

RHYME and REASON

Reading the Bible in the vernacular: A closer look on the translation strategies used in Bible-translations in Old Norse and Middle Dutch.

Cathrine Renaa



Supervisor: Professor Karl G. Johansson

Masterthesis. Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies

November 2015
University of Oslo

Abstract

This thesis compares *Stjórn I* and *de Rijmbijbel*, two medieval vernacular translations of the Bible mediated through *Historia Scholastica*. Rita Copeland has studied medieval translation strategies and come to the conclusion that *appropriation* was a much used medieval method when translating Latin texts into vernacular languages. *Stjórn I* and *de Rijmbijbel* are at a first glance very different from each other, and also written in two different environments; one close to the medieval European centre of learning, one in the periphery of Europe. The comparison aimed to uncover which translation strategies the respective writers used, and if these strategies differed.

A closer study of the chapters Genesis 1 and 2 shows that the two texts has surprisingly many similarities, and when compared to their source-text *Historia Scholastica* and a medieval English translation of the same source, the similarities are even more obvious. Both use the same translation strategies and both seem to use appropriation, adapting the material to their respective audiences. A study of the prologues of *Stjórn I* and *de Rijmbijbel*, together with their respective strategies, language and treatment of the material, makes a tentative hypothesis on their intended audience possible. *Stjórn I* seems, as is said in its prologue, to have been written primarily with a male audience, probably at the king's court, in mind. *De Rijmbijbel* seems primarily to have been written for an educated secular mainly female audience.

My thanks

Nothing is created in a vacuum. I am eternally grateful to my supervisor, Professor Karl Gunnar Johansson, for all his support, his enormous patience, his sharp brain and sharp tongue.

Also to my father, Torstein Renaa, for proof-reading and suggestions, and my mother Bjørg-Helene Renaa, for regularly dragging me out from my workplace to do other things.

And last, but certainly not least, my wife, Cynthia Renaa, for never-ending support throughout the whole process. I promise to return the favour.

Likewise no text is ever truly finished, and I therefore borrow some words from van Maerlant, written some 540 years ago and still just as relevant:

nu soldi sonder vursten Gode met mi bidden mede dat hi mi dor dese warede die hic dichte van siere weet vergheue dat hic mi besmet hebbe in luegheliken saken, ‘now you shall, without delay, help me beg God that He, because I write the truth, knows to forgive me for having meddled in these things’.

Contents

Abstract	p.2
My thanks	p.3
Reading the Bible in the vernacular	p.6
<u>Part one – Forming the Questions</u>	
Introduction	p.6
-A Bible is a Bible is a Bible?.....	p.8
-The source-material for the thesis.....	p.8
Subject	p.9
Method	p.9
Medieval theories on translation	p.11
A Short Historiography	p.13
The source-texts: - <i>Stjórn</i>	p.13
- <i>De Rijmbijbel</i>	p.13
- <i>Historia Scholastica</i>	p.14
Secondary literature	p.15
Theoretical framework	p.16
<u>Part two – Seeking the Answers</u>	
A discussion on two different genres	p.17
<i>Historia Scholastica, Stjórn</i> and <i>de Rijmbijbel</i> . Introduction to the main work ...p.20	
<i>Historia Scholastica, Stjórn</i> and <i>De Rijmbijbel</i> . Comparisons	p.22
<i>Historia Scholastica, Stjórn</i> and <i>De Rijmbijbel</i> . Analysis	p.63

Thoughts on the Prologues	p.69
Analysis of the main body of the translations	p.70
Discussion	p.115
A short recapitulation of strategies	p.118
Summary	p.126
Conclusion	p.128
Bibliography	p.130
Appendix I <i>Historia Scholastica</i>	p.133
Appendix II <i>Stjórn</i>	p.142
Appendix III <i>De Rijmbijbel</i>	p.175

Reading the Bible in the vernacular: A closer look on translation strategies used in Bible-translations in Old Norse and Middle Dutch.

In the following, a comparison will be made between two different vernacular translations of Genesis. One is the prose-translation from Latin into Old Norse, known as the *Stjórn*. The second is the rhymed adaptation into Middle Dutch made by Jacob van Maerlant, known as *De Rijmbijbel*. Both translations make extensive use of the *Historia Scholastica* by Petrus Comestor, and both compilers also refer him as their source. A comparison will be made between the two, in an attempt to identify the strategies used by the translators in adapting the text into their respective languages. This will be used to try to throw a light on the process of making bible-material available to lay people. A study of translating strategies could give information not only about educational and intellectual preferences in the milieu surrounding the translators, but also of the intended audience and of the intended use of the translations.

Part one – Forming the Questions

Introduction

Gregory the Great formulated a much used metaphor about the Bible, in which he states that the Bible was like a stream, both broad and deep. It was shallow enough for the lamb to go wading in but deep enough for the elephant to swim in.¹ To make use of his metaphor, the medieval elephants (the educated) could go swimming to their hearts fulfilment in the available Latin texts, but the lambs, that is the lay people, had to rely on translations into their vernacular language to be able to even dip their little hooves. Translations, on the other hand, are always tricky. The subject of translations has been much theorized on from the time the educated elite of Ancient Rome started to translate Greek texts for the edification of their non-Greek-speaking fellow Romans. How should a word, a phrase or a passage be translated? Should the translation be verbatim, that is, each translated word faithfully following the same word in the source-text, or should the *essence* of the text be translated, to render the text the comparable, yet different, beauty in the target language as it had in the source-text?²

In every translation, even the shortest and seemingly easiest ones, choices must be made. To make a tiny example: every language has its own multi-layered words and expressions, and when more than one interpretation is possible, which one does the translator choose to use in his target-language and what motivates this choice? How are the innuendos, ambiguities, or

¹ Gregorius Magnus, *Moralia in Job. Epist ad Leandrum* 4, ed. M. Adriaen (CC SL, 143), Turnhout, Brepols, 1979, p 6 II. 177-178, quoted in François, Wim&August den Hollander, “*Wading Lambs and Swimming Elephants*” *The Bible for the Laity and the Theologians in the Late Medieval and Early Modern Era*. Leuven: Peeters, 2012, p. ix.

² Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, p. 9.

for that matter, verbal jokes, to be transferred to the translation? These are important issues because the choices made by the translators will influence the understanding of their readers. Vernacular readers cannot know that the text originally hold different interpretational options and they will have to accept, unquestioned, the choices made for them by the translators. Likewise a passage that in the source-text holds one clear message, could, maybe unintentionally, in the target-language become a multi-layered one.

As any translation affects all future readings of the translated text, at least until a new translation is made, the choices of translation strategies can be used to steer the intended audience and to form their experience of the text. In a text with a certain authority this influence can be stretched to embrace even the future thoughts and actions of the intended audience. In her book *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages*, Rita Copeland studies the concept of translation through the medieval translations of ancient Roman writers into vernacular European languages. She sketches the history of translation and translation theory from the time of Cicero through the Middle Ages. Among other things, she states that “Moreover, in the Middle ages, as in Roman antiquity, translation was a vehicle for expressing or playing out large questions of cultural difference.”³ She also states⁴ that medieval translation seems to have been made with the intention of not only translating the source-text, but to emulate it and displace it,⁵ showing the translators grasp of his subject. The term Copeland uses for this process is *appropriation*. However, the text was not changed solely to show the prowess and penmanship of the translator, but also to fit the translation into the targeted society. Presumably this would make it easier to find readers/listeners for the translated work, and, if it was a didactic piece, to get compliance. Through strategic choices during translation the text was changed from being a foreign object into working as an identifying text, ready to take its place in the group-consciousness of a given vernacular audience in a given language-region. A tool in this aim was the use of hermeneutics: the source-text was translated and explained upon, the explanation and commentaries becoming a part of the translation.

Then, seen that, as Toury expresses it in his book *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*, “a translation is a fact of whatever target sector it is found to be a fact of”, one could wonder which effect it has on a translation if it is made in what could be considered to be a central part of Western Europe, i.e. what today is known as the Netherlands, or in what by many still

³ Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation*, p 222.

⁴ Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translations Studies – and beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamns Publishing Company, 2012, p 23.

⁵ Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation*, p 222.

today is considered to have been the very periphery of Christendom, *ultima orbis provintia*,⁶ in this case in what today is known as Norway. Would there be a difference in approach and strategies? Jensen describes it in his article *Martyrs, Total War, and Heavenly Horses: Scandinavia as Centre and Periphery in the Expansion of Medieval Christendom*, that it is possible that the picture of Scandinavia as a backward and primitive area, is a result not as much from reports from medieval sources but from “an understanding of European history that developed in the second half of the nineteenth century”.⁷ It would seem that this nineteenth century interpretation could be in need of modification. There seem to have been areas where features were “surprisingly contemporaneous”⁸ in central parts of Europe, mainly France and Germany, and in Scandinavia.

A Bible is a Bible is a Bible?

The medieval view on the Bible differs quite a lot from our contemporary view, and this is also to be seen in the translation-practises. Complete Bible translations were extremely rare anywhere. Usually only the historical books, i.e. the texts from the Old Testament which holds historical information, were translated and circulated. The New Testament was represented by separate *Evangelioria* that told the life of Jesus through the four gospels.

Many medieval vernacular Bible translations were based on the history-bible of Petrus Comestor, the *Historia Scolastica*, written in Latin presumably in Paris between 1169 and 1175. Comestor based *his* work on several sources. The *Vulgat*, the Bible translation made by Jerome between ca 390 and 405 AD, and the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Flavius Josephus, written around 94 AD, are considered to be his two main-sources.⁹

The source-material for the thesis

The first translation of Bible material in Old Norse is much discussed upon. Ian Kirby considers it not only possible, but plausible, that Old Norse translations of the gospels, or at least parts of them, existed as early as in the beginning of the 12th century, and maybe even in the missionary period. According to him, translations of the Old Testament were in existence at least at the end of the 12th century.¹⁰ The earliest translation still existing however is the one known as *Stjórn*. Consisting of what modern scholars consider to be four parts, called *Stjórn I*,

⁶ Jensen, Kurt Villads. *Martyrs, Total War, and Heavenly Horses: Scandinavia as Centre and Periphery in the expansion of Medieval Christendom*. In: *Medieval Christianity in the North*. (Ed: Salonen, Kirsi; Jensen, Kurt Villads & Torstein Jørgensen). Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2013, p 90.

⁷ Jensen, p 91.

⁸ Jensen, p 92.

⁹ Sherwood-Smith, Maria C. *Studies in the reception of the Historia Scholastica of Peter Comestor*. Oxford: The Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature, 2000, p 4.

¹⁰ Kirby, Ian. *Bible Translation in Old Norse*. Universit'e de Lausanne. Publications à l'Université de la faculté des lettres XXVII. (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1986), p 94, p 98-99.

Stjórn II, *Stjórn III* and *Stjórn IV* respectively, they are thought to have been written somewhere between the late 12th (Kirby, sic) and early 14th century. The writers are unknown but subject to considerable scholarly discussion.

Jacob van Maerlant (ca 1230 – 1295) finished his Bible translation on rhyme in March 1271 according to himself. As it consists solely of rhyme, the translation is known as *De Rijmbijbel*. This is a history-bible based on the *Historia Scholastica* by Petrus Comestor and *De Bello Judaico* by Flavius Josephus. It consists of roughly 35 000 verse-lines and is the first translation of the Bible history into Middle Dutch. For a century, it even is the only known translation. *De Rijmbijbel* was later used as one of the sources for the next translation into Middle Dutch, known as *de Heernse Bijbel*.¹¹

Subject

Following the hypothesis of Rita Copeland on translation theories in the Middle Ages, the following main-questions were formulated:

Which strategies for translation can be identified in the Old Norse translation of the Bible, now known to us as *Stjórn I*, possibly made by someone close to the court of Hákon V and, if this is correct, compiled sometime between 1299 and 1319¹², and which strategies are found in the Middle Dutch translation known as *De Rijmbijbel* by Jacob van Maerlant, presumably finished in March 1271?

Questions considered:

- Can a closer reading of the prologues give information about the thoughts of the writers/translators on the subjects of their translations and their intended audience?
- Were the same strategies used in both languages, or do they differ?
- Can anything be deduced from the similarities or differences?
- What, if anything, do the strategies used suggest to us about the intended use of the vernacular translations, as for example their intended audience and the intention with the translations?

Method

This thesis aims to be a descriptive translations study, with a comparative perspective. In the study I have tried to establish the relationship between the assumed source-text, *Historia Scholastica*, and the two target-texts, *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel*, respectively. All three texts

¹¹ The *Heernse Bijbel* consists of the Old Testament, was translated between 1360 and 1385 and attributed to Petrus Naghel. www.kartuizer.herne.be

¹² Astås, Reidar. *Stjórn, del I. Norrøne tekster nr 8*. (Oslo: Riksarkivet, 2009) p.xix.

were transcribed and analysed, and then compared against each other. This comparison aimed to let the two texts high-light each others choices of strategies. The two target-texts were contextualized, mainly through a closer study of the prologues in combination with a study of the existing research on the subject of the writers, the languages and the poetics of the period and respective part of the world.

Both *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel* claims to be translations. De author of *de Rijmbijbel* specifically describes in his prologue that his aim is to make a translation of *Historia Scholastica*. *Stjórn I* is, according to its prologue, a translation of *heilagra manna blomstr*, ‘the flower of the holy men’, and Comestor is one of the holy men intended. Holy would here mainly be used to indicate authority, and a wisdom accepted by the Church. *Historia Scholastica* is mentioned by the compiler as one of the main sources. Also Astås among others has identified the main source of *Stjórn I* to be the *Historia Scholastica*.¹³

Because of this, the structure and the form of *Historia Scholastica* were used as the underlying structure in the present study. This made a comparison possible, even if the target-texts in no way conform to the word-by-word translations we today use as the most popular translation-method. The two target-texts were separated into passages corresponding to the sections of *Historia Scholastica*. In this process a loose translation was made of the two target-texts into contemporary English. This translation focused on the source languages, with the structure of the sentences kept as close as possible to their originals, and alternative solutions indicated. The aim was to make the analysis and the reasoning around the translations easier to follow for the reader. A cross-reading was done with the target-texts and the comparable passages in the *Historia Scolastica*. As a point of reference, a third medieval translation of the *Historia Scholastica* was used, an Old English translation of *Historia Scolastica* known as *The Historye of the Patriarks*. *The Historye of the Patriarks*, showing a third way of adapting and translating, made the alternative strategies of translation even clearer. This helped to identify the textual choices made by van Maerlant in *de Rijmbijbel*, and by the unknown writer of *Stjórn I*, through among other things showing which choices they could have made, but didn’t. A close reading of the texts made a comparison of the different choices possible, and from this, a comparison of translation strategies. Both van Maerlant and the compiler of *Stjórn I* explained, added and subtracted material, but not always in the same passages or to the same extent.

The study was confined to the Book of Genesis, chapter 1 and 2.

¹³ Astås, Reidar. *En kompilator i arbeid. Studier i Stjórn I*. Avhandling. Tønsberg, 1985, p xx.

Medieval Theories on Translation

Translations appear from the very beginning of written material, as can be seen in the archaeological findings of 4500 year old clay tablets inscribed with a vocabulary in both Sumerian and Eblaite.¹⁴ Theories on translation have probably been discussed just as long. The Romans leave us the first traces of such discussions, and these immediately touch upon the core problem: How to translate when two languages seldom have the exact same vocabulary, not to mention the same grammatical possibilities? These questions arose from the bilingual world of the upper Roman classes, where Greek (seen as the superior language) and Latin texts were translated into each other. As Greek was considered to be a richer and more developed language, the aim for the translator according to Cicero was to make Latin into “a fitting linguistic instrument for the transmission of Greek philosophical texts and thoughts”. Cicero was himself a translator but stated that he translated “not as an interpreter, but as an orator, keeping the same ideas and the forms, or so as one might say, the ‘figures’ of thought, but in language which conforms to our usage. And in so doing, I did not hold it necessary to render word for word, but I preserved the general style and force of the language”¹⁵

The Romans, being “the first known people in European West to exploit another language in order to achieve mastery of their own”¹⁶ developed a complex translation theory¹⁷ with several branches. One of these was translation used within grammatical studies, where translation was a form of commentary. Quintilian formulates that students should “...give its meanings in different language, and finally proceed to a freer paraphrase in which they will be permitted now to abridge and now to embellish the original, so far as this may be done without losing the poet’s meaning”.¹⁸ Another branch was seen in the rhetorical studies, where translation was seen as an imitation. These two seem incessantly to intertwine, finally both landing firmly within grasp of the rhetorical school and translation became seen ultimately as hermeneutics: As Copeland describes it: “the art of interpretation, or hermeneutics, may be seen as a function of practical wisdom, for the interpretation of discourse is not simply a mastery of rules, but a judicious response to the contingent or changing circumstances which can determine different responses to that discourse”.¹⁹ Anyone ever confronted with a machine-aided translation, the most crude, but also quite possibly the

¹⁴ Deslisle, Jean&Judith Woodsworth, ed. *Translators through history*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995. p 7.

¹⁵ Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation*, p 33.

¹⁶ Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation*, p 11.

¹⁷ Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation*, p 10.

¹⁸ Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation*, p 23.

¹⁹ Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation*, p 19.

most commonly used, being the ‘Google translator’, will agree with the need of “functional wisdom” within an interpretation!

Roman commentaries on translation exists foremost in versions from the fourth through the sixth century CE, and are assumed to mirror practices used much earlier, from the time of Cicero at least.²⁰ Copeland writes that “They offer an indication of an early connection between paraphrase and literary exegesis”,²¹ and this connection was something that would influence medieval theological practises on translations deeply. The academic tradition in the Latin-oriented medieval society leaned towards *enarratio*. Instead of mere copying of a text, the text was, just as Quintilian suggests for the advanced students, abbreviated and embellished and changed into something sometimes quite different. It could change the text in both style, structure and meaning.²² Vernacular medieval texts are modelled upon this Latin tradition of translation.

Literal translation was not only intricate because of differences in the structure of languages, but also because an imitation, that is a direct copy, was seen as inferior to a remade text. A remade text could for example have been “modernized” (as Cicero advised Brutus to do, to take the speeches of Cato the elder and “modernize” it to revitalize it!) and thus made more usable for the present generation. The conventions of secular literary theory was applied directly to sacred texts, as can be seen in the bible commentaries made by among others Pierre Abelard and Gilbert de Poitiers.²³ The conventions and categories used in ancient Rome were reused in European medieval academic circles. The academic thoughts on translation as an art of commentary would presumably also have had an impact on translations made into the vernaculars Old Norse and Middle-Dutch. The translators would have faced several challenges in their works, not only how much to paraphrase but also the linguistic challenges and maybe the rivalry that comes into working²⁴ when translating a “superior” language (i.e. Latin) into an “inferior” language.

²⁰ Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation*, p 22.

²¹ Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation*, p 22.

²² Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation*, p 87.

²³ Minnis, Alistair. *Medieval theory of authorship*. Aldershot: Wildwood House Ltd, 2nd ed., 1988, p 4.

²⁴ Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation*, p 28.

A Short Historiography

The source-texts

Stjórn

Stjórn is the earliest existing translation of the bible in Old Norse. It has been identified as to be based on the *Historia Scholastica* by Petrus Comestor. Reidar Astås has edited the text of *Stjórn* based on the existing manuscripts, foremost the AM 227 fol. and the AM 226 fol.²⁵ His edition was published in 2009 in a two-bind edition as vol. 8 in a series of Old Norse texts published in the name of Riksarkivet, The National Archives. The manuscript AM 227, named after the manuscript collector Árni Magnússon (1663 – 1730), was, according to Magnússon, part of the belongings of the church in Skálholt. Skálholt was in the Middle Ages the main church in the southern of the two bishoprics on Iceland. Magnússon acquired the manuscript in 1699 and donated it after his death, together with other manuscripts, to a foundation at the University of Copenhagen. The AM 226 was acquired by Magnússon in 1708 from an Icelandic official, Brynjólfur Þórðarson, and is supposed to have been written ca 1360 at the Augustine convent at Helgafell on Iceland, to which it belonged until the Reformation in 1560. After the Reformation the manuscript was kept safe by the family of Gísli Þórðarson for several generations, until it reached the collection of Magnússon. This manuscript too is in the collection at the University of Copenhagen.

De Rijmbijbel

For the text of *de Rijmbijbel* the edition of Maurits Gyssling was used, from the series *Corpus van Middelnederlandse teksten*. Jacob van Maerlant finished his translation of the historic parts of the Bible, in his own words based on the *Historia Scholastica*, on 25th of March in 1271.²⁶ His translation is as mentioned rhymed, and it became very popular. There are 15 existing manuscripts, ranging from plain to exquisite, and coming from different regions of the Medieval Low Countries. They have been dated from the late 13th to the early 15th century. Considered to be one of the two most uncorrupted versions of *de Rijmbijbel*, the oldest manuscript of *de Rijmbijbel*, the KB Brussels MS. 15001, was used as the base for the so-called *editie Gyssling*, published in 1983.²⁷ (The other of the two manuscripts considered to be among the most true to the original is the UB Leiden BPL 14C). One of the most beautiful versions is by the way the manuscript today resting in Museum Mermanno-Westreenianum in Den Haag, the 10 B 21. Both can be found on-line, both as reproduction

²⁵ Astås, Reidar. *Stjórn, del I*, p. xxxv-xxxli.

²⁶ Stoffers, Manuel (ed). *De middeleeuwse ideeënwereld 1000-1300*. Herleen/Hilversum: Open Universiteit/ Uitgeverij Verloren, 2nd ed. 1999.

²⁷ Gyssling, Maurits (ed). *Rijmbijbel*. In: *Corpus van Middelnederlandse teksten (tot en met het jaar 1300)*, Reeks II: Literaire handschriften, deel 3. Martinus Nijhoff: Leiden, 1983.

and as a diplomatic version.²⁸The version of the Gyssling-edition is found at the Digital Library of Dutch Texts, the *Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren*, usually abbreviated *DBNL*.²⁹

Historia Scholastica

The *Historia Scholastica* was written with the aim of being a student's guide to the historical books of the Old Testament. Its author was the then chancellor of Notre Dame, Petrus Comestor. The name Comestor is a nick-name with an uncertain origin: meaning "the one who devours" it is among other explanations held to describe the writers appetite for reading, the meaning then widened to "the one who devours books". Petrus Comestor was born and bred in Champagne and it is assumed that he was educated at the cathedral school of Troyes, in the second quarter of the 12th century. He became dean of the same school, St. Troyes, somewhere around 1145, suggesting that men saw a great potential in him from early on. He then moved on to Paris to study and later, to teach there. Here too his potential was appreciated, and he was made chancellor of Notre Dame somewhere around 1164, keeping this assignment to his death in 1178. As teacher (and former student!) he must have seen the need of making the Bible more approachable to the learners. By 1173 Comestor had finished a summary of the histories told in Genesis, with commentaries. Points considered by Comestor to be extra important or more difficult to understand, were by him commented on with added extra information and explanations gathered from his own readings. His sources encompassed both Jewish and Pagan writers, and Christian writers from the Church Fathers and through to scholars modern in the 12th century. The commentaries more than the summaries, seem to have made this work such a success. Comestor really showed his ability to devour and digest material in using such a multitude of sources in his commentarial material.

His work was named *Historia Scholastica*, and in the year 1215 it was officially approved as an accepted text by the pope Innocentius III at the Fourth Lateran Council. It became an extremely popular book, and from 1250 it was part of the curriculum in both Paris and Oxford theological studies. It stayed in the curriculum for several centuries, and its popularity is to be seen in the amount of surviving manuscripts (there are ca 800 manuscripts existing from between late 12th to early 16th century – 25 of them from the 12th century alone, when the book was newly written and not even yet approved of by the highest of church-authority) and it was printed in Latin for the first time in 1473. There are nine known existing incunabula editions. Further it was printed at least another eleven times between 1500 and 1729.

²⁸ geheugenvannederland.nl

²⁹ dnbl.org. *Rijmbijbel* (1983 editie). Based on the *Rijmbijbel* In: Instituut voor Nederlandse lexicologie (samenstelling en redactie), *Cd-rom Middelnederlands*. Den Haag/ Antwerpen: Sdu Uitgevers/ Standaard uitgeverij, 1998. (Made from the editie Gyssling.)

There are several medieval translations made into different European vernacular languages. The French, the Dutch, the Germans, and the Norwegians all made their own translations of this work.

In the series *Early European Books: printed sources to 1700* the *Historia Scholastica* is available as digital reproduction at the University library of Oslo University. This edition is also published as a book. I have, however, used the printed edition which Mayumi Taguchi used in his edition of *The Historye of the Patriark*, which is taken from the *Historia Scholastica* edition of Emanule Navarrus in 1699 and later reprinted in 1855, from the PL 198, cols. 1053 – 1142, but with new punctuation. According to Taguchi this is a closer match to most medieval translations than the newer edition of Agneta Sylwan (from 2000), and it also contains some “additions” missing in the Sylwan edition.³⁰

Secondary literature

The English medieval version *The Historye of the Patriarks* was edited by Mayumi Taguchi in 2010, and contains the Old English translation and the corresponding passages from the *Historia Scholastica* (and also from the *Bible Historiale* in Medieval French, by Guyard Desmoulins). Taguchi edited *The Historye of the Patriarks* from the manuscript Cambridge, St. John’s College MS G 31. This is by the way the only known existing copy of the text of *The Historye of the Patriarks*. This copy was presumably written somewhere in the middle of the 15th century.³¹ It was donated to the St. John College already in the 17th century. *The Historye of the Patriarks* is still today the only translation of the *Historia Scholastica* into the English language.³² It has been of interest both to use as a parallel and invaluable in a comparison to show what other choices *could* have been made in the translations and adaptations.

There is a lot of secondary literature on the two main translations used as source texts. Reidar Astås has written extensively on *Stjórn*,³³ as has Ian Kirby.³⁴ Frits van Oostrom has written on van Maerlant as a writer,³⁵ but more to the point over *De Rijmbijbel*.³⁶

³⁰ Taguchi, Mayumi. *The Historye of the Patriarks. Edited from Cambridge, St John’s College MS G.31. With Parallel texts of The Historia Scholastica and the Bible Historiale*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, (2010), p 1.

³¹ Taguchi, Mayumi, *The Historye of the Patriarks*, p.xiv.

³² Taguchi, Mayumi, *The Historye of the Patriarks*, p.xi.

³³ Astås, Reidar. *Stjórn. Nytt lys over våre eldste bibeloversettelser*. (Bibelselskapets skriftserie nr 2, 1990)

³⁴ Kirby, Ian. *Bible Translation in Old Norse*. Universit’e de Lausanne. Publications à l’Université de la faculté des lettres XXVII. (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1986)

³⁵ van Oostrom, Frits. *Maerlants wereld*. (Amsterdam: Prometheus, 1998)

³⁶ van Oostrom, Frits. *Scholastica willic ontbinden: over de Rijmbijbel van Jacob van Maerlant*. (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1991)

Theoretical framework

When we come to the theoretical framework, Rita Copeland has written extensively about translation theory in the Middle Ages in her book *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*, and although she bases her book on the study of vernacular translations of Roman authors from the antiquity, her hypothesis on medieval translations seems to be applicable to the sacred texts as well. Of particular interest are her thoughts on translations as a means of *appropriation*, the process of changing a text from something foreign into becoming part of the repertoire in the translator's language-region. Her examination of the changes in the function of rhetoric is also very interesting, in showing possible ideological forces behind medieval translation and compilation.

Alastair Minnis has studied the medieval theory of the concept of authorship, and the scholastic practices of medieval Latin and vernacular works. He has studied the practices of writing of prologues, and, curving back to the genre-question, he presents among other things the medieval written (by Boccaccio, no less!) confirmation that "Apparently the end of poetry is not incompatible with the superior end of theology".³⁷

Gideon Toury has written *Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond*. He emphasizes, among other things, the need to focus on context in translation studies, as "translation is thus as good as initiated by the target culture",³⁸ which supports Copeland's thoughts on appropriation being central in vernacular translations. He also suggests that translation-analysis could be made through choosing "coupled pairs", where he states that "any source-text entity... may in principle turn out to have represented a translationally relevant segment" and that "there is no need for a replacing entity to be identical".³⁹

On the topic of genres, Orlanda S.H. Lie has written on the medieval debate on verse versus prose 'What is Truth? The Verse-Prose Debate in Medieval Dutch Literature'.⁴⁰

³⁷ Minnis, Alistair, *Medieval theory of authorship*, p.217.

³⁸ Toury, *Descriptive Translations Studies*, p 22.

³⁹ Toury, *Descriptive Translations Studies*, p 104.

⁴⁰ Lie, Orlanda S.H. 'What is Truth? The Verse-Prose Debate in Medieval Dutch Literature.' *Queeste* 1 (1994) 34 – 65.

Part two – Seeking the Answers

Hier vindic rime dachcortinghe: A discussion of two different genres

At a glance one sees that the two translations obviously are made in two different genres: *Stjórn I* was written in prose, and *de Rijmbijble* was written as rhymed verse. A discussion on the topic of genres is necessary, as it also could shine a light on the chosen strategies of translations as well as on the intended use of the translations. Why was the respective media chosen? What was the presumed effect of the respective translations?

De Rijmbijble became the vernacular translation of the Bible mainly in use in the Netherlands until the translation of the *Heernse bijble* came, a hundred years later. *De Rijmbijble* was however not the first rhymed translation in the same language-region.⁴¹ The older known rhymed version is the *Rhijnlandse Rijmbijbel* or, what is maybe a more proper name, *De Middelfrankische Rijmbijbel*. It exists in four different finds of fragments, and is thought to have been written in the language-region where Old Dutch and Old High German both claim roots. The fragments were written in different dialects, and one theory is that the original was written before 1160 in the *Abdij van Verden*, an Imperial Abbey within the Lower Rhenish–Westphalian Circle. Both German and Dutch philologists and historians are laying claim to the text, but the fragments show at any rate that the *idea* that biblical material could be translated and transformed into rhymes was not new in the language-region.

The prose-translation of *Stjórn* on the other hand, was in use until the Reformation. To my knowledge no rhymed versions are known of Old Norse biblical translations, only prose-versions. One could ask why this consistent choice of prose, in a culture where verse, in the form of Skaldic art, had had such an important standing. The shadow of the (Skaldic) use of alliteration is by the way to be seen through *Stjórn I*.

In his prologue, van Maerlant states *his* reason to present the text in a rhymed version:

*hier vindic rime dachcortinghe
ende daer toe ware leeringhe
der noten gheliict dese ystorie
dat meerct wel in huwe memorie*

‘In this I find that rhyme amuses (literally: makes the day shorter!) and it also has true teachings, that are better remembered’ – or, it can be read as an imperative: ‘remember this well!’

⁴¹ <http://www.handschriftencensus.de/4846>

There are some studies made into the question of different genres and their presumed effect. Orlanda Lie has studied the historical development in medieval literary forms to search for a reason behind choices of form, verse contra prose, in the article *What is Truth? The Verse-Prose Debate in Medieval Dutch Literature*. Having analysed a number of poetical writings dating from the 13th century through to the 15th century, her tentative hypothesis is that the Dutch and the French language-spheres differed in their view on the use of verse in this period. First, we follow Lie as she quotes the researcher in Dutch medieval literature, Evert van den Berg. He considers that “versification of Flemish romances and their affinity with the tradition of oral epics are indication that the process of literarification (the gradual development from a society with a predominantly oral culture into a society with a written culture) took place at a slower pace in Flanders than in Brabant”.^{42 43} The fact that van den Berg here writes about romances notwithstanding, the proposed affinity between written verse and oral performances of a text is known.

Reworking biblical material into verse-form was not a novelty in Latin – the *Aurora* or *Biblica versificata*, as an example, was written by Peter Riga – then Canon of Reims – somewhere between 1170 and 1200, and could have been known to Van Maerlant at least by reputation. Verse-form continued to be used also in the French language-sphere, the discussion of truth aside, as is shown in the *Bible de Macé de la Charité*, written by a parish priest, Macé de la Charité, between 1283 and 1300 and based on the *Aurora*.⁴⁴

As late as in the 15th century an anonymous Dutch translator and writer retold Christ’s passion in medieval Dutch (Middle Dutch) in verse and he advised the part of his audience that could not read, that they should memorize the text on the sufferings of Christ as if it was the text of a popular song and carry it with them in their hearts.⁴⁵ Slowly, however, prose grew to be the preferred form in the Dutch language-sphere as well. Lie suggests, from the studies of other scholars, several cultural and social changes behind this development, such as the change of audience, from “an aristocratic audience (listening to romances) to a public of educated burghers who mastered the art of reading”.⁴⁶ This particular argument, originating with the German scholar Köhler, could be said to have some issues. Setting a listening aristocratic audience against a reading educated class of burghers does not entirely explain the shift to prose, as the burghers presumably was just as familiar to verse-form as was the aristocracy.

⁴² Van den Berg, Evert. «Vorm en inhoud: ontwikkelingen binnen de ridderepiek ca 1200 – 1350» in *De Nieuwe Taalgids*. Jaargang 85. p 405 – 421, Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1992.

⁴³ Lie, ‘What is Truth?’, p 64.

⁴⁴ Taguchi, Mayumi, *The Historye of the Patriarks*, p. xl.

⁴⁵ Lie, ‘What is Truth?’, p 58.

⁴⁶ Lie, ‘What is Truth?’, p 36.

Lie quotes Schnell, that suggests that the rivalry between vernacular oral poets and written Latin prose was the reason behind the growing despise for verse. However, the fall of verse and the rise of prose were most likely due to several cooperating forces. This change seems to have happened earlier in the French language-sphere. There verse became viewed as synonymous to lies, while prose writings became synonymous with truthfulness, already in the beginning of the 13th century. In Middle Dutch writings the first mention of verse as false opposed to prose as truthful, is found in the 14th century, in the prologue of *Livre de Sidrac*, completed in 1318, some 45 years after the completion of Van Maerlant's *De Rijmbijbel*.

In Middle Dutch, verse-form continued to be the preferred form through the 13th and 14th century. Here too, the demands of evidence of accuracy and truthfulness in a text were central, but the evidence for truthfulness was considered to lay in the sources used for the translated works, and not in the chosen form of the work. Both religious literature and scientific material was thus translated into vernacular verse. So, to return to the findings of Lie, medieval French writers were adamant that truth lay in prose texts, while texts written in verse was to be considered as false. The Dutch translators and writers were just as adamant that their audience should listen to and read the truthful texts they themselves had made, as opposed to some texts written by competing writers not considered serious enough. The truth lay in the sources used, and sometimes in the material itself⁴⁷ but, as mentioned, not in the form of the presented material. Quite the opposite, because verse was considered a great medium both because it enhanced an illiterate's ability to remember the text, and also because it was pleasing to the ear. People will want to listen to this story again and again, van Maerlant writes in his prologue.

The anonymous writer of *Stjórn I* does not mention his choice of form in the prologue. He does however mention that his work is meant to give education *æigi mikil þuingan*, "without much pain"/"without forcing". This is probably to be interpreted as that it is meant to be entertaining to listen to. The writer also expresses that the text is made to be read out aloud and that it is translated for the benefit of wise individuals not able to read and understand Latin. Astås finds, already in his early extensive studies of *Stjórn I*,⁴⁸ that the main material seems to be adapted for a listening audience, among other through being written in paragraphs suitable for loud reading. Here then, the prose form is definitely not chosen to accommodate for silent readers, as was earlier discussed. Had the writer been influenced by the discussions in the French language-sphere? It is well known that the Norwegian church was strongly connected with France, as its priests, or at least its highest dignitaries, were educated in

⁴⁷ Lie: 'What is Truth?': "Minstrels, narrators of love-stories, and authors of animal tales are denounced as liars and impostors», p 39.

⁴⁸ Astås, Redar. *En kompilator i arbeid*, p152.

France for hundreds of years.^{49 50} It could be presumed that this French-inspired higher education included an introduction to the academic way of thought in the French language-sphere, perhaps to the point of adopting what seems to have been the educated view of the French scholars of the period, namely that writings in versified form were false, while prose writings were truthful. The suitable form for an educated audience and a serious topic would then naturally be prose. This already being obvious, there would be no need for a discussion, or even a mention, of the choice of literary form.

Historia Scholastica, Stjórn and de Rijmbijbel. Introduction to the main work.

Working with three texts simultaneously is a challenge, not to mention finding a comprehensible manner of presenting the findings. Reading a thesis built on three separate texts in three different languages can also be quite time-consuming. To make the access to the texts and the findings as easy as possible, the texts are here presented several times in different manners. The reader will first find the texts of *Historia Scholastica*, *Stjórn I* and *de Rijmbijbel* from the prologue to the end of Genesis chapter 2, in their original languages. The structure of the text used in *Historia Scholastica* is ordered as a prologue, followed by chapter I to XX in Roman numbers, with a short title informing the reader of the topic of each chapter. This same structure, and the chapter headings, has here been used to compare the corresponding texts from *Stjórn I* and *de Rijmbijbel* with the chapters of the source-text. The three texts, in their original languages, are grouped together under the main headings from *Historia Scholastica*.

The section, “*Historia Scholastica, Stjórn and de Rijmbijbel: Comparisons*”, is mainly meant to give the especially interested an easy access to the texts, to compare them with my interpretation and analysis, which follows in the following section. Also, the most cursory glance through the pages will show how the volume of the material differs in the texts. At two occasions the text of *Stjórn I* is slightly rearranged, partly placed under other headings, or partly left out as it ventured out in a totally different direction. This is described in the chapter: “*Historia Scholastica, Stjórn and de Rijmbijbel: Analysis*” The numbers within parenthesis are the page numbers from the editions of the full-text mentioned in the bibliography, or, with *de Rijmbijbel*, the number of the verse-line in the edition. The full text of each work can be found in the appendix, to give the reader access to the full text without first finding a well-stocked library.

⁴⁹ Kolsrud. *Presteutdanning i Noreg*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1962, p 27.

⁵⁰ Gunnes, Erik. *Erkebiskop Øystein. Statsmann og kirkebygger*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1996, p 35 – 40.

Then follows the main part of the thesis, “*Historia Scholastica, Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel: Analysis*” This chapter is ordered in the same way, following the headings of *Historia Scholastica*, with its short title and the Roman numbers I-XX. To make the analysis easier to follow, the different texts has been “lightly translated” into English, using a source-language friendly strategy. This is not necessarily reader-friendly. To make it more readable, it has been adorned with punctuation. The texts of *Stjórn I* and *de Rijmbijbel* are here compared to *Historia Scholastica* and to each other and, to give extra perspective, with the text of *The Historye of the Patriarks*. Every section begins with the translated texts, followed by an analysis from a comparative perspective. In the Discussion finally, a short recapitulation is given of the findings in the main body of the works, i.e. the text, here presented under the corresponding chapter-headings of the Roman numbers I – XX.

Most readers will probably find it more interesting to continue directly to the following chapter, on page 63, but I pray, leaf through the tri-lingual section and see the words dance.

Historia Scholastica, Stjórn and de Rijmbijbel: Comparisons.

The prologue

Historia Scholastica

Imperatoriae majestatis est in palatio tres habere mansiones: auditorium vel consistorium in quo jura decernit, coenaculum in quo cibaria distribuit, thalamum in quo quiescit. Ad hunc modum Imperator noster, qui imperat ventis et mari, mundum hunc habet pro auditorio ubi ad nutum ejus disponuntur, unde illud Isaiae: *Coelum et terram ego impleo*. Secundum hanc dicitur Dominus, unde: P4. *Domini est terra, et plenitudo ejus*. Animam justii habet pro thalamo, quia: *Deliciae et esse cum filiis hominum*. Secundum hanc dicitur sponsus, et anima cujusque sponsa:

Sacram scripturam habet pro coenaculo in qua sic suos inebriat ut sobrios reddat, unde: *Ambulavimus in domo Dei cum consense*, in sacra scriptura id ipsum sapientes. Secundum hanc dicitur paterfamilias...

Stjórn

(p3) þersa bok let snara hakon konungr hinn koronoða or latinu er heiter heilagra manna blomstr. prologus.

Sa er háátt ok vaní keisaralegs valldz ok konungs garðz slekt at hafva þrenn einkannlegha ok heímolegh hede Rijmbijbel ergí. Hið fyrsta konungs hede Rijmbijbel ergí er þat ihueriu er hann sitr upp áá raað eðr stefnur ok sæmer lqgh ok réttendi manna i mílli. Annat er þat sem hann etr i ok veiter sinum monnum veizlur. hið þríða hans hede Rijmbijbel ergi er þat sem hann hefer ser til heímollegra nááða ok hann sefr í. Upp áá þenna haatt hefver vááR konungr sáá sem stiornar meðr síalfs hans ualldí / uindum ok veralldar sio þenna heím fyrer þat hede Rijmbijbel ergi \i hueriu er hann / hefver sin raað ok ræður ok skipar máálum manna. huar er aller luter skipaz epter hans valldi ok vilía af þessu kallaz hann sem hann er uar herra hvaðan er dauid seger i sálmínunum váárs herra er iqrðín ok ql hennar fýlling. Aund ok hiarta hvers sem eíns rettláátz mannz hefuer / hann séér sua sem til nááða hu | uss ok heimollegrar huilldar. þuiat miktill lýstvgleíki er honum at uera sætlega at vera sętleggha meðr svnum /mannanna sua sem skrifat er af huerre samueru ok sętrí huilld er hann /kallaz brudgumí heilaggha skrift ok røksamligha ritningh hefer hann ser til þeirar hallar ok heimollegs hede Rijmbijbel ergis sem hann veiter í. i huerri er hann giorer sína menn þa leiðis qlóða at þar af skapaz þeir hofsamer huar af er sua segiz in sallterínu. Meðr samþýkki gongum ver iguðs husi. þat er sua vnder standa at iheilagrí ritningu skildum ver aller hinn sama lut meðr einu samþýkki af huerri greín er hann kallaz husbondí. þetta sama hede Rijmbijbel ergi heilugh guðs rítningh hefuer þrennar greíner eðr háálfur. þat er grunduql. vegg / ok þekíu. Sagan sialf

er grunduollr þessa heimollegha guðs huss ok hede Rijmbijbel ergis. Su skýringh af heilagri skript som seger huat huert verkit i sǫgunni hefer at merkía er hinn hæri veggrinn. Enn su þýðingh er i þekian sem oss skýrer þann skilningh af þeim giǫrðum ok verkum er sagan hefer i sér sem oss er til kennidoms huat er oss hefer fra uerið sagt.

Nu sua sem váár uirðuligr herra hakon noregs konungr hinn koronaði sun Magnusar konungs let snara þa bók upp í norenu sem heiter heilagra manna blomstr þeim skýnsǫmum monnum til skemtanar sem æigi skilía eðr vnder | | standa látínu huer er gengr ok seger af ser huerium heilagum monnum áá þeira hátíðum ok messu dǫgum upp áá þann háátt uilldi hann ok at þeim goðum monnum meþti ýfer sialfs hans borði af þersari guðds hǫll ok hede Rijmbijbel ergí þat er af heilagri skript medr nǫkkuRi skemtanar vissv kvnnikt uerða sua þo at hinvm visarum mettí æigi míkil þuingan i vera af huerium stormerkium eðr til fellum sunnu daghar ok adrer þeir tímar eru halldner sem eigi eru ǫðrum heilagum monnum eínkannleggha sungit enn sialfum guði. Uill han sua i sialfs sins hede Rijmbijbel ergi þui sem hann veiter i sinum beztum monnum liosliga lesaz lááta fyrer ǫllum goðum monnum af þuí guðs husi. þat er af heilagri ritningu meðr hueri er sialfr hann seðr sǫtlega alla sína menn. Enn sáá sem norenaði kennandi sinn fatǫkdóm ok vanfæri tok þetta verk meíR upp áá sik af boðskap ok forsǫgn fýR sagðz uirðuligs herra enn þat er hann uissí sik æigi þar til miok vlíkan ok vanferan huar fyrer er hann biðr at aller goðer menn sé honum værkunnigher vm alla þa lutí sem hann hefer i þessari giǫrd uirðkuæmiligha saght eðr framm. Býriaz þessor giord ok hefz af sǫgdum guðds hallar grund uelli. þat er (p5) af ritningarennar upphafi ok ǫnduerðri genesi epter þui sem timanum til heýrer nǫkkurum lutum þar meðr afǫðrum bokum sua sem af scolastika historia ok af speculum Hýstoriale epter sialfs hans forsǫgn saman lesnum ok til loğðum.

de Rijmbijbel

Vader soene helech gheest
Enich god sonder beghin
Ghef mj hulpe ende wleest
Ende gratie in mjnen sijn
(5) Dat hic vinde moghe word
Scone ende rime goed
Daer hic bi moghe bringhen vord
dat leget in minen moet
Marie moeder der genaden
(10) Moeder der ontfarmecheit
Ghi hebt den meneghen beraden
Ghetroest van sire serecheit
helpt mi vrouwe met vre bede
dat hic ghewinne den eleghen gheest
(15) die mi cracht ende moghentede

verle'e'ne. dat mach mi helpen meest
 So bem ic danne onuervaert
 vraie rjme te bringhene vord
 van ere gesten die ic begard
 (20) hebbe. te ontbindene jn dietsche word
 Scolastica willic ontbinden
 Jn dietsche word vten latine
 Vrouwe nu moeti hu bewinden
 troest te sine in mjne pine.
 (25) Nv merct die hier an sult le'e'sen
 wat nutscepe dat hier an sal wesen
 hier ne vint men no fauele no borde
 No ghene truffe no faloerde
 Maer vraie rime ende ware woerd
 (30) hoe dat die tiit es comen voerd
 Sint dat die werelt erst begonde
 al tote dien dat quam die stonde
 dat ihesus xpristus te hemele clam
 die onse mensceit ane nam
 (35) hier vindic rime dachcortinghe
 ende daer toe ware leeringhe
 der noten gheliict dese ystorie
 dat meerct wel in huwe memorie
 die buten bitter heft die slume
 (40) die scale so art dat mense cume
 Metten tanden mach ghewinnen
 Maer al die soeteit die es binnen
 die bittereit van deser geste
 dats dat die vroetste ende die meeste
 (45) van lancheit dit ghegronden cume
 dits de bittereit van der slume
 die artheit die leghet an die scale
 dats dat niemen al te male
 Mach verstaen wat die wort dieden
 (50) die soeteit der af dats dat den lieden
 die recht verstaen ende recht minnen
 Ende wareit ende goet bekinnen
 dat hem die woert so soete smaken
 omme dat sii sin van waren saken
 (55) dat sise gherne horen leesen
 Want daer ne mach ghen verlies an weesen
 Hoert hier oe god die weerelt stichte
 den troen metten sterren verlichte
 die lucht metten voeghelen vercierde

(60) die vissche int water visierde
die erde vercierde metten dieren
Ende met cruden van manieren
ende oe hi tachterst maecte den mensche
doe hi hem alle die wensche

(65) adde ghemaect die hem bedursten
Maer nu suldi sonder vursten
Gode met mi bidden mede
dat hi mi dor dese warede
die hic dichte van siere weet

(70) vergheue dat hic mi besmet
hebbe in luegheliken saken
die mi die lichteit dede maken
vander herten ende van den sinne
Ende die weerelike dinghe

(75) Ende hi die nideghe verdue
die altoes versch siin ende nue
Ende talre stont daer toe gherust
dat hem te begripene lust
Min ghedichte ende mine word

(80) Ghi nideghe merct ende hord
Ghi ne sult mi niet ghedeeren connen
al te spade hebdis begonnen
hets dompeit dat ghi vertert
hu nijt dinct mi dat niemene deert

(85) dan hu seluen in huen siin
Ghi hebt die meer suareit der in
Ghi siit te magher ende te bleker
tui si di voer den oghen smeker
ende bachten valsch alse uerrader

(90) Met judase moet ghiis alle gader
hebt hu den nijt hic wille dichten
ende mi der mede verlichten
dor min segghen dor min castien
Sone suldiis niet vertien

(95) dies wille ghaen an min beghin
Nu god verclare minen siin
Merct hic wille ghis seker siit
dits beghin van alre tiit

The main body of the works.

HISTORIA LIBRI GENESIS.

I. De creatione empyrei et quatuor elementorum

(4) *In principio erat Vede Rijmbijbel um*, et Vede Rijmbijbel um erat principium, in quo et per quod Pater creavit mundum... Cum vero dixit Moyses: Creavit, trium errores elidit: Platonis, Aristotelis et Epicuri. Plato dixit tria fuisse ab aeterno, scilicet Deum, ideas (Graeca exemplar seu forma), ile (ile est prima materia et interpretatur silva), et in principio temporis de ile mundum factum fuisse. Aristoteles duo: mundum et opificem qui de duobus principiis, scilicet materia et forma, operatus est sine principio et operatur sine fine. Epicurus duo: inane et atomos, et in principio natura quosdam atomos solidavit in terram, alios in aquam, alios in aera, alios in ignem. Moyses vero solum Deum aeternum prophetavit et sine praejacenti materia mundum creatum. Creatus autem est in principio, id est in Filio, et iterandum est in principio sic: *In principio creavit Deus coelum et terram*, in principio scilicet temporis, coeva enim sunt mundus et tempus. Sicut autem solus Deus aeternus, sic mundus sempiternus, id est semper aeternus, temporaliter aeternus; angeli quoque sempiterni. Vel in principio omnium creaturarum creavit coelum et terram, id est has creaturas primordiales fecit, et simul. Sed quod simul factum est, simul dici non potuit. Licet enim hic prius nominetur coelum quam terra, tamen scriptum est: *In initio tu, Domine, terram fundasti et opera manuum tuarum sunt coeli*. Hanc creationem mundi, praelibata sub operibus sex dierum, explicat scriptura insinuans tria: creationem, dispositionem et ornatum. In primo die creationem et quamdam dispositionem; in secundo et tertio, dispositionem, in reliquis tribus ornatum.

Stjórn

(p13) **her seger af þui huersu almattigr guð skapaði himin ok iorð ok huersu lucifer braut meðr sinu drambi ok ofund i moti gvði sialfum ok huersu guð drottinn heidraði þa engglana sem honum sneruz til staðfastligs ok çuenligs kiçrleiks i himinrikis dýrð meðr sialfum ser utan enda**

I Upphafi skapaði guð himinríki huat er meðr sinum englum ok hímneskum kröptum var þegar í stað fyllt sua sem fyrst ok fremzt milli allra þeira luta sem hann skapaði. ok iorðina þat er at skilia samblandit ok usamið efni til fiçgurra hçfutskepna ellds ok loptz vatnz ok iarðar sua sem frío ok vnderstçðu til allra likamligra ok sýniligra luta. Var himinríki þa þegar allt skipat ok skreytt/ af utçluligum fiçlða heilagra engla ok anarra himneskra ok vsýniligra /krapta sem kirkiunnar kennifeðr ok heilugh skript seger ok meðr anda-/legum skýringum eru skiliandi þo at þa luti sem aðra uerði meðr þess hááttar orðum ok çðrum hááttum millum váar

líkamlegra ok dauðlegra manna skilianlega at giora ok i frasagner fera. Skýrer ritnhuerer er þa i fyrstu voru sua skapaðer ok vordner sik at þeir hófðu fullkomið ok frialst sialfræði at snuaz at einu sinni huart er þeir uilldu til elsku viðr/ almátkan guð eðr æigi. Enn æigi optarr sem andleg nattura utan likams/ er til. þeir voru þa ok enn æigi fullkomlega sçler fyrer þann skýlld at þeir/ uoru uuitandi sitt epterkomanda çuentýr. Eigi hófðu þeir þa enn full-/ kominn kiærleik til guðs ok elskaðu þeir hann af sialfrí nattuinn (p14) ýfer alla framm af þeim girndar elskhuga er þeir glødduz með sialfum honum vm framm allt annat af sialfs hans asynd. Enn meðr vínattu kier- leik elskaðu þeir sik mest þuiat þeir uilldu sialfum ser bezt. Nu sem lucifer einn af hinni fremztu engla skipan skryðdr ok pryðdr umframm aðra þa hugleidde hann ok uirði fegrð ok forþrisan sinnar náátturu ok diupsetta uitru ser veítta hóf hann sik sua háátt meðr sinu of drambí at hann uilldi iafnaz ok viðrlíkiaz sialfan guð. ok fyrer þa sök skilði hann sik I fra sannleikinum þegar i hriðinni ok þar meðr i brott af öllum setleik ok eýlifrí sçlu sua at þar af fekk hann meðr öllu engan þef eðr kenning. Enn hann fell sua háátt æigi at eins af þeiri sçlu sem hann hafði þegid vtan ok þar meðr af þeire sem guð mundi honum gefit hafa ef hann hefði villat honum lýðinn vera at hann varð öllum veslare ok lægri fyrer sinn öde Rijmbijbel çtilegan skaða ok glæp þuiat hann misgiørði vtan nõkkurs annars a eggian eðr freistni. Ok sem hann fell dro hann meðr ser mikinn fiöldá engla þeira sem honum samþýktuz ok sinnaðu.

de Rijmbijbel

God die maecte int beghin
 100 Den hemel ende oec mede der in
 Alle die inghelike nature
 Desen hemel heet die scrifture
 Empireus in rechter name
 daer die inghele hare beghin in namen
 105 ende hi maecte die erde mede
 Wi verstaen al hier ter stede
 daer die lettere die erde noemnt
 dat met hare materien compt
 al dat bi der erden leuet
 110 ende al die dinc die soe vte gheuet
 Ende weder in hare kert
 dies weest oec wijs ende gheleert
 die materie van allen dieren
 van allen cruden van manieren
 115 van boemen. van adams vlesche mede
 brochte soe voer hare daer ter stede
 Maer niet ne maketse god noch toe
 hier namaels maect hise ende hoert hoe
 die viere elemente. water. vier.

120 Erde. lucht. die waren hier
Ghemaect al daer men die erde noemnt
nu merct oe die redene compt
Werelt ende tiit siin euen out
dus spreect die wareit onse behout
125 van nieute maecte god int beghin
den emel ende die jnghele der in
Ende die andre elemente mede
die erde was van hare scoenede
Nochtoe deelloes na der nature
130 dies heetse jdel die scrifture

II. De primaria mundi confusione

(6) *Terra autem erat inanis et vacua*, id est machina mundialis adhuc erat inutilis et infructuosa et vacua ornatu suo. *Et tenebrae erant super faciem abyssi*. Eadem machinam quam terram dixerat, abyssum vocat pro sui confusione et obscuritate. Unde et Graecus eam chaos dixit. Quia vero dictum est: tenebrae erant, quidam dogmatizaverunt tenebras fuisse aeternas: quae jam, scilicet cum mundus fueret, erant. Alii irridentes Deum veteris testamenti, dicunt eum prius creasse tenebras quam lucem, sed tenebrae nihil aliud sunt quam lucis absentia. Obscuritas autem quaedam aeris a Deo creata est et dicta tenebrae, unde et in catalogo creaturarum dictum est: *Benedicte, lux et tenebrae, Domino!* Et Spiritus Domini, id est Spiritus Sanctus Dominus vel Domini voluntas, *ferebatur super aquas*. Sicut voluntas artificis habentis prae oculis omnem materiam domus faciendae illam fertur, dum quid de quo facturum est disponit. Praedictam machinam aquas vocat, quasi ductilem materiam ad operandum ex ea. Ideo vero sic variantur ejus nomina, ne, si unius elementi nomine tantum censeretur, illi magis putaretur accomoda. Hebraeus habet pro super ferebatur, incubabat, vel Syra lingua, fovebat, sicut avis ova. In quo etiam omne cum regimine nascentis mundi notatur initium. Hunc locum male intellexit Plato dictum hoc putans de anima mundi. Sed dictum est de Spiritu sancto creante, de quo legitur: *Emitte spiritum tuum et creabuntur*.

Stjórn

Genesis 2a Jordín var þa auð ok avaxtarlaus ok utan alla þrýði. **Af scolastica historia.** Þat er sua mikít at segia at fyrr sagt heimsíns smíði sua skapat var vsýniligt autt ok vsamið epte þui sem augustínus seger í sinni fýRnefndri bok þar til er guð skipaði qlum lutum eiginlegar mýnder huerium sem einum í sínum stodum ok stettum. **Af genesi 2bc** Ok voru mýrkr af loptzíns skugga ok vskiqrleik alla uegna vm iqrðina enn guðs heilagrar andí flutti ok ýfer vqrnín

af scolastica hýstoria þat er ýfer fyrer sagt heimsins smíði eðr efni meðr sialfs sins uilia ok fyrer hugsan til epterfaranda skapanar fyrer sagt heimsins smíði eðr efni kallar bokín fyrer þann skýlld stundum iðrð. annan tíma unde díup ok stundum vötn at þat sýniz þa fleirum til heýra sem þat er æigi at éins meðr einnar hōfut skepnu nafní nefnt fyrer þui uar þat þa þegar kallat himinn ok iðrð. at himinn ok iðrð wrðu sköpuðuz þar af fyrer þa sök uar iðrðin sögð usýniligh ok usamið ok mýrkr ýfer under díupið at hon var þa utan alla epterfarand formeran ok hon hefði þa enn meðr engarrí mýnd megat sééin eðr handlat verða þo at nõkkuR maðr hefði þa til þess uerit at hafa prouat þat. fyrer þui var þat sama smíði vatníð nefnt at ðat var þeim auduelldekt ok epterláátsamt sem af þui skapaði epterfarandi lutí. ok fyrer þa greín aðra at aller þeir luter sem áá iarðriki feðaz huart sem þat eru helldr kuíkendí. vaxandi viðr eðr groandi grōs ok þiliker luter þa taka aller af vōkunní ok af vatnínu nering ok sina formeran.

de Rijmbijbel

(131) Ende met dempstereden bedect
die scrifture die vertrect
dat die eleghe gheest ons heren
dats gods wille dus salment keeren
die wart up water ghedraghen
dies woerds mach ons wel behaghen
daer wart betekent ende bediet
dat dopsel dat men nu pliet

III. De opere primae dici

(8) *Dixitque Deus: Fiat lux. Et facta est lux.* Id est vede Rijmbijbel um genuit in quo erat ut fieret kux, id est tam facile ut si quis diceret vede Rijmbijbel o. (Sicut Vede Rijmbijbel um est Fileus, ita dicere est gignere et gigni.) Lucem vocat quamdam nubem lucidam illuminatam superiores mundi partes, claritate tamen tenui ut fieri solet dilucilo. Et hoc admodum solis circumagitata, praesentia sui superius hemisphaerium et inferius vicissim illuminat. . . Per fiat, praesentia vel praescientia lucis in Deo intelligitur priusquam fieret, per facta est, essentia ejusdem in actu, scilicet cum prodiit ad esse. *Et vivit Deus lucem, quod esset bona*, id est quae placuerat in praesentia, vel praescientia, ut fieret. placuit in essentia ut maneret. Vel tropice vidit, id est videre fecit. *Et divisit lucem, ac tenebras.* Hic incipit dispositio. Et tamen aliquid dicit de creatione, quasi cum luce tenebras creavit, id est umbram ex objectione corporum luci, et creatas divisit locorum distantia et qualitate ut scilicet nunquam simul sed semper e regioe diversa hemisphaeria vicissim sibi vindicarent. Intelligitur etiam hic angelorum facta divisio: stantes lux, cadentes tenebrae dicti sunt. *Et appellavit lucem diem*, a dia Graeco quod

est claritas, sicut lux dicitur quia luit, id est purgat tenebras. Tenebras dixit noctem a nocendo, quia nocet oculis ne videant: sicut tenebrae, quia tenent oculos, ne videant. Sicut tamen dies exortum est a dia Graeco, ita nox a nyctim. Et *factum est vespere et post factum est mane* et sic completus est *dies unus*, naturalis. Primo enim cum coelo et terra lux est create, qua paulatim occidente factum est vespere primae diei usualis, et, eadem migrante sub terras et ad ortum veniente, factum est mane, id est terminata est nox, et inchoavit dies secunda. Itaque praecedente luce diei et sequente nocte terminata exstitit dies unus. Lux ipsa divisas partes ostendebat, sed non dividebat.

Stjórn

af genesi.3 OK Þa sagði guð sua. Verði líos. ok (p 19)þa þegar i stað uarð lios **4** ok sialfr hann sáá at líosið var gott ok skildi hann þat ibrott fra mýrkrínu **5a** ok gaf þuí nafn at þat skýllði heíta dagr enn mýrkrunum at heíta nátt. **af scolastica hýstoria.** Sem þessi skilnaðr giørðiz milli lioss ok mýrksins varð æigi siðr meðr guðs boði af glæp ok tilskýlldan luciferi ok hans fylgiara englana skilnaðr þuiat fyrer liossins nefnd merkiaz þeir englar sem stoðu ok staðfestuzt i guðs áást ok elskhuga. enn fyrer mýrkrin merkiz fiandinn ok þeir sem meðr honum fellu. Voru þeir aller keyrðer brott sumer allt niðr til hrlúitis enn sumer i þat þoku fulla lopt milli hímsins ok iarþar sem æigi er sua ofarlega at þeir hafi nõkkurn fagnat eðr gledí af liosínu. æigi ok miøk neðarlega sua að þeir megi sua mickla freistní ok margan ufagnat oss giøra sem þeira vili er til ok þo fylger þeim efenlegha sín heluitis pína huar sem þeir eru. **af genesi** Ok sua varð aptann ok morginn beði samt einn naatturulegr dagr. **af scolastica hýstoria.** þat eru váar tuav dægr þuiat i fyrstu er guð skapaði himin ok iørð skapaði hann ok liosit sem sagt var. Nu sem þat settiz ok minnkaðiz ę seint ok seint þa varð þaðan af fyrsta dags aptann ok morginn epter vaarum vana ok þi sama lioso vmlíðanda iørðina ok siðan upp rennandi vaed morginn. **af augustino** FýR nefnder villu menn maníchei kallandi þat at dagrinn hefði af aptninum hafiz skilðu æigi at sua sem liosið var kallat dagr enn mýrkrin náátt heyrði deginum til. enn aptaninn varð epter þat sama verk sua sem liðnum ok lýktaðum sialfum deginum enn fyrer þa skýnsemð at nááttin heyrði sinum degi til. þa segiz einn | dagr qðrun víss hafa lýktaz ok vm liðit vtan að liðinni nááttinni sua sem morginn varð. teliaz sua siðan meðr sama hætti aðrer (p20) dagarner fra morní til annars morgíns. leið sua naattin ok lýktaðiz. enn annaR dagr býriaðiz.

de Rijmbijbel

Doe maecte god met sinen worde
(140) dat lecht also hict bescriuen hoerde
dwoerd gods dats die soene
die ons verloeste dats die goene
die vlesch in marien ontfinc
dat lecht her die sonne up ghinc

(145) was een suerc claer ende scone
 Gheliic der dagheraet anden trone
 der sonnen onghelic van lechte
 al dus descriuen ons gods knechte
 doe sach got dat lecht was goet
 (150) Ende versciet daer metter spoet
 dat lecht van der deemsterhede
 al hier verstaen wi teser stede
 dat lucifer ende sine scare
 versceden worden openbare
 (155) Omme hare ouerdeghe sonden
 van den jnghelen die wlstonden
 diere staende bleuen heet die boec dlecht
 Ende diere vielen na al recht
 Moghen wel heeten demsterede
 (160) daer noemde god dus le'e'st men mede
 dat lecht bi namen ende hiet dach
 die tiit daer deemsterede ane lach
 hiet onse here nacht bi namen
 Ende dit was alse wi vernamen
 (165) Een sondach ende dalreste dach
 die ter weerelt oint ghelach

IV. De opere secundae dici

(10) Secunda die disposuit Deus superiora mundi sensibilis. EMPYREUM enim coelum quam cito factum est, statim dispositum est et ornatum, id est sanctis angelis repletum. *Fecit ergo es die Deus firmamentum in medio aquarum*, id est quamdam exteriorem mundi superficiem ex aquis congelatis, ad instar crystalli consolidatam, et perlucidam, intra se caetera sensibilia continentem ad imaginem testae, qua in ovo est, et in eo fixa sunt sidera. Et dicitur firmamentum, non tantum propter sui soliditatem sed quia terminus est aquarum quae super ipsum sunt, firmus et intransgressibilis. Dicitur etiam coelum, quia celat, id est tegit omnia invisibilia. Et cum legitur firmamentum coeli, endiadis est, id est firmamentum quod est coelum, ut cum dicitur creatura salis. Unde et pro sui concameratione graece dicitur uranon, id est palatium. Vel dicitur coelum quasi casa elios, quia sol sub ipso positus ipsum illustrat. Hanc tamen circumvolutam concamerationem philosophus summitatem ignis intellexit. Cum enim ignis non habet quo ascendat, circumvolvitur ut in clibano patet; ita et circa mundi exteriora ignis volvitur. Et hoc est sidereum vel aetherum coelum...

Deus autem unitas est et sectionem et discordiam detestatur. Possumus tamen dicere quia opus tertiae diei quasi adhuc est de opere secunae diei, quod post patebit. Unde non commendatur nisi in tertia die, quasi post sui consummationem.

Stjórn

(p20) **fra þui er guð skapaði á þóðrum degi festingar himín ok sundr skipting a vötnum hafandi i ser alla luti.**

A þóðrum degi skipaði guð hínun hæstum þessa heims haalfum. þuiat himinríki var þegar i stað skipat. skreytt ok fyllt af heilagum englum er þar uar skapat sem fýR var sagt. Giórði hann þa festingar himín hafandi innan i séer alla þa luti sem ver hōfum nõkkura skilning eðr vissu af ok skilði meðr honum i sundr ۆll þau vötn sem hann villdí at her veri epter i verolldinni fra hínun sem ýfer honum eru sua strengðum ok þrongðum sem kristallus eðr hinn harðaztigler iss til at iafna vtan þat at þau megu litt eðr ekki brááðna af nõkkurum elldzhita **6** ok sagði sua. **af genesi**. Verði festingar himinn milli vatnanna ok skili þau I sundr sín imilli. **af scolastica historia. 7a** Giórði guð þa festingar himinn af vatzíns hōfutskepnu sua sterkliga samantengðan ok strengðan at hann hefer i ser aller himínfastar stiornur ok þuilikaz skięran af sialfum ser sem kristallus sua huelfðan til litils lutar at iafna sem bōllott eggskurn ok greíndi sua meðr honum I sundr þav vötn sem vnder honum voru fra þeim sem ýfer hem eru. þa skapaði hann vnder festingarhímínsins nafni aðra himnana enn sialft himínríki. Enn fyrer hueria søk er guð uilldí at vötnín veri ýfer festingarhímínun þa er þat sialfum honum kunnikt epter þui sem seger commestor þo at nõkkurer menn hafi þa ætlan áá at i suma staði komi þaðan regn á sumar tíma. Augustinus segher at huilik vōnt er þar eru ok meðr huerium (p 21) hētti þau eru þar þa efum meðr engum moti at þau eru þar. þuiat meirí er rōksemð þessarar ritningar seger hann enn allr glōggleiki ok skoðan mannligs skilnings ok huguiz er til. **genesis 7c** ok þegar varð sua. **8a** gaf þa guð honum það namn at hann heti himínun. **af scolastica hýstoria** þuiat himinn hefer í þessum stað allt eitt at þýða ok hulning fyrer þa søk at hann hýlr ok hirðer fyrer oss alla vsýniliga luthi. **af genesi 8b** ok sua varð aptann ok mmorginn meðr fýrri greín annaR dagr. **scolastica hýstoria** Hebresker menn at engillinn varð a þessum degi fiandi ok draga þat æigi sizt til demís þar vm þo at þessa dags verk se gott sem allra þeira annaRa er guð giórði. þa er þo allt at eíns æigi her af þessum þat einkannlega lesit at guð sáá at þat var gott. huerium er þeir sýnaz samþýkkiaz sem áá máánadaga ueniaz messur at sýngia englum sua sem til lofs þeim sem staðfestuz i guðs þionostu enn heilager kennifeðr hallda annat helldr fyrer sannara at þat se meirR sua ok fyrer þi leiðiz hann allan á skilnat ok sundrþýkt. enn tuítalan greinuz fýrst vt af éiningunni ok fyrer þann skýlld takaz aðrar tōlur iheilagri ritningu meðr meirí uirkt ok metare merkingu. Ma þat ok vel auðsýnaz af váars herra orðum at engilinn hafi áá hínun fýrsta degi fallit þar sem sialfr hann talar sua af honum milli annassa luta i ions guðzpialli at hann var allt fra vpphafi manndrapare ok hann stoð engan tíma ne staðfestiz (p 22)í sannleikínun. enn af þui at sua má segiaz at hins þriðia dags uerk

greiníz vt at annars dags uerki sem síðar má sýnaz. Þa lofaz þat ægi sua sem önnur fýR enn á þriðja degi sua sem þat er fullulegha lýktat ok algort.

de Rijmbijbel

Des ander daghes dus eist bekent
Maecte god dat firmament
Jnt water ter middewarde recht
(170) van watere so maecte hi echt
hart ende vast gheliic kerstale
Claer ghescepen alse dei scale
Die sterren dit es bekent
Die staen in dit firmament
(175) firmament hetet bi namen.
Omme da hem vaste hout te samen
Ende het die watre alsoe hout
Die bouen hem siin met ghewoud
dat sii niet ne comen ne'e'der
(180) wat sii daer doen antwordic weeder
dat ne weet niemene dan god ons here
Sonder dat sulc in sine leere
Seghet dat die dau danen coemt
dit firmament heuet hi ghenoeemt
(185) Spreket die boec hemel bi namen
Omme dat beaect al te samen
Ende verhemelt die weerelt al
Water. vier. berch ende dal.

V. De opere tertiae dici

(12)Tertia die aquas sub firmamento congregavit Deus *in unum locum*. Quae licet plura obtineant loca, tamen quia omnes continentur in visceribus terrae, in unum locum congrgatae dictae sunt. Et potuit esse ut aquae quae totum aeris spatium occupant vaporabilis, solidatae modicum obtineant locum. Vel terra paululum subsedit, ut eas tanquam in matrice concluderet et sic apparuit arida, quae quasi latens sub aquis proprie humus dicta est. Sed cum apparuit arida eadem dicitur terra, quia teritur pedibus animantium. Vel circumpositis tribus elementis dicitur solum, quia solida. Dicitur tellus, quia tolerat labores hominum: *Congregationes aquarum vocavit maria* Hebraeorum idiomate, qui quaslibet aquarum congregationes aquarum vocant maria. Completo ergo aquarum opere subditur: *Et vidit Deus quod esset bonum*, et additit aliud opus illi, cum dixit: *Germinet Terra*. Nec de opere germinandi tantum

intelligendum est sed de potentia, quasi potens sit germinare. Produxit enim de terra *hede Rijmbijbel am virentem et facientem semen et lignum pomiferum faciens fructum secundum genera sua*. Patet quia non per moras temporum ut modo produxit plantas suas terra, sed statim in maturitate viridi, in qua et hede Rijmbijbel ae seminibus, et ade Rijmbijbel ores pomis onustae sunt. Notandum quod dictum est: virentem. Quidam dicunt mundum in vere factum, quia viror illius temporis est et fructificatio. Alii, quia legunt: lignum faciens fructum, et additum: hede Rijmbijbel am habentem semen, factum dictum in Augusto sub leone. Sed in Martion factum dogmatizat ecclesia...

Stjórn

fra þui er guð let iorðina birtaz ok friofaz ok skapaði sioenn ok iorðina. Scolastica historia.

A þriðja degi let guð þau vötn sem vnder festingarhimninum voru safnaz i einn stað ok iorðina birtaz skipaði hann sua fíorum fýR sögðum höfvtiskepnum huerri meðr sinni spera innan festingarhimínsins epter þui sem sialfra þeira þýkt ok þunleikí er til. elldinn efztan nest festingar himninum þuiat hann er lettaztr af huerium er truiz at sialf himintunglin hafi giöR verit. loptið er þat i sinum efra part skiert i ser. enn i hinum neðra hefer þat marga ruglan af vindum ok vëtum þokum ok reidar þrumum sníofum ok elldingum ok öðrum þeim lutum til komandi sem ver höfum fulla raun af. þar næst vatnið huert er hann safnaði i vnderdiupð dreifandi þaðan af sua sem af einu moðurkyni öll veralldarennar vötn vm leýnilegar veralldarennar rááser okumferðer henni til friofanar ok mannum til nýtsemðar Neðsta skapaði hann iorðina ok innzta i öllum þeim þuiat hon er þungaz iafn vettandi hana sem meðr einni váág ok setiandi i miðian heimsins punkt meðr öllum sinvm ýfer uettis þunga. molldu ok allzkýns maalma kyni. grioti ok gimsteinum meðr öllum annars hááttar steinvm ok sem hann býriaði þessa dags uerk sagði hann sua. **genesis 9c** Safniz saman i einn stað vötn þau sem vnder himninum eru at þuRlendi megi sýnaz. (p 23)ok þegar i stað varð sua. **Af augustino**. Sua skildiz ok i sundr skiptiz þa i þær mýnder sem nv seam ver þat hið vsýnliga efni heimsins sem stundum var kallat auð ior ok vsamít. annan tíma mýrks ok vnderdiup ella vatn ýfer huert er guðs andí fluttiz meðr fýRi greín. sva at iorðin formerat af þi sama efni birtiz auðsýnliga i sinum stað epter þi sem nu sýniz þat er ok er beði sallt ok seþt. Maattí þat vel vera at þau vötn sem meðr nokkurri þoku dögguan hulðu ok vm foru allt þat rvm ok viðættu sem i loptinu er sua sem meðr smaregni edr 'singu fengi verið i litlum stað hia þi sem aadr síðan er þeim var sua sterkliga saman strengt. **10ab** kallaði hann þa þurlendit iorð enn allt saman vatnanna megín kallaði hann hauf. ok sua sem vatnanna verk var fýllt ok framm komít seger moýses at **10c** sua var gott ok vel gort ok lagði þar til iamframm annat verk meðr þersu **11** ok sagði sua. **af genesi** Groi iorðin ok friofiz meðr blomganda gras geranda sitt sáád ok meðr epli berandi trío ok allzkýns allðin við. giörandi allan sin avòxt epter þui kyni sem þat er vorðit sik til huers saað er í sialfu ser skal á iorðunni vera ok þetta varð allt sua. **12a-c** at

iðrðin bar þegar grænt gras meðr hinn bezta bloma ok sáað beranda meðr sinv kýní ok epli berandi trío gerandi fagran avoxr ok huert sem eítt hafandi meðr ser sialfs sins sáád meðr sinni eiginni mýnd. **Af scolastica hýstoria.** Eigi leiddi iðrðin þa ok sua seínt ok alonqum tímum framm sinar plantaner sem nu.helldr var ql þersi hennar fegrð ok frýgð þegar i stað meðr sinum eiginleghum blom ok auexti.Ok þo at nqkkurer menn hafi þrætt vm ok á greínt hvart helldr hefer uerit heímriinn skapaðr áá váár tíma. þuiat þa blomgaz ok avaxraz flester luter eðr a haustar tíma i augusto manaði (p24) af fyrer farandi orðum at iðrðin bar framm epli berandi treo giorandi fagran avoxr ok gras hafanda sitt sááð. þa helldr heilug kirkia þat stað- fastlega fyrer satt i sinvm kenningum ok lerídomí at hann hafi áá vaarit i marcío manaði skapaðr verit. A þeíma degí plantaði guð ok iarðneska paradís þat land er sua heiter ok liggr til austrættar af þeiri heimsins haalfu er asia heíter. mýcklu hera enn nqkkut annat land aa váru býggiligu iarðriki ok þi máttí noa floð huergi namunda þui ganga ok fýllði þat þegar meðr qlumlýstugleík ok vnatsemð vpprennandi eðar meðr fogr- um frammfliotandi vqtnum meðr iarðrennar berelegum blomstrum ok allz hááttar þeim tríom sem full voru af frýgð ok fogrurum auexti. Nu sua gort sem var **12d** sa guð at þetta var allt saman goð skepna **13** ok sua varð aptann ok morginn ok lýktaðiz hinn þriðí dagr.

de Rijmbijbel

Den derdendaghe leese wi van gode
 (190) dat hi met sinen ghebode
 dwater uersaemde in een couent
 dat es onder tfirmament
 dat hare die droecheit openbaerde
 die droecheit noemde god doe harde
 (195) Ende des waters versaminghen
 daer sii alle te samene ghinghen
 dat hiet hi bi namen zee
 Ende daer naer so maecte hi mee
 God besach dat het was goet
 (200) Ende hi seide metter spoet
 hic wille di gheuen cruut
 Ende hare groeneit comme vt.
 daer af comen moeghe saet
 Ende datter gheboemte up staet
 (205) dat appelle draghe na siere maniere
 Ende vrucht oec meneghertiere
 al dat hi seide was wl daen
 Want siin wille moeste wlgaen

VI. De opere quartae dici

(14) Quarto die quae disposuerat coepit ornare rebus illis, quae infra universum mundum congruis motibus agerentur. Plantae enim, quia terrae haerent, ad dispositionem terrae quasi magis spectant, et sicut dispositionem sic et ornatum a superioribus inchoavit. Fecit enim eadem die luminaria, solem et lunam et stellas. Et dicitur sol, quia solus lucet, id est nullum cum eo. Luna luminum una, id est prima ut una dierum, vel una Sabbatorum dicitur. Sol et luna dicuntur *magna luminaria* in duobus et ex duobus, id est non solum pro quantitate luminis sed et corporis, et non tantum comparatione stellarum sed et secundum se, quia sol dicitur octies major terra...et luna etiam major terra dicitur. Lunam et stellas voluit illuminare noctem, ne nox sine lumine nimis esset indecora, ut operantes in nocte ut nautae et viatores solatium luminis haberent. Sunt etiam quaedam aviculae, quae lucem solis ferre non possunt, et fere nocte pascuntur. (Maxime hae aves in desertis Aethiopiae arenosis ubi modicus impulsus veti inventa itinerantium vestigia complanat.) Nec superfluit sol, licet nubes lucida vicem ejus ageret, quia illa tenuem et insufficientem lucem habebat, et forte non nisi superiora illuminabat, sicut nec stella modo. De illa autem nube lucida supradicta traditur modo quod vel redierit in materiam, unde facta fuerat, ut stella quae apparuit magis et columba in qua visus est Spiritus sanctus, vel quod semper solem comitatur, vel quod de ea factum est corpus solare. Nec tantum ad decorem, et ad usum luminis ea voluit esse, sed etiam ut essent *in signa, et tempora et dies et annos*, ut scilicet signa sint serenitatis et tempestatis, vel ut ex ipsis fierent signa dupdecim majora et quadam signa minora. Plura his quae dicuntur signa vel sidera, tum quia magna diligentia signavit, vel consideravit ea antiquitas, tum quia adhuc signant et considerant ea homines ad disensionem temporum...

Stjórn

(p24) **afiörða degi skapaði guð sol ok önnvr himintungl.af speculo historiale.**

A fiörða degi þrýddi guð ok prisulega skreyttí himín ok þa luti meðr himneskum liosum sem aðr hafði hann gort. eínkannlega fyrst hinar efztu heimsins háálfur skapandi þa öll himintungl huert er iörðina skýllði birta þeði vm neþr ok vm daga huart eþter sinum heþti ok greína alla tíma huart meðr margfalldrí sinni neþringu **14** ok sagði sua **Genesis** Uerði lýsandi stiörnur i festingar himnínnum at þær greíni i sundr ser huart dag ok náátt at þær se til taakna ok tíma dagha ok áára **15** at lýsi i festingar himnínnum. ok birtí iörðina ok þegar varð sua. **scolastica hýstoria** Eigi at eíns guð þessi lýsandi lios sem ver köllum himintungl verða verölldinni til fegrðar ok liossins nýtsemðar nema (p 25) ok þar meðr til táákna eðr marka at af þeim megi merkiar huart er helldr eru skir veðr eðr v skír blið eðr hriðer. ella til þess at af þui skýllði verða þau xij. táákn er. ver köllum stiörnur mörk sem zodiacus hefer í séer ok at greína tíma þat er vaar ok sumar haust ok vetr ok þar meðr þa sem ver köllum solstoðu tíma a vetr ok sumar ok iafn neþtis tíma a haust ok váár ok at greína daga vikur ok manaði áár ok

allder. **de genesi 16** Guð giordí ok tuau stór himíntungl hið meira. þat er solina til þess at þat skýllði meðr sinní birtí deginum lýsa. hið minna þat er tunglit at þat lýstí nááttínni. Stíornur giordí hann þar meðr **17a** ok settí þær allar í festingar himnínú vtan æigi þer.vij. meðr solu ok tunglí sem planete heita þær reika ok leíka lausar í loptínu ok ganga í gegn fýR sōgðum festingar himní at þer meðr sinn gang tempri hans vellting ok vturnan. setti hann þær **17b** fyrer þa sōk þar at þær skýllði meðr þi liosi sem þær hefði af solinní birta alla verolldina ok giora greín milli lioss ok mýrkr. **scolastica | hýstoria**. Eigi let guð fyrer þann einn skýlld beði tungl ok stíornur birta nááttína at hon skýllði æigi meðr ǫllu fegrðar laus vera sua sem þa vþeri ef hon hefði meðr ǫllu ekki lios ok birti utan ok til þess æigi síðr at þeir menn sem áá nattar tímanum starfaði skýllði þar af hialp ok huggan hafa sua sem skiparar ok aðrer farandi menn ok eínkannlega íblalandz eýði mōrkum eðr sandhōfum þar sem litill vindzblær sletter ok hýlr þa vegv sem aadr hafa farnar uerit. **ýsidorus**. þeir eru sumer fuglar sem æigi megu þola at sia solrennar lios sua sem noctua er allr er einn ok nocticorax huerr er fyrer þa sōk heiter noctua at hann flýgr vm netr ok sézt engan tíma vm daga þuiat þegar í stað sliofaz hans sýn sem dagrín birtiz. hann er eíngí í þeiri eý creta heiter. ok þo at hann se þangat fluttr af oðrum stōðum þa deýr hann þegar leið sem hann (p26) kemr þar. Sa fugl sem strix heiter er ok náátt fugl meðr fleirum oðrum ok feðaz þeir flester miōk aa nattinni. Eigi var solin ok þuí síðr nauzunligh ok þarflig at þat hid biarta ský giordí ok fýllði hennar embętti sem verolldina birtí þuiat sama ský hafði litið líos ok læmegít ok lýsti letlega huergi eðr litið vtan hina hęstu luti sem nu lýsa stíornur. scolastica historia. Eru ýmissar getur ok ętlanir áá huat af þuí skýí hafi vordit annat huat at þat hafi apr horfit í þat sama efní sem þat var ááðr skapat af sua sem su stiarna er austrvegs konungum vitradiz. ella at þat farí ok fýlgi íafnan meðr solinni. ella þat at solrennar likamr se af þi sama giōrr. Sua finnz ok skrifat at solin var giōrr a morgin tima ok í austrí. enn tunglit at aptní sua sem tilkomandí náátt ok í austrí. Enn þo vilia nōkkurer segia at þau vþeri beði samt skōput a morgín tima. sol í austrí enn tungl í vestrí ok þann tima sem solin settíz hýrui tunglit at tilkomandi náátt til austrs. heilagr augustinus sýniz hinni fýrri greíninni samþýkkia í fýR nefndri sinni bok ýfer genesim. her seger ok sua milli þeira sem maluglega ok kauislega kallz sua sem epter frettandi huilikt tunglit var skapat í fýrstv. huat helldr þilikt sem þa er prím er saker þess at þa ętti sua at telia eðr fullt ok fiortan náátta fyrer þann skýlld at þat hefði þáá aatt vskadt at hafa uerit at hann sinnar huarigum ne samþýkker í alla staði. helldr gengr þar í milli hann seg- iandi berlega meðr fullkomnum orskurð at huat sem þeir kalla í þann punkt verit hafa sem prím er eðr fullt Sua sem.xiiij.náátta at guð giordí þatalgort. **de genesi.18c** Ok sialfr hann sáá at þetta var einn eín goð (p 27)skepna. **19** vard sua aptann ok morginn ok lýktaðiz hinn fiordí dagr.

de Rijmbijbel

Den vierdendaghe macte der ane
(210) Onse here sonne ende mane

Ende die sterren die hi ghesent
 Ende gheseet heft int firmament
 verre beneden sterren staen
 Sonne ende mane sonder waen
 (215) Ende alle die plane'e'ten mede
 derde heft de nederste stede
 van al den sterren. ende als hic wane
 Ende also men leesende vint de mane
 es de minste van den sterren
 (220) die ons lichten noch van verren
 die vroede liede segghen al bloet
 die sonne achtwaruen else groet
 else die erde es al gheheel
 Ende die mane es meerre een deel
 (225) dan die erde dus eist bescreuen
 Mane ende sterren siin ghegheuen
 dat sii dien naect maken clare
 want hi anders te leeliic ware
 Ende omme dat die nachts in watere pinen
 (230) Ende die oec wandelen in wostinen
 daer bi souden ghetroest weesen
 Ende alre meest oec else wi leesen
 van libien int groete sant
 daer een clene wint alte hant
 (235) die weghe verwait soe dat se man
 altoes neghen bekennen can
 Ne daden die sterren men ne vonde
 Niemene diere gheghaen in conde
 Noch men ne vonde nemmermee
 (240) Niemene die voere in de zee
 Oec leesmen dat men voghele vint
 die vander sonnen niet en tuint
 Die clareit ghedoghen connen
 Nachts moetsi vliegghen ende ronnen
 (245) Ende hem bi den sterren voeden
 dat suldi mede wel ghevroeden
 dat niet alleene dor die sconeede
 Noch allene dort leecht mede
 Sonne. sterre. ende mane.
 (250) Sijn gheseet. maer om te verstane
 Scone weder ende quaet der bi
 Ende om dat die minste des vroet sii
 dat si sceden dach ende nacht
 Weke ende maent ende dees jaers cracht

(255) lentin. somer. heerst. ende winter.
 die van dompeiden ghenen splinter
 Stekende heeft in sinen siin
 die magher vele leeren in
 versta wi so merken conne
 (260) dat ghemaect was die sonne
 Jnt oesten tilike te haren up ganghe
 des auons der na. dan was niet langhe
 doe soe was ten onderen gane
 Maecte god risende de mane
 (265) Ende soe was wl van haren lechte
 dus proeuent mesters al bi rechte

VII. De opere quintae dici

(16) Quinta die Deus ornavit aerem et aquam vola tilia dans aeri natalitia aquis, et utraque ex aquis orta sunt. Facilis enim transitus est aquae in aera tenuendo et aeris in aquam spissando. Pisces vocavit moyses reptilia, quia impetu quodam totos se rapiunt, ut serpents; non feruntur pedibus, ut ferae. Nota quia ex hoc quod dictum est: creavit volatile coeli super terram, erravit Plato qui descendens in Aegyptum, libo Moysi legit, et putavit Moysen sensisse volatilia esse ornatum aeris tantum circa terram, ornatum vero aeris superioris calodaemones, et cacodaemones. (Cum magis vere daemones dicantur boni angeli quam mali in suggillationem tamen promissionis eorem, scilicet: *Eritis sicut dii*, datum est eis hoc nomen.) Sed non ita est. Boni enim daemones ut dictum est, sunt in empyreo, mali vero in hunc aerem caliginosum detrusi sunt ad poenam, non ad ejus ornatum. *Deus enim peccantibus angelis non pepercit.* Creavit Deus, id est plasmavit, cete grandia. Cete generis neutri est indeclinabile. Declinatur, tamen cetus, ceti, *Et omnem animam viventem atque motabilem, quam produxerat aquae.* Motabiles autem dicuntur animae piscium et avium respectu animae hominis. Illae enim moventur de esse ad non esse, ista non, quia perpetua est, vel quia forsam animas non habent, sed tamen spiritus vegetativos quia cum ipsis animabus exstinguitur... ipsum animal vocavit animam, id est vivens. Unde, et Graeci dividunt animalia per zoa et psycheia: zoa id est viventia, bruta, sed psycheia animata, a psyche quod est anima rationalis. Sed etiam dicitur creatum motabile, quod creatum est sic ut moveretur de vita ad mortem, quod non homo qui creatus est, ut non moreretur si vellet. Illo vera creata sunt vel ut in esum cedant aliis vel senio deficient. His benedixit Deus: *Crescite et multiplicamini.*

Stjórn

(p27) fra þui er guð skapaði fiska ok fugla á fimta deghi. Scolastica historia ok speculum historiale.

A fimta degi prýddi guð loptið meðr flúgandi fuglum ok vatnið meðr suímandum fiskum takandi af vatninu efni til þersa huarsþueggia þuiat vatnit snýz liettlega til lopzens sua sem þat þýnniz. loptit snýz ok á sòmuleið auðuellega til vatzens sua sem þat þýknar. augustinus. Skulu þeir aller skýnsamer menn sem þessor orð ok atkuęđi gięra nękkura ręring eđr efađ semđ þat uel mega uita at hiner uisaztu menn þeir sem þers hattar lutí skođa ok skýnia vanduirklega taka þetta hiđ vęku mickla ok þoku fulla lopt meðr vętnunum sem fuglarnar fliuga í. þuiat loptiđ þręnguiz sua ok þýknar af þeim vętum ok andargust sem upp leggr af ęllu saman ięrđunni ok af vatninu at þat þoler harđa vel fuglanna flug. þaraf verđr sua mikil dęggfęll um nętr iafn vel at heiđskirum veđrum at grasiđ er alváatt af þeiri sęmu dęgg einni saman vm morgininn epter þi sem ver megum sialfer sia. Sua finnz ok skrifat i hinum skiluisaztum bokum ok roksamlegum ritn,ingum at þat fiall sem olimpus heiter ok stendr i þeiri haalfu grechie sem heiter macedonia se sua ýfer uettis háatt at áá þess efztum heđum verđi huarki ský ne vindr fýr þann skýlld at þat er ęllu uętu loptinu þersv hera ihveriv er fuglarnar fliuga ok fýrer þa sęk segiz at þar fliugi ægi nękkur fvgl. Enn þersa varđ sua víst ok kunnikt gort at þeir menn sem til þess vęllduz ok vęnduz áár fra áári at fara vpp a ofan vert þat (p28)sama fiall saker nękkura fornřering sinna. ægi veit ek huerra helldz seger hinn heilagi augustinus. þa skrifađu þeir nękkura merkilega luti vppi þar a moldinni eđr duptinu hueria er þeir fundu meðr ęllu vskadda annat áárit epter sem þeir þar komu. mattí þat meðr engu moti vera sem huerr skýnsamr madr ma skilia utan þar kiemí huarki vindr nęvęta. Enn af þi at þar var loptiđ micklu þunnara enn þeir međtí þat standaz saker eingis andar gustz motí vana sinum ok naturv þa baru upp þannig meðr sér vaata suęppu ok logđu viđr nasar áá sialfum ser at þaðan af tęki þeir þýkkara lopt ok likara sinni nátturu. Sogđu þeir sik ægi einn fugl þar sieđ hafa. Eigi seger sia hin skiluislegzta ok hin truanligzta skript v skýnsamliga at þui eđr urettlega ægi at eins fiska ok ęnnur kuikendi sem vętnunum flýtiaz. utan ok iafn vel þar meðr fliugandi fugla af uęnunum fez hafa. fýrer þa grein at þeir megu uel ok fagrleggha vm þetta loptiđ fliuga sem af iarđarennar ok hafsíns vękum ok uętum ríss ok þýknar. **genesis.20** Guđ sagđi þa sua. leiđi vętnín vt af ser skriđanda lifs anda kuikenda ok fliuganda fugla kýn vnder festingar himnínun vpp ýfer ięrđina. scolastica hýstoria. fýri þann skýlld eru fiskarnar her kallađer skriđkuikendi at þann tíma er þeir lengia sik suimandi sem akafligaz. flýtiaz þeir þo at lettlegarr ýfer sin bríost a orđi villtíz mięk hinn vísi plaot þann tíma sem hann kom niđr a egipta land ok las þar bekr moýsi at fliuganda fugla kýn leiddiz upp ýfer ięrđ-ina hugđi hann at moýses hefđi þann skilning áá haft at fliugandi fuglar (p 29) vęri loptzens skráut ok prýđi ateíns niđri viđr ięrđina, enn gođer englar ok illir verí himu efra loptinu til skrautz ok fegrđar enn þat er ekki sua. þuiat gođer englar eru i himínrikí sem fýr var sagt. enn iller voru ibrott keyrđer ok rekner i þetta hiđ þoku fulla lopt sialfum ser til eýlifrar pínu enn ekki til nękkurs skrautz eđr pryđi. **Genesis.21** Ok þa skapaði guđ stora huali ok annan lifanda ok hręriligan fiska kýns anda huat er votnín hofđu gefit ut af ser meðr sinum eiginlegum mýndum ok fliugandi fugla huern epter sinu kýni. Guđ sáá at þetta var ein gođ skepna **22** ok blezađi beđi fiskum ok fuglum sua segiandi Vaxi þer ok fięlgiz ok fýllit

siofarens vötn ok fiölgiz fuglarnar ægi síðr ýver alla iordina. 23 varð sua aptann ok morginn ok lýktaðiz hinn fimtí dagr.

de Rijmbijbel

Des.v. daghes versierde god ons here
wende lucht. met groeter ere
Der lucht gaf hi dat vlieghen conde
(270) Ende dat suemmende ghinc ten gronde
vissche en voghele dat es waer
Maecte hi beede van watre daer
God maecte alle dinc die roet
Clene ende groet diet water voet
(275) Ende wat so gaet oec ende vlieghet
bedi mesdoet hi ende lieghet
die seghet dat sij iet maken conden
die quade gheeste dane sonden
doe seinde hise ende benedide
(280) Om dat hi wilde dat siin wille diide

VIII. De opere sextae dici

(p18) Sexta die ornavit Deus terram. Produxit enim terra tria genera animalium: **jumenta**, **reptilia**, **bestias**. Sciens enim Deus hominem per peccatum casurum in poenam laboris ad remedium laboris dedit ei jumenta, quasi adjuvamenta, ad opus vel ad esum. Reptilia vero ed bestiae sunt ei in exercitium. Reptilium vero sunt tria genera: trahentia ut vermes qui se ore trahunt, serpentia ut colubri qui vi costarum se rapiunt, repentia pedibus scilicet ut lacertae et batracae. Dicuntur autem bestiae quasi vastiae et vastando, id est ledendo et saeviendo. Quaeritur de quibusdam minutis animantibus quae vel ex cadaveribus vel humoribus nasci solent, si tunc orta fuerint. Quorum sex sunt genera. Quaedam enim ex exhalationibus habent esse bibiones, vermes qui ante clepsidram nascuntur, bibiones ex vino, papiliones ex aqua. Quaedam ex corruptione humorum ut vermes in cisternis. Quaedam ex cadaveribus ut apes ex juvencis, scarabaei et scabrones muscae magnae quae sonant ex volatu, nascuntur ex equis. Quaedam ex corruptione lignorum ut teredines. Quaedam ex herbarum corruptione ut erucae ex oleribus. Quaedam ex corruptione fluctuum ut gurguliones et fabis. De his dicitur quia quae sine corruptione nascuntur, ut illa quae exhalationibus tunc facta sunt, quae vero ex corruptionibus post peccatum ex rebus corruptis orta sunt. Quaeritur quoque de nocivis animantibus, si creata sunt nociva vel primo mitia post facta sint homini nociva. Dicitur quod ante peccatum hominis fuerunt mitia, sed post peccatum facta sunt nociva homini tribus de

causis: propter hominis punctionem, correptionem, instructionem. Punitur enim homo cum laeditur his vel cum timet laedi, quia timor maxima poena est. Corrigitur his, cum scit ista sibi accidisse pro peccato suo. Instruitur admirando opera Dei, magis admirans opera formicarum quam onera camelorum, vel cum videt haec minima sibi posse nocere, recordatur fragilitatis suae et humiliatur. Sed diceret quis quod quaedam animalia laedunt alia,

(20) quae nec inde puniuntur vel corriguntur vel instruuntur, sed ex his et in his instruitur homo. Per exemplum etiam ad hoc creata sunt, ut aliis sint in esum. Sed si iterum dicitur quod etiam in mortuos homines saeviunt, sed et in his instruitur homo, ne aliquod genus mortis horrescat, quia per quoscunque transeat meatus, nec capillus de capite ejus peribit. Ad hunc modum solet quaeri de herbis et arboribus infructuosis, si etiam in illis diebus orta sint, cum scriptura non memoret nisi herbas seminales et arbores fructiferas quae modo sunt. Potest dici quia quae modo infructosa sunt, ante peccatum fecerunt fructum aliquem, post peccatum potius nascuntur homini ad laborem quam ad utilitatem. Vel homini propter et post peccatum orta sunt, quia post dictum est homini: *Spinas et tribulos germinabit tibi*. Vel quaecunque terris haerent faciunt fructum, id est utilitatem manifestam vel occultam. Quia vero piscibus, et avibus dictum est: *Crescite et multiplicamini*, etiam de his intelligendum est, licet non sit dictum. Haec est enim communis causa creationis eorum.

Stjórn

fra þi er guð skapaði lauf ok gras ok skryddi iorðina meðr allzkonar blomstrum ok kuikendum.

(p29) A hinum setta degi prýddi guð iorðina seinaz sua sem þa eina af fyR nefndum fiorum hofutskepnum sem þungaz er ok lægz liggr qlum hinum hęrrum heimsins haalfvm. þat er himninum. loptinu ok þar meðr vatninu fyrri fagrlega skipaðum ok skryddum. Skapaði hann áá a þeima deghí vpp á iorðina þrenn kuikenda kým eitt er alidyr þat er ver kqlum bu smala. annat skridkuikendi. þridia qnnur ferfett kuikendi sem villi dýr ok fyrer þa sok at guð uissi þat fyrer at maðrenn mundi sýndalegha falla þa skapaði hann bued honum til fedu ok vidrhialpar epter komana erfiði. þuiat iumentum er vpp áá no- rænu at segia sua sem ein hialpaðar skepna. A þann sama dagh skapaði hann ok æigi siðr manninn til at byggia þessa heims verolld sua (p30) sem hann hafði hana algort ok fagrlegha prýdda giorandi hann af tu- eim nátturum. likamann af iarðarennar molldu satengiandi honum skýnsamlegan lifs ánda af engu efní vtan at eins af sialfs hans efméttí skapaðan. Ok enn sem hann býriaði þersa dags verk ok skapan **24** sagði hann sua. **Genesis** Leiði iorðin framm ok gefi vt af ser lifanda anda meðr sinnu kýni busmala. skridkuikendi ok ferfett kuikendi hvert sem eitt meðr sinum eiginlegum myndum. varð ok þegar í stað sua **25** at guð giørði ql iarðarennar skridkuikendi epter sinu eignu kýni. Ok sem guð faðer sá at þetta var enn ein goð skepna **26** sagði hann sua til sins seta sunar ok heilags anda. Gerum ver manninn epter váarri liking ok likneskiu at hann se stiornari

ýfer siofar fiskvm ok himínsins fuglum. ferfettum kuikendum ok qllv iardríkinu ok þar meðr
 qlu þui skrið kuikendi sem nokkura lifs rering hefer i veroldinni. **27** Skapaði guð mannen
 epter sialfs sins mynd ok likneskiu. skapaði hann beði karlman ok kuenmann ok þo siðar
 konuna sem ofar meiR man heýraz mega. **Scolastica hýstoria.** Af þrennum greinum máá
 eínkannlega merkiaz manzens tign ok virðing. þat er hið fyrsta at æigi at eíns varð hann isinu
 kýni sem fyrr sagþer luter. helldr ok iamn uel þar meðr at hann er guðs likneskia fyrer þui at
 hann gaf honum einum skýnsemðar skilning af qlum veralldar kuikendum. Er likneskia heil-
 agrar þrenningar meðr þrífalldri mynd ok skilning manzens ond ok hugskot. þat er til minnis
 til skýnsemðar skilningar ok till uilia eðr elskhuga þuiat þeser .iij.luter eru eín ueran ok eitt lif
 meðr huerium (p 31) sem eínum manni sua sem .iij. personur eru i guðs þrenningu. faðer ok
 sonr ok heilagr andi ok þær allar erv þo einn guð. þat er annat at hann var skapaðr meðr
 staðfestre fyrer hugsan þuiat i oðrum sinum verkum bauð guð að eíns ok wrðu þeir luter. Enn
 i þersu sogðu guðs personur faðer ok sonr ok heilagr andi sua fyrer hugsandi ok staðfestandi
 sin a milli. Giqrum ver manninn. þat er hið þriði manzens tign ok forprisan at hannvar
 skapaðr herra ok sua sem konungr allra annara iardneskra kuikenda ok at þau skýlldu honum
 til feðu ok kleðnaðar ok til erfðis letta ok viðr hialpar siðan er hann hafði misgort. þuiat fyrer
 sýndina gaf guð beði mannum ok oðrum kuikendum iardrennar a vøxtu til feðu fyrer þui at
 iorðin leiddi þa engan lut u frean ut af ser eðr skepvnni skaðsamleghan. Enn þersararar
 drottnanar misti hann af sýndarennar til skýlldan beði ýfer hinum stæstum kuikendum ok
 hinum smæstum. ýfer hinum stæstum sem leonum. til þers at hann víti ok viðr kenniz at hann
 hefer latið sitt valld ok drottnan ýfer þeim. Enn ýfer hinum smestum sem fuglum til þess at
 hann skili ok vnderstandi þar af huersu vanmeginn ok herfiligr hann er þar af vorðinn ýfer
 meðal kuikendum hefer hann enn ualld sér til hugganar. ok at hann víti þaðan af at hann hafði
 sua fyrer sýndina ýfer oðrum sem þessum. **speculum hýstoriale.** Meðr þessi hinni fyrstu ok
 hinni fremztu fýR sagðri heilagrar þrenningar likneskiu sem manzins hugskoti er. i huerri er
 hann samlikiz guði meðr heilagum englum berr maðrinn ok guðs likingh. eínkannlegha .iv.
 lutvm hín fyrsta er su drottnanar roksemð ok (p32) valld sem i fyrstunni var honum veitt.
 þuiat sua sem guð er allra luta drottinn ok herra himneskra ok iardneskra ok iardneskra ok
 þeira sem i helueti eru. A þa leið var maðrinn sem drottnari ok herra ýfer skipaðr æigi at eíns
 fýR sogðum kuikendum utan ok þar meðr allri þessa heims veralldar býgð sem var sagt.
 Annat er upphafsins roksemð þuiat áá þann háatt sem guð er vpphaf allra luta fyrer sina
 skapan. sua er adam allramanna upphaf ok fyrstr fyrer getnaðarens skýlld. þat hið þriðia at sua
 sem nokkuerer luter eru samkuemíliger milli guðs ok annara luta. sua kemr ok mart saman
 meðr mannum ok oðrum veralldlegum lutum ok þaðan af kallaz hann minni heímr. þat hið
 fiórða at sua sem guð er allra luta endalýkt. sua er maðrinn siðaztr epter naatturv skipan-
 enne. þuiat hann var seínaz skapaðr þo at hann veri allra iardneskr luta fyrstr ok fremztr epter
 skýnsemðar skípan. þat er hit fimta at sua sem guð er huerúitna allr meðr sinn almáatt í hínun
 meíra heimí. sua er aundin í sinum. minna heimí. þat er í qlum likamsins limum meðr

huerium sem einum sem veralldligum manni. Maðrinn meðr sinni skýnsemð er ægi þa leiðis skapaðr lútr ok niðrleítr sem skýnlaus kuikendí. er hanslikams vøxtr retrr forme raðr vpp til himnisins sua sem sialfan hann aminnandí at hann hafi á þann haatt sin hug skotz augu ok skilningar vit til himneskra luta sem hans likamleg augu ok skilningar vit ok a siona veit vpp til himinsins. hann var ok þa litlu stund sem hann stoð i meínleýsis stett ok skýllði çuenlegha verit hafva | vtan alla píníliga angist ef hann hefði ægi misgort. þuiat honum skýllði huarki hungur ne þorstí.ægi kulði ne hití aigi erfíði ne nõkkur haattar krankleikí angrat hafa. Eigi hefði hann ok þurft likams dauðann at ottaz þuiat lifandis (p33) likamnum skýllði hann flutz hafa til éylífrar dýrðar. ægi hefði hann ok þurft klednat at hafa ok þo hefði hann þar af enga skammfýlling fengit þuiat engan kendi hann þa uera sinn leýndalim helldr enn hof- uðit hendr ç fetr. Maðrinn hefði þa getinn uerit vtan alla sýnd ok sui uirðu enn feðdr utan allra sutar ok sáárleiks. ok epter þat er guð hafði sua skapat þau blezaði hann þeim ok sagði sua. **Genesis.** Uaxit þit ok fiølgiz ok fýllit iørðina ok stiornít henni. drottnit ok siofarins fiskum. himninsins fuglum ok øllum þeim kuíkendum sem røraz á iardríkí. **scolastica hýstoria.** þar sem guð sagði sua vaxit þidok fiølgiz huat er ægi meþti verða vtan þeira samblandan þa skapaði hann hiuskap milli karlmannz ok konu huar af er þeir villu menn eru af sinni sogn aprt setter ok suivirðer sem þat sogðu at sambuð milli karlmanz ok konu metti alldregen uerða utan sýnd ok sáálu háaska Augustinus. Voru þeir menn ok er þers spurðu huersu maðrenn hafði nõkkut valld ýfer fiskum eðr fuglum dýrum ok øðrum dauðligum kuíkendum. meðr þui at versiam mennína af morgungum dýrum verða drepna ok marga þa fugla oss mein giora sem ver uilldim feginsamlega fordaz ella giarnsamligha gripa ok faam þat ægi gort þui helldr. huersu tøkum ver at þui valld ýfer þuílikum lutum. Meðr fyrstu grein maa þeim þui uel suara at þeir villaz mikillegha þar sem þeir hugleiða mannzins stett huersv (p34) hann fordemðiz meðr dauðleik þessa lifanda lifs epter sýndina. týndi sua ok misti þers algiørleiks sem hann var til skapaðr. guðs likneskiú. Nu af mannzens fordemingar stett efler ok orkar sua micklu at hann stýri ok stiorní sua morgungum kuíkendum sem busmalinn er meðr enn fleirum øðrum. ok þo at hann megi saker likamsins breýskleíks af morgum dýrum drepinn verða sua máa hann af engum kosti þeim tamðr uerða sua morg ok mikils hættar dýr sem hanntems huat er af hans ríki þa hugsanda þi sem honum endr nýiuðum ok frialsaðum ok af sialfum guði fyrer heitið. J aðra deilld erv øll ønnur kuikendí manninum vnder lagitæigi fyrer likamsims skýlld vtan helldr fyrer þa skýnsemð og skilning sam ver høfvum ok þau hafa ægi þo at likaminn vááR se ââ iamuel sua uorðinn sik at hann sýni þat a sialfum ser at ver sem betri enn ønnur kuikendi ok fyrer þa greín guði liker. þuiat mannzins likamr at eins er retrr skapaðr ok uppreistr til himíns sem fýR var sagt. **genesis.29** Ok enn talaði guð til þeira. Se herna at ek gaf ýkkur huert sem eitt gras beranda sitt sááð ok annan eiginlegan a voxt ýfer alla iørðina ok øll þau trío sem i sialfúm ser hafa saað ok frío sins eigins kýns at þesser luter se ýkkur til feðis ok viðrlífis **30** ok øllum iardarennar kuíkendum øllum himinsins fuglum ægi siðr ok þar meðr øllum þeim iardneskum lutum sem røraz mega ok lifandis andi er meðr at (p35) þau megi þar af feðaz Ok þetta varð

allt sem hann bauð. **31** Sa guð alla þa luti sem hann hafði gort ok voru harðla goðer. varð sua aptann ok morginn ok lýktaðiz hinn settí dagr.

de Rijmbijbel

Den sesten daghe versierde god
De erde ende hiet na siin ghebod
dat soe beesten brochte voerd
hi wiste wel merct ende hoert
(285) dat de mensche vallen soude
maer doer sine dueghet so woude
hi den mensche beesten gheuen
Omme te verlichtene dat suare leeuen
beesten merct dit wordelike saen
(290) het si om dat sii ons bi staen
Nv vraegt men of die goedertiere
God. maecte die felle diere
Ende de gheueninde voer adaems sonden
die redene hebbic al vonden
(295) dat alle diere sonder waen
Ghemaect waren onderdan
den mensche te sine emmermeere
adde hi gheoert na onsen here
Maer na de mesdaet alst wel sciint
(300) word sii fel ende gheueniint
Ende staende na siine scade
Oec mede om siine mesdade
Segghen ons die eleghe lude
dat die boeme ende die crude
(305) die nu wassen vruchte loes
dat elc siine cracht verloes
van der mesdaet van adame
Sonne ende mane van groeter scame
Sterren ende diere steene
(310) Ne behilden nemmeer alleene
van hare cracht dan zeeuende deel
te voeren adden sii se al gheel.

IX. De creatione hominis

(22) Deinde subditur de creatione hominis, sic: *Faciamus hominem* etc. Et loquitur Pater ad Filium et Spiritum sanctum. Vel est quasi communis vox trium personarum: Faciamus et nostrum. Factus est autem homo ad imaginem Dei quantum ad animam... Sed imago Dei est anima in essentia et ratione ejus, quia spiritus factus est et rationalis ut Deus, similitudo in virtutibus, quia bona, justa, sapiens. Cum imagine pertransit homo, quia illam habet etiam homo peccans, similitudine vero saepe privatur. Masculum vero et feminam creavit eos. Hoc quantum ad corpus, tamen dicitur creasse propter animam... Eos autem dicit pluraliter, ne androgeos, id est hermaphrodites, factos putaremus. Tamen secundum corpus factus est homo quodammodo ad imaginem Dei, cum os homini sublime dedit, etc., ut Deum et coelestia videat et imitetur. Unde cum quaesitum esset a quodam philosopho ad quid factus fuisset, respondit, ut contemplet coelum et coeli numina. Dedit autem homini Deus potestatem, ut praesentet aliis animantibus. In tribus ergo notatur hominis dignitas. Primo, quia non solum factus est in genere suo ut praedicta, sed etiam quia imago Dei est. Secundo, quia cum deliberatione factus est. In aliis siquidem operibus *dixit et facta sunt*. In hoc tanquam inter se deliberantes personae aierunt: faciamus. Tertio, quia scilicet homo dominus statutus est animalium, ut essent ei quem futurum mortalem Deus sciebat in alimentum in indumentum et laboris adjumentum. Ante peccatum enim herbas tantum et fructum arborum dedit Deus in escam hominibus et animalibus. Quod inde colligitur, quia ante peccatum nihil noxium aut sterile terra produxit. Et nota, quia in maximis ut in leonibus perditit homo dominium, ut sciat se amisisse, et in minimis ut in muscis etiam perditit, ut sciat vilitatem suam; in mediis habet dominium ad solatium, et ut sciat se etiam in aliis habuisse.

Stjórn

(p30) **26** sagði hann sua til sins seta sunar ok heilags anda. Gerum ver manninn epter váarri liking ok likneskiu at hann se stionari ýfer siofar fiskvm ok himínsins fuglum. ferfettum kuikendum ok qllv iarðríkínu ok þar meðr qllu þui skrið kuikendi sem nokkura lifs rering hefer i veroldinni. **27** Skapaði guð mannen epter sialfs sins mýnd ok likneskiu. skapaði hann beði karlman ok kuenmann ok þo siðaR konuna sem ofaR meiR man heýraz mega. **Scolastica hýstoria.** Af þrennum greinum máá eínkannlega merkiaz mannzens tígn ok virðing. þat er hið fyrsta at æigi at eíns varð hann isinu kýní sem fyrr sagþer luter. helldr ok iamn uel þar meðr at hann er guðs likneskia fyrer þui at hann gaf honum einum skýnsemðar skilning af qllum veralldar kuikendvm. Er likneskia heilagrar þrenningar meðr þrífalldri mýnd ok skilning mannzens qnd ok hugskot. þat er til minnis til skýnsemðar skilningar ok till uilia eðr elskhuga þuiat þeser.iiij.luter eru eín ueran ok eitt lif meðr huerium (p 31) sem eínum manni sua sem .iiij. personur eru i guðs þrenningu. faðer ok sonr ok heilagr andí ok þær allar erv þo einn guð. þat er annat at hann var skapaðr meðr staðfestre fyrer hugsan þuiat i qðrum sinum verkum bauð guð að eíns ok wrðu þeir luter. Enn i þersu soqðu guðs personur faðer ok sonr ok heilagr

andi sua fyrer hugsandí ok staðfestandí sin a milli. Giqrum ver manninn. þat er hið þriði manzens tign ok forprisan at hannvar skapaðr herra ok sua sem konungr allra annaRa iardneskra kuikenda ok at þau skýlldu honum til feðu ok kleðnaðar ok til erfíðis letta ok viðr hialpar síðan er hann hafði misgort. þuiat fyrer sýndína gaf guð beði manninum ok oðrum kuikendum iardrennar a vöxtu til feðu fyrer þui at iorðin leiddi þa engan lut u frean ut af ser eðr skepnvnni skaðsamleghan. Enn þersararar drottnanar misti hann af sýndarennar til skýlldan beði ýfer hinum stærstum kuikendum ok hinum smærstum. ýfer hinum stæstum sem leonum. til þers at hann víti ok uíðr kenniz at hann hefer latið sitt valld ok drottnan ýfer þeim. Enn ýfer hinum smestum sem fuglunum til þess at hann skili ok vnderstandí þar af huersu vanmeginn ok herfiligr hann er þar af vorðinn ýfer meðal kuikendum hefer hann enn ualld sér til hugganar. ok at hann víti þaðan af at hann hafði sua fyrer sýndina ýfer oðrum sem þessum. **speculum hýstoriale.** Meðr þessi hinni fyrstu ok hinni fremztu fýR sagðri heilagrar þrenningar likneskiu sem manzins hugskotí er. i huerrí er hann samlikiz guði meðr heílagum englum berr maðrinn ok guðs lik-ingh. eínkannleggha . i.v. lutvm hín fyrsta er su drottnanar røksemð ok (p32) valld sem i fyrstunni var honum veítt. þuiat sua sem guð er allra luta drottinn ok herra himneskra ok iardneskra ok iardneskra ok þeira sem i heluetí eru. A þa leið var maðrinn sem drottnari ok herra ýfer skipaðr æigi at eíns fýR sögðum kuikendum utan ok þar meðr allri þessa heims veralldar býgð sem var sagt. Annat er upphafsins røksemð þuiat áá þann háátt sem guð er vpphaf allra luta fyrer sina skapan. sua er adam allramanna upphaf ok fýrstr fyrer getnaðarens skýlld. þat hið þriðia at sua sem nokkuerer luter eru samkuemíliger milli guðs ok annaRa luta. sua kemr ok mart saman meðr manninum ok oðrum veralldlegum lutum ok þaðan af kallaz hann minni heímr. þat hið fiórða at sua sem guð er allra luta endalýkt. sua er maðrinn síðaztr epter naatturv skipanenne. þuiat hann var seínaz skapaðr þo at hann verí allra iardneskra luta fýrstr ok fremztr epter skýnsemðar skípan. þat er hit fimta at sua sem guð er huerúitna allr meðr sinn almáátt í hínun meíra heimí. sua er aundin í sinum. minna heimí. þat er í qlum likamsins limum meðr huerium sem eínun sem veralldligum manni. Maðrinn meðr sinní skýnsemð er æigi þa leiðis skapaðr lútr ok niðrleítr sem skýnlaus kuikendí. er hanslikams vöxtr retrr forme raðr vpp til himnisins sua sem sialfan hann aminnandí at hann hafí á þann haatt sin hug skotz augu ok skilningar vit til himneskra luta sem hans likamleg augu ok skilningar vit ok a siona veit vpp til himinsins. hann var ok þa litlu stund sem hann stoð i meínleýsis stett ok skýllði euenleggha verit hafva vtan alla píníliga angist ef hann hefði æigi misgort. þuiat honum skýllði huarki hungur ne þorstí.æigi kulði ne hití aigi erfíði ne nokkur haattar krankleikí angrat hafa. Eigi hefði hann ok þurft likams dauðann at ottaz þuiat lifandis (p33) likamnum skýllði hann flutz hafa til eýlífrar dýrðar. æigi hefði hann ok þurft kleðnat at hafa ok þo hefði hann þar af enga skammfýlling fengit þuiat engan kendi hann þa uera sinn leýndalim helldr enn hofuðit hendr e fetr. Maðrinn hefði þa getinn uerit vtan alla sýnd ok sui uirðu enn feðdr utan allra sutar ok sáárleiks.

de Rijmbijbel

Doe sprac god make wi den man
Nu merct ende verstaet hier an
(315) tote wien seide hi maken wie
der persone so siin drie
de drieuoudecheit spreect ghemeene
dits den mensche ene here niet cleene
dattene god makede met voerrade
(320) al maecti met siire ghenade
al de andre creaturen
hine sprac niet van hare naturen
alse hi tote des menschen dede
Nochtan was hi ghemaket mede
(325) Na der zielen des gods ghebelde
dit was den mensche groete welde
Na den lichame wildit horen
heft hiis vele te voren
want hi es van meester werden
(330) den besten staet dat oeft ter erden
Ende den mensche te hemele waert
In drien saken openbaert
God des menschen weerdechede
dat hi niet alleene mede
(335) Ghemaect was omme hertsche welde
Maer na der zielen gods ghebelde
Dander es als ic erst seide
datter god sinen raet toe leide
Ende seide maken wi den man
(340) de derde waerdecheit der an
dats dat hi ghemaect was alse here
van allen dieren met groeter ere
dat sine voeden na den sonden
Ende cleden soudentallen stonden
(345) Ende helpen sinen ade Rijmbijbel eit draghen
vor de mesdaet hoer ic ghewaghen
Gaf god den mensche ende den dieren
vruucht tetene van manieren
want derde brochte niet dan goet
(350) Mensche marc of du bes vroet
du heues verloren in den meesten
dine herscap in den besten
an draken ende an liebarde
an tigren ende an luparde

(355) dit was groete waerdechede
an die mintste hef stu mede
Ghewelt verloren om diin lieghen
dats an messien ende an vlieghen
an die middelste hefstu ghewout
(360) om dat tu merken sout
dattu here altoes wars bleuen
der beesten atstu niet begheuen
tgebod dat di god gheboet
dus vielstu in groeter noet

X. De institutione conjugii

(24) *Et benedixit eis Deus sic: Crescite et multiplicamini...* De homine vero, ut de caeteris dixerat, non dixit: Et vidit Deus quod esset bonum, quia in proximo sciebat lapsurum, vel quia nondum homo perfectus erat donec ex eo fieret mulier. Unde et post legitur: *Non est bonum hominem esse solum.*

Stjórn

(p33) ok epter þat er guð hafði sua skapat þau blezaði hann þeim ok sagði sua. **Genesis.** Uaxit þit ok fiqlgiz ok fýllit iqrðina ok stiornít henni. drotnit ok siofarins fiskum. hímninsins fuglum ok qlum þeim kuikendum sem rþraz á iardríkí. scolastica hýstoria. þar sem guð sagði sua vaxit þidok fiqlgiz huat er æigi meðti verða vtan þeira samblandan þa skapaði hann hiuskap milli karlmannz ok konu huar af er þeir villu menn eru af sinni sogn aprt setter ok suivirðer sem þat sogðu at sambuð milli karlmanz ok konu metti alldregen uerða utan sýnd ok sáálu háaska

de Rijmbijbel

(365) God benedide den man
ende seide deese woert der an
wasset ende wert menech vout
dit woert dat men ghescreuen hout
Gaet jeghen die buggheren die spraken
(370) valschelike in haren traken
dat huwelic te gherestonde
Ne mach weesen sonder sonde
die daet waent hem weert suaer pardoen
God en hiet noint sonde doen

XI. De quiete sabbati et sanctificatione

*Igitur perfecti sunt coeli et terra. Conclusio est hic operum, quia creati, dispositi, ornati, igitur perfecti... Complevit Deus die septimo opus suum quod fecerat... si complere est finale quidpiam operis facere, quomodo verum est quod sequitur: Requievit Deus die septimo etc. Verum est quod diem septimum fecit et ipsum etiam benedixit et post requievit. Vel complevit, id est completum ostendit, cum nihil novum in eo fecerit, et tunc requievit ab operum generibus novis. Nihil enim post fecit, cujus tunc non fecisset materiam ut corporum vel similitudinem ut animarum. Non enim quasi fessus dicitur quievisse, sed quia cessavit, sicut in Isaia dicitur quod *seraphim requiem non habebant dicentia santus sanctus*, id est non cessabant. Vel requievit ab opere vel in operibus, id est non eget operibus suis, et est dictum quasi negative. Vel requievit ab opere in semet ipso, id est a mutabilitate operum ejus immutabilis appetuit, nam stabilis manens dat cuncta moveri. Quod autem dicitur *ab omni opere*, quod patrarat, innuit esse opus quod nondum fecerat a quo nondum quiescit. Tria enim opera fecerat: creavit, disposuit et ornavit. Quartum opus propagationis non desinit operari. Quintum faciet, et praecinget se, et transiens ministrabit, ubi praecipue erit requies. *Et benedixit diei septimo*, id est *sanctificavit eum*, id est sanctum et celebrem eum esse voluit. Semper enim ab aliquibus nationibus ante legem etiam dicitur Sabbatum fuisse observatum. Hujus observantioam in lege etiam dixit sanctificationem, ibi: *Memento ut diem Sabbati sanctifices...**

Stjórn

(p38) Hímínn ok iorð voru nu algiör ok öll þeira fegrð ok þryðí fýllði guð ok lýktaði þat er sua mikít at **2** hann sýndí fullgort vera sitt verk ahinum siavnda degí ok huíldiz a hinum sia0nda degi af öllu þui verki sem hann hafði þa gort ok framít. æigi sua sem af nokkuRí meðu. helldr af lettandí fýR sagðri sinni skipan ok giörð a þeim sama degi þuiat guð hafði þa skipat efní til allra likamligra luta ok líking saalna þeira sem hann skapaði síðan hueria a sínúm skapanar tíma. hafði hann nu framíð ok algiort þersi .vij. daga uerk meðr fýR sagðri skapan ok skipan ok skýringu. Meðr skapan aa hinum fýrsta deghi sua sem hann framði sina skapan af engv efní ok meðr skipan þa er hann skilði liosit fra mýrkrinu meðr skipan eðr sundr skiptíngu áá öðrum ok hinvm þriþia. enn meðr skreyting á þrimr hinum síðaztum. **Augustinus J** þeim orðum sem moýses seger at guð hvíldiz á hinum siavnda degi af þeim sinum harða goðum verkum sem hann hafði gort, ma ok æigi síðr meðr andlegum skilnínghi ok skýrum (p 39) merkiaz uáár epter komandi huíld. þa sem hann man oss gefa af öllum váárum verkum ef ver hofum þau góð gort. þuiat öll vaar góð uerk er honum at kenna ok eigna sem oss kallar til góðgiörn

(p44) þat er à hinum .vij. heims alldrinum þeim er engan hefuer aptaninn vęnti huerr sem einn gođr mađr sier at þui eylifrar dyrđar epter hardla gođ .vij. daga verk. þat er epter .vij. dagha vmlidna ok skili sua huat er þat hefuer at þyđa er guđ huilldiz a hinum .vij. degi af ęllum sinum verkum. þuiat sialfr hann vinnr alla l þa gođa luti meðr oss sem ver giorum. ok af þui er þat rettlegha sagt at hann huiliz. þuiat epter ęll þessi verk man hann þersum meðr sialfum ser efenlegha huilld veita. **de genesi. 3** Blezađi guđ þa ok helgađi hinn .vij. daghinn. þat er sua at skilia at hann skapađi at sa dagr uęri haleitr ok heilagr halldinn þuiat àà honum lette hann af ęllv verki sinu þi sem hann hafđi þa skapat. **scolastica hystoria.** þat sem seger at guđ huilldiz à hinum .vij. degi af ollu verki sem hann hafđi fyllt ok framit. þa tēz ok syniz þat verkit sem hann hafđi þa enn æigi gort af hueriv er hann lietter enn æigi eđr hiliz. þriu fyRsogđ verk hafđi hann þa gort. skapat skipat ok skreytt. hit fiorda hans verk letter alldregin af sua lengi sem hann letr mannkynit aukaz skapandi ok samtengiandi huers sem eins sàal sinum eiginlegum likam. hit fimta man hann fremia annars heims synandi þa ęllum gođum mon | num sialfs sins asionu sem þionandi mađr seđandi þa ok sęmandi ęfenlegha meðr sialfum ser i himinriki.

de Rijmbijbel

(375) God sach al dat hi adde ghemaect
al waest goet ende wel gheraect
Uulmaect es nu hemel ende erde
Ende al hare sierheit met groeter werde
Des .vi. daghes verwldi mede
(380) al werc daer hi neerenst toe dede
Ende ruste up den .vij. dach
Niet dat hem eneghe pine verwach
Maer dat hi siin maken liet
Jn sulken ne market niet
(385) hine maect noch alle daghe
vele dincs dins ghene saghe
Maer hine maecte niet hier na
Sine materie die ne was daer
Ghemaect of hare ghelike
(390) an adame was sekerlike
die materie van alden lieden
dit willic an siin vlesch bedieden
van sinen vlessche esset al
dat es ende was ende commen sal
(395) Ende mensche voerme heuet ontfaen
van der zielen suldi verstaen
dat daer ghene ziele af cam
Maer wie so vlesch van hem nam

God gaf hem ziele ghelic adame
 (400) de zeuende dach die heet die name
 daer god up ruste saterdach
 Ende in ebreus eist also ict sach
 heetent die iueden sabaet
 dats ruste gods daert al ane staet
 (405) ende hi benedidene dats waer
 Sint vierdemenne menech jaer
 Duus also ghiit hier hebt vernomen
 So eist ons van Moysesse comen
 dat got maecte hemel ende erde
 (410) Ende al dat boerde thare werde
 al benediide hiit ende seinde
 dit was eer dat noint reinde
 want eene fontejne van groeten prijse
 die quam uten paradyse
 (415) gaf natheit in groeter tiit
 al omme ende omme der weerelt
 tparadys bediet marien
 de fonteine ihesus den vrien
 die al met duegeden maket nat

XII. De creatione animae protoplasti

(26) *Formavit igitur Dominus Deus hominem de limo terrae...* Ad carnem enim spectat quod dicitur: *Formavit hominem de limo terrae.* Ad animam cum dicitur, *inspiravit* etc., Totum enim hominem animavit, sed faciem tanquam partem digniorem, quia sensuum capacem, solam nominavit. Eadem autem animam etiam *spiraculum vitae* vocat, quia per eam homo spirat et vivit. Et post dicit: *Animam viventem* in se, id est in perpetuitate vitae viventem, non mortabilem, ut animam pecudis...

Stjórn

(p47) Genesis. at guð drottinn formeraði mannzens likam af iardarennar leiri sem fyR var saght ok bles lifs anda af engu efni skapaðan ihans asionu ok þar meðr allan likamenn. ok sua euarð maðrinn til lifandi såålar ok skynsemdarskilningar scolastica hystoria. Her hið fyrsta sinn kallar bokin guð drottin eðr herra. þuiat hann hafði sèr þa þionustu mann. þenna stað skildi plato vrettlegha segiandi guð hafa skapat audina at (p48) eins. enn engla gort hafa likamann. Sua mà þat ok æigi standa ne fyrer satt hallda sem sumer segia at ondin se giqr af guðlegri ueran ok under stoðu. þuiat þa màatti hun eðr maðrinn meðr engv moti misgiqra.

Maðrenn var ok skapaðr arosknum alldri ok fullkomnum dauðlegr ok u dauðligr. þuiat at hann m àtti deyia ef hann skyllðaði til þers sem raun berr àà ok hann m àtti verit hafa u dauðligr sem fyR var sagt. fra sellifis paradis ok huersu almattigr guð skipaði hennar blom strum.

de Rijmbijbel

God maectene alse hier voren steet
(425) van der herden van den lime
Na den vlesche eist dat ic riime
Ende die ziele maecti van niete
weet weel dat hi achter liete
de wareit die niet gheloueden dies
(430) de lettre spreect dat hi in blies
hem den leuenliken gheest
dat bediet recht alre meest
dat hi die ziele sende in vat
plato dolde in deeser stat
(435) die edelste clerc van ogher name
die seide dat ten lachame
die inghele maecten ende god den gheest
dat segghen sulke hebbe ic ghevreest
dat de ziele ware meede
(440) ghemaect vander goddeliichede
ware dat waer sone mochte dan
Niet ghene sonde doen de man
Niechtemeer dan onse here
Noch oec steruen nemmermeere
(445) DE man was ghemaect vander moude
dat merct. recht in manliker oude
wlcommen in crachte in wlre jueghet
wl maect van leeden jn sulker dueghet
wilde hi tghebot gods niet begheuen
(450) dat hi mochte eweelike leuen
vede Rijmbijbel rake hiit oec doer eneghe noet
Dat hire omme smaken soude de doet
Duus was hem wl wille ghegheuen
Weder hi steruen wilde ofte leuen

XIII. De paradiso et lignis ejus

Plantaverat autem Dominus Deus paradysum voluptatis a principio...Unde alia translatio habet: paradysum in Eden ad orientem. Eden hebraice, latine deliciae interpretatur. Ergo idem est paradysum voluptatis quod paradysum in Eden, id est in deliciis...Produxitque Deus in paradiso de humo diversa ligna, quibus delectaretur homo vedendo et sustentaretur edendo. Produxit quidem, id est procul in altum duxit. Vel produxit, id est pro homine duxit. In medio quorum tanquam digniora posuit lignum vitae et lignum scientiae boni et mali...

Stjórn

(p48) Sëllifis paradís hafði guð plantat fra upphafi. Þat er à hinum þriðja degi þa er hann bauð at iorðin skyllði þbirtaz ok friofaz sem fyR uar saght ihueria er hann flutti ok setti manninn er hann hafði skapat àà þeim velle her àà vaarre byggilegre iorðu sem campus damascenus heiter. Þenna stað let hann auðgaz ok alskipaðan verða meðr allzkyns ynnileghum uíði ok alldin treom þeim sem beði voru manninum lystilegha fõgr at sia upp àà set a bergia. milli huerra er hann skipaði þeim tueim treom imiðri paradís sem agiætaz voru af ۆll- um þeim er annat het lifs tre af þeire natturu er þat hafði meðr ser. þuiat sàà maðr sem optsinnis ęti af þui màatti ægi deya likams dauða. ægi siukleik elle eðr nõkkurskyns angist fàà. Enn annat uizkv tre millem goðs ok illz. þuiat fyR enn maðrenn àat þar af kunni hann fyrer þann skyllð enga grein à illu at hann hafði þat ægi àaðr profat. þuiat annat epterlęti kۆllum ver gott.**scholastica hystoria.** kenthafði adam þo þegar þersa fyR sagða illa lutì af sinni vitru meðr nõkkurur moti i sialfs sins samuizku enn ægi meðr nõkkuRi raun eðr profan upp àà þann hàatt sem goðr lekner þann tima sem hann heill ok under stendr annars (p49)mannz krankleik ok sàà hinn sami lekner skilr hann þo allt eins giõrr meir þann tima sem hann hefer hinn sama krankleik a sialfum seet. þuiat ða er beði at hann skilr ok kenner at sua sem sa smasueinn sem hann er virðulega ok fagrlegga upp fęddr veit ægi driugum skyn a illu. ella mekiz u hlyðni rettlegha fyrer illt enn hlyðni fyrer gott þuiat sua sem hann hafði etið af þi sama tre.þa uissi hann huersu mikit gott hlyðnin màatti ok huersu mikit illt vlyðnen stetti.

de Rijmbijbel

(455) God die milde es ende wiis
die maecte dat paradys
ten derden daghe doe hi vt
Comen dede bome ende cruut
al daer die weerelt es an beghin
(460) dat es ten oesten no meer no min
al daer heuet hiit gheseet
het bescriuet die heleghe weet
dat et es die scoenste stede

die es onder den emel mede
 (465) beede bi berghen ende bi landen
 vte onser wanderinghen ghestanden
 Jof so gheuest metter zee
 dat man ne ghewonne nemmermee
 Noch ne gheen came in de stede
 (470) Met neghere bendechede
 het was toter manen oech
 Bedi bleeft vander loeuien droech
 Jnt paradys sette onse here god
 alt hout want het was siin ghebod
 (475) dat scone was ende smaken soechte
 omme dat den man ghenoeghen mochte
 bede de smake ende dat up sien
 jn die middewarde van dien
 sette hi des leeuens hout
 (480) dat heuet die cracht ende die ghewout
 die de vruucht et soe mach hem gheuen
 ghesonde ende langhe leeuën
 Oec segghen sulke boeke meer
 dat hi mach leuen emmermeer
 (485) bedi sette hi oec der binnen
 den boem die goet ende quaet leert kinnen
 dat heuet bedi de name ontfaen
 Om dat doe adaem adde mesdaen
 daer an dat hi maecte tquade
 (490) ende van den goeden vel in scade

XIV. De fonte paradisi et quatuor fluminibus ejus

Et fons vel *fluuius egrediebatur; ad irrigandum paradisum*, id est ligna paradisi... Qui fons dividitur in quator flumina. Unus dictus est Phison... *hic circumit terram Hevilath*, id est Indiam, et trahit aureas arenas. Alius dictus est Gehon vel Gihon vel Igion qui et Nilus... *hic circumit Aethiopiam*. Alii dup primis nominibus vocantur Tigris et Euphrates... *Hic vadit contra Assyrios*... Euphrates frugifer vel fructuosus de quo per quas transiret regiones, quasi notum, tacuit Moyses, quia est in Chaldaea...

Stjórn

(p 49) **genesis. 10** Ein harða fōgr upp sprettu eðr eðr brunnr gekk vt ok flaut af þersum hinum ynniligzta stað paradís at dōggua til friouanar ok auaxtar ǫll hennar tre ok þersi sama

uppspretta skiptiz þaðan ok isundr greindiz i fiorar hinar sterstu hqfut àår er menn hafa sogur af. **11** heiter ein phison ok qðru nafni ganges af gangaro indialandz konungi. þuiat hon kemr þar framm ok fellr vm þat sama land. **12** finnz þar ok fez betra gull enn i qðrum londum ok ein hinn dyrasti steinn onichinus.hun skiptiz ok meðr ymisleghum litum sua sem hon er i ymissum londum edr stqðum þuiat i qðrum stað er hon skiqr enn i qðrum ruglat ok blandin. J annan stað er hon litil enn i annan stað mikil ok dreifiz uifa. J qðrum stað ken er hon kòlld. enn i audrum heit. Enn phison aa bresku. er flockr upp inorròenu. þiat hon fylliz ok aukaz af þeim x. aam sem lsem falla i hana. **13** Aunnur heitir gyon er fellr bæði um blàland ok egipta land. Ok heitir hon þar nilus. **Genesis. Capitulum 14a** Hin þridia heitir tigris er fellr um austan uert þat land. er mesopotamia heitir. ok allt moti þi landi er assiria heitir.**Scholastica hystoria. Capitulum** Tigris heiter eitt hit skiotazta dyr. Er þersi aa fyrir þann skyllid af sinum stridum straumi. ok fliotum fors faullum kallað tigris. **Genesis Capitulum 14b** Hin fiorda er eufrates. er fellr um uestan uerða mesopotamiam ok allt i kaldeam huadan er Abraham er kyniaðr. **Scholastica hystoria. Capitulum** þessar iiij. àår fliota ok framm renna af einni upp sprettu sem sagt uar. ok skiliaz þa fyrst enn siðan koma saman nockurar af þeim. skiliaz þa enn anna tima þuiat þær uikaia ok uenda sinni ràas optliga nidr iordina koma siðan upp i einum ok ymsum stòðum ok londum. þapan af er þat at eigi hafa allir eina fra sògn huar þeira uppspretta er iuarri byggligri uerolldu. Sua segiz af sumum monnum. at ganges komi upp æigi fiarri fialli þi sem caucasus heitir. Enn nilus næri þi mikla fialli sem athlans heiter. Enn tigris ok eufrates af armenia.**Genesis.** Eptir þat flutti gud mannin i brott af þeim stad. sem hann hafði skapað hann. ok setti hann iþann enn ynniliga stað paradis. at hann skyllidi þar uera ok uinna. eigi nockurs kyns erfiði helldr ser til lystiligrar næringar. ok hann skyllidi hennar geymati uera enn gud beggia þeira. **Capitulum augustinus.** Su uinna uar hardla lofsamlig.enn eigi erfidiss saum þuiat manzins à stund-an ok uinna i huilld ok kyrrleik þers sæla lifs sem qnguan biðr dauðann. er at geyma þat ok hirða sem hann helldr upp àà.

de Rijmbijbel

de fontejne daer ic er af liet
die dor dat paradys al vliet
Gaf al den boemen saeps ghenoech
[ende al der plaetchen int gheuech]
(495) die deelt haer daer in vieren riuieren
de namen salic u visieren
fisons. ende ganges eet die eene
die lopet endi duere alleene
men vint gout in hare sant
(500) tdbeste dat es in enech lant
Gion of nilus comnt ghelopen
dor dat lant van ethyopen
al dus eet dandre riuiere

tygris de derde. eufrates. dits viere
(505) dicken vallen sie in de erde
dat si lopen hare verde
Ende springhen vte eere andre stad
die boeke beschriuen ons dat

XV. De praecepto et prohibitione edulii

(28) *Tulit ergo Deus hominem de loco formationis suae in paradysum scilicet terrestrem ut operaretur ibi, non tamen laborando ex necessitate sed delectando et recreando, et sic Deus custodiret illum, scilicet hominem. Vek utrumque refertur ad hominem, ut scilicet homo custodiret paradysum et operaretur, ut dictum est...Praecipitque ei dicens* ets. Ut homo sciret se esse sub Domino, praeceptum accepit a Domino. Omnis autem iussio est in duobus, in praeceptione et prohibitione, et ideo utroque usus est Dominus. Praecipit: *Ex omni ligno paradysi comede*. Prohibuit: *De ligno scientiae boni et mali ne comedas*. Et datum est viro mandatum, ut per virum etiam transiret ad mulierem. Vel forte est praecoccupatio, quia facta muliere utrique simul datum est. Subdit autem poenam, si contemneret: *Quacunque die comederis, morte morieris*, scilicet animae et necessitatem mortis habebis...

Stjórn

(50) **16b** Ok fyrir þi sagði hann sua. **Genesis Capitulum** Et ok fōdz af hueri tre sem einu. þi sem her bidr. i paradys 17 utan af uitzku tre milli gods ok illz. skallt þu eigi eta. fyrir þann skylld at aa þeim degi sem þu hefir af þi etit mant þu andliga deya ok daudligr uerda. **Scholastica hystoria. Capitulum** Karlmanninum uar þetta boðord gefit. ok sett af guði. Enn fra honum skylldi þat koma til konunnar. ella uar þat eigi fyrri sett ok skipat enn þau uoru bæði skapað.

de Rijmbijbel

God droech den mensche van der erde
(510) dat hine adde ghemaect werde
jnt paradys om dat hi woude
dat hi der in werken soude
Niet der in pinen dor de noet
Maer ghenoechte hebben groet
(515) Ende dattene god soude wachten mede
Ende zee. man die eleghe stede
Gods ghebot hem wildit weeten
van alre vruucht soe soutu eeten

Sonder die es an den boem
(520) Die goets ende quaets leert neemen goem
vp wat daghe dat dur af eets
Sprac got hic wille dat tud weets
Dan soutu daer naer steruelic wesen

XVI. De impositione nominum animantium principaliter et mulieris formatione

Dixit quoque Deus: Non est bonum hominem solem esse: faciamus ei adiutorium ad procreandos liberos quod sit simile illi. Similia enim de similibus naturaliter nascuntur. Sed ne videretur Adae superflua mulieris formatio, putanti sibi in animantibus esse simile, ideo adduxit Deus ad Adam omnia terrae animantia et aeris...ut imponeret homo eis nomina, in quo scirent eum sibi praeesse et sciret Adam nullum ex eis simile sibi. Et imposuit eis nomina Adam lingua Hebraea, quae sola fuit ab initio. Quod inde perpenditur, quia nomina quae leguntur usque ad divisionem linguarum Hebraea sunt...

Stjórn

(50) Eigi er manningur gott eðr gledilíght at hann sæð ein saman. gerum honum fulltingiara sealfum honum líkan. **19** Nu sem guð drottinn hafði skapat ok formerat öll iardnesk kuikendi ok þar meðr fiska ok fugla. þa let hann aull þau koma fyrir adam. ok at (51)hann skylldi sea ok segia huersu hann uilldi huert þeira heita láta þiat þat er huers kuikendis nafn allt til þersa dags sam adam gaf þi talandi upp aa ebreska tungu þuiat hon ein uar fra upphafi allt til tugna skiptis. Fyrir tuenna sök let guð aull kuikendi fyrir aadam koma, at hann gięfi þeim lnöfn. þa adra at þapan af mætti þau uita hann uera sinn formann ok stjornara. Enn þa adra at hann sæi þat uissuligha. at þers haatar kuikenda uar sealfum honumm líkt. ok honum uar fyrir þa sök konan naudsynligh.

de Rijmbijbel

Doe seide god te ant na deesen
(525) dat de mensche weesen moet
alleene dan nees niet goet
make wi hem oec bedi
hulpe die hem gheliic siiEnde met dien so brochte god
(530) voer adame na siin ghebod
alle voghele metten dieren
van lichte van lande van riuieren
Ende al dat men vint in der zee
Omme tue saken ende nemmee

(535) dat hise noumen soude daer
Ende hi weeten soude voer waer
dat siin gheliic na den lechame
No der sielen daer niet ne came
daer gaf hem doe adaem de ionghe
(540) name na ebreusche tonghe
die deerste was van allen spraken
doe deede god na deesen saken

XVII. De somno Adae et formatione mulieris de costa ejus

(p30) *Cumque obdormisset tulit Dominus unam de costis ejus, carnem scilicet et os et aedificavit ministerio angelorum illam in mulierem, de carne carnem de osse ossa faciens, et statuit eam ante Adam. Qui ait: Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis et caro de carne mea...*

Stjórn

(p51) Þaa let gud þilikt sem suefn ok enn helldr nockurs konar umegin falla aa adam. ok I þersu sama umegni. truiz at hann hafi andliga leiddr uerit. ok upp numinn til himinrikiss. hirðar. þiat siðan er hann uaknaði. uar hann fullkominn. ok sua framr spaa maðr. at hann spaaði fyrir samband iHistoria Scholasticau xpristi. ok heilagrar kirkiu. ok þat hit mikla floð er uarð aa dögum noe. ok þar meðr eigisidr hinn efzta dom. er fyrir elldinn skal uerða. ok sagði alla þersa luti sinum sunum. **21b** Ok sem han uar skapaðr tok guð brott af honum eitt hans rif. ok sua mikit kiöt sem þii til heyrdi. enn let kiöt koma i stað rifsins. **22a** ok skapadi konuna fyrir englanna þeonostu af þi sama rifi. Gorandi hennar likam af kiötinu enn beinin af sealfu rifinu. **22b** let hana siðan koma fyrir adam **23ab** ok þa sagdi hann sua. þetta bein er nu af minum beinum. ok þetta kiöt er af minum likam til tekít. **Scholastica historia.** Af þersu hinu litla orði .nu. fengu iuðar mikla uillu ok uantru. er adam sagdi sua. þetta bein er nu af minum beinum. þiat segia at hann gerdi nu adra konu. ok taka adams ord sem sua hafi hann talat. Hin fyrri konan uar gor medr mer. af molldu ok leiri. Enn þessi er nu gòr af sealfs mins. likama. Hegoma þeirrok liuga margar ættar tølur fra .ij. hans husfryium. Enn þeira uilla ok hegomi auðsynuz af sialfum texta genesis. þar sem iafnan talar einfalldeliga af einni hans husfru.

de Rijmbijbel

Eenen slaep comen in adame
al heuet die dinc slapens name
(545) het was al onmachte van sinne

daer wi gheloeuen dat hi jnne
 die emelsche bliscepe vernam
 want dat eersten doe hi bequam
 profetiseerde hi segghen clerke
 (550) van ihesus ende van der elegher kerke
 Ende voerseide der loeuien ganc
 Ende doemesdach te voeren lanc
 dat hi met brande soude comen
 dit seidi siinen kindren somen
 (555) jn deesen slape te deeser stede
 Nam god eene rebbe ende vlesch der meede
 Ende maectere af .j. wiif alleene
 vlesch van vlesche been van beene

XVIII. De nominibus mulieris

Et imposuit Adam uxori suae nomen tanquam dominus ejus et ait: *Haec vocabitur virago*, id est a viro acta, et est sumptum nomen a viri nomine, ut materia de materia sumpta fuerat... Imposuit ei et aliud nomen, Eva scilicet post peccatum quod sonat vita, eo quod futura esset mater omnium viventium...

Stjórn

(p52) Gaf Adam henni þa nafn sua sem hennar herra. 23c ok sagði sua. þessa skal kerlingh heita. þiat han er af karlmanninum komin. uard þetta fyrir þa sök hennar eiginlight nafn.

de Rijmbijbel

Ende setteese voer adame
 (560) dat hi hare gheuen soude name
 hi sprac dit vlesch ende dit been
 es van den minen ende al een
 virago sal mense noemen
 dat luut van manne comen
 (565) aldus hiet soe voer de sonden
 maer daer naer in corten stonden
 doe soe de sonde adde ghedaen
 so hiet hise. eua. saen
 dat woert mach men dus bedieden
 (570) dat soe was moeder al der lieden
 alst kint ter weerelt comet vt
 So es des cnapelins eerste luut
 .a. ende des meiskins .e.

dit ne faeliert nemmermee

XVIX. De prophetia Adae ...

(p30) *Et erunt duo in carne una*, id est unientur ambo in uno carnali opera, vel erunt duo in carne una, pueri gignendi. Non enim ex sanguine uno sed ex sanguinibus concreatur parvuli caro. Vel licet sint duo personaliter, erunt tamen in conjugio una caro, in aliis duo, quia neuter habet potestatem suae carnis.

Stjórn

(p52) Ok þegar eptir spááði hannsua segiandi 24 fyrir þenna skyld at hon er sua til komin. man margr madr fyrir lata sinn fõður ok moður ok samtegiar sinni husfru. sem einum part af sealfum ser. ok manu þau ij.uera medr einn likam. af þi at af samblandingh beggia þeira bloðð byriaz barnit,. Ok huarki þeira hefir meðr ollu eitt saman ualld yfir sealfs sins likam.

de Rijmbijbel

(575) doe adaem dwijf adde ghenant
profeterde hi alte ant

Omme dat soe es van minen liue
sal de man volghen siinen wiue
moeder ende vader begheuen

(580) Ende daer naer so es bescreuen
jn eenen vlesch sulsi tue weesen
huwelic voerseide hi na desen
doe eua ende adaem waren ghemaect
waren si bedegader naect

XX. De statu innocentiae eorum ante peccatum

(p30) *Erat autem uterque nudus, nec erubescabant...*

Stjórn

(p52) Huartueggia þeira adams ok hans husfru voru medr ollu navckuit utan alla skammfylling. sem fyrr uar sagt. Hugdu þau fyrir þau sauk ònguan hlut à ser hylia þurfa. at

kendu aungua þa girnd edr freistni medr ser sem þau þyrfti at staudua. sua sem uær skamm
fyllumz eigi huerr sem ser oss aa oss höfuð ok føtr.

de Rijmbijbel

doe eua ende adaem waren ghemaect
waren si bedegader naect
(585) Ende sine scaemden hem niet
Maerct dat men dit an kindren siet
sine scamen hem niet eer entujnt
Eer hare nature sonden kint
dus waest van euen ende van adame
(590) dat sii waren sonder scame

Historia Scholastica, Stjórn and de Rijmbijbel: Analysis

The prologues

Stjórn Prologue

This book was translated on the initiative of the crowned king, Hakon, from Latin; it is called *The Flower of Holy Men. Prologue.*

As is the habit and expected from the power of emperors and in the (family of) royal house(s), they have three distinct and separated houses. The first of the king's houses is that where in he sits to give judgement or conferences, and keeps law/justice between men. The second is the one where he eats and feasts his men. The third of his houses is that which he has for his own private peace and where he sleeps. In this way our King /Lord that rules with his own power over the winds and the worlds, this earth as that house wherein he holds his council and converses and keeps justice between men. Where all things are arranged according to his power and will. Because of this he is called what he is, our lord, as David says in the psalms: The earth and everything on it belongs to our Lord. Spirit and heart as every righteous man has, that is as the peaceful house and private hideout. So that it gives him much pleasure to be/ behave properly together with his men as is written. From this conversion and private abode it is, that he who is called bridegroom in the holy writ and trustworthy writings, he uses as halls and private guesthouses to feast in, where he is giving such mild guidance that from this they are made to be more gentle as is told in the Psalter. In the same way /in a corresponding way is the house of God. That is to be understood thus: In the holy writ all the same things are separated in the same way, from which he is called master. The same guesthouse, being the holy writ of God, has three parts or sections, that is: foundation, walls and roof. The story itself is the foundation of this Gods own house and guesthouse. The explanation of the holy writ, that tells us what to notice in every one of the works in the story, is these walls. And the interpretation is the roof, that enlightens us on the interpretation of the works and deeds that the story holds, that are teachings to us, which has been told us.

Now that our worldly lord, Hakon, king of Norway, the crowned, son of king Magnus, has had this book, that is named *The Flower of the Holy Men*, translated into Old Norse, as entertainment for wise men that can not grasp or understand Latin, it is valid and tells about the holy men and their ways and of mass-days. In this way he wanted that the good men be filled, at his own tables, from the thesaurus/ riches of the hall and guesthouse of God, that is of the holy writ with some entertaining, (to) get true knowledge from this wise explanation without it being much pain/compulsion. From which sacraments or suitable Sundays and other of the offices/ times that is held, that is the property of other holy men, especially sung for God himself. He will then let this be read openly in his own guesthouses where he feasts

his best men, in front of all god men from this house of God. That is from the holy writ, with which he soon wil make all his men courteous.

And as the one translating this in Old Norse (“Old Norsifying it”), knowing the poverty and ineptitude, this work adapted more into itself on the decree and request from the before mentioned worldly lord, as he well knew that here was much inequality and ineptitude, he asks that all good men to forgiving in all the things that he (the compiler) has said (here) in this (that is) unsuitably.

This work has its origin and its foundation from the before mentioned hall of God. That is, from the story itself and not from it explanations or interpretation but is rather having the same foundations. That is, the beginning of the writing, belonging to the first, Genesis, and later things that happened, thereby some things (which) belongs to other books as from *Scholastica Historia* and *Speculum Historiale* from his own request both for reading and enlightenment (/regulation).

***de Rijmbijbel* Prologue**

Father, Son and Holy Spirit, one God without beginning, give me help and fulfilment and grace in my mind that I may find the words, beautiful and good rhymes that I may bring forth what is in my passion. Mary mother of grace, you have given many (people) advice, comforted by your serenity. Help me Lady with peaceful prayer, that I achieve the elevated spirit that gives me power/energy and ability, which help me the most. Then I am not afraid to produce pretty rhymes of the talented I have wanted to translate into Diets /vernacular. I want to translate *Scholastica* in the vernacular from Latin. Lady, you must now busy yourself with being my comfort in my pain. Notice, what you here shall read, how it will be useful. Here men will find no faults or lies, no deceit of wrong words. But pretty rhymes and true words, how the time has come forth/ how time has developed since the beginning from the world and to the time when it happened that Jesus Christ, who accepted humanity/took on humanity (on himself), rose to heaven. I find rhymes to be entertaining and also true teaching. The nuts that on the outside are bitter and have hard shells, are like this story, remember that well. Men can barely get through with their teeth to get to the sweetness on the inside. The bitterness from this talented (work)/ spirit, is the wisest and greatest. From the length (of it) men could hardly understand it, this is the bitterness from the husk. The hardness of the shell is that no one, bad as it is, may understand what the words did, the sweetness comes from that people understands it correctly and to love it. And to know the truth well, and that the words taste so good to him because it is about the truth, so that he gladly listens to it. Because this can never give a loss. Listen here how God created the world, lit the firmament with stars, decorated the air with birds, set the fish in the water, decorated the earth with the animals and with herbs from (different) species. And how he finally made the human, when he had made him

everything he could wish for. But first now you shall pray together with me to God, through the truth of his knowledge that I turn to poetry, forgives me that I have meddled in such things, that made me make light of it for the hearts and minds and worldly things.

And to the mean persons that always again and again and at every moment is prepared to criticise my words. You mean people, hear and notice, you cannot stop me. You have begun far too late, it is stupidity that drives you. Your evil I think, harms no one but yourself in your mind. You have a heavy mind, you look thinner and paler, because the one that serves fro the eyes and betrays behind ones back, with this evil you are together with Judas (a pair with Judas). If you have the jealousy (that) I would write poetry and enlighten me with your critic and through punishing me, then you shall not be able to delay it. Because of this I start. May God clear my mind. Notice, I want you to really know/see, this is the beginning of all time.

Analysis

The writer of *Stjórn* does not seem to doubt his mission, or that he has chosen the right medium, prose, in which to inform his audience. He shortly and to the point informs us that this book was translated on the wish of the honoured king Hakon “the crowned”. The *causa* is thus at first sight only the will of the king, but this will come to change further down the prologue where the king is compared to God – or rather, God presented as King. The writer informs us that the text was translated from Latin from the book known as *heilagra manna blomstr*, ‘the flower of the holy men’. This also seems to work as a short *auctoritas*, as the work the originally would be written by a holy, presumably wise, man. Later in the prologue comes another claim, when we are informed that the crowned King, son of the late King Magnus, has had the translation made. Besides showing the genetic line of the king (a true king, son of a king) this is maybe to be interpreted as that the son continued the wish of his father, which was known to have been a religious man, seeking education on these matters. It could be that the double indication functions as a sort of extra *auctoritas*. The importance of the work is shown through the fact that not one but two kings stand behind its translation.

The writer also informs us that the translation is made *skynsqmum monnum til skemtanar*, ‘for the entertainment of wise and reasonable men’, and the writer continues, that are not able to understand Latin. An important point seems to be made here: a man could be both wise and reasonable even though he lacked the ability to understand Latin.

Then follows what seems to be the reason given for the importance of the work, the *utilitas*, or everyday use. Following the *Historia Scholastica* closely, the audience is informed of a parallel existing between the King’s court and the Heaven of God. Just as it is the custom that the King has three different houses, for different uses, our God above too has different spaces. In the Royal court, men will expect a house where the King is holding court, keeping the

peace between his people and serving judgement in conflicts. There will also be a house where the King eats and feasts his men, a guesthouse. The King will then have a third house, and this is a protected house where he can be alone with his thoughts, where he can find rest and where he can sleep. The courthouse where the King keeps peace is to be compared with this world that we see, here everything is to be ruled and taken care of according to the King's will. The title of King is now given to God above, giving the same honorific to both the earthly king and the heavenly at the same time, presumably stroking the earthly royal ego. Anyway, this is the reason why God is called Lord, as David tells us in the Psalms, because he says "The earth and everything on it belongs to the Lord".

The third and private house at the king's court is comparable to the inner life of every man, where he has his emotions as in a private and protected secret room. But the second royal room, is the room where the king *veiter sinum monum veizlur*, the guesthouse where he holds feasts for his men. This room is comparable to the Holy Bible. There the King, the heavenly one, gives his men the mild and loving guidance that results in that the men are more able to become temperate and mild, as is said in the psalms of David.

The holy number of the trinity is echoed in the description of *heilaghi guðs ritningu*, which is the house of feasts a.k.a. the Holy Scripture. This house of God is, as mentioned, compared to the guesthouse-building at the Kings court, and as this house has its foundation, walls and roof, so has the Holy Bible. The storyline itself is the foundation. The interpretation, telling readers what it is that is important to observe in every part in this story, is the walls. And the explanation of the interpretation, giving insight in the works described in the storyline, is the roof. This part of the prologue is a very close translation of the short prologue of the *Historia Scholastica*.

As God rules above, the king rules below. This seems to be the underlying meaning when the kings are introduced as the agents behind the translation, for the education of wise men without knowledge of Latin. The king's men will be introduced to information about the mass and the sacraments in a way that will be entertaining, so that the instruction will not be experienced as painful but appreciated. Here we seem to encounter the idea of vernacular instructions of the Holy bible as infotainment. Through having the translation read out aloud at court, the king shall influence his good men to think and to consider, and the king will in return make of his men a courteous people.

The writer continues with a passage that states that he who has translated this, *sáá sem norænaði*, 'as being the one who Norsified it', knows how bad it was, the poverty and wretchedness (of his work? of the Norwegian language? Of his own Norwegian? Or actually of the *mores* of the country?), but this work has been adapted with extra information, as the above mentioned honourable lord (the king, thus) seems to know that there are differences in

the educational level (of his men). The king also seems to expect that every good man staying at court shall wish to be educated on the matters mentioned in this work. Here the listeners get both another *utilitas*, the use of the work is to edify; as well as an important motivation to keep listening, because it is the mark of a wise man and, just as important, the wish of the king. The writer gives some of his sources, the first he mentions apart from the Bible is the *Historia Scholastica*.

Nothing from the prologue of *Historia Scholastica* is translated or even in the slightest reused in *de Rijmbijbel*. Van Maerlant has written an impressive prologue, but he has clearly not seen anything useful in the prologue of Comestor. Much of his prologue consists of prayer, first a humble prayer to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, *enich god sonder beghin*, ‘one and only God without beginning’, that He may grant him help, support and perseverance and the grace to find the right words and the proper (pure!) rhymes to present what he has to say. He then asks of Mary the merciful that she helps him to find the right mood, as she is known to be the one who gives advice and comfort to the masses. The bard needs to find an inner source of power, an *eleghe geest*, ‘the talent and equilibrium’ to present the text in *vraie rime*, ‘beautiful rhymes’, as he translates this text into *dietsche*, ‘the vernacular’. The writer goes on to inform the reader or listener that it is (*Historia*) *Scholastica* that he wishes to *ontbinden*, translate from Latin. The word *ontbinden* directly translated means something like “unbind”, make loose, here from the bonds of another language.

He directs himself directly to Mary, mother of Christ, and asks her *vrouwe, nu moeti hu bewinden troest te sine in mjne pine*, ‘Lady, you must make it your work to comfort me in my pain’. This could be a subtle reminder of their common ground. He too, as she once was with Christ, is in the pains of labour. Mary was giving birth to Christ; in the medieval period by the way often referred to not only as the son of God, but as the Word of God; while van Maerlant is “giving birth” to mundane words, i.e. the new text we are here reading.

Seeking the support from Heavenly agents for his undertakings not only shows an appropriate humility in the writer, but also seems to indicate that the *causa*; that the real reason behind the work-to-be-presented, is God and His will.⁵¹

The writer then turns directly to his readers. “Note, the one who is going to read this, how useful this will be. Here men will find no faults and no lies or fantasies. Here will be found beautiful rhymes and the truth about how time has unrolled from the beginning of the world and to the moment when Jesus Christ climbed up to heaven after having lived as a man”. Thereby van Maerlant has already given a short summary to what will come.

⁵¹ Compare, for example, what Minnis says about Ulrich of Strassburg in *Medieval theory of authorship*, p.162, “that the efficient cause of his *Liber de summo bono* was the Holy Spirit who speaks in us”.

He next states why he has chosen to write the text in a rhymed version: *hier vindic rime dachcorthinge/ende daer toe ware leeringhe/der noten gheliict dese ystorie/dat meerct wel in huwe memorie*, ‘I find rhymes to be a pleasure, entertaining (“making the day shorter”. This is by the way a direct parallel to the Old Norse word *skemtanar* that the compiler of *Stjórn* uses, which also could mean *tidtrøyte*, “making the time shorter”) and at the same time it is true learning, as well as this story, keep that in your memory’ (or it could be interpreted as “it will be well kept in your memory”) This texts can be like nuts with a thick and bitter shell, so hard that men can hardly get their teeth through them, van Maerlant continues: they give a bitter taste and make for long chewing but inside is the sweetness of wisdom. In his work, however, the listeners will come easily to the kernel of this sweet truth and will come to love and remember the story. This will be a text that people will wish to listen to (again and again) and they will never lose anything in listening to it. This part not only excuses and explains why van Maerlant has used a rhymed form to the translation of *Historia Scholastica*; it also describes the *utilitas* – the continual use of the work. In modern day we would probably call what van Maerlant (and the compiler of *Stjórn*) wished to create *infotainment*. A difficult subject is brought into your mind under your guard because you actually had pleasure in reading it /listening to it/seeing it.

Van Maerlant then lays out an itinerary. This, he writes, is what you as reader will find: Hear how God created the world, filled the firmament with stars and beautified the skies with the birds, the fish in the waters, the earth with animals and herbs. And last, how He made mankind after having given them all that they could wish for.

But first, van Maerlant continues, you, the reader, must *sonder vursten Gode met mi bidden mede dat hi mi dor dese warede die hic dichte van siere weet vergheue dat hic mi besmet hebbe in luegheliken saken*, ”without delay help me beg God that He, because I write the truth, knows to forgive me for having meddled in these things”. We as readers are made a living part of his translation, taking part in the work ourselves through our intervention on the writer’s part between him and God. The writer also seems to predict that he will be criticized for his choice of medium and translation “they criticize my work again and again”. He asks God to destroy (!) these malignant people, and he speaks directly to his enemies, whom he compares to Judas with their backstabbing. Their hatred will not hurt him, the writer, only the critics themselves –see, they are getting paler and thinner!

Thoughts on the Prologues.

In this thesis I have chosen to accept the prologues as expressions of the intentions of the writers regarding the original works *Stjórn I* and *de Rijmbijble*. I have chosen not to enter into the discussion of the authenticity of the prologues, or their function in copied material. Instead I have regarded the prologues as expressions meant to influence the first intended audience's reception of the text.

While the prologue of *de Rijmbijble* could be interpreted as humble and excusing, the writer asking the forgiveness of God for meddling with such an important matter as the Holy Bible, there is no meekness or humility to notice in the prologue of *Stjórn I*. Was humility really an expected trait in an academic prologue to any studies, let alone sacred material, or does it suggest a less academic approach? We know from mainland Europe that the humble approach was still used in the late 14th century, so there is no reason to think that it had “gone out of fashion” in the span of thirty or so years that lies between the writing of *de Rijmbijble* and *Stjórn I*. On the other hand, the writer of *The Historye of the Patriarks*, not to mention Comestor himself, has also left all humility out of the prologue. Can this be a question of cultural adaptation? Van Maerlant wrote for a continental audience and had been the tutor and chaplain at the small court of the count of Voorne, even if he is thought to have left this position at the time he was writing *de Rijmbijble*,⁵² to live in Damme in Flanders. Could it be that the formula of expression differed between the courtly cultures of Voorne and Flanders and the courtly culture of Norway? From the tacit, rather self-assured way the writer of *Stjórn I* express himself it could seem that he was in no great need of heavenly support – or at least that any such need was not to be expressed publicly.

Both writers seem to aim at making the Holy Bible not only understandable but digestible and entertaining for lay people, even if it is possible that their respective idea on intended lay audience was very different. A pleasurable way of learning is however explicitly mentioned by both. But while van Maerlant possibly aims at a wider audience, the writer of *Stjórn* aims specifically at the king's good men. This was presumably an exclusive group. Not only are these men to be educated for the good of themselves, but they are to be formed by this education into more courtly men, developing temperance, for the good of their king. Besides showing great expectations in the effect of his work, this could be taken to indicate that both courtliness and temperance were in short supply at the receiving court at the time. That the compiler of *Stjórn* writes that he has translated “The flower of holy men” indicates that his main source may have been some sort of an anthology, a *florilegium*. A curious fact is that in the Dutch of today, the word most used for an anthology is “bloemlezing” – the reading of flowers.

⁵² van Oostrom, Frits. *Maerlants wereld*, p 137.

Analysis of the main body of the translations

I. De creatione empyrei et quatuor elementorum

Stjórn

Here it is told how God almighty created heaven and earth and how Lucifer opposed with his arrogance and jealousy against God himself, and how God the Lord honoured the angels who turned to him in unchanging and eternal love in heavenly glory that is without end.

In the beginning God created heaven with all its angels, and it was immediately filled with the heavenly power, principally between all the things he created, and earth, that is to say mixed and disordered material for earthly main-creations; fire and air, water and earth as the seed and underlay for all bodily and visible things. Heaven was immediately created and decorated with countless crowds of holy angels and other heavenly and invisible powers that the church fathers and the holy writ tells about and explains with spiritual interpretations.

So that the things from long ago was with such words and in other manners made understandable between our bodily and mortal men, and made into stories. Explaining writings are the ones, which is primarily created and made in such a manner that they are perfectly fitted to (give) salvation, and turn a soul to peace so (that) there is no mind which would not turn to love and hold God almighty. But not often the spiritual nature is (there) in the same degree as the body. They were then too not yet perfected souls because they did not know their following fate/adventure. They then (afterwards) needed nothing except a perfect love of God and they loved him naturally above all other desire, they forthwith glowed with (love of?) himself and/but foremost from his presence. And with friendly love they loved (him) the most so that they wanted to be best (most good).

Now that Lucifer, one of the foremost angels, created, decorated and ornated before (the) others; that made him imagine (that) his beauty and being the foremost (was) his nature/fate and (with) wily wisdom he turned and acted in such a manner with his vainness that he wanted to be equal to or better than God himself. Because of this he separated himself from truth/reality at once in the same moment, and with this, in offence of all decency and eternal souls, so that from this he got no taste or knowledge of. And he fell in such a manner that he could demand the souls that had served him but not the ones too that God may have give to him if he had wanted to be obedient to him, so that he became all over/ inn every way smaller and lower because of his irreparable damage and fault, because he sinned from no other incitement than temptation. And as he fell he dragged a great manifold of angels with him, the ones which agreed with him and sinned themselves.

de Rijmbijbel

God made in the beginning the heaven, and with this too all the angels. The scripture names the heaven “Empyrius” as its correct name. That is where the angels began their existence, and he also made the earth. By the word earth, in the writings, all of us here understand that *with* the earth comes everything that lives on the earth, and everything that grows from her and that returns to her. This is too, and this is (most) wisely taught, (that) the material of all animals, all sorts of herbs, from trees and also the flesh of Adam, was brought forth there on the place. But didn’t God also make, he did afterwards and listen how: The four elements, water, fire, earth, air, they were here already made, on what men calls the earth. Notice the reason why, the world and the time is equally old, this truth tells us our saviour/ the holiness.

From nothing God made in the beginning the heaven and the angels in it. And the other elements too. The earth was from nature not to be divided from its beauty, therefore the scripture calls it priceless.

Analysis

Comestor is here concerned with the matter from which God created the heaven and earth, he created it with Verbum, the Word; and how Plato, Aristoteles and Epicurus all had stated the origin of the world incorrectly, because they claimed that matter, or atoms, were part of the beginning (and not the Word of God). He is also concerned with the aspect of eternity, that God, his world and the angels are eternal, and gives a short abstract of what is to come; the creation in six days, in three different strands of work; creation, ordering and adorning.

The writer of *Stjórn* chooses to inform us of the beginning of heaven, not earth, in a more practical way: that God created heaven and filled it with heavenly creatures and earth, as yet just the four elements in their respective pairs: fire and air, water and earth. The compiler of *Stjórn* then introduces the literature of the church fathers and the holy script itself, explaining the properties of religious books aimed to enlighten and elevate the souls of men. He goes on to inform us in more detail on the angels, beginning with Lucifer and his fall from grace.

The chapter continues for another three pages, not translated here, with information on the good angels and the names of some of them; Michael, Gabriel and Raphael. About Michael we are also informed about his four main tasks: he is a fighter of dragons (i.e. the enemy himself, the devil); the helper of the people of God: the collector of good souls; and the prepositus and leader of the heavenly paradise. According to the notations of Astås, this is taken from the *Speculi Maioris* of Vincent de Beauvais.

Van Maerlant too states that God first made the heaven and all the angels, and the ground-material that later became earth and every living thing on it: the four elements. He echoes

Comestor in telling his audience that the world and the time are equally old, but does not mention the aspect of eternity. He also informs us that the correct name of the heaven is, according to the bible, “Empyrius”, and that God made it all – heaven, angels, the elements beginning and therefore named priceless, may be seen as an etymological pun, as the word used for priceless, *edel*, is spelled *ijdel*, giving the clue for its intended pronunciation. The word is then *not* pronounced “eedel” as it would be today, but as “ei-deel”, which means “not-divide”. Categorizing words etymologically after how their sound corresponded with traits in what they symbolized, was a usual medieval technique.⁵³

Both translators have mainly ignored the other information Comestor gives us, and none of them introduces the philosophers – Plato, Aristoteles or Epicurus – at all. One reason for this could be that they knew (or suspected) that their audience would need too much explanation to be able to use information on how these three thought about the beginning of time and how this was all wrong, seen from the fact that the true beginning was the Word. Actually neither the compiler of *Stjórn* nor van Maerlant introduces the Word at all. Was the thought of the beginning of everything in the form of a mere word, thought to be too complicated to be of practical use for their respective audiences? The creation of the angels and the four elements are present in both translations, though they have not gotten this from Comestor on this point. Astås indicates Augustinus and Vincent de Beauvais as the sources of these parts of *Stjórn*. The dramatic fall of Lucifer, and the position of Michael as fighter and leader seems to be highlighted by the compiler of *Stjórn*. Maybe the intended audience of *Stjórn* was thought to need these dramatic happenings as a further incitement to listen to the work, and more than anything, to accept the “spiritual interpretations” of the church fathers? It is good for the soul, we learn, it turns the soul to God – and gives salvation. Possibly the audience of van Maerlant was considered to already acknowledged this, because they are instead informed that the earth, and every living thing on it, is made from the same material. As a comparison, *The Historye of the Patriarks* does give a clear and concise information on the three philosophers and how they were wrong: they all thought that *materia* already existed, from the beginning, and that God used *materia* to create the heaven and earth. As we know, this is wrong and it all began with that God, in his three persons, said one word. How one word could result in two things (heaven and earth) is also explained.

⁵³ Stoffers, Manuel, *De middeleeuwse ideeënwereld*, p 323.

II. De primaria mundi confusione

Stjórn

Genesis 2a The earth was desolate and bare without any decoration. **From scolastica historia.** That is to say as before mentioned that the work made on the world was invisible, desolate, after what Augustinus says in his before mentioned book. Thereto God created for all things a special form, every one (of them) in their own place and rank. **From genesi 2bc** And it was dark from airily shadows and uncleanliness everywhere around the world, and the holy spirit of God also floated over the waters. **From scolastica hýstoria** That is (what is), as said before above, the worlds finished work or material with/from his own will, and because of the thoughts of the following creations the finished work of the world or materials is for that reason called earth. Other times (it is called) abyss and sometimes waters, it is that it seems to belong to more (parts/properties) so that there is not only one name given to the main creation, because that was then immediately called heaven and earth. That the heaven and earth were created from this. For this reason the earth was said to be invisible and unordered/chaotic, and darkness (was) over the abyss, that she was then without all following forming, and she had then also no perceivable form and could not be touched/ felt if it had been any man there to try to do this. The same finished work (was) called water, because that it was without resistance and pliable, as (was) from this subsequently created things, and on the other hand/ on the other side that all the things that are fed/born in the earthly kingdom, every one, is it creatures, growing forest or growing grass and such things, all take from moisture and from water (their) nutrition and their forming.

de Rijmbijbel

And covered in darkness. The scripture tells that the Holy spirit of our Lord, which men shall understand as the will of God, this was carried on the water. These words may please us, because they mean and tell us about (in the future) the baptism men now use/pledge one self to.

Analysis

The compiler of *Stjórn* states that the earth was bare and desolate, but with form – it is not formless. It was just not touchable or visible, even if, the compiler ads in a leap of thought, there *had* been any man present to try to see or touch it. Airily shadows cover it, and uncleanliness. The first creation also has several names. Water, though pliable, is central as everything on earth thrives on or in it. (These comments could come from Comestor's short discussion on the fact that the spirit of God floated over just one element, water, and that in other languages the spirit floated over other things, but in the notations in this edition of *Stjórn*, made by Astås, it is indicated that Augustinus is the source). The Spirit of God is

actually left hanging over the waters. Comestor's comparison with a craftsman building a house is not used, but the compiler of *Stjórn* does state that all material was already in existence. He dwells on this, that the materia/materials of the world, as the start of all following creation, already was in place; and on the understanding that as he saw it, the world was created but still not really created, as the real creation happens on the first day of creation. His solution is, as we have seen, formidable: it was already created but still invisible and untouchable. He does not translate what Comestor wrote on the discussion among scholars of the darkness was already there before the beginning of time, and that what God did was to create light.

Van Maerlant is very short and to the point here, just telling us that in the darkness, the spirit of God was "carried on the water". But he does inform us that the Holy Spirit is to be understood as God's will, just as Comestor says. Van Maerlant then casts his net of imagination forward, and describes this moment of the Spirit floating over the water as the premonition or promise of the baptism of men, yet to come but present in the everyday life of his audience. Van Maerlant thus succeeds in placing the first beginnings of the world in his present day, with the connection between the Spirit of God and baptism. He does not linger upon the early forms of the earth or lack thereof, does not mention that there is a discussion on whether darkness is eternal and already existed when God created the light, and does not enter into the question of the existence of materials, or use the comparison with a craftsman. *The Historye of the Patriarks* on the other hand follows *Historia Scholastica* closely here, using both the discussion on the early existence of darkness, and a comparison with the materials of a carpenter.

III. De opere primae dici

Stjórn

From genesi.3 And God said thus: Be light. And immediately it was light there. **4** and he saw himself that the light was good and he separated that (and broke it) from the darkness. **5a** and then gave the name that it should be called day and the dark be called night. **From scolastica hýstoria.** As the light and darkness was separated was both sides on the command of God and from the fault and blame of Lucifer and his following of angels separated, so that for light is to be understood and noticed the angels that stood by and where affirmed in the presence and love of God, and for darkness the enemy is noticed/ meant and the ones that fell with him. They were all driven away, some entirely down into hell and some to the mist-filled air between heaven and earth but not so high that they have some pleasure and joy from the light

but also not so low that they may do much temptation and much calamities to us as their will is and thus everlasting hellish pain follows them wherever they are.

From genesi And so it was evening and morning, both together (making/constituting) a natural day. **From scolastica hystoria.** That it was two days, so that first as God created heaven and earth, he also made the light, as before is said. Now as that went down and decreased gradually then came from this (point) the evening of the first day and the following morning as we expects, and the same light going around the earth and then rising up in the morning. **From augustino** The before mentioned errant men/ heretics, called Manichean, say that the day had been ended by the evening, not that as the light was called day and the dark night, belonging to the day, and the evening, according the same work, (completed and) ended the day and because of this teaching the night belongs to its day. That means that a day is not over/ended until the night is passed and it has become morning (again). In the same manner days are counted from one morning to the morning the other/next day. So the night was (completed and) ended, and the second day began.

de Rijmbijbel

Then God with his word made the light as I have heard described. The word of God, which is the Son who redeemed us, that is the one that begot flesh in Mary. The light before the sun rose was a sky, clear and beautiful as the dawn on the firmament differing in light from the power of the sun, as the men of God tells us. Then God saw that the light was good and quickly separated that light from the darkness. Here on this place we understand that Lucifer and his crowd were obviously separated because of their unforgivable sins, from the angels that persevered. The ones that kept standing (by God), the book calls the light and the ones that fell, and rightly, could well be called darkness. Then God called, as men reads, the light by name and called it day. The time when darkness lay, our Lord called by the name of night. And this was as we have observed, a Sunday and the first day ever to smile upon the world.

Analysis

The compiler of *Stjórn* quotes Genesis, and then goes directly on to the separation of the angels, connecting the good ones to light and Lucifer and his followers to the night and darkness. He describes how the followers of Lucifer are driven away, some the whole way to hell, but some, not so evil, is placed in the grey and misty regions of heaven, to low to have any pleasure of the light. This seems to be taken from a later chapter of *Historia Scholastica*. He then translates Comestor in the description of how light dwindles and comes back, creating a new day, and then goes on to discuss when the beginning and the end of each day is. Here he agrees with Comestor: a natural day is from the morning, through the day and following evening and night, ending with the coming light of the following day. Not, he says,

quoting Augustinus, as the heretics, the Manicheans, thought; that the day ends with the evening and that the following night belongs to the coming day. This is presented as a known truth and actually informs us how the days of the intended audience, their time and culture, was counted. Considering that as there was no clocks to count midnight from, as we have today, this seems entirely logical as beginning a day from 00.00 as we are doing, was hardly feasible.

On his description of the first day of creation, van Maerlant, at last, introduces the Word of God. This Word made it light. Was van Maerlant perhaps one of the persons (mentioned by Comestor as being totally wrong!) that thought that the darkness was eternal and already existed, and that God only created light in an already eternally existing darkness? That could maybe explain why he did not use the discussion on this topic from the text of Comestor. Van Maerlant seems to have found that the information of the Word was more fitting here, at the beginning of the first day, maybe because this is when we see that there are results coming from the words (or Word) of God. Again he connects the early days of creation to the life of Christ, and Christ, van Maerlant tells us, is the Word of God made flesh. This was of course a widely spread image in the medieval period, mirrored in both literature and pictures, among others with pictures of baby Jesus sleeping in a crib made of an open book. That van Maerlant repeats the image here makes it all the more plausible that the birthing of the Word Christ was what van Maerlant had in mind when he, in his prologue, reached out to Mary, mother of Christ, for support in his own pain.

Van Maerlant also describes the light that God now made, before the sun has been made, just as Comestor did. Probably because this could make you wonder: there was light but no sun yet? It was however a light like the sky at dawn. This, men can relate to. Van Maerlant too tells us about the sorting of angels, as does Comestor, and about how they are connected to light and darkness according to if they stood by God or fell from grace. Van Maerlant informs us that the first day was a Sunday – which is natural as the day of rest is the Jewish Sabbath on Saturday. Both translators are true to the main core of the first day, the creating, separating and the naming of light and darkness, and seems to agree that the day came first, continuing into the night. None of them translates what Comestor writes on the names of day and night, taken from the Greek words. The translator of *The Historye of the Patriarks*, as a comparison, tells us that God willed light to be made (through the Word) because he wanted “all things to be perfect and pleasant. (None of “our” writers seems to have considered the reason why God would create light – and darkness – in the first place!) The translator of *The Historye of the Patriarks* also declares that evening was created first, and then day came out of the night, while Comestor writes that God introduces the light gradually, letting the first day unfold into the evening and first night.

IV. De opere secundae dici

Stjórn

From when God created the fixtures of heaven on the second day and separated the waters. The second day God created the fixtures of this world-half, so that heaven was immediately in place, created, decorated and filled with holy angels who there were created as said earlier. Then he made the firmament, says the people who has explored this and have some knowledge thereof, and with this he separated all the water that he wanted to stay in this world from that which was over him (/the firmament), it is so strong and compact as crystal or the hardest smooth ice that does not get milder or melt from any heat from fire **6** and he said this **From genesi**. Let there be a firmament between the waters and let this separate the waters from each other **From scolastica historia. 7a** God made the firmament in the main form of a tub/barrel so strongly put together and fastened that it has all the fixed stars and just a clarity in itself as crystal so it curves a little, comparable to a rounded eggshell, and separates so with this the water that was under him from that which was above him. Then he made under the firmament other heavens bearing the same name, and Heaven (the heavenly kingdom) itself. And why God wanted water to stay above the firmament only he knows, from what Comestor says, so that some men has imagined that sometimes rains comes from there. Augustinus says that whatever the water is exactly; and in which manner it is there, doubt in no way that it is there. So that the authority of the Bible (/this, what is written) is greater than all the intelligence and investigations of human interpretations and thought. **genesis 7c** and quickly it became so **8a** God then gave him the name of heaven. **From scolastica hýstoria** So that heaven in this also means cover, because it covers and conceals for us all the invisible things. **From genesi 8b** and then on this subject it was evening and morning the second day. **scolastica hýstoria** Hebrew men says that the angels on this day became enemies even though this gives no place (sitting) for judgement of this so that the work of this day is (as) good as the one God did on the other days. Then there is that in any way none of these specially reads that God saw that it was good. Which they seem to agree in who teaches (/are used to?) to sing masses in praise for the angels on Mondays, they who were affirmed in the service of God. And the holy teacher holds the second to be truer and because of that it leads all into separation and disagreement. Still (it is/was/became) a double (/split into two) case from what was one, and because of this the before mentioned languages /eloquent speakers accepted it (as having) more care (/study) and valuable interpretation /function. May it too be obvious from the words of our Lord that the angels has fallen on the first day, as he himself says, there where he himself speaks of this between other things in the gospel of John, that he was a murderer from the beginning and he was at no time affirmed in the truth. It must be said that his work of the third day are grown out of the work of the

second day as later must be seen/obvious. Then this (the second day) is not praised as (the) others, before on the third day, when it is ended and completed.

de Rijmbijbel

The second day it is known that God made the firmament. In the middle of the water he made a clearly formed shape like a bowl, firm and hard as crystal. It is known that the stars are set in this firmament. It is named firmament because it holds everything firmly together. And it also holds the waters above it with strength so it does not fall down. Why it (the water) is there at all, I can only say, that no one knows but God our Lord. Without that such people say in their teachings that the dew comes from this. He has named this the firmament says the book, the heaven by this name, because it, all seen together, already stood as a heaven over the world, water, fire, mountain and valley.

Analysis

The compiler of *Stjórn* follows Comestor in his description on the fixtures and the firmament, describing the firmament as being hard as ice and not melting from any heat. Just as Comestor he likens the form of the firmament to an egg, a rounded eggshell to be more precise, and its material is compared to crystal. But he also has another description and likens it to a tub or barrel, one that is very well put together. He mentions that God created other heavens, all with the same name, and the Heavenly kingdom itself. Skilfully braiding Augustinus, Genesis and *Historia Scholastica* together, he concludes that one does not know why God wanted water to be held above the firmament, if that maybe was, as men says, to have for to use as rain. Anyway, the compiler writes, the Bible has more authority than all the intelligence and investigations of humans (so whatever the reason, there would be one, a good one, one gathers). This seems to have been a necessary comment in his surroundings, as he opens the question especially, and then uses different sources to answer it, and does so with authority. He ignores the dip by Comestor into Greek words for heaven, but makes a strange comment: *þuiat himinn hefer í þessum stað allt eitt at þýða ok hulning fyrer þa sǫk at hann hýlr ok hirðer fyrer oss alla vsýniliga luthi*, ‘that heaven in this also means cover, because it covers and conceals for us all the invisible things’, which does not seem to make any sense etymological in Old Norse. He also ignores the turning of the world, and goes instead on to the discussion on why this day is not seen as as good as the other days. In this he quotes Comestor from later in the *Historia Scholastica*, on the subject of Hebrew men. They think that the angels became enemies on this second day, and that this was the reason why the work that day was not seen as equally good as on the other days. This, the compiler says, they seem to agree to, who sings masses to the angels on Mondays (and here we see, without that it is explicitly said, that he too agrees on that the work on the creation was started on the Sunday). But the compiler explicitly agrees with Comestor, and writes that the Lord himself tells us

that the angels fell on the first day, and not on the second. In consequence the reason why the second day was not praised before on the third day is, that this is when all the work on it was completed.

De Rijmbijbel too follows Comestor closely on the description of the firmament, but equals it to a bowl instead of an egg, firm and hard as crystal. He also explains the word firmament after the etymological practises of the time; it is called *firmament* because it is holding *firmly*. He sidesteps a discussion on the question of why God wished to have water above us by saying that this, as he has said before, only God knows. This actually seems to come down to the message in what Augustinus says but without the mentioning of human explorations. Some men, van Maerlant continues, say that dew comes from this (the water held above the firmament). The Middle Dutch word *dau* could in extension be used for moisture, thus it might be that it could cover rain as well. Van Maerlant then picks up on Comestors etymological discussion on the word heaven, but in Middle Dutch – it is called *hemel* because it already *gehemelt* (spans) the world.

Both translators follow what seems to be the main-thread by Comestor: the existence, form and properties of the firmament. Both makes a deviation into the question as to why God would have wanted to have water held above us by the firmament in the first place. None of the translators goes into the description of the firmament as an oven, reflecting sunlight, something which is translated in *The Historye of the Patriarks* in detail, while *The Historye of the Patriarks* on the other hand, makes no mention of why God would want waters above us, or mentions the withholding of blessings this day. Van Maerlant too ignores that the second day is not seen as as good as the others. The compiler of *Stjórn* seems to find this so important that he tells us of the idea of Hebrew scholars, thereby introducing more possible explanations for why the second day is different from the others.

V. De opere tertiae dici

Stjórn

From this, that God let earth be born and thrive, and made the sea and the earth.

Scolastica historia.

On the third day, God let the water that was under the firmament be gathered together in one place and the earth appear. Then he made four earlier mentioned main figures each with its sphere in the firmament after how it suited from how they were thick or thin. The sun (*eldinn*) was fastened to the firmament because this is the lightest/easiest. It is believed that the heavenly bodies/planets has been in a group/has been grouped together. The air is in its upper

part clear and in the lower part it has a lot of roughness from winds and moist mist and thunder, snow and lightning and other of these things that belongs there and that we have full experience of. Then (thereafter) the water where it is gathered drifting in the abyss, from this point it comes, as from a mother-source, to all the waters in the world via secret rivers/tunnels, and surrounds the world to the thriving and benefit of men.

At the bottom, he created the earth inmost of all of them, because she is the heaviest of them (weigh heaviest of them, measured against the others) as if (measured) on scales, and in the middle of earth setting a midpoint with all its extremely heavy soil and all sorts of ore. Granite and gemstones and all other kind of stones and as he began the work of this day he said thus: **genesis 9c** Let all the water that is under the heavens be gathered in one place, so that dry land may be seen. And immediately this was done/ was so. **From augustino.** So he separated and divided the seas in that pattern/manner as we now have, (with) this the invisible work of the materials of the earth that sometimes is called void earth and irregular, at other times darkness and abyss, over which the spirit of God floated in the earlier section. So as the earth is formed from the same materials, showing clearly in this case as it is now seen, and is both salt and sweet.

It may be that this water, that was veiled in some moist mist and which surrounded all the room and open space that is in the air, as with drizzle and light snow, captures in a small way that which on the other side (of the firmament?) is bond so strongly together. **10ab** He called the dry land earth and the big gathering of water he called sea. And when the /work on the water/ watery work was finished /filled and had appeared/, Moses says that **10c** this was good and well done and at the same time God added other work to this, **11** and said he thus: **From genesi** Let the earth grow and thrive with flowering grass, making its seed, and with fruit-bearing trees and all kinds of fruit thereby, making all its growth in the manner of its own, each with its own seed, shall be on the earth. And everything became so **12a-c** that the earth immediately grew green grass with the best flowers and carrying seed of its own kind, and fruit-bearing trees with great harvest, each one having their own seeds in their own pattern/form. **From scolastica hystoria.** The earth did not bring forth its planting so slowly and time-consuming as now. Rather all her beauty and grace immediately was in place with its real (full) flowers and growth. It is also so that some men has discussed and explained upon when the world was created, as to our time(-measuring) So it is that flowering and growth from most things has (its) harvest time in the month of August from the earlier that the earth brought forth fruit-bearing trees with great harvest and grass with its seed. The very holy church has affirmed in its knowledge and teachings that it was created in the month of March. The same day God too planted the earthly paradise, the land that is called this, and which lies eastward (in the eastern part) of the half of the world that is named Asia. Here more than in any other land there is inhabitable land and for that reason the flood of Noah in

any case passed close by. And (he/God) filled it immediately with all kinds of desirable and graceful fountains and with beautiful flowing waters, with earthly berries (and) flowers, and every sort of the trees which was full of delight and pretty growth. Now that this was done **12d** God say that this was all well created. **13** and then it became evening and morning and the third day ended.

de Rijmbijbel

The third day we read about God that he with his commandments gathered the water that was under the firmament in a reservoir/ gathered the waters. This revealed dryness. This dryness God then named earth. And the gathering of water where all the water was together, he called sea. Thereafter God experienced that it was good and said directly: I wish to give you (the earth) herbs, and let her greenness appear, so that from this seed/grain may come. And I wish trees to stand there, bearing apples (/fruit) each in their own manner. And fruit (/harvest) of many kinds. Because his will must be done.

Analysis

The compiler of *Stjórn* describes how four “main figures” are made and fastened on their place, here on the third day. In this he describes the creation of the elements, and how the fire, maybe equalled to the sun, is fastened to the firmament because it is the lightest. Then air is described, clear at its top-layer and rough and moist from thunder, snow and lightening, in its lower part. The water comes next, gathered in some depth (an abyss, the mother-source of all water, feeding rivers and the likes via secret tunnels) and for the thriving and benefit of men. It would seem that he writes for an audience well versed in using the oceans for beneficiary purposes, and for which the four elements were familiar enough to be interesting. The earth/the element of earth, being the heaviest, is created “at the bottom”, inmost, of all the elements. The hidden treasures of the earth, such as ore and gems, granite and other useful types of stones are mentioned. The different aspects of the globe we know as earth are mentioned, quoting Augustinus: it has hidden materials, darkness and abyss (the same mentioned earlier, which God floated over, the writer adds) and is both salt and sweet. The compiler of *Stjórn* is open to the idea, that the water that the firmament holds, may well be what we see in drizzle, snow and other moisture on earth, and this he uses here (and not as van Maerlant, with the creation of the firmament on the second day). For the creation of grass and trees he quotes *Historia Scholastica*, embellishing it a little in telling that it did not grow so slowly and time-consuming as contemporary crops, but sprung out immediately. He also follows Comestor in the discussion of *when* this happened, compared to contemporary time. The fruits mirror harvest time, August. But everything sprung up immediately, and the spring is the beginning of all green, and the Church, is according to its teachings, created in the spring, in the month of March. The creation of earthly paradise on this the third day is

mentioned, and first after this creational work the chapter is concluded with the words of Genesis.

De Rijmbijbel is here, on the other hand, very much to the point. It relates only the bare facts of the gathering of the waters and the appearance of dry land, and how both was named by God, but adds an etymological item: why the earth got its name. *Earth* is called *aarde* in the Dutch from today, and often *eerde* or *(a)arde* in Middle Dutch texts, but as in other languages some dialects introduce an extra *h* in front of words and here this is made use of. Van Maerlant spells *aarde* as *harde*, equalling it to the word *hard*, thus explaining, without more words necessary, its name. “This dryness God then named *harde*.” Comestor too is, by the way, adding etymological explanations in his description of the third day, but then in Latin, of course. The herbs and trees created by God bear fruit/harvest of their own kind, van Maerlant continues, because his (Gods) will must be done. The importance of that the trees brings forth their fruit to be obedient to God, is also found in *The Historye of the Patriarks*, and this writer too, gives only the short facts of the third day, but also again adds that this was done because God wanted things to be perfect, profitable and pleasant.

VI. De opere quartae dici

Stjórn

On the fourth day God created the sun and other celestial bodies. From *speculo historiale*.

On the fourth day God adorned and wonderfully decorated the heaven and all that with heavenly lights that he had made especially (before). (He) began with the upper half of the world making all the celestial bodies that was to (should) give the earth light, both night and day each after its own manner and clarify all times each with the manifold of their nutrition. **14** and (God) said thus: **Genesis** Let it be shining stars fastened to the firmament that they will clarify and separate each day and night, that they are signs, separating hours, days and years. **15** Let it be light on the firmament and let it light the earth, and immediately it was. **scolastica hystoria** Not only that God (lets) these shining lights that we names planets /celestial bodies be to beautification and usefulness to the world, but moreover as signs or marks, so that from them may be seen what is (if it is to be) clear weather or unclear (bad), nice weather or stormy. Or that from these (the stars) should be the 12 signs that we call star signs, that especially (has the assignment) to separate time, that is spring and summer, autumn and winter, and with them that what which we call solstice in winter and summer and the time of the equinox autumn and spring and also to separate days, weeks and months, years and age. **De genesi 16** God also did another work, (he) made two big celestial bodies. That is the sun

that should, with its brightness, light the days. The moon is the planet that lights the nights. Moreover he made stars **17a** and fixed them in the firmament, except the 7, with the sun, celestial bodies that are called planets. They wander and moves freely in the air and moves against the before mentioned heavenly firmament, there governed by its rounding and turning. He placed them there **17b** for the reason that it, with the light that it has (that comes from) the sun, should light the whole world and separate light and darkness. **scolastica hystoria**. Not only did God let both moon and stars especially lighten the nights so that it should not totally lack in beauty, as it would have if it was without light and lightness but also no less so that the men that are dying in the hours of the night should have help and comfort, and so too sailors and other travelling men and especially in Africa, in desolated land or sand-deserts where small winds erase and covers the roads were others have travelled. **ysidorus**. There are some birds that doe not tolerate the daylight well. Noctua is one and also nocticorax. The reason it is called noctua is that it flies at nights and is not seen at any time during the days because as the day breaks his eyesight at once deteriorates. He is only on the island called Crete. And it is so that if he leaves there to other places, then he dies at once as he arrives there (to the other place). The bird that is called strix is also a night bird, together with several others, and most of them eats much (/mainly) at night.

Just as the sun was necessary and useful because its work made the sky bright and it filled its office as the light of the world, but also the same sky had little light and weak and no or little pleasure without the highest thing that now are shining stars. **scolastica historia**. There are different thoughts and opinions as to how the sky changes, one is that it returns/turns back (to what it was/changes?) to what it looked like/ was made as, as the star that visited the kings from the east. Or if that moves and follows the sun or if the body of the sun is made of the same. So it is also written that the sun was made in the morning and in the east, and the moon in the evening of the following night and in the east. But some people will say that they were both created in the morning the sun in the east and the moon in the west and that the time that the sun set, the moon vaults (up) the following night from the east. The holy Augustinus agrees with the first explanation in his earlier mentioned book about Genesis. It is also discussed between the ones that are called talkative and striding, asking about how the moon was first created, either as new moon, or the argument is of it was full or fourteen nights. That is because that it would then not have been decreased at that moment. None of the groups agree on all levels. Rather they walk among themselves talking flowering with total conviction, each of their (own) position, is it new moon or full moon, as well as (or) the fourteen nights, that God perfected. **De genesi.18c** And he saw for himself that it was well created. **19** It became evening and morning and the fourth day ended.

de Rijmbijbel

The fourth day our Lord made the sun and the moon and the stars that he sent and set in the firmament. Far beyond the stars the sun and the moon stays without fault. And all the planets too. The earth is on the lowest place seen from all the stars. And if men reads he finds that the moon is the smallest of the stars, still lighting us from far away

The wise men say openly that the sun is eight times as big as the whole earth and the moon is just a part (of the size) of the earth, so it is described. The moon and the stars are given to lighten up the night because otherwise it (the night) would be ugly. And because the ones (sailing) troubled on the waters and the ones wandering in the dessert, should be comforted by this. and most of all we are reading of Libya in the big sand, where a small/insignificant wind can blow (the sand) over the roads so that they are nowhere to be seen. Without the stars showing men how to find the way, no one could travel there. Nor would men ever find someone to travel the sea. Men too reads, that one can find birds that almost cannot stand the light from the sun. They must fly and seek food in the night and eat under the stars. Then you will have been informed that not alone because of its beauty or its light the sun, the stars and the moon are set in their place, but to give information on fine weather and also bad weather, because they separate day and night, weeks and months and the power of the years, spring, summer, autumn and winter. The ones who does not have a sliver of stupidity stinging in their minds can learn much from this. Understand the ones who can notice this that the sun was made in the east to rise (from there) as well. The evening after, not long after that she had set, God made the moon rise. And her light was good, this the masters correctly prove.

Analysis

The compiler of *Stjórn* uses Comestor in that God *adorned and decorated* the heaven with the heavenly lights – he had already paved the way for these creations in the previous day, when he described the making and placing of the elements. He then lays the ground for much of this chapter with mentioning the manifold of their *neringhu*, meaning ‘nutrition’, but also ‘their use’ or ‘what you can gain from them’ (maybe a concept akin to the “profitable” of the writer of *The Historye of the Patriarks?*). Quoting Genesis he tells of the creation of the stars and shows the use of them for men in separating day and night, time, days and years. The writer then quotes Comestor on their other uses, as to indicate clear or bad weather (or even stormy weather) to come, and making up the twelve star signs, especially assigned to separate time, spring, summer, autumn and winter, but also showing spring and autumnal equinox and the two solstices. They separate time in days, weeks, months, years and ages.

Returning to Genesis, the compiler tells of the creation of the sun and moon, and other planets, seven altogether (the sun and moon was traditionally counted as planets in medieval

society). These are not fixed to the firmament like the stars, but wanders freely in the air under the firmament, turning according to its rounded form. The writer of *Stjórn* also quotes Comestor on the use of moon and stars for beautifying the night and for helping sailors and travellers. But he adds to this list the task of helping and comforting men who are dying at night. The travellers in Africa are also especially mentioned, in desolated land or sandy desserts, where even small winds erase the roads made by other travellers.

He then quotes Isidorus de Sevilla from his *Etymologiae*, on the matter of birds. Here the writer of *Stjórn* of course also goes into the meaning of words, as that the *noctua* is called thus because it flies at night. We get some insight in the lives of this bird, its eye-sight deteriorates during day and it is only found on the island of Crete. If it ever leaves Crete, it dies the very moment that it arrives somewhere else! The *strix* is another bird mentioned, and as the *strix*-family is the family of owls, these must surely have been well known to Scandinavians under their Old Norse name, *ugla*, but this connection (*strix* – *ugla*) is not made in the text.

The compiler of *Stjórn* then opens a can of worms, in the form of a rather rambling discussion on the universe and, primarily, of the creation of the moon. Quoting *Historia Scholastica* in a later chapter, he writes that there are different opinions on how it comes that the sky changes. Does it turn back to how it originally looked as the star that guided the kings from the east did? Does it follow the sun? The sun, he writes, was made in the morning in the east and the moon was made in the evening also in the east. But, some say that both were created in the morning, the sun in the east and the moon in the west, to await nightfall. Augustinus, we are told, supports the first theory. Also, quarrelsome men are discussing how the moon was made, was it full or new? They never agree, each using their arguments with full conviction on their own position. Offering no suggestion for a correct view but leaving it at that, he ends the chapter with the final quote of the day from Genesis.

Van Maerlant too explains that God on the fourth day made the sun, the moon and the stars, and placed them in the firmament, claiming that the sun and moon, together with the other planets (their number is not mentioned), was higher placed than the stars. *De Rijmbijbel* takes the discussion from *Historia Scholastica* on the size of the planets, namely the sun, the moon and the earth. But while Comestor says that the sun is eight times the size of the earth and the moon and the earth is even in size, van Maerlant describes the sun as eight times the size of the earth but the moon just a part of the size of the earth. We then learn from van Maerlant of the purpose of the stars: To lighten up the night together with the moon to beautify the night, and to comfort and lead sailors, and travellers wandering in the desserts, the big sands, of Libya. There even insignificant winds can blow the sand so it covers up the roads, leaving men to navigate the dessert by the stars. Comestor is followed quite closely here, except that Comestor also specifies the comfort of the passengers of the sailing vessels, and that the

night-living birds are mostly in Ethiopia. In the same geographic place, groups of travellers need the stars to navigate through the sands.

The night-living birds are mentioned by van Maerlant too, these birds cannot stand the sun. They fly and seek food in the night under the stars. Van Maerlant ignores the more theological parts of *Historia Scholastica*, of the Holy spirit taking its place in the dove and in the star of the Magi, and instead continues with the practical uses of the stars and other heavenly objects, foretelling weather and separating the time into day and night, weeks, months and years, in spring, summer, autumn and winter. He does not touch upon the star signs or divination at all, and does not enter into any discussions on how the moon was created. The sun, he tells us, was created in the east, where it also rose, and the moon was made to rise as the sun set the following evening. No alternatives are suggested. Both the compiler of *Stjórn* and van Maerlant picks parts of the text of Comestor, developing other and different points each in their own directions. The help given to travellers in the deserts is interestingly enough mentioned by both our authors, even if none of them places it in Ethiopia as does Comestor. The compiler of *Stjórn* places it in Africa, while van Maerlant is more specific, naming Libya. *The Historye of the Patriarks* shortly retells the making of sun, moon and stars to separate time and help creatures labouring by night, foremost sailors and birds.

VII. De opere quintae dici

Stjórn

From that God created fish and birds on the fifth day. Scolastica historia and speculum historiale.

On the fifth day God decorated the air with flying birds and the water with swimming fish, choosing ability from the water to each one so that in (the) water they quickly (and) easily move as if it were thin (permeable) as air. In air too (they) move quickly and with suitable ease as if it thickens. **augustinus.** If these the most wise/educated men, whose words this renders, should create any confusion or doubt, is it appropriate to know well that these the wisest of men, in their manner, look into these things and explore this work meticulously with much vigil. The mist is thronged with water that the birds are flying in. So that the air is thronged and filled with the moistures and winds coming up as fog from all the earth and from the waters that very well suffers the flight of birds. From there comes such a great fall of dew at night even with clear weather that the grass is drenched only with this the same dew on the morning after, as everyone can see for themselves. It is also written in the most credible books and in /holy writings/ the holy scripture that there is the/a mountain that is called Olympus and stands on the Greek peninsula named Macedonia, and it is so enormous big that it from

that reason knows nor skies nor wind Because the air where the birds fly in, there is so full of water, and for that reason say men, no birds fly there. And it is so wisely and knowledgeable arranged, that the men that are chosen for this used to, year by year, climb to the top of the same mountain to bring their offerings. I do not know exactly where, says the holy Augustinus. Then they wrote some strange things up there in the earth or dust where they all were found unharmed the year after they came (to be written) there. May that in no way happen/ this can in no way happen, as every knowledgeable man knows, (if it is not so that) there does not come nor wind nor rain. And because the air was much thinner than they liked, and (because) the situation with no gust of wind is against their way and their nature, so they withstood (it) in this way: with these wet mushrooms that they lay by their own noses, that is because these holds in thicker air that is more to their nature. They say they had not seen one bird there. So then says the most credible and believable writings sensibly that because it is (otherwise) unfair that not only fish and other creatures are floating in water but also (in the same manner/at the same time) flying birds has permanent seat/ a fast hold on water, from the reason that they may both/also beautifully fly in the air (as well as) because of that which rises and thickens from the earth and from the oceans humidity and moisture. **genesis 20** God then said: let the waters fill up with crawling creatures and the sort of birds fly under the fixed heaven above the earth. **scolastica hýstoria**. The fish is here called crawling creatures because they are swimming lengthwise in rapid moves and too, that they easily move on their breast(stomach). These words confused the wise Plato very much, the time that he came down to Egypt and there read in the books of Moses that flying birds were led out over the earth he thought that Moses had then differed/understood/meant that flying birds only were the decoration and pride down by (/close) to the earth, and that good angels and bad had their home in the upper sky for decoration and beauty but that is not so. Because good angels are in heaven as before is said. And bad (angels) were chased away and roam (hidden) in the misty air, being themselves in eternal suffering and not the decoration or pride of anything. **Genesis.21** God also created big whales and other living creatures, and other similar sorts of fish what the waters should yield as its own gift, and flying birds all of its own kind. God saw that this was well created and blessed both the fish and the birds in this way, saying: Grow and multiply and fill the waters of the seafarer and multiply the birds themselves then over the whole earth. It then was evening and morning and the fifth day ended.

de Rijmbijbel

The fifth day God decorated growth and sky with great honour. The sky he gave what could fly. And what could swim went to the ground. Fish and birds, that is true, he made both as being from/ belonging to the waters there. God made everything on root, small and big, that is fed by water. And whatever walks and or flies, the one that says that he could make this, he

both lies and does wrong. This bad spirit gives sin. Then he blessed them because he wanted them to do his will.

Analysis

The compiler of *Stjórn* follows Comestor in that God *decorated* air and water. Comestor underlines how easily water and air flows, the one into the other, and the writer of *Stjórn* develops this, into that the ability of water was chosen to each of the main-species fish and birds, making them move easily in water, as if that was thin as air, and move easily in air as if they were carried by (the thickened substance of) water. With the help of Augustine he explains this more in detail, assuring his audience that this is thoroughly investigated by the wisest of men. The air, mist, is filled with water, making it possible for the birds to fly, while in fact they are moving through water, just as fish, but in the sky. This water rises as fog from the earth, and this same water is the reason that the grass is drenched with dew in the mornings, even though the night has been clear. That is with no rain to account for the moisture. This everyone can see for themselves. Also, the compiler tells us, there is a mountain called Olympus in Macedonia, a Greek peninsula. This mountain is so high that it “knows neither skies nor wind” and because of this there is so little moisture up there that no birds can fly. The air is too thin, not thickened with moisture as it normally is. On a yearly basis men are chosen to bring offerings up to the mountain, and they survive their climb through breathing through water-drenched mushrooms, that helps thicken the air they breathe. These men have reported never to have seen birds fly there. Thus water is the natural habitat, seating, for both fish and birds, the latter (as said) flying on the moisture rising from the earth. Nothing of this is mentioned by Comestor. Via a quote from Genesis the compiler of *Stjórn* then moves back to *Historia Scholastica*, and tells us that fish is called *skriðkuikendi*, reptiles, because they move sidewise quickly on their breasts. Comestor does however not mention that they move on their breasts but instead that they do not use legs. Following Comestor closely, the compiler tells about the confusion of Plato, coming to Egypt, reading the books of Moses. He then thought that Moses had meant that birds was for the adornment of the earth and that the air was filled and decorated with both good angels and bad (the compiler of *Stjórn* does not use the word “demons”, as Comestor does). But that is not so. The good angels are in heaven and bad angels were driven away, roaming hidden in misty air, being in eternal suffering and not a decoration for anything. It is obvious that we are not to think otherwise! It is a strange concept to us today that demons too should roam layers of the air, but Comestor describes this too, and he is the direct source here, so it must have been “common knowledge” in scholarly circles at the time.

Going back to Genesis, the compiler tells us about how God created big whales and other similar living creatures and flying birds, and how he told the fish to multiply and “fill the waters of the seafarer” (the birds to multiply and spread out over the earth). Again we are

shown both the blessing of God and the use of his creation at the same time. Dare we think that the seafarers' waters were known to as well as important to the audience?

De Rijmbijbel shortly informs us that God decorated the ground and the skies, with birds given to the sky and fish to the ground level, the water. But both belong to the water, in fact, it would seem that everything is connected through the water or their need of water, because we are told that everything with a root feeds on water. No one can make these creatures (except God), and it is a sin to claim it. This seems a strange thing to write. Why would anyone claim to be able to create a fish or a bird? Strange is also the comment that God blessed them because he wished them to do his will, and not the other way around, that he blessed them because they already did his will. There is no mention here of "be fruitful and multiply" or of Plato, Moses or what is in the sky apart from birds. Also, none of the writers uses or adapts any of the thoughts which Comestor has, on how a living thing can have motion but not an eternal soul. It is possible that this was considered too difficult a material for the audience, as it seems to have been one of the great theological questions of the period.

As a comparison, *The Historye of the Patriarks* too has a very short entry, but it adds that God made fish in the water and birds belonging to the earth (and not the sky!) because the water and earth was "not yet fully arranged to the pleasure of mankind".

VIII. De opere sextae dici

Stjórn

From when God created leaf and grass and decorated the earth with all kinds of flowers and creatures.

On the sixth day God (did the last decoration) decorated the earth at last. As the (one of) before mentioned four main forms (i.e. the elements) that are heaviest and lowest, all laid (out) in the world-half of the Lord, that is (under) Heaven. He had already filled the air and the waters with beautiful creatures and decorations. On this day he then created on the earth three sorts of creatures. One is livestock, that (is) what we call dairy cattle. Another is the reptiles. The third is four legged creatures like wild animals. Because God already knew that man would/could fall in sin, he created livestock for him to eat and to help and support him in his subsequent travails. Because *jumentum* means in Old Norse something like a helping creature. At the same day he also created the man to settle on this worldly earth that he had perfected and decorated beautifully, making him of two natures. The body of earthly soil, binding together in him the breath of life no other material than only his own almighty creating/creation. And as he began the work and creation of this day **24** he said this: **Genesis**

Let the earth bring forth and give out from it living life with its species, cattle, reptiles and four legged creatures, each with each own form/sort, and immediately it was so. **25** Thus God made all earthly reptiles each after its own kind. And as God the Father saw that this was well created **26** he said this to his own son and holy spirit: Let us make man after our likeness and image so that he governs over the fishes of the sea and the birds of heaven, four legged creatures and the whole of the earthly kingdom and with this all the reptiles that has life in the world. **27** Then God created man after his own likeness and image. He created both man and woman and the woman last as men will hear more about. **Scolastica hystoria.** Form three things may be noticed the special rank and honour/worth. This is the first, he was not only made of his own kind as the earlier mentioned creatures, but rather also in the likeness of God, which gave him an intellectual/a mental difference from all the earthly creatures. It is the image of the holy trinity with threefold form that makes a difference/ differs between the spirit and mind of man.

That is the mind, the sensible insight and for will and/as well as love, because these three parts are one being and one life/body as one man, just as three persons/beings are in the trinity of God: Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and where all though are one God. The second is that he was made with premeditation, so that his other works God ordered once to be and they were. But in this (case) the three personalities of God, father, son and Holy Spirit spoke, so that it was premeditated and affirmed between them: Let us make the man. The third of (the signs of) the rank/regard and primacy of man is that he was made lord and king over other earthly creatures and that they should give him food and clothes and lighten his travail and help him after he had sinned. So that before the sin, God gave both man and other creatures, the growth of the earth for food because the earth then had no unfriendly things or something was made malicious. And this lordship he lost because of the sin, both over the biggest creatures and the smallest. Over the biggest, as the lions, so that he knows and recognizes that he has lost his power and lordship over them. And over the smallest like the birds so that he discerns and understands how helpless and wretched he is become because of it (the sin). Over the medium big creatures he still has power, as a comfort, and that he shall know this from it that he had the same power of the others before the sin. **speculum hystoriale.** Together with these first and foremost before mentioned image of the holy trinity that the soul of man is, in which manner he is comparable to God together with holy angels, man too bears the image of God in .iv. (four) special ways/matters. The first is the lordship, wisdom and power that first was given to him. So that in the way God is the king and lord over heaven and earth and the ones that are in hell. In the same way man was king and lord over the creation, not only he before mentioned creatures but also all the land in the world as before is said. The second is respect for the origin, so that in the same manner that God is the origin/originator of everything because he has created it, is Adam the origin for all men, the first for the generations (for the reason of offspring). The third is, that just as some parts connects God and other things, so

comes much together with man and other worldly things, and therefore it is called micro cosmos. The fourth is that as God is the end/exit of everything so man is created last of the creation, he was created last because he was the first and foremost of all earthly creation/things, created after consideration. The fifth is that as God with his omnipotence is everywhere in macro cosmos, so is the spirit in his micro cosmos. That is in all the parts of the body in one and all of earthly men. Man with his sense/insight is not made as the senseless creatures, facing down (to earth). The proper form of his body is straight up in the direction of the heaven as if in itself reminding him that he has in this way his mind's eye and senses to heavenly matters just as his bodily eyes and senses can look up to the heaven/sky. He was also that short time when he was innocent, without any pain and fear, and would have been for ever if he had not sinned. So that he would not have felt hunger or thirst, nor cold nor heat nor fear nor hard work or had any sort of sickness or sorrows. And he had not needed to fear bodily death because he would have a living body for everlasting glory. He had not needed to have clothes and had not had a feeling of shame, no more over his genitals than over his hands and feet. Man had been bred without any sin and so born without sorrow or pain. After that God created this he blessed them and said thus: **Genesis.** (May it/this) Grow and multiply and fill the earth and govern it. Be lord over the fish of the sea, the birds of the sky and all the other creatures that move in the earthly kingdom. **scolastica hystoria.** Where God said "let them grow and multiply", (what is that) this cannot be without their union, so then he made marriage between men and women. Therefore they are foolish, the men that from their statements punishes and reproaches and says that intercourse between man and wife never may be without sin and danger for the soul. **Augustinus.** There are men that asks how man could have any power over the fish or birds, four legged animals and other creatures that must die (mortal creatures), as we see many men be killed of many animals and many of the birds are doing us damage, that we would happily escape from or gladly seize and nevertheless we cannot. How could we take from this power over such things. In the first case, may they well thus answer that they are greatly confused if they heed the standing of man in/as to he was condemned to die from this living life after the sin. He then destroyed and lost the perfection in which he was created, the image of God.

Now from the condemnation of man: (he has) the support, strength and can work so much because he rules and controls so (very) many creatures. Cattle is one of them and many more and even though he may, because of the frailness of his body, be killed by many of them, he may also effortlessly domesticate many kinds of animals as he domesticates what is in his kingdom/land, then thinking on that, which once long ago was newly made (new works) (or nysidr= Christendom!) and gave us salvation, and on God himself for keeping his promises. For the second part, all other creatures subject to man. Not because of the body but rather because of the mind and sense that we have. And it has it so that our bodies are or have become (made) so that it is to see on it that we are better than (the bodies of) other creatures

and because of that like God. Because the body of man is created straight, and upright towards the heavens as mentioned before. **genesis 29** And then God spoke to them: See here/ this here that I gave you every grass bearing its seed and other special growth all over the earth and all of the trees, carrying their own seed in themselves and thrive in its own kind that all these things are for you for food and sustainment **30** and all earthly creatures, all birds of the heavens as well as (there by) all the earthly things that can move and has living breath, they may eat from this. And this was everything as he ordered. **31** God saw all the things that he had done and it had become very good. It was evening and morning and the sixth day ended.

de Rijmbijbel

The sixth day God decorated the earth and commanded that beasts/creatures were brought forth. He knew, know this without doubt, that mankind should fall but from his goodness he wanted man to have the animals to lighten their difficult lives. “Beesten”, note that this literally says that they are here to support us. Now men ask if the good God made the dangerous animals and gave them for the sins of Adam. I have found the reason already. All animals without exception were made to be submissive to man forever if he had listened to our Lord. But after the wrongdoing, as is obvious, they became aggressive and hostile and wishing to harm. Also because of the wrongdoing holy men says that the trees and the herbs that are no giving wax-fruit (inedible fruit) lost their potency from the sin of Adam.

Analysis

On the sixth day God decorated the earth as the last. The compiler of *Stjórn* builds on his earlier laid foundation in his explanation as to *why* the earth was last to be decorated: it is the heaviest element, therefore it is placed at the bottom, and it is natural that God will come last to the lowest part. It would seem that this is a reasoning taken from a later chapter of *Historia Scholastica*, according to Astås. The compiler then follows Comestor on what he writes on the creations of the sixth day: God creates three kinds of animals: livestock, (that is domesticized animals), reptiles and wild animals. Because God already knew that man would fall in sin, he created livestock for him to eat and as help and support for him in his subsequent travails, the writer explains, and he even once uses the Latin word for livestock, *jumentum*, explaining that *þuiat iumentum er vpp áá norænu at segia sua sem ein hialpaðar skepna*, ‘this means in Old Norse something like a helping creature’. The compiler then shows us what will come, in telling that God the same day also created man to settle on this worldly earth that he had perfected and decorated so beautifully, making him of two natures: The body was made of earthly soil, but his “breath of life” from no other material than God’s own “almighty creation”.

Quoting Genesis the compiler of *Stjórn* goes from the creation of cattle, reptiles and beasts directly on to the creation of man, not giving this a section of its own as Comestor choose to do, and the same goes for his thoughts on the creation of marriage. Both are embedded in the sixth day of creation. Here I have chosen to sort these parts under the headings corresponding to the *Historia Scholastica*.

Quoting Augustinus, the compiler of *Stjórn* then addresses another question: How can we say that man holds any power over fish or birds, four legged animals and other mortal creatures, when we see so many men being killed by animals, and that much damage is done by birds? And we cannot escape these things. How could we from this interpret that we have any power at all? It seems plausible, that the writer here primarily reflects on everyday situations, with livestock and horses and other domesticated animals (even today, as an example, the cow is said to statistically be one of the most dangerous animals in Norway, resulting in both damage and death to humans!) whose interaction with humans results in death. The damage done by birds also seems to have a possibly rural connection, maybe the writer is alluding to damage done to crops or newly sown fields? Well, he answers himself, it is confusing, but man has lost his original status due to his sin. And on the condemnation of man: he has the support and the strength, and can do much because he rules and controls so many creatures. Cattle is one of them, and there are many more. And even though he may, because of his frailness, be killed by many of them, he may also effortlessly domesticate many kinds of animals just as he domesticates what is in his kingdom. And also, all other creatures are subject to man because of the mind and sense that we have. Besides, our bodies are better than the bodies of other creatures, created straight and upright, and because of this also like God. In this way the compiler seems to give not only comfort, but a reminder as to what his audience has to be thankful for, and where their superiority lies. He could here easily have used the three reasons Comestor gives for the difficulties man face from beasts: that it is meant as punishment, admonition or instruction, but he chooses not to. In his confirmed pattern he ends the section of the sixth day with directly quoting Genesis.

Van Maerlant tells us that God decorated the earth and commanded creatures to be “brought forth”. God knew that mankind would fall, but from his goodness he wanted man to have the animals to make life easier, to support them in their future difficulties. This follows Comestor closely. Van Maerlant continues that *beesten merct dit wordelike saen het si om dat sii ons bi staen*, ‘the name given to them, beesten, literally says that they are here to support us’. The word *beesten* is pronounced very near to the word *bijstaan*, which means to support. He then gives the reason why God, being good, made the dangerous animals. It was because of the sin of Adam. Before his sin all animals were, without exception, made to be submissive to man, and they would have stayed so forever if only man had listened to our Lord. The sin is also the reason that we have fruit inedible for man, just as Comestor writes. None of the translators

goes into the three kinds of reptilians or the six kinds of insects that Comestor describes. The fate of mankind seems to be considered more interesting by both the compiler of *Stjórn* and Jacob van Maerlant. Neither of the writers here uses the thoughts of Comestor on the reason for the difficulties man faces with the beasts: that they are meant as punishment, admonitions or instruction.

Van Maerlant regularly uses etymological explanations, in Middle Dutch, but this section is one of the few where the compiler of *Stjórn* does that – and he then uses a Latin word, explaining it in Old Norse. Comparing with *The Historye of the Patriarks*, its text also follows Comestor when describing that God created animals as a help for man, knowing that the sin would occur. This writer adds that man because of sin was expelled from paradise. He tells his readers that together with useful, helping animals, God also created other harmful creatures, worms, to hurt and persecute man. The writer then adds that they were harmless before the sin but got new assignments after the sin, and following Comestor closely, the writer of *The Historye of the Patriarks* tells which insects were made before the sin and which were made afterwards (the last being the ones “taking their food from corrupt matter”). Still following Comestor the writer tells about the unfruitful trees, and even quotes Comestor in what the Lord says to man: *Spinas et tribulos germinabit tibi terra*, ‘thorns and thistles will grow from your land’.

IX. De creatione hominis

Stjórn

(Excerpt from the sixth day of creation) **26** he said this to his own son and Holy Spirit: Let us make man after our likeness and image so that he governs over the fishes of the sea and the birds of heaven, four legged creatures and the whole of the earthly kingdom and with this all the reptiles that has life in the world. **27** Then God created man after his own likeness and image. He created both man and woman and the woman last as men will hear more about. **Scolastica hýstoria.** Form three things may be noticed the special rank and honour/worth. This is the first, he was not only made of his own kind as the earlier mentioned creatures, but rather also in the likeness of God, which gave him an intellectual/a mental difference from all the earthly creatures. It is the image of the holy trinity with threefold form that makes a difference/ differs between the spirit and mind of man.

That is the mind, the sensible insight, and for will and/as well as love, because these three parts are one being and one life/body as one man, just as three persons/beings are in the trinity of God: Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and where all though are one God. The second is that he was made with premeditation, so that his other works God ordered once to be and they were.

But in this (case) the three personalities of God, father, son and Holy Spirit spoke, so that it was premeditated and affirmed between them: Let us make man. The third of (the signs of) the rank/regard and primacy of man is that he was made lord and king over other earthly creatures and that they should give him food and clothes and lighten his travail and help him after he had sinned. So that before the sin, God gave both man and other creatures, the growth of the earth for food because the earth then had no unfriendly things or something was made malicious. And this lordship he lost because of the sin, both over the biggest creatures and the smallest. Over the biggest, as the lions, so that he knows and recognizes that he has lost his power and lordship over them. And over the smallest like the birds so that he discerns and understands how helpless and wretched he is become because of it (the sin). Over the medium big creatures he still has power, as a comfort, and that he shall know this from it that he had the same power of the others before the sin. **speculum hystoriale**. Together with these first and foremost before mentioned image of the holy trinity that the soul of man is, in which manner he is comparable to God together with holy angels, man too bears the image of God in .iv. (four) special ways/matters. The first is the lordship, wisdom and power that first was given to him. So that in the way God is the king and lord over heaven and earth and the ones that are in hell. In the same way man was king and lord over the creation, not only he before mentioned creatures but also all the land in the world as before is said. The second is respect for the origin, so that in the same manner that God is the origin/originator of everything because he has created it, is Adam the origin for all men, the first for the generations (for the reason of offspring). The third is, that just as some parts connects God and other things, so comes much together with man and other worldly things, and therefore it is called micro cosmos. The fourth is that as God is the end/exit of everything so man is created last of the creation, he was created last because he was the first and foremost of all earthly creation/things, created after consideration. The fifth is that as God with his omnipotence is everywhere in macro cosmos, so is the spirit in his micro cosmos. That is in all the parts of the body in one and all of earthly men. Man with his sense/insight is not made as the senseless creatures, facing down (to earth). The proper form of his body is straight up in the direction of the heaven as if in itself reminding him that he has in this way his mind's eye and senses to heavenly matters just as his bodily eyes and senses can look up to the heaven/sky. He was also that short time when he was innocent, without any pain and fear, and would have been for ever if he had not sinned. So that he would not have felt hunger or thirst, neither cold nor heat, nor fear, nor hard work, or had any sort of sickness or sorrows. And he had not needed to fear bodily death because he would have a living body for everlasting glory. He had not needed to have clothes and had not had a feeling of shame, no more over his genitals than over his hands and feet. Man had been bred without any sin and so born without sorrow or pain.

De Rijmbijbel

Then God say, let us make man. Notice and understand from this: To whom was he speaking and why did he say let US make? The personality is in itself three. The trinity speaks together. This is the one great Lord of man. It is no small matter that God made man with premeditation. Even if he out of his grace made all the other creatures, he did not speak of their nature as he did to mankind. Furthermore he was made with a soul after the image of God. This is the great wealth of man. Regarding the body, if you want to know, he has many benefits because he is become a master (of them). The animals usually stand on the ground and man stretch towards heaven. In three things God shows the worth of men; that he was not only made for the earthly pleasures (/riches) but in the soul in the image of God. The second is as I first said, that God planned this and said “Let us make man”. The third proof of privilege is that he is made as honourable master of all the animals, so they should provide him with food after his sin, and cloth him at all times, and help him bear his labour. Before the sin I hear alluded that God gave man and animals fruit of different sorts to eat because the earth gave nothing but good things. Man, notice if you are wise: you have mainly lost your rule over the animals; over dragons and over lions, over tigers and over leopards. This was a great privilege. According the smallest (creatures) you have because of your lie lost power over small birds (/tits) and over flies so that you will notice good that you would have remained the master over the creatures if you had not disobeyed the command that God commanded you. Thus you fell in greater distress.

Analysis

The compiler of *Stjórn*, as mentioned, obviously felt that this section was part of the sixth day of creation. While van Maerlant kept closer to the pattern of Comestor, the compiler of *Stjórn* seems to have felt confident enough to consider his own pattern as more suitable. By writing how God the Father said to his own Son and to the Holy Spirit: “Let us make man after our likeness ...”, he has already explained why God say “Let us make”, in mentioning to whom he spoke. We learn that God created man and woman after his own likeness and image, but that he created the woman last. Going forth to the explanations from *De creatione hominis* in *Historia Scholastica* he follows them closely with slight additions, and presents the three signs that man has a special rank in the creation of God: He was made in the likeness of God, having inside of himself a sort of mirroring trinity: Intellect, insight and spirit/will/love. His soul is not actually mentioned. Further, man was made with premeditation, because God speaks to himself: Let us make...and obviously agrees with himself, because man is being made. Therefore man is not only premeditated but also *affirmed* between the three parts of the trinity, and this affirmation is *explicitly* mentioned in *Stjórn*. Thirdly, man is by God made

lord over all earthly creatures. Other creatures are made to help him, as mentioned, in the difficult life after he has sinned.

Next we are informed that both man and animals in the beginning ate from the fruit provided by God; and that there were no dangerous animals or things. After the sin, and the compiler makes this very clear, man lost his lordship over the biggest and the smallest of the creatures. As example of the big ones, lions are mentioned, and the loss of power over them is meant to show man the range of the power that he has lost. Of the smallest creatures, birds are mentioned, this loss of power is to remind man of his sin and his wretchedness after his fall. This now, is a deviation from *Historia Scholastica* where the example of the smallest creatures is flies. Overall it seems that the compiler of *Stjórn*, even if he follows *Historia Scholastica* quite closely in this section, gives it his own twist.

He chooses not use the thoughts on the gender of the soul, for example. He does however tell of the creatures man still is in control of, as a comfort to him and to remind him of what he has lost: Man still has power over the medium sized creatures. Turning to *Speculum Historale* as his source, the compiler shows that man bears the image of God in four special ways: As God is Lord over the universe; man is lord over the earthly creations, including land. Then too, as God is the origin of everything, Adam is the origin of all men, the first of the generations (and we must perhaps presume that this is equalled in every man that has begotten offspring, he is the first of his own line of the generations). Thirdly, as God is connected with everything in the big picture, cosmos, man is connected in small things, this is called micro cosmos. The fourth is that just as God is the end of everything, so man is the final creation. He was created last because he was the foremost of all earthly creation and created after consideration. It then becomes more difficult to follow. The fifth – out of the four!- is that as God with his omnipotence is everywhere in macro cosmos, and so is the spirit in his micro cosmos. And the micro cosmos, we just read, is in all the parts of the body in every one of all men. This would surely boost the feeling of importance of the audience!

Then too, man is not made as the “senseless creatures” walking on four feet and facing the earth. Man, in his proper form, stands straight up in the direction of the heaven, and is thus constantly reminded of his connection to heavenly matters. The short time when he was innocent he was without any pain and fear, and this could have lasted forever had he not sinned. Had Adam and Eve just kept away from the forbidden fruit, they, their descendants, could have lived their lives without hunger or thirst, fear, hard work or any sort of sickness or sorrows, and had not needed to fear death because they would have lived forever. The compiler paints a beautiful picture, adding that man had then not needed to have clothes because he would not have had any feeling of shame, “no more over his genitals than over his hands and feet”. Returning to Genesis, the writer quotes the blessing of God when he tells the human, in the first version of the creation, to “Grow and multiply and fill the earth and govern

it. Be lord over the fish of the sea, the birds of the sky and all the other creatures that moves in the earthly kingdom.”

Van Maerlant also explains to his audience why God say “let us make man”, but on a more personal note: “Notice and understand from this: To whom was he speaking and why did he say let us make? The personality is in itself three. The trinity speaks together. This is the one great Lord of man”. He highlights the premeditation in the making of man, telling his audience that this “is no small matter”. Furthermore he follows Comestor and tells that man was made with a soul after the image of God. He does however not enter into the question of the gender of the soul. Instead he goes to the erect position of the body of man as compared to that of animals, a sign of him being chosen by God to be the master of animals. The three things setting men apart is constructed to be how God shows the *worth* of men, and not their dignity. They are slightly changed. There is an addition to the first one, to show that his soul wa made in the image of God, van Maerlant assured that man was not “only made for the earthly pleasures /riches” (but also for an afterlife, one assumes). The second one is premeditation, but this time presented in a simple language: “that God planned this and said ‘Let us make man’”. The third is almost verbatim translated: (man) is made the honourable master of all the animals, so that they should provide him with food after his sin, and cloth him at all times, and help him bear his labour. Also the loss of edible fruit and control over animals is following the text of *Historia Scholastica*, but with some interesting additions: The small creatures are flies as in the text of Comestor, but also birds as in *Stjórn*, and these seems actually to be decided into subspecies (“tits”). Among the bigger animals we find a veritable zoo, not only lions but tigers, leopards and dragons, no less. One should imagine that the loss of control of these exotic animals would not have created great fear among the Dutch audience. The moral is made very obvious: “you will notice well that you would have remained the master over the creatures if you had not disobeyed the command that God commanded you”. None of the translators uses the material on the gender of the soul. Both the compiler of *Stjórn* and van Maerlant has made clear choices as to *how* God speaks to himself. In *Stjórn* we read that the Father speaks to the Son and the Holy Ghost. In *de Rijmbijbel* the explanation is that the Trinity speaks to itself. Comestor however gives two alternatives: One is that it is the Father who says this to the Son and the Holy Spirit, the other that it was the “common voice of the three Divine persons”. Here the translators each have chosen one of the explanations. The writer of *The Historye of the Patriarks* on the other hand has chosen another way, in using both version and adding yet another alternative to the ones of Comestor, suggesting that it could have been the Son, “second person of the Trinity” that spoke thus to the Father. Otherwise Comestor is closely followed by him, down to the flies as being the smallest creatures, except for the discussion on the soul, this is completely ignored.

X. De institutione conjugii

Stjórn

After that God created this he blessed them and said thus: **Genesis.** (May it/this) Grow and multiply and fill the earth and govern it. Be lord over the fish of the sea, the birds of the sky and all the other creatures that moves in the earthly kingdom. **scolastica hýstoria.** Where God said “let them grow and multiply”, this cannot be without their union, so then he made marriage between men and women. Therefore they are foolish, the men that from their statements punishes and reproaches and says that intercourse between man and wife never may be without sin and danger for the soul.

De Rijmbijbel

God blessed man and say these words to him: Grow and multiply. This men hold as written. Go against the heretics who spoke falsely in their treatises that marriage never can exist without sin. Who imagines such things will be punished severely. God never tells us to sin.

Analysis

The compiler of *Stjórn* quotes Comestor on the matter of marriage, and as we have seen he found its proper place to be embedded in the sixth day of creation: Where God said “let them grow and multiply”, they (man and woman) cannot do this without mating, so what God really did here was describing marriage between men and women. The writer then deviates from Comestor, stating that they are foolish, the men that from their statements punishes and reproaches and says that intercourse between man and wife never may be without sin and danger for the soul. So the writer takes a stand for sexual relations within marriage, calling it foolish to think this a sin. Van Maerlant is not so lenient; he seems to feel much stronger about this and encourages his audience to go against the heretics, no less, who says such things. They should be severely punished, not only punished, but severely! God say this to men, that they should multiply, and God does not encourage sin, therefore can this in no way be a sin. That it is wrong to think that even marriage cannot hold sexual relations free of sin, Comestor allegedly discusses in a later chapter in *Historia Scholastica*, but the fervour of van Maerlant seems to be his own. The writer of *The Historye of the Patriarks* chooses to ignore the whole matter of marriage.

XI. De quiete sabbati et sanctificatione

Stjórn

Heaven and earth was now completed and all their beauty and decoration God filled in and then he stopped. That is, he thought his work was completed on this the seventh day, and wanted on this seventh day the work that he had done there. He rested on this seventh day from all the work that he had done and promoted /not making something more nor taking away any of/ his before said creation he had done on the same days. That God had created matter for all bodily creatures and also as their souls that he made thereafter, each in its time of making. He had now success and completed the work of this seventh day with all the before-mentioned makings and creations and explanations. What with his creation on the first day the way he made his creation from nothing and with his creation where he separated light and darkness and the making and ordering of the second and third (day) and with decorating on the three last (days). **Augustinus** The words that Moses says that God rested on the seventh day from his very good work that he had done but not afterwards with spiritual insight and explanations. Notice the benevolence // that he may give us in all our work if we have done them well. So that all our good work is known to him and in his honour, he who calls us to do good works.

(Here follows a long passage ruminating over the seven ages of man compared to the seven ages of the world, according to Astås mainly inspired from Augustinus. It cleverly links back to the seventh day with the following passage:)

This is in this the seven ages of the world. There is no one who has waited/longed for the evening as a good man, saying that there is eternal glory after seven days very good work. That is, after seven days passed, and they then explain what it means that God rested on the seventh day after all his work. So that he himself accomplishes all the good things with us that was done, and from this it is justly said that he rests. Because after all this work he (man) may know for himself eternal rest.

From **genesi. 3** God blessed this the seventh day and made it holy. This is to be understood so that he made that this day should be elevated and held holy because on this day he completed all his work, they which he had made until then. **scolastica hystoria**. This that says that God rested on this the seventh day from all his work that he had completed (and succeeded with). It honours and shows the work that he had done, wherefore it is no less than holy. The three before mentioned work he has done; he created, ordered and decorated. His fourth work never stops as long as he lets mankind multiply; creating and uniting everyone's soul with its real body. The fifth, he may promote the other world /home / heaven showing all good men his

own face/likeness, serving man, giving nourishment, and also unifying the suitable (the ones with good abilities) with himself in heaven.

De Rijmbijbel

God looked at all that he had made. Everything was good and well arranged. Heaven and earth is now completed and all her valuable decoration. The sixth day he completed with this all the work he passionately had done, and rested on the 7th day. Not that he was in any pain (from having worked) but he stopped creating. Not that we sense this, he still every day creates many things no one has seen before but he did not make afterwards matter that was not (already) made or something similar to it. Surely from Adam came the matter from the old people, this I will explain about over his flesh. From his flesh exists everything that is, was and shall be. And men has gotten the form of the soul (formed appropriately to house a soul), you must understand, that no soul came from this. But anyone who got their flesh from him (i.e. Adam) God gave souls alike to Adams. The seventh day when God rested had the name Saturday. And in Hebrew what I could see, the Jews called it Sabbath. God rested there without any pomp. Later men celebrated for many years. So as you have understood from this, Moses tells us that God made heaven and earth and (everything that was there) he blessed it all. This was before it ever rained because a valuable/praiseworthy fountain that came from paradise gave water for a long time everywhere across the world. The paradise means/equals Mary and the fountain Jesus the free that makes everything wet with virtues.

Analysis

The text in *Historia Scholastica* explains why God rested – he was not tired but had simply finished all his groundwork, from now nothing new were added but his work continued to develop. He had created, appointed and adorned, and this was finished. Therefore he rested on the seventh day, and therefore we are taught to keep the Sabbath holy. The compiler of *Stjórn* follows Comestor, but gives us more detail, setting the creation mainly on the first day, the ordering on day two and three, and the decoration on the last three days. We also are informed that God made not only the matter for all “bodily creatures”, but also their souls. There is no assurance that God did not rest from exhaustion, it is as if the idea that he should have been tired is not even a possibility. The writer does add however, that just as God rested from his good work, he recognizes and blesses us when we do good work, especially if it is in his honour. It is all known to him.

Here the compiler of *Stjórn* weaves together the seven days of the creation with the seven ages of the world, simultaneously relating them to the seven ages of man. We get a glimpse of expectations in his contemporary society, as to when a boy or a man was considered ready to fulfil his different tasks in the world, but as this is inspired from Augustinus according to

Astâs, we are now not going into the full text (The full text is found in appendix II, pp 38-44). The writer then skilfully knits the text back to Genesis with a paragraph on old age, when someone who has done good work can look forward to eternal rest in glory. We are then enlightened via Genesis, that the Sabbath was made holy by God, and curves back to *Historia Scholastica*, where the compiler of *Stjórn* closely translates the three works of God (creating, ordering and adorning) that are finished, and the next two that goes on “forever”, namely his fourth work; being, that as all living creatures multiplies, God gives everyone a soul to go with the body (Comestor does not seem to mention that God gives every body, of all living creatures, a soul), and the fifth, being that he shows us how to live as good men, showing us his face, and serving us with nourishment, to then take the suitable among men up to heaven to unite with himself. Comestor does not mention this last part.

Van Maerlant assures us that God did not stop creating because he was made weaker from his hard work, but because he was finished. His creation goes on daily but nothing new comes into the world anymore. Van Maerlant mentions the creation and the decoration but not the “appointing” in itself. He goes into detail to explain how everything (that exists today) was already made, in telling us that all new people are formed from the same matter as Adam, and our bodies are formed in the appropriate form to house a soul, so each new body gets a soul from God (as the compiler of *Stjórn* mentioned, but not, on this point at least, Comestor), alike to the one he gave to Adam. This day of rest was (of course) a Saturday, and was called Sabbath by the Jews, we learn. God rested on this day without any pomp or circumstance, but later men celebrated. Van Maerlant then places this seventh day of creation in an historical perspective by telling us that all of this happened before it ever rained, when everything still got its water supplied by the fountains of paradise. This paradise really indicates Mary, and the fountain is Jesus, who made everything wet with virtue. Again we see that van Maerlant connects the life of Christ with the creational process. Meanwhile *The Historye of the Patriarks* has left the pattern set out by Comestor, and is lumping the blessing of Adam and Eve (which, as is mentioned in *De prophetia Adae*, the writer of *The Historye of the Patriarks* did not connect to marriage at all) together with the blessing of the seventh day, adding that God rested for all work he had done “not denying but he had more to make thereafter”.

XII. De creatione animae protoplasti

Stjórn

Genesis. That God the king formed the body of the man from earthly clay as was told before, and blew the spirit of life in this way making his face/ his likeness and thereby the whole body and thus man became a living soul and (got) senses/wit. **scolastica hystoria.** Here for

the first time the book calls God king or lord. Because he had the servant, man. This matter Plato wrongly explained, saying that God has made the fates once and angels has made the body. Then it must also not be understood or taken as true what some people say, that the spirit/soul is made of godly matter or knowledge. Also man was created at an adult age and wholly mortal and immortal. This they, or men, must in no way do wrong. That is that he must die when he was obliged to/guilty, as is clearly proven, even if he was immortal as was said before.

de Rijmbijbel

God made him, as it says here before, from the earth, from the mucus. According to the flesh. This, the rhyme demands that I write! And the soul he made from nothing. Know that here the truth is, the one who does not believe this. The text says that he blew in him the living spirit. That is rightly to be understood as that he sent the soul into the body. Plato was wrong on this matter, the noblest writer of a high name/standing. He said that angels made the body and God the spirit. I am afraid that such people will say that the souls were made with godly matter. If this was true then could man not do any sins, no more than our lord, nor could he (man) ever die. The man is made of the dust/earth, notice correctly, in adult age, in perfect powers of the grown youth, well formed in arms and legs. In such a manly power, that if he did not betray the command from God he may live forever. As he broke the command through any reason, this would make that he would taste the death. Thus was to him a will/ a choice given, whether he would die or live.

Analysis

Both *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel* are quoting Plato, and addressing the misconception that angels should have made the bodies of men and God only the spirit – or in the Old Norse version, the word used actually means fate. This is not mentioned at all in *Historia Scholastica* or in *The Historye of the Patriarks* at this point. The crucial point seems to be, that one should on no account think that the spirit of man was made of “godly matter”, as this collides with the ability to sin or do evil, and that man is mortal. God does not sin and not die, and anything made from godly matter would likewise be exempt from these traits.

The Old Norse version also lingers by the use of the word *drottinn*, ‘king’ or ‘lord’. There is a difference in the two stories of creation in the first and second chapter of Genesis, namely that in the second chapter of Genesis, God is given the epithet “the Lord”. One could maybe see the second chapter as a close-up of the sixth day described in chapter 1. The compiler of *Stjórn* has chosen to highlight the point that God did not get the epithet *lord* earlier than after he had created a servant, man, and thus had a human to “lord it over”.

De Rijmbijbel on the other hand chooses to highlight the free will of man, which was enabling him to choose whether to obey Gods commands and live forever, or to follow his own path and become mortal. Both the compiler of *Stjórn I* and Van Maerlant also informs us that Adam was created grown, so that he was on the height of his manliness, as a well formed grown youth. This is another point that is not mentioned by Comestor.

The writer of *The Historye of the Patriarks* seems to have felt that he already had said all that was necessary on the making of Adam earlier, and ignores this chapter.

XIII. De paradiso et lignis ejus

Stjórn

Paradise itself God had planted from the beginning. That was on the third day when he commanded that the earth should be born and thrive as is said before. Wherein he moved and placed the man he had made on the meadows here on our more habitable land that is named Campus Damascus. This place he made rich and full of people with all sorts of sweetness and all the trees that to men are both pleasantly beautiful to look upon and to taste. In between which he made two trees in the middle of paradise, which were the most famous of them all. One of them is the tree of life, of its nature it was in this manner, that the man who ate frequently of it must not own the death of the body, nor sickness nor feel any sort of fear/anxiety. And another (was the) wise tree of good and evil, because before that men ate from this he could for this reason do no evil because he had not tasted it. Because of this we name obedience to be good. **scholastica hystoria**. At once Adam had tasted this before mentioned evil thing (fruit) of its wisdom, with some restraint in his own conscience, with trial or examination in the way that seems good, then it happened that he wholly understands another mans sickness/weakness and saw the same weakness and in the same way he furthermore understands just as well that it has happened that he has sown the same sickness in himself.

So that it is both that he understands and knows that as the small boy, that when he is raised worldly and prettily, (he) does not know much about (what is) evil. (As he grows) older he notices that disobeying leads to bad things, and obeying leads to good thing. So that when he (Adam) had eaten from this same tree, then he knew how much good obedience will succeed in and how much evil disobedience supports.

de Rijmbijbel

God, that is mild and wise, made the paradise on the third day when he let trees and plants appear there in the beginning of the world. It is in the east, no less. He has put everything there. It is described by the holy law that it is the most beautiful place under the sky both concerning the mountains and concerning the lands. Witnesses to our wanderings /way of life or so bound with the sea that men never again lost it /gave it away. Nor did it come something else instead. With nine blessings it was high as the moon. Furthermore it stayed dry from the flood. In the paradise God our lord set all the wood /the trees because it was his command that it was (to be) beautiful and tasty to give the man pleasure both to taste it and to look at it. In the middle of it all he set the tree of life. This has the power and the ability to give, to the one that ate the fruit, a healthy and long life. Certain books will tell us more too, that man could live forever (after having eaten it). Then he also planted there the tree that teaches to know good and evil. This has gotten the name of both (good and evil) /This also was named thus. Because of when Adam had done wrong (/sinned) in that he had done evil and harmed the good.

Analysis

That paradise itself had been planted by God from the beginning, or rather on the third day when he commanded that the earth should be born, and thrive is verbatim translated. But the compiler of *Stjórn* also knows that this happened in the proximity of a land that is named Campus Damascus. This is a detail we do not find by Comestor. The two most famous trees, the tree of life and the tree good and evil, are placed by God in the midst of paradise. The tree of life is in *Stjórn* introduced in a positive way *þuiat sáá maðr sem optsinnis ęti af þui máátti æigi deyia likams dauða. æigi siukleik elle eðr nokkurskyns angist fáá*, ‘the man who ate frequently of it must not own the death of the body, nor sickness nor feel any sort of fear/anxiety’. The name of the other tree, the wise tree of good and evil, is explained in a more enigmatic way: Man could not do evil before he had eaten from this tree. It would seem though that the fruit of this tree also gives insight, as Adam after having eaten from it, could *sem hann er heill ok under stendr annars mannz krankleik ok sáá hinn samí lekner skilr hann þo allt at eíns giqorr meir þann tíma sem hann hefer hinn sama krankleik á sialfum ser*, ‘wholly understands another man’s sickness/weakness and saw... that it has happened, that he has sown the same sickness in himself’.

The importance of obedience as a means to make good things happening, is mentioned several times. The writer compares the situation of Adam before his sin with the state of a small boy not knowing anything of good or bad, but learning to obey because it “leads to good things”. Adam learnt about good and evil after eating the fruit of knowledge. He also learned about how obedience will lead to good things and that disobedience will support evil. The compiler

is quoting *Historia Scholastica* over the disobedience of Adam, from a later chapter. Obviously it was considered to fit in better here.

Van Maerlant finds it important to describe God as mild and wise. He also tells us that the paradise is in the east, just as Comestor, and gives no detail as to where. He describes the beauty of the paradise in some detail, not only the trees but he adds mountains to, and that it was never touched by the flood. The trees were planted in paradise for beauty and pleasurable taste, to provide man with several pleasures at once. The tree of life is given the most central place and then as an addition, the tree that “teaches good and evil” is planted there too. The reason of the name is that Adam sinned in that he did evil and harmed the good. According to Maerlant then, man does not learn evil from the fruit, but his taking the fruit unlocks evil in the world, harming the goodness. While both *Stjórn I* and *de Rijmbijbel* are giving attention to the planting of paradise, and the when and where of it, *The Historye of the Patriarks* is much more sparing on detail, just stating that God placed Adam into that joyful place, paradise, where trees were brought, fair to look at and sweet to eat, and in the middle, the tree of life and the tree of good and evil. No moral stance or extensive description is used. Neither of the translators has named the paradise as the garden of Eden, or used the etymological description that Comestor gives for the name Eden.

XIV. De fonte paradisi et quatuor fluminibus ejus

Stjórn

genesis 10 An especially beautiful water-source or well came up and flowed from this sweetest place, paradise, to water the trees there to make them thrive and grow. This same water-source was split in such a way and into separate parts to the four biggest main-rivers that men have stories about/knows about. **11** One is named Phison and another name is Ganges, coming from Gangari, the kings of the land of India, because she comes there and flows around this same land. **12** There is also better gold to be found there than in other countries, and a precious stone, onichinus. The river is split up and has different colours, so that she is (looking) different in different countries and cities, so that in one city she is clear and in another restless and not to be trusted. In one city she is small and in another big and wide. In another city she will feel cold, and in yet another warm. And Phison in Hebrew means *flokkr* (a group, more specific a group of military men) in Old Norse, because she is filled and swollen with the ten rivers that are flowing into her. **13** Another is named Gion and flows through/around both Africa and Egypt. It is also called the Nile there. **Genesis. Capitulum 14a** The third one is named Tigris. It flows along the east part of the land named Mesopotamia in the direction of the land named Assyria. **Scholastica hystoria. Capitulum**

Tiger is the name of a dangerous animal. This river (carries this name) because of its strong currents and wide rapid waterfalls. **Genesis Capitulum 14b** The fourth one is Euphrates. This flows along the east part of Mesopotamia and to Chaldea, where Abraham is spawned.

Scholastica hystoria. Capitulum These 4 rivers flows forth from one source as is said. Some of them is first separated and flows later together again. Then they are separated again and sometimes it happens that they turn and twist their flows into the earth and comes up again in different cities and countries. This makes that no one has all the information (stories) over where their sources are in the inhabited world. So say some men that Ganges comes up in their own mountains called Caucasus. And the Nile from the big mountains called Atlas. And Tigris and Euphrates from Armenia.

de Rijmbijbel

The fountain that I stopped telling you about (earlier), the one that flowed through the whole of paradise, gave all the trees enough water (and all the plants what they needed). This divides itself there into four rivers. I shall tell you the names. Phisons and Ganges is the name of one that flows and goes through by itself. Men find gold in her sand, the best to be found in any country. Gion or Nilus comes flowing through the land of the Ethiopians; this is thus the second river. Tigris is the third, Euphrates that is the fourth. Frequently they go underground, where they flow quickly long distances, and springs out somewhere else. This is described to us in the book.

Analysis

De Rijmbijbel informs us that the rivers often goes underground to emerge somewhere else (and that rivers can go underground and surface somewhere else is also indicated by the compiler of *Stjórn* in the chapter *De opere secundae dici*), but otherwise we are not told much more than the names of the rivers, that the Nile flows through Ethiopia and that there is good gold to be found in the sands of Phison. *Stjórn* describes Ganges in more detail than *Historia Scholastica*, adding that the name Ganges comes from the name of the kings in India, and that the gold found there is the best known to man. We are also told of precious stones. The gold, as well as the precious stones, is also mentioned by *Historia Scholastica*. But *Stjórn* goes on to tell about the different faces of the river Ganges, how it can be clear (tranquil?) or rough and untrustworthy, small or wide. Also we are given information of the mountains where the rivers come from. Some of this extra information is according to Astås taken from a later chapter of *Historia Scholastica*, but the more detailed information of the faces of the river Ganges almost gives the impression of having acquired it from someone who has travelled there and seen the different faces of the river at first hand. None of the two translators retells what Comestor says over the fruitfulness of Euphrates, that is giving it its name, nor does van Maerlant mention Chaldea. Here the writer of *The Historie of the Patriarks* follows Comestor

closely as he names and describes the rivers. He also mentions that Euphrates flows around Chaldea, thus at least connecting the two, even if it is without details.

XV. De praecepto et prohibitione edulii

Stjórn

And before that he said thus. **Genesis Capitulum** Eat and take nourishment from every tree from the ones that are here in paradise except from the knowledgeable tree between good and evil, (from this) you shall not eat. Because of that the day that you have eaten of this you must die in spirit and become mortal. **Scholastica hystoria. Capitulum** This commandment was given to the man and given from God. And from him (i.e. man) it was given to the woman. Or, it was not told earlier than that both were made.

de Rijmbijbel

God dragged the man/human from the earth that he had made him (of), into paradise because he wanted him to work there. Not in pain or from stark necessity but because it would give him great pleasure. And that he should submit to God and see, man, the holy place. The commandment God gave him, if you wish to know, was that you shall eat from all the fruit except the one that is on the tree that teaches men to be aware of good and evil. On the day that you eat from this, say God, I want you to know that then you shall from then on be mortal.

Analysis

The compiler of *Stjórn* writes about the question of guilt that *Historia Scholastica* mentions: that the commandment of which fruit to eat, and more especially, of which fruit *not* to eat, was given when the man was alone in paradise, and that it then was his duty to give it on to the woman when she was made, implying that the man had maybe not been sufficiently good at making this commandment clear to Eve and that he therefore in some measure was to blame for her eating from the forbidden fruit. Just as in *Historia Scholastica*, the compiler of *Stjórn* quickly adds that maybe this was not so, maybe the commandments were given later, to both humans simultaneously. In *Stjórn* we are also told that we must die spiritually. *De Rijmbijbel* only tells us that God has informed man that from the day the forbidden fruit is eaten, man shall be mortal. Van Maerlant does not mention that man may have been the only one to hear this command. The writer of *The Historye of the Patriarks* tells very shortly of God placing Adam (no Eve) in paradise and giving his command not to eat from the tree of life (it is here not the tree of good and evil!) or man shall die. But he adds that *But Adam*

vndrestode not our Lorde so. Here a misunderstanding, and nothing else, seems to have been the reason for the sin of Adam.

XVI. De impositione nominum animantium principaliter et mulieris formatione

Stjórn

It is not good or pleasant that he is alone. Let us make him a female helper similar to himself. Now that God had created and formed all earthly animals/living creatures, and also fish and birds, he let them come to Adam so that he should say and tell how he wanted everyone of them to be called. It is so that to this day every living creature bears the name Adam spoke in the Hebrew language so that it was one (name) from the beginning until the languages split up. There were two reasons that God let all living things come before Adam, that he would give them their names. The other (reason) was that in this way they knew him to be their leader and governor. And the other (reason) (was) that he saw for sure that the other animals were unlike to him, and therefore it was necessary for him (to have) a wife/woman.

de Rijmbijbel

After this, God say that it is not good for man (the human) to be alone. Let us because of this make him some help that is similar to him. And having said this God brought to Adam at his bidding all the birds with animals from land and rivers and everything men finds in the sea. For two reasons, namely that he should name them there and that he would know truly that there was no one there similar to himself in body or soul. There Adam the young gave them names in the Hebrew language, the first language ever to be spoken.

Analysis

In neither translation is there here any mention of the necessity of a woman for the procreation of children, as it is in *Historia Scholastica* (which *The Historye of the Patriarks* also follows). While the *Historia Scholastica* (and *The Historye of the Patriarks*) clearly states the need for Adam to see for himself that no other creature was similar to himself because he would then find the making of a woman necessary and not superfluous, the possibility that Adam would ever consider the making of a female to be superfluous is not mentioned in *de Rijmbijbel*. In *Stjórn*, on the other hand, this is mentioned, but in a positive way: Because he saw that no one was similar to himself, he saw that it was necessary for him to have a woman. There is a difference between seeing the necessity of a woman through watching the animals, and having the need to see the animals so that the making of a woman would not be considered to be *unnecessary*.

That Adam spoke Hebrew, is mentioned in both translations, but while *Stjórn* follows the *Historia Scholastica* (just as *The Historye of the Patriarks* does, and there the compiler goes further, reminding the audience of the tower of Babylon) and explains that not only is Hebrew the first language, but remains the only language until the languages are split up, *de Rijmbijbel* just names Hebrew as the first language ever spoken.

XVII. De somno Adae et formatione mulieris de costa ejus

Stjórn

Then God let something like a sleep, or some sort of senselessness, fall upon Adam. And in this same senselessness it is believed that he has had a spiritual journey and been taken up into heaven. So that when he woke up he was perfect and foretold the connection of Jesus Christ and the holy church and that would be a great flood in the days of Noah and of the last Judgement that will come with fire and all people telling (about) their sins.

And as he were thus God broke one of his ribs away and as much flesh as belonged to it, and let flesh fill up in place of the rib, and (God) made the woman, in the presence of the service of angels, from the same rib. Making her body of the flesh and the bones of the rib itself. Thereafter he let her come before Adam and he then said: This bone now is from my bones and this flesh is taken from my body. In *Historia Scholastica* it says that: from this small word “now” Jews catches a lot of negativity and unbelieving. Because Adam say this, they say that this now was the second wife of Adam, the first one was made of earth and clay, but “this one now is made from my own body”. They lie and makes up a lot of stories about his other wife. But (if we are) looking at the text of Genesis they clearly lie. There it is always spoken over just one wife.

de Rijmbijbel

A sleep came to Adam, well, even if it is named sleep, it was unconsciousness. We believe that he inside his mind experienced the joy of heaven, because the learned scribes say that the first thing he did when he awoke was telling prophecies over Jesus and the holy church and foretold the Flood and that Doomsday would come and bring fire. While he lay there in this sleep, God took a rib and some flesh with it and made from it one single woman, flesh of flesh, bone of bone.

Analysis

Both versions try to make the audience understand that this was no natural sleep. Neither Genesis nor *Historia Scholastica* nor *The Historye of the Patriarks* makes an issue of whether

it was natural sleep or not, they both mention a deep sleep, and nothing else. The story of what happens to Adam while in sleep is also told both in *de Rijmbijbel* and in *Stjórn*, but not in the *Historia Scholastica* or *The Historye of the Patriarks*. It seems plausible that both *de Rijmbijbel* and *Stjórn* here made use of another, well known, source to fill in this gap. Maybe this had become an important point in the period between the making of *Historia Scholastica* and the adaptation of the Old Norse and the Middle Dutch versions. One can in such a scenario only assume that this story-line had lost its importance again when *The Historye of the Patriarks* was written – or that the translator of *The Historye of the Patriarks* had a more limited range of sources. *Stjórn* also has a passage over the Jewish theory of Lilith, the first wife of Adam. The compiler seems to feel strongly against this theory and calls it a lie, blaming *íuðar*, the Jews, for making the stories up. Van Maerlant has probably known of the theory too, it would otherwise seem unnecessary to mention *.j. wiif alleene*, ‘one single woman/ just one woman’. This seems like a strange choice of words even if it should be for the sake of a rhyme. He does however not embroider on the subject.

XVIII. De nominibus mulieris

Stjórn

And Adam gave her name as he was her master and said, this shall be named *kerling* because it is made from *karlmanninum*. Because of that, this became her real name.

de Rijmbijbel

And he placed her before Adam so he should name her. He spoke: This flesh and this bone is from mine, and she shall be called virago, that word comes from man. So he said before the sin, but shortly after, when he had sinned, he named her Eva, that word may men understand as the mother of all humans. As children comes into the world, the first sound from a boy is *A* and from a little girl *E*. This never fails.

Analysis

The reasoning that, taken from a man in *materia*, her name also should be taken from the name for man, must in the Old Norse version be deduced. The translator has used an (presumably old) Old Norse word, *kerling*, nowadays often translated with something like ‘crone’, or just ‘old woman’. It can however also mean “wife”, and it is impossible today to be certain of the connotations of the word then, in the society contemporary to the compiler of *Stjórn*. It is however a word he only uses once, at least in these sections, otherwise usually choosing the word *kona* for woman, or *husfru*, for wife. Presumably his choice is made to

repeat the etymological pun from Comestor on *virago* – *viro*, making the comparable connection *kerling* – *karlmann* in Old Norse. The naming of Eva as the mother of all is not used in *Stjórn* at this point, but taken up later, on page 58 in the edition of Astås.

Van Maerlant follows *Historia Scholastica* at first, and he has also not deemed it necessary to explain the Latin word for man, *vir* to his audience. Neither does he explain the name Eva, as being the word for life. Was this supposed to be known by his audience, as rudimentary Latin? At the end of this section, van Maerlant gives a glimpse into childcare, and states that the first sounds of a new-born differs according to their gender. He must have thought that this information would be of interest to his audience. The writer of *The Historye of the Patriarks* tells that Adam named woman *virago*, explaining that this means a creature made of man or taken of (/from) man.

XIX De prophetia Adae

Stjórn

And directly after this he made a prophesy, saying: For the reason that she is made in this way, many men will leave their father and mother and go live with (have fields together with) their wife, that is a part of himself, and also the two may then be one body. From the mixing of the blood of them both, children are started. And both of them have totally the same power over their own body.

de Rijmbijbel

When Adam had named the woman, he already made (her) a prophesy. Because that she is from my upper body, the man shall follow his wife and abandon mother and father. And after this it is described that in one flesh shall the two be. Marriage was what he in this prophesied.

Analysis

Historia Scholastica uses the Bible verse we now know as Genesis 2:24, to explain how children are made – they (Adam and Eve/ man and woman) shall be two people in one body, working together. This brings forth children: not by the blood of one but by blood of two is the flesh of children made. They (Adam and Eve/man and woman) are allowed to be two persons, but even so they will in marriage be one flesh, otherwise two, because none of them has the power (to create children) of his own flesh. *Stjórn* follows Comestor closely and states that because woman has arrived in this way (from the rib if Adam, sic), a great many men shall leave their fathers and mothers and live with (own fields together with) their wife, as she is a part of himself. The two should be one body, because of this mixing of the blood of both

of them, children are made (“started”). Then the compiler states that *hvarki þeira hefir meðr ollu eitt saman valld yfir sealfs sins likam*. The word *hvarki* can mean that either and both of them or that neither of them has power over their own bodies, but as Comestor allows two separate beings in marriage I have chosen for the later possibility, that either of them has (both) their own power over their own body. This should then have been the compilers way of informing that marriage allowed the spouses to be separate persons.

De Rijmbijbel states in a direct speech of Adam that “Because she is of my upper body, the man shall follow his wife and leave his mother and father”, naming the mother first. The continuation is from the view of the storyteller:”thereafter is described how the two should become one flesh. According to this he foretold marriage”. How children are made from that the two are becoming one flesh is not mentioned, nor is there a mention made that children are a result of the union of man and woman and from marriage, as opposed to being the work of one single person. Also no mention is made of any right to remain a separate being in a marriage, or indeed of any right to hold any power of one’s own body. On the other hand, the writer of *The Historye of the Patriarks* states that none of them, man nor woman, shall have power of their own flesh, but that “*either of other have equal power*”, and even gives that as the reason why the two shall become one flesh. Adams prophecy is repeated thus, but is not named as a prophecy, nor connected to marriage. Also there is no mention of how children shall come from this union, or even that they can arrive in the union at all.

XX De statu innocentiae

Stjórn

Both of them, Adam and his wife, were naked without any feelings of shame, as was said before. They thought that there was no need/necessity to cover them selves because they felt no carnal lust or temptation that they needed to curb. Just as we are not ashamed for anyone seeing our head and feet.

de Rijmbijbel

When Eve and Adam was made, they were both naked. And they felt no shame. Notice that men can see this in children, they are not ashamed before they are shown and knows the true nature of sin. So it was with Eve and Adam, that (is the reason why) they were without shame.

Analysis

Here too, both the *de Rijmbijbel* and *Stjórn* translate the storyline from Genesis verbatim, and both develop their own reasoning connected to the text. *Stjórn* informs us that Adam and Eve felt no shame for their nakedness, because they did not feel carnal lust or temptation when looking at each other, no more than we (the audience) feel shame as someone sees our feet or heads. From this we can also with some certainty deduce that the Old Norse society had no taboo on showing heads or naked feet! The feeling of shame is here connected to the ability to think further, to the act that can follow as one is naked, and as a result feel carnal lust. The naked image thus awakens the lust via the imagination of the person looking. Clothes are obviously considered to be useful to “curb” the sexual lust.

De Rijmbijbel on the other hand goes on to say that *Maerct dat men dit an kindren siet, sine scamen hem niet eer entujnt Ere hare nature sonden kint*, ‘Note that we can see this in children; they are not ashamed before they are showed, and know, the nature of the sins’. Here nakedness seems to be directly tied to sin, presumably carnal sin. It is to be deduced that young children do not know carnal lust and are therefore oblivious to any shamefulness in nakedness. As they are instructed they come to understand what carnal sin is (presumably before they are old enough to know this sin from first hand experience) and are in this way taught by society to feel shame. Interestingly, in this section van Maerlant consequently names Eve first, even when the rhyme does not demand it.

In *Stjórn*, the explanation does not linger on children or on their moral education, but on direct relation to the rules of adult society. A quick comparison shows that *The Historye of the Patriarks* does not offer any explanations at all. There, the statement of Adam and Eve being *nakyd but nothyng ashame*, is followed with the story of the envy of Lucifer, bringing downfall to the human race through the serpent.

Discussion

As this study began, some questions were formulated with the aim of looking at two different medieval translations of *Historia Scholastica*, to learn more about the time and milieu wherein they were made. The main question was as follows:

- Which strategies for translation can be found in the Old Norse translation of the Bible, now known to us as *Stjórn I*, and which strategies can be found in the Middle Dutch translation known as *de Rijmbijbel*?

The study was confined to the Book of Genesis, chapter 1 and 2. The following sub-questions were used to further develop the question:

- Does a closer reading of the prologues give information about the thoughts of the writers/translators on subjects as the translation and the intended audience?
- Were the same strategies used in both languages, or do they differ?
- Could anything be deduced from the similarities or differences?
- What, if anything, do the strategies used suggest to us about the intended use of the vernacular translations, as for example their intended audience and the intention with the translations?

Did a closer reading of the prologues give information about the thoughts of the writers/translators on subjects as the translation and the intended audience?

The medieval prologue was formalized and based on the antique prologue, known as the “Aristotelian prologues”. It was expected to state among other things the reason for the book that followed (*causae*), its title, of course (*titulus*), its usefulness (*utilitas*) and on what authority it was made.⁵⁴ A prologue also told the intended audience what to expect from the work at hand. This can all be found in both of the two vernacular prologues. In the prologue of *Stjórn I* the writer also explicitly states who his intended audience is: men at the kings court that lacks proficiency in Latin. On the subject of translation he seems to view Old Norse as inferior to Latin. He also explains that he is bringing material from several sources into his work, but does not mention commentary from himself as part of the material. The compiler uses the prologue of *Historia Scholastica* to explain the connection between the secular world and the sacral heaven, and expands upon this. The aim of his work is stated to be to educate in an amusing way.

In *de Rijmbijbel* the writer only specifies his audience as far as that it is aimed at people without knowledge of Latin. The writers thoughts on translation is given as that it must be

⁵⁴ Minnis, *Medieval theory of Authorship*, p160-162.

done without distorting the truth of the source material. The aim is to instruct the audience and the source material can, and will, be presented in an amusing way, adapted to be easier to understand and to remember. Here there is also a discussion, almost a defence for, the choice of presentation, in a rhymed version. Both prologues thus give information on intended use and, to a degree, the audience. Both prologues state an intention to make difficult material not only understandable but enjoyable for the intended audience.

Were the same strategies used in both languages, or do they differ?

Following the hypothesis of Rita Copeland, it was probable that the popular medieval way of translating; that is translating as a process of commenting, subtracting from, adding to and compiling simultaneously, would be found in a learned vernacular work such as a translation of *Historia Scholastica* would have been. The two translations were, on the other hand, neither of them at the first glance what one would call an average staple-translation, one being rhymed, and the other made in the far North, where we are maybe not used to expect sophistication.⁵⁵ However, both translators/compiler used the very method Copeland describes. Both adds, explains, subtracts and comments, and both seem to use this to adapt their material to their own audience, that is, to appropriate the text. The Old Norse version even used the technique lavishly, expanding the material to more than double the original material in bulk, with long spinning reasoning on adjoining topics, cherry-picked not only from the Bible and the *Historia Scholastica* but also from Augustinus, Isidorus de Sevilla and Vincent de Beauvais. The rhymed translation into Middle Dutch also used these same sources, but expanded less upon the text.

The exact date of the writing of *Stjórn I* is unknown, but if the prologue is authentic it would have been somewhere between 1299 and 1319. It is thus written no later than 38 years after *de Rijmbijbel*. It seems that the learned way of showing penmanship, through adapting, expanding upon and appropriating the text, was just as viable in the scholarly circles in the North at that time, as it was in the scholarly circles in the more central part of Europe where van Maerlant was writing.

Could anything be deduced from the similarities or differences?

That one version is rhymed, and one is written in prose suggests two different views on both the material and on the act of translation, as we see in the chapter on genres. More to the point here; the difference in genre notwithstanding, there seems to be a greater compliance between *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel* than between any one of the two and *The Historye of the Patriarks*. It

⁵⁵ Jensen, 'Martyrs, Total War, and Heavenly Horses': "...the majority of historians in Scandinavia agreed that everything came a little late to Scandinavia..." and that medieval sources, in this case Peter of Cluny, writes of "The land of the primitives", p 89-90.

is possible that *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel* were made close enough in time to draw from much the same sources, a cluster of sources being especially popular in academic circles at that actual timeperiod in Western and Northern Europe perhaps? Or it could be that the two writers had other things than just the sources in common. We do not know anything about the compiler of *Stjórn*, and very little of Jacob van Maerlant, but it is possible that the education of the two writers was sufficiently alike to make them use much the same sources. One reason could be that they were educated within the same system, for example within the same or very similar religious orders. It is also possible that these two translations were main stream version of adaptations of *Historia Scholastica*, and that *The Historye of the Patriarks* is the one that is different and unique. To be certain if the similarities are more specifically unique to these two writers, more vernacular translations of history bibles needs to be studied and compared with *Stjórn I*, *de Rijmbijbel*, and also with *The Historye of the Patriarks*.

What, if anything, does the strategies used suggest to us about the intended use of the vernacular translations, as for example their intended audience and the intention with the translations?

Central in the work of Copeland is what she has coined *appropriation*, the wilfull act of using subtraction and adding, and not the least, using hermeneutics, to adapt the text one is translating with the aim of appropriation; that is, making this text into a text at home in its new environment. Looking at what the compiler of *Stjórn I* and what van Maerlant has chosen to use or to discard from the material of Comestor, their choices gives an indication as to what was deemed interesting, understandable and/or adequate knowledge for their respective audiences. Information discarded could give a hint as to what the writers deemed unnecessary or maybe to complicated knowledge for their audiences. In both texts, for example, Greek etymology is left out, and most of the Latin too. Both texts mainly ignore references to philosophers. Both texts also ignore some of the scholarly discussions, such as the gender of the soul, or how animals can have motion but not a soul. Both texts adds other scholarly discussions, but it would seem that these are of a more practical sort, for instance whether sexual relations are sinful within marriage or not. *Stjórn I* does however add more abstract discussions, such as whether the moon was full or new at the moment of its creation.

What material the writers added would have been intended to fill in what the writers considered to be lacuna's in the text, adding information necessary for their audiences, or information intended to catch their audiences' interest. Any parts where details are added to an existing topic, or concepts are explained in some detail compared to *Historia Scholastica*, should point to areas where the audiences were expected to not understand or to misunderstand without a deeper explanation, or maybe to areas wherein they were expected to have a special interest. Also *foregrounding* could point to what the writers thought was of special interest to their audience, or high-light topics that the writers wanted to impress upon

the audience. Foregrounding could be explained as the way of expressing things so that they draw attention to them selves. As an example, van Maerlant instead of the expected *Adam and Eve* writes *Eve and Adam*. It can also be to give unexpected priority to a topic, as when the compiler of *Stjórn* lets God instruct the fish explicitly to “fill up the *seafarers’* waters”.

A short recapitulation of the strategies

I. **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel* mention the four elements. **Neither** mentions the Word as the true beginning of the world, **nor** do they mention that Plato, Aristoteles and Epicurus thought the *materia* already to exist. *The Historye of the Patriarks* does mention the Word, and it does mention the three philosophers, but not the four elements.

II. Only *Stjórn* has the **added explanation** that the world was created but invisible and untouchable. **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel* **ignore** the comparison to the carpenter, but *Stjórn* at least mentions that the materials were already in existence. *De Rijmbijbel* uses the point of Comestor that the Holy Spirit is to be understood as Gods will. It also introduces **Christology**; comparing the Spirit of God floating over water to the baptism. **None** of the two translates the discussion on whether darkness already existed. *The Historye of the Patriarks* uses both the comparison of the carpenter and the discussion on the earlier existence of darkness used by *Historia Scholastica*.

III. **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel* are true to the main core, the creating, separating and naming of light and darkness, as well as the angels sorted into dark and light, connected to night or day. *Stjórn* follows the description of the dwindling light and the new day more closely. **None** of them enters into the **etymological** explanations from Greek words. In *Stjórn*, we get an **explanation** on when the day begins and ends. In *de Rijmbijbel*, the information of the Word is used here, on the First Day of Creation, with the **added information** that the Word of God is the Son of God, made flesh in the womb of Mary (a piece of **Christology**). We also get a **description** of how the newly created light looked like, when there was no sun yet. *The Historye of the Patriarks* adds a reason for the creation, that God wanted all things to be perfect and pleasant, and that evening was made first, followed by the day.

IV. **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel* tells over the form and quality of the firmament, following Comestor. **Both expand on the description** of the firmament in the form of an eggshell. *Stjórn* describes it as a barrel, and *de Rijmbijbel* describes it as a bowl. **None** of the writers uses the **etymological** explanations over **Greek** words for heaven, but in *de Rijmbijbel* we get an **etymological** explanation of the word *hemel* and also the word *firmament*, related in **Middle Dutch** (*firmament* was thus obviously a word integrated in the Middle Dutch vocabulary). In *Stjórn* we get an **added discussion** on the possibility that the angels did not

fall until on the second day, Monday, a view with which the writer disagrees. **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel* **add** a question as to why God would want to hold water above the firmament. **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel* conclude that some men say that it is used for rain/dew. **None** of them translates the description of the firmament as an oven, reflecting sunlight. Van Maerlant **ignores** that the second day should be less good than the other days, while the compiler of *Stjórn* seems to find this question so important that he **adds** the discussion on which day the angels fell, as a new possible explanation. *The Historye of the Patriarks* follows Comestor in the description of the firmament but also in the comparison to an oven. It ignores completely that the second days should be less good.

V. *Stjórn* describes not only the bare facts of gathered water and dry land, but also **adds** the four elements, putting them in their order, and giving a reason for the order. Fire is thus placed first and highest because it is the lightest, and earth ordered last and lowest because it is the heaviest. Both water and earth is **described with beneficiary traits**, the water “benefits men” and the earth holds ore, gemstones and other things useful to men. Going back to the water held above the firmament, he agrees that this could be the reason for drizzle, snow and other moisture. It seems obvious that this is weather known to his audience. He **embellishes** on the growth of grass, herbs and trees, stating that they did not grow as slow as they do today, but was fully matured at once. He also **quotes** Comestor, in comparing this with “our” way of counting time, comparing the mature crops with harvest time and telling that the Church was created in spring (However, no mention is here made as to *why* the church counts spring as its “birthday”, that is Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit descends in the disciples of Christ). *De Rijmbijbel* is very to the point, only relating the barest of facts, but **adding an etymological** item in **Middle Dutch**. We are also given a **reason** for why herbs and trees bear harvest, it is to be obedient to God. *The Historye of the Patriarks* also gives the bare facts, adding the reason that this was done as God wanted things to be perfect, profitable and pleasant.

VI. **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel* follows the main core of the creation of sun, moon and stars, and the practical use of the latter in telling time and the weather (*Stjórn* **adds** “stormy weather), and for the stars, to be guiding travellers and birds at night. *Stjórn* **adds** that they are made for the consoling and helping of men dying at night, to the tasks of moon and stars. Also *Stjórn* **repeats** from Comestor that the stars make up twelve star signs, but their use is given as separating time, and telling solstice and equinox, and divination is **not** mentioned. The stars are fixed in the firmament but the seven planets, sun among them, wanders freely. *De Rijmbijbel* **ignores** the star signs but **quotes** Comestor on the size of the sun, moon and earth. He also mentions the planets but does not tell how many they are. The night-flying birds are mentioned shortly, while *Stjórn* **adds** more detail and even names two species (one with an **etymological** explanation in Latin, and one which must have been well known to the

audience, the strix-family, owls, known as *ugla* in Old Norse, though this name is not mentioned at all). **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel* mentions travellers in the desert sand as being especially in need of the stars for navigation, but the place varies. *Stjórn* just mentions Africa, and *de Rijmbijbel* mentions Libya. Comestor speaks of Ethiopia. *Stjórn* has an **added** discussion on the creation of the moon: quarrelsome men discuss of it was full or new when it was created. **Alternatives** as to where and when it was created (east or west, in the morning with the sun or in the evening on its own) are given. *De Rijmbijbel* tells shortly that the moon was made to rise as the sun set, **no** discussion or **alternatives** are mentioned. *The Historye of the Patriarks* shortly tells about the making of sun, moon and stars, and the use of the later for separating time and helping creatures labouring at night, foremost sailors and birds.

VII. Here *Stjórn* **adapts** the words of Comestor, who describes how easily water and air flows, with a **detailed** explanation on how fish and bird moves, the birds actually swimming in the moisture of the air, so that where the air is thin, that is, not sufficiently packed with moisture, birds cannot fly. An **example** is given, from a specific geographic location, in Macedonia, Greece. We are also informed that fish are counted as reptiles because of their movement, this information comes **from Comestor**, but is formulated **differently** – they are, in Old Norse, moving on their breast, while Comestor states that they are moving without legs. Comestor is **closely followed**, in an account of Plato misunderstanding “the book of Moses” **adding** that bad angels are hidden in misty air, eternal suffering and not a decoration for anything. Fish and other greater water-living creatures, the whales are named, are told to multiply and fill *the waters of the seafarers’*. Comestor is **also followed** by *de Rijmbijbel*, in that both birds and fish belongs to water, but **without explanation** into how, and with the **addition** that everything on earth is connected through their need of water. Van Maerlant then **deviates** into telling that only God can make these creatures and that it is a sin to claim otherwise. He also **adds** that God blessed these creatures because he wanted them to do his will (not because they already did his will, thus). He does **not mention** that they are ordered to be fruitful and multiply, nor Plato, Moses or demons and angels in the sky. **None** of the writers translates Comestors thoughts on how living beings can have motion without an eternal soul. *The Historye of the Patriarks* shortly informs over the creation of fish and birds, adding that both species belongs to the earth and were made by God because he found that water and earth was “not yet fully arranged to the pleasure of mankind”

VIII. The compiler of *Stjórn* orders his description of the creation of the world after his **own explanatory model** (according to Astås found in a later chapter of *Historia Scholastica*), and in this it is perfectly natural that the earth is decorated last, it is the heaviest and inmost/lowest of the elements. He **follows** this chapter of Comestor in the three sorts of animals created, reptiles, livestock and wild beasts, even for the second time adding an **etymological** explanation in Latin, over that *jumentum* means something like helping animal (beast of

burden is otherwise an often used English translation). God knew that man would fall, as Comestor explains. The compiler of *Stjórn* has further chosen to embed the creation of man and the creation of marriage here under the heading of the sixth day, thus leaving the structure of Comestor, **rearranging** it in a way he himself obviously has found more logical. To return to the sixth day of creation, Comestor explains how all animals once were dominated by man, but man has lost this domination, over all but the medium sized animals.

In *Stjórn* we also reads this reasoning but with the **added** reflection on how we can say that man holds any power over animals, as so many men are killed by animals and so much damage is done by birds. However, the sin of man is responsible for most, as man lost his original status (and powers) there. The sin is also responsible for inedible fruits. But then comes an interesting reasoning, maybe aimed to show that men even so has a lot of power over their life (and has no reason to feel downtrodden) Man has support and strength and controls a lot of creatures, even if he because of his own frailty is easily killed by them. And mans mind and bodie are better than the creatures. *De Rijmbijble* **follows** Comestor in the decoration of the earth and that God knew man would fall, and wanted to give man the animals as support after the sin. Van Maerlant then gives an **etymological** explanation of the Middle Dutch word for animals, *beesten*, which can be pronounced close to *bijstaan*, to support. All animals were friendly to man before his sin, and the sin is the reason that some animals became dangerous as man lost control over them, **just as** Comestor tells. **Neither** *Stjórn* nor *de Rijmbijble* uses the three reasons Comestor gives for the difficulties man faces from beasts; that they are for punishment, admonition and instruction. **Nor** do they go into the different kinds of reptiles and insects. Meanwhile *The Historye of the Patriarks* follows Comestor closely, even repeating a Latin quote (that Comestor uses here but that actually comes from Genesis chapter 3). It also tells of insects and which of them was made before the sin and which ones were made after the sin.

IX. As mentioned, the compiler of *Stjórn* here **deviates** from the structure of Comestor and embed the creation of man in the creation of the sixth day. He **explains** why God say “Let us make man” as he already from the beginning writes that “God said to his own Son and to the Holy Spirit”, a both simple and profound theologically based explanation. Both man and woman are created after the likeness of God, but woman is created last. The compiler **follows** Comestor closely as he presents three signs that man has a special status in the creation, but with **additions**. Thus man has inside him a soul mirroring the Trinity, and he is not only premediated but affirmed by the Trinity. He also **follows** Comestor in that both animals and man initially ate fruit; eating flesh came with the sin. Examples are given as to which animals man cannot longer control and why, **just as** Comestor does, but **deviates** in the example of the smallest uncontrollable animals, where birds are used, not flies. The compiler then uses

another source, *Speculum Historale*, to show how man is the image of God in four different ways. Here, among other things, man as micro cosmos is introduced.

A pretty picture of man before sin is given, and if he had not sinned, he had always been without pain, hard work, hunger or illness. No mention is made of the pains of childbirth, although this seems, from a theological point of view, to have been a natural place to mention that giving birth with pain, was something that came to women after the original sin. The writer mentions however, that men would, if the sin had not occurred, not have needed clothes, as they then would have been no more ashamed of their genitals than over their hands and feet. *De Rijmbijble* **explains** to his audience on a **personal** note why God said “Let us make”. It is the Trinity talking to itself. He very clearly tells how man is made with premeditation, and adds that this “is no small matter”. **Following** Comestor he tells that man is made with a soul after the image of God. He **repeats** the three signs marking the special status of man, but **adds** that man was made “not only for earthly pleasures/riches”, presumably meaning that man was also made for an afterlife. The premeditation is presented in very **simple words**; that “God planned this and said ‘Let us make man’”. The third sign is as good as **verbatim** translated. Also the sin as responsible for the loss of control in both bigger and smaller animals and for inedible fruit follows Comestor, but the animals are more **detailed**. Among the examples of the greater animals over which man has lost control, not only lions, tigers and leopards but dragons are mentioned. The smallest animals are represented both with flies, as in *Historia Scholastica*, but also with birds, as in *Stjórn*. **Neither** in *Stjórn* nor *de Rijmbijble* the gender of the soul is discussed. **Both** use different explanations for how the Trinity speaks with itself, both chosen from of the two explanations Comestor gives. *The Historye of the Patriarks* also introduces a third explanation: *Wherfor the blyssyd Sonne, secounde persone of the trinitie, spak(e) vnto the Fadre*. Otherwise this writer follows Comestor closely, except that he too ignores the discussion on the gender of the soul.

X. **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijble* **quotes** Comestor in that when God told mankind to multiply, this means that he spoke on marriage. **Both** then choses to **deviate** from the text, on this point **adding** a comment on that some men (presumably religious scholars?!) claims that sexual relations never is without sin, not even within marriage. Comestor seems to cover this in a later chapter, but both *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijble* use it here, together with the command of God to multiply. While the compiler of *Stjórn* calls this view foolish, van Maerlant seems to feel more strongly about this topic and uses *de Rijmbijble* to demand severe punishment for anyone claiming that sexual relations within marriage is sinful. He calls them heretics who hold such views, as God commanded men to multiply and God never encourages sin. *The Historye of the Patriarks* quietly ignores the whole question of marriage.

XI. While Comestor explains in *Historia Scholastica* that God rested, not because he was tired but because he was finished, *Stjórn* **ignores** this as if any such suggestion was unthinkable. Otherwise *Stjórn* **follows** Comestor in the three works of God that was now finished (creating, appointing, adorning) but **adds** more order to the reasoning, arranging day 1 as the work of creation, ordering/appointing on day 2 and 3 and finally, decoration on the last three days. The compiler **adds** that God rested on the seventh day from his good work, and he recognizes and blesses us when we have done good work. What then follows are several pages where the compiler has **added material** inspired from Augustinus, weaving together the seven days of creation with the seven ages of the world and with the seventh days of men. He ends with the comparison of a good man in old age, awaiting the eternal rest of the seventh day in heaven. *Stjórn* then curves back to Comestor, again describing the three works now finished, but **adding** the works of God that is never finished, namely the giving every new living thing a soul, and showing us how to live as good men, taking the worthy up to him in heaven. *De Rijmbijble* assures its audience that God did not rest because he was made weaker from his hard work, but because he was finished, even though his work unfolds daily. We are told how everything that exist, comes from matter already existing on the seventh day. Just as the compiler of *Stjórn*, van Maerlant **adds** that God gives each new body a soul. He also **adds** that the seventh day was a Saturday, called “Sabbath” by Hebrew men. God rested this day without pomp and circumstance, but since then men has had this as a day of feast, Van Maerlant then **adds** some **Christology**, telling us that this happened before it rained, while everything got water from the fountains of paradise, and that the paradise actually equals Mary mother of Christ and that the fountain is Jesus. *The Historye of the Patriarks* lumps the blessing of Adam and Eve together with the blessing of the seventh day, adding that even if God rested after his work had been done, there was “not denying but that he had more to make thereafter”, which opens an intriguing theological view which we, however, are not going to pursue here.

XII. Here **both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijble* **deviate** from Comestor, **adding** the misconception of Plato, that angels had formed the body and God just the soul of man. **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijble* are also adamant that men must not think that the soul is made of “godly matter”, because God cannot sin or die, and anything created of godly matter likewise cannot sin or die, but man clearly can both. Both also inform us that Adam was created as a young grown man, “on the height of his manliness”. *Stjórn* then **adds** that this is the first place in the bible where God is called king/lord, and that this is because he now has created a servant, man, over which he can be said to be king. This is not mentioned in *de Rijmbijble*, where van Maerlant instead **adds** that man was given free will and therefore had his own choice in whether to obey God and live forever, or be disobedient and become mortal. None of this is mentioned in *Historia Scholastica* at this point, and *The Historye of the Patriarks* refers the whole making of Adam in one short sentence, ending with him being placed in paradise.

XIII. **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijble* follows Comestor in that God had already planted paradise on the third day, but while *de Rijmbijble* **quotes** Comestor in that paradise lies in the east but **adds** a description of its beauty and how it was never touched by the flood. *Stjórn* **adds** more detail, saying that paradise lies close to Campus Damascus. **Both** tell over the planting of trees, beautiful to look at and sweet to eat from, and of how in the middle of paradise, the trees of life, and of good and evil were placed. *Stjórn* even quotes that this were the most famous of the trees. *Stjórn* **adds** that the tree of life had the effect that the man who ate from it regularly, would never be sick or die. Man could not do evil before he had eaten from the tree of good and evil, but having eaten from it, Adam understood “another mans sickness/weekness, and saw that he had sown the same weekness in himself”. Obedience is central in creating good things and Adam is compared to a young boy, learning how obedience leads to good things and disobedience leads to bad things, “supports evil”. This reasoning seems to build on Comestor from a later chapter, but added in this chapter, presumably because it was found to fit better here. *De Rijmbijble* **adds** that God is mild and wise. He **explains** to us that the name of the tree of good and evil, comes from that Adam when he ate from it did evil and harmed the good. Man did not actual learn to do evil from eating from the tree but eating the fruit unlocked the evil in the world. **Neither** *Stjórn* nor *de Rijmbijble* mentions the name of Eden or uses the etymology reasoning that Comestor uses when writing about Eden. *The Historye of the Patriarks* shortly states that Adam was placed in paradise, that the trees were planted, fair to look at and sweet to eat, and in the middle, the tree of life and the tree of good and evil.

XIV. As we come to the fountains of paradise, **both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijble* **follow** Comestor in the description of the four rivers, with some changes. *Stjórn* describes Ganges in more detail then *Historia Scholastica*, adding that its name comes from the names of the kings of India. Comestor is also quoted on the matter of the gold (best known to man in the world) found in the rivers of India, and gemstones. *Stjórn* however **adds** more detail on the different “faces” of the river Ganges, and about the rivers where the rivers come from, and that Chaldea is where Abraham was “spawned”. *De Rijmbijble* tells us that the rivers can go underground and then re-appear somewhere else, but otherwise tells us only the names of the rivers, and that gold can be found in the sands of the river Phison. **Neither** *Stjórn* nor *de Rijmbijble* mentions what Comestor tells over the name of Euphrates, coming from its fertility. *The Historye of the Patriarks* follows Comestor closely here in naming and describing the rivers and the lands.

XV. While **both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijble* of course **quotes** the commandment of which trees not to eat from, *Stjórn* says that as man eats from the tree of good and evil, he shall die in spirit and become mortal, and then continues to **quote** Comestor in stating that man was alone when this was commanded – or was it given later, to both of them? *De Rijmbijble* quotes

Comestor in that man was placed in paradise to be there in great pleasure (work, but not from pain or necessity, van Maerlant specifies). On the day man eats from the tree of good and evil, God tells him, he shall become mortal. **No mention** is made of that Adam maybe was the only one to hear this, and responsible for telling Eve about it later. *The Historye of the Patriarks* shortly tells that Adam was placed in paradise with the commandment not to eat from the tree of life (and not the tree of good and evil!) but adds that “But Adam did not understand the Lord so”, indicating that a misunderstanding was behind the sin.

XVI. Here *Historia Scholastica* states the necessity of a woman for the procreation of the species. This is **not mentioned** in *Stjórn* or *de Rijmbijble*. In *Stjórn*, Adam is showed the animals to name them, just as in *Historia Scholastica*, but also so that he shall see that it is **necessary** for him to have a woman, all the animals were “unlike to him”. Another reason is added, that the animals should know that Adam was their “leader and governor”. *De Rijmbijble* **only mentions** that God wants to give Adam someone to help him that is similar to him, and the naming of the animals, to give them names, and that he would then see that there were no animal similar to him in soul or body. Not that Adam could have thought the making of a woman unnecessary, or that he really thought about this at all. Also we read nothing about the animals learning that Adam was their governor. *Historia Scholastica* formulates the ulterior motive of God differently, namely that having named and seen all the animals, Adam would not consider the making of a woman *superfluous*. Also, **both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijble* inform us that Adam spoke Hebrew when naming the animals, and that this was the first language, just as *Historia Scholastica* does. *Stjórn* states that Adam spoke in Hebrew, so that animals had one name only “until the languages split up” (surely meaning the tower of Babel without actually mentioning it). *The Historye of the Patriarks* follows *Historia Scholastica* closely, both as to the need of a woman to “bring forth fruit like himself” and the need to show him all other animals so he would not “think the making of a woman idle and unprofitable” (!). Here we are also told that Hebrew was the only language until the tower of Babel.

XVII. **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijble* relate how God made Adam sleep, took one of his ribs and made woman from this. But **both** also **add** that this sleep was more than a usual sleep, more a sort of unconsciousness. *Historia Scholastica* only mentions a deep sleep (as does *The Historye of the Patriarks*). The story of Adams experience or vision when he lay there in sleep, is also **added** in both *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijble*, but not in *Historia Scholastica* nor in *The Historye of the Patriarks*. *Stjórn* also **adds** a passage on the “Jewish” discussion on the existence of Lilith, feeling strongly against this. It would seem as if van Maerlant knew this story too, as he, a bit unnecessary it could seem, mentions that only one single woman were made out of the rib of Adam.

XVIII. **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijble* uses some sort of **etymological** explanation for the name for woman, just as *Historia Scholastica*, but in *Stjórn* this is done in the vernacular, while in *de Rijmbijble*, the word *virago* is used without more explanation than that “that word comes from man”. *De Rijmbijble* continues, as does *Historia Scholastica*, with telling that after the sin Adam named her Eva, “that men may understand as the mother of all humans”, which is not a very clear explanation in vernacular Middle Dutch. Van Maerlant then **adds** an item he seems to have thought important for his audience; the first sounds a new-born made, according to gender. Boys cries aaaaaaa and girls cries eeeeeee we are told. Needless to say, this is not used in *Historia Scholastica*, nor in *Stjórn*. *Stjórn* does tell the name of Eve, but first later, on page 58 in the edition of Astås. *The Historye of the Patriarks* quotes *Historia Scholastica*, including using the word *virago*, and that she after the sin was named Eve.

XIX. *Stjórn* **follows** Comestor with a slight **deviation**, stating that “a great many men shall leave their fathers and mothers” for the sake of their wife. The two shall be one body, because the mixing of blood is what starts a child. Just as Comestor, the writer goes on to say that they have power over their own body (Comestor says that they have the right to remain two persons, but in marriage they will be one flesh because they cannot create children on their own). *De Rijmbijble* relates the prophesy of Adam in direct speech, “Because she is of my body, the man shall follow his wife and leave his mother and father”, thus also **foregrounding** the mother. There is **no mention** of how children are made from the two becoming one flesh, and no mention of that one could remain two persons within the marriage or have a say over one’s own body.

XX. **Both** *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijble* follows Comestor, and both **adds** a comparison on how Adam and Eve could feel no shame. *Stjórn* states that as they did not feel carnal lust, they did not need to cover their bodies, feeling no more shame than the audience did when someone saw their head or feet. *De Rijmbijble* compares their shamelessness to that of young children before they are taught about sin (by society?). Van Maerlant **foregrounds** Eve, two times writing Eve and Adam.

Summary

The compiler of *Stjórn* often adds material of a practical nature, often seen from the profitable use of the earth. He does not go to the length of describing the earth as it is made as “profitable”, as does the writer of *The Historye of the Patriarks*, but he seems to lay priority on topics close to manly occupational uses (ore, valuables, fishing, and so on). Also some additions seem to be intended to show how society is, or should be, organized. There are, for example, many comments on obedience and some on leadership. The writer also seems to have a liking for the dramatic, as when he describes the fall of Lucifer or the different faces of the river Ganges. The insertion of the seven ages of man, weighed against the seven ages of

the world and the seven days of creation, probably echoes the medieval urge to categorize and create order, but it also suggests that the male world was central to the audience. The compiler does not introduce much of the philosophical material of Comestor, and only three times an etymological explanation is used. Only one time an Old Norse word is used for this, the word for woman, come from the word for man, as she was made from man. Often more scholarly discussions in the source material is ignored, but others, seemingly more practical, are added.

In *de Rijmbijbel* the writer seems rather fond of etymology, as he in nearly every section explains a vernacular word from the etymology of the time, which was often based on logic and homonymies between traits of what was described, and the sound of the word for it. Once or twice he enlightens his audience as to a Latin word (*empyrius*, as being the correct name for heaven, and *virago*, for woman) but he does only give etymological *explanations* for words in the vernacular language. He also does not explain upon the Latin words. Regularly he uses direct speech, even letting Adam turn directly to the audience.

Van Maerlant further often uses Christology, relating things in the process of the creation of the world to the coming of Christ or to every day practices in the contemporary society, such as the baptism. His text otherwise seems to give priority to morality, and to foreground women and children. In his prologue it would seem as if he was comparing him self, as producing or giving birth to a book, to Mary mother of Jesus, giving birth to Jesus. It is not difficult to draw a line of similarity between the writer and *any* woman having given birth. This could indicate that he wanted to engage his audience in his writing. It could be interpreted as lifting women to his creational level, having given birth, just as Mary mother of Christ, and just as him self, the creator of books. Or he could be creating a link where the audience lifted him to their level, one of them, as he too had given birth. Of course both interpretations could be working simultaneously, from separate perspectives, depending on the writer's and the audience's regard of them selves versus "the other". However, this *could* perhaps have been meant as a subtle linking.

His explanation of the first sounds of little babies is also interesting, suggesting that his audience would have had knowledge of, and an interest in, the very first sounds of new-borns, something that would presumably point to a secular female audience. A secular audience had probably more experience with child-birth, if not personally, then as part of a household. They were presumably also more focused on children than nuns would be. A male audience would probably not be as interested in the reference to new-borns; however this could be stereotyping a medieval male audience!

Also van Maerlant's foregrounding of mothers, and of Eve before Adam, as she is mentioned together with Adam, is interesting. There is to my knowledge no precedence for using the formula *Eve and Adam* instead of *Adam and Eve* in Dutch bibles. Even if the rhyme could,

maybe, be used as an excuse at one point, it does not explain why he uses the same formula again.

Van Maerlant seems very irritated on persons claiming that sexual relations within marriage is a sin, even demanding strong punishment against such talk. Again, a secular audience is more probable than a religious one. This however, is a topic possibly of interest for both genders.

Both texts have braided geographical information and knowledge of plants and animals into the material, which is not only taken from *Historia Scholastica* but from Augustinus, Vincent de Beauvais and Isidorus de Sevilla.

Conclusion

It seems obvious that neither *Stjórn* nor *de Rijmbijbel* were written for a previously entirely uneducated audience. To make sense of the text one would not only need to have the ability to listen to and to process a text, but also would have needed, and was clearly expected to, some knowledge of the Bible. As an example there is in *Stjórn* on page 26, where the night and the stars are discussed at some length, a short reference to *su stiarna er austrvegs konungum vitradiz*, the star that the kings in east were visited by (the same wise kings that would later visit Bethlehem to pay homage to the new-born King). The psalms of David are also mentioned.

In *Stjórn I* it is possible to recognize strategies used to make the text suitable for public reading, such as being structured in paragraphs of a suitable length. *De Rijmbijble*, being rhymed, is already through its form well suited for loud recitations. Copeland describes translation strategies with an eye on literature, but it is obviously that the same strategies could also be used in academic texts. The strategies used in both *Stjórn I* and *de Rijmbijble* seems to be identical; adding, subtracting, explaining and emphasizing (*foregrounding*), and they also seem to be identical to what Copeland describes as the medieval contemporary way of translating a text with the aim of appropriating it, thus adapting it to the target language.

Even if the translated material is just a fragment of the works here discussed, it is possible to make some observations. Both *Stjórn* and *de Rijmbijbel* adds and subtracts from their source text. Frequently they choose to add information on the same topics. They also often choose the same items to leave out. In fact there are much more similarities between the two texts of *Stjórn I* and *de Rijmbijbel* as to choice of which material to add or to subtract, than it is between any of the two texts and their main source *Historia Scholastica*, or between any of them and the slightly younger translation of the same main source, *The Historye of the Patriarks*.

However, it would seem that their material is adapted for two different audiences. Both prologues are long and detailed, giving much the same information, but with interesting differences. The views of the writer on translation and on the intended audience was, to a certain degree, possible to recognize. From the differences in how the texts were adapted, a plausible idea could be formed as to the respective intended audiences.

The compiler of *Stjórn* tells us in his prologue exactly which audience he has in mind, namely men at the king's court that does not understand Latin. The compilers choice of material is in harmony of his written aim, as it would seem that manly occupations and male development is central. Children, for example, are only mentioned a couple of times, and then as "young boys". In the prologue of *de Rijmbijbel* the intended audience is only given as "the ones not able to understand Latin". In the work itself, however, we repeatedly find the concept of children used as example on moral and biblical material, as when they are used as a picture of man before the sin, or in how new-borns in their first sounds echoes the names of Adam and Eve. The material seems in a lesser degree to be concerned about practical occupational uses. Several times women are foregrounded, as in the expressions *mother and father*, and *Eve and Adam*. Also, the writing of the work seems in the prologue at one point to be compared to child-birth. Even though van Maerlant does not specify the gender of his intended audience in his prologue, it does not seem to require a great leap of imagination to propose that his work was actually written with a fairly well educated secular female audience in mind – and probably also their young off-spring. The text seems moral and modest enough to be read aloud for any age-group. The children, at least, would have enjoyed the thought that once, men could control dragons.

Bibliography

Primary literature

Stjórn I

Astås, Reidar. *Stjórn, del I. Norrøne tekster nr 8*. Oslo: Riksarkivet, 2009.

De Rijmbijbel

Gyssling, Maurits (ed). Rijmbijbel. In: *Corpus van Middelnederlandse teksten (tot en met het jaar 1300)*, Reeks II: Literaire handschriften, deel 3. Martinus Nijhoff: Leiden, 1983.

http://www.dnbl.org/tekst/maer002mgys01_01/ dnbl.org. *Rijmbijbel* (1983 editie). Based on the *Rijmbijbel* In: Instituut voor Nederlandse lexicologie (samenstelling en redactie), Cd-rom Middelnederlands. Den Haag/ Antwerpen: Sdu Uitgevers/ Standaard uitgeverij, 1998.

Historia Scholastica

Taguchi, Mayumi. *The Historye of the Patriarks. Edited from Cambridge, St John's College MS G.31. With Parallel texts of The Historia Scholastica and the Bible Historiale*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2010.

Historia Scholastica. Early European Books: printed sources to 1700.

<http://www.eeb.chadwyck.co.uk>

Secondary literature

Astås, Reidar. *En kompilator i arbeid. Studier i Stjórn I*. Disertation. Tønsberg, 1985.

Astås, Reidar. *Stjórn – nytt lys over våre eldste bibeloversettelser*. Bibelselskapets skriftserie nr 2, 1990.

van den Berg, Marianus K.A. *De Noordnederlandse historiebijbel. Een kritische editie met inleiding en aantekeningen van Historia Scholastica. Ltk 231 uit de Leidse Universiteitsbibliotheek*. Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1998.

Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Deslisle, Jean & Judith Woodsworth, ed. *Translators through history*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995.

François, Wim & August den Hollander (ed.) *“Wading Lambs and Swimming Elephants” The Bible for the Laity and the Theologians in the Late Medieval and Early Modern Era*. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.

Gunnes, Erik. *Erkebiskop Øystein. Statsmann og kirkebygger*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1996,

Jensen, Kurt Villads. Martyrs, Total War, and Heavenly Horses: Scandinavia as Centre and Periphery in the expansion of Medieval Christendom. In: *Medieval Christianity in the North*. (Ed: Salonen, Kirsi; Jensen, Kurt Villads & Torstein Jørgensen). Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2013.

Kolsrud. *Presteutdanning i Noreg*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1962.

Kirby, Ian. *Bible Translation in Old Norse*. Université de Lausanne. Publications à l'Université de la faculté des lettres XXVII. Genève: Librairie Droz, 1986.

Lie, Orlanda S.H. ‘What is Truth? The Verse-Prose Debate in Medieval Dutch Literature.’ *Queeste* 1 (1994) 34-65.
http://www.dnbl.org/tekst/lie_002what01_01/lie_002what01_01_0001.pThe Historye of the Patriarks

Minnis, Alistair. *Medieval theory of authorship*. Aldershot: Wildwood House Ltd, 2nd ed., 1988.

van Oostrom, Frits. *Maerlants wereld*. Amsterdam: Prometheus, 1998.

van Oostrom, Frits. *Scholastica willic ontbinden: over de Rijmbijbel van Jacob van Maerlant*. Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1991.

Sherwood-Smith, Maria C. *Studies in the reception of the Historia Scholastica of Peter Comestor*. Oxford: The Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature, 2000.

Stoffers, Manuel (ed). *De middeleeuwse ideeënwereld 1000-1300*. Herleen/Hilversum: Open Universiteit/ Uitgeverij Verloren, 2nd ed. 1999.

Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translations Studies – and beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012.

De Rijmbijble Original of Ms Museum Mermanno 10 B 21, at www.geheugenvannederland.nl

De Heernse bijbel, dnbl version, www.dnbl.org

www.kartuizer.herne.be downloaded 13.07.2014.

<http://www.handschriftencensus.de/4846> downloaded 30.08.2014.

Appendix I *Historia Scholastica*

(Prolog)

(p2) Imperatoriae majestatis est in palatio tres habere mansiones: auditorium vel consistorium in quo jura decernit, coenaculum in quo cibaria distribuit, thalamum in quo quiescit. Ad hunc modum Imperator noster, qui imperat ventis et mari, mundum hunc habet pro auditorio ubi ad nutumejus disponuntur, unde illud Isaiae: Coelum et terram ego impleo. Secundum hanc dicitur Dominus, unde: P4. Domini est terra, et plenitudo ejus. Animam justii habet pro thalamo, quia: Deliciae et esse cum filiis hominum. Secundum hanc dicitur sponsus, et anima cujusque sponsa: Sacram scripturam habet pro coenaculo in qua sic suos inebriat ut sobrios reddat, unde: *Ambulavimus in domo Dei cum consense*, in sacra scriptura id ipsum sapientes. Secundum hanc dicitur paterfamilias...

Historia libri genesis

I. De creatione empyrei et quatuor elementorum

(p4) *In principio erat Verbum*, et Verbum erat principium, in quo et per quod Pater creavit mundum... Cum vero dixit Moyses: Creavit, trium errores elidit: Platonis, Aristotelis et Epicuri. Plato dixit tria fuisse ab aeterno, scilicet Deum, ideas (Graeca exemplar seu forma), ile (ile est prima materia et interpretatur silva), et in principio temporis de ile mundum factum fuisse. Aristoteles duo: mundum et opificem qui de duobus principiis, scilicet materia et forma, operatus est sine principio et operatur sine fine. Epicurus duo: inane et atomos, et in principio natura quosdam atomos solidavit in terram, alios in aquam, alios in aera, alios in ignem. Moyses vero solum Deum aeternum prophetavit et sine praejacenti materia mundum creatum. Creatus autem est in principio, id est in Filio, et iterandum est in principio sic: *In principio creavit Deus coelum et terram*, in principio scilicet temporis, coeva enim sunt mundus et tempus. Sicut autem solus Deus aeternus, sic mundus sempiternus, id est semper aeternus, temporaliter aeternus; angeli quoque sempiterni. Vel in principio omnium creaturarum creavit coelum et terram, id est has creaturas primordiales fecit, et simul. Sed quod simul factum est, simul dici non potuit. Licet enim hic prius nominetur coelum quam terra, tamen scriptum est: *In initio tu, Domine, terram fundasti et opera manuum tuarum sunt coeli*. Hanc creationem mundi, praelibata sub operibus sex dierum, explicat scriptura insinuans tria: creationem, dispositionem et ornatum. In primo die creationem et quamdam dispositionem; in secundo et tertio, dispositionem, in reliquis tribus ornatum.

II. De primaria mundi confusione

(p6) *Terra autem erat inanis et vacua*, id est machina mundialis adhuc erat inutilis et infructuosa et vacua ornatu suo. *Et tenebrae erant super faciem abyssi*. Eamdem machinam

quam terram dixerat, abyssum vocat pro sui confusione et obscuritate. Unde et Graecus eam chaos dixit. Quia vero dictum est: tenebrae erant, quidam dogmatizaverunt tenebras fuisse aeternas: quae jam, scilicet cum mundus fueret, erant. Alii irridentes Deum veteris testamenti, dicunt eum prius creasse tenebras quam lucem, sed tenebrae nihil aliud sunt quam lucis absentia. Obscuritas autem quaedam aeris a Deo creata est et dicta tenebrae, unde et in catalogo creaturarum dictum est: *Benedicte, lux et tenebrae, Domino!* Et Spiritus Domini, id est Spiritus Sanctus Dominus vel Domini voluntas, *ferebatur super aquas*. Sicut voluntas artificis habentis prae oculis omnem materiam domus faciendae illam fertur, dum quid de quo facturum est disponit. Praedictam machinam aquas vocat, quasi ductilem materiam ad operandum ex ea. Ideo vero sic variantur ejus nomina, ne, si unius elementi nomine tantum censeretur, illi magis putaretur accommoda. Hebraeus habet pro super ferebatur, incubabat, vel Syra lingua, fovebat, sicut avis ova. In quo etiam omne cum regimine nascentis mundi notatur initium. Hunc locum male intellexit Plato dictum hoc putans de anima mundi. Sed dictum est de Spiritu sancto creante, de quo legitur: *Emitte spiritum tuum et creabuntur*.

III. De opere primae dici

(p8) *Dixitque Deus: Fiat lux. Et facta est lux*. Id est verbum genuit in quo erat ut fieret lux, id est tam facile ut si quis diceret verbo. (Sicut Verbum est Fileus, ita dicere est gignere et gigni.) Lucem vocat quamdam nubem lucidam illuminatam superiores mundi partes, claritate tamen tenui ut fieri solet dilucilo. Et hoc admodum solis circumagitata, praesentia sui superius hemisphaerium et inferius vicissim illuminat... Per fiat, praesentia vel praescientia lucis in Deo intelligitur priusquam fieret, perfecta est, essentia ejusdem in actu, scilicet cum prodiit ad esse. *Et vivit Deus lucem, quod esset bona*, id est quae placuerat in praesentia, vel praescientia, ut fieret. placuit in essentia ut maneret. Vel tropice vidit, id est videre fecit. *Et divisit lucem, ac tenebras*. Hic incipit dispositio. Et tamen aliquid dicit de creatione, quasi cum luce tenebras creavit, id est umbram ex objectione corporum luci, et creatas divisit locorum distantia et qualitate ut scilicet nunquam simul sed semper e regioe diversa hemisphaeria vicissim sibi vindicarent. Intelligitur etiam hic angelorum facta divisio: stantes lux, cadentes tenebrae dicti sunt. *Et appellavit lucem diem*, a dia Graeco quod est claritas, sicut lux dicitur quia luit, id est purgat tenebras. Tenebras dixit noctem a nocendo, quia nocet oculis ne videant: sicut tenebrae, quia tenent oculos, ne videant. Sicut tamen dies exortum est a dia Graeco, ita nox a nyctim. *Et factum est vespere et post factum est mane* et sic completus est *dies unus*, naturalis. Primo enim cum coelo et terra lux est creata, qua paulatim occidente factum est vespere primae diei usualis, et, eadem migrante sub terras et ad ortum veniente, factum est mane, id est terminata est nox, et inchoavit dies secunda. Itaque praecedente luce diei et sequente nocte terminata exstitit dies unus. Lux ipsa divisas partes ostendebat, sed non dividebat.

IV. De opere secundae dici

(p10) Secunda die disposuit Deus superiora mundi sensibilis. EMPYREUM enim coelum quam cito factum est, statim dispositum est et ornatum, id est sanctis angelis repletum. *Fecit*

ergo es die *Deus firmamentum in medio aquarum*, id est quamdam exteriorem mundi superficiem ex aquis congelatis, ad instar crystalli consolidatam, et perlucidam, intra se caetera sensibilia continentem ad imaginem testae, qua in ovo est, et in eo fixa sunt sidera. Et dicitur firmamentum, non tantum propter sui soliditatem sed quia terminus est aquarum quae super ipsum sunt, firmus et intransgressibilis. Dicitur etiam coelum, quia celat, id est tegit omnia invisibilia. Et cum legitur firmamentum coeli, endiadis est, id est firmamentum quod est coelum, ut cum dicitur creatura salis. Unde et pro sui concameratione graece dicitur uranon, id est palatium. Vel dicitur coelum quasi casa elios, quia sol sub ipso positus ipsum illustrat. Hanc tamen circumvolutam concamerationem philosophus summitatem ignis intellexit. Cum enim ignis non habet quo ascendat, circumvolvitur ut in clibano patet; ita et circa mundi exteriora ignis volvitur. Et hoc est sidereum vel aetherum coelum...

Deus autem unitas est et sectionem et discordiam detestatur. Possumus tamen dicere quia opus tertiae diei quasi adhuc est de opere secundae diei, quod post patebit. Unde non commendatur nisi in tertia die, quasi post sui consummationem.

V. De opere tertiae diei

(p12) Tertia die aquas sub firmamento congregavit *Deus in unum locum*. Quae licet plura obtineant loca, tamen quia omnes continentur in visceribus terrae, in unum locum congregatae dictae sunt. Et potuit esse ut aquae quae totum aeris spatium occupant vaporabilis, solidatae modicum obtineant locum. Vel terra paululum subsedit, ut eas tanquam in matrice concluderet et sic apparuit arida, quae quasi latens sub aquis proprie humus dicta est. Sed cum apparuit arida eadem dicitur terra, quia teritur pedibus animantium. Vel circumpositis tribus elementis dicitur solum, quia solida. Dicitur tellus, quia tolerat labores hominum: *Congregationes aquarum vocavit maria* Hebraeorum idiomate, qui quaslibet aquarum congregationes aquarum vocant maria. Completo ergo aquarum opere subditur: *Et vidit Deus quod esset bonum*, et addit aliud opus illi, cum dixit: *Germinet Terra*. Nec de opere germinandi tantum intelligendum est sed de potentia, quasi potens sit germinare. Produxit enim de terra *herbam virentem et facientem semen et lignum pomiferum faciens fructum secundum genera sua*. Patet quia non per moras temporum ut modo produxit plantas suas terra, sed statim in maturitate viridi, in qua et herbae seminibus, et arbores pomis onustae sunt. Notandum quod dictum est: *virentem*. Quidam dicunt mundum in vere factum, quia viror illius temporis est et fructificatio. Alii, quia legunt: *lignum faciens fructum*, et additum: *herbam habentem semen*, factum dictum in Augusto sub leone. Sed in Martion factum dogmatizat ecclesia...

VI. De opere quartae diei

(p14) Quarto die quae disposuerat coepit ornare rebus illis, quae infra universum mundum congruis motibus agerentur. Plantae enim, quia terrae haerent, ad dispositionem terrae quasi

magis spectant, et sicut dispositionem sic et ornatum a superioribus inchoavit. Fecit enim eadem die luminaria, solem et lunam et stellas. Et dicitur sol, quia solus lucet, id est nullum cum eo. Luna luminum una, id est prima ut una dierum, vel una Sabbatorum dicitur. Sol et luna dicuntur *magna luminaria* in duobus et ex duobus, id est non solum pro quantitate luminis sed et corporis, et non tantum comparatione stellarum sed et secundum se, quia sol dicitur octies major terra...et luna etiam major terra dicitur. Lunam et stellas voluit illuminare noctem, ne nox sine lumine nimis esset indecora, ut operantes in nocte ut nautae et viatores solatium luminis haberent. Sunt etiam quaedam aviculae, quae lucem solis ferre non possunt, et fere nocte pascuntur. (Maxime hae aves in desertis Aethiopiae arenosis ubi modicus impulsus veti inventa itinerantium vestigia complanat.) Nec superfluit sol, licet nubes lucida vicem ejus ageret, quia illa tenuem et insufficientem lucem habebat, et forte non nisi superiora illuminabat, sicut nec stella modo. De illa autem nube lucida supradicta traditur modo quod vel redierit in materiam, unde facta fuerat, ut stella quae apparuit magis et columba in qua visus est Spiritus sanctus, vel quod semper solem comitatur, vel quod de ea factum est corpus solare. Nec tantum ad decorem, et ad usum luminis ea voluit esse, sed etiam ut essent *in signa, et tempora et dies et annos*, ut scilicet signa sint serenitatis et tempestatis, vel ut ex ipsis fierent signa duodecim majora et quadam signa minora. Plura his quae dicuntur signa vel sidera, tum quia magna diligentia signavit, vel consideravit ea antiquitas, tum quia adhuc signant et considerant ea homines ad disensionem temporum...

VII. De opere quintae dici

(p16) Quinta die Deus ornavit aerem et aquam vola tilia dans aeri natalitia aquis, et utraque ex aquis orta sunt. Facilis enim transitus est aquae in aera tenuendo et aeris in aquam spissando. Pisces vocavit ;oyse reptilia, quia impetu quodam totos se rapiunt, ut serpentes; non feruntur pedibus, ut ferae. Nota quia ex hoc quod dictum est: creavit volatile coeli super terram, erravit Plato qui descendens in Aegyptum, libro Moysi legit, et putavit Moysen sensisse volatilia esse ornatum aeris tantum circa terram, ornatum vero aeris superioris calodaemones, et cacodaemones. (Cum magis vere daemones dicantur boni angeli quam mali in suggillationem tamen promissionis eorum, scilicet: *Eritis sicut dii*, datum est eis hoc nomen.) Sed non ita est. Boni enim daemones ut dictum est, sunt in empyreo, mali vero in hunc aerem caliginosum detrusi sunt ad poenam, non ad ejus ornatum. *Deus enim peccantibus angelis non pepercit*. Creavit Deus, id est plasmavit, cete grandia. Cete generis neutri est indeclinabile. Declinatur, tamen cetus, ceti, *Et omnem animam viventem atque motabilem, quam produxerat aquae*. Motabiles autem dicuntur animae piscium et avium respectu animae hominis. Illae enim moventur de esse ad non esse, ista non, quia perpetua est, vel quia forsam animas non habent, sed tamen spiritus vegetativos quia cum ipsis animabus exstinguitur...ipsum animal vocavit animam, id est vivens. Unde, et Graeci dividunt animalia per zoa et psycheia: zoa id est viventia, bruta, sed psycheia animata, a psyche quod est anima rationalis. Sed etiam dicitur

creatum motabile, quod creatum est sic ut moveretur de vita ad mortem, quod non homo qui creatus est, ut non moreretur si vellet. Illo vera creata sunt vel ut in esum cedant aliis vel senio deficiant. His benedixit Deus: *Crescite et multiplicamini*.

VII. De opere sextae dici

(p18) Sexta die ornavit Deus terram. Produxit enim terra tria genera animalium: *jumenta, reptilia, bestias*. Sciens enim Deus hominem per peccatum casurum in poenam laboris ad remedium laboris dedit ei jumenta, quasi adjuvamenta, ad opus vel ad esum. Reptilia vero ed bestiae sunt ei in exercitium. Reptilium vero sunt tria genera: trahentia ut vermes qui se ore trahunt, serpentia ut colubri qui vi costarum se rapiunt, repentia pedibus scilicet ut lacertae et batracae. Dicuntur autem bestiae quasi vastiae et vastando, id est ledendo et saeviendo. Quaeritur de quibusdam minutis animantibus quae vel ex cadaveribus vel humoribus nasci solent, si tunc orta fuerint. Quorum sex sunt genera. Quaedam enim ex exhalationibus habent esse bibiones, vermes qui ante clepsidram nascuntur, bibiones ex vino, papiliones ex aqua. Quaedam ex corruptione humorum ut vermes in cisternis. Quaedam ex cadaveribus ut apes ex juvencis, scarabaei et scabrones muscae magnae quae sonant ex volatu, nascuntur ex equis. Quaedam ex corruptione lignorum ut teredines. Quaedam ex herbarum corruptione ut erucae ex oleribus. Quaedam ex corruptione fluctuum ut gurguliones et fabis. De his dicitur quia quae sine corruptione nascuntur, ut illa quae exhalationibus tunc facta sunt, quae vero ex corruptionibus post peccatum ex rebus corruptis orta sunt. Quaeritur quoque de nocivis animantibus, si creata sunt nociva vel primo mitia post facta sint homini nociva. Dicitur quod ante peccatum hominis fuerunt mitia, sed post peccatum facta sunt nociva homini tribus de causis: propter hominis punitionem, correptionem, instructionem. Punitur enim homo cum laeditur his vel cum timet laedi, quia timor maxima poena est. Corrigitur his, cum scit ista sibi accidisse pro peccato suo. Instruitur admirando opera Dei, magis admirans opera formicarum quam onera camelorum, vel cum videt haec minima sibi posse nocere, recordatur fragilitatis suae et humiliatur. Sed diceret quis quod quaedam animalia laedunt alia,

(p20) quae nec inde puniuntur vel corriguntur vel instruuntur, sed ex his et in his instruitur homo. Per exemplum etiam ad hoc creata sunt, ut aliis sint in esum. Sed si iterum dicitur quod etiam in mortuos homines saeviunt, sed et in his instruitur homo, ne aliquod genus mortis horrescat, quia per quoscunque transeat meatus, nec capillus de capite ejus peribit. Ad hunc modum solet quaeri de herbis et arboribus infructuosis, si etiam in illis diebus orta sint, cum scriptura non memoret nisi herbas seminales et arbores fructiferas quae modo sunt. Potest dici quia quae modo infructosa sunt, ante peccatum fecerunt fructum aliquem, post peccatum potius nascuntur homini ad laborem quam ad utilitatem. Vel homini propter et post peccatum orta sunt, quia post dictum est homini: *Spinas et tribulos germinabit tibi*. Vel quaecunque terris haerent faciunt fructum, id est utilitatem manifestam vel occultam. Quia vero piscibus,

et avibus dictum est: *Crescite et multiplicamini*, etiam de his intelligendum est, licet non sit dictum. Haec est enim communis causa creationis eorum,

IX. De creatione hominis

(p22) Deinde subditur de creatione hominis, sic: *Faciamus hominem* etc. Et loquitur Pater ad Filium et Spiritum sanctum. Vel est quasi communis vox trium personarum: *Faciamus et nostrum*. Factus est autem homo ad imaginem Dei quantum ad animam... Sed imago Dei est anima in essentia et ratione ejus, quia spiritus factus est et rationalis ut Deus, similitudo in virtutibus, quia bona, justa, sapiens. Cum imagine pertransit homo, quia illam habet etiam homo peccans, similitudine vero saepe privatur. Masculum vero et feminam creavit eos. Hoc quantum ad corpus, tamen dicitur creasse propter animam... Eos autem dicit pluraliter, ne androgeos, id est hermaphrodites, factos putaremus. Tamen secundum corpus factus est homo quodammodo ad imaginem Dei, cum os homini sublime dedit, etc., ut Deum et coelestia videat et imitetur. Unde cum quaesitum esset a quodam philosopho ad quid factus fuisset, respondit, ut contemplet coelum et coeli numina. Dedit autem homini Deus potestatem, ut praesentaret aliis animantibus. In tribus ergo notatur hominis dignitas. Primo, quia non solum factus est in genere suo ut praedicta, sed etiam quia imago Dei est. Secundo, quia cum deliberatione factus est. In aliis siquidem operibus *dixit et facta sunt*. In hoc tanquam inter se deliberantes personae aierunt: *faciamus*. Tertio, quia scilicet homo dominus statutus est animalium, ut essent ei quem futurum mortalem Deus sciebat in alimentum in indumentum et laboris adjumentum. Ante peccatum enim herbas tantum et fructum arborum dedit Deus in escam hominibus et animalibus. Quod inde colligitur, quia ante peccatum nihil noxium aut sterile terra produxit. Et nota, quia in maximis ut in leonibus perditit homo dominium, ut sciat se amisisse, et in minimis ut in muscis etiam perditit, ut sciat vilitatem suam; in mediis habet dominium ad solatium, et ut sciat se etiam in aliis habuisse.

X. De institutione conjugii

(p24) *Et benedixit eis Deus sic: Crescite et multiplicamini*... De homine vero, ut de ceteris dixerat, non dixit: *Et vidit Deus quod esset bonum*, quia in proximo sciebat lapsurum, vel quia nondum homo perfectus erat donec ex eo fieret mulier. Unde et post legitur: *Non est bonum hominem esse solum*.

XI. De quiete sabbati et sanctificatione

Igitur perfecti sunt coeli et terra. Conclusio est hic operum, quia creati, dispositi, ornati, igitur perfecti... *Complevit Deus die septimo opus suum quod fecerat*... si complere est finale quidpiam operis facere, quomodo verum est quod sequitur: *Requievit Deus die septimo* etc. Verum est quod diem septimum fecit et ipsum etiam benedixit et post requievit. Vel complevit, id est completum ostendit, cum nihil novum in eo fecerit, et tunc requievit ab

operum generibus novis. Nihil enim post fecit, cujus tunc non fecisset materiam ut corporum vel similitudinem ut animarum. Non enim quasi fessus dicitur quievisse, sed quia cessavit, sicut in Isaia dicitur quod *seraphim requiem non habebant dicentia santus sanctus*, id est non cessabant. Vel requievit ab opere vel in operibus, id est non eget operibus suis, et est dictum quasi negative. Vel requievit ab opere in semet ipso, id est a mutabilitate operum ejus immutabilis apparuit, nam stabilis manens dat cuncta moveri. Quod autem dicitur *ab omni opere*, quod patrarat, innuit esse opus quod nondum fecerat a quo nondum quiescit. Tria enim opera fecerat: creavit, disposuit et ornavit. Quartum opus propagationis non desinit operari. Quintum faciet, et praecinget se, et transiens ministrabit, ubi praecipue erit requies. *Et benedixit diei septimo*, id est *sanctificavit eum*, id est sanctum et celebrem eum esse voluit. Semper enim ab aliquibus nationibus ante legem etiam dicitur Sabbatum fuisse observatum. Hujus observantioam in lege etiam dixit sanctificationem, ibi: *Memento ut diem Sabbati sanctifices...*

XII. De creatione animae protoplasti

(p26) *Formavit igitur Dominus Deus hominem de limo terrae...* Ad carnem enim spectat quod dicitur: *Formavit hominem de limo terrae*. Ad animam cum dicitur, *inspiravit* etc., Totum enim hominem animavit, sed faciem tanquam partem digniorem, quia sensuum capacem, solam nominavit. Eandem autem animam etiam *spiraculum vitae* vocat, quia per eam homo spirat et vivit. Et post dicit: *Animam viventem* in se, id est in perpetuitate vitae viventem, non mortabilem, ut animam pecudis...

XIII. De paradiso et lignis ejus

Plantaverat autem Dominus Deus paradysum voluptatis a principio... Unde alia translatio habet: *paradisum in Eden ad orientem*. Eden hebraice, latine deliciae interpretatur. Ergo idem est *paradisum voluptatis* quod *paradisum in Eden*, id est in deliciis... *Produxitque Deus* in paradiso *de humo* diversa ligna, quibus delectaretur homo vedendo et sustentaretur edendo. Produxit quidem, id est procul in altum duxit. Vel produxit, id est pro homine duxit. *In medio* quorum tanquam digniora posuit *lignum vitae* et *lignum scientiae boni et mali...*

XIV. De fonte paradisi et quatuor fluminibus ejus

Et fons vel *fluvius egrediebatur; ad irrigandum paradysum*, id est ligna paradisi... Qui fons dividitur in quatuor flumina. Unus dictus est Phison... *hic circumit terram Hevilath*, id est Indiam, et trahit aureas arenas. Alius dictus est Gehon vel Gihon vel Igion qui et Nilus... *hic circumit Aethiopiam*. Alii dup primis nominibus vocantur Tigris et Euphrates... *Hic vadit contra Assyrios...* Euphrates frugifer vel fructuosus de quo per quas transiret regiones, quasi notum, tacuit Moyses, quia est in Chaldaea...

XV. De praecepto et prohibitione edulii

(p28) *Tulit ergo Deus hominem* de loco formationis suae in paradysum scilicet terrestrem *ut operaretur* ibi, non tamen laborando ex necessitate sed delectando et recreando, et sic Deus *custodiret illum*, scilicet hominem. Vek utrumque refertur ad hominem, ut scilicet homo custodiret paradysum et operaretur, ut dictum est...*Praecepitque ei dicens* ets. Ut homo sciret se esse sub Domino, praeceptum accepit a Domino. Omnis autem jussio est in duobus, in praeceptione et prohibitione, et ideo utroque usus est Dominus. Praecepit: *Ex omni ligno paradysi comede*. Prohibuit: *De ligno scientiae boni et mali ne comedas*. Et datum est viro mandatum, ut per virum etiam transiret ad mulierem. Vel forte est praeoccupatio, quia facta muliere utrique simul datum est. Subdit autem poenam, si contemneret: *Quacunque die comederis, morte morieris*, scilicet animae et necessitatem mortis habebis...

XVI. De impositione nominum animantium principaliter et mulieris formatione

Dixit quoque Deus: Non est bonum hominem solem esse: faciamus ei adjutorium ad procreandos liberos quod sit simile illi. Similia enim de similibus naturaliter nascuntur. Sed ne videretur Adae superflua mulieris formatio, putanti sibi in animantibus esse simile, ideo *adduxit* Deus ad Adam omnia terrae animantia et aeris...ut imponeret homo eis nomina, in quo scirent eum sibi praeesse et sciret Adam nullum ex eis simile sibi. Et imposuit eis nomina Adam lingua Hebraea, quae sola fuit ab initio. Quod inde perpenditur, quia nomina quae leguntur usque ad divisionem linguarum Hebraea sunt...

XVII. De somno Adae et formatione mulieris de costa ejus

Cumque obdormisset tulit Dominus unam de costis ejus, carnem scilicet et os (30) et aedificavit ministerio angelorum illam in mulierem, de carne carnem de osse ossa faciens, et statuit eam ante Adam. Qui ait: *Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis et caro de carne mea...*

XVII. De nominibus mulieris

Et imposuit Adam uxori suae nomen tanquam dominus ejus et ait: *Haec vocabitur virago*, id est a viro acta, et est sumptum nomen a viri nomine, ut materia de materia sumpta fuerat...Imposuit ei et aliud nomen, Eva scilicet post peccatum quod sonat vita, eo quod futura esset mater omnium viventium...

XVII. De prophetia Adae ...

Et erunt duo in carne una, id est unientur ambo in uno carnali opera, vel erunt duo in carne una, pueri gignendi. Non enim ex sanguine uno sed ex sanguinibus concreatur parvuli caro.

Vel licet sint duo personaliter, erunt tamen in conjugio una caro, in aliis duo, quia neuter habet potestatem suae carnis.

XX. De statu innocentiae eorum ante peccatum

Erat autem uterque nudus, nec erubescabant...

Appendix II *Stjórn*

Prolog

Þessa bok let snara hakon konungr hinn koronoda or latinu er heiter heilagra manna blomstr. prologus.

Sa er háátt ok vani keisaralegs valldz ok konungs garðz slekt at hafva þrenn einkannleggha ok heímolegh herbergi. Hið fyrsta konungs herbergi er þat ihueriu er hann sitr upp áá raad eðr stefnur ok sæmer lqgh ok réttendi manna i mílli. Annat er þat sem hann etr i ok veiter sinum monnum veizlur. hið þriðia hans herbergi er þat sem hann hefer ser til heímollegra nááða ok hann sefr í. Upp áá þenna haatt hefver vááR konungr sáá sem stiornar meðr síalfs hans ualldi / uindum ok veralldar sio þenna heím fyrer þat herbergi i hueriu er hann / hefver sin raad ok ræður ok skipar máálum manna. huar er aller luter skipaz epter hans valldi ok vilia af þessu kallaz hann sem hann er u\ar herra hvaðan er dauid seger i sálmínum váárs herra er iqrðin ok ql hennar fýlling. Aund ok hiarta hvers sem eíns rettláatz mannz hefuer / hann séer sua sem til nááða hu |uss ok heímollegrar huillardar. þuiat miktill lýstvgleiki er honum at uera sætlega at vera setleggha meðr svnum /mannanna sua sem skrifat er af huerre samueru ok setrí huilld er hann /kallaz brudgumí heilaggha skrift ok røksamligha ritnínggh hefer hann ser til þeirar hallar ok heímollegs herbergis sem hann veiter í. i huerri er hann giorer sína menn þa leidis qlóða at þar af skapaz þeir hofsamer huar af er sua segiz in sallterínu.

Meðr samþýkki gongum ver iguðs husi. þat er sua vnder standa at iheilagrí ritningu skilðum ver aller hinn sama lut meðr einu samþýkki af huerri grein er hann kallaz husbondi. þetta sama herbergi heilugh guðs rítninggh hefuer þrennar greíner eðr háálfur. þat er grunduql. vegg / ok þekíu. Sagan sialf er grunduqlr þessa heímollegha guðs huss ok herbergis. Su skýringgh af heilagrí skript som seger huat huert verkit i sqgunni hefer at merkía er hinn hærí veggrinn. Enn su þýðinggh er i þekian sem oss skýrer þann skilnínggh af þeim giqrðum ok verkum er sagan hefer i sér sem oss er til kennidoms huat er oss hefer fra uerið sagt.

Nu sua sem váár uirðuligr herra hakon noregs konungr hinn koronadi sun Magnusar konungs let snara þa bok upp í norenu sem heiter heilagra manna blomstr þeim skýnsqmum monnum til skemtunar sem

ægi skilía ęđr vnder || standa látínu huer er gengr ok seger af ser
huerium heilagum monnum áá þeira hátíðum ok messu dögum upp áá
þann háátt uilldi hann ok at þeim goðum monnum međti ýfer sialfs
hans bordi af þersari guđs holl ok herbergi þat er af heilagri skript
međr nokkuRi skemtanar vissv kvnnikt uerđa sua þo at hinvm visarum
metti ægi mikił þuingan i vera af huerium stormerkium eđr til fellum
sunnu daghar ok adrer þeir tímar eru halldner sem eigi eru ođrum
heilagum monnum eínkannlegha sungit enn sialfum guđi. Uill han sua
i sialfs sins herbergi þui sem hann veiter i sinum beztum monnum
liosliga lesaz lááta fyrer ollum goðum monnum af þui guđs husi. þat er
af heilagri ritníngu meðr hueri er sialfr hann seđr sętlega alla sína
menn. Enn sáá sem noręnađi kennandi sinn fatękdóm ok vanfæri tok
þetta verk meíR upp áá sik af bođskap ok forsogn fýR sagđz uirđuligs
herra enn þat er hann uissí sik ægi þar til miok vlíkan ok vanferan
hvar fyrer er hann biđr at aller gođer menn sé honum værkunnigher
vm alla þa lutí sem hann hefer i þessarí giord uviđrkuæmíligha saght
eđr framm. Býriaz þessor giord ok hefz af soğdum guđs hallar grund
uelli. þat er

p5

af ritningarennar upphafi ok onduerđri genesi epter þui sem timanum
til heýrer nokkurum lutum þar meðr af ođrum bokum sua sem af
scolastika historia ok af speculum Hýstoriale epter sialfs hans forsogn
saman lesnum ok til loğđum.

p7

her býriaz upp su bok er Biblea er kallat. capitulum

Almaattígr guđ. uerandi satt lios huerr er liosiđ elskar ok giorer alla luti
međr liosi býriandi rettlegha ok vel viđrkuemilegha heimsins skapan ok
smiđ af liosinu. A fyrsta degi sua sem sagt er að hann skapađi himín ok
iord. þat er efni ok sua sem frío til himins ok iardar ok þar meðr allra
likamliga luta **3b** sua segiandi. verđi lios ok þegar istad varđ liosit ok đat
sama lios meðr sinni birti ok vmferđ giordí þria naatturuligha dagha þar
til er son ok onnur himin tungl voru skapat á hinum fiordá degi. Eigi
skulum ver þann skilning eđr hugleiđingh áá hafa fýR soğdum guđs
orđagreinum ok atkuæđum ođrum þeim einkannlegha sem ritningin tér
ok greiner i fyrstum sialfs hans sex dagha uerkum at þau hafi likamligh

sua sem stundligt ok timalight tal ok orða tiltęki. veriđ. epter þui sem hinn heilaghi augustinus byskup seger iþeiri fýstu bok sem hann hefer moti þeim villv mǫnnum gort sem manichei voru kallađer ýfer genesim. ok enn fleirum þeim lutum sem þar eru greinder. þuiat eighi kom sialf spekin almaattigs guđs. seger hann. þat er eingetinn guđs son ihsuc xpistuc takandi til þess vǫarn vstýrkleik upp   sinn signađa guđdóm safnandi sonum hierusalem. đat er retttuauđum ok vel friđsǫmum kristnum monnum under sialfs sins ualld ok verndar skaut upp     þann h att sen hęnan safnar sinvm vngvm under sina vęngi at ver skýlldim iafnan born ok smasueinar i

p8

skýnsemdinni ok v arum skilningi vera vtan helldr til þess at ver s em i illzku ok af giordinn  einni saman sma bǫrnum liker enn iskýnsemd ok skilningum letti ver af þeim at likiaz. Ok ef ver kunnum nǫkkvra þa guđliga lut  at lesa hvart sem þat er helldr hvart sem þat er helldr i þessari eđr anna R  bok sem vaarum hugskotz // augum verđi miǫk mýrker ok fiarlaager af huerium er einer okađrer ýmisliger or skurder megi vel g qraz ok wt gefaz at heilli ok halldinn  vaarri kristiligri tru. þa kastim ver ok fellim v arn skilning til eínskis af  llum þeim annars helldr enn annars međr ofǫrsialigri sannan eđr frammleypiligu fýlg  til þers at ver fallim  igi ferliga uerndandi þann  r skurdinn međr u skýnsemd sem ver hofum  ađr ýfrit skiotlega sint ok sannat  igi sua sem urskurd guđliga ritninga vtan helldr v arn orskurđ sialfra ef sua kann lettlega til bera at þesst falleriz rettlegha fyrer þeim sem međr meira sannleik hefer greindr ueriđ ok gefinn uilum sua vik a ok uenda skriptar-ennar ok sannleiksins orskurđ þar epter v arum skilningi eđr  rskurđ vilia uik a. Er þat ok vissulig v an at þeir menn sem f akunniger eru til bękrinnar fa   igi skilit þau orđ mǫrg mýrk ok diupsett sem moyses hefer sett i s na bok genesim ok enn fleiri ađrar sinar b ekr þær sem fýRnefndr Augustinus segiz margfallda orskurđi af þeim út hafa gefit i fýR nefndri sinni bok sem sýnaz m   idi diarfliga eđr miǫk huat skeytliga nǫkkurn einn af þeim i mǫrgum stǫdum sannlegztan. domand  at hann gi ri  igi annars mannz skýringu eđr orskurđi nǫkkut preiuicium til þess at hverr sem einn taki þann

p9

helldz ok veli sem hann vil ok honum verðr viðrtękiligztr epter sinni
 skilningu ok skýnsem-ðar manére. Enn þar sem maðr kemr æigi sínum
 skilningi til þa veití hann guðligri skript heiðr ok sæmð enn otta sialf-
 vm sér. Her til kemr þat sem nefndr augustinus byskup seger at sua sem
 almattugr guð faðer allra luta skapari sagði. Verði lios ok enn litlu siðaR
 at ssialfr hann kallaði liosið dagh enn mýrkr náátt. ok enn þar með fleiri
 sialfs hans orð qnnur i heimsins skipan. þa talaði hann æigi upp áá
 ebresku. girzku eðr láátínu nõkkura aðra likamlegha eðr veralldlega
 tungu. helldr talaði hann þat allt meðr þui sama vsundrskiptilíga orði ok
 sameiginlíga ey lifv sialfum ser. sem hinn heilagi Jon postolí seger af
 isinu guðzpialli at i vpphafi var orð. ok fyrer þat sama orð.urðu aller
 luter. Nu þar sem aller luter vurðu fyrer guðs skýlld ok þetta samaguðs
 orð. þa er auð sýnt at liosið varð ok fyrer þetta sama orð. þat er fyrer
 eíngetinn guðs son. þetta sama ord var ok upphaf ihueríu ok fyrer huat er
 guð skapaði allan heíminn. þat er himinriki ok himinn meðr qlu þui sem
 hann | | hefer innan sik ok þar meðr allt iarðriki. Ef hann hefði meðr
 þuilikum orðum talat sem ver tolum. meðr huerri tungvnní talaði hann at
 því þar sem eín'gin var þa enn skipat eðr til huers þurftí þa enn þess
 hááttar vmlíðandi lioðan eðr mááls greín þar se æigi beið þa enn nõkk-
 urs likamligs heýrn eðr eyru til at heýra þar upp áá. einn ok skięR
 skilningr vtan alla ruglan ok hareýsti tungnanna ýmíseik er meðr guði
 feðr er sua sem tal ok tunga. Enn þar sem sua er til orðz tekit at hann
 | kallaði liosið dagh er sua skíliandi at hann let kallaz þuiat alla luti
 skipaði hann sua ok greíndí at dagarner ok aðrer lúter mááttv sýnaz ok

p10

epter þui nõfn taka sem hans speki hafði meðr eýlifrí ok gudligrí forsio
 skipat ok fyrer sied. Eru þesser luter fyrer þann skýlld her skrifaðer at
 þeir menn heýrandi frasagner af þersarí eðr oðrum guðs ritningum sem
 minnr eru til bekrínnar visír variz ok viðr siaí at ðeir vikí æigi eðr vendi
 ofmiøk nõkkurum þeim lutum eínkannlega guðs orðum eðr giørðum
 ísinum hiortum ok enn siðr meðr nõkkurum of diarfligum domum eðr
 orskurðum til likamligs ok ueralldligs skilnings sem kirkivnnar kenni-
 feðr ok heilugh seger at meðr andleghum skýringum eru skíliandi þo at
 þa lutí sem aðra verði meðr þess hááttar orðum ok oðrum atvik-
 um.milli váár likamligra ok dauðligra manna skilianligha at giora ok i fra
 sagner færa. Skýrer ritningín heimsins giørð greinandi guðs verk áá
 .vi.ðogum hinum fyrstum meðr þrennum hááttum sem siðaR man sagt

verða. Þat er meðr skapan skipan ok skýringu. Þuiat ifyrstu sem hann skapaði engilega natturu skapaði hann ok þar meðr þessa heims efní ok allra likamligra luta utan sundr skipting ok epter farandi formeran. I annan stað skipaði hann ok sundr skipti sinni skapan. I þriðia stað skreytti hann sina skepnu giorandi serhueria þessa luti á huern þann dagh sem síðar segir. Skrifaði hinn heilagi moyses spamaðr ok hertugi ýfer israels folkí fullr af heilags anda gipt. þessa frasogn i fyrstu a þriðia heims all dri síðar enn þessi guðs skipan varð. Enn sua sem honum var boðit af guði vandasamligt embetti ok vkunnikt. at hann skýlldi vera höfðingi ok domarí ýfer israels folkí þui sem bedi var vsiðláátt ok sæmð-

p11

ar laust fyrer þui aðallt israels folk var þann tíma i aanauð ok þrældomi. Þa tuk moyses at leiða at huga huersu hann metti þvi siðlausa folkí fáá stiornat til goðra síða ok fyrer þann | | skýlld at hann hafði huarki verið fyrer beitr vanda máál eðr nokkurskonar freístní. Þa beiddiz hann þess af guði at hann sýndi honum ǫll þau dæmi ok atburði sem verit höfðu fra upphafi ok þar til ok villdi hann ópinberlegha sýna israels folkí ǫll þau dæmi ok atburði sem verið höfðu fra upphafi ok þar til ok villdi hann ópinberlegha sýna israels folkí ǫll þau dæmi at þeir mætti þaðan af auðullega nema viðrsýnd illra atburða enn draga ser til nýtsemðar ǫll þau goð dæmi sem verit höfðu | ok höfðu aller atburðer fallit i tion saker athuga leýsis allt til þeirar stundar. Enn epter guðlegri forsogn tok moyses at rita ok ibækr at setia alla þa luti sem guð sýndi honum at æigi ýrði þeir optarí fyrertynder ef menn villdi þa þaðan j fra varðueita ok ser í nýt tæra. Huaðan af er þat merkianda at þrenn eru spaleiks anda kyn epter þui sem viða finnz i heilogum ritningum. Þetta er eítt sem hafði heilagr moyses at kunna sua sannlega. fra segia þeim stortíðend-um er mǫrgum mannzǫlldrum wrðu fyR enn sáá var feddr er fra er sagt sem hann hefði innuirdiliga þann sieð ok heýrt ok þo vtan alla víssu af mannligrí til uísan huat er einginn maðr fær gort utan af einkannligrí heilagsanda gipt ok spadóms giǫf. Þat er annat at segia sannliga fyrer þa uorðna luti sem lǫngu síðar koma framm sva sem giorðu ýsayas ok ieremías ok marger aðrer guðs spamenn af sialfs hans hegat burð ok

p12

pinu ok iamvel af hans hinni siðaztu hegat kuamu í verolldina er hann kemr at dema huern epter sinni til skýlldan. Þat er hið þriðia spaleiks

anda kyn sem hafði hinn heilagi pall postolí ok enn fleirí guðs áástu-
iner. Hann vissi þa er hann predikaði sið dags inní i nokkuru lopthusi
huat er utí fór framm um þann unga mann eutichum sua at eingi maðr.
sagði honum sem fell sua háátt niðr af þuí sama husi til iarðar at hann
lampiz þegar ok do þar af. Nu af þeiri heilags anda. spadoms giof eínk-
annlegha sem fyrst uar greind giqrdí moyses .v. bekr af huerium er hin
fyrsta heíter genesis ok fyrer þuí sua at hon hefer e ser heimsins upphaf
ok veralldarennar giqrdí ok getnat. Býriar hann i þeiri somu bok sina
frasogn af heimsins skipan meðr þeíma hættí ok meðr þuilikum orðim
vpp af i vaart at segia sem her fylger.

p13

**| her seger af þui huersu almattigr guð skapaði himin ok iorð ok
huersu lucifer braut meðr sinu drambi ok ofund i moti gyði sialfum
ok huersu guð drottinn heiðraði þa eng | | glana sem honum sneruz
til staðfastligs ok çuenligs kiærleiks i himinrikis dýrð meðr sialfum
ser utan enda**

I Upphafí skapaði guð himinríkí huat er meðr sinum englum
ok himneskum kröptum var þegar í stað fyllt sua sem fyrst ok
fremzt milli allra þeira luta sem hann skapaði. ok iqrdina þat
er at skilia samblandit ok usamið efni til fiogurra hofutskepna
ellds ok loptz vatnz ok iarðar sua sem frío ok vnderstöðu til allra
likamligra ok sýniligra luta. Var himinríki þa þegar allt skipat ok
skreytt/ af utöuligum fiqlða heilagra engla ok anarra himneskra ok
vsýniligra /krapta sem kirkiunnar kennifeðr ok heilugh skript seger
ok meðr anda-/legum skýringum eru skiliandi þo at þa luti sem aðra
uerði meðr þess / hááttar orðum ok oðrum hááttum millum váár
líkamlegra ok dauðlegra manna skilianlega at giora ok i frasagner
fera. Skýrer ritnhuerer er þa i fyrstu voru sua skapaðer ok vordner sik
at þeir hofðu fullkomit ok frialst sialfræði at snuaz at einu sinní
huat er þeir uilldu til elsku viðr almátkan guð eðr æigi. Enn æigi
optarr sem andleg nattura utan likams er til. þeir voru þa ok enn æigi
fullkomlega seþer fyrer þann skýlld at þeir uoru uuitandi sitt
eþterkomanda çuentýr. Eigi hofðu þeir þa enn fullkominn kiærleik til
guðs ok elskaðu þeir hann af sialfrí natturunní

p14

yfer alla framm af þeim girndar elskhuga er þeir glødduz með sialfum honum vm framm allt annat af sialfs hans asýnd. Enn meðr vínattu kierleik elskaðu þeir sik mest þuiat þeir uilldu sialfum ser bezt. Nu sem lucifer einn af hinni fremztu engla skipan skryddr ok pryddr umframm aðra þa hugleidde hann ok uirði fegrð ok forprisan sinnar náátturu ok diupsetta uitru ser veitta hóf hann sik sua háátt meðr sinu of drambí at hann uilldi iafnaz ok viðrlikiaz sialfan guð. ok fyrer þa sòk skilði hann sik I fra sannleikinum þegar i hriðinni ok þar meðr i brott af ǫllum setleik ok eýlifrí sælu sua at þar af fekk hann meðr ǫllu engan þef eðr kenning. Enn hann fell sua háátt æigi at eins af þeiri sælu sem hann hafði þegið vtan ok þar meðr af þeire sem guð mundi honum gefit hafa ef hann hefði villat honum lýðinn | vera at hann varð ǫllum veslare ok lægri fyrer sinn ǫrbetilegan skaða ok glæp þuiat hann misgiørði vtan nõkkurs annars a eggian eðr freistni. Ok sem hann fell dro hann meðr ser mikinn fiølda engla þeira sem honum samþyktuz ok sinnaðu sialf | | krafí isinum glæp ok vgiptu vtan alla freistní nema at eins af sinni eiginligri ǫfund ok ofbelldi þuiat þesser glødduz sua af sinni mekt ok valldi sem sialfer þeir væri ok veittí sér þann hinn hesta fagnat ok heiðr sem þeir hõfðu ok fyrer þui steýptuz þeir niðr til sinna eginligra staða brott af sameiginligri allra þeira sælu ok fagnaði sem i goðu staðfestuz hafandi fullt ofmetnaðar frammfreði í stað hins haleítazta eýlifleiks. hegoma slægðer fyrer honum vissuligzta sannleik á skilnaðar stderan ok áá stundan fyrer usundrskiptileghan kierleik ok i ofbelldis fuller ok ǫfundar siuker lýgner ok lasta samer ok i ǫllumlutum miøk slæger

p 15

stirðer ok staðfaster i sinni illzku. harðla lýstuger ok iafnan meín at giora. Nu sua sem þessser sneruz i fra skaparanum i sinni ǫfund ok staðfestuz i illu þa sneruz aðrer englarnar meðr hans fulltíngi til staðfastlegs ok efenlegs kierleíks viðr sialfan hann. ok upp i fra þui staðfestí guð þessa igóðu ubrigðiliga gleðiandi þa ok semandí medr sialfum ser sem honum santengðuz litilláátlega fýllandi þa meðr sínum andalegum áástgíǫfum epter þi sem huerr sem einn fyrer sinn áástarhita var verðugr ok uíðrtøkiligr ok greínandi þa meðr ýmislegum gradum ok stettum isueiter ok fýlki epter ýmissare giafanna tign ok virðing. Aller þeir ok sem af sialfum guði sendaz til nõkkurs. þa gioriz þat manninum til hialpar ok heilsugiafar fyrer sialfra þeira uerðleik ok þa iafnskipti-

legha i náátturu ok elskhuga sem millum mannzins er ok engilsins ok til þess at maðrinn viðrkeniz sína tign ok virðing. Sumer af þeim eru prouinciales fyrer þann skýlld at þeir eru meðr éinkannlegre dispenser-an einum ok ýmislegum þioðum til uerndar ueitter ok skipaðer. Aðrer af þeim eru personalegher fyrer þa sök at þeir eru sierhuerium sáálum setter til verndar ok varðueizlu. Maðrenn hefuer tuifallda meinandi skaðsemð epter sýndina fengið þat er sýndarennar kueýking innan meþr sialfum ser ok fiandans freistní fyrer sik. fyrer þi sáá guð meðr sinni signaðv miskvnn sua fyrer at hann setti honum tuifallda giæzlu ok geýmslu þat er sialfs sins mískunn moti sýndarennar kveýkingu. enn geýmslu engillinn moti pukanum ok hans áeggian. Miskunnsamr ok almattigr gud véittí mannínium þrenna vqrðu ok geýmara af hinni sǫmv naatturv til | tekna motí þrennum hans vuinum sua sem hann var iþersa vtlegð brott Ifra sialfs hans asionu fyrer tilskyllan skýfðr | | ok rekinn þat er goðan giæzlu engil motí fiandanum pinu váárs herra likama motí horvndínu. Enn motí heímínium ok veralldligum girndum heilagra manna bęner ok

p 16

þeira epter demí sem af heímínium eru til eylifs rikís haleítlegha vpp hafðer. þesser goðu englar sáálnanna geýmarar ok heilager hirðar stunda oss meðr harða mikill vmhyggju tendrandi meðr oss goðar ok guðlegar hugrenningar enn hinar i brott rekandí sem ðeim eru gagnstaðlegar hugatsamlega ok goðfusliga milli farandi guðs ok váár þann tima sem þeir flytía truligha ok dýggiliga váárar iðranar suter ok þar meðr alla váára goða luti til almattígs guðs ord. ok. uerk ok iafnvel hugrenningar. þa glediaz þeir ok giora guði þakkerfyrer þann skýlld at þeir elska sina samborgar menn ok samfagna þeim styrandí þeim ok stýrkandí. lifandi ok lerandí vernandi þa ok í ǫllum lutum forsio ueítandí. þeir girnaz ok harða giarna váára tilquamu þuiat þeir biða uęntandi af oss ok uáRi til kuamu maní leidrettaz ok aprt bętaz þat skarð ok skaði sem áa varð sialfra þeira borg i niðr falli luciferi ok hans fylgiara huar fyrer er þeir eru meðr mikilli sketan ok gleði þo at usýnilega hia oss þann tima sem ver sýngium sęmílega ok biðiumz fyrer rękílega ok stoða iafnuel oss ǫndvðum huat er þeir megu stetta. þeir flytía ok goðra manna sáálur i paradisum meðr fíorfalldri greín epter þi sem ritningin seger. Su er eín at þeir flyta þers iafnan ok eggia til góðs huar fyrer er þeir giǫraz makliger þagat at koma. I annan stað eggia þeir salurnar á sialfum andláz timanum at girnaz vpp áá paradísar fagnat ok tendra þer sua framar-

lega þar til at þær skiliaz giarnsamlega viðr líkaminn at niðr lagðri þeiri naaturulegre áástvð ok aluöru sem þer höfðu viðr hann haft ok lagit langan tíma. I þriðiu deilld reka þeir v reína anda i brott fra þeim þann tíma sem þer fara framm af líkaminum til þess at þeir megi saalunum enga tálman eðr hindran þa giöra. Meðr fiordú grein flýtia þeir iafnuel sýni-

p17

legha nokkuRa forþrisaðra heilagra manna saalur til himínrikis epter andláatið sua sem önd heilags martíni ok hins sæla benedicti. Eigi fęr goðr engill sied af sialfs sins naaturur andarennar hugrenningar einar saman sua lengi sem hon lifer i líkaminum hvaðan af er hann understendr ægi ne skilr manzens innri lutí utan af nokkuRi líkamsins giörfð eðr athöfn. ella af krapti þess lýsanda spegils | sem hann birtiz af. Eigi fęr | | ok fiandinn þershááttar hugrenningar skilít eðr seð Englarner taka ok nöfn af sínum erendum ok embętti huern tíma sem þeir eru til mannanna sender. sua Michael. Gabriel. Raphael. hínur heilaga michaele eru fíorer luter kender okeinkannlega eignaðer. þat er eítt at hann berst motí drekanum. þat er i gegn sialfum fiandanum. Annat er þat er hann kemr til hialpa ok fulltínia guðs folkí. Þt er hið þriðia at hann flýtr goðra manna saalur til hinnar himnesku paradisar. I fiordá stað er hann prepositus paradisar forstíori. þat er þeirar heilagrar kristní sem her stríðer nu fyrer guðs skýlld i uerolldínni. sua sem hann i fyrstunni fyrer vaars herra þíníng uar forstíori sínagoge. Nu þa at þeir se til nokkurs gudlígs embęttis sender. þa sia þeir allt at eíns iafnlegha guðs feðr ásionu ok iafnan gírnaz þeir hana at sía. ok þo at andlig skepna megi takaz eðr skiliaz vnder staðarens grein eðr endimarkí meðr þuí at hon se sua ínökkurum stað at hon se ægi iöðrum ok hon líði or öðrum ok i annan stað þa gíorer hon þo ægi meðr sinni tilkuamu nęring eðr naueru grein. þuiat ægi þryngði marger andar eðr mínkkaði sua rúm allt at eíns þo at þeir kiemi utöpluliger i einn stað aller samt ok i senn at þar

p18

metti fyrer hann skýlld þa ferí menn ok aðrer líkamliger luter vera enn ááðr ok væri þo einginn þeira andanna annaR í öðrum vtan helldr mundu þeir aller greíníliga vera skilðer huerr uíðr annan ok i fra öðrum sin imillí. þuiat andarner einer saman fýlla engan stað meðr líkamligum mikilleik huersu mickler eðr marger sem þeir eru vtan helldr meðr heilögum ok

haleitum krapti **Genesis 2a** Jordin var þa auð ok avaxtarlaus ok utan alla þryði. **Af scolastica historia.** þat er sua mikít at segia at fyrr sagt heimsins smíði sua skapat var vsýniligt autt ok vsamið epte þui sem augustínus seger i sinni fýRnefndri bok þar til er guð skipaði ǫllum lutum eiginlegar mýnder huerium sem einum i sínum stodum ok stettum. **Af genesi 2bc** Ok voru mýrkr af loptzins skugga ok vskíerleik alla uegna vm iorðina enn guðs heilagr andí flutti ok ýfer vǫtnín **af scolastica hýstoria** þat er ýfer fyrrer sagt heimsins smíði eðr efní meðr sialfs sins uilia ok fyrrer hugsan til epterfaranda skapanar fyrrer sagt heimsins smíði eðr efní kallar bokín fyrrer þann skýlld stundum iorð. annan tíma unde díup ok stundum vǫtn at þat sýniz þa fleirum til heýra sem þat er ægi at eins meðr | | einnar hǫfut skepnu | nafní nefnt fyrrer þui uar þat þa þegar kallar himinn ok iorð. at himinn ok iorð wrðu skǫpuðuz þar af fyrrer þa sǫk uar iorðin sǫgð usýniligh ok usamið ok mýrkr ýfer under diupið at hon var þa utan alla epterfarand formeran ok hon hefði þa enn meðr engarrí mynd megat séein eðr handlat verða þo at nokkuR maðr hefði þa til þess uerit at hafa prouat þat. fyrrer þui var þat sama smíði vatnið nefnt at ðat var þeim auduelldekt ok epterláátsamt sem af þui skapaði epterfarandi lutí. ok fyrrer þa greín aðra at aller þeir luter sem áá iarðriki feðaz huart sem þat eru helldr kuikendí. vaxandi viðr eðr groandi grǫs ok þiliker luter þa taka aller af vǫkunní ok af vatnínu nering ok sina formeran. **af genesi.3** OK Þa sagði guþ sua. Verði líos. ok

p 19

þa þegar i stað uarð líos 4 ok sialfr hann sáá at líosið var gott ok skildi hann þat ibrott fra mýrkrínu **5a** ok gaf þui nafn at þat skýlldi heíta dagr enn mýrkrunum at heíta nátt. **af scolastica hýstoria.** Sem þessi skilnaðr giørðiz milli lioss ok mýrksins varð ægi siðr meðr guðs boði af glæp ok tilskýlldan luciferí ok hans fylgiara englana skilnaðr þuiat fyrrer liossins nefnd merkiaz þeir englar sem stoðu ok staðfestuzt i guðs áást ok elskhuga. enn fyrrer mýrkrin merkiz fiandinn ok þeir sem meðr honum fellu. Voru þeir aller keyrðer brott sumer allt niðr til hrluitis enn sumer i þat þoku fulla lopt milli hímsins ok iarþar sem ægi er sua ofarlega at þeir hafi nokkurn fagnat eðr gledí af liosínu. ægi ok míǫk neðarlega sua að þeir megi sua mickla freistní ok margan ufagnat oss giǫra sem þeira vili er til ok þo fýlger þeim efenlegha sín heluitis pína huar sem þeir eru. **af genesi** Ok sua varð aptann ok morginn beði samt einn naatturulegr dagr. **af scolastica hýstoria.** þat eru váár tuav dægr þuiat i fýrstu er

guð skapaði himin ok iorð skapaði hann ok liosit sem sagt var. Nu sem þat settiz ok minnkaðiz ę seint ok seint þa varð þaðan af fyrsta dags aptann ok morginn epter vaarum vana ok þi sama lioso vmlidanda iorðina ok siðan upp rennandi vaed morginn. **af augustino** FýR nefnder villu menn manichei kallandi þat at dagrinn hefði af aptninum hafiz skilðu ægi at sua sem liosið var kallat dagr enn mýrkrin náátt heyrði deginum til. enn aptaninn varð epter þat sama verk sua sem liðnum ok lýktaðum sialfum deginum enn fyrer þa skýnsemð at nááttin heyrði sinum degi til. þa segiz einn | dagr oðrun viss hafa lýktaz ok vm liðit vtan að | | liðinni nááttinni sua sem morginn varð. teliaz sua siðan meðr sama hætti aðrer

p20

dagarner fra morní til annars morgíns. leið sua naattin ok lyktaðiz. enn annaR dagr býriaðiz. **fra þui er guð skapaði á oðrum degi festingar himín ok sundr skipting a vøtnum hafandi i ser alla luti.**

A oðrum degi skipaði guð hínun hæstum þessa heims haalfum. þuiat himinríki var þegar i stað skipat. skreytt ok fýllt af heil-agum englum er þar uar skapat sem fýR var sagt. Giørði hann þa festingar himín hafandi innan i séer alla þa luti sem ver høfum nõkkura skilning eðr vissu af ok skilði meðr honum i sundr oll þau vøtn sem hann villdi at her verí epter i verolldinni fra hínun sem ýfer honum eru sua strengðum ok þrongðum sem kristallus eðr hinn harðazti gler iss til at iafna vtan þat at þau megu litt eðr ekki brááðna af nõkkurum elldzhita **6** ok sagði sua. **af genesi.** Verði festingar himinn milli vatn-anna ok skili þau I sundr sín imilli. **af scolastica historia. 7a** Giørði guð þa festingar himinn af vatzins høfutskepnu sua sterkliga samantengðan ok strengðan at hann hefer i ser aller himínfastar stiornur ok þuilikaz skięran af sialfum ser sem kristallus sua huelfðan til litils lutar at iafna sem þollott eggskurn ok greindí sua meðr honum I sundr þav vøtn sem vnder honum voru fra þeim sem ýfer hem eru. þa skapaði hann vnder festingarhímínsins nafni aðra himnana enn sialft himínríki. Enn fyrer hueria søk er guð uilldi at vøtnín verí ýfer festingarhímíninum þa er þat sialfum honum kunnikt epter þui sem seger commestor þo at nõkk-urer menn hafi þa ætlan áá at i suma staði komi þaðan regn á sumar tíma. Augustinus segher at huílik vønt er þar eru ok meðr huerium

p 21

hætti þau eru þar þa efum meðr engum motí at þau eru þar. þuiat meíri er röksemd þessarar ritníngar seger hann enn allr glöggleiki ok skoðan mannlígs skilnings ok huguiz er til. **genesis 7c** ok þegar varð sua. **8a** gaf þa guð honum það namn at hann hetí himínn. **af scolastica hýstoria** þuiat himínn hefer í þessum stað allt eitt at þýða ok hulníng fyrer þa sök at hann hýlr ok hirðer fyrer oss alla vsýnílíga luthi. **af genesi 8b** ok sua varð aptann ok mmorgínn meðr fýrrí greín annaR dagr. **scolastica hýstoria** Hebresker menn | | at engill | inn varð a þessum degi fiandi ok draga þat æigi sízt til demís þar vm þo at þessa dags verk se gott sem allra þeíra annaRa er guð gíordí. þa er þo allt at eíns æigi her af þessum þat einkannlega lesit at guð sáa at þat var gott. huerium er þeír sýnaz samþýkkíaz sem áá máánadaga ueniaz messur at sýngia englum sua sem til lofs þeim sem staðfestuz í guðs þionostu enn heilager kennifeðr hallda annat helldr fyrer sannara at þat se meíR sua ok fyrer þi leíðiz hann allan á skilnat ok sundrþýkt. enn tuítalan greíniz fýrst vt af eíníngunni ok fyrer þann skýlld takaz aðrar tölur íheilagrí ritníngu meðr meíri uírk ok metare merkingu. Ma þat ok vel auðsýnaz af váárs herra orðum at engilínn hafí áá hínú fýrsta degí fallit þar sem sialfr hann talar sua af honum millí annassa luta í íons guðzþíalli at hann var allt fra vpphafí manndrapare ok hann stoð engan tíma ne staðfestiz

p 22

í sannleikínú. enn af þui at sua má segíaz at hins þríðía dags uerk greíniz vt at annars dags uerki sem síðaR má sýnaz. þa lofaz þat æigi sua sem onnur fýR enn á þríðía degi sua sem þat er fullulegha lýktat ok algort. **fra þui er guð let íorðina birtaz ok fríofaz ok skapaði síoenn ok íorðina. Scolastica historia.**

A þríðía degi let guð þau vötn sem vnder festíngarhímínú voru safnaz í eínn stað ok íorðina birtaz skipaðí hann sua fíorum fýR sögðum höfvtskepnum huerri meðr sínni sþera ínnan festíngarhímínsíns epter þui sem sialfra þeíra þýkt ok þunleíkí er til. elldínn efztan nest festíngar hímínú þuiat hann er lettaztr af huerium er truiz at sialf hímíntunglín hafí gíor verit. loptíð er þat í sínum efra part skíert í ser. enn í hínú neðra hefer þat marga ruglan af vínú ok vøtum þokum ok reíðar þrumum sníofum ok elldíngum ok oðrum þeim lutum til komandí sem ver höfum fulla raun af. þar nøst vatníð huert er hann safnaði í vnderdíupð dreífandi þaðan af sua sem af eínu moðurkýní oll veralldarennar vötn vm leýnilegar veralldarennar

ráaser okumferðer henní til friofanar ok manninum til nýtsemðar Neðsta skapaði hann iorðina ok innzta i ǫllum þeim þuiat hon er þungaz iafn vettandi hana sem meðr einni váág | | ok setiandi i miðian heimsins punkt meðr ǫllum sinvm | ýfer uettis þunga. molldu ok allzkýns maalma kýni. grioti ok gimsteínum meðr ǫllum annars hááttar steinvm ok sem hann býriaði þessa dags uerk sagði hann sua. **genesis 9c** Safniz saman i einn stað vǫtn þau sem vnder himnínnum eru at þuRlendi megi sýnaz.

p 23

ok þegar i stað varð sua. **Af augustino.** Sua skildiz ok i sundr skiptiz þa i þær mýnder sem nv seam ver þat hið vsýnliga efni heimsins sem stundum var kallat auð ior ok vsamít. annan tíma mýrks ok vnderdiup ella vatn ýfer huert er guðs andí fluttiz meðr fýRi greín. sva at iorðin formerat af þi sama efni birtiz auðsýnliga i sinum stað epter þi sem nu sýniz þat er ok er beði sallt ok seþt. Maatti þat vel vera at þau vǫtn sem meðr nõkkurri þoku dǫggvan hulðu ok vm foru allt þat rvm ok viðættu sem i loptinu er sua sem meðr smaregni edr 'singu fengi verið i litlum stað hia þi sem aadr siðan er þeim var sua sterkliga saman strengt. **10ab** kallaði hann þa þurlendit iorð enn allt saman vatnanna megin kallaði hann hauf. ok sua sem vatnanna verk var fýllt ok framm komít seger moýses at **10c** sua var gott ok vel gort ok lagði þar til iamframm annat verk meðr þersu **11** ok sagði sua. **af genesi** Groi iorðin ok friofiz meðr blomganda gras geranda sitt sáad ok meðr epli berandi trío ok allzkýns alldín við. giorandi allan sin avòxt epter þui kýni sem þat er vorðit sik til huers saad er i sialfu ser skal á iorðunni vera ok þetta varð allt sua. **12a-c** at iorðin bar þegar grænt gras meðr hinn bezta bloma ok sáad beranda meðr sinv kýni ok epli berandi trío gerandi fagan avoxst ok huert sem eítt hafandi meðr ser sialfs sins sáad meðr sinni eiginni mýnd. **Af scolastica hýstoria.** Eigi leiddi iorðin þa ok sua seint ok alǫngum tímum framm sinar plantaner sem nu. helldr var ǫll þersi hennar fegrð ok frýgð þegar i stað meðr sinum eiginleghum blom ok auexti. Ok þo at nõkkurer menn hafi þrætt vm ok á greint hvart helldr hefer uerit heimrinn skapaðr áá váár tíma. þuiat þa blomgaz ok avaxtaz flester luter eðr a haustar tíma i augusto manaði

p24

af fyrer farandi orðum at iorðin bar framm epli berandi treo giorandi fagan avoxst ok gras hafanda sitt sáad. þa helldr heilug kirkia þat stað-

fastlega fyrir satt í sínu kenningum ok lærídomi at hann hafi áá vaarit í marció manaði skapaðr verit. A þeíma degi plantaði guð ok iarðneska paradís þat land er sua heiter ok ligger til austr | | ættar af þeiri heimsins haalfu er asia heiter. mýcklu hera enn nokkut annat land aa váru byggiligu iarðriki ok þi mátti | noa floð huergi namunda þui ganga ok fýllði þat þegar meðr ǫllumlýstugleík ok vnatsemð vpprennandi eðar meðr fǫgrum frammfliotandi vǫtnum meðr iarðrennar þerelegum blomstrum ok allz hááttar þeim tríom sem full voru af frýgð ok fǫgrum auexti. Nu sua gort sem var **12d** sa guð at þetta var allt saman goð skepna **13** ok sua varð aptann ok morginn ok lýktaðiz hinn þriðí dagr. **afiörða degi skapaði guð sol ok ǫnnvr himíntungl.af speculo historiale.**

A fiörða degi prýddi guð ok prisulega skreyttí himín ok þa luti meðr himneskum liosum sem aaðr hafði hann gort. eínkannlega fyrst hinar efztu heimsins háálfur skapandi þa ǫll himintungl huert er iorðina skýllði birta þeði vm neþr ok vm daga huart eþter sinum þetti ok greína alla tíma huar`t´ meðr margfalldrí sinni neþringu **14** ok sagði sua **Genesis** Uerði lýsandi stiornur í festingar himnínium at þær greíní í sundr ser huart dag ok náátt at þær se til taakna ok tíma dagha ok áára **15** at lýsi í festingar himnínium. ok birtí iorðina ok þegar varð sua. **scolastica hýstoria** Eigi at eíns guð þessi lýsandi lios sem ver ǫllum himíntungl verða verǫlldinni til fegrðar ok liossins nýtsemðar nema

p 25

ok þar meðr til táákna eðr marka at af þeim megi merkiaz huart er helldr eru skir veðr eðr v skír blið eðr hriðer. ella til þess at af þui skýllði verða þau xij. táákn er. ver ǫllum stiornu mǫrk sem zodiacus hefer í séer ok at greína tíma þat er vaar ok sumar haust ok vetr ok þar meðr þa sem ver ǫllum solstoðu tíma a vetr ok sumar ok iafn neþtis tíma a haust ok váár ok at greína daga vikur ok manaði áár ok allder. **de genesi 16** Guð giörði ok tuau stór himíntungl hið meira. þat er solina til þess at þat skýllði meðr sinní birtí deginum lýsa. hið minna þat er tunglit at þat lýstí nááttínni. Stiornur giörði hann þar meðr **17a** ok settí þær allar í festingar himnínium vtan æigi þer .vij. meðr solu ok tunglí sem planete heíta þær reika ok leíka lausar í loptínu ok ganga í gegn fýR sǫgðum festingar himní at þer meðr sinn gang tempri hans vellting ok vmturnan. setti hann þær **17b** fyrir þa sǫk þar at þær skýllði meðr þi liosi sem þær hefði af solinní | | birta alla verollina ok giora greín milli lioss ok

mýrkr. **scolastica** | **hýstoria**. Eigi let guð fyrir þann einn skýlld beði tungl ok stjornur birta nááttina at hon skýlldi ægi meðr ǫllu fegrðar laus vera sua sem þa veri ef hon hefði meðr ǫllu ekki lios ok birti utan ok til þess ægi siðr at þeir menn sem áá nattar tímanum starfaði skýlldi þar af hialp ok huggan hafa sua sem skiparar ok aðrer farandi menn ok eínkannlega iblalandz eýði mǫrkum eðr sandhofum þar sem litill vindzblær sletter ok hýlr þa vegv sem aaðr hafa farnar uerit. **ýsidorus**. þeir eru sumer fuglar sem ægi megu þola at sia solrennar lios sua sem noctua er allr er einn ok nocticorax huerr er fyrir þa sǫk heiter noctua at hann flýgr vm netr ok sézt engan tíma vm daga þuiat þegar i stað sliofaz hans sýn sem dagrín birtiz. hann er eíngi í þeiri eý creta heiter. ok þo at hann se þangat fluttr af oðrum stǫðum þa deýr hann þegar leið sem hann

p26

kemr þar. Sa fugl sem strix heiter er ok náátt fugl meðr fleirum oðrum ok feðaz þeir flester miǫk aa nattinni. Eigi var solin ok þui siðr nauzunligh ok þarflig at þat hid biarta ský giordí ok fýlldi hennar embætti sem verolldina birtí þuiat sama ský hafði litið líos ok læmegit ok lýsti letlega huergi eðr litið vtan hina hestu luti sem nu lýsa stjornur. scolastica historia. Eru ýmissar getur ok ętlanir áá huat af þui skýi hafi vordit annat huat at þat hafi apr horfit i þat sama efní sem þat var ááðr skapat af sua sem su stiarna er austrvegs konungum vitraðiz. ella at þat farí ok fýlgi iafnan meðr solinni. ella þat at solrennar likamr se af þi sama giǫrr. Sua finnz ok skrifat at solin var giǫrr a morgin tima ok í austrí. enn tunglit at aptní sua sem tilkomandi náátt ok í austrí. Enn þo vilia nokkurer segia at þau veri beði samt skǫput a morgin tima. sol i austrí enn tungl i vestrí ok þann tima sem solin settíz hýrui tunglit at tilkomandi náátt til austrs. heilagr augustinus sýniz hinni fýrri greíninni samþýkkia i fýR nefndri sinni bok ýfer genesim. her seger ok sua milli þeira sem maluglega ok kausilega kallz sua sem epter frettandi huilikt tunglit var skapat i fýrstv. huat helldr þilikt sem þa er prím er saker þess at þa ętti sua at telia eðr fullt ok fiortan náátta fyrir þann skýlld at þat hefði þáá aatt vskadt at hafa uerit at hann sinnar huarigum ne samþýkker i alla staði. helldr gengr þar í milli hann seg-iandi berlega meðr fullkomnum orskurð at huat sem þeir kalla i þann punkt verit hafa sem prím | | er eðr fullt Sua sem.xiiij.náátta at guð giordí þat | algort. **de genesi.18c** Ok sialfr hann sáá at þetta var einn ein goð

skepna. **19** varð sua aptann ok morginn ok lýktaðiz hinn fiordí dagr. **fra þui er guð skapaði firka ok fugla á fimta deghi. Scolastica historia okspeculum historiale.**

A fimta degi prýddi guð loptið meðr flúgandi fuglum ok vatnið meðr suímandum fiskum takandi af vatnínu efní til þersa huarsþueggja þuiat vatnit snýz liettlega til lopzens sua sem þat þýnniz. loptit snýz ok á sòmuleið auðuellega til vatnzens sua sem þat þýknar. **augustinus**. Skulu þeir aller skýnsamer menn sem þessor orð ok atkuęđi gięra nękkura ręring eđr efađ semđ þat uel mega uita at hiner uisaztu menn þeir sem þers hattar lutí skođa ok skýnía vanduirklega taka þetta hiđ vęku mickla ok þoku fulla lopt meðr vętnunum sem fuglarnar fliuga í. þuiat loptiđ þręnguiz sua ok þýknar af þeim vętum ok andargust sem upp leggr af ęllu saman ięrđunni ok af vatnínu at þat þoler harđa vel fuglanna flug. þaraf verđr sua mikil dęggfęll um nętr iafn vel at heiđskirum veđrum at grasiđ er alváatt af þeiri sęmu dęgg einni saman vm morgininn epter þi sem ver megum sialfer sia. Sua finnz ok skrifat i hinum skiluisaztum bokum ok roksamlegum ritn,ingum at þat fiall sem olimpus heiter ok stendr i þeiri haalfu grecie sem heiter macedonia se sua ýfer uettis háatt at áá þess efztum hęđum verđi huarki ský ne vindr fýr þann skýlld at þat er ęllu uętu loptinu þersv hera ihveriv er fuglarnar fliuga ok fyrer þa sęk segiz at þar fliugi ægi nękkuR fvgl. Enn þersa varđ sua víst ok kunnikt gort at þeir menn sem til þess vęllduz ok vęnduz áár fra áári at fara vpp a ofan vert þat

sama fiall saker nękkura fornfering sinna. ægi veit ek huerra helldz seger hinn heilagi augustinus. þa skrifaðu þeir nękkura merkilega luti vppi þar a moldinni eđr duptinu hueria er þeir fundu meðr ęllu vskadda annat áárit epter sem þeir þar komu. mattí þat meðr engu moti vera sem huerr skýnsamr madr ma skilia utan þar kiemi huarki vindr nęvęta. Enn af þi at þar var loptiđ micklu þunnara enn þeir męttí þat standaz saker eingis andar gustz motí vana sinum ok naturv þa baru upp þannig meðr sér vaata suęppu ok logđu viđr nasar áá sialfum ser at þaðan af tęki þeir þýkkara lopt ok likara sinni nátturu. Sogđu þeir | | sik ægi einn fugl þar sieđ hafa. Eigi seger sia hín skiluislegzta ok hin truanligzta skript v skýnsamliga at þui eđr urettlega ægi at eíns fiska ok ęnnur

kuikendí sem vötn | unum flýtiz. utan ok iafn vel þar meðr fliugandi fugla af uönunum fez hafa. fýrer þa greín at þeir megu uel ok fagrlegha vm þetta loptið fliuga sem af iardarennar ok hafsíns vökum ok uetum ríss ok þýkknar. **genesis.20** Guð sagði þa sua. leíði vötnín vt af ser skriðanda lifs anda kuíkenda ok fliuganda fugla kým vnder festing-ar h'mnínun vpp ýfer iorðina. **scolastica hýstoria.** fýri þann skýlld eru fiskarner her kallaðer skriðkuikendí at þann tíma er þeir lengia sik suimandi sem akafligaz. flýtiz þeir þo at lettlegarr ýfer sin bríost a orði villtíz miök hinn vísi plaot þann tíma sem hann kom niðr a egipta land ok las þar bekr moýsi at fliuganda fugla kým leiddiz upp ýfer iorðina hugði hann at moýses hefði þann skilning áá haft at fliugandi fuglar

p 29

verí loptzens skráut ok prýði ateíns niðri viðr iorðina, enn goðer englar ok illir verí himu efra loptinu til skrautz ok fegrðar enn þat er ekki sua. þuiat goðer englar eru i himínrikí sem fýR var sagt. enn iller voru íbrott keyrðer ok rekner i þetta hið þoku fulla lopt sialfum ser til eýlifrar pínu enn ekki til nõkkurs skrautz eðr pryði. **Genesis.21** Ok þa skapaði guð stora huali ok annan lifanda ok hreriligan fiska kýns anda huat er votnín hofðu gefit ut af ser meðr sinum eiginlegum mýndum ok fliugandi fugla huern epter sinu kými. Guð sáá at þetta var eín goð skepna **22** ok blezaði beði fiskum ok fuglum sua segiandi Vaxi þer ok fiølgiz ok fýllit siofarens vötn ok fiølgiz fuglarnar æigi siðr ýver alla iorðina. **23** varð sua aptann ok morginn ok lýktaðiz hinn fimtí dagr. **fra þi er guð skapaði lauf ok gras ok skrýddi iorðina meðr allzkonar blomstrum ok kuikendum.**

A hinum setta degi prýddi guð iorðina seinaz sua sem þa eina af fýR nefndum fiorum hofutskepnum sem þungaz er ok lægz liggr øllum hinum herum heimsins haalfvm. þat er hímnínun. loptínu ok þar meðr vatnínu fýrri fagrlega skipaðum ok skrýddum. Skapaði hann áá | | a þeima deghí vpp á iorðina þrenn kuíkenda kým eítt er alidýr þat er ver køllum bu smala. annat skridquikendí. þridia ønnur ferfett kuikendi sem villi dýr ok fýrer þa søk at guð uissi þat fýrer at maðrenn mundi sýndalegha falla þa skapaði hann bued honum til fedu ok viðrhialpar epter komana erfíði. þuiat iumentum er vpp áá norænu at segia sua sem eín hialpaðar skepna. A þann sama dagh skapaði hann ok | æigi siðr manninn til at býggia þessa heíms verolld sua

sem hann hafði hana algort ok fagrlegha prýdda giorandi hann af tu-
 eim nátturum. likamann af iardarennar molldu satengiandi honum
 skýnsamlegan lifs ánda af engu efní vtan at eíns af sialfs hans efmétti
 skapaðan. Ok enn sem hann býriaði þersa dags verk ok skapan **24** sagði
 hann sua. **Genesis** Leiddi iorðin framm ok gefi vt af ser lifanda anda meðr
 sinnu kýni busmala. skriðkuikendi ok ferfett kuikendi hvert sem eitt
 meðr sinum eiginlegum mýndum. varð ok þegar í stað sua **25** at guð
 giørði qll iardarennar skriðkuikendi epter sinu eignu kýni. Ok sem
 guð faðer sá at þetta var enn eín goð skepna **26** sagði hann sua til
 sins seta sunar ok heilags anda. Gerum ver manninn epter váarri lik-
 ing ok likneskiu at hann se stionari ýfer siofar fiskvm ok himínsins
 fuglum. ferfettum kuikendum ok qllv iardríkinu ok þar meðr qllu þui
 skrið kuikendi sem nokkura lifs rering hefer i veroldinni. **27** Skapaði
 guð mannen epter sialfs sins mýnd ok likneskiu. skapaði hann beði
 karlman ok kuenmann ok þo siðar konuna sem ofar meir man heýraz
 mega. **Scolastica hýstoria.** Af þrennum greinum máá eínkannlega
 merkiaz manzens tign ok virðing. þat er hið fyrsta at æigi at eíns
 varð hann isinu kýni sem fyrr sagþer luter. helldr ok iamn uel þar
 meðr at hann er guðs likneskia fyrer þui at hann gaf honum einum
 skýnsemðar skilning af qllum veralldar kuikendvm. Er likneskia heil-
 agrar þrenningar meðr þrifalldri mýnd ok skilning manzens qnd ok
 hugskot. þat er til minnis til skýnsemðar skilningar ok till uilia eðr
 elsk=huga þuiat þeser .iij.luter eru eín ueran ok eitt lif meðr huerium

sem eínnum manni sua sem .iij. personur eru i guðs þrenningu. faðer
 ok sonr ok heilagr andi ok þær allar erv þo einn guð. þat er annat at
 hann var skapaðr meðr staðfestre fyrer hugsan þuiat i qðrum sinum
 verkum bauð guð að eíns ok wrðu þeir luter. Enn i þersu soqðu guðs
 personur faðer ok sonr ok heilagr andi sua fyrer hugsandi ok staðfestandi
 sin a milli. Giqrum ver manninn. þat er hið þriði | | manzens tign ok
 forprisan at hannvar skapaðr herra ok sua sem konungr allra annaRa
 iardneskra kuikenda ok at þau skýlldu honum til feðu ok kleðnaðar
 ok til erfíðis letta ok viðr hialpar siðan er hann hafði misgort. þuiat
 fyrer sýndína gaf guð beði manninum ok qðrum kuikendum iardrennar
 a vøxtu til feðu fyrer þui at iqrdin | leiddi þa engan lut u frean ut af ser
 eðr skepnvnni skaðsamlegan. Enn þersararar drotanar misti hann af

sýndarennar til skýlldan þeði yfer hinum stærstum kuikendum ok hinum smærstum. yfer hinum stæstum sem leonum. til þers at hann vití ok uíðr kenniz at hann hefer latið sitt valld ok drottnan yfer þeim. Enn yfer hinum smestum sem fuglum til þess at hann skili ok vnderstandí þar af huersu vanmeginn ok herfiligr hann er þar af vorðinn yfer meðal kuikendum hefer hann enn ualld sér til hugganar. ok at hann víti þaðan af at hann hafði sua fyrer sýndina yfer oðrum sem þessum. **speculum hýstoriale.** Meðr þessi hinni fyrstu ok hinni fremztu±fýR sagðrí heilagrar þrenningar likneskiu ± sem manzins hugskotí er. í huerri er hann samlikiz guði meðr heilagum englum berr maðrinn ok guðs likingh. eínkannleggha i.v. lutvm hín fyrsta er su drottnanar roksemð ok

p32

valld sem í fyrstunni var honum veítt. þuiat sua sem guð er allra luta drottinn ok herra himneskra ok iarðneskra ok iarðneskra ok þeira sem í heluetí eru. A þa leið var maðrinn sem drottnari ok herra yfer skipaðr æigi at eíns fýR soðum kuikendum utan ok þar meðr allri þessa heims veralldar býgð sem var sagt. Annat er upphafsins roksemð þuiat áá þann háátt sem guð er vpphaf allra luta fyrer sina skapan. sua er adam allramanna upphaf ok fyrstr fyrer getnaðarens skýlld. þat hið þriðia at sua sem nokkuer luter eru samkuemíliger milli guðs ok annaRa luta. sua kemr ok mart saman meðr mannum ok oðrum veralldlegum lutum ok þaðan af kallaz hann minni heímr. þat hið fiórða at sua sem guð er allra luta endalýkt. sua er maðrinn síðaztr epter naatturv skipanenne. þuiat hann var seínaz skapaðr þo at hann verí allra iarðneskra luta fyrstr ok fremztr epter skýnsemðar skípan. þat er hit fimta at sua sem guð er huerútna allr meðr sinn almáátt í hínun meíra heimí. sua er aundin í sinum. minna heimí. þat er í ollum likamsins limum meðr huerium sem eínun sem veralldligum manni. Maðrinn meðr sinní skýnsemð er æigi þa leiðis skapaðr lútr ok niðrleítr sem skýnlaus kuikendí. er hanslikams vøxtr retrr forme | | raðr vpp til himnisíns sua sem sialfan hann aminnandí at hann hafi á þann haatt± sin hug skotz augu ok skilningar vit til ± himneskra luta sem hans likamleg augu ok skilningar vit ok a siona veit vpp til himinsins. hann var ok þa litlu stund sem hann stoð í meínleýsis stett ok skýlldi euenleggha verit hafva | vtan alla píníliga angist ef hann hefði æigi misgort. þuiat honum skýlldi huarki hungur ne þorstí.æigi kulði ne hití aigi erfíði ne nokkur haattar krankleikí

anprat hafa. Eigi hefði hann ok þurft likams dauðann at ottaz þuiat lifandis

p 33

likamnum skýlði hann flutz hafa til eýlifrar dýrðar. æigi hefði hann ok þurft klednat at hafa ok þo hefði hann þar af enga skammfýlling fengit þuiat engan kendi hann þa uera sinn leýndalim helldr enn hofuðit hendr ę fetr. Maðrinn hefði þa getinn uerit vtan alla sýnd ok sui uirðu enn feðdr utan allra sutar ok sáárleiks. ok epter þat er guð hafði sua skapat þau blezaði hann þeim ok sagði sua. **Genesis.** Uaxit þit ok fiqlgiz ok fýllit iorðina ok stiornit henni. drottnit ok siofarins fiskum. himninsins fuglum ok qlum þeim kuikendum sem ręraz á iardriki. scolastica hýstoria. þar sem guð sagði sua vaxit þiðok fiqlgiz huat er æigi mętti verða vtan þeira samblandan þa skapaði hann hiuskap milli karlmannz ok konu huar af er þeir villu menn eru af sinni sogn aptr setter ok suivirðer sem þat sogðu at sambuð milli karlmanz ok konu metti alldregen uerða utan sýnd ok sáálu háaska Augustinus. Voru þeir menn ok er þers spurðu huersu maðrenn hafði nokkut valld ýfer fiskum eðr fuglum dýrum ok ± oðrum dauðligum kuikendum. meðr þui at ver± siam mennina af morgungum dýrum verða drepna ok marga þa fugla oss mein giora sem ver uilldim feginsamlega fordaz ella giarnsamligha gripa ok faam þat æigi gort þui helldr. huersu tókum ver at þui valld ýfer þuilikum lutum. Meðr fyrstu grein maa þeim þui uel suara at þeir villaz mikillegha þar sem þeir hugleiða mannzins stett huersv

p34

hann fordęmðiz meðr dauðleik þessa lifanda lifs epter sýndina. týndi sua ok misti þers algiorleiks sem hann var til skapaðr. guðs likneskiu. Nu af mannzens forðemingar stetttr efler ok orkar sua micklu at hann stýri ok stiorní sua morgungum kuikendum sem busmalinn er meðr enn fleirum oðrum. ok þo at hann megi saker likamsins breýskleiks af morgum dýrum drepinn verða sua máá hann af engum kosti þeim tamðr uerða sua morg ok mikils hættar dýr | | sem hanntems huat er af hans ríki þa hugsanda þi sem honum endr nýiuðum ok frialsaðum ok af sialfum guði fyrer heitið. J aðra deilld erv ql qnnur kuikendí mannum vnder lagitæigi fyrer likamsims skýlld vtan helldr fyrer þa | skýnsemd og skilning sam ver hofvm ok þau hafa æigi þo at likaminn vááR se âê iamuel sua uorðinn sik at hann sýní þat a sialfum ser

at ver sem betri enn önnur kuikendi ok fyrer þa greín guði liker. þuiat mannzins likamr at eins er rettr skapaðr ok uppreistr til himíns sem fyR var sagt. **genesis.29** Ok enn talaði guð til þeira. Se herna at ek gaf ýkk huert sem eitt gras beranda sitt sááð ok annan eiginlegan a voxt ýfer alla iorðina ok öll þau trío sem i sialfúm ser hafa saað ok frío sins eigins kýns at þesser luter se ýkk til feðis ok ± viðrlífis **30** ok öllum iarðar-ennar kuíkendum öllum himinsins fuglum ægi siðr ok þar meðr öllum þeim iarðneskum lutum sem ræraz mega ok lifandis andi er meðr at

p 35

þau megi þar af feðaz Ok þetta varð allt sem hann bauð. **31** Sa guð alla þa luti sem hann hafði gort ok voru harðla goðer. varð sua aptann ok morginn ok lýktaðiz hinn setti dagr. **augustinus.** þeir menn sem þess spýria fyrer hueria greín er guð giórði sua morg kuikendi huart sem þau erv helldr i sío eðr landi sem mannum eru þui siðr nauzýnlig eðr nýt-samlig at morg af þeim eru honum helldr reðiligh ok miok skaðsamlig. þa skilia þat ægi ne understanda huersu aller luter eru skapanum fagrer ok fegiliger þeim sem alla þa hefer ok nýter til at drotna ok stiorna þar meðr allri sinni skepnu huerri er hann drottnar meðr hinu haleítazta loqmaali. Ef sua berr til at einn v uitr maðr gengr inn i nokkurs mannz húús forhags eðr smiðiu þar sem hann flýtr framm sina orku þa séer hann þar mōrg þau tol ok tēki sem hann veit eigí til huers skolo eðr fyrer huern skýlld þau eru giōr ok hýggr þau v nýt ok til einskis hef ef hann er miok v uitr maðr. Eínkannlega ok ef hann er miok uforsiall eðr hefer fallit i einnhuern ofn eðr hefer sērt sik meðr nokkurv huōssu iarni þi sem hia smiðnum hefer legit sua sem hann hōndlar þat v uar-lega þa ætlar hann ok hýggr marga lutí þar liggiandi miok meínsamlega ok skaðsamlega vera huerra nauzun ok nýtsemd er smiðrinn veit harða vel. ok fyrer þi spottar hann ok daarar hins v uizku ok gefr sér ekki vetta vm hans v uitrleik ok uidrķemilig orð fremíandi sina íðn ok orku fasta farí | | sua sem hann hefuer aaðr ætlat ok þo eru marger menn sua v uítrir ok heimsker at þa luti sem þeir vita ægi meðr manninum eíns hueria

p 36

smið til huers þeir eru hefēr eðr nýter. þora þeir ægi at lasta. helldr trua þeir þa. nauzunlega ok til | nokkuRa nýtsemda giorfa vera þegar sem þeir sia þa.enn þeir þora marga þa lutí at lýta ok lasta i þessarí uerolldu huerrar skapari ok veitari almáttigr guð er sem þeir vita ægi fyrer huern

skýlld skapaðer eru. vilja þeir sua i uerkum ok smðúelum almattígs hof-
uðsmiðs ok hans hagleiks tolum sýnaz þat vita sem þeir vita meðr engu
mot'. Ek iatar ok vel uiðr gengr seger hinn mickli augustínus at ek veit
ægi fyrer huern skýlld mýss ok maðkar flugur ok froskar eru skap-
aðer. ok þo sér ek allt at eíns qll kuikendi ísinu kýní. fogr vera ægi siðr
þo at mǫrg af þeim sýniz saker sýnða váára oss vera þeði meinsom ok
motstaðlig. ægi hugleiðer ek sua eðr ser nõkkurs kuikendis likam eðr
limu seger hann at ek finni þar ægi máátéer ok męlingar. skilrikis tǫl-
ur ok skipaner til sęmilígs sama ok samþýktar einíngar saman koma.ægi
feðR ek ok skilið huaðan af þesser aller luter munu til koma utan af þeiri
hinni hęstu męlingu. skipan ok tǫlu sem i sialfre v skiptiligri ok eýlifre
guðs tign ok sęmð erv ok saman standa af huerium er þat er harðla
viðrkuęmílikt ok sannlegha skrifat at hann skipar alla lutí meðr uaag
ok tǫlu máter ok melingu. oll veralldar kuikendi eru manninum anat
huart nýtsamlig ella skięð ok skaðsamleg. ella í þriðia stað huarki með
ne í motí. Af nýtsamligum þarf ægi at spýria ne segia fyrer hueria sǫk
þau voru skapat ok skaðsamligum lutum pinumz ver ok fremívumz eðr
reiðumz til þess at ver of elskim ægi ne fýsumz of miǫk upp á þetta

p37

liðanda líf sem mǫrgum haaskasamligum lutum er laðit ok under gef-it.
helldr elskum ver ok girnumz upp áá annat lifit þat sem micklu er betra
þar sem hinn hesti fríðr ok vrugg farseld er. kaupum þat lif ok
verðskýlldum meðr milldleiks uerkum. Maðrinn pinaz ok miǫk þa er
hann verðr meiddr eðr meðr nokkuru moti skaddr af þeim eðr ottaz at
verða meiddr.þuiat otti ok rezla er harðla mikil pina huar af er hann máá
hialpsamlega hirtaz sua sem hann ser þersa lutí fyrer saker sýnda sinna
sér til hafa fallit. þar af máá hann ok míkillega lęraz sua at ottaz ok undraz
guðs verk ok sem hann er ok hugleiðer hina minztu luti ser mega meín
| | gera þa endr minniz hann sins breýkleiks hvar af er hann mettí ok eþtí
einkannlega at legiaz ok litilltaz.vurðv þau fyrer þessa þrenna greín
manninum skaðsamlig epter sýndina ok þar af pínaðiz hann. hirtiz ok
lerðiz þar sem þau voru miǫk hǫguęr skapat i fýrstu fyrer sýndina.
Mǫrg | af þeim verða ok qðrum at skaða huerr er ekki pinaz þa leiðis
þar af sem maðrenn ok ægi hirtaz þau ne lęraz af þessum demum ma
maðrinn enn ægi siðr læri d'm fáá ef hann hugsar sik vm. NokkuR af
þeim er sua skapat at þau skulo qðrum kuikendum vera til feðv ok
viðr lífis. Enn til huers at ver grafimz epter greinum af þeim kuikendum

sem huarkí eru meðr oss ne motí seger augustinus. Mislikar þer þat maðr at þau stoda þer ekkí ne stetta þa laat þer þat lika at þau meina þer ekkí vetta. **scolastica hýstoria.** Af hinum minnztum kuikendum þeim sem af dauðra kuikenda likamum eðr váánzlegum uokum dalegum ok dýgðar lausum grōsum erv vōn at feðaz hefar umręða uerit manna i millí huart þau rýnni þa þegar upp sua sem ōnnur kvíkendi. enn þar til er su orlausn gefin at þau sem æigi feðaz af nokkuri spellan eðr skað semð

p 38

vurð þa þegar. enn þau sem af einum ok ōprum spellaðum lutum feðaz runnu af þeim sōmum upp epter sýndina. þers máá ok einn huerr lettlega spyria fýrer hueria skýlld er guð gaf manninum fezlu fýrer sýndina til viðrlífis þar sem hann var þa oðauðligr. enn þat var fýrer þa sōk at sá oðauðleikr vae meðr feðu nęrandi sem hann uar meðr skapaðr. ok æigi þar vm meðr þeim hettí sem hinn er vkomínn er huerr er engarrar feðu þarf eðr þers haattar nęringar. þuiat i hinum fýRa maatti maðrenn þat at deýia æigi. Enn ihinum siðara má hann æigi deýia. **her viðrlíkiz.vij. daga uerk almattigs guðs uidr uij. alldra heímsins. capitulum.**

Hímínn ok iqrð voru nu algiqr ok ōll þeira fegrð ok prýdí fýlldi guð ok lýktaði þat er sua mikít at **2** hann sýndí fullgort vera sitt verk ahinum siavnda degí ok huilldiz a hinum sia0nda degi af ōllu þui verki sem hann hafði þa gort ok framít. æigi sua sem af nōkkuRí meðu. helldr af lettandí fýR sagðri sinni skipan ok giqrð a þeim sama degi þuiat guð hafði þa skipat efní til allra likamligra luta ok líking saalna þeira sem hann skapaði siðan hueria a sínum skapanar tima. hafði hann nu framíð | | ok algiort þersi .vij. daga uerk meðr fýR sagðri skapan ok skipan ok skýringu. Meðr skapan aa hinum fýrsta deghi sua sem hann framði sina skapan af engv efní ok meðr skipan þa er hann skildí liosit fra mýrkrinu meðr skipan eðr sundr skiptingu áá ōðrum ok hinvm þriþia. enn meðr skreyting á þrimr hinum siðaztum. **Augustinus J** þeim orðum sem moýses seger at guð hvilldiz á | hinum siavnda degi af þeim sinum harða goðum verkum sem hann hafði gort, ma ok æigi siðr meðr andlegum skilnínghí ok skýrum

p 39

merkiaz uáár epter komandi huilld. þa sem hann man oss gefa af ōllum váárum verkum ef ver hōfum þau góð gort. þuiat ōll vaar góð uerk

er honum at kenna ok eigna sem oss kallar til góðgiörn \inga ok meðr þeim tekr sýner oss sannleiksins vegh ok lokkar oss ok laðar til þess at ver gangim hann. gefr oss þar til afl ok orku at ver fýllim þat meðr frammkiemð sem hann býðr oss. Enn þat er inn virðilegha hugleidanda seger augustínus fyrer hueria skýnsemð þessi huilld veítiz a hinum .vij. deghi. hann svarar síer sialfr ok seer.vi.alldra uinnu fulla vm allan texta guðliga ritningha sua sem greinda meðr sinum eiginlegum endimörkum til þers at huilldín veítiz á hinum .vij, ok fyrer þi segher hann þa sǫmu .vi. alldra hafa mýnd ok merking þessara .vi. dagha áá huerium er guð giordí þa fýR sagða luti sem skriptin skýrer ok nu var fra sagt. Manndomsins upphaf sua sem maðrinn tok a neýta ok níota þersa veralldar lioss i paradiso samvirðiz vel ok viðrkiemiliga hinum fyrsta deghi á huerium er guð giordí liosið þessi alldr má ok æigi siðr sua takaz sem hín yngsta barn ęska allrar þessarar veralldar. hans lengð var fra adamí til noa floðs ok

p 40

stadlegh festing milli þeira vatna hinna neðri sem hon fluttiz i ok þeira hinna efri sem ofan rigndi at henni. þessi alldr fyrer verðr sik æigi af fleðinni. þuiat annaR mannzins alldr er sueindomrinn fra þui er hann er vij. l vetra ok til þers hann er xiiij. vetra gamall þuæz æigi ne fellr iam giarna meðr nõkkuRi gleymsku or hans minni sem hinn fyrsti þuiat ver munnum þat sen vorum små sueinar. enn neppilegha eðr æigi þat er ver uorum smaborn. Tungna skiptið ok þeira hneykingh ok niðran sem giqrðv stopulinn babel var aptann þessa heims alldrs. Eigi gat þessi guðs lyð helldr enn hinn fyRi þuiat annaR mannzinz alldr er æigi mǫguligr af spring at geta. | Hins þriðia heims alldrs morginn byri- aðiz af abraham hefer hann harða viðrkiemilega hinum þriðia mannz alldrinum fra þi er hann .xiiij. vetra ok hann hefuer viij. vetra vm tuitught. þuiat sàà alldr er vel meginn ok mattugr af springh at geta. hann samuirðiz ok harða uel ok uidrkiemilegha hinum þriðia degin- um a huerium er iordín var i brott skipt ok fra skila giqr votnnum fyrer þann skyllid at àà þeima heims alldri greindiz guðd lyðr ok fraskila giqrðiz þeim hinum mickla heidínna þioða hegoma ok vaandu villu fyrer truar- ennar feðr hinn agięta abraham sem þeir i vofðuz meðr margskonar skyrtiligum skurðgoða blotvm sua sem i hreðileghum ok v stadleghum vazens vind bårum. ok enn helldr sem i hreði legum haf baarum ok sterkum brimstormum frialsðiz guðs lyðr þa ok fraskildiz upp a þann

sàatt þessare þeira vantru sem iorðin af vötnunum þann tíma sem hon birtiz ok þuRlendit syndiz. Greindiz hann þa ok þyrsti þa leiðis himneska skur guðlegra boðorða dyrkandi ein saman ok lifanda guð sem su iorð matulegha dögguat sem síðan mundi fagran frykt ok nytsamlegha auòxta heilagra ritningha hqfut fedra ok spamanna gefva megha.

p41

fyrer þi talaði guð sua til abrahams. Margra þioða fedr skipaði ek þik. þersi alldr vannz allt til dagha dauíðs. var hans aptann i syndalegum lifnaði saul konungs ok ferleghum framferðum þers foks sen vnder hans stiorn var. þaðan byriaðiz hins fiórða heims alldrs morginn af hinum frægja konungi dauid. hann er ok likr hinum fiórðs mannzalldrinum þeim er sem er fra þi er hann viij. vetr ok .xx. ok framm til þers er hann er fimmtugr. Nu berr sia roskín leikinn senni lega til allra millum annaRa alldra ok er hann fastligt ok frygðarsamligt sterkt ok stað fastligt skart ok skraut annaRa alldra alldanna ok fyrer þa sök samuirðiz hann heiðrs uel ok fagrleggha hinum fiórða deghinum a huerivm er himin ll tunglin voru giqr ifestingar himinum. Eðr huat meggha biartlegarr ok aaudsynilegaR merkia heiðr ok birti konunglegs rikis ok þann lyð sem honum er alluel hlyðinn. Enn solarennar fegrð ok forprisan tunglsins birti merker sialfa synagogam. Stiqrnurnar henna hqfðingia ok alla luti sua grundvallaða ok staðfesta i rikis stiorn sem stiqrnur i festningar himni. Aptann þersa heims alldsa var þa i efi ok syndalegum lifnaði hinna síðarri konunga huar fyrer er ebreska manna þioð var hertekin ok iþrældom rekin. Hins fimta alldrsins morginn varð hin mickla herleiðing i babilone. | var hann æigi vlikr þeim luta manzens alldrs ok efi sem honum þyngiz ok honum hallar af roskínleiknum til ellennar. hann kallaz i bokinni þungleika alldr. hann er fra þui er maðrenn er fimtugr ok til þess er hann siauræðr ok se þo enn æigi sialfr ellidomrinn kominn. A þessum alldri hallaðiz à þa leið rikissins stiorn ok staðfesta meðr gyðinga folkì sem maðrinn þann tíma sem hann liðr

p42

af roskínleikinum til ellidomsins. hans lengd var af nefn dum tíma til hegatburðar vðars herra ihu xpisti. Samvirdiz hann vel hinum .v. deghinum a huerium er fiskar ok fuglar voru skapaðer fyrer þann skyllid at viðara tokv þa niðr at hafaz millem heiðinna þioða sua sem i siofar hàaska ok at hafa uuislega ok ustaðfasta tru sem fliugandi fuglar renna

ok reika heghat ok þeghat. Voru þar ok uissulega storer hualer. þat erv þeir sterker ok staðfaster menn sem giarnare uilldu ok vel màattv helldr stiorna ser ok oðrum veraldrennar bårum ok bylgium. enn þiona eðr i þrældom leggiar i þeiri herleiðingv. þuiat þeir vurðu meðr einkis kyns otta eðr rezlu til skurðgoða blotz eðr nõkkvrrar anarrar villu ok vantru leiddur ok lokkaðer. þat er geymanda at guð blezaði þessum kuikendum ok sagði sua. Vaxit þer ok fiqlgiz ok fyllit siqfarens vqtn. enn fuglarnar fiqlgiz yfer iorðina þuiat gyðinga þioð friofaðiz ok fiqlg-aðiz harða mikit upp fra þeim tíma sem hon dirfðiz milli heidinna þioða. þess. þessa hins ,vta. alldrsins aptann. var þat hið mickla ok hit margfallda synda fang meðr gyðinga folki er þeir voru sua blindaðer at þeir kendu æigi vaarn herra ihsum xpistum til sin komanda hegat i volldina. Hins setta alldrs morginn byriaz vpp ok hefz af guðzpiallzens predican fyrer lausnara varn ihsum xpistum. A þessum hinum. vita. heims alldrinum || lamdiz storlega miqk ok niðr lagðiz þat hið likam-legha ok hið veralldlegha iuða riki a huerium er þeir | ra musteri var niðr brotið ok þeira fornferingar eyddar ok unytar ok su þioð er driugum

p43

komin at endalykt lifsins epter þui sem rikissins afli ok orku til heyrer. A þersum alldri feddiz þo nyr maðr sua sem i ellidomì hins gamla mannz sa sem nu lifer andlegha. a hinum. vita. degghi uarð maðrenn til guðs likneskiu ok likingar ok à þersum hinum .vita. heimsalldri feddiz vâar herra likamlegha heghat i heim af huerium er spamaðrenn seger sua. Maðr er hann ok huerr man kenna hann? Ok sua sem à þeim degghi varð beði karlmaðr ok kona. meðr ðeim hetti er àa þersum alldri iHsuc xpistuc ok hans kristni. a þeim degghi var maðrenn vpp a þann | haatt yfer skap-aðr busmqlum. hoggormum ok himinsins fuglum. sem kistr styrer ok stiornar þeim hugskotum a þersum alldri sem honum geraz hlyðin ok til hans kristni koma ok kriupa huart sem þat er helldr af heidunum þioðum eðr gyðinga folki til þers at þeir temiz ok tempriz af sialfum honum eðr huat manna þeir eru sem hoguerer giqraz ok honum lydner huart sem þeir hafa fyrer likams fystum of gefner verit sem busmaler eðr hafa þeir i myrkra þoku sua sem villu eðr nõkkuri vantru vafðer ok blindaðer uer-ið sem eitr ormar eðr hafa þeir of metnaþar fuller verit ok framm giarner sem fliugandi fuglar. Biðium þess guð at sa veralldarennar timi sem er sua sem aptann þessa heimsalldr taki oss æigi ne beri àa uara lifdagha þuiat þat er veralldarennar endalykt ok timar antixpisti af huerium er

guð seger. Hyggr þv eðr ętlar at mannzens sun muni nõkkura trv finna a iardriki þann tima sem hann hefer komit. Epter þenna aptan man morginn koma sua sem sialfr guð man hegat koma meðr sinni signaðri birti. þa munu þeir huilaz af ęllum sinum verum meðr ihesu xpisto sem alaz af hans epter dęmum hafa hardla goðuerk gort þui at epter þuilik verk er ęllum godum monnum huilldin uęntandi a hinum .uij.

p44

deginum. þat er à hinum .vij. heims alldrinum þeim er engan hefuer aptaninn vęnti huerr sem einn goðr maðr sier at þui eylifrar dyrðar epter hardla goð .vij. daga verk. þat er epter .vij. dagha vmlidna ok skili sua huat er þat hefuer at þyða er guð huilldiz a hinum .vij. degi af ęllum sinum verkum. þuiat sialfr hann vinnr alla | þa goða luti meðr oss sem ver giorum. ok af þui er þat rettlegha sagt at hann huiliz. þuiat epter ęll þessi verk man hann þersum meðr sialfum ser efenleggha huilld veita. **de genesi. 3** Blezaði guð þa ok helgaði hinn .vij. daghinn. þat er sua at skilia at hann skapaði at sa dagr uęri haleitr ok heilagr halldinn þuiat àà honum lette hann af ęllv verki sinu þi sem hann hafði þa skapat. **scolastica hystoria.** þat sem seger at guð huilldiz à hinum .vij. degi af ollu verki sem hann hafði fyllt ok framit. þa tēz ok syniz þat verkit sem hann hafði þa enn æigi gort af hueriv er hann liettr enn æigi eðr hiliz. þriu fyRsogð verk hafði hann þa gort. skapat skipat ok skreytt. hit fiordā hans verk letter alldregin af sua lengi sem hann lętr mannkynit aukaz skapandi ok samtengiandi huers sem eins sàal sinum eiginleghum likam. hit fimta man hann fremia annars heims synandi þa ęllum goðum mon | num sialfs sins asionu sem þionandi maðr seðandi þa ok sęmandi efenleggha meðr sialfum ser i himinriki **her greiner ok skyrer af skapan ok setning heimsins ok mannzens skapan ok sundr greining natturu hans**

p45

Fyrer þa sęk at um hrið var saght beði i senn af skapan karlmannz ok konu huat er þa varð æigi alli i senn ok àà einum tima þa endr- tekr moyses meðr nõkkuru moti aptr fyRsagða luti til þers at hann þui fullegaR til lykta leiði þat sem hann hefer àader meðr skiotu ok skęmmu maali vid komit ok tekr i fyrstunni sua til orðz **Genesis. 4** þessor eru giordęr ok getnaðer himins ok iardar þann tima sem þau voru skapat a þann sama dag sem guð giordę himin ok iord 5 ok allan

akrsins blomstr ok grensku ok hans fòðr ok fezlu fyR enn þat rynni upp yfer iorðina ok þar meðr allt iarðarennar gras fyR enn þat friofaðiz þuiat guð hafði þa enn æigi nõkkurn stað låatid regna yfer alla iorðina. æigi uar þa ok nõkkur maðr til hana at yrkia eðr uinna. **6** helldr reis einn storr vpp sprettv brunnr ok vatnzins eðr upp af iorðinni dõgguaudi allan hennar a voxt ok asynd. **augustinus.** seger at sàa maðr se þui siðr oðfundaðr eðr lastandi sem þersa luthi feR sua uel ok vitrlega skilit epter þuisem letrið heyriz lioda at hann forðaz allar guðlastaner ok aðra þa luti sem kristiligri tru eru gagnstaðleger. ok at hann se helldr sem einkannlegr ok harðla lofsamlegr skilningar maðr hafandi ok halldan l di. Enn ef þar til er einginginn uidrkiemiligri uegr milldr ne guði makligri at þesser faer framm sagðer luther se oðru uiss enn meðr merkinghum ok skyringhum skilder. þa hõfum þann hãatt ok hugsan àa sõgðum orðum sem sialfr hann hefer meðr þess fylltingi gort ok gefit sem oss eggj- ar at biðia. leita ok knyia. Fyrrum voru .vij. daghar tinder ok talðer. enn nu er einn dagr a nefndr ok til tekinn à huerium er guð giordí

p46

himin ok iorð oll alla akrsins blomgan ok hans fezlu kyn i vpphafi sua sem sagt er at guð skapaði himin ok iorð Er þat ok berlega lesit at iarðarennar blomstr ok hennar feðu kyn varð ahinum þriðia degi ok þo skapaði guð æigi oðru viss himin ok iorð. enn aðr hefer sagt verit ahinum fyrsta degi. I þessum hinum fãam orðum tẽr fyR nefndr spa- maðr oss ok skyrer meðr merkingar skilningi alla skepnuna fyrer and- ar syndina under nafni himins ok iarðar merkiz oll syniligh | skepna. J nafni dagsins merkiz allr timi þersa liðanda lifs a huerium er æigi at eins varð himinn ok iorð utan þar meðr styriz ok stiornaz skipaz ok vei- tiz oðl synligh skepna. Vnder akrsins blomstri ok hans feðu kyni vill hann at usynilig skepna skiliz sua sem oðdin fyrer lifsins blomgan ok sterkleik. enn þat sem hann leggr þa til ok seger. fyR enn þat akrsins blomstr vpp rann eðr uarðyfer iorðina er sua skilianda aðr enn oð- in misgiordí. þuiat þann tima segiz hon vera eðr feðaz iorðina yfer sem hon saurgaz af veralldligum girndum ok ferlegum fystum fyrer þann skyllid sagði hann at guð hafði þa enn æigi regna låatid yfer iorðina sem hann segði sua opinberlegaR. Eigi veitti vaaR herra ritninganna skyi- um þa enn leringar regn til at dõggua ok endrlifga saalina meðan hon hafði eigi misgort Spa manna bekr ok postlanna ritningar verða morg- um sua myrkr ok v skilianlegar sem þer se meðr nõkkurum þokum

eðr skyflokum skygðar ok hulðar. Enn þa uerða þær uel skiliandum monnum sua sem nytsamligh sannleiks skur ef þær eru meðr margfalldri ok uitrlegri tracteran talaðar ok skynsamlegha skyrðar. Enn þessa ritningarennar regns þurfti ǫndin æigi aaðr hon misgiordí. Eigi hafði vaar herra þa enn fyrer mannzens skyllid þers sem iordín kallaz ok

p 47

er vaars likama hulning ok sky tekit upp àa sinn signaða guðdom fyrer huat er hann veitti hardla noglegga guðþpiallzens skurer ok fyrer hueria ll sök æigi vtan at einginn maðr var saa at iordína vynni. þat er sua mikit at segia at maðrinn misgiordí æigi þa ok fyrer þi var honum eingi nauzuni àa skriptarenar skurum ok ritningarennar regnum sem þeim manni er iordína vinnr ok erfidar at almattigr guð dǫgguaði fyR nefndan akrsins blomstr þann sem æigi hafði þa enn yfer iordína komit. þat er synda laus såal meðr hinni innri ok andalegre sannleinsins eði ok upp sprettu seðiandi meðr sinum innztum leyndum lutum fyrer innan i sialfrar hennar skynsemð ok skilningu sem vel maa skilia af þeim vitranum ok visdomi sem adami birtiz fyrer syndina ok siðaR man heyrar. Af þessari eði eðr uppsprettubrunni seger bokin at einn brunnr reis upp af iordínni ok dǫgguaði allt iarðarennar yfer bragð ok asionu. ok af þeiri iorðu þo sem psalmistinn seger af til sialfs guðs. þu ert min vaan ok mitt lutskipti alifandi manna iorðu. Epter þessa syningnok skyringh synligrar ok usynligrar skepnu ok þar meðr almennileghan guðlegrar eðar ok vppsprettu uelgiorninginn uidr sialfs hans usynilegha skepnu. er til sǫgunnar apr huerfanda | ok þar til takanda sem frR var fra horfit. **Genesis.** at guð drottinn formeraði mannzens likam af iarðarennar leiri sem fyR var saght ok bles lifs anda af engu efni skapaðan ihans asionu ok þar meðr allan likamenn. ok sua euard maðrinn til lifandi såalar ok skynsemdarskilningar **scolastica hystoria.** Her hið fyrsta sinn kallar bokin guð drottin eðr herra. þuiat hann hafði sèr þa þionustu mann. þenna stað skilði plato vrettleggha segiandi guð hafa skapat audina at

p 48

eins. enn engla gort hafa likamann. Sua mà þat ok æigi standa ne fyrer satt hallda sem sumer segia at ǫndin se giǫr af guðlegri ueran ok under stoðu. þuiat þa màatti hun eðr maðrinn meðr engv moti misgiǫra. Maðrenn var ok skapaðr arosknum alldri ok fullkomnum dauðlegr ok u dauðligr. þuiat at hann màatti deyia ef hann skyllíðaði til þers sem raun berr àa

ok hann mætti verit hafa udrauðligir sem fyR var sagt. **fra sellifis paradis ok huersu almattigr guð skipaði hennar blom strum.**

Sellifis paradis hafði guð plantat fra upphafi. þat er à hinum þriðia degi þa er hann bauð at iorðin skyllði lbirtaz ok friofaz sem fyR uar saght ihueria er hann flutti ok setti manninn er hann hafði skapat àa þeim velle her àa vaarre byggilegre iorðu sem campus damascenus heiter. þenna stað let hann auðgaz ok alskipaðan verða meðr allzkyns ynnileghum uíði ok alldin treom þeim sem beði voru manninum lystilegha fõgr at sia upp àa set a bergia. milli huerra er hann skipaði þeim tueim treom imiðri paradis sem agiætaz voru af ulla þeim er annat het lifs tre af þeire natturu er þat hafði meðr ser. þuiat sàa maðr sem optsinnis eti af þui mættu æigi deya likams dauða. æigi siukleik elle eðr nõkkurskyns angist fàa. Enn annat uizkv tre millem goðs ok illz. þuiat fyR enn maðrenn àat þar af kunni hann fyrer þann skyllt enga grein à illu at hann hafði þat æigi àaðr profat. þuiat annat epterleti kollum ver gott. **scholastica hystoria.** kenthafði adam þo þegar þersa fyR sagða illa luti af sinni vitru meðr nõkkurur moti i sialfs sins samuizku enn æigi meðr nõkkuri raun eðr profan upp àa þann hæatt sem goðr lekner þann tima sem hann heill ok under stendr annars

p 49

mannz krankleik ok sàa hinn sami lekner skilr hann þo allt eins giõrr meiR þann tima sem hann hefer hinn sama krankleik a sialfum seet. þuiat ða er beði at hann skilr ok kenner at sua sem sa smasueinn sem hann er virðulega ok fagrlegga upp feðdr veit æigi driugum skyn a illu. ella mekiz u hlyðni rettlegha fyrer illt enn hlyðni fyrer gott þuiat sua sem hann hafði etið af þi sama tre. þa uissi hann huersu mikit gott hlyðnin mætti ok huersu mikit illt vhlyðnen stetti. **genesis. 10** Ein harða fõgr upp sprettu eðr eðr brunnr gekk vt ok flaut af þersum hinum ynniligzta stað paradis at dõggua til friouanar ok auaxtar ulla hennar tre ok þersi sama uppspretta skiptiz þaðan ok isundr greindiz i fiorar hinar sterstu hõfut àar er menn hafa sogur af. **11** heiter ein phison ok oðru nafni ganges af gangaro indialandz konungi. þuiat hon kemr þar framm ok fellr vm þat sama land. **12** finnz þar ok fez betra gull enn i oðrum londum ok ein hinn dyrasti steinn onichinus. hun skiptiz ok meðr ymisleghum litum sua sem hon er i ymissum londum eðr stõðum þuiat i oðrum stað er hon skiær enn i oðrum ruglat ok blandin. J annan stað er hon litil enn i annan stað mikil ok dreifiz uíða. J oðrum stað

ken er hon kòlld. enn i audrum heit. Enn phison aa bresku. er flockr upp inorròènu. þiat hon fylliz ok aukaz af þeim x. aam sem lsem falla i hana. **13** Aunnur heitir gyon er fellr bæði um blàland ok egipta land. Ok heitir hon þar nilus. **Genesis. Capitulum 14a** Hin þridia heitir tigris er fellr um austan uert þat land. er mesopotamia heitir. ok allt moti þi landi er assiria heitir. **Scholastica hystoria. Capitulum** Tigris heiter eitt hit skiotazta dyr. Er þersi aa fyrir þann skyllð af sinum stridum straumi. ok fliotum fors faullum kallað tigris. **Genesis Capitulum 14b** Hin fiórða er eufrates. er fellr um uestan uerða mesopotamiam ok allt i kalldeam

p 50

huaðan er Abraham er kyniaðr. **Scholastica hystoria. Capitulum** þessar iiii. àar fliota ok framm renna af einni upp sprettu sem sagt uar. ok skiliaz þa fyrst enn siðan koma saman nockurar af þeim. skiliaz þa enn anna tíma þuiat þær uikaia ok uenda sinni ràas optliga nidr iiordina koma siðan upp i einum ok ymsum stòðum ok londum. þapan af er þat at eigi hafa allir eina fra sògn huar þeira uppspretta er iuarri byggligri uerolldu. Sua segiz af sumum monnum. at ganges komi upp æigi fiarri fialli þi sem caucasus heitir. Enn nilus næri þi mikla fialli sem athlans heiter. Enn tigris ok eufrates af armenia. **Genesis.** Eptir þat flutti gud mannin i brott af þeim stad. sem hann hafði skapað hann. ok setti hann iþann enn ynniliga stað paradís. at hann skyllði þar uera ok uinna. eigi nockurs kyns erfíði helldr ser til lystiligrar næringar. ok hann skyllði hennar geymati uera enn gud beggia þeira. **Capitulum augustinus.** Su uinna uar hardla lofsamlig. enn eigi erfidiss saum þuiat manzins á stund-an ok uinna i huilld ok kyrreik þers sæla lifs sem ǫnguan biðr dauðann. er at geyma þat ok hirða sem hann helldr upp á. **Scholastica historia. 16a.** Ok þa setti gud honnum eitt boð orð. huadan af er hann skyllði uita sik undir sealfs hans ualldi uera eiga. ok drottnan. Ok aa þessir hätt sem oll uerolldin ok ònnur skepna uar honum hlydin. sua skyllði hann ok skaaranum hlydinn uera. **16b** Ok fyrir þi sagði hann sua. **Genesis Capitulum** Et ok fòdz af hueri tre sem einu. þi sem her bidr. i paradís **17** utan af uitzku tre milli gods ok illz. skallt þu eigi eta. fyrir þann skyllð at aa þeim degi sem þu hefir af þi etit mant þu andliga deya ok daudligr uerda. **Scholastica hystoria. Capitulum** Karlmanninum uar þetta boðord gefit. ok sett af guði. Enn fra honum skyllði þat koma til konunnar. ella uar þat eigi fyrri sett ok skipat enn þau uoru bæði skapað. **18** Ok þa sagdi Guð. **Genesis. Capitulum** Eigi er manninum gott eðr gledilight at

hann sèè ein saman. gerum honum fulltingiara sealfum honum likan. **19**
Nu sem guð drottinn hafði skapat ok formerat öll iardnesk kuikendi ok
þar meðr fiska ok fugla. þa let hann aull þau koma fyrir adam. ok at

p51

hann skylldi sea ok segia huersu hann uilldi huert þeira heita læta þiat
þat er huers kuikendis nafn allt til þersa dags sam adam gaf þi talandi
upp aa ebreska tungu þuiat hon ein uar fra upphafi allt til tugna skiptis.
Fyrir tuenna sök let guð aull kuikendi fyrir aadam koma, at hann gięfi
þeim lnofn. þa adra at þapan af mætti þau uita hann uera sinn formann
ok stionara. Enn þa adra at hann sæi þat uissuligha. at þers haatar
kuikenda uar sealfum honumm likt. ok honum uar fyrir þa sök konan
naudsynligh. **Genesis. Capitulum** þaa let gud þilikt sem suefn ok enn
helldr nockurs konar umegin falla aa adam. ok I þersu sama umegni.
truiz at hann hafi andliga leiddr uerit. ok upp numinn til himinrikiss.
hirðar. þiat siðan er hann uaknaði. uar hann fullkominn. ok sua framr
spaa maðr. at hann spaaði fyrir samband **ihsu xpristi**. ok heilagrar
kirkiu. ok þat hit mikla floð er uarð aa dögum noe. ok þar meðr eigi
sidr hinn efzta dom. er fyrir elldinn skal uerða. ok sagði alla þersa luti
sinum sunum. **21b** Ok sem han uar skapaðr tok guð brott af honum eitt
hans rif. ok sua mikit kiöt sem þii til heyrdi. enn let kiöt koma i stað
rifsins. **22a** ok skapaði konuna fyrir englanna þeonostu af þi sama rifi.
Gorandi hennar likam af kiötinu enn beinin af sealfu rifinu. **22b** let hana
siðan koma fyrir adam **23ab** ok þa sagdi hann sua. þetta bein er nu af
minum beinum. ok þetta kiöt er af minum likam til tekit. **Scholastica**
historia. Af þersu hinu litla orði .nu. fengu iuðar mikla uillu ok uantru.
er adam sagdi sua. þetta bein er nu af minum beinum. þiat segia at hann
gerdi nu adra konu. ok taka adams ord sem sua hafi hann talat. Hin fyrri
konan uar gor medr mer. af molldu ok leiri. Enn þessi er nu gòr af sealfs
mins. likama. Hegoma þeironok liuga margar ættar tölur fra .ij. hans
husfryium. Enn þeira uilla ok hegomi auðsynuz af sialfum texta genesis.
þar sem iafnan talar einfalldeliga af einni hans husfru.

p52

Gaf Adam henni þa nafn sua sem hennar herra. **23c** ok sagði sua. þessa
skal kerlingh heita. þiat han er af kalmanninum komin. uarð þetta fyrir
þa sök hennar eiginlight nafn. Ok þegar eptir spáaði hannsua segiandi
24 fyrir þenna skylld at hon er sua til komin. man margr maðr fyrir lata

sinn fōður ok moður ok samtegiar sinni husfru. sem einum part af sealfum ser. ok manu þau ij.uera medr einn likam. af þi at af samblandingh beggia þeira bloðd byriaz barnit,. Ok huarki þeira hefir meðr ollu eitt saman ualld yfir sealfs sins likam. **her segir fra adam ok euo huersu hòGormr kom til þeira ok eggidi þau til at briota moti gud sialfum. Capitulum.**

Huartueggia þeira adams ok hans husfru voru medr ollu navckuit utan alla skammfylling.

Appendix III *De Rijmbijbel*

Vader soene helech gheest
Enich god sonder beghin
Ghef mj hulpe ende willeest
Ende gratie in mjnen sijn
5 Dat hic vinde moghe word
Scone ende rime goed
Daer hic bi moghe bringhen vord
dat leget in minen moet
Marie moeder der genaden
10 Moeder der ontfarmecheit
Ghi hebt den meneghen beraden
Ghetroest van sire serecheit
helpt mi vrouwe met vre bede
dat hic ghewinne den eleghen gheest
15 die mi cracht ende moghentede
verle'e'ne. dat mach mi helpen meest
So bem ic danne onuervaert
vraie rijme te bringhene vord
van ere gester die ic begard
20 hebbe. te ontbindene jn dietsche word
Scolastica willic ontbinden
Jn dietsche word vten latine
Vrouwe nu moeti hu bewinden
troest te sine in mjne pine.
25 Nv merct die hier an sult le'e'sen
wat nutscepe dat hier an sal wesen
hier ne vint men no fauele no borde
No ghene truffe no faloerde
Maer vraie rime ende ware woerd
30 hoe dat die tiit es comen voerd
Sint dat die werelt erst begonde
al tote dien dat quam die stonde
dat ihesus xpristus te hemele clam
die onse mensceit ane nam
35 hier vindic rime dachcortinghe
ende daer toe ware leeringhe
der noten gheliict dese ystorie
dat meerct wel in huwe memorie
die buten bitter heft die slume
40 die scale so art dat mense cume
Metten tanden mach ghewinnen
Maer al die soeteit die es binnen

die bittereit van deser geste
dats dat die vroetste ende die meeste
45 van lancheit dit ghegronden cume

dits de bittereit van der slume
die artheit die leghet an die scale
dats dat niemen al te male
Mach verstaen wat die wort dieden
50 die soeteit der af dats dat den lieden
die recht verstaen ende recht minnen
Ende wareit ende goet bekinnen
dat hem die woert so soete smaken
omme dat sii sin van waren saken
55 dat sise gherne horen leesen
Want daer ne mach ghen verlies an weesen
Hoert hier oe god die weerelt stichte
den troen metten sterren verlichte
die lucht metten voeghelen vercierde
60 die vissche int water visierde
die erde vercierde metten dieren
Ende met cruden van manieren
ende oe hi tachterst maecte den mensche
doe hi hem alle die wensche
65 adde ghemaect die hem bedursten
Maer nu suldi sonder vursten
Gode met mi bidden mede
dat hi mi dor dese warede
die hic dichte van siere weet
70 vergheue dat hic mi besmet
hebbe in luegheliken saken
die mi die lichteit dede maken
vander herten ende van den sinne
Ende die weerelike dinghe

75 Ende hi die nideghe verdue
die altoes versch siin ende nue
Ende talre stont daer toe gherust
dat hem te begripene lust
Min ghedichte ende mine word
80 Ghi nideghe merct ende hord
Ghi ne sult mi niet ghedeeren connen
al te spade hebdis begonnen
hets dompeit dat ghi vertert
hu nijt dinct mi dat niemene deert

85 dan hu seluen in huen siin
Ghi hebt die meer suareit der in
Ghi siit te magher ende te bleker
tui si di voer den oghen smeker
ende bachten valsch alse uerrader
90 Met judase moet ghiis alle gader
hebt hu den nijt hic wille dichten
ende mi der mede verlichten
dor min segghen dor min castien
Sone suldiis niet vertien
95 dies wille ghaen an min beghin
Nu god verclare minen siin
Merct hic wille ghis seker siit
dits beghin van alre tiit
God die maecte int beghin
100 Den hemel ende oec mede der in
Alle die inghelike nature
Desen hemel heet die scrifture
Empireus in rechter name
daer die inghele hare beghin in namen
105 ende hi maecte die erde mede
Wi verstaen al hier ter stede
daer die lettere die erde noemnt
dat met hare materien compt
al dat bi der erden leuet
110 ende al die dinc die soe vte gheuet
Ende weder in hare kert
dies weest oec wijs ende gheleert
die materie van allen dieren
van allen cruden van manieren
115 van boemen. van adams vlesche mede
brochte soe voer hare daer ter stede
Maer niet ne maketse god noch toe
hier namaels maect hise ende hoert hoe
die viere elemente. water. vier.
120 Erde. lucht. die waren hier
Ghemaect al daer men die erde noemnt
nu merct oe die redene compt
Werelt ende tiit siin euen out
dus spreect die wareit onse behout
125 van nieute maecte god int beghin
den emel ende die jnghele der in
Ende die andre elemente mede
die erde was van hare scoenede

Nochtoe deelloes na der nature
130 dies heetse jdel die scripture
Ende met deemstereden bedect
die scripture die vertrect
dat die eleghe gheest ons heren
dats gods wille dus salment keeren
135 die wart up water ghedraghen
dies woerds mach ons wel behaghen
daer wart betekent ende bediet
dat doepsel dat men nu pliet.
DOe maecte god met sinen worde
140 dat lecht alsoe hiet bescriuen hoerde
dwoerd gods dats die soene
die ons verloeste dats die goene
die vlesch in marien ontfinc
dat lecht her die sonne up ghinc
145 was een suerc claer ende scone
Gheliic der dagheraet anden trone
der sonnen onghelic van lechte
al dus bescriuen ons gods knechte
doe sach got dat lecht was goet
150 Ende versciet daer metter spoet
dat lecht van der deemsterhede
al hier verstaen wi tesar stede
dat lucifer ende sine scare
versceden worden openbare
155 Omme hare ouerdeghe sonden
van den jnghelen die wlstonden
diere staende bleuen heet die boec dlecht
Ende diere vielen na al recht
Moghen wel heeten demsterede
160 daer noemde god dus le'e'st men mede
dat lecht bi namen ende hiet dach
die tiit daer deemsterede ane lach
hiet onse here nacht bi namen
Ende dit was alsoe wi vernamen
165 Een sondach ende dalreste dach
die ter weerelt oint ghelach

Des ander daghes dus eist bekent
Maecte god dat firmament
Jnt water ter middewarde recht
170 van watere so maecte hi echt
hart ende vast gheliic kerstale

Claer ghescepen alse dei scale
Die sterren dit es bekent
Die staen in dit firmament
175 firmament hetet bi namen.
Omme da hem vaste hout te samen
Ende het die watre alsoe hout
Die bouen hem siin met ghewoud
dat sii niet ne commen ne'e'der
180 wat sii daer doen antwoordic weeder
dat ne weet niemene dan god ons here
Sonder dat sulc in sine leere
Seghet dat die dau danen coemt
dit firmament heuet hi ghenoeemt
185 Spreket die boec hemel bi namen
Omme dat beaect al te samen
Ende verhemelt die weerelt al
Water. vier. berch ende dal.
DEn derdendaghe leese wi van gode
190 dat hi met sinen ghebode
dwater uersaemde in een couent
dat es onder tfirmament
dat hare die droecheit openbaerde
die droecheit noemde god doe harde
195 Ende des waters versaminghen
daer sii alle te samene ghinghen
dat hiet hi bi namen zee
Ende daer naer so maecte hi mee
God besach dat het was goet
200 Ende hi seide metter spoet
hic wille di gheuen cruut
Ende hare groeneit comme vt.
daer af comen moeghe saet
Ende datter gheboemte up staet
205 dat appelle draghe na siere maniere
Ende vrucht oec meneghertiere
al dat hi seide was wl daen
Want siin wille moeste wlgaen

DEen vierdendaghe macte der ane
210 Onse here sonne ende mane
Ende die sterren die hi ghesent
Ende gheseet heft int firmament
verre beneden sterren staen
Sonne ende mane sonder waen

215 Ende alle die plane'e'ten mede
derde heft de nederste stede
van al den sterren. ende als hic wane
Ende alse men leesende vint de mane
es de minste van den sterren
220 die ons lichten noch van verren
die vroede liede segghen al bloet
die sonne achtwaruen alse groet
alse die erde es al gheheel
Ende die mane es meerre een deel
225 dan die erde dus eist bescreuen
Mane ende sterren siin ghegheuen
dat sii dien naect maken clare
want hi anders te leeliic ware
Ende omme dat die nachts in watere pinen
230 Ende die oec wandelen in wostinen
daer bi souden ghetroest weesen
Ende alre meest oec alse wi leesen
van libien int groete sant
daer een clene wint alte hant
235 die weghe verwacht soe dat se man
altoes neghen bekennen can

Ne daden die sterren men ne vonde
Niemene diere gheghaen in conde
Noch men ne vonde nemmermee
240Niemene die voere in de zee
Oec leesmen dat men voghele vint
die vander sonnen niet en tuint
Die clareit ghedoghen connen
Nachts moetsi vliegghen ende ronnen
245 Ende hem bi den sterren voeden
dat suldi mede wel ghevroeden
dat niet alleene dor die sconeede
Noch allene dort leecht mede
Sonne. sterre. ende mane.
250 Sijn gheseet. maer om te verstanen
Scone weder ende quaet der bi
Ende om dat die minste des vroet sii
dat si sceden dach ende nacht
Weke ende maent ende dees jaers cracht
255 lentin. somer. heerfst. ende winter.
die van dompeiden ghenen splinter
Stekende heeft in sinen siin

die magher vele leeren in
versta wi so merken conne
260 dat ghemaect was die sonne
Jnt oesten tilike te haren up ganghe
des auons der na. dan was niet langhe
doe soe was ten onderen gane
Maecte god risende de mane
265 Ende soe was wl van haren lechte
dus proeuent mesters al bi rechte

DEs .v. daghes versierde god ons here
wende lucht. met groeter ere
Der lucht gaf hi dat vlieghen conde
270 Ende dat suemmende ghinc ten gronde
vissche en voghele dat es waer
Maecte hi beede van watre daer
God maecte alle dinc die roet
Clene ende groet diet water voet
275 Ende wat so gaet oec ende vliegheet
bedi mesdoet hi ende lieghet
die seghet dat sij iet maken conden
die quade gheeste dane sonden
doe seinde hise ende benedide
280 Om dat hi wilde dat siin wille diide

DEn sesten daghe versierde god
De erde ende hiet na siin ghebod
dat soe beesten brochte voerd
hi wiste wel merct ende hoert
285 dat de mensche vallen soude
maer doer sine dueghet so woude
hi den mensche beesten gheuen
Omme te verlichtene dat suare leeuën
beesten merct dit wordelike saen
290 het si om dat sii ons bi staen
Nv vraegt men of die goedertiere
God. maecte die felle diere
Ende de gheueninde voer adaems sonden
die redene hebbic al vonden
295 dat alle diere sonder waen
Ghemaect waren onderdan
den mensche te sine emmermeere
adde hi gheoert na onsen here
Maer na de mesdaet alst wel sciint

300 word sii fel ende gheueniint
Ende staende na siine scade
Oec mede om siine mesdade
Segghen ons die eleghe lude
dat die boeme ende die crude
305 die nu wassen vruchte loes
dat elc siine cracht verloes
van der mesdaet van adame
Sonne ende mane van groeter scame
Sterren ende diere steene
310 Ne behilden nemmeer alleene
van hare cracht dan zeeuende deel
te voeren adden sii se al gheel.

DOe sprac god make wi den man
Nu merct ende verstaet hier an
315 tote wien seide hi maken wie
der persone so siin drie
de drieuoudecheit spreect ghemeene
dits den mensche ene here niet cleene
dattene god makede met voerrade
320 al maecti met siire ghenade
al de andre creaturen
hine sprac niet van hare naturen
alse hi tote des menschen dede
Nochtan was hi ghemaket mede
325 Na der zielen des gods ghebelde
dit was den mensche groete welde
Na den lichame wildit horen
heft hiis vele te voren
want hi es van meester werden
330 den besten staet dat oeft ter erden
Ende den mensche te hemele waert
In drien saken openbaert
God des menschen weerdechede
dat hi niet alleene mede
335 Ghemaect was omme hertsche welde
Maer na der zielen gods ghebelde
Dander es als ic erst seide
datter god sinen raet toe leide
Ende seide maken wi den man
340 de derde waerdecheit der an
dats dat hi ghemaect was alse here
van allen dieren met groeter ere

dat sine voeden na den sonden
Ende cleden souden tallen stonden
345 Ende helpen sinen arbeit draghen
vor de mesdaet hoer ic ghewaghen
Gaf god den mensche ende den dieren
vruucht tetene van manieren
want derde brochte niet dan goet

350 Mensche marc of du bes vroet
du heues verloren in den meesten
dine herscap in den besten
an draken ende an liebarde
an tigren ende an luparde
355 dit was groete waerdechede
an die mintste hef stu mede
Ghewelt verloren om diin lieghen
dats an messien ende an vlieghen
an die middelste hefstu ghewout
360 om dat tu marken sout
dattu here altoes wars bleuen
der beesten atstu niet begheuen
tgebod dat di god gheboet
dus vielstu in groeter noet
365 God benedide den man
ende seide deese woert der an
wasset ende wert menech vout
dit woert dat men ghescreuen hout
Gaet jeghen die buggheren die spraken
370 valschelike in haren traken
dat huwelic te gherestonde
Ne mach weesen sonder sonde
die daet waent hem weert suaer pardoen
God en hiet noint sonde doen

375 God sach al dat hi adde ghemaect
al waest goet ende wel gheraect
Uulmaect es nu hemel ende erde
Ende al hare sierheit met groeter werde
Des .vi. daghes verwldi mede
380 al werc daer hi neerenst toe dede
Ende ruste up den .vij. dach
Niet dat hem eneghe pine verwach
Maer dat hi siin maken liet
In sulken ne market niet

385 hine maect noch alle daghe
vele dincs dins ghene saghe
Maer hine maecte niet hier na
Sine materie die ne was daer
Ghemaect of hare ghelike
390 an adame was sekerlike
die materie van alden lieden
dit willic an siin vlesch bedieden
van sinen vlessche esset al
dat es ende was ende commen sal
395 Ende mensche voerme heuet ontfaen
van der zielen suldi verstaen
dat daer ghene ziele af cam
Maer wie so vlesch van hem nam
God gaf hem ziele ghelic adame
400 de zeuende dach die heet die name
daer god up ruste saterdach
Ende in ebreus eist also ict sach
heetent die iueden sabaet
dats ruste gods daert al ane staet
405 ende hi benedidene dats waer
Sint vierdemenne menech jaer
Duus also ghiit hier hebt vernomen
So eist ons van Moysesse comen
dat got maecte hemel ende erde
410 Ende al dat boerde thare werde
al benediide hiit ende seinde
dit was eer dat noint reinde
want eene fontejne van groeten prijse
die quam uten paradyse
415 gaf natheit in groeter tiit
al omme ende omme der weerelt
tparadys bediet marien
de fonteine ihesus den vrien
die al met duegeden maket nat
420 hier naer sal hict verclaren bat
wat riiuieren der ute quamen
Ende oe dat sii heeten bi namen
hoert van adame dat besceet

God maectene also hier voren steet
425 van der herden van den lime
Na den vlesche eist dat ic riime
Ende die ziele maecti van niete

weet weel dat hi achter liete
de wareit die niet gheloueden dies
430 de lettre spreect dat hi in blies
hem den leuenliken gheest
dat bediet recht alre meest
dat hi die ziele sende in vat
plato dolde in deeser stat
435 die edelste clerc van ogher name
die seide dat ten lachame
die inghele maecten ende god den gheest
dat segghen sulke hebbe ic ghevreest
dat de ziele ware meede
440 ghemaect vander goddeliichede
ware dat waer sone mochte dan
Niet ghene sonde doen de man
Niechtemeer dan onse here
Noch oec steruen nemmermeere
445 DE man was ghemaect vander moude
dat merct. recht in manliker oude
wlcommen in crachte in wlre jueghet
wl maect van leeden jn sulker dueghet
wilde hi tghebot gods niet begheuen
450 dat hi mochte eweelike leuen
verbrake hiit oec doer eneghe noet
Dat hire omme smaken soude de doet
Duus was hem wl wille ghegheuen
Weder hi steruen wilde ofte leuen

455 God die milde es ende wiis
die maecte dat paradys
ten derden daghe doe hi vt
Comen dede bome ende cruut
al daer die weerelt es an beghin
460 dat es ten oesten no meer no min
al daer heuet hiit gheset
het descriuet die heleghe weet
dat et es die scoenste stede
die es onder den emel mede
465 beede bi berghen ende bi landen
vte onser wanderinghen ghestanden
Jof so gheuest metter zee
dat man ne ghewonne nemmermee
Noch ne gheen came in de stede
470 Met neghere bendechede

het was toter manen oech
 Bedi bleeft vander loeuien droech
 Jnt paradys sette onse here god
 alt hout want het was siin ghebod
 475 dat scone was ende smaken soechte
 omme dat den man ghenoeghen mochte
 bede de smake ende dat up sien
 jn die middewarde van dien
 sette hi des leeuens hout
 480 dat heuet die cracht ende die ghewout
 die de vruucht et soe mach hem gheuen
 ghesonde ende langhe leeuën
 Oec segghen sulke boeke meer
 dat hi mach leuen emmermeer
 485 bedi sette hi oec der binnen
 den boem die goet ende quaet leert kinnen
 dat heuet bedi de name ontfaen
 Om dat doe adaem adde mesdaen
 daer an dat hi maecte tquade
 490 ende van den goeden vel in scade
 de fontejne daer ic er af liet
 die dor dat paradys al vliet
 Gaf al den boemen saeps ghenoech
 ende al der plaetchen int gheuoech
 495 die deelt haer daer in vieren riuieren
 de namen salic u visieren
 fisons. ende ganges eet die eene
 die lopet endi duere alleene
 men vint gout in hare sant
 500 tdbeste dat es in enech lant
 Gion of nilus comnt ghelopen
 dor dat lant van ethyopen
 al dus eet dandre riuiere
 tygris de derde. eufrates. dits viere
 505 dicken vallen sie in de erde
 dat si lopen hare verde
 Ende springhen vte eere andre stad
 die boeke descriuen ons dat
 God droech den mensche van der erde
 510 dat hine adde ghemaect werde
 jnt paradys om dat hi woude
 dat hi der in werken soude
 Niet der in pinen dor de noet
 Maer ghenoechte hebben groet

515 Ende dattene god soude wachten mede
Ende zee. man die eleghe stede
Gods ghebot hem wildit weeten
van alre vruucht soe soutu eeten
Sonder die es an den boem
520 Die goets ende quaets leert neemen goem

vp wat daghe dat dur af eets
Sprac got hic wille dat tud weets
Dan soutu daer naer steruelic wesen
Doe seide god te ant na deesen
525 dat de mensche weesen moet
alleene dan nees niet goet
make wi hem oec bedi
hulpe die hem gheliic sii
Ende met dien so brochte god
530 voer adame na siin ghebod
alle voghele metten dieren
van lichte van lande van riuieren
Ende al dat men vint in der zee
Omme tue saken ende nemmee
535 dat hise noumen soude daer
Ende hi weeten soude voer waer
dat siin gheliic na den lechame
No der sielen daer niet ne came
daer gaf hem doe adaem de ionghe
540 name na ebreusche tonghe
die deerste was van allen spraken
doe deede god na deesen saken
Eenen slaep comen in adame
al heuet die dinc slapens name
545 het was al onmachte van sinne
daer wi gheloeuen dat hi jnne
die emelsche bliscepe vernam
want dat eersten doe hi bequam
profetiseerde hi segghen clerke
550 van ihesus ende van der elegher kerke
Ende voerseide der loeuien ganc
Ende doemesdach te voeren lanc
dat hi met brande soude comen
dit seidi siinen kindren somen
555 jn deesen slape te deeser stede
Nam god eene rebbe ende vlesch der meede
Ende maectere af .j. wiif alleene

vlesch van vlesche been van beene
Ende setteese voer adame
560 dat hi hare gheuen soude name
hi sprac dit vlesch ende dit been
es van den minen ende al een
virago sal mense noemen
dat luut van manne comen
565 aldus hiet soe voer de sonden
maer daer naer in corten stonden
doe soe de sonde adde ghedaen
so hiet hise. eua. saen
dat woert mach men dus bedieden
570 dat soe was moeder al der lieden
alst kint ter weerelt comet vt
So es des cnapelins eerste luut
.a. ende des meiskins .e.
dit ne faeliert nemmermee

575 doe adaem dwijf adde ghenant
profeterde hi alte ant
Omme dat soe es van minen liue
sal de man volghen siinen wiue
moeder ende vader begheuen
580 Ende daer naer so es bescreuen
jn eenen vlesch sulsi tue weesen
huwelic voerseide hi na desen
doe eua ende adaem waren ghemaect
waren si bedegader naect
585 Ende sine scaemden hem niet
Maerct dat men dit an kindren siet
sine scamen hem niet eer entujnt
Eer hare nature sonden kint
dus waest van euen ende van adame
590 dat sii waren sonder scame