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Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 1545 is a modest, glossed manuscript of the Pauline Epistles, which has been completely unknown to the scholarly world; it was probably written in Italy in the early thirteenth century and belonged to the convent of San Domenico in Bologna. The layout consists of a central text column with two lateral columns intended to receive the Gloss. The interlinear spaces of the central text column are

1 The Psalms and the Pauline Epistles were the most popular texts among medieval biblical commentators; the reasons for this, at least until the first half of the twelfth century, are discussed by Beryl Smalley, The Gospel in the Schools, c. 1100-c.1280 (London-Ronceverte, 1985), pp. 1–35 (especially pp. 1–2). Perhaps because of the abundance of material (some of which is still unpublished), we do not yet have a history of exegesis of the Pauline Epistles. Nonetheless, studies published in the first half of the last century allow us, in part, to reconstruct this history. Heinrich Denielle, in his Luther und Luthertum. Ergänzungsband I: Quellenbelege: Die abenländischen Schriftausleger bis Luther über Justitia Dei (Röm. 1,17) und Iustificatio, Quellenbelege zu Denielle's Luther und Luthertum, 2 Aufl. Bd. 1, 2. Abteilung, Beitrag zur Geschichte der Exegese, der Literatur und des Dogmas im Mittelalter (Mainz, 1905) collected a long series of commentaries on Rom. 1.17 (Iustitia Dei) and reported, in addition to published works, unpublished works with lists of manuscripts and in many cases an indication of the date of composition and sometimes the author. Werner Affeldt, in “Verzeichnis der Römerbrief-kommentare der lateinischen Kirche bis zu Nikolaus von Lyra”, Traditio, 13 (1957), 369–406, described around fifty commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, listing many manuscripts and editions; this study did not list works by their incipit and explicit (the essential tools that make an identification of a medieval scholastic text possible), however, they can be deduced from the descriptions in Stegmüller (at http://www.repbib.uni-trier.de/cgi-bin/reblinindex.tcl, consulted 06 July 2012). A list of commentaries on the Pauline Epistles is also available at http://www.appstate.edu/~bondhl/romans.htm (consulted 06 July 2012). The texts in the Bologna manuscript are not related to any of the texts described in these previous studies.


3 This is the "simple" model presumably based on the Carolingian glossed books, see Lesley Smith, The 'Glossa Ordinaria': The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary, Commentaria 3 (Leiden and Boston, 2009), pp. 94–95.
further subdivided, although not on all pages, into four smaller spaces, three of which were intended for interlinear glosses (fig. 5.2). These extra lines were added regardless of the presence of glosses. The two columns intended to receive the Gloss are ample, but although the manuscript has been carefully prepared with additional vertical lines between the text and the Gloss in the margins and in the interlinear spaces, it was not a commentary by a single author, such as a postilla, an expositio or a reportatio; the Gloss on the Pauline Epistles of the Bologna manuscript is instead made up of different exegetical microstructures including in addition to scholastic prologues and glossae, distinctiones, schemas of quaestiones, annotations and excerpts from other works (fig. 5.1 and plate IX). In short, as will be demonstrated in the following pages, the marginalia proves that this manuscript was heavily annotated by a number of masters (not students), who were members of a religious order, most likely the Dominicans. Moreover, a careful analysis of the sources of selected texts included in this manuscript suggests that the identity of these masters should probably be sought among the earliest masters of the Dominican Order.

The Bologna manuscript begins with the Epistle to the Romans, introduced by the initial P (38 × 20 mm), enclosing a bust-length portrait of St. Paul with a sword; the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (fol. 64v) is also introduced by a depiction of St. Paul, but without sword, book, or any other symbol. The remaining Epistles have only foliate initials, and even without a detailed art-historical analysis, the initials were evidently by different hands, and probably date from different periods. Biblical chapters are marked twice, both in the outer margin, the first one in brown ink, the second in red.

The Epistles of St. Paul also include the pseudepigraphal Epistle to the Laodiceans. All the Epistles, apart from the Epistles to the Hebrews and to the Laodiceans, are introduced by prologues. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians has two different prologues. The Pauline Epistles and the

---

4 More information is found in the Appendix.
6 The first begins: "§ Hec epistula dividitur in .iii. partes. In prima ponit salutatio, in secunda benivolencie cepitatio..."
Figure 5.1. Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 1545, fol. 1r.
prologues were written by a single copyist in *littera textualis*; the *marginalia* were copied in *notularis* and in simplified *littera textualis*, probably by two hands, both fairly regular and most likely Italian. The story of the composition, transcription and use which furnishes the background for the Bologna manuscript is a complicated one. It therefore seems desirable

Figure 5.2. Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 1545, fol. 122r.
to begin by presenting a few select examples of each genre of exegetical microstructure copied in the margins, most of which are on its opening page.

I

A gloss is a brief explanation or interpretation that is not completely understandable if it is not related to the text. The relationship between the text and the gloss was usually created either by repeating the biblical word (such as “Romani”, or “Paulus”) or by putting the same sign or letter alongside both text and corresponding gloss. Most glosses in the Bologna manuscript are introduced by a paragraph mark, but in some cases the biblical words are not repeated, and when they are, they are not underlined, thus making it difficult to distinguish between a gloss and other types of texts.

“§ Ihesus ebraice, sother grece, salvator latine” and “§ Christus grece, mesias ebraice, unctus latine”, on fol. 1r in the top-left margin, are certainly two glosses, both introduced by a paragraph mark. In other cases, however, the paragraph mark is followed by a different type of text. In the same margin, after the two glosses we read:

§ Ex humili factus est altus, ergo non rem(anet) quod sit humilis.
R(esponde)o: factus non dicit mutationem de quali in quale contrarium, set in tale de non tali, vel de statu in statum.

In this case the paragraph mark introduces not a gloss but a schema of a *questio* as revealed by the presence of the abbreviation of *respondeo*.

In the same margin, over a partial erasure, we read (fig. 5.3):

R(esponde)o: hoc dicitur quia predicatio sua per totum orbem delata est.

Figure 5.3. Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 1545, fol. 1r (detail).
The entire annotation, which includes numerous abbreviations, is introduced by a paragraph mark and by an abbreviation that look likes $c'$. The first section “Totius orbis predictor” and the abbreviation for Respondeo (℞) are both underlined. The first is a quotation that is not from the Pauline Epistles, but from the Collectanea (or Glossa) in epistulas Pauli of Peter Lombard. The contra (☞) that follows the quotation argues against the opinion, expressed by the Lombard and other masters, that St. Paul preached only among Gentiles. The solutio (solution) is introduced by Respondeo (℞), and it is precise and authoritative: St. Paul is “totius orbis predictor” (a preacher for the whole world) because his preaching “per totum orbem delata est” (spread throughout the whole world). This schema does not include the complete quaestio, but instead is a kind of mnemonic annotation for later disputations; note that the subject which interests the teacher in the lecture reflected here springs not from the reading of the biblical passage but from the Lombard’s commentary on the biblical passage, a commentary that is not copied in this manuscript.

The source of the quotation clarifies the meaning of the first abbreviation – that it is not in fact $c$’ but $g'$ for glossa –, and in the remainder of the Bologna manuscript there are many texts introduced or marked by the same letter. In other words, marginal annotations introduced or marked by $g'$ are comments on, or excerpts from, Peter Lombard’s Glossa in epistulas Pauli.

In addition to the $g'$, that appears to be the most frequent, there are other abbreviations found inside or near the glosses. After the first glosses, the copyist, wishing to avoid misunderstanding, did not write the abbreviations inside the gloss (after the paragraph mark) but rather outside, and to emphasise his exegesis he wrote marginal sigla for identifying sources.

---

7 “Destinatus est Apostolus gentibus totius orbis predictor, at reliqui, singulis provinciis facti sunt legati ac predicatores” (PL 191:1305). Bologna, Biblioteca Comunale dell’Archiginnasio, MS A 935 with the Glossa magna in epistulas Pauli of Peter Lombard formerly belonged to the Dominican convent of Bologna. The manuscript, originally extensively glossed, has suffered many erasures in the margins.

8 The textbooks of theology were the Bible and the Sentences of Peter Lombard; at an earlier time the Historia Scholastica of Peter Comestor was a third textbook. In the constitution of the Dominican Order of 1288 there is the following provision: “Statuimus autem ut quelibet provincia fratribus suis misis ad studium ad minus in tribus libris theologiae, videlicet biblia, sententias et historiaris, providere teneatur. Et fratres misis ad studium in historias et sententias et textu et glossa precipe studeant et intendant”; Constitutiones antique ordinis Fratrum Predicatorum, ed. A. H. Thomas, in De oudste Constituties van de Dominicanen: Voorgeschiedenis, Tekst, Bronnen, Ontstaan en Ontwikkeling (1215–1237), Bibliothèque de la Revue d’Histoire Ecclesiastique 42 (Leuven, 1965), p. 360.
References of this sort were not a new form of biblical exegesis. In the Bologna manuscript they have been inserted on the left (in the left-hand column), and on the right (in the right-hand column); in the case of the interlinear glosses, in contrast, the abbreviations remain inside the space of the gloss. This modification suggests that the layout of the Gloss was not copied from another model, but was instead elaborated for this manuscript and developed in the course of copying. Among the authorities found in the MS are ab' or Amb for Ambrosius, ag' for Augustinus (in some cases followed by the title of the work, e.g. *De civitate Dei*), Jo for Hieronymus, pe. ra. for Petrus Ravennas and ys' for Isidorus.

II

At least two different teachers, at different times, used the manuscript and added their commentaries; in some cases we find different texts on the same subject, for example, on the first folio on the biblical lemma "Paulus". The first text we shall examine is an interlinear *glossa* written in *notularis* in brown ink. It is preceded by the abbreviation ‘A’ for Augustinus. This *glossa* is also found in the *Glossa ordinaria* and in the *Glossa magna* of Peter Lombard, but with some differences:⁹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bologna</th>
<th><em>Glossa ordinaria</em></th>
<th>Petrus Lombardus</th>
<th>Augustinus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

⁹ I consulted the *Glossa ordinaria* (*Biblia cum glossa ordinaria*, ed. Adolph Rusch [Strasbourg, 1480/1481]), the *Glosa magna in epistulas Pauli* of Peter Lombard (Paris, 1541) and the *Postills* of Hugh of St. Cher (Venice, 1703) at Glossae.net: gloses et commentaires de la Bible au Moyen Âge: http://glossae.net/ (consulted 2 October 2011). In many cases, however, I have examined *Postills* of Hugh of St. Cher and the *Glosa magna* of Peter Lombard directly from manuscripts that can provide more information than the printed editions.
The first part of the gloss “Non ob aliud ... Apostolorum” comes from Augustine’s *De spiritu et littera* (7, 12), as indicated by the presence of the abbreviation Aug. In the *Glossa ordinaria* and in Peter Lombard’s commentary, the same text is followed by another passage, which is also taken from Augustine, but from his *Enarratio in psalmum* 72,4: “Non quasi iactantia ... modicum est”. This second quotation is omitted in the Bologna manuscript. It is possible, of course, that the omission is accidental, but the fact that the gloss closes with the sentence “vel forte binomius fuit”, suggests that our master used his sources (the *Glossa ordinaria*, Peter Lombard, Augustine and so forth) but did not copy them exactly. In this case, it seems likely that he deliberately omitted the second passage from Augustine.
The second *glossa* on “Paulus” is copied near the initial P by in a very simplified *textualis*:

§ Paulus: hebraice quietus, grece modicus: I(er)o(nimus) in libro ebraicorum nominum dicit quod inter(pretatur) electus vel mirabilis, quasi *vas electionis*, quasi Deus eius vitam et doctrinam fecit mirabilem.

In the *Glossa ordinaria* the text is divided in two different glosses, the first is interlinear:

§ Hebraice quietus, grece modicus, latine nomen humilitatis ut in eam provocet.

The second is a marginal gloss:


There is a certain similarity, but the texts are not identical. The *Glossa ordinaria* cited Jerome only by name, and did not include the title of his work. Overall, we can conclude that the gloss in the Bologna manuscript is not a verbatim quotation from the *Glossa ordinaria*.

The third text devoted to Paulus is a *distinctio*. The term *distinctio* derives from the exegetical technique employed in the *dialectica*: the *divisio*. In a *distinctio* a word or a sentence is distinguished on the basis of its different meanings that can be drawn from the Scriptures or, less commonly, from other sources.¹⁰ As Nicole Beriou has shown,¹¹ even before its content is examined, a *distinctio* is immediately recognizable in a manuscript by its graphical presentation: the word or the sentence is linked to different quotations, explanations and *auctoritates* by straight or wavy lines, thus creating a diagram.

In the first page of the Bologna manuscript there are four different *distinctiones*: “Predestinatus”, “Nomen eius commutatum est”, “Promisit

---

¹⁰ Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, “Biblical Distinctions in the Thirteenth Century”, *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 41 (1974), 27–37 at 28: “First, a distinctio does not necessarily distinguish the traditional four senses, but rather many (even ten or fifteen) or as few as its author pleased, some of the senses having much more to do with metaphor and rhetoric than with scriptural exegesis; and secondly, the illustrations of the senses need not be drawn from scriptures but may instead derive from other sources (...).” For an overview of the genre: Louis J. Bataillon, “Les instruments de travail des prédicateurs au XIIe siècle”, in *Culture et travail intellectuel dans l’Occident médiéval* (Paris, 1981), pp. 197–209, repr. in Idem, *La prédication au XIIe siècle en France et Italie. Etudes et documents* (Ashgate, 1993), §IV.

Deus filium suum venturum“ and “Paulus”. There is no direct verbal connection between the distinctiones “Nomen eius commutatum est” and “Promisit deus filium suum venturum”, and the Pauline Epistles. The distinction “Nomen eius commutatum est” consists of five sections:

- [I] In signum mutate mentis.
- [II] In signum humilitatis, ut ostendat se minimum omnium apostolorum: Cor. xvii; Augustinus.
- [IV] A Paulo proconsule quem convertit etc. Aimo; I(e)ronimus.

The first section is of special interest. Since no source is specified, this may be the original teaching by the master who is copying out this distinction; the other auctoritates are from the Bible, Augustine, Jerome, and Haimo of Auxerre. The sentence in the third section ascribed to Victor episcopus is now attributed to Pelagius.12

“Paulus” is the first word of the Epistle to the Romans and we can assume that this distinction was probably one of the first texts to be added in the margin, not only because it was copied in the bottom margin, where there was ample space, but also because the writing is large, visible and easily legible.

The distinction describes the characteristics of St Paul: modicus (“moderate”), quietus (“quiet”), electus (“elect”) and mirabilis (“admirable”), characteristics already listed in the gloss on “Paulus”. Before their inclusion in a formal collection, distinctiones were tools used by masters to memorize the Bible or to prepare sermons. Distinctiones therefore can be hidden in different types of texts, including sermons, lectures, postills, and so on.

---

The commentary had a rather complicated genesis. According to P. Glorieux, “Essai sur les Commentaires scripturaires de saint Thomas et leur chronologie”, Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale 17 (1950), 237–266 at 254–258, Thomas Aquinas read the Epistles in the schools only once, in Italy between 1259 and 1265. The text of the lecture was reported (“collecta eo legente”) by Reginaldo of Piperno. Later, in Paris, around 1270–1274, Thomas reviewed the reportatio to prepare the text personally, but without being able to complete the review. The surviving manuscripts are witnesses to this long process that took place at different times. For the commentary on 1 Cor 7.10–10.33 (missing in the original text) that of Peter of Tarantaise was used, in the version revised by Nicolas of Gorran. Most probably the commentary as it appears in the manuscripts and editions (that is, Rom 1 - 1 Cor 7.10 = text reworked by Thomas around 1270–1272; i Cor 7.10–10.33 = commentary of Peter of Tarantaise revised by Nicolaus of Gorran; i Cor 2- Hebr = reportatio of Reginald of Piperno (1259–1265)), is the result of a revision done in the first half of the fifteenth century, as many manuscripts are late or revised, for example, Ferrara, Biblioteca Ariostea, MS II. 1896 (ca 1456), at fol. 168rb: “Explicit sancti Thome de Aquino ordinis predicatorm super epistolas sancti Pauli. Super illam enim quae est ad Romanos dictavit ipse et super XI capit. prime ad Corinthios. Cetera sunt collecta eo legente etc”. In Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 1655, at fol. 81v (I Cor 7) we read: “Nota quod hinc usque ad xi. cap. exclusive non est expositum secundum beatum Thomam sed summum est de verbo ad verbum de expositione cujusdam fratris Nicolai gallici ordinis predictorum qui tamen satis docte et lucide omnes epistolae explanavit”. This Bologna manuscript, that comes from the Dominican convent, like most of the

In the commentary by Thomas Aquinas on the Pauline epistles, there is a distinctio on the different characteristics of St. Paul, which can be compared with the distinctio in the Bologna manuscript:

---

13 The commentary had a rather complicated genesis. According to P. Glorieux, “Essai sur les Commentaires scripturaires de saint Thomas et leur chronologie”, Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale 17 (1950), 237–266 at 254–258, Thomas Aquinas read the Epistles in the schools only once, in Italy between 1259 and 1265. The text of the lecture was reported (“collecta eo legente”) by Reginaldo of Piperno. Later, in Paris, around 1270–1274, Thomas reviewed the reportatio to prepare the text personally, but without being able to complete the review. The surviving manuscripts are witnesses to this long process that took place at different times. For the commentary on 1 Cor 7.10–10.33 – missing in the original text – that of Peter of Tarantaise was used, in the version revised by Nicolas of Gorran. Most probably the commentary as it appears in the manuscripts and editions (that is, Rom 1 - 1 Cor 7.10 = text reworked by Thomas around 1270–1272; i Cor 7.10–10.33 = commentary of Peter of Tarantaise revised by Nicolaus of Gorran; i Cor 2- Hebr = reportatio of Reginald of Piperno (1259–1265)), is the result of a revision done in the first half of the fifteenth century, as many manuscripts are late or revised, for example, Ferrara, Biblioteca Ariostea, MS II. 1896 (ca 1456), at fol. 168rb: “Explicit sancti Thome de Aquino ordinis predicatorm super epistolas sancti Pauli. Super illam enim quae est ad Romanos dictavit ipse et super XI capit. prime ad Corinthios. Cetera sunt collecta eo legente etc”. In Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 1655, at fol. 81v (I Cor 7) we read: “Nota quod hinc usque ad xi. cap. exclusive non est expositum secundum beatum Thomam sed summum est de verbo ad verbum de expositione cujusdam fratris Nicolai gallici ordinis predictorum qui tamen satis docte et lucide omnes epistolae explanavit”. This Bologna manuscript, that comes from the Dominican convent, like most of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bologna</th>
<th>Thomas Aquinas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ Paulus: hebraice <em>quietus</em>, grece <em>modicus</em>: I(er)jo(nimus) in libro ebraicorum nominum dicit quod inter(pretatur) <em>electus</em> vel <em>mirabilis</em>, quasi <em>vas electionis</em>, quia deus eius vitam et doctrinam fecit mirabilem.</td>
<td>Secundum enim quod potest Hebraem esse idem est quod <em>mirabilis</em> vel <em>electus</em>; secundum autem quod est Graecum idem est quod <em>quietus</em>; secundum vero quod est Latinum idem est quod <em>modicus</em>. Et haec quidem ei conveniunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Modicus</em> quantum ad humilitatem, Co. xv: <em>ego sum minimus</em>. B‹ernardus›: in alto non alta sapere sed humilibus consentire nihil deo karius vel rarius apud homines.</td>
<td><em>Modicus</em> per humilitatem, I Cor. XV,g: <em>ego autem sum minimus</em> apostolorum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quietus</em> quantum ad pacem et mentis tranquillitatem He. vel pacem sequimini et sanctioniam.</td>
<td><em>Quietus</em> in contemplatione, Sap. c. VIII,16: <em>intrans in domum meam conquiescam cum illa</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Modicus* and *quieta* are used in the same sense as *modicus* and *quietus*. *Modicus* is used in the sense of modesty, *quieta* in the sense of peace and tranquility. *Mirabilis* is used in the sense of marvelous, *electus* in the sense of elected, and *quietus* in the sense of tranquil. The quotations from the commentary reported here belong to the section revised by Thomas Aquinas.
Unlike Thomas, the master who wrote the distinctio “Paulus” selected quotations not only from the Bible but also from other sources to interpret the four attributes. The figura of the medulla (kernel), the more hidden part and at the same time the quintessence of a man, was taken from the Sermo I in festo SS. Petri et Pauli of Bernard of Clairvaux.\footnote{Compared to the edition of Leclercq-Rochais where we read “sapientiam et medullam sacrorum sensuum non a primo vel secundo, sed a tertio caelo largiter asportavit”, the text of the distinctio presents some variants, e.g. scientiam instead of sapientiam.} For Thomas Aquinas, St. Paul was “mirabilis in opere” (“to be admired for his works”), but for our anonymous writer, St. Paul was “mirabilis quantum ad sapientiæ profunditatem” (“to be admired for the depth of his wisdom”).

The author of this distinctio appears to have a special fondness for the border of the page, and his texts are found in the bottom (most often) or top margins; other distinctiones by this hand are: “Revelatio” (fol. 2r), “Tribulatone” (fol. 9r), “Munditia baptismi tenenda est” (fol. 11r), “Anathema” (fol. 17v), “Homo per peccatum incorrebat” (fol. 28v), “Tribulatia est signum” (fol. 37v), “Vitanda est consorsia malorum ne homo” (fol. 39v), “Gloria apostolus in” (fol. 65v), “Facies predicatoris debet esse” (fol. 79r), “Fuga bonorum” (fol. 83r), “Non est cedendum” (fol. 88r), “Verbhum Christi non habitat in homine” (fol. 120v), “Vite nostre condimentum debet esse” (fol. 121v), “Sancti habent spem sicut” (fol. 128v), “Mala speces est vitanda” (fol. 129v), “Movent homines ad credendum” (fol. 130v), “Custodia castitatis” (fol. 139r), “Disciplina non est negligenda” (fol. 172v), “Genua sunt” (fol. 173r), “Hospitalitas debet esse” (fol. 174v), to name only some of the numerous examples. In fact, there are so many distinctiones copied in the margins of the Bologna manuscript that these texts, taken by themselves, constitute a collection. In other words, if we were to extract only these texts from the margins of the Bologna manuscript, we would have another work: a collection of Distinctiones based on a reading of the Epistles of St. Paul.

Hugh of St. Cher’s biblical postills have come down to us in two versions: the longer version (Postilla maior) is printed in early editions; the shorter version (Postilla minor) is unpublished and remains in manuscript form.\footnote{I have listed the two versions of the Postills of Hugh of St. Cher in my Opere diffuse per exemplar e pecia (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 539–552.} Durham, Cathedral Library, MS A.1.16 contains the longer version of the Postillae super Epistulas Pauli, and includes pecia marks.\footnote{See Anja Inkeri Lehtinen, “The apocope of the manuscripts of Hugh of St Cher’s Works”, Medievio. Rivista di Storia della filosofia medievale 25 (1999–2000), 1–167 at 146–155.} In the margins of the manuscript are distinctiones not found in the printed
editions, and not reported in the descriptions of the manuscript. Some of these are also found in the Bologna manuscript. Although I have not found the *distinctio* on “Paulus” in the Durham manuscript, both manuscripts, for example, share the *distinctio* on “Predestinatus”. Despite their nominal attribution to Hugh of St. Cher, the *Postillae*, as well as the verbal concordance to Sacred Scripture and the *correctorium*, were produced by a team of Dominicans friars under Hugh’s direction. It is possible that the *Distinctiones super Epistulas Pauli* in both manuscripts are taken from a single-source. And that this source is Dominican.

III

To explore further the identity of the masters who used the Bologna manuscript, or more generally, the school where the manuscript was used, I have compared other texts and the *glossa* devoted to *servus*, the second word of the Epistle to the Romans (“Paulus servus…”). The interlinear text devoted to *servus* does not begin with the word *servus* but with the exclamation *Felix conditio!*

§ *Felix conditio! Nam ei servire regnare est, nam si servus regis par comiti, servus summi imperatoris omnes reges excellit, infra eodem cui servus.*

The *glossa* by Peter Lombard on *servus* begins with the biblical quotation and reads as follows:

*Servus Iesu Christi. Ecce conditio. [Origenes] Sed quaerendum est cur servus dicitur, qui alibi scriptit: *Non enim accepistis spiritum servitutis*, etc (Rom. 8). Et iterum alibi: *itaque iam non est servus sed liber* (Gal. 4). Et Dominus apostolis ait: *Iam non dicam vos servos, sed amicos* (Ioh, 15). [Haim] Ad quod dicendum est quod duo sunt genera seruitutis: Est enim servitus timoris, et pene servilis; et est servitus amoris et filiationis et humilitatis, qua instar filii, qui servit, non vult offendere patrem. Si ergo id secundum humilitatis et amoris servitutem dictum putemus, non errabimus. [Origenes] Non enim per hoc laeditur veritas libertatis in Paulo, quia omni libertate nobilior est servitus Christi. Dicendo ergo servus, nomen humilitatis ponit, ut ad eam provocet superbos quibus scribiet. Et ne misera servitus videatur, non simpliciter ait servus, sed addit, Iesu, id est Salvatoris, cui merito omnes servire debent: ei etenim servire regnare est (PL 191:1303a).*

Only the last part (“ei etenim servire regnare est”) (“in fact to reign is to serve Him”) appears in the Bologna manuscript. The gloss *felix conditio!* is, however, very similar, although not identical to that attributed to the Dominican Master Hugh of St. Cher, in which we find a precise reference to the *predicator*:
Ecce felix conditio, infra eodem [Testis est mihi Deus cui servio in spiritu meo:] contra hypocritas, qui tantum corpore. Similiter debet esse predicatrix servus Iesu Christi quod magnum est. Nam cum dicatur servus regis par comiti, servus summi Regis est super omnes imperatores et maxime qui servit ei ad convertendas animas.\(^{17}\)

For Hugh and for our exegete, the condition of servus (“servant”) is a felix conditio (“happy condition”); for another Dominican, Thomas Aquinas, this condition is abiecta (“si absolute consideretur”) (“if considered in an absolute sense”).

Texts such as this gloss, that are not derived from the Glossa ordinaria or from the Glossa of Peter Lombard or other known works, may offer clues to identify, if not the masters, at least the school where this manuscript was used. Many clues indicate that this school was a Dominican one; a conclusion supported by the fact that most of the distinctiones are focused on preaching, for example, the following distinctio found on fol. 79r:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Facie} & \quad \text{predicatoris} \\
\text{debet esse} & \\
\text{humilis} & \text{in conversatione; ut } h(\text{um})i(t)l(is), \text{ ut placeat.} \\
\text{splendida} & \text{in predicatione: 4. } \text{splendida } f(\text{ulgebis})\ e(t); \text{ Ec} \text{-vii: in } f(a(cie))\ p(ru(dentis)), \text{ [ut lu}ceant]. \\
\text{durissima} & \text{ad tolerandum, in tribulatione; Ys l e.\[7\]; } \text{ponam } f(a(ciem)\ m(\text{cam})\ u(t)\ p(e)\ t(ram)}, \text{ [ut nil eum frangat].} \\
\text{gratissima} & \text{ad reconciliandum, in or(ati)o(n)e; Hest. xv. \[17\]: } f(a)cies \text{ } f(\text{ua})\ p(e)\ t(\text{a}), \text{ [ut } d(e)c\text{ o placeat].} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(*The face of the preacher must be: humble in conversation; splendid while preaching; tough to bear, in tribulation; very grateful to the reconciliation, during prayer.*)

This distinctio was taken from 2 Cor 10.1: “qui in facie quidem humilis sum inter vos”, (“the one who is so humble when he is facing you”) which is the reference in the first part (ut humilis, here extremely abbreviated as \(\ddot{u}\ h\)) of the first section, but the biblical reference is omitted. Anonymous distinctiones may have been presented orally and may even have been originally intended for private reading, but this particular distinctio also includes new scriptural references that were added in the margin, probably at a different time. These additions look like revisions by the author.

\(^{17}\) Biblia latina cum postillis Hugonis de Sancto Caro (Basel: Johann Amerbach, for Anton Koberger, 1498–1502 = ISTC no ib00610000), p. vii; see also Munich, BSB-Ink B-481 – GW 4285; permanent link: http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb00026105-6.
In this *distinctio* there are three different additions in the space at the top and bottom, each preceded by a different sign. The first / adds “ut luceant” after the section related to *splendida*; the second : adds “ut nil eum frangat” after the third section; the last . adds “ut d(e)o placeat” to the fourth section. In the second part of the section related to *splendida* there is a citation that was evidently based on memory and not verified in the written text – *Ec* VII refers to Eccl 8, 1: “Sapientia hominis lucet in vultu eius, et potentissimus faciem illius commutabit”, (“Wisdom brightens a man’s face and changes its hard appearance”) but the sentence that follows is “in facie prudentis” (*lucet sapientia*) that derives from Prv 17,24 “In facie prudentis lucet sapientia”. *Splendida, durissima, gratissima* are not words found very frequently in the Bible, and the search for sentences which could illustrate their meaning must have been quite difficult and prolonged. The face of a preacher is not a subject for debate or for theological speculation, but it is a matter of practical interest – especially for those who dedicate themselves to preaching. Given the presence of these additions to the text, I believe that this *distinctio* is original to this manuscript, and that the hand that has inserted the additions is that of the author.

In conclusion, I would suggest that this was not a manuscript written by someone who was recording the opinions of a teacher in the margins after a lecture, or copying fragments of the discussion (*contra – respondeo*). Additions like that of the *distinctio* “Facies predicatris debet esse”, in my opinion reveal the hand of a *magister*; this conclusion is also supported by the absence of attributions after some texts or sections of texts.

IV

Ownership notes reveal that this manuscript belonged to the convent of San Domenico in Bologna; its content demonstrates that it belonged to one or more Dominican masters, and was in use for a period of time in the first half of the thirteenth century. Proof of intensive use come from the evidence that ink in the outer margins has been rubbed away through use; consequently, in some cases the term or short sentence that introduces a *distinctio* is illegible. When a page is filled with glosses, annotations and schemas, the size of the script of later additions necessarily decreases; the latest interventions on the pages are often in smaller writing than the earlier additions. In some cases, to avoid overlapping, the most recent additions are copied around an existing form (e.g. in the bottom margin of fol. 0001830015.INDD 142 4/3/2013 6:41:00 PM
12v a new text was written all around the distinctio “peccatum est”, evidence that that distinctio is earlier than the other texts on the page).

The comments or extracts from Peter Lombard, Augustine, Isidore, Ambrose, etc. and the distinctiones are not the only texts used to gloss the Epistle of St Paul in the Bologna manuscript. As I mentioned at the beginning, there are also some excerpts from other works. The text written in a very clear and elegant notularis that fills the entire bottom margin of fol. 50v (“Vir non debet ... quod terrena querit”) is derived from the Expositio of Haymo of Auxerre on the Epistle (ch. 11 = PL 117: 568); at the bottom of fol. 35r, the same hand copied part of the decretal by Pseudo-Urban, “Omnes ... christiani per manus impositionem...” followed by the indication: “Ex ep. Urbani pape”. This segment was included by Ivo of Chartres in his Decretum (col. 131) and in the Panormia (I, 13 = PL 161:1069). One of these two Canon Law collections was certainly the source of this gloss.

Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 1736, belonged to the convent of San Domenico in Bologna, much like MS 1545, and was probably one of the first manuscripts to enter the library of the Dominican convent. The first codicological unit of MS 1736 (fols. 1–48) contains the De vita contemplativa of Pomerius, followed by a collection of canons on fasting, the Constitutiones of Frederic Barbarossa, and papal letters on the decime, in addition to the De arbitratis et iudicibus of the Bolognese jurist Bulgaro. An unusual series of records written on a former flyleaf (fol. 48v), including two poems, close this codicological unit. The collection of canons on fasting were probably taken from the book IV of the Decretum of Ivo of Chartres, the book on “De observandis festivitatibus et ieiuniis legitimis, de scripturis canonicis et consuetudinibus et celebratione concilii”, which is also the source of the excerpt on fol. 35r in MS 1545.

Copied in the margins of the De vita contemplativa in MS 1736, are some postills, including a reference on fol. 5rb to St. Paul. The script of this postill is very similar to that used to copy many of the marginal texts in MS 1545, in particular the distinctiones – so similar in fact that we may assume it is probably the same hand.

Since the same hand appears in two different manuscripts that belonged to the library of St. Dominic at Bologna, and since MS 1736 was most probably one of the first manuscripts to enter the library, it is possible that the

---

18 For Ivo of Chartres see the work in progress: http://project.knowledgeforge.net/ivo/ (consulted 06 July 2012).
same Dominican was responsible for the postills on the *De vita contemplativa*, and for part of the marginal texts that formed the Gloss on the Pauline Epistles of MS 1545.

It is unfortunate that we know so little about the early Dominican school. We know almost nothing about the preaching of the founder of the order, St. Dominic, and as of yet the works of the first Dominican teachers, Reginald of Orléans, Paul the Hungarian, Roland of Cremona (Hugh of St. Cher’s teacher in Paris), Moneta of Cremona and the English Alexander of Stavensby, are still little known. I believe that it is from among these teachers that we will find the name of the person who made use of these two manuscripts.

APPENDIX

Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 1545
Parchment (with many irregularities, see: fols. 3, 7–8, 13, 14, 15, 22–23, 33–35, 38, 39, 42, 45, 51–52, 58–59, 67, 69, 76, 83–84, 87, 92, 94–95, 98, 101, 116, 123, 129, 133, 156–157, 163, 174, 178); sec. xiii (1220–1230), i (paper) + ii (parchment) + 180 + i (paper); 280 × 198 mm; quires: 1–22 (fols. 1–168), 22 (fols. 169–178), 23 (fols. 179–180). The quires begin with the flesh side on their opening recto; the Rule of Gregory, matching hair to hair, and flesh to flesh, is respected. Pricking was accomplished on the compiled and nested gathering, usually working from the verso of the last leaf; it serves as the guide for six vertical and fourteen horizontal rules, done with a colored line (not dry point). The layout is formed by a central text column (170 × 74 mm.), with glosses added in the lateral margins and between the lines. Distance between the lines is about 12 mm. The thirteen interlinear spaces are further subdivided, although not on all pages, into four smaller spaces, three of which were intended for marginal and interlinear glosses (measuring 3 mm in height). These extra lines were added regardless of the presence of glosses. The pricking that would have guided these supplementary lines is not visible. The columns intended to receive the gloss measure 37 mm for the internal column, and 60 mm for the outer column respectively (measurements taken on fol. 75). Historiated initials in colours at fols. 1ra (38 × 20 mm) and 64va; foliate initials at the beginning of the other Epistles. Initials in red and blue at the beginning of the prologues. Titles and biblical chapters in red and blue.

PROVENANCE: fol. 1r: “fratris Dondedei Bonon. ordinis predicatorium” (sec. xiv); “Iste liber est ordinis predicatorium concessus fratri Dondedeo Bonon. eiusdem ordinis in vita sua” (sec. xiv). Sources attest to Dondedeo’s
presence at the convent of Bologna from 1306 to 1309. In these years he does not appear to have held positions of particular significance.

**TEXT: Pauline Epistles with Commentary**


Fols. 32r-64v *Prologus I ad Cor.* “Corinthi sunt Achaici. Et hii similiter ab apostolo audierunt uerbum ueritatis et subuersi multipharie a falsis apostolis.... ab Epheso per Timotheum discipulum suum” (De Bruyne, “Prologue”, 13–14); Paulus, *I ad Corinthios* “Paulus uocatus apostolus Iesu Christi per uoluntatem Dei...” (Biblia Sacra vulgatam, 1769–89);

Fols. 64v-86r *Prologus II ad Cor.* “Post actam penitentiam consolatam scribit eis a Troade epistolam per Titum et conlaudans eos hortatur ad meliora. Contristatos eos quidem, sed emendatos ostendens scripta a Macedonia per Titum. Anathema interpretatur perditio. Maranatha autem ... in temptatio dominus noster ueniet” (“Post ... ostendens”: De Bruyne, “Prologue”, 15; “Anathema interpretatur...” cf. Stegmüller, no 682); Paulus, *II Ad Corinthios* “Paulus apostolus Ihesu Christi per uoluntatem Dei et Timotheus frater...” (Biblia Sacra vulgatam, 1789–1802);

Fols. 86r-97v *Prologus ad Gal.* “Galathe sunt Greci. Hii uerbum ueritatis primum ab apostolo acceperunt. Sed post discessum ... Hos apostolus reuocat ad ueritatis scribens eis ab Epheso” (De Bruyne, “Prologue”, 13; Stegmüller, no. 707); Paulus, *Ad Galatas* “Paulus Apostolus non ab hominibus neque per hominem sed per Ihesum Christum...” (Biblia Sacra vulgatam, 1802–08);

Fols. 97r-107v *Prologus ad Philipp.* “Phylippenses sunt Macedones. Hii accepto uerbo ueritatis pristiterunt in fide. Hos collaudat apostolus, scribens eis a Roma de carceri per Tythicum diaconum” (De Bruyne, “Prologue”, 15); Paulus, *Ad Ephesios* “Paulus apostolus Ihesu Christi per uoluntatem Dei sanctis omnibus...” (Biblia Sacra vulgatam, 1808–15);

Fols. 107v-115v *Prologus ad Philipp.* “Philippenses sunt Macedones. Hii accepto verbo veritatis pristiterunt ... de carceri per Epaphroditum” (De Bruyne, “Prologue”, 15; Stegmüller, no. 728); Paulus, *Ad Philippenses* “Paulus et Timotheus serui Ihesu Christi omnibus sanctis omnibus...” (Biblia Sacra vulgatam, 1815–20);
Fols. 115v-122v *Prologus ad Col.* “Colossenses et hii sicut Laodicenses sunt Asiani. Et ipsi prevenient erant a pseudoapostolis nec ad hos accessit ... ab Epheso per Tythicum diaconum et Onesimum acolitum” (De Bruyne, “Prologue”, 14; Stegmüller, no. 736); *Paulus, Ad Colossenses* “Paulus apostolus Christi Ihesu per voluntatem Dei et Timotheus frater...” (*Biblia Sacra vulgatam*, 1820–24);

Fols. 122v-129v *Prologus ad Thess.* “Thessalonicenses sunt Macedones. Hii accepto uerbo ueritatis perstiterunt in fide etiam in persecutione ... ab Athenis per Tithicum diaconem et Onesimum acolitum” (De Bruyne, “Prologue”, 15). *Paulus, I Ad Thessalonicenses* “Paulus et Siluanus et Timotheus ecclesie Thessalonicensisium...” (*Biblia Sacra vulgatam*, 1824–29);

Fols. 129v-133r *Prologus II ad Thess.* “Ad Thessalonicenses (ms Salonicenses) secundam epistolam scribit apostolus, et notum facit eis ... ab Athenis per Tithicum diaconem et Onesimum acolitum” (De Bruyne, “Prologue”, 15; Stegmüller, no. 752); *Paulus, II Ad Thessalonicenses* “Paulus et Siluanus et Timotheus ecclesie Thessalonicensisium...” (*Biblia Sacra vulgatam*, 1829–1831);

Fols. 133r-141r *Prologus ad Thim.* “Thimotheum instruit et docet de ordinatione episcopatus et diaconii et omnis ecclesiastic discipline. Scribens ei de Laodicaea” (De Bruyne, “Prologue”, 16; Stegmüller, no. 765); *Paulus, I Ad Timotheum* “Paulus apostolus Ihesu Christi secundum imperium Dei saluatoris nostr...” (*Biblia Sacra vulgatam*, 1831–36);

Fols. 141r-147r *Prologus II ad Thim.* “Item Timotheo scribit de exhortatione martyrii et omnis regule veritatis et quid futurum sit temporibus nouissimis et de sua passione scribit ei ab urbe Roma de carcere» (De Bruyne, “Prologue”’ 16 with variants; Stegmüller, no. 772); *Paulus, II Ad Timotheum* “Paulus apostolus Christi Ihesu per voluntatem Dei...” (*Biblia Sacra vulgatam*, 1836–40);

Fols. 147v-151r *Prologus ad Tit.* “Titum commonefacit et instruit de constitutione presbyterii et de spirituali conversatione et hereticis uitanidis qui in scripturis Iudaicis credunt. Scribit eis a Nicopoli...” (De Bruyne, “Prologue”, 16 with variants; Stegmüller, no. 780); *Paulus, Ad Titum* “Paulus Dei seruus, apostolus autem Christi Ihesu...” (*Biblia Sacra vulgatam*, 1840–42);

Fols. 151v-152v *Prologus ad Philem.* “Phylemoni familiare litteras facit pro Onesimo seruo eius. Scribit autem ei a Roma de carcere...” (De Bruyne, “Prologue”, 15); *Paulus, Ad Philemonem* “Paulus uinctus Christi Iesu et Thimotheus frater...” (*Biblia Sacra vulgatam*, 1842–43);

Fols. 152v-176v *Paulus, Ad Hebraeos* “Multifariam multisque modis olim Deus loquens patribus in prophetis...” (*Biblia Sacra vulgatam*, 1843–58);

Fols. 176v-177v *Ad Laodicenses* “Paulus apostolus non ab hominius neque per hominem sed per Iesum Christum... Et facite legi Coloniiensium vobis” (*Biblia Sacra vulgatam, Appendix*, p. 1976).