
Journal of Religious Culture

Journal für Religionskultur

Ed. by / Hrsg. von
Edmund Weber
Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main

in Association with / in Zusammenarbeit mit

Matthias Benad, Mustafa Cimsit, Natalia Diefenbach,
Martin Mittwede, Vladislav Serikov, Ajit S. Sikand,
Ida Bagus Putu Suamba, Roger Töpelmann
in Cooperation with the Institute for Religious Peace Research /
in Kooperation mit dem Institut für Wissenschaftliche Irenik
Assistent Editor/ Redaktionsassistentin Susan Stephanie Tsomakaeva

ISSN 1434-5935 - © E.Weber – E-mail e.weber@em.uni-frankfurt.d;
<http://publikationen.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/solrsearch/index/search/searchtype/series/id/1613>;

No. 287 (2022)

Results of a linguistic in-depth investigation of
the first chapter of *Genesis*, verses 1-3, in the
Latin Vulgata

By

Dagmar Coward

Philological premise:

For a correct understanding of a text, an exact use of language is needed. This means:

Semantically, a word carries the meaning it is given at its first occurrence.

This does not exclude a later addition of a second meaning which, however, does not invalidate the original one, both meanings are valid at the same time.

Each word has its specific meaning.

Two different words could not have the same meaning, for example 'create' is not the same as 'make'.

A name or designation is logically tied to something in existence.

What does not exist cannot be named.

Genesis 1:1

In principio creavit Deus caelum et terram. -

'In the beginning created God heaven and earth'.

creavit is the one, decisive activity characteristic of *Deus*, the 'Creator' who in a single act produces something new, inexistent before.

Duality from the beginning

Deus 'creates' two at the same time: first-named *caelum*, followed by *terra*; one dual result. This means that *caelum*

and *terra* cannot be considered in isolation; where there is one, the other must be, too. The derivative ‘Creation’ necessarily addresses both; it could not apply to *terra* alone.

The ‘creative’ act can be conceived of as a single violent one which splits one unknown thing into two; a single blow producing an inseparable twosome, that is, two new objects out of one, who share a common origin, but are opposites, a condition which links them together inseparably and at the same time keeps them apart, forever unable to come together, condemned to a perennial state of duality and all its consequences.

This is rather like a logman splitting a block of wood with one blow, thus producing two complementary pieces which could be stuck together and form one again.

Opposites: *caelum* and *terra* are in an unbreakable hostile relationship which makes them dependent on one another. They depend for their respective meaning on that of their opposite, one being precisely what the other is not. Theoretically, should one of them disappear, the other one would disappear, too, for it would have lost the reference by which it defines itself negatively.

caelum has the qualities ‘immaterial, invisible’, as opposed to *terra* who is ‘material, visible’. If *caelum* i-was lost, *terra* would logically lose its meaning, or sense, its very *raison d’être*. They exist together or not at all, as the text makes clear at v.1.

This is so for all opposites, for example *bonus - malus, dies - nox, vita - mors, etc.*

Concerning the relationship of ‘visibles’ and ‘invisibles’, cf. Paul’s *Letter to the Hebrews* 11:3, among others

Thus, from the outset the ‘Creation’ is marked by the state of Duality, one part not conceivable without the other; they appear jointly, exist jointly and potentially disappear jointly (Is.13:5; Matt.5:18; Apocal.20:11; etc.).

Deus Initiator/ Creator/ Head of the entire ‘Creation’.

caelum et terram The twin result of the ‘creative’ act: invisible, unknown *caelum* and visible known *terra*, is named, without further information:

There is no indication that *caelum* and *terra*, or *terra* alone, are in a state of perfection.

There is no indication that v.1 is to be taken as a kind of general heading unconnected with following vv.2 - 31 and chapter 2.

As the text stands, it must be taken as a continuous narrative consisting of verses numbered from 1 - 31 (chapter 1).

Genesis 1:2

Terra autem erat inanis et vacua, et tenebrae super faciem abyssi, et spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas.’ -

'The earth, however, was formless and empty, and darkness over the face of the abyss, and the spirit of God was carried above the waters'.

His 'creative' act produces a divine being in *caelum* v.2, his 'spirit' part which is also called *Pater spirituum* - 'father of the spirits' Hebrs.12:9, *Pater caelestis* - 'heavenly Father' Matt.6:14, 26; 5:48.

Deus v.3 then comes third, also as a result of the 'creative' act and obviously confined to *terra* as described at v.2 - the *terra* part of *Deus* v.1, a divinity preoccupied by *terra* which must be made a better place.

On the basis of these manifest facts, it is clear that *Deus* v.3 is not identical with *Deus* v.1.

Deus v.3 is a lesser divinity who has usurped the designation given to the 'Creator'. The motivation for this can only be **Pride**, the desire to be equal by hook or by crook with the highest and to receive the concomitant worship, or adulation.

From now on, the initial fraud: usurpation of the name *Deus* by a lesser divinity, is developed systematically, blinding the reader who is made to think by clever wording that *Deus* v.3 is the 'Creator', for example, basic notions like *caelum* and *terra* are transposed from their universal context at v.1 into the confined context of *terra* of which they are arbitrarily made a part:

caelum v.1 ironically serves as a designation for *firmamentum* - ‘support, prop, stay’, v.8, a solid, material object characteristic of *terra* - while in reality this word applies to the very opposite of *terra*. *terra* in turn is used to designate the dry parts only, v.10, and many more.

The effect is that with the same words, that is, by imitation, beginning with *Deus*, a secondary ‘creation’ is produced, one limited to *terra*, but passed off as the original one, of which the reader duly loses track, to the point of calling *terra* ‘the Creation’.

Cf. *Deus est aemulator* - ‘zealous imitator’, Ex.34:14; Deut. 5:9; 6:15; etc.

A detailed investigation of the ‘Imitation’ Topos has been made.

Deus v.3 thus appears as a malevolent divine being who manipulates language in pursuance of his interests which are focused solely on his undesirable location *terra*, a place to be made amenable according to his wishes. By implication, the divine agent

Deus v.3 brings ‘badness’ - *malus* to *terra*, as opposed to ‘goodness’ - *bonus* logically situated in *caelum*.

The case of *Lucifer*

In the discussed context it is of interest that certain Bible versions in the Middle Ages, like *Speculum Humanae Salvationis*, “tell the Bible story...from the fall of *Lucifer* to

the Redemption of Man” (Brewer’s Dictionary of Phrase and Fable, Centenary Edition, London 1970).

The fall in question must relate to Genesis 1:1-3.

‘Light carrier’ *Lucifer* (Luke 10:18; Is.14:12) is somehow linked to the arrival of light in *terra*.

Any being in *caelum* must be of a spiritual nature. *Lucifer* comes down to *terra* in the form of a spirit, a ‘bad’ one. He corresponds to *Deus* v.3.

Résumé:

It is clear at this stage of the linguistic investigation that the text as worded admits of two ‘Gods’, not only one:

Deus v.1, supreme over both *caelum* and *terra*;

Deus v.3, ruler of *terra* alone as given at v.2.

Is.54:5 *Deus omnis terrae vocabitur* -‘he will be called the God of all the earth’

2Cor.4:4 *Deus huius saeculi* -‘the God of this world’

Acts 17:24 *Deus qui fecit mundum et omnia quae in eo sunt, hic caeli et terrae Dominus cum sit* -‘God who made (N.B. not ‘created’) the world and everything in it, he being Lord of heaven (N.B. *firmamentum*) and earth’.

Both divinities are referred to by the same word, which produces confusion.

The plurality of ‘God’ is supported by the Hebrew word *Elohim* and, among other texts, by certain verbal plural forms, like

Gen.1:26 *Faciamus hominem* - ‘Let us make man’,

2:18 *faciam ei adiutorium* - ‘let us make him a help’

3:22 “*Ecce homo factus est quasi unus ex nobis*” - ‘See, man is made like one out of (the two) of us’.

Apocal.4:11 *Domine et Deus noster* - ‘the Lord and our God’, two agents, one a concept of *terra* - Lat. *dominus* is a human ‘ruler, lord, master’ - the other ‘God’, both ruling over ‘man’.

These clues, and others, like activities specific to one or the other, which help to ascertain the truth, must be given because the law of Duality, to which the ‘Creation’ is subject, demands that where there is lie, there must also be truth.

As for the word *Deus*, wherever it occurs after 1:3, it carries two meanings, forced as it is by the manipulation of *Deus* v.3.

Deus v.1 thus not only oversees the ‘Creation’, but is obliged by his ‘offspring’, or son, to enter *terra*, the ‘bad’ part;

Deus who, like man, is in need of Salvation, responsible as he is for the violent act at the ‘beginning’ and thus for all that followed as a result.

This is expressed in the Scriptures numerous times:

Gen.49:18; Is.52:10; Lam.3:26; etc.

Example: Is.52:10 *et videbunt omnes fines terrae salutare Dei nostri* - 'and all ends of the earth will see the salvation of our God'.

It is interesting to compare the different renderings into modern languages of a sentence whose meaning is clear linguistically, but awkward dogmatically, for traditionally it is man alone who is to be saved, precisely by the one 'God'.

There are many more examples where the modern translations, under the pressure of dogma, do not accord with the Latin Vulgata.

The reader for one will be focussed on *terra* and terrestrial *caelum* because they alone are brought to his attention, things he can ascertain with his limited senses; but he is kept ignorant of their equally present, but invisible model.

He is thus misled about his true situation, of which he ignores an important part, the invisible one linked to original *caelum* which provides the very basis of his earthly existence.

Cf. investigation "*hominem - homo - hominem*"

All of this was known by Catharism.

Postface

This is a linguistic investigation of the Latin text of *Nova Vulgata*, 1979, which is the basis of the Church of Rome.

What gave rise to this investigation:

The study of *Troubadour poetry* inevitably leads to that of the Bible, the most widely spread book, in the form of the Latin *Vulgate*, in the Middle Ages; inevitably because many Troubadours had a clerical background, knew the *Vulgate* well and made use of biblical motives in their largely obscure works. To this can be added the fact that *Catharism* was contemporary, located in the same geographical area and present in the castles visited by the Troubadours who must have been familiar with its teachings which are based, like those of the Church of Rome, precisely on the *Vulgate*. How can two such different movements be based on the same text?

There must be more than one interpretation of one and the same text.

The present investigation, motivated by a purely philological interest on a strictly rational basis seeks to throw light on the obscurity of *Troubadour poetry* by ascertaining the impact a contemporary intellectual movement like *Catharism* must have had on this branch of literature. At the same time, the correct understanding of the Vulgata texts is at stake.

The *Vulgate*

The original texts of OT and NT are separated by very different languages, something which emphasizes a perceived basic difference in outlook: On the one hand the severity of society law jealously guarded by a wrathful, vindictive 'God' - on the other hand love, pardon, sacrifice by a kindly 'God' who holds out life eternal.

The languages involved, together with variants and other significant uncertainties, give rise to endless theological discussions whose hypothetical results are regularly overtaken by more modern ones in the course of history. As for the attentive layman, he is unable to follow.

It is the merit of the *Vulgate* to have united by means of a common third linguistic medium, Latin, the two parts of the Bible, thus allowing a coherent view of all the texts and a consistent linguistic analysis from Genesis 1:1 to Rev. 22:21.

The text thus fixed and unified is a work of literature which can be dealt with accordingly, that is, scientifically by strict philology: absence of extrapolation, text-internal evidence only. The philological approach, solely based on logic, is limited to the text.

From the beginning the *Vulgate* was accepted by the Church of Rome as the authentic form of the whole Bible, the basis of its teachings to the present day, the text revised from time to time, as in 1979 when *Nova Vulgata* appeared in the currently accepted wording. In the Middle Ages variants existed, such as handed down in *Vulgata Clementina*, the revised version preceding *Nova Vulgata*, like at *Genesis 2:7 in faciem eius*, as distinct from *in nares eius*, a variant occurring in medieval texts, for example *Las Novas del Heretge*, written in *oc* and generally thought to be conform with the teachings of the Church of Rome.

Secure statements about the message of a text, its true content, can only be made from a fixed text. The Church of Rome has cut a gordian knot by accepting the Vulgate as this text. It is now a matter of exploring what the Vulgate concretely, verifiably states. Everything outside the Vulgate, in the case of OT different Hebrew versions none of which were used by Jerome whose sources are lost, can only lead to unproved hypotheses which are scientifically worthless.