed Bibles began to circulate in France, England, and Germany, apparently from a center of production at Paris, whose famous schools attracted book-buying students and teachers from throughout Christendom. Around 1220 the first complete glossed Bibles were produced, and about the same time what was by then a more or less standard text came to be called the *Glossa ordinaria*, the Ordinary Gloss to scripture, its status promoted, if not at first achieved, in connection with the theology faculty of the new university of Paris.[10] Some of these standard glosses compiled material from many authors (glosses to the Psalter, Song of Songs, Pauline Epistles, and Apocalypse). Others drew predominantly from a single source (Bede in Ezra to Nehemiah, Mark, Acts, and the Catholic Epistles; Rabanus Maurus in the Pentateuch and the Books of Maccabees).[11] In addition, these Bibles with commentary were

---

the eleventh century in the west. Aryeh Graboïs, "L'exégèse rabbinique," *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, pp. 234–5.

[8] An early example, a copy of the visions of Ezechiel with interlinear and marginal glosses, was produced by an Irish monk who came to the monastery of Saint Gall, suggesting that the idea if not the text followed the movement of Northumbrian and Irish monks to the continent in the late eighth and early ninth centuries. Lobrichon, "Les gloses," pp. 98–9.

[9] The beginning of European theological literature independent of biblical commentary occurred at about the same time, and this apparent departure from exegesis into the systematic analysis of doctrine has often been emphasized. Artur Michael Landgraf, *Einführung in die Geschichte der theologischen Literatur der Frühscholastik* (Regensburg: Gregorius-Verlag, 1948), pp. 39–47. J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du xiie siècle* (Bruges: Editions de Tempel, 1948). But the fact that the biblical gloss developed alongside the new literature has often been overlooked. Jean Châtillon, "La Bible dans les écoles du xiie siècle," *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, pp. 163–97. For the early history of the *Glossa ordinaria*, consider Christopher De Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Booktrade* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: D. S. Brewer, 1984); Lobrichon, "Les gloses," pp. 99–110 (the most up-to-date general account); Smalley, *Study of the Bible*, pp. 46–52; Mark A. Zier, "The Manuscript Tradition of the Glossa Ordinaria for Daniel, and Hints at a Method for a Critical Edition," *Scriptorium* 47 (1993): 3–25, esp. 3–5 for a brief summary of scholarship.

[10] Lobrichon, "Les gloses," pp. 101, 103, 112–14. Margaret T. Gibson, "The Glossed Bible," *Biblia Latina cum glossa ordinaria: Facsimile Reprint of the Editio Princeps, Adolph Rusch of Strassburg 1480/81*, ed. Karlfried Froehlich and Margaret T. Gibson (Brepols: Turnhout, 1992), pp. vii–xi. The *Glossa ordinaria* was, according to Margaret Gibson, consolidated between 1110 and 1120 possibly at Laon or Auxerre, but the history of the Gloss from that time until c. 1140/50 is "shrouded in an uncertain and deceitful mist." Ibid., p. xi.

[11] Ibid., p. ix.