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Abstract

The Glossa ordinaria on the Bible stands as one of the prime achievements of the period in western intellectual history known as the Renaissance of the twelfth century. In spite of the great number of still extant manuscripts very little is known about the circumstances around its composition. This state of affairs is partly explained by the lack of modern and critical editions of the books of the Glossa ordinaria.

The present work is the first critical edition of the Glossa ordinaria on the Book of Lamentations, and consists of the forewords, or prothema, and the first book (of five) of this text, which was compiled early in the twelfth century by the theologian and Ciceronian rhetorician Gilbert the Universal (†1134), schoolmaster at Auxerre and subsequently Bishop of London.

The introduction includes a background sketch of the environment in which the Glossa ordinaria was conceived – the school of Laon – with a short biography of Gilbert the Universal, as well as a study of the sources to this particular part of the Gloss, chief among them the ninth-century commentary of Paschasius Radbertus. It is shown that Gilbert’s major improvement to his source, apart from drastically rewriting it, consists of the introduction of Ciceronian rhetorical loci to the verses of Lamentations. The introduction furthermore provides the reader with an analysis of the manuscript tradition of the early twelfth century and a selective analysis of the later manuscript tradition (some 86 manuscripts have so far been traced). One of the conclusions reached is that the Gloss on Lamentations exists in two textual recensions, the one original, the other a later redaction made once the Gloss had become a success and preserved in nearly all the later manuscripts.

The manuscripts of the first recension, which is the one edited in the present work, may be organised into a stemma codicum consisting of two major families originating in a single archetype. It is possible to reconstruct this archetype on the basis of the five oldest manuscripts. An English translation of the edited text is included, as well as a ‘semi-critical’ edition of the text of the second recension.

An important part of the present work consists of an effort to combine the sophisticated mise-en-page of the glossed manuscripts with the standards of presentation to be expected of a modern critical edition.
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CHAPTER 1

The Purpose of the Present Work

Anyone trying to trace the history of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Bible is immediately faced with a curious circumstance: the quantity of manuscript witnesses surviving is huge – it is not uncommon to find between 50 and 100 extant manuscript copies per glossed book¹ – but the history of its origins remains obscure. This exuberance of manuscripts testifies to the importance of the Gloss in the Middle Ages, as do the innumerable references and allusions to it in the works of masters such as Peter the Lombard, St Albert the Great and St Thomas Aquinas. Despite this, and despite the efforts exerted by modern research, the early history of the Gloss ‘still bristles with question-marks’;² principally, this is due to the lack of critical editions. In an attempt to thwart this stalemate, the primary purpose of the present work is to present a critical edition of one of the glossed books of the Bible – the *Glossa ordinaria* in *Lamentationes Ieremie prophete*.

The *Glossa ordinaria* was to be a complete, well-balanced and authoritative standard commentary on the whole of the Bible, encompassing the essence of patristic interpretation of Holy Writ, collected as glosses surrounding and interweaving the *sacra pagina*.³ Arising from a need for systematisation of the

¹ Mary Dove (1997), pp. 50–53, for instance, in her edition of the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Song of Songs, lists 73 manuscripts of that text. Provisional lists of manuscripts of the books of the Gloss may be found in Stegmüller, RB, 11781–11854.
³ Although recognised as the standard commentary apparatus on the Bible, the *Glossa ordinaria* was not referred to as ‘ordinaria’ until the fourteenth century: Smalley (1984), p. 452; until then, it was simply referred to as Gloss. An earlier commentary would be referred to as *glosa vetus* or *vetus glosatura*: see Smalley (1983), p. 56 and 65. From c. 1100 the term *libri glosati*, often seen in contemporary library catalogues, referred strictly to biblical glosses: see Lobrichon (1984), p. 97.
already existing biblical commentary material, which had become unfathomable, the *Glossa ordinaria* is a product of the ‘Renaissance of the Twelfth Century’. Or rather, rooted as it is in the late eleventh century, and making maximum use of the trappings of nascent scholasticism – the improving methods of scholarship, innovations in textual layout, and the systematisation and organisation of material – it ushered in that very era. It was planned at Laon, then completed ‘by a miracle of teamwork’ among the masters of the cathedral schools at Auxerre, Laon and Paris, which had by the eleventh century generally become more important than their monastic counterparts. Its date is set broadly at c. 1080–1130, but the manuscripts generally belong to the next generation, c. 1140–70, and beyond.

To avoid confusion in the following discussion, and throughout this study, the distinction is made between on the one hand a gloss (*glossa*) or individual extract or comment, and on the other ‘the Gloss’ to a biblical book, meaning the *Glossa ordinaria*. The individual glosses are further divided into ‘interlinear’ or ‘marginal’, dependent on their specific function on the page.

The Gloss came to exert a tremendous influence on both literature and theology through the Middle Ages. It brought into effect the programme of Bible-based education outlined by St Augustine and propagated by the Venerable Bede, which was developed a little later by the Carolingians and definitively resumed in the reforming circles of the 1040s and 1050s – Lanfranc of Bec, Manegold of Lautenbach and consortes – who acted as forerunners to the compilers of the *Glossa ordinaria*.

---

4 ‘It was essential for teaching purposes that the [biblical] text should have some standard exposition accompanying it as a gloss, for use in lectures, which should be accessible to all scholars and students, and which everyone could refer to in the certainty of being understood’: SMALLEY (1983), p. 52.

5 The term was coined by Charles Homer HASKINS (1927); the theme has been revised several times since, for example in the comprehensive BENSON & CONSTABLE (1982), and further developed in CONSTABLE (1996).


7 SMALLEY (1983), p. 46; this is of course true above all for contemporary theology. The monastic schools remained largely unaltered and continued to do what they always had done, namely the contemplative rumination upon Holy Writ: see also LECLERCQ (1996).


10 In his *De doctrina Christiana*, especially book 4.

11 In *De arte metrica* and *De schematibus et tropis*.

1. The Purpose of the Present Work

Against the background of the significance of the Gloss to medieval theology, it is rather surprising that so little is known about the men who composed it, and practically nothing about the circumstances of its conception. How is it that a text which, as testified by the quantity of surviving witnesses, enjoyed such a popularity among contemporaries, should remain so enigmatic in its conception? Questions abound when dealing with the Glossa ordinaria: Who compiled each book of the Gloss? Which are the sources? How is the source material treated? In the light of its treatment, is it possible to say anything about the particular compiler, or his method of compilation, or about the conception and method of the Gloss in general? Extant sources, which are all in manuscript, give no explicit answers to these questions. The only certainty, and a fact that modern scholars supported by a few medieval witnesses generally agree upon, seems to be the connection with Anselm of Laon and the cathedral schools of Laon, Auxerre and Paris in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries.

1.1 Previous Research

The most concise survey of the origins and history of the Gloss is given by Beryl Smalley in her groundbreaking monograph of 1941, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (a revised and enlarged second edition was published in 1952, and a revised third edition in 1983). Beside Smalley’s writings, Margaret Gibson, although a specialist in Carolingian biblical commentary, has published important articles, especially on the history of the development of the Gloss; the manuscripts scholar Christopher de Hamel has traced the history of the production of the codices containing the Gloss; the art historian Patricia Stirnemann has presented fundamental research on the palaeography of the Gloss manuscripts; and Franz Bliemetzrieder, Msgr Artur Landgraf, P. Heinrich Weisweiler, P. Joseph de Ghelinck, Dom Odon Lottin and Guy Lobrichon have richly contributed to the related subject of a school of Laon

---

15 Stirnemann (1994).
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and the intellectual and theological Sitz-im-Leben of the glossators. Marcia Colish and Valerie Flint, furthermore, have fiercely debated the possibility of a 'school of Laon', and its supposed theological method. In 1992 a facsimile of the editio princeps of the Gloss (Strasburg, 1480/81) was published. Five years later, the first modern, though not critical edition of a book of the Gloss appeared, the Glossa ordinaria in Canticum canticorum, edited by Mary Dove. Since then, various articles have been written, among them one trying to trace the role of the Cistercians in the diffusion of the Gloss, another boldly wishing to identify the individual contributors, as well as works touching upon the subject, for instance manuscript catalogues. Despite these scholarly exertions, no comprehensive study of the Gloss has as yet emerged, nor has a critical edition of any of its books.

To launch a full-scale frontal attack on an edition and study of the Gloss is hardly a feasible undertaking at this stage of research, and the aim would probably be lost quite quickly; a more fruitful starting-point is to sort out and attempt to solve the riddles that flock around a single glossed book. As each book of the Gloss poses its own questions as far as its sources, compiler and method are concerned, the very first step to be taken must inevitably be a critical edition of a single book of the Glossa ordinaria, the lack of which Beryl Smalley for many years indefatigably lamented.

1.2 THE PRESENT WORK

The present work aspires to be a modest contribution to this state of affairs. Its primary purpose is to present a critical edition of one of the books of the Gloss.

16 Bliemetzrieder has traced the connections of important twelfth-century scholars and churchmen such as Robert of Melun (1934a) and Hugh of Rouen (1934b and 1935) to Anselm and his school; Landgraf has discovered and studied manuscripts with connections to the school of Laon (1945); Weisweiler has shown the importance of Carolingian writers, above all Paschasius Radbertus, to Anselm's school (1960); De Ghellinck has placed the glossators within the currents of literature and theology in the twelfth century (1946, 1948); Lottin has studied and edited manuscripts originating from the school of and at Laon (1959); and LoBrichon (1984) has studied the development of the Gloss and the intellectual novelty constituted by it.

17 Flint (1971) and Colish (1986).
18 Rusch (1480; 1992).
19 Dove (1997).
22 E.g. Sheppard (1997).
1. The Purpose of the Present Work

– the *Glossa ordinaria in Lamentationes Ieremia prophete*.\(^{23}\) The sole book of the glossed Bible whose author is known, the Gloss on Lamentations was compiled – or rather, dramatically adapted from the ninth-century commentary of Paschasius Radbertus, abbot of Corbie – by Gilbert the Universal, biblical scholar, Ciceronian rhetorician and a close collaborator with Anselm of Laon, in the early twelfth century.

As the methods of textual criticism applied to the present edition will reveal, the Gloss on Lamentations is preserved in two textual recensions. The earlier, which I term the ‘first recension’, originated with Gilbert the Universal and the Laon circle. This text was revised shortly afterwards, probably at Paris. In presenting a critical edition of the first recension, this edition aspires as far as possible to reconstruct the readings of the original text, as it was when it left the hands of Gilbert the Universal. The readings of the ‘second recension’, known through the later manuscripts and printed in the *editio princeps*, are given for reference, to do justice to the manuscript tradition, and to enable the reader to compare the two.

The differences between the two recensions, although not of major importance for the interpretation of the text, are certainly of interest for an understanding of the making of the Gloss. A comparison of the two recensions furthermore raises important new questions concerning the conception of the Gloss and its comprehension in the mid-twelfth century. Some of the changes seem futile, and raise the further question of whether other books of the glossed Bible have a comparable second recension.

Further questions arise from the apparent duality of the text, resulting from its two ‘authors’, Radbert and Gilbert. How was the redaction performed by Gilbert? Were other sources involved? Are there important differences in the treatment of the biblical text between the source text and the compiler?

In editing a book of the Gloss, the delicate problem of transposing the sophistication of the medieval gloss format to the modern printed page presents itself, and an ancillary purpose of this study is to find a solution to this

\(^{23}\) A slight *cautus* applies at this place: on account of the size of this text, only the forewords (*prothema*) and the first book of the Gloss on Lamentations will be edited here; the other four books, together with the prothema and the first book, will be edited at a later date and published in the series *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis*. As a result, examples throughout the present study are taken from the prothema and first book only.
question.24 In addition, it will be appropriate to provide an introductory sketch and outline of the milieu in which the Gloss was conceived and executed.

This book consists of two parts: an introduction and an edition. The introduction is divided into six chapters: this first outlines the purpose of the present work. The second chapter provides a general introduction to the Glossa ordinaria and the problems connected with it – its conception, its history, its compilers, etc. Chapter 3 deals with the author of the Gloss on Lamentations, Gilbert the Universal. Chapter 4 constitutes a background to the Gloss on Lamentations, with a specific study of its sources and other important aspects of its compilation. Questions arising from differences between the redaction and its source will be addressed, as well as questions of rhetoric. In chapter 5 the manuscript witnesses will be examined and their relations established. Chapter 6 describes the principles of the edition adhered to in editing the present text.

The critical edition (with an English translation) constitutes the major part of this book. Indices follow, after which come appendices and a bibliography. Plates of the most important manuscripts will be found at the beginning of the book.

24 Apart from the editio princeps of the 1480s and its numerous scions (the first edition is described below in section 5.7), two interesting efforts have to my knowledge been made to tackle the problem of the gloss format, namely Mark ZIER (1993) and Mary DOVE (1997). While Dove edits the Gloss on the Canticles in its entirety, Zier applies his method only to the beginning of the Gloss on the prophet Daniel. This will be further discussed in chapter 6 below.
CHAPTER 2

The Glossa ordinaria on the Bible

2.1 ON THE ORIGINS AND EARLY HISTORY OF THE GLOSS

Biblical commentary is the literary genre par excellence of Christian culture. From the earliest times and throughout the early Middle Ages, the books of Genesis and Job, the Psalter, the Song of Songs, the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles were expounded upon time after time. Bible study had always consisted in the study of the sacred text together with a commentary; the one was inseparable from the other. The Glossa ordinaria on the Bible was a formidable attempt to organise all important knowledge on the Bible into one standard work. In practice, the Gloss is two things: first, the complete Bible text, and second, a more or less exhaustive commentary on that text, consisting of interlinear and marginal glosses. As is evident from the manuscripts of the Gloss, this commentary material was drawn primarily from the vast bulk of expositions of the Church Fathers and other authorities. First and foremost in the eyes of the

---

1 The biblical text of the Gloss is remarkably stable. The need for a correct text of Scripture itself prompted an awareness of textual criticism with the glossators, which led to frequent consultations with Jewish biblical scholars and others. Although an important related subject, there is no place here for telling the history of the Versio vulgata; a good overview, though, is given by Raphael Loewe in CHTB (1987), pp. 102–54.

2 Glossa is an ancient term of Greek origin. Its meaning in the Middle Ages was the explanation of a word in need of clarification, as for instance in Hugh of St Victor, Didascalicon, IV, 16: 'Glossa Graecum est, et interpretatur lingua, quia quodammodo loquitur significationem subjectae dictionis': ed. Buttimer (1939), p. 94. An interesting distinction between glossa and commentum is made by William of Conches (fl. saec. xii), in his Glossae super Platonem. He explains why glossa is preferred to commentum: ‘... non hodie vocamus commentum nisi alterius libri expositorium. Quod differt a glossa. Commentum enim, solam sententiam exequens, de continuatione vel expositione literae nichil agit. Glossa vero omnia illa exequivet. Unde dicitur glossa id est lingua’: ed. Jeaneau (1965), p. 67. Thus commentum is for William some sort of resumé, describing the author's sententia or doctrine, while glossa explains individual words and treats and expounds the context. See also Lobrichon (1984), p. 96.
INTRODUCTION

compilers of the Gloss stood the works of St Jerome, who, basing much of his exegesis on Origen, provided material for the Gloss on major parts of the Old Testament, conveying the *Hebraica veritas* to the moderns. The commentaries of St Augustine form the basis of the Gloss on Genesis and those of St Ambrose on St Luke; Cassiodorus's comprehensive commentary is a fundamental source for the Gloss on the Psalms, and the works of Gregory the Great form the basis at least of Job and to some extent also Ezekiel and the Gospels. The exegetical works of the Venerable Bede may be seen behind the Gloss on the books from Ezra to Nehemiah, St Mark, the Acts and the Canonical Epistles. Among the Carolingians must be mentioned Hraban Maur, who edited the previous commentaries of St Jerome and others and added his own thoughts and remarks, thus in some cases preserving Jerome for the glossators of the twelfth century. Paschasius Radbertus, the second great Carolingian contributor, was the *auctor* behind the Gloss on Lamentations and on St Matthew. We will have reason to return to him later.

Before we proceed with the Gloss on the Bible there must be mentioned another body of text that also produced a standard set of glosses: the *corpus iuris civilis* and *canonici* – Roman and canon law. Where the history of the Gloss on the Bible is obscure, that for the glosses of the canonists and civilians is more translucent, and much easier to trace. The *glossa ordinaria* of the civil law schools was compiled in c. 1215 and comprised all the previous apparatus to the books of Justinian law (the three *Digesta*: *Digestum vetus*, *Infortiatum*, *Digestum novum*; the *Codex*; the *Tres libri*; the *Instituta*; the *Authenticum*), therefore appearing a century after the Gloss on the Bible. There was never a similar *glossa ordinaria* on canon law, principally because there was no inherited corpus of texts: the first book of canon law to be glossed was the *Concordia discordantium canonum* (generally called the *Decretum Gratiani*), the work of the Bolognese...

---

3 Without the commentary work of St Jerome, the Gloss would surely have been radically different. Jerome was originally responsible for the translated text of the Bible, for most of the prefaces to the various biblical books, and for the thorough and comprehensive exegesis of most of the Old Testament and parts of the New: see the chapter on Jerome by E. F. SUTCLIFFE in *CHTB* (1987), pp. 80–101. The commentaries are listed in DEKKERS (1995), nos 580–91.


6 See WEISWEILER (1960).

7 A brief but accurate overview is given by Hermann KANTOROWICZ in SMALLEY (1983), pp. 52–55; see also HÄRING (1982), pp. 182–85.
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The scholar Gratian that saw the light in 1120–40. It would thus have been difficult for the glossators of the Bible to have looked at a definite standard ‘gloss’ on the juridical corpus for inspiration, since there was none in existence in the late eleventh century. As a matter of fact, it would seem that things are the other way round: as the canonist Titus Lenherr has recently suggested, Gratian had parts of the Glossa ordinaria on the Bible before his eyes when compiling his Decretum.

The history of the Glossa ordinaria on the Bible is very much the history of its sources: there is a separate tradition of sources for each book, the selection of which is very much dependent on the quantity and diversity of material accessible to the compiler, as well as the compiler’s own temperament. The vast body of exegetic material at hand to the twelfth-century scholar required careful digestion and reorganisation. The performance of this tremendous task was, at least initially, undertaken at Laon, under the auspices of Master Anselm. A large part of the work seems also to have been performed at Auxerre, and other traces are left in Chartres and Paris – notably at the Abbey of St Victor. The remainder of this chapter will briefly examine the development of the biblical Gloss, its importance, its general history, and special features such as the characteristic format of the manuscripts containing the Gloss, as well as some consideration of the glossators themselves and their theological milieu.

2.1.1 Carolingian interference

With time, biblical commentary material had cumulated to form, by the end of the eleventh century, a mass of material too vast to fathom. It became necessary to find a means of navigating among the vast bulk of sometimes conflicting commentaries. This need for sorting of information gave rise to new innovations. In tackling this problem the Glossa ordinaria was at once an effort to gather into one place the most important biblical knowledge at hand, and to present it in a useful manner. While some books of the Bible had received ample treatment, others had had hardly any commentator’s attention at all. From the former, a useful collection and combination had to be made, and for the latter, the already existing commentary material had to be rearranged and expanded, or entirely new commentaries had to be written. To the medieval

8 Recent research by Anders Winroth (2000) has revealed that Gratian compiled his Decretum twenty years earlier than has previously been believed.

9 See Gibson (1989), p. 244.

10 Lenherr (2000).
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mind, material compiled from other, older sources had an air of authenticity and credibility, qualities of far greater importance than originality. In fact, this led to the twelfth-century masters of the sacred page more or less obtaining the rank of authorities — auctoritates — siding with Jerome, Gregory, Bede and others, simply through the act of glossing, that is, by the systematic analysis of sources inherent in the verb ‘to gloss’.12

Rather than taking excerpts directly from the original patristic sources, the glossators often worked from earlier, notably Carolingian, collections.13 The sources thereby varied considerably from book to book — some books of the Gloss contain extracts from several authorities, others from only one, depending on the treatment the particular book had received previously. The Gloss on the Pentateuch, for instance, is composed of extracts from various auctoritates, patristic and post-patristic, whereas the Gloss on Lamentations, into which we shall delve more deeply presently, is compiled from only one major source, the Carolingian commentary of Paschasia Radbertus.

The influence of the Carolingians helps to explain a die-hard myth about the authorship of the Gloss that was finally settled only in the twentieth century, namely that Walahfrid Strabo (†849) was the author of the Glossa ordinaria, or, to be more precise, that Walahfrid wrote the marginal glosses, while the interlinear glosses were said to be a later addition of the twelfth century. This false attribution, first noted by Samuel Berger and subsequently rooted out by Jean de Blic,14 goes back 450 years to 1494, when it was first uttered by the reform-minded abbot Johannes Trithemius in his De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis; it was reiterated in the various publications of the Glossa ordinaria through the sixteenth century,15 and lived its false life well into our own times.16 This misconception has without doubt been strengthened by the quotation from Walahfrid’s commentary on Genesis 1:1, which is also found in the editio princeps of the Gloss.17 Modern scholars have shown that this attribution arises mainly

---

16 For instance De Gheillineck (1946), vol. 1, p. 96, and Bertola (1978), the latter of whom would wish to call into question all of the modern research that attributes the composition of the Gloss to Anselm of Laon (see below, section 2.2.3). His objections are, however, fruitfully answered by Wielockx (1982), pp. 226–27, who presents medieval testimonies to the authorship of Anselm by (inter alia) Herbert of Bosham, Alexander Neckam and Robert of Bridlington.
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from a misunderstanding, and perhaps also wishful thinking on the part of some.\textsuperscript{18} The solution to the problem is actually quite simple: the twelfth-century compilers of the Gloss used commentaries by Walahfrid Strabo among many other sources. ‘Strabo, like many other scholars of his day, was merely an unwitting contributor to the Glossa Ordinaria.’\textsuperscript{19}

However, the false attribution to Walahfrid Strabo does stress an important circumstance: there is a duality between the ninth and twelfth centuries inherent in the Gloss, as the later compilers had access to patristic opinion primarily through Carolingian florilegia.\textsuperscript{20} The Gloss was thus to some extent built upon a foundation of already existing commentary material,\textsuperscript{21} and could justifiably be spoken of as the final synthesis of ‘the ever-growing body of comment which became attached to the Bible from patristic times’\textsuperscript{22}. In this context, the role played by Paschasius Radbertus, abbot of Corbie, holds a special importance for the present work. As Weisweiler has shown, the theological ideas of Radbert as extant in his commentaries on St Matthew and Lamentations, found in the Gloss a special bridge to the nascent scholasticism of the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{23}

2.1.2 Eleventh-century precursors

Before arriving in the hands of the twelfth-century glossators, the earlier commentary material was again filtered, this time by the scholars of the reform circles of the 1050s and 60s. Among these precursors to Anselm and the Laon circle must be mentioned, for instance, Berengar of Tours (†1088), Lanfranc of Bec (†1089), St Bruno the Carthusian (†1101), Manegold of Lautenbach

\textsuperscript{18} Trithemius himself belonged to the ultra-humanist ‘Sodalitas Rhenana’, which showed elaborate pro-German likings, and therefore wanted the Glossa ordinaria to be the product of a man ‘natioe Teutonicus’; Walahfrid Strabo was given the honour. See FROEHLICH (1993), pp. 193–95.

\textsuperscript{19} SWANSON (2001), p. 159. A good account of this rather confused subject is given by SMALLEY (1983), pp. 56–60.

\textsuperscript{20} In some cases, including that of the Gloss on Lamentations, the only commentary available to a certain biblical book was Carolingian. A thorough discussion of this will be given below, in chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{21} This material has been studied to some extent, but never fully, above all by SMALLEY (1937), (1961) and elsewhere; further discoveries in the field of the sources to the Gloss remain to be made.

\textsuperscript{22} SWANSON (2001), p. 156.

\textsuperscript{23} See WEISWEILER (1960).
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(†1110), Lambert of Utrecht (fl. c. 1100) and St Ivo of Chartres (†1116). Some of them have left their mark in the Gloss in the form of an occasional signed Gloss. In addition to these, there were certainly others whose names have been lost; glossators of Scripture tended only rarely to sign their own glosses. From the patristic, Carolingian and eleventh-century material, and from combinations of all three, the compilers of the Gloss had therefore to collect the most important opinions on the sacra pagina. In the words of Gillian Evans:

The achievement of the eleventh and twelfth century scholars who put the Glossa Ordinaria together was to go over the existing commentaries, to select and prune, and to draw everything together into a relatively uniform whole, covering all necessary points briefly, clearly and authoritatively.

The activities of the twelfth-century glossators themselves will be discussed in the following section (2.2). Their work was, as we shall see, performed above all at the cathedral schools of Laon and Auxerre. These schools, as Stirnemann has shown, did not possess facilities for the large-scale production of manuscripts of the Gloss that the popularity of the Gloss came to demand. The early manuscripts of the Gloss from the scriptoria of Laon and Auxerre reflect this fact; they are not the luxurious codices that came into being in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Let us now turn our gaze to Laon, where the Gloss first was planned and executed.

2.2 THE SCHOOL OF LAON

The cathedral school at Laon was of ancient origin; in Carolingian times, the fortified hill-top was a Royal city – urbs regia – enjoying privileges from the ruling monarchs. The illustrious John Scot Eriugena, connected to the palace school of Charles the Bald, was of great influence to the cathedral school and contributed to its fame. From the end of the ninth century, after the death of Charles and the generation of learned scholars in his protection, the school was

---

25 Signing glosses was a practice of the legal glossators; see Smalley (1983), pp. 52–55.
27 See Chatillon (1984), p. 175; also Contreni (1978) and Jeauneau (1972a).
29 Jeauneau (1972a), pp. 498, 500 and 514.
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in decline.\textsuperscript{30} In the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, however, the school was governed by Master Anselm of Laon († 1117) and his brother Master Ralph († 1134 or 1136)\textsuperscript{31} and saw a renascence from about 1080 to 1100.\textsuperscript{32} If we are to believe Peter Abelard, who for some time pursued his studies there, the \textit{schola divinitatis} at Laon was again on the wane some ten to twenty years later. According to Abelard, Anselm's fame had been acquired more through use than talent, and his teaching was founded rather on fanciful rhetoric than on doctrine:

\begin{quote}
Accessi igitur ad hunc senem, cui magis longevus usus quam ingenium vel memoria nomen comparaverat. Ad quem si quis de aliqua qustione pulsandum accederet incertus, redibat incertior. Mirabilis quidem in oculis erat auscultantium, sed nullus in conspectu questionantium. Verborum usum habebat mirabilem, sed sensum contentibilem et ratione vacuum. Cum ignem accenderet, domum suam fumo implebat, non luce illuabrat. Arbor eius tota in foliis apiscientibus a longe conspicua videbatur, sed propinquibus et diligentius intuentibus infructuosa reperiebatur. Ad hanc itaque cum accessissem ut fructum inde colligerem, deprehendi illam esse ficulnem cui maledixit Dominus, seu illam veritatem quercum cui Pompeium Lucanus comparat dicens,

Stat, magni nominis umbra,
qualis frugifero quercus sublimis in agro, etc.\textsuperscript{33}
\end{quote}

Abelard's caricature chimes rather badly with the fact that the school at Laon at this time obviously possessed great powers of attraction; some of the best minds of the kingdom clustered at Laon,\textsuperscript{34} and Anselm lectured to many of the famous masters-to-be of the next generation.\textsuperscript{35} Among them stood William of Champeaux († 1121), who in the years 1103–08 ran the cathedral school at Paris,\textsuperscript{36} later founding the house of canons regular at St Victor in Paris and teacher to Peter Abelard; Abelard himself († 1142), who, as we just saw,

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 508.
\textsuperscript{31} See for instance \textsc{Smalley} (1983), p. 49. Ralph, of the same theological view as his brother, succeeded him to the chair of the cathedral school, but was obviously not able to maintain the former glory of the school; see \textsc{Robert} (1909), p. 12.
\textsuperscript{32} \textsc{Gibson} (1992\textsuperscript{a}), p. 20.
\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Historia Calamitatum}, ed. \textsc{Monfrin} (1959), p. 68. The quoted passage is from Lucan, \textit{Pharsalia}, 1, 135–36.
\textsuperscript{34} See \textsc{Bljemetzrieder} (1934\textsuperscript{b}), pp. 261–62.
\textsuperscript{35} In addition to those listed here, \textsc{De Ghellinck} (1948), p. 133, mentions other names 'de futurs évêques ou de cardinaux, toutes les célébrités théologiques' who studied at the school of Laon.
\textsuperscript{36} See \textsc{Bljemetzrieder} (1929), pp. 435, 450–80.
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spurned his master’s lectures; Gilbert of Poitiers (†1154), who delivered his commentary on the Psalms before master Anselm’s correcting ear; and the Cluny-Benedictine Hugh, abbot of Reading in the diocese of Salisbury, later bishop of Amiens and archbishop of Rouen, 1130–64 (†1164), author of several theological treatises.

Master Anselm himself was teaching at the school before 1100, became dean between 1106 and 1109, and taught there perhaps until 1115, when he became archdeacon. Nothing is known of where Anselm himself pursued his studies, but there now seems to be a connection between Manegold of Lautenbach and Anselm’s teaching. It has so far been impossible to establish the exact extent of Anselm’s work; apart from his involvement in the compiling of the Gloss, which we will deal with presently, he made glosses of his own on the Pauline Epistles, perhaps on the first chapters of Genesis, on St Matthew and possibly on the Song of Songs.

2.2.1 A spearhead of theological invention?

Ever since it was first formally studied almost a century ago, the twelfth-century school of Laon has been a subject of debate. Scholars of the early twentieth century praised the school for its systematic and innovative nature. Its masters,

---

37 Hist. Calam., pp. 68–70.
38 EVANS (1984), p. 41; the manuscript Oxford, Balliol College, 36, a copy of his commentary on the Psalms, has the end-note, ‘Explicit glosatura magistri Giliberti Porretani super Psalterium quam ipse recitavit coram su o magistro Anselmo causa emendationis’ (fol. 145v); see also MYNORS (1963), p. 26; BLIEMETZRIEDER (1934a), p. 167.
39 BLIEMETZRIEDER (1934b) and (1935) has established connections between Hugh and the school of Laon by means of Hugh’s writings, on which he says (1934b), p. 46: ‘vraiment! C’est une connaissance théologique respectable qu’il a amorcée à l’école de Laon, au pied de la chaire de maître Anselme’. Hugh’s writings are published in PL 192; see also LOTTIN (1959), p. 9.
40 LOTTIN (1959), p. 9; LEFÈVRE (1895), pp. 16 and 46.
41 St Anselm of Canterbury, however, then teaching at Bec, has been suggested as the Laonnoise Anselm’s master; see CHATILLON (1984), p. 175, and GLUNZ (1933), pp. 202–03. The latter also stresses the influence of Lanfranc on the thinking of the future Laonnoise master.
43 His gloss on the Pauline Epistles, the so-called Pro altercatione, named after its incipit, was eventually to become the ordinaria, later called the parva glosatura. See GLUNZ (1933), pp. 203–08; MARTIN (1938), pp. XXXIII–XXXVII; LOTTIN (1959), pp. 31–32 and WEISWEILER (1960); it would be interesting to know whether his other biblical works in a like manner are prototypes for the Gloss.
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principally Anselm of Laon, have been extolled as being the inventors of the systematic sentence collection— that is to say, a collection of theological questions and answers extracted principally from biblical and patristic sources and arranged under topic headings such as De sacramentis, Cur Deus homo, De peccato, etc., a form which was to be codified later in the twelfth century with Peter the Lombard’s Libri quattuor sententiarum, and perfected in the scholastic genre of the summa in the thirteenth century. In the opinion of some, the sentence collection was the most important invention of the theological revival of the twelfth century; Smalley, for instance, claims that ‘the Summa Theologica traces its formal pedigree back to Laon’.

However, the editorial work above all of Heinrich Weisweiler and Dom Odon Lottin has proved the situation to be more complex. Bringing more texts to light, they have shown that there are indeed preserved collections of sentences from twelfth-century Laon, but that these collections are not arranged systematically, in the later, scholastic understanding of the word. Rather, according to Weisweiler and Lottin, Anselm’s view of theology was very much contrary to the dialectical vogue of the time, as evident in the conflict with Abelard. To counteract the dialectical method, which to his mind was nothing but a childish play on words, Anselm developed a model for theology based on the Bible and the Church Fathers. The most complete of the compilations of sententiae from Laon is the Liber pancrisis (‘id est totus aureus’), containing excerpts (‘auree sententie’) from St Augustine, St Jerome, St Ambrose, St Gregory, St Isidore and Bede, but also from the ‘magistri moderni’ William of Champeaux, St Ivo of Chartres and Anselm and Ralph of Laon, and this shows clearly how diverse the collected opinion of the school of Laon actually was, a fact which must reflect the manner in which theology may have been taught at the school. Lottin’s conclusion is that the systematic arrangement evident in the manuscripts containing the sententiae from Laon was imposed at a later stage, as was the addition of further sententiae by later masters

44 Most significantly Msgr Martin GRABMANN (1909–11), pp. 157–68. The most enthusiastic, however, is BJIEMETZRIEDER (1929), p. 438, who, comparing Anselm with the inventor of the locomotive, considers him to be ‘supérieur, de très loin supérieur, à un Pierre Lombard’, who, for his part, ‘s’appuie sur les épaules d’Anselme de Laon’. See also DE GHELLINCK (1946), vol. 1, pp. 41–43, and idem (1948), pp. 138–148, who, albeit seeing the Laon masters as less concerned with speculation than with ethics and exegesis, nevertheless emphasises the systematic nature of their work.

46 LOTBIN (1959), WEISWEILER (1932).
47 See LOTBIN (1959), p. 11.
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of the school. In spite of all this, he furthermore concludes that the theology of
the school of Laon was ‘distinctive, coherent and vital’, albeit borrowing from
other contemporary schools and earlier traditions from earlier in the twelfth
century. The ‘system’ of the school of Laon was thus of a different kind; employing
rather a biblical and patristic outlook, it shows us that systematic theology was
not the only type and method of theology taught at the cathedral schools in the
early twelfth century. The way of thinking of the school of Laon was
thoroughly founded on the religious truths and metaphysical realities found in
Holy Writ. The matter of dealing with these truths consisted in drawing them
out of their biblical context, unmasking them of the sometimes opaque
language of Scripture, and setting them forth in their full clarity. The next step
of scholastic consideration would have been to systematise the material thus
extracted, supplying a logical structure to the biblical material, and, as the third
step of scholastic philosophy, confirming it with the aid of rational thought.
The method taught and studied at Laon lacked the aim of scholasticism, which
was to arrive by means of a series of syllogisms and logical conclusions at a
point where apparent contradictions were reconciled and the final truth
brought to light. The lack of this last, philosophically speculative stage was
probably what bothered Abelard. In fact, it would seem that Anselm,
confronted with the new way of putting every word of Scripture under dispute,
vigorously defended his old, Augustinian approach to the study of the Bible. In
a letter to Abbot Heribrand of Saint-Laurent at Liège, he gives voice to his way
of approaching seemingly contradictory biblical passages:

Videndum est … ne illa quaestio, quae apud vos sic agitur, non in scientia,
sed in pugnis verborum sit. Rectos sensus discutere virorum est, in verbis
litigare puerorum est, qui non nisi tenuiter intelligunt, quae dicit vel
audunt. … Quidam maxime inflati nomine scientiae, sensus Patrum
ignorantes, languent, ut ait Apostolus, circa quaestiones et pugnas verborum.
Sententiae quidem omnium catholicorum diversae, sed non adversae, in
unam concurrent convenientiam, in verbis vero sonant quaedam quasi
contrarietates et pugnae, in quibus scandalizantur pusilli, exercentur strenui,
contendunt superbi, exclusuntur probati, qui aliis langentibus expedite
dissonantia consonare ostendunt."
Facing contradictory opinions was therefore not something that scared Anselm. For him, reconciliation of the seemingly contrary sentences was the guiding principle. The application of speculative philosophy to Scripture was of no interest to the very conservative Anselm, who believed that the important thing was to protect the biblical Word against any charge of ambiguity. These are certainly words expressing an attitude hard to digest for the poor dialectician who had to conform to it. The conflict with Abelard perhaps arose not so much from the contents of the teaching as from the method, which at the school of Laon followed its own structure and curriculum.

Yet the very existence of a school of Laon has been contested. Valerie Flint has argued that, due to the diversity of theological opinion (in the *sententiae*) actually preserved from the school at Laon, Anselm’s theology was not dialectical or properly ‘systematic’, and thus that no ‘school of Laon’ existed at all.\(^{51}\) According to Flint, it is impossible to speak about a ‘school of Laon’; the school physically situated at Laon was only one in a much larger exegetical movement, including the works of the masters of the period of renewal in the 1050s such as Manegold of Lautenbach and Lanfranc of Bec.\(^{52}\) In answer to Flint, Marcia Colish, on the basis of recent research, has shown that the Laon masters, although conservative as regards systematic theology, displayed a ‘great sensitivity, both methodological and substantive, to the problems and principles that are earmarks of early twelfth century theology’.\(^{53}\) As a matter of fact, many parts of Abelard’s own theology were already taught at the school of Laon, albeit in a different guise: the school could be ‘as skilled at historical analysis, as critical, as flexible, and as personalistic, as Abelard himself’,\(^{54}\) which is also true of its approach to the psychology of ethical acts, for example the primacy of intentionality in the definition of the ethical act.\(^{55}\)

Although to some extent used by Abelard himself, he and the rest of the world had to wait for the full application of the scholastic method until the arrival on the scene of Aristotelian logic some hundred years later. Abelard’s caricature of his former master is, as might be expected, exaggerated and unjust. Since his views are utterly partial, arising from a sense of wounded pride, does not his criticism rather concern the method than the state of the school? Are we not witnessing a clash between generations, seen from the young and

---


hot-tempered Abelard’s point of view? Of course Abelard had severe troubles
digesting a method which built on the general sentiment, perhaps best
expressed in the words of Master Ralph, that man ’dimittens omnes rationes, in
manu dei totum posuit sciens quod potens erat facere quicquid uellet’.56

In contrast to Flint’s belief, a twelfth-century cathedral school therefore did
not have to be ‘profound’, in the modern sense of the word, to have been
influen
tial.57 The contents of the _sententiae_ from Laon are not primarily
speculative: they do not dwell on philosophical discussions of the hypostatic
union or of transubstantiation, but rather on moral concerns of everyday life,
such as the will of God, man’s free will, justice, the virtues and vices, the
sacraments, and so on. This was clearly a disappointment to Abelard. Were not
the schools, at least initially, intended for the formation of the clergy in service
of God and the laity?58 I would suggest that the school of Laon in a unique way
provided its students with a foundation for further study, not excluding the
dialectical approach. Both its aim and its method were purely biblical. The two
literary creations most closely associated with the school of Laon – the
collection of sentences and the _Glossa ordinaria_ on the Bible – are thus to my
mind essentially connected.59 The question at issue is not whether the
collections of sentences can be said to be arranged systematically, but rather
one of how they interact with the project of compiling and constructing the
Gloss, and how these two products provided a fundamental basis for later
scholastic exercises on the _sacra pagina_.

2.2.2 The project of the Gloss

The most persuasive outlook thus seems to agree with Colish that the school of
Laon did not apply scholastic dialectic to theology, did not invent the
proto- _summa_, nor did it prescribe any particular sequence for the topics that it
chose to treat.60 Its excellence consisted in an entirely different, and more
fundamental, matter: the treatment of biblical material. Anselm and his
collaborators brought the art of collecting and compiling, sorting and

---

59 Interesting in this connection, and asserted by FLINT herself (1971), p. 94, is the close
relation between the contents of the _sententiae_ and the exegesis performed at Laon; the
_sententiae_ are for the most part drawn from the exegesis of the same biblical books that
occupied Anselm of Laon: the Epistles of St Paul and the Psalms.
60 See COLISH (1986), pp. 20–21.
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excerpting close to perfection. 61 The Glossa ordinaria on the Bible was the ultimate product of this endeavour, and consequently the project of the Gloss has been ‘more persistently recognised as Laon’s claim to fame than the project of the production of a theological summa’. 62 The greatest distinction of Master Anselm and his school was to have played an important role in the confection of the biblical Gloss. 63 Interestingly, the two creations of the school of Laon have never, to my knowledge, been treated together: the Gloss has not been studied, or hardly thought of, in connection with the sentence collections. 64 Nor, unfortunately, does space permit such a study in the present introduction. For these purposes, it will suffice to note that if Anselm and his school provided the propaedeutics by means of both the sentence collections and the Gloss, it is not difficult to understand why contemporaries regarded his school as necessary to pass through before approaching more difficult subjects. Nor is it difficult to understand what an excellent tool the Gloss must have been in such a situation. Both the basic study of Scripture and the scholastic method exercised upon it gained immensly by having all the fundamental knowledge gathered in one place.

There was nothing revolutionary in the subject-matter of the Gloss. The idea was to facilitate biblical study by providing the means of simple access and commentary to the Bible text. In this respect the project was radical, in terms both of the collection and systematisation of material, and of the manner of its presentation, with consistent use of the mise-en-page of gloss format (to be discussed below, section 2.5).

Faced with these facts, one immediately realises why and from where the need for the Gloss sprang up. As Gibson asserted, perhaps with a slightly different end in view, ‘the twelfth-century glossed Bible may be regarded as the hinge, the Wendepunkt, between the old exegesis and the new’. 65 The Gloss provided the means to undertake the new exegesis. The collection of patristic

61 On the method of the school of Laon, see for instance CHATILLON (1984), pp. 175–76.
63 CHATILLON (1984), p. 177, is of the opinion that the first initiative to the Gloss was undertaken at Laon, but that the subsequent work and completion was performed elsewhere, particularly at Paris. On this idea, see section 2.3 below, and GIBSON (1989), pp. 232–44.
64 LUSCOMBE (1970), p. 174, mentions the two creations in the same sentence, which is about the nearest we get to an integral evaluation of the two works together. Also EVANS (2000), p. 239, briefly considers the influence of the school of Laon in connection with both products.
material was of the utmost importance, since scholastic thinking was a logical
philosophy which seized on biblical truth and the traditional doctrines of the
Church. To perform any scholastic tabulation or systematising, however, this
material had first to be made accessible, and easily so. If the teachings and
theological method of Laon is to be appropriately evaluated, the Gloss must
certainly be taken into consideration. As a reference tool the practical use of
which is impossible to underestimate, it was to be found in every library ready
to be consulted by a Peter Lombard or a St Thomas Aquinas.

2.2.3 The contributors: Anselm and Ralph of Laon; Gilbert the Universal

Although the idea and initiative of the Gloss may be traced back to Laon and
Master Anselm,66 the question still remains as to who compiled each book of
the Gloss, which glosator was responsible for which part of the glossed Bible.
Even for contemporary readers, the compilers of the different parts of the
Gloss seem to have been a matter of uncertainty. There is no complete
contemporary list of glossators, and the books of the Gloss were regularly not
signed by their compilers (Lamentations being the only known exception). Our
only witnesses are occasional remarks in manuscripts, of the Gloss and others.
On occasion the presence of glosses headed by ‘Anselmus’ or ‘Gislebertus’
gives us a clue as to who might be the author of the glossed book in question.
Judging by such manuscript evidence, it is possible to deduce that Anselm of
Laon is responsible for having compiled the Glossa ordinaria on the Pauline
Epistles, the Psalms67 and probably the Gospel of St John.68 As the research of

66 Anselm of Laon was ‘a critical figure in the process of creating the Glossa Ordinaria’:
SWANSON (2001), p. 164; ‘the central figure in the process of bringing this work together
and developing it into what became known as the Glossa Ordinaria’: EVANS (1984), p. 41;
‘Laissant de côté les conjectures, nous pouvons en toute sécurité, considérer la Glose comme
une compilation faite par différent auteurs ; et nous pouvons attribuer le rôle principal à

67 The Gloss on these two books was later to be known as the parva glosatura to distinguish
it from the media and the magna glosatura to the same books by Gilbert of Poitiers and Peter
the Lombard respectively: see SMALLEY (1978), p. 3.

68 These are traditionally seen as the three most important texts, especially concerning
pastoral care. That Anselm undertook the glossing of these texts himself may be taken as a
fine, if not sterling, indication of his leadership in the making of the Gloss. Another proof
of Anselm’s immediate involvement would be if the thesis of the abbé Bernard MERLETTE
is correct, that the manuscript Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, 78 (Glossa ordinaria on the
Gospel of St John) is an autograph of master Anselm himself. Basing his hypothesis on
palaeographical observations, MERLETTE claims that Anselm first made a draft text for the
Gloss to this particular book, and then corrected it before ‘publishing’ it. It could, however,
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Édouard Jeuneau has shown, the Gloss on St John is largely (perhaps two fifths) derived from the commentary of John Scot Eriugena – still extant in the manuscript Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, 81. Thus Anselm is building upon an ancient Laonnoise tradition.\(^69\) According to most manuscript witnesses, Anselm’s brother Ralph compiled the gloss on St Matthew,\(^70\) and the very intriguing person of Gilbert the Universal – a pupil of Anselm’s, or his collaborator? – certainly compiled the Gloss on Lamentations,\(^71\) but probably also the Gloss on the Pentateuch and the Greater Prophets,\(^72\) perhaps even on as WIELOCKX (1982), pp. 223–25, has shown, also be the other way round: an earlier gloss to St John was quite simply ‘corrected’ into the standard Gloss, by means of a manuscript, albeit early, of that Gloss. The fact is that the Gospel of St John was one of the earliest biblical books to be glossed and fitted into the *Glossa ordinaria*. If the corrections, however, can be proved to be at the same time corrections and introductions of a revised way of thinking, the autograph hypothesis must be taken into consideration. Besides, the dating of Laon 78 is questionable: according to MERLETTE (1975), pp. 47–48, it dates from the beginning of the twelfth century, if not late eleventh, while for instance STIRNEMANN (1994), p. 260, prefers to date the manuscript c. 1120–35. Should a comparison of the text in Laon 78 with the rest of the manuscript tradition reveal significant errors in Laon 78, it could hardly then be the autograph of the author himself, since the autograph could not contain scribal errors in the same way as, for example, an archetype would. This matter remains under question.


\(^{70}\) According to Petrus Comestor († c. 1178), St Matthew was glossed by Ralph; on the authorship of a gloss to St Matthew (1:12) he says, ‘De hoc habes glosam Rabani. Non tamen habes hanc glosam intutilatam cuius auctoris sit, et ideo incertum est unde magister Radulphus, frater magistri Anselmi, qui glosaturam ordinavit, eam assumpsit …’: Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud. misc. 291, fol. 5[; see SMALLEY (1978), p. 5. WEISWEIL (1960), pp. 363–402, 503–36, has confirmed this information, also showing that the Gloss on St Matthew largely depends on the commentary by Paschasius Radbertus, combined with Hraban Maur and patristic sources.

\(^{71}\) As is attested by its colophon, which in nearly every extant manuscript reads: ‘Sufficient hoc ad expositionem lamentationum Jeremie, que de patrum fontibus hausi ego Gislebertus Autisiodoresis ecclesie diachonus’; an early Cistercian manuscript, today Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, 71, our L, ascribes the authorship of this part of the Gloss to him with the words, ‘Glose perutiles in lamentationes Jeremic compilate a magistro Gisliberto universalii’.

\(^{72}\) SMALLEY (1983), p. 60, views this as a fact: Gilbert left signed glosses in the Gloss on the Pentateuch, the Greater Prophets and, of course, Lamentations (see below, chapter 4). His authorship of the Gloss on the Prophets is confirmed by an anonymous gloss in the Gloss on Jeremiah in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Cambridge, Pembroke College, 7, where the anonymous commentator verifies certain glosses as being from Gilbert’s pen: SMALLEY (1937), p. 365, n. 2. For SMALLEY, the uncertainty lies with the Gloss on the Lesser Prophets. Ezekiel and the Pentateuch were glossed around 1110–25: see SMALLEY
Kings, Joshua, Ruth and Judges, and maybe also on the Lesser Prophets, as claimed by Robert of Bridlington. Furthermore, as yet unpublished lectures on the Gospels by Petrus Comestor contain valuable information on the Gloss. Commenting on the prologue of St Mark, he tells us that neither Master Anselm nor Ralph glossed St Mark’s gospel: ‘Marcum pene intactum, quia pedissecus est Mathei; etiam pro difficultate eum reliquerunt antiqui, nec legit eum magister Anselmus nec magister Radulphus frater eius.’ The two Laon brothers appear, then, to have glossed the other three gospels, and left the remaining one to some unknown collaborator. In one manuscript, the glossing of the Apocalypse is ascribed to Gilbert of Poitiers. The Gloss on Acts is occasionally mentioned in contemporary sources as a work of a ‘Master Alberic’; this could perhaps be the Master Alberic of Reims who studied under Anselm.

Many books, however, remain without the slightest clue as to who compiled them. In her work to collect ‘les plus anciens exemplaires de la glose ordinaire, à établir le lieu et la date de leur origine, et à observer les modifications formelles qui marquent des étapes chronologiques’, Patricia Stirnemann is baffled by the lack of congruence between the list reconstructed above (of who glossed which book) and her own list of the earliest Gloss manuscripts, i.e. those dated before 1135–40 and associated either definitely or putatively with Laon. The glossed books in pre-1140 manuscripts definitely originating in Laon
2. *The Glossa ordinaria on the Bible*

are, in her analysis, Genesis, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, St Matthew, St John, the Canonical Epistles and the Apocalypse. The Psalter is a puzzling exception; according to Stirnemann’s research, no glossed Psalter is datable to before 1140.

The first manuscript of the entire *Glossa ordinaria* that can be dated with any certainty, which contains the Gloss on Lamentations, was copied in 1131 in Riechenberg in modern Germany. This leaves a gap of at least one or two decades between the time of the compilation and the earliest extant manuscripts of the Gloss, which lack of correspondence perhaps arises from the Gloss’s possible origination in lectures, the very first manuscripts having the character of prototypes, most of which would consequently have been destroyed as soon as the Gloss as a whole begun to take shape c. 1130. The first Laonnoise attempts at glossing the entire Bible, which eventually resulted in the *Glossa ordinaria*, ought therefore to have taken place rather before 1100 than afterwards.

Gilbert the Universal is the only writer to have personally left evidence as to which books he glossed and which glosses he wrote or compiled. Of course, it may be objected that the attribution is made by someone else, that the work was performed by a secretary or a similar person. However, the colophon carries his name, as do five glosses in the text, and other contemporary sources speak of him as the compiler of the Gloss on Lamentations. His involvement in the glossing of Lamentations is as established as Anselm’s in the Gloss in general. In any case, the major parts of the books of the Bible ought to have been glossed and fully available by c. 1130 (as we have seen, Anselm died in 1117, Gilbert left France and was occupied by episcopal duties in 1128, and Ralph died in 1132 or 1134).

The question still remains, though, of where and by whom the various books of the Gloss were brought together. Siding with Laon, the evidence points towards Auxerre. If Gilbert the Universal was responsible for having glossed the major part of the Old Testament, he would largely have done so in

---

80 Ibid., p. 262.
81 Ibid., p. 264.
82 Now Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek, 2° Ms. Theol. 6, our K.
83 Compare the existence of ‘gloses périmées’ in early glossed manuscripts: SMALLEY (1961). According to MERLETTE (1975), pp. 47–48, such neglected glosses are signs of originality, pointing to Laon.
84 See above, and below, section 3.2.
85 SMALLEY, as we have seen, cautiously suggests this; MAZZANTI considers it ultimately proven: see below section 3.2.
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Auxerre, where he was a schoolmaster for many years (see chapter 3 below). Both Laon and Auxerre provided good libraries, not only in their cathedrals, which contained the collected knowledge of the Carolingians. In Carolingian times, furthermore, the intellectual exchange between Laon and Auxerre had been immense. Both cities stood under the protection of Charles the Bald; Heiric of Auxerre was, just as his master John Scot Eriugena, tied to the palace school of the king. Laon masters taught at the schools of Auxerre (mainly the monastic school of Saint-Germain) and vice versa. This bond may very well have lasted throughout the ages; we have already seen the twelfth-century glossators continuing Carolingian traditions, and Gilbert the Universal might be a good example of this practice.

2.3 THE ABBEY OF ST VICTOR

Because of the uncertainties surrounding the conception of the Gloss, and following a mysterious note by Peter the Chanter in which is claimed that Anselm never completed his Gloss on the Bible, it has been argued that the final compilation of the Gloss was undertaken elsewhere. Taking this opinion even further, Margaret Gibson, following Peter the Chanter, suggests that Anselm did not finish his Gloss on the Bible, and indeed that no one in Laon did so. Her suggestion is that the Gloss to the remainder of the Bible – those parts for which Anselm was supposedly not responsible – were compiled at St Victor in Paris; that, in fact, the whole of the Glossa ordinaria ‘was organized for the school of St Victor’, and that Hugh of St Victor was responsible for

88 ‘Unde lugere adhuc debemus super hoc, quod magister Anselmus non permittebatur perfecte glosare omnem sacram paginam sicut incepit, quia canonici, quorum erat decanus, et alii plures cum ab illo studio amorverunt sepe vel litigando, scilicet, propter lites suas vel honorando per adulationem vel pauperes opprimendo, quorum necessitates exigebatur interesse, vel persequendo, quando, scilicet, compellebant eum interesse negotiis capituli sui.’ The text is cited from SMALLEY (1937), p. 400, with some changes in punctuation; the piece is found in the manuscript Paris, BnF, lat. 12011, fol. 173v. In the early 1110s, Anselm was further disturbed by worldly troubles, as described by Guibert de Nogent in his autobiography: the Laon commune was in uproar, culminating in 1112 with the burning down of the cathedral and the lynching of the bishop; see LABANDE (1981) 3.8, pp. 339–43, also GIBSON (1992a), p. 17: ‘The man who had to steer an even course through such disasters might well be distracted from glossing the Bible.’
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‘setting in order the definite version of the Gloss’.\(^90\) To my mind, the Gloss should have been completed long before Hugh’s active period at St Victor in the 1120s and 30s. As the Abbey of St Victor was founded \( \approx 1108 \), it seems furthermore unlikely that the enormous work of compiling the entire Gloss was performed in little less than twenty years, and without leaving any trace of such activity there. The lack of decisive evidence as to where it actually was made is not of itself enough to allow one to assert that it was made at St Victor. Nevertheless, though Gibson’s suggestion is rather precipitate, the Victorines certainly had much to do with the Gloss: they made use of it,\(^91\) and there were intellectual connections between Laon and St Victor.\(^92\) Through the means of William of Champeaux, the Abbey of St Victor inherited the traditions of biblical study at Laon and Auxerre.\(^93\) To the school at his newly founded abbey, the former archdeacon of Paris brought the methods he had learned at Laon of glossing Scripture and collecting and arranging patristic sentences to answer questions pertaining to certain biblical passages. At St Victor, the old exercises of the monastery were in a fruitful way combined with the new methods of the schools.\(^94\) This bond may very well have resulted in the Victorines being involved in one or more of the ‘crystallisations’ undergone by the text of the Gloss through the twelfth century.

Most importantly, however, it stresses one very important circumstance: whether completed in Laon or Auxerre, neither city had the means for the full-scale manufacturing which was eventually to secure the success of the Gloss;\(^95\) it depended on other establishments for its wider dissemination. The Victorines, with their up-to-date scriptorium, certainly produced glossed books, but their role in the history of the Gloss was, to my mind, more an intellectual one. They may have performed the final touches the text received throughout the century, and thus took part in its standardisation, while the large-scale copying of glossed manuscripts was probably performed on contract with the

\(^{90}\) Gibson (1989), p. 244. She later seems to have modified this rather bold hypothesis: (1992b), p. x.

\(^{91}\) It is evident that the Gloss had been established as a work of reference at St Victor at least by the 1140s; see van Lier (1996), pp. 249–53.


\(^{93}\) Chatillon (1984), pp. 175–86.
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professional scriptoria that were developing in the city.\textsuperscript{96} However, the role of the Victorines in the history of the Gloss still awaits a fuller study.

2.4 Paris

Whether or not the Victorines were involved in the copying and diffusion of the Gloss, the task had to be taken to Paris, a city of schools and scriptoria, which by 1150 became the principal centre for the copying of manuscripts of the \textit{Glossa ordinaria}.\textsuperscript{97} There is evidence for at least some parts of the Gloss being copied in Paris as early as 1137,\textsuperscript{98} though it was not until the mid-century that the enterprise gained momentum. Furthermore, from \textit{c.} 1140–50 onwards, no major additions or changes were made to the Gloss, only an occasional prothema or a stray interlinear gloss. Scholars who have studied the Gloss often show surprise at the general consistency of the text. Notwithstanding its inherent complexity, the text

remains remarkably stable, probably because the great bulk of the manuscripts was produced between the mid-twelfth and the early thirteenth century. Throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the \textit{Glossa ordinaria}, though widely available, was not constantly being transcribed; it was not, for instance, a set text in the universities. Thus the text suffered little contamination or evolution.\textsuperscript{99}

By this time, the mid-twelfth century, a glossed Bible normally had one standard set of prefaces and glosses for each biblical book. Other, notably older, glosses or apparatus might be referred to as \textit{vetus glosatura} or \textit{glosa vetus},\textsuperscript{100} and were no longer copied. This corresponds both to the ‘first crystallisation’ mentioned by Lobrichon, which occurred in Paris at the time of the Gloss being received as the standard text at the end of the twelfth century, at the side

\textsuperscript{96} Judging by the interesting fact that glossed Bibles are frequently recorded in the libraries of Cistercian houses, Constance Bouchard (2000) has argued that much of the development and the dissemination of the books of the Gloss may be accounted to the monks of the Cistercian order.


\textsuperscript{98} Smalley (1983), p. 64.


\textsuperscript{100} Petrus Comestor, commenting on the Gloss on St Matthew 2:12, which reads ‘Haec responsio non fit per angelum sed per ipsum Deum …’, testifies to the existence of an older gloss, ‘quod in greco manifestum est, sicut in \textit{vetri glosa} habetur; habent enim greci articulos quibus magis proprie possunt dicere quod volunt, quam nos …’: quoted from Smalley (1937), p. 368; emphasis added.
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of the *magna* and *media glosatura*, and with the latter stages of the codicological development described by de Hamel (the ‘alternate-line’ format; our stage ‘B’ below, section 2.5.2). A few final touches in the shape of a few new prothemata and a handful of new glosses completed the Gloss in the years around 1200.

Though it was an immediate success, the Gloss was not at once recognised as the standard text. The establishment of the Gloss as the *ordinaria*, and the ousting of the earlier apparatus from favour, came with Gilbert of Poitiers and Peter the Lombard, both of whom used it in their teaching and as a basis for their own work. Gilbert expanded Anselm’s Gloss on the Epistles of St Paul and the Psalms, which work he humbly read before Master Anselm, ‘causa emendationis’, and which was to become known as the *media glosatura*. The Lombard also expanded upon these two Anselmian glossed books, and his exposition was to become known as the *maior* or *magna glosatura*. In his slightly later *Liber quatuor sententiarum*, which eventually became the standard manual of theology and remained such for centuries, Peter made use both of his own *magna glosatura* and of the *Glossa ordinaria*, which was of course of great importance in the ‘canonising’ of the latter as a standard text-book of exegesis. Thus, the books of the Gloss were widely read and used, though not copied to any larger extent. Furthermore, the text, although intended for school use, was never subject to perpetual revisions by masters and students, as is customary with classroom notes. It was always a library text.

---


104 Some scholars assert that with time the Lombard’s new expositions replaced all other glosses for these books: see, for example, SMALLEY (1983), p. 64; GIBSON (1992), p. ix, n. 32. But there is a diversity of opinion: the Lombard’s work did not replace Anselm’s *parva glosatura* as an element in the Glossed Bible. Be that as it may, both of Anselm’s works are retained in the *editio princeps* (vols 2 and 4) of the Gloss.

105 There are approximately 175 references to the Gloss in the *Sententiae*, for instance in Liber IV, dist. 43 (on the Resurrection), cap. 2: ‘De voce tubae. Causa enim resurrectionis in mortuorum erit vox tubae … Unde propheta: *Dabit voci suae voce virtutis*, “id est effectum resuscitandi mortuos”’, where the latter quotation is from the Gloss on the Psalms (67:34); see BRADY (1971–81), p. 511, n. 1.

106 GIBSON (1992), p. vii. As was mentioned above, the changes consisted in the addition of an occasional prothema or gloss. This applies only to the Gloss as a whole; as we will see, the changes that take place with the second recension of the Gloss on Lamentations were of a more subtle nature. See below, chapter 5.
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The medieval book was an intellectual work of art. Its primary purpose, though, was to transmit a message. To obtain this end, a variety of visual tools were employed, together forming the layout, or the mise-en-page, of the text. This art was perfected through the twelfth century with the manuscripts of the Glossa ordinaria. Inspired by a format occasionally occurring already in the ninth century, the classic mise-en-page of the glossed books derives both from the display Psalters of c. 800–1050 and from secular teaching books of the same period, their way of glossing no doubt originating with the glossed manuscripts of late antiquity with texts of the standard curriculum of grammar: Virgil, Ovid, Martianus Capella and others. Lanfranc’s exposition of the Pauline Epistles, for instance, survives in manuscripts which are in the format of the double gloss: they consist of marginal annotation and brief words or phrases between the lines. It was not, though, used consistently as a format for a project such as the Gloss; the breakthrough for this mise-en-page came with the Gloss on the Bible. Nowhere before had it been used to that extent or with such thoroughness.

2.5.1 General observations

Some of the contents of the Gloss may have been of ancient date; the consistent use of the gloss format of the manuscripts, though, was a striking novelty. The textual layout, remarkable in its usefulness and practicality, enabled the reader to turn to the margin or to the space between the lines of the biblical book he was occupied with to find the explanation of a difficult word, a grammatical construction or rhetorical figure, or an extract from St Gregory, St Augustine, St Jerome or another authority to enlighten a puzzling passage. Through the gloss format, the Gospel was carried into the

107 Gibbons (1992a), p. 19. This division of the page into at least three columns, with a double apparatus of glosses, is, as Lobbichon (1984), p. 98, states, perhaps somewhat surprisingly a phenomenon typical of Latin Christianity, and not at all, as one might have suspected, adopted from the Jewish Talmud exegesis: ‘Le zèle sacré des copistes juifs de la Torah ne semble pas s’être relâché au point d’introduire des gloses de main d’homme dans l’espace réservé à la Bible. Le Talmud peut entourer le texte biblique, mais il ne pénètre pas dans la colonne centrale.’

108 See Lobbichon (1984), pp. 98–99; the practice of glossing biblical books in the same way seems to have been (re-)introduced to the continent, as with so many other things, by Northumbrian and Irish monks from the end of the eighth century.
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Old Testament; the Old Testament narrative could be read with its fulfilment ready at hand, in the form of explanations on the allegorical level of interpretation, between the lines or in the margins. In a lexicographical fashion, Old Testament characters and events were directly interpreted in New Testament terms.\textsuperscript{110} The format of the glossed books, originally cast in the cathedral schools of Laon and Auxerre, underwent occasional development through the course of the twelfth century, particularly since the Gloss had reached the market in c. 1140. This evolution has been thoroughly studied from the palaeographical and codicological angle by Christopher de Hamel.\textsuperscript{111} It was most probably at Paris that the innovations of the gloss format were undertaken. To make better use of the parchment, which in early glossed books often had large sections left blank, a new method of planning and executing the \textit{mise-en-page} was gradually developed through the mid-twelfth century. Their original, rather spontaneous character was transformed into one of methodical rationalisation.\textsuperscript{112} Where in earlier books of the Gloss the central Bible text was first copied throughout the entire codex and interlinear and marginal glosses supplied thereafter, now each page came to be planned and copied as a unit, with such characteristic features as the varying biblical text column and marginal glosses in split columns very often continuing onto the following page, tied to each other by elaborate \textit{signes-de-renvoi}. This ‘alternate-line’ method\textsuperscript{113} enabled different scriptoria to produce almost identical codices, with the same amount of writing and the same planning of each page. This level of efficiency, though, belongs to the later stage when the Gloss had reached Paris and was subject to almost industrial copying; in the beginning, codices were less fanciful, not infrequently taking the shape of teaching material.

Each biblical book was treated; generally, a glossed book contained first the text of one or more biblical books, preceded by prefaces – \textit{prothemia} – consisting of the prologue or prologues of St Jerome and other prefatory material. The biblical text was then written in a central column in a larger script. In the columns to the left and right of the central text, the ‘marginal’ glosses were copied, often marked by gibbets – paragraph signs – to separate them from each other. The marginal gloss was either placed directly opposite the biblical lemma it aimed to expound, or was referred to with a repetition of the

\begin{itemize}
  \item See \textsc{Signer} (1997), p. 593.
  \item \textsc{De Hamel} (1984).
  \item See \textsc{Stirnemann} (1994), p. 258.
  \item The term is coined by \textsc{De Hamel} (1984), pp. 24–25.
\end{itemize}
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lemma at the beginning of the gloss, in some manuscripts indicated by means of a tie-mark, a graphic symbol marking the place where a comment or insertion is to be made. A corresponding symbol introduces the comment, i.e. the marginal gloss in question. In the space between the lines of the central biblical text were placed the much shorter ‘interlinear’ glosses, often ‘hooked’ to the Bible text right above the word or words they aim to explain. These two methods of glossing are easy to distinguish from the Bible text by the size of their script, which is about half that of the biblical text. The scribal competence required for executing a *mise-en-page* that would fit these three types of text was immense.

The development in sophistication of the gloss format is also mirrored by a growth in the size of the manuscripts: early manuscripts of glossed books of the Bible tend to be smaller than later ones.114 This relative growth culminated in about 1220 with the advent of the first grand glossed Bibles, luxurious manuscripts produced for major religious centres and universities.115 However, there was never one single manuscript with the *Glossa ordinaria* to the entire Bible, though traces of a glossed Bible in two volumes have come down to us.116 According to Gibson, a typical division would have followed the nine-volume scheme of Cassiodorus.117 As de Hamel asserts, ‘a full set of glossed books of the Bible generally comprised about twenty-one volumes’,118 but Thomas à Becket’s 21 glossed books lacked Ezra, Daniel, Maccabees and Acts.119 Since there was no general plan or prescription for copying the Gloss, medieval libraries seem to have possessed a wide range of glossed manuscripts, with duplications of some books and no copies of others.120

---

114 The average twelfth-century size of a page is 240 × 170 mm: see GIbson (1989), p. 233.
116 One such second volume is known, preserved in the manuscript Oxford, Bodl. Libr., Laud Lat. 9, from Proverbs to the Apocalypse, a French manuscript of 458 large folios, dating from the mid-thirteenth century: see GIbson (1992a), p. 19, n. 69, and PÆCHT & ALEXANDER (1966) vol. 1, no. 527, p. 41 and pl. xl.
118 DE HAMEL (1984), p. 10. However, complete sets of the Gloss may have consisted of fewer volumes, for instance one from St Victor, Paris, BnF, lat. 14398–14410 (saec. xii).19
119 Ibid., p. 12.
120 See *ibid.*, pp. 5–13. Some idea of the other books of the Gloss with which the Gloss on Lamentations was generally copied may be gleaned from the descriptions of the manuscripts used for the present edition, section 5.3 below.
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2.5.2 The format of the Gloss on Lamentations

The descriptions of the gloss format made by de Hamel, Stirnemann and Lobrichon\textsuperscript{121} are largely but not entirely in accord with the analysis of the manuscript tradition of the Gloss on Lamentations undertaken for the present edition (and performed in chapter 5 below). Any divergences principally concern the dates at which particular gloss formats are encountered. For example, where de Hamel suggests that the first type of gloss format (our stage ‘A’ below) was outdated already in the 1130s,\textsuperscript{122} it continues to be used for the Gloss on Lamentations in manuscripts dating from as late as the 1170s.

The presentation given here is my own interpretation and adaptation of the gloss format as described by de Hamel, with special consideration given to the Gloss on Lamentations. Below, slightly modifying de Hamel’s conclusions,\textsuperscript{123} the development of the gloss format has been classified into three groups (‘A’, ‘B’ and ‘C’), each representing a general stage of development.\textsuperscript{124} This system of classification is then used in the manuscript descriptions in section 5.3 below.

The principal differences that distinguished an early book of the Gloss from a later one lie in the way the page was planned: in the first third of the century, the biblical text was ruled and copied in a central column throughout the entire manuscript, before any glossing was added.\textsuperscript{125} Within a decade or two each page was copied as a single unit, even allowing the biblical central column to alternate in width and position on the page.

A: The page is ruled, with a central column for the biblical text; this text is then written out in full throughout the entire manuscript, after which the glosses, marginal as well as interlinear, are added. Glossed manuscripts of this kind often give the impression of being incomplete because of the unavoidable blank spaces between many glosses.\textsuperscript{125} Occasionally, longer glosses extend in L-shapes around the ‘corners’ of the biblical text. This type of gloss format

\textsuperscript{122} DE HAMEL (1984), p. 17.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., especially chapter 2, pp. 14–27.
\textsuperscript{124} A similar analysis, with regard to medieval commentary texts in general, has been made by Gerhard POWITZ (1979). With manuscripts, however, tending not to fit into rationalised templates, I have refrained from using his somewhat strict classification here, reducing the various formats to a minimum, thus allowing for the variations of the individual manuscripts.
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corresponds roughly to the two first stages described by de Hamel and seems
to have been the original practice of the glossators. It was principally used, with
some developments, throughout the first half of the twelfth century. See plate I.

An alternative *mise-en-page* within this stage is extant in the manuscript Kassel,
Universitätsbibliothek, 2° Ms. Theol. 6, our K, where the biblical text is written
not in the centre of the page, but consistently in the inner column. The
marginal glosses are written in the outer column, occasionally extending in
L-shapes around the corners of the text. The interlinear glosses are placed at
their usual position within the biblical text space. Thus an opening presents a
two-column central biblical text surrounded by marginal glosses and
interwoven with interlinear ones. One peculiar feature of the *mise-en-page* of this
manuscript is that throughout the first book, only one glossed verse of
Lamentations is copied on each page.

**B:** The principal difference between this type and the first is that where the first
ruled and copied the biblical text first, with glosses added later, this second
stage planned and executed each page as a single unit. The scribe estimated the
amount of glossing each page would hold, and ruled the page accordingly,
before beginning to write. Eventually, and on account of the irregular length of
the glosses to different lemmata, this practice developed into also varying the
width of the central column of the biblical text. This stage is what de Hamel
refers to as the ‘alternate-line’ type, and was developed from c. 1150.\(^{126}\) See plate
II.

**C:** A continuous (*catena* or *glosa continua*) form of exposition, in one or two
columns, at certain places interrupted by portions of the biblical text being
commented upon, with interlinear glosses either interspersed between the lines
of the lemma or collected in an appendix after the main text, or gathered before
each verse in a continuous and abbreviated form. This practice seems to have
taken place in the latter part of the twelfth century,\(^{127}\) and may have been
inspired by the deviation from the classic gloss format which occurred with the
*media* and *magna glosatura* of Gilbert of Poitiers and Peter the Lombard

---


\(^{127}\) DE HAMEL (1984), p. 22, notes the first occurrence of this type of format in the 1170s.
There has been some debate as to which format the very first books of the Gloss assumed:
the regular gloss format or a continuous *catena* type of commentary. SMALLEY argued in
favour of the second, while others including DE HAMEL have stressed the primordial nature
of the gloss format for the first glossed books.
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respectively. These texts were arranged in a continuous fashion, with the Bible text copied at the side of and as lemmata within the expository text. A variant of this type of format is exhibited by the manuscript Paris, BnF, lat. 2578, our Pa, where Bible text and marginal glosses are copied in a continuous fashion throughout the codex, and the interlinear glosses (with a repetition of the Bible text) are appended in a section of their own at the back of the codex. See plate III.

2.6 The aftermath

Copying of the Gloss seems to have abated from c. 1250, and after 1300 hardly any copies were produced at all. Later readers were apparently satisfied with using the utterly well-executed and textually stable copies of the early twelfth century. Such late, stable and formal manuscripts seem to have been used by the printer Adolph Rusch of Strasbourg for the editio princeps of 1480/81. Obviously inspired by the great utility of the gloss format of these manuscripts, Rusch retained this manner of presentation throughout his edition, and enhanced its utility by adding tie-marks in the shape of letters, crosses, darts and gibbets for the purpose of connecting marginal and interlinear glosses to their relevant biblical lemma in the central column. Rusch’s editio princeps, meticulously composed, formed the basis for the eleven further editions that were made between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries. These remained substantially unchanged, but some material was added, generally the Postillae of Nicholas of Lyre and the Additiones of Paul of Burgos.

Even at the time of the printing of the first edition, so close to the origin of the Gloss both in years and in spirit, the identities of the glossators were unknown to the printers. In the Venice edition of 1495, it is said à propos the uncertain authorship of the Gloss:

illas autem glosas que nullius nomen habent et similiter interlineares addiderunt diversi doctores qui dictas doctorum glosas [i.e. Augustine, Jerome, etc.] diversis temporibus ordinaverunt ... et quamvis nesciatur precise quis quam fecerit, tamen omnes semper fuerunt et sunt apud omnes maxime auctoritatis.
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It was no wonder that it gave rise to speculation. In 1852, in adherence to an ancient myth, the notorious abbé Jacques-Paul Migne printed parts of the Gloss in his *Patrologia Latina* among the works of Walahfrid Strabo (PL 113, 114). In doing this, he chose not to include the interlinear gloss at all, basing his decision on the old prejudice that it was a twelfth-century addition, and consequently neither original nor of any interest at all. ‘Alienum porro est’, Migne wrote, ‘a proposito nostro additamenta scriptorum duodecimi, decimi tertii etiam quinti decimi saeculi recudere’. With it went the whole text of the Vulgate. The ingenious gloss format was thus abolished at the same time, and the text of the marginal glosses is printed in the usual parallel columns of the *Patrologia*. Neither did Migne bother to print the text of glossed books which he thought were later additions or existed elsewhere, such as Ezekiel, Daniel, the Minor Prophets, or the Books of Maccabees and Lamentations.

The latter, the Gloss on Lamentations, is in Migne disposed of because its ‘author’, Paschasius Radbertus, was unknown to Strabo, who was 40 years his elder: ‘Hanc [expositionem Paschasii] certe, ut annis quadraginta Ratperto senior, non novit Walafridus, et ideo nunc omittendam censuimus, mox inter Opera Paschasii Ratperti suo loco daturi’. What is printed *suo loco* is indeed the vast Carolingian commentary of Paschasius, but hardly the Gloss on Lamentations. Smalley’s laconic judgement on the general utility of Migne’s rendering of the Gloss is indeed apposite: ‘Anyone who has tried to use it knows how worthless it is.’ The *editio princeps*, now available as a facsimile reprint, is in the absence of a critical edition far more useful.

To learn more about the Gloss and how it was made, a thorough investigation of the sources to each glossed book of the Bible must be made. Smalley’s remark alluded to above, that the history of the Gloss is the history of its sources, still applies; there is a separate tradition of sources for each book. In

---

131 See above, section 2.1.1.
132 On the various enterprises of the abbé Migne, see the enlightening BLOCH (1994).
133 PL 113, cols 11–12.
134 PL 114, cols 63–64.
135 PL 120, cols 1059–1256; see below, chapter 4.
137 See RUSCH (1480; 1992).
2. *The Glossa ordinaria on the Bible*

the light of what has been said above, the questions posed in chapter 1, questions any modern editor of a book of the Gloss is faced with, regarding its sources and method of compilation, are brought to the fore. From where were the extracts taken – from the *auctoritas* itself or from some earlier apparatus? On what principles were the choices made from this earlier apparatus? To what extent did the glossator rely on the earlier apparatus? To what extent was there a need to rewrite and reorganise? The compiler’s addition of his own glosses and his method of abbreviation and rewriting must, of course, also be taken into consideration. And each book of the Gloss will bring its own set of answers. By such thorough editorial work, more light may be shed on the *Glossa ordinaria*. An attempt to do so with respect to the Gloss on Lamentations will be made in chapter 4. Let us first, though, turn our attention to the person of Gilbert the Universal.
CHAPTER 3

Gilbert the Universal

3.1 CAUSIDICUS FAMOUSUS

The destiny and fame of Gilbertus ‘Universalis’ are forever entwined with the Glossa ordinaria; he ‘thrusts himself on the attention of anyone who sets out to investigate the Gloss problem’.1 And yet he is surprisingly little known, for one bearing such a bold appellation.2 Nothing is known of Gilbert’s early life, save that he was a Breton by birth, according to Richard of Poitiers.3 The first time he is mentioned is in Auxerre in 1110, as witness to a charter of the Abbey of Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire, at which time he was a member of the chapter of the church of Saint-Etienne and referred to as ‘magister Gislebertus’.4

The next mention of him, and at the same time the first occurrence of the epithet universalis, is in a charter of 1120 drawn up at Auxerre, to which ‘Magister Guilbertus Universalis’ is one of the witnesses.5 Thus it would appear that it was sometime between 1110 and 1120 that he began to be called ‘the Universal’. In the colophon of the Gloss on Lamentations, he signs himself not ‘Universalis’, but merely ‘Gislebertus Autisiodorensis ecclesie diachonus’ – these facts taken together would date this part of the Gloss to before 1120 (see below, chapter 4). Every other mention of him is later, and practically every later source refers to him by his ‘Universal’ epithet.

2 The most complete biography is provided by SMALLEY (1935, 1936), on the basis of which articles this outline is sketched. The following section does not claim to contest Smalley’s research in any way; its purpose is rather to relate the known facts of major importance and perhaps to stress a point or two, as well as supplying one or two pieces of information unknown to Smalley. Most recently, in the new Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (2004), a couple of documents on Gilbert’s life not known to Smalley are brought to light by Falko NEININGER; these are also taken into consideration in the present work.
3 This statement is strengthened by the Liber Eliensis; see SMALLEY (1935), pp. 236–37.
4 PROU & VIDIER (1900–07), no. 107, pp. 267–69. In the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography the year of this charter is given erroneously as 1100.
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A very interesting but much later (saec. xvi/xvii) note in a manuscript from the Austin canons of Riechenberg in present-day Germany states that he claruit – 'became famous' – in 1090, which would place his scholarly career about twenty years earlier than has previously been assumed. He was canon and probably also schoolmaster at the church of Saint-Etienne in Auxerre. In 1761, the canon Potel in Auxerre compiled a necrology from various sources, the Auxerre obituary amongst them, which are lost today. If we are to believe the entry for 8 August in this necrology, and assuming it is not a later interpolation, we have firm evidence of Gilbert running the Cathedral school at Auxerre; ‘Gislebertus diaconus’ is there also ‘scholis ecclesiae cathedralis prefectus’.7

Sometime between 1090 and 1120 he therefore ought to have finished his biblical scholarship and embarked upon his journey to fame. To what, then, was this fame accountable? There are numerous statements as to Gilbert's great learning and achievements as a biblical scholar, but no source explicitly states what his learning consisted of. He appears to have been learned in theology as well as in canon law; his fields of action were both the classroom and the Roman Curia. According to the English chronicler Henry of Huntingdon († c. 1160), his outstanding learning took him to the episcopal see of London (in 1128):

Quid memorem Gilebertum, cognominem Vniuersalem, episcopum Lundoniensem? Non fuit adusque Romam par ei scientia. Artibus erat eruditissimus, theoria singularis et unicus. Fama igitur celebris et splendidus. Quapropter dum scholas regeret Nauernis in Gallia, ad summum Lundonie sacerdocium uocatus est et exoratus concessit.8

Henry is the only writer also to mention him as a schoolmaster at Nevers. Lebeuf’s statement that he was also treasurer at Nevers is not possible to verify, as the obituary of Nevers has disappeared since Lebeuf saw it.9 There was a school at Nevers, at least between 1047 and 1145,10 which may have been run by Gilbert at the time when he was called to the episcopal see of London.11 However, in a document of 1126 not mentioned by Smalley, a canon by the

6 On fol. 89r. The manuscript is now Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek, 2° Ms. Theol. 6, our K.
10 Ibid., p. 237.
11 The abbé Lebeuf conjectures that Gilbert 'was invited to Nevers to re-establish the cathedral school as he had done at Auxerre': quoted from ibid., p. 237.
3. Gilbert the Universal

name of ‘Gislebertus’ may be found witnessing a charter of the chapter of the church of Saint-Etienne at Auxerre.\textsuperscript{12} Other sources also have him coming to London directly from Auxerre.\textsuperscript{13} Only in the chronicle of John of Worcester is he supposed to have been a canon of Lyons.\textsuperscript{14}

Nevertheless, Henry’s are no light words, and as they are not written in a laudatory context, they ought to be taken rather seriously.\textsuperscript{15} Furthermore, according to Hugh the Chanter, a contemporary historian of the church of York, Gilbert visited the Roman Curia in the winter of 1125–26, and there took part in the lawsuit between the archbishops of York and Canterbury arising from the latter’s ‘notorious claim … to primacy’ over the former.\textsuperscript{16} The outcome of the proceedings was probably what determined his further career. It is clear, as Hugh the Chanter tells us, that he had promised his services to Thurstan, archbishop of York, but eventually sided with William of Corbeil, archbishop of Canterbury, in hope of greater revenue.

Fuit autem ibi quidam clericus sapiens et causidicus famosus, Gillebertus, cognomento Vniuersus vel pocius Vniuersalis, iusticiam inuersare contendens, a nostris auerus, et factus adversarius. Qui cum archiepiscopo nostro secum uenire promississet, et per litteras suas semel et iterum mandasset, postea Cantuariensi adhiesit, sperans se tanto copiosius accepturum quanto archiepiscopatus ille nostro copiosior diuiciis habundat. Sed, Deo pauperes adiuuante, nec illi profuit nec nostro obesse ualuit, et spes sua eum aliquantum decepit, et a quibusdam in curia Curio appellatus est, de quio Lucanus :

Audax uenali comitantur Curio lingua.\textsuperscript{17}

There is an element of bitterness in Hugh’s relating of this tale, which fits rather well with the outcome of the matter. In spite of Gilbert’s hopes being somewhat thwarted, as told by Hugh, and the main issue left undecided, some precedence was actually given to Canterbury, as William of Corbeil, the archbishop, was created a papal legate.\textsuperscript{18} Thurstan, archbishop of York, who claimed the independence of his see, went out of the contest empty-handed. As

\textsuperscript{12} LAURENT (1911), no. 642, p. 482.
\textsuperscript{13} See WHARTON (1695), p. 51.
\textsuperscript{14} McGURK (1998), p. 176: ‘Quidam ecclesie Laugdunensis canonicus, uir probus et grandeus electus est ad pontificatum ecclesie Lundoniensis … Gilebertus nomine, cognomine uero Vniuersalis’, but he is not mentioned in the Lyons obituary.
\textsuperscript{15} See below, section 3.3.
\textsuperscript{16} POOLE (1915), p. 143.
\textsuperscript{18} See POOLE (1915), pp. 144–45.
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a matter of fact, this was a royal victory, as the English King, Henry I ('Beauclerc'), supported William of Corbeil against York. Thus, at the Curia, in exchanging his loyalties from York to Canterbury, Gilbert rendered the King a service.

Subsequently, in the spring of 1127, on the death of Richard de Belmeis I, bishop of London, Gilbert was appointed as his successor by King Henry, while the King was in Normandy. He was consecrated, already grandaevus, on 22 January 1128, and died early in August 1134. In the Auxerre obituary, in the entry for 12 August, he is described as

venerabilis memorie magister Gislebertus, veteris et novi Testamenti glosator eximius, qui universalis merito est appellatus, hujus ecclesie canonicus.

The obituary then mentions with gratitude the gifts he sent to the chapter from England after he was made bishop of London.

3.2 GLOSATOR EXIMIUS

This brings us to the issue of his biblical scholarship. ‘Outstanding glossator of the Old and New Testament’ is a magnificent description, albeit rather vague. As contemporary manuscript sources explicitly tell us only that Gilbert was responsible for the Gloss on Lamentations, the question of his involvement in the making of the Glossa ordinaria has undergone debate for many years. The most recent contribution, made by Giuseppe Mazzanti in 1999, laments the substantial lack of attributions of authorship to the various glossed books of the Bible and makes the claim of having found the solution, once and for all: his proposition is ‘di dare conto di una nuova fonte che permette di identificare finalmente gli autori del nucleo originario della Glossa’. This ‘new’ source is a

21 There is some confusion as to the correct date of his death: see Henry of Huntingdon, in Greenway (1996), pp. 488–90: ‘Obiit Gislebertus Lundoniensis episcopus, et Lauandensis episcopus in uia Rome, pro causa sua tamdiu agitata.’
22 Longnon (1909), p. 239. This statement is confirmed by the necrology of canon Potel, mentioned above. In this, the whole entry for 8 August runs: ‘Ob. venerabilis memorie Gislebertus diaconus, scholis cathedralis prefectus, veteris et novi Testamenti glossator eximius, a Bernardo propter doctrinæ prestantiam universalis appellatus.’
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Victorine chronicle composed c. 1190, at the end of which, according to the author of the article, the solution as to who compiled the Gloss is found:

Fuit et alius magister Gislebertus cognomento Universalis, scolaris ut fertur magistri Anselmi qui glosavit psalterium et epistolam Pauli, qui Gislebertus ex maxima parte libros veteris et novi Testamenti preter psalterium et epistolas Pauli glosavit.25

It is indeed the case that this passage has hardly ever been reported by scholars of the Gloss. But does it, as Mazzanti proposes, tell us any more about the conception of the Gloss, and Gilbert’s role in it, than every other contemporary source? Are there not other sources close to the Victorine in importance? We have seen one source speak about Gilbert as a ‘veteris et novi testamenti glosator eximius’. Other contemporary witnesses to his supposed role as glossator are, for instance, St Bernard, who congratulates him on his ‘renewal of the whole of Scripture’:

in cunctis huius mundi sapientium litteris et studiis ludens, omnem quoque studuit et potuit divinam quoadammodo revocare et renovare Scripturam.27

This is yet another outstanding judgement, however vague. Are there no contemporary sources that state explicitly which books of the Gloss Gilbert was responsible for? Witnesses to the books which Anselm and Ralph glossed have been given above, but in Gilbert’s case, though he is extolled for his great learning and scholarly achievements in various sources, there is no firm evidence as to what he actually wrote, except, as we have seen, for the Gloss on Lamentations. To this, the Yorkshire canon Robert of Bridlington (fl. 1150) stands alone in adding the Gloss on the Lesser Prophets. Robert’s own commentary on the Lesser Prophets is compiled from among others, ‘glosis Gilleberti Universalis in eosdem prophetas’.28 Gilbert is here notably the only ‘modern’ scholar among the illustrious company of St Jerome, St Augustine, St Gregory, St Ambrose, Bede and Haymo. Robert of Bridlington obviously held the glosses of Gilbert in very high esteem.

24 Published by DICKINSON (1950), pp. 284–85. The chronicle is found in the manuscript Paris, BnF, lat. 15009, fols 42r–77r.
25 Ibid., p. 284.
27 Epistola 24, ed. LECLERCQ (1974), p. 77. See also below; section 3.3.
28 The manuscript Oxford, St John’s College, 46, fol. 1v; see SMALLEY (1935), p. 248. As was seen above, however, other sources ascribe the Gloss on the Lesser Prophets to Ralph; see section 2.2.3.
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Gilbert’s putative authorship of other books of the Gloss must be deduced from his leaving signed glosses in them. Among the glossators, this was a habit that he alone was to exhibit, perhaps a remnant of his former juridical career. The Gloss on the Pentateuch, for instance, is compiled from many sources. Among them is Gilbert; he has left signed glosses on Exodus 6:16, 7:7; Leviticus (prologue); Numbers 1:39; and Deuteronomy 1:6, 1:19, 2:1 and 10:4. These glosses probably were written specially for the glossed book in question, and not excerpted from another work, as they ‘read like the comments of an editor; it is difficult to see them as excerpts, like the other glosses, from some larger work’. Furthermore, an interlinear gloss to Exodus 30:10 is in another work ascribed to Gilbert once again by Robert of Bridlington, who, as we have seen, was a great admirer of Gilbert. Gilbert’s involvement in glossing the Pentateuch is therefore established beyond doubt. But for now we cannot say with any certainty that he alone was responsible for its compilation.

St Bernard’s testimony as related above is confirmed in a collection of miracles of a St Erkenwald, written by one of the clergy of St Paul’s, London, who claims to be the nephew of Gilbert. In the piece in question, Gilbert is described as

nempe litteris et sapientia, necnon auctoritate et frugalitate media cumulatus ante episcopatum uetus instrumentum ad liquidum exposuerat.

His virtues, furthermore, are extolled by ‘uniuersa latinitas’. Surprisingly, Smalley takes ‘uetus instrumentum’ in this passage to refer to one glossed book of the Bible only (the nephew ‘mentions a commentary on the Old Testament

29 Signing glosses was a habit of legal scholars: see SMALLEY (1983), pp. 52–55.
30 See also the gloss to Exodus 19:7–8, ‘notandum quod lex non incautis vel nescientibus … causetur’, which in the printed edition is ascribed to St Gregory, but apparently in some manuscripts is ascribed to Gilbert. Confusing the two exegetes does not seem uncommon: see for example manuscripts Ba and V of the present edition, section 5.3.
31 Another gloss to the prologue to Leviticus, generally carrying the name Hesychius, is in other sources ascribed to Gilbert; it is most probably the question of a typically Gilbertine abbreviation of the original author: see SMALLEY (1936), pp. 49–50.
33 Interlinear glosses regularly lack ascriptions.
34 Interestingly, the gloss in question reads: ‘Quotidie ingrediebatur sacerdos in sancta sanctorum ad adolendum thymiamata, semel autem in anno cum sanguine quo aspergebant cornua altaris’. This theme is taken up in the Gloss on Lamentations (1:10).
35 ‘Eius nepotem’; this nephew was alive at least in 1140, when on 16 February he witnessed the translation of the saint. See WHATLEY (1989), p. 130.
36 Ibid., p. 130.
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To my mind, to ‘have expounded the Old Testament to full certainty’ can hardly refer to just one book. The words are of utmost importance, especially when originating with this very source. The apparent consanguinity to Gilbert and the vicinity both in time and place give us hardly any reason not to believe the testimony of this miracle-writer.

Apparently, then, the Victorine passage of Mazzanti’s appears to be less accurate than many of the even earlier sources. It tells us that Gilbert glossed the major part (‘ex maxima parte’) of the Bible, except for the Psalter and the Pauline Epistles, which Anselm undertook to gloss. Still, ‘ex maxima parte’ leaves us with one or more biblical books whose authorship is unaccounted for. Mazzanti would furthermore like the ‘ut fertur’ of the passage to fulfil two purposes: first, it would refer only to the connection with Anselm (‘scolaris ut fertur magistri Anselmi’); secondly, it would indicate a very careful chronicler, as the supposed fact of the twofold authorship of Anselm’s and Gilbert’s ‘doveva essere assolutamente evidente a lui’, presumably on account of the milieu in which he lived (St Victor), and because of the success of the Gloss.38 It was necessary, furthermore, for the chronicler to mention the contribution by Anselm, but not to indicate Anselm’s part, simply indicating that only these two books were not glossed by Gilbert.39 This passage, and this passage only, is thus taken as evidence that only Gilbert and Anselm produced the Glossa ordinaria, and that Gilbert was responsible for the major part of it. The possible role of other contributors, such as Ralph of Laon, is effectively dismissed by their being co-contributors to Gilbert’s works.40

Mazzanti may very well be correct in his conclusions – as a matter of fact, both the contemporary sources and modern research point to that. His premises, though, are not valid. There is no firmer evidence in the Victorine chronicle as to what Gilbert wrote than in any other contemporary source.

Gilbert’s achievement as a biblical scholar fits very well with the activities of the cathedral school of or at Laon. As we have seen, he co-operated with Anselm in compiling the Gloss. Was he his pupil, then, or his contemporary? Did he merely study at Laon, or did he also teach there? The ‘scolaris ut fertur magistri Anselmi’ is, in fact, the only explicit contemporary mention of Gilbert as a student of Anselm’s. Indeed, the word scholarius does not necessary imply

38 MAZZANTI (1999), p. 11.
39 Ibid., p. 12.
40 Ibid., p. 16.
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‘student’ or ‘pupil’, but may very well mean something like ‘belonging to the same school’ or, according to Blaise, ‘maître qui enseigne’.

Anselm died in 1117. Gilbert, when rising to the see of London in 1127, was already an old man, and he died only seven years later, seventeen years after Anselm, which makes him rather a contemporary than a younger student. Abelard mentions him as one of his opponents, together with other friends of St Bernard’s, in his *Introductio ad theologiam*:

Sed nec magistros divinorum librorum, qui nunc maxime circa nos pestilentiae cathedras tenent, praetereundos arbitramur, quorum unus in Francia, alter in Burgundia, tertius in pago Andegavensi, quartus in Bituricensi, multa catholicae fidei, vel sanctis doctrinis adversa non solum tenent, verum etam docent.

The master in Burgundy has been identified as Gilbert, which fits very well with him teaching at Auxerre (in Burgundy) at the time of the writing of Abelard’s *Introductio*, c. 1122–25. The other three masters would be Alberic of Reims, Ulger, and Joscelin of Vierzy, all friends of St Bernard, and in the case of Alberic, former student at Laon (see section 2.2.3 above). The mentioning of Gilbert among the enemies of Abelard might also make him belong to a generation younger than Anselm’s.

Of even greater interest is the appeal to his authority at the Council of Reims (1148) when Gilbert of Poitiers was on trial. John of Salisbury relates that when the question of the *proprietates personarum* of the Holy Trinity was at issue, according to the archdeacon of Châlons, Magister Robert de Bosco, one should not make too hasty a judgement,

audierat enim, ut dicebat, in scolis clarissimorum doctorum fratrum Anselmi et Radulfi Laudunensium hoc fuisse quesitum, sed ab eis minime receptum

---

42 As was mentioned earlier, a note on fol. 89r (saec. xvi/xvii) in the manuscript Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek, 2° Theol. 6, our K, tells us that Gilbert *claruit* in 1090; see also Pietke (1995), p. 260.
43 PL 178, col. 1056. The putative erratic doctrines are mentioned by Abelard as (i) distinguishing the three persons in the Trinity from the three essences; (ii) denying that Christ had grown in his human body ‘more aliorum hominum’ and that his body was thus as tall in the womb of his mother as in the cradle and on the cross; and (iii) allowing people in religion to marry, even after their public profession, if they made due penitence for their transgression.
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Here, together with Anselm and Ralph – but, significantly, not in the same sentence – Gilbert is cited to the defence of Gilbert of Poitiers, pupil of Anselm; and once again he is in the company of Alberic of Reims, also Anselm’s pupil, as was William of Corbeil, archbishop of Canterbury, above. The former schoolmates kept together in defence of some doctrines – could this be seen as yet another trace of a school of Laon? In spite of these facts, all of which point to Gilbert’s belonging to a younger generation than Anselm, his age still makes him more likely a contemporary than his pupil, which is a supposition that takes for granted that the study of the curriculum should be made at a certain age, and always was made at that certain age. If Gilbert, as the sources indicate, had pursued a legal career before his biblical studies, he might have completed them at Laon rather late in life, and subsequently went to Auxerre to teach his skills.

3.3 Avarice stifled?

Universally extolled though he was for his remarkable learning, Gilbert seems not to have left traces of a comparably remarkable moral character. In the letter from St Bernard cited above, Bernard congratulates Gilbert for having overcome his avarice:

Longe satis exiit sermo quem fecisti, et magnum dedit suavitatis odorem, ad quoscumque potuit pervenire. Exstincta est avaritia; cui non suave redoleat? Caritas regnat; cui dulce non sapiat? Quando hoc cognoscunt omnes, quia

45 This is, interestingly, a testimony to the ‘conservatism’ of the school of Laon. Another testimony to the theological achievements of the two brothers comes also from John of Salisbury, this time in his *Metalogicon* 1, 5 (PL 199, col. 832), when speaking of a certain Cornificius: ‘Impudenter etiam, (in latebris tamen, quia palam non licet), offuscare nititur splendidissima lumina Galliarum, Lauduni gloriam, fratres theologos, Ansellum et Radulfum, quorum memoria in jucunditate et benedictione est …’.


47 As a matter of fact, there was a law school of some reputation at Auxerre, at which Thomas à Becket studied after he had been at Bologna (sometime between 1143 and 1148). See William Fitzstephen’s *Vita S. Thomae*, ed. ROBERTSON (1877), pp. 138–43. It is not at all improbable that Gilbert had something to do with this school, well versed as he was in theology as well as canon law.
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This stifling of avarice might have been a temporary recovery. Other sources lend support to this supposed flaw in his character. Henry of Huntingdon, for instance, readily admits the bishop’s high learning, as we have seen above, but nevertheless accuses him of extreme avarice:

Qui magna expectatione susceptus cepit avaricie crimini deseruire, multa perquirens, paucis largiens. Moriens siquidem nihil diuisit, sed infinitam thesauri copiam rex Henricus in eius deliticiis inuenit. Occis etiam episco pi auro et argento referte in fiscum regium allate sunt. Vnde uris summe scientie ab omni populo habitus est pro stultissimo.

Gilbert’s frugilitas, as related by his nephew (above), might be an understatement, or perhaps an attempt to restore his uncle’s reputation. As we have seen, Hugh the Chanter also accused him of greed. Smalley gives other witnesses to his potential ardor rapacitatis.

50 SMALLEY (1935), p. 245.
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Whence, then, did his peculiar epithet ‘Universalis’ spring? His was obviously a great name among his contemporaries. He was the most learned man ‘from here to Rome’; ‘unparalleled and unique in speculative thought’, he was ‘a wise man’ who had ‘renewed Scripture’ and a ‘great philosopher’. He may have earned his fame from his universal, comprehensive knowledge, on account either of his double competence in both canon law and theology, or, perhaps more probably, of his work in glossing almost the entire Bible. And yet he is reported as being deceitful and extremely avaricious, and at the same time, a ‘poor man’. Every contemporary witness has something different to say about him. If of nothing else, ‘Universalis’ may very well at least be taken as a summary of all these varying judgements.

By this time it ought to be quite clear that no further progress can be made on the question of who wrote which glossed book of the Bible, basing such deductions on what few contemporaneous accounts survive. They are all too vague. If further light is ever to be shed upon the compilers, it must require a thorough investigation of each book of the Gloss, with descriptions of the extant sources, the techniques of compilation, of abbreviation, of rewriting, and the adding of individual remarks. Mazzanti concludes his article by stating that it is time to begin repaying our debt, that is to say our debt to Gilbert. Even if Mazzanti’s every word may not be taken on trust, it is at least highly appropriate to begin to enquire into the role Gilbert played in the composition of the *Glossa ordinaria*. The present work could be seen as an approach in that direction. In the Gloss on Lamentations, to which his authorship is confirmed, one has a good point of departure in terms of judging the techniques of compilation employed by Gilbert, this *magnus philoophus* and *vir doctissimus*. Perhaps, then, the same way of treating source material can be discovered in other books of the Gloss, and more works may with some certainty be established as originating from Gilbert’s pen. We shall occupy ourselves with this pen in the following chapter.

52 Henry of Huntingdon; see Greenway (1996), pp. 610 and 478.
INTRODUCTION

Table 1: Gilbert the Universal: the course of his life

- **c. 1055–65** Born (conjecturally), in Brittany (Richard of Poitiers).
- **c. 1090** *claruit* ("became famous"), according to a note in Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek, 2° Ms. Theol. 6 (fol. 89r).
- **c. 1100** Pursued studies at Laon under Master Anselm, either as his pupil or his collaborator, or both. The *Glosa ordinaria* is undergoing compilation.
- **1110** The first actual mention of Gilbert, among the clergy in an act of the Abbey of Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire. Canon and schoolmaster at the cathedral of Saint-Etienne of Auxerre. Begins to call himself, or to be called, 'Universalis' sometime between 1110 and 1120.
- **1120** Witnesses a charter at Auxerre, signing himself 'Magister Guilbertus Universalis'. A few sources connect him with Lyon (John of Worcester) and Nevers (Henry of Huntingdon).
- **1125/26** In the winter he was at the Roman Curia, where he took part in the lawsuit between the archbishops of York and Canterbury. Showed himself both a theologian and a lawyer. As a protegé of Henry I of England, with the proceedings almost resulting in a royal victory to which Gilbert evidently contributed, the bishopric of London may have been his reward.
- **1127** Bishop of London *electus*.
- **1128** 22 January, consecrated Bishop of London: ‘vir probus et grandaevus’ (John of Worcester).
- **1129** Took part in the Council of London, establishing the feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin. Gilbert was ‘sufficienter instructus’ in the matter, having been canon at Lyon,53 where the feast was first introduced.
- **1128–34** Appears in several chronicles and records as Bishop of London.54
- **1134** 8 or 12 August: dies.

---

53 BISHOP (1918), pp. 243–45; see also WHARTON (1695), p. 51.
54 See SMALLEY (1935), pp. 246–47.
Table 2: Works attributed to Gilbert

Within the Glossa ordinaria:

The Gloss on the PENTATEUCH:
- GENESIS: the glosses, ‘Sicut Paulus per revelatione dicit’, ‘Divina Scriptura aliquando aeterna’, ‘Ut est in principio erat Verbum’, are, according to the manuscript Eton College, 48 (fol. 107) composed by Gilbert; see Stegmüller, RB, 2536.
- EXODUS: signed glosses to 6:16, 7:7, 19:7-8; interlinear gloss to Exodus 30:10; see Stegmüller, RB, 2537.
- LEVITICUS: a signed gloss on the Prologue; see Stegmüller, RB, 2538.
- NUMBERS: a signed gloss to 1:39; see Stegmüller, RB, 2539.
- DEUTERONOMY: signed glosses to 1:6, 1:19, 2:1, 10:4; see Stegmüller, RB, 2540.
- The Gloss on ISAIAH: see Stegmüller, RB, 2542 and 2565–68.
- The Gloss on JEREMIAH: see Stegmüller, RB, 2543; 2544,1; 2570–72.
- The Gloss on LAMENTATIONS: see Stegmüller, RB, 2544; 2544, 2; 2545 and infra.
- The Gloss on EZEKIEL: see Stegmüller, RB, 2546.
- The Gloss on the LESSER PROPHETS: see Stegmüller, RB, 2548 and 2575.

Books of the Gloss whose authorship is spuriously attributed to Gilbert:
- The Gloss on TOBIT, JUDITH and ESTHER: see Stegmüller, RB, 2561–63.
- The Gloss on JOB: see Stegmüller, RB, 2564.
- The Gloss on ECCLESIASTES: see Stegmüller, RB, 2564, 2.
- The Gloss on the SONG OF SONGS: see Stegmüller, RB, 2564, 3.
- The Gloss on ST MATTHEW: see Stegmüller, RB, 2576.

An abbreviated ‘gloss’ on the Old Testament (including Lamentations, heavily abbreviated from this Gloss) is found in the manuscript London, British Library, Royal 2 E VIII (Stegmüller, RB, 2549–60; 2564, 2568, 2569, 2573) and entitled (fol. 1r) ‘magister gilibertus super vetus testamentum’.

Other works:
In addition to this scholarly activity, which is restricted entirely to the framework of the Glossa ordinaria, Gilbert is held to have composed a continuous commentary on the Psalms, Glossula magistri G. Universalis super Psalterium, based on a similar work by Bruno the Carthusian. This text is extant in one manuscript only, Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, 17, fols 1–152, and covers Psalms 1:1–78:13; see Stegmüller, RB, 2541 and Smalley (1936), pp. 51–60.
CHAPTER 4

The Glossa ordinaria on Lamentations

4.1 LAMENTATIONS AND LAMENTATIONS EXEGESIS

Before proceeding with the primary purpose of the present work, the critical edition, in the present chapter the Glossa ordinaria in Lamentationes Ieremie prophete will be subject to a number of investigations: the first will describe how the text of this particular part of the Gloss is presented in the manuscripts: its general structure, how the page is laid out, the position and function of the different glosses, and so on. The second investigation pertains to the text itself: its sources and manner of composition. This will involve a textual comparison between the Gloss and its immediate source, the Expositio in Lamentationes Hieremiae of Paschasius Radbertus. The third treats the inherent rhetoric of the text. Before doing this, however, let us first say something about Lamentations and Lamentations exegesis in general.

The Lamentations, in Hebrew qînôt, 'elegies', or in Greek Threni, are a series of five poems mourning the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple in 587 BC. In the Septuagint, and subsequently in the Vulgate, they are appended to the book of the prophet Jeremiah, although the question of their true authorship is far from settled.1 Following an ancient Hebrew tradition, the five poems are in the Greek as well as the Latin translations preceded by a caption, which in the Vulgate reads: 'Et factum est, postquam in captivitatem redactus est Israel, et Ierusalem deserta est, sedit Ieremias propheta flens et planxit lamentatione hac in Ierusalem et amaro animo suspirans et eiulans dixit …'.2 In the original Hebrew, the first four

---

1 Today, the general assumption is that the five poems were not written by Jeremiah, but date from his lifetime, between 587 and 538 BC: see GOTTWALD (1954), p. 21.
2 On this, and a discussion of the attribution to Jeremiah, see PROU & VIDIER (1900–07), pp. 408–10. See also Vulg., Ed. maior, p. 285.
poems, or books, have an acrostic form. The first book follows the standard order of the Hebrew alphabet with 22 verses, the first verse beginning with *Aleph*, the last with *Tau*. In the second, third and fourth books, the letters *Ain* (no. 16) and *Phe* (no. 17) are reversed, though still with 22 verses; the third book, furthermore, makes each letter appear three times so that the full number of verses amounts to 66. The fifth book lacks the acrostic form but retains the basic structure of 22 verses. The Latin Vulgate translation does not maintain the acrostic form, but the Hebrew letters beginning each verse were kept as verse headings.

The Lamentations found a place in the liturgy of the Roman church. In Holy Week, when the suffering and death of Christ is ritually re-enacted, selections from all five books of Lamentations make up the lessons for the office of *Tenebrae*, the first nocturn of matins on Maundy Thursday, Good Friday and Holy Saturday.

Turning now to exegesis, it is surprising to find that there were apparently no proper Lamentations commentaries written before the ninth century. As related by Eusebius, Origen seems to have written something on Lamentations in his commentary on Jeremiah, but this piece of work was hardly known to the

---

3 In this edition, the biblical book of Lamentations will be treated as divided into five books, each book divided into a certain number of *verses* (22, or 66 in the case of the third book), while the Gloss on Lamentations is divided into the same five books, each book divided into 22 or 66 *chapters*, and each chapter consisting of a certain number of *lines*.

4 The alphabetical order is a peculiarity of Hebrew biblical poetry; it is encountered in different shapes in Psalms 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119 and 145, and in Proverbs 31:10 and Nahum 1:2–8: see PROU & VIDIER (1900–07), p. 408.

5 On Maundy Thursday, the three lessons of the first nocturn of matins are Lamentations 1:1–14; on Good Friday, Lamentations 2:8–15 and 3:1–9; and on Holy Saturday 3:22–30, 4:1–6 and 5:1–11. This order corresponds to the order found in the eighth-century manuscript Paris, BnF, lat. 740, fols 175v–179r, a Gallican lectionary from Saint-Martial in Limoges, which is the oldest extant witness to this tradition. Originally, this tradition or practice does not seem to have had its origins in Rome: see BISHOP (1918), p. 159. The office of *Tenebrae*, with its dramatic extinguishing of candles, is still observed in several churches and monasteries around the world.

6 Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 6, 24, 2 and 6, 25, 2, ed. SCHWARTZ (1908), pp. 572, 574.

7 Cassiodorus (*Inst.*, 1, 3, 3) mentions 45 homilies on Jeremiah by Origen, of which he has found 14 in Latin: ‘Hieremiam vero, qui “civitatis suae ruinas quadruplici alfabeto”, quadraginta quinque omelis Attico sermone Origenes exposuit; ex quibus xiiiis translatas inveni vobisque dereliqui.’ These were, however, hardly on Lamentations. Some of Origen’s exegesis on Lamentations survives in Byzantine patristic *catena*, an edition of one such being printed in PG 13, cols 606–62, under the heading ‘Ex Origene selecta in Threnos’. This text, however, has nothing to do with the Gloss on Lamentations.
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Latin world of the Middle Ages. It might have been known to St Jerome, but he seems not to have made any use of it in his own exegesis, particularly as he never wrote on Lamentations directly. He did, though, write in a letter to his friend Paula the few words that came to shape the understanding of the Hebrew poems as being written according to the classical rules of metre. Discussing biblical texts which make use of the Hebrew alphabet, he says about Lamentations:

habes et in Lamentationibus Hieremiae quattuor alphabeta, e quibus duo prima quasi Saffico metro scripta sunt, quia tres uersiculos, qui sibi conexi sunt et ab una tantum littera incipiunt, heroici comma concludit; tertium uero alphabetum trimetro scriptum est et a ternis litteris, sed eisdem, terni uersus incipiunt; quartum alphabetum simile est primo et secundo.

The idea of the four Hebrew alphabets and their supposed metricality was to become decisive for the subsequent interpretation of the five poems of Lamentations. Although not preserved in Jerome’s Latin translation of the Bible, the concealed metricity of Lamentations was alluring to the medieval commentators. Crucial for the later medieval interpretation of Lamentations was, furthermore, the fact related by the author of the Pseudo-Jerome commentary mentioned above (note 9), that each Hebrew letter was believed to possess a certain meaning:

sed interpres [i.e. St Jerome], qui transtulit eas de Hebraeo in Latinum, noluit moras innectere, ut hoc observaret, sed tantummodo elementa litterarum in principio posuit, quia sensus sententiae ex interpretatione litterae pendet.

Although not able to preserve the supposed metre of the poems, Jerome was able to retain this meaning of the individual letters and put them as headings at the beginning of each verse, as ‘the sense of the passage depends on the interpretation of the letter’ – the interpretation of each verse is dependent upon the allegorical meaning of its respective letter. Jerome gives us the full catalogue in his letter 30 to Paula:

8 See epistula 33, 4, where, among other works of Origen, he mentions ‘in Lamentationes Hieremiae tomos V’.
9 The brief commentary on the first chapter of Lamentations printed in PL 25, cols 787–92, among the work of Pseudo-Jerome, is most probably not from the great translator’s pen. On this text, and its importance to the Gloss on Lamentations, see below, section 4.3.1.
11 See for instance prothema no. VI of this edition.
Apart from this brief exposition, the first substantial exegesis upon any part of Lamentations was made by Gregory the Great in his *Moria in Iob*, where there are at least seventeen references to Lamentations, all of them expounded at some length.14 Widely known to the Carolingian world, Gregory’s *Moria* naturally influenced the first known piece of Latin Lamentations exegesis proper, which was performed by Hraban Maur (†856); he was the first to treat the entire text of Lamentations,15 which he did by devoting the last three books of his commentary on Jeremiah to the five poems.16 Apart from occasional quotations and allusions notably from Gregory’s indirect exegesis on Lamentations, ‘the greater part of Hrabanus’ exposition of Lamentations … comes from his own pen’.17

### 4.1.1 Paschasius Radbertus

Written only a few years after the appearance of Hraban’s commentary, and relying partly upon it, the *Expositio in Lamentationes Hieremiae* of Paschasius Radbertus (†c. 860)18 is the first treatment of the poems as an individual work; the Benedictine abbot of Corbie was the first to make the deliberate choice to comment on Lamentations, and Lamentations only, a text he obviously found worthy of theological interest in itself. Radbert’s commentary was to serve as a model for all western Lamentations exegesis to follow, not least for the Gloss, as we shall see presently. Although he states in his preface that he undertakes the endeavour of expounding Lamentations, ‘… licet neminem Latinorum

---

14 Ed. ADRIAEN (1979); see MATTER (1982), p. 137.
15 Hraban’s exegetical work is vast: he commented on the Greater Prophets, all of the Old Testament historical books, Judith and Esther, Wisdom and Ecclesiastes, Maccabees, the Gospels of Matthew and John, the Acts and the Pauline Epistles. Most of his works are still in manuscript; see the lists in STEGMÜLLER, *RB*, nos 7021–77.
16 PL 111, cols 1182–1272.
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legerim explanasse Threnos’, Radbert’s major source (at least for the first and second book) was the commentary of Hraban Maur, his anterior by forty years. This is obvious even from a cursory comparison of the two; they give at times the same biblical quotations, at times the same passages from Gregory the Great, and occasionally Radbert quotes Hraban verbatim, albeit without mentioning his source.

Radbert’s commentary builds on the multiple interpretation of Scripture; towards the end of his lengthy introduction, he explains that he has decided to expound Lamentations in relation to three times – the past, the present and the future – as well as with regard to three types of desolation: that of the city, that of the Church and that of the human soul. Each verse of Lamentations is then explained according to its historical, allegorical and tropological meaning, often in the light of St Jerome’s allegorical interpretation of the Hebrew letters. The second sense, however, is occasionally termed ‘spiritualiter’, ‘secundum anagogen’ or simply ‘mystice’. The sometimes obscure text of Lamentations is often elucidated by means of other passages from the Bible. As Ann Matter has pointed out, the biblical books most frequently quoted are those of the liturgical round of monastic life: the Psalms, of course, and the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, the Apocalypse and the Song of Songs.

In the introductory chapter, the Song of Songs is contrasted with Lamentations; just as the book of Solomon, a fountain-head of joy and rejoicing, is called the Song of Songs, the mourning song of Jeremiah is called the Lamentations of Lamentations. The first four books are treated from Aleph to Tau. The fifth is taken as a summary of the preceding books and is, as Radbert says in the preface to this book, ‘according to the laws of rhetoric’ (p. 310, lines 5–6), acting as a sort of peroration or conclusion to the whole.

4.1.2 Post-Carolingian Lamentations exegesis

Between Radbert’s commentary and the twelfth century, no commentaries on Lamentations seem to have been written. None of the intervening compilers or commentators of the 1050s connecting the Carolingians to the ‘moderns’, discussed above (in chapter 2) with reference to other glossed books of the Bible, was concerned with Lamentations. In the twelfth century, however, the

20 On this method of exegesis, see De Lubac (1959). See also the section on the fourfold interpretation of Scripture as described in Hraban Maur’s Enarrationes in epistolas Pauli 15, 4 (PL 112, col. 331).
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situation is reversed, and there is an explosion of Lamentations commentaries. Those preserved to this day are the *Tropologiae*, moral reflections on Lamentations by Guibert de Nogent († 1124);22 a commentary by Guillaume de Flay (fl. c. 1120);23 another one by Hervé de Bourg-Dieu († 1150);24 the *Adnotationes elucidatoriae* of Hugh of St Victor († 1141);25 a commentary on Lamentations by Peter the Chanter († 1197), which is in fact an abbreviation of the Gloss on Lamentations;26 and other commentaries written by Rupert of Deutz (fl. c. 1130)27 and William of Malmesbury († 1142).28 On the threshold of this sudden period of prosperity stands, of course, Gilbert the Universal’s Gloss on Lamentations.

The twelfth century seems indeed to have brought with it a sudden interest in unveiling the mysteries of the book of Lamentations. Was it due to the fact that the book had been so little treated before? That it was believed to contain truths hidden beneath its obumbrate language? Has it anything to do with the flourishing interchange with Jewish scholars? Was it accountable to the special treatment it had received by the great glossator of Scripture, Gilbert the Universal? Or was he too following a general trend? Only a thorough investigation and comparison of the extant commentaries and their sources will be able to answer these questions. Unfortunately this is not the place for such an examination, and the present work must principally consist of a critical

23 Preserved in the manuscript Paris, BnF, lat. 575 (saec. xii), fols 1–123. On this commentary and its author, see Gilbert DAHAN (1978), especially pp. 48–50.
25 PL 175, cols 255–322. Hugh’s authorship of this work has recently been contested; see MOORE (1998).
26 The text is extant *inter alia* in the manuscript London, British Library, Royal 2 C VIII, fols 174–85; very much shorter than the Gloss on Lamentations, this text, consists of a mixture of the contents of marginal and interlinear glosses, and ends with the words ‘Gillebertus antisiodorensis diaconus exponens lamentationum ieremie ordinavit’ [sic]. According to STEGMÜLLER, *RB*, 6487, the same text can be found in the manuscripts Chartres, Bibliothèque municipale, 179 and 201, and Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 178. See below, section 5.1, note 2.
27 CCCM 23.
28 Preserved in the manuscript Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodl. 868, fols 1–126 (saec. xii, England). As the author himself writes in an introductory letter on fol. 1r, he has based his commentary on Radbertus, ‘Ex omni igitur materiarum copia elegisti mihi lamentationes ieremie prophete … Sed cum inopis sensus conscius altum carum pelagus ingredi pavitarem, vix ab aliquo priorum nodatum, aede ut nec beatissimus eronimus eas attigerit, qui ceteros omnes prophetas exponit, paschasium R<adbertum> carum expositionem obiecisti petens ut cum tibi abbreviarem’.

56
4. The Glossa ordinaria on Lamentations

edition of the text. What can be done, though, after briefly having examined the aforementioned commentaries, is to state that Gilbert the Universal depends in no way on any of the other twelfth century commentaries. In editing his own exposition, he headed straight for the Carolingian commentary by Paschasius Radbertus.

4.2 The Gloss on Lamentations: External Aspects

The external aspects of the Gloss on Lamentations include both the parts constituting the text as a whole, and those that make up each page. In this section, the question of its author and date of composition will also be briefly touched upon.

4.2.1 A description of the Gloss on Lamentations

The Gloss on Lamentations fundamentally follows the structure of the biblical book of Lamentations, that is, the division into five books, the number of verses to each book, and so on. In most manuscripts, the exposition proper of the text is preceded by eleven prefaces, called prothemenata, nine of which are composed from the corresponding introductory chapter of Radbert's commentary. One of these prothemenata (no. III in the present edition) is augmented by an argument on the mystic significance of the number four, taken from Radbert's preface to book four; two are glosses by Gilbert the Universal himself, both on the inherent rhetoric of Lamentations and the use made of it by the redactor.

In the manuscript tradition, the number of prothemenata is stable and is subject to little variation in comparison to other books of the Gloss. There are, as a matter of fact, only two slight variations in the manuscripts: first, prothema X is occasionally found – probably on account of the repetition of the lemma with which it begins – as a marginal gloss to chapter one, Aleph, and is sometimes headed epilogus (as in the manuscript Paris, BnF, lat. 2578, our Pa);

29 The manuscripts used for the present edition are all duly described in detail in section 5.3 below.
30 The term has been adopted from the editio princeps and seems to be generally accepted for denoting prefaces to the different books of the Glossa ordinaria; see for example ZIER (1993), p. 6.
31 The prothema is, in fact, not improved by Gilbert to form an ‘independent argument’ as SMALLEY thought: (1935), p. 252.
second, the manuscripts of the second recension unite the end of prothema II and the beginning of prothema III to form one sentence, and thereby mould them into one section (‘et Ieremias precipue sub quadrato celci cardine …’). ³³ The prothemata are regularly written in two columns, occasionally only one, and sometime three. Each section is either headed by the name of its supposed author, Paschasius or Gislebertus, or not headed at all. The size of the script of the prothemata is usually about the same as that used for the marginal glosses, occasionally somewhat larger.

After the prothemata, there follows the exposition proper of the Bible text, divided into five books according to the original structure of Lamentations. Each verse begins with the Hebrew letter, the interpretation of which, following St. Jerome, forms the basis of the exegesis on that verse: ‘Aleph interpretatur “doctrina”’, etc. The text excerpted from Radbert forms the basis of the marginal glosses; these glosses are headed, according to the type of interpretation it contains, Paschasius historice, allegoric, moraliter, etc., with slight grammatical variations among the manuscripts, i.e. one manuscript may more or less consistently write allegoria instead of the usual allegoric. The commentary is shaped in the following fashion.

4.2.2 Elements of the glossed page

The format of glossed manuscripts in general was discussed in chapter 2 above. What was said there will here be expounded and treated in detail with particular regard to the Gloss on Lamentations. See plates I–IV for reference.

4.2.2.1 The Bible text

In the manuscripts, the Bible text forms the natural centre of each page, written in larger script down a central column. Marginal glosses surround it; interlinear glosses are interwoven between its lines.

4.2.2.2 The marginal gloss

By adhering to one major source only, the Gloss on Lamentations differs from other glossed biblical books, which are generally compiled from a wide range of various auctoritates. In the absence of other material, our redactor has made extensive use of his source, which makes the marginal glosses longer, and not so easy to confuse with the interlinear or middle ones, which could easily happen in other books of the Gloss, where the marginal glosses to a greater

³³ For a detailed description of the first and second recensions, see below, chapter 5.
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degree have the shape of extracts or abstracts of varying length from various sources.\(^3_4\)

The marginal gloss is placed in either the inner or the outer margin, and if of some length, it sometimes, according to the relevant gloss format, extends in an L-shape around the biblical text column, sometimes via a *signe-de-renvoi* continuing onto another page. Normally, the marginal glosses would be positioned at the side of the biblical text being glossed, for direct reference. With Lamentations, however, where the marginal glosses are longer than the standard, the scribes of the manuscripts have not been able to uphold this practice, and lemmata linking marginal gloss to biblical text have been introduced, as in the following example:

7, 21–22 ET RECORDATA EST IERUSALEM &c: Non recordatur ad consolationem DESIDERABILium SUORUM sed ad multiplicandum dolorem ... The beginning of the biblical passage commented upon is repeated as a heading. The marginal gloss is in this case an expository text, either historical, allegorical or tropological, that is tied to at least one biblical lemma, which it aims to expound and comment upon. Above all, it is the text of the marginal glosses, constituting the bulk of the work, that has been adapted from the Lamentations commentary of Paschasius Radbertus, whereas the interlinear glosses are either the work of Gilbert’s own hand or, as we shall see, taken from another source.

4.2.2.3 The interlinear gloss

Shorter than the marginal glosses, the interlinear gloss is written between the lines of the biblical lemma, explaining a single word or phrase rather than a larger portion of text. Occasionally, however, an interlinear gloss comments on a larger portion of text. In some cases, an interlinear gloss can be quite long, as with that to the biblical text ‘NON EST QUI CONSOLETUR EAM’:

2, 8–10 Hoc proprium ad ultimam captivitatem pertinet. Ex tunc enim nec principes habuerunt nec sacerdotes. In Babilone autem consolatores habuerunt: Danielem, Ezechiel: et alios multos.

As for their contents, in chapters 1–10, 12–13, 17 and 21, a number of interlinear glosses have been picked up from the anonymous Lamentations commentary printed by Migne under the name of Pseudo-Jerome.\(^3_5\)


\(^3_5\) PL 25, cols 787–92. On this text, see further below, section 4.3.1.
Occasionally, the contents of an interlinear gloss have been picked up from a corresponding marginal one (examples are verses 3, 7–11 and 3, 20–24). It has sometimes been said that while the marginal glosses explain whole passages, the interlinear explain the single words of the text. In fact, they ought to be seen as a whole; the shorter glosses were put between the lines out of convenience. Their role was perhaps to provide a support for the memory when teaching, or for quick references in lectures, both for teacher and students.

4.2.2.4 The ‘middle’ glosses

Apart from the ordinary interlinear and marginal glosses, a third type of gloss can be discerned, which type I have chosen to call ‘middle gloss’, quite simply because it is longer than an interlinear gloss and shorter than a marginal one. Whereas the first two types have their fixed position on the page, either in the margin or between the lines, this gloss might vary in position from manuscript to manuscript, here in the margin, there between the lines of the Bible text; hence ‘middle’ gloss. A typical example is:

2, 18–20 OMNES AMICI EIUS SPREVERUNT EAM: Similiter ecclesia non numquam pro peccatis suis afflictur et contemptur tam ab interioribus inimicis quam ab exterioribus.

Among these middle glosses are found the Ciceronian rhetorical loci of which Gilbert himself speaks in prothema no. XI, and which he has spread throughout the work as ‘seeds of rhetoric’ to provide the acute and penetrating reader with a means to understand the inherent rhetorical qualities of Lamentations:

2, 15–17 PLORANS PLORAVIT: Quartus locus questionis, per quem res turpes et humiles et indignae patientibus proferuntur, qui hic sepe et sepissime frequentantur.

To these loci rhetorici we have due reason to return below, in section 4.4.

---

36 This seems to be a common practice for the Gloss in its entirety; see SMALLEY (1936), p. 26: ‘In many cases, the Interlinear [gloss] appears to be drawn from the same source as the marginal.’ In this view, she agrees with GLUNZ (1933), pp. 216–17. The two types of glosses were probably not compiled at different times, but the one made use of the other and vice versa.

37 ‘Rethorica semina’; the expression is Gilbert’s own, taken from a rhetorical gloss of his in book 3.
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4.2.3 The question of the date

Thus the commentary runs throughout the five books to the end, with the glosses on the final strophe of the last verse of book 5, ‘iratus es contra nos vehementer’. This is followed by the colophon, which in most manuscripts reads:

Sufficiant hec ad expositionem lamentationum Ieremie, que de patrum fontibus hausi ego Gislebertus Autisiodorensis ecclesie diachonus.

As was discussed in chapters 2 and 3 above, the Gloss on Lamentations is the only work that with certainty can be attributed to Gilbert the Universal, as is understood from this colophon. At present, this is our only means of trying to date the Gloss on Lamentations; the author still appears as deacon at Auxerre when finishing his work, and does not call himself by his later epithet ‘Universalis’, which, as was mentioned above (section 3.1), he used at least from 1120 onwards. This may perhaps imply that this part of the Gloss was finished some time before 1120, which time fits rather well with Gilbert’s teaching at Auxerre and his time at the Papal Curia in 1125/26 and his going to London in 1128. The earliest extant manuscript with the Gloss on Lamentations, our K, was copied in Riechenberg in present-day Germany in 1131; this date, together with the time it took for texts to travel, speaks for this particular part of the Gloss being finished and on the market at least before c. 1125, and probably even earlier.

4.3 The sources to the Gloss on Lamentations

Smalley viewed the expression in the colophon above, ‘que de patrum fontibus hausi’, as rather pretentious, ‘seeing that Radbert was apparently Gilbert’s only source’.

This is not the whole truth: Radbert is evidently Gilbert’s major source, but he is not the only one. For the major part of the commentary, he has used him exclusively, rewriting and abbreviating, polishing and omitting. Radbert’s commentary is the basis of the marginal glosses. He is always present; it is his text that is remodelled, as is seen most directly in the headings to each marginal gloss: ‘Paschaisius historice’, ‘Paschaisius allegorice’, and so on. But while constituting the backbone of the exposition, the marginal gloss is not all.

39 Interestingly, the Gloss on St Matthew, also based on a commentary by Paschaisius Radbertus, seems to have been compiled in a like manner; see Weisweiler (1960).
The interlinear, not to mention the middle glosses, are integral parts of the Gloss and contain important exegesis and comments. For the former, one major source is the exposition of the first book of Lamentations printed by Migne among the works of Pseudo-Jerome (see below, section 4.3.1). For the latter, the rhetorical works of Cicero, especially the *De inventione*, are fundamental (see below, section 4.4). With this in mind, the expression of the colophon, albeit a standard phrase, is perhaps not so pretentious after all. The independent employment of additional sources such as Cicero and Pseudo-Jerome rather modifies Smalley’s restrictive opinion related above. As we shall see presently, this was not the work of someone merely compiling and choosing excerpts, but of a conscious and careful scholar with the ambition to render the important implications to be drawn from Lamentations in a proper way.

Adhering closely to the exposition of Radbert’s commentary, the sources, both biblical and others, are substantially the same in Gilbert and Radbert, which is due to the fact that Gilbert derived his information from Radbert and not directly from the older sources. St Jerome, St Gregory the Great and St Isidore are present, as well as Hraban Maur and Flavius Josephus. Allusions are occasionally made to works of St Augustine, St Benedict and the Venerable Bede, but also to classical authors such as Persius and Pliny. At the same time, there are sources, both biblical and non-biblical, that were not used by Radbert but appear in Gilbert’s text. Pseudo-Jerome and Cicero have already been mentioned; allusions are made at least also to Remigius of Auxerre. The use of the sources will be evident from the *index locorum Sacrae Scripturae* and the *index auctorum et locorum similium* of the present critical edition, where sources used by Gilbert and not Radbert are specially noted.

### 4.3.1 Pseudo-Jerome

A number of interlinear glosses have been drawn from a treatise ascribed to Pseudo-Jerome, and printed in Migne’s *Patrologia Latina* under that name. Migne thought the treatise ‘certe videri Bedae’. Recent research suggests that

---

40 PL 25, cols 787–92.
42 On Flavius Josephus, see BLATT (1958), pp. 9–16.
43 The commentary is, according to STEGMÜLLER, RB, 3423 and 8565, extant in two twelfth-century manuscripts, Barcelona, Cathedral 64 and Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 4. 6. The latter is described in ROBINSON (1988), p. 36, where it is dated to between c. 1130 and 1145.
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the Pseudo-Jerome who wrote for instance the pseudo-Hieronymian *Quaestiones* on the book of Samuel was a converted Jew living c. 800. It is far from settled, though, whether this particular Pseudo-Jerome is the same as the one who wrote the commentary on Lamentations of PL 25.

The text in question is a commentary on the first book of Lamentations, building upon the interpretation of the Hebrew letters as prescribed by St Jerome. Each verse is commented upon quite briefly, and the four remaining books are dismissed with the words ‘Expositio unius alphabeti ordine, reliquias qui sequuntur, codem sensu sunt intelligendi: ideoque dignum duximus non esse necessarium idipsum per singulos repetere’.45

As a matter of fact, the exegetical contents are rather similar to those of the Gloss, and thus to Radbert. The text of Pseudo-Jerome was probably procured with one eye to Radbert and, as there are passages in Pseudo-Jerome that are not extant in Radbert’s text, the other to another source, or do these non-Radbertian passages stem from Pseudo-Jerome himself. In any case was the text of Pseudo-Jerome not compiled from the Gloss, as the relevant passages in the Gloss are of an abbreviated character in comparison with the text of Pseudo-Jerome. The latter’s brief work was used by the redactor of the Gloss on Lamentations, especially to provide material for the interlinear glosses, for example:46

\[
\text{PSEUDO-HIERONYMUS} \\
1, 2 (7888) \\
Haec verba proprie ad ultimam vastationem pertinent, post quam non habuerunt ullum principem. Nam in Babyloniae captivitate habuerunt Danielem et socios ejus, Ezechielem et alios multos.
\]

\[
\text{GILBERTUS} \\
2, 8–10 \\
Hoc proprie ad ultimam captivitatem pertinet. Ex tunc enim nec principes habuerunt nec sacerdotes. In Babilone autem consolatores habuerunt: Danielem, Ezechielem et alios multos.
\]

Further interlinear glosses the contents of which are derived from the treatise of Pseudo-Jerome may be found in chapters 1–10, 12–13, 17 and 21. For exact references, see the *apparatus fontium* and the *index auctorum et locorum similium* of the present edition.

---

44 See Saltman (1975), especially pp. 11–29.
45 PL 25, col. 792.
46 References to the text of the present edition are of two types: the prothemata are indicated with a Roman numeral (I–XI) followed by a line number, and a chapter, or verse, of the expository text in book one by its (Arabic) number (1–22) followed by line number. See further chapter 6 below.
Even more interesting is the occurrence in some (early) manuscripts of the Gloss on Lamentations of some 5–10 additional prothemata, some of which derive from the treatise of Pseudo-Jerome. On these, see further below, section 5.4.3.

4.3.2 Redactorial technique: a comparison with Paschasius Radbertus

In Gilbert’s Gloss on Lamentations, there are many differences from the source text. When compiling one text from another, one might perhaps expect it to be a question of the mere copying of passages. Gilbert does not content himself with that, but, although making almost exclusive use of his source, treats it independently. In this section, we shall see how Gilbert treats his original – where he abbreviates and how, where he changes the words, their cases and inflection, and, more rarely, the sense – in short: his redactorial technique. In this study, the investigation will be limited to the prothemata and the first book.47 Later, in section 4.4, we shall investigate the inherent emphasis on rhetoric.

This is not an exhaustive study, nor is it intended to overshadow the primary editorial purpose of the present work, but is rather an attempt to describe the relationship between Gilbert and his major source, showing the sometimes dramatic alterations effected in the rewrit.

The passages from Radbert’s exposition are taken from the edition of Dom Beda Paulus and referred to by means of book, chapter and line number (within brackets). Paulus’s edition is not syntactically punctuated, except on a handful of occasions, and I have refrained from introducing such a punctuation here. The sumptuous italicising of quotations and allusions in Paulus’s edition is, for the sake of clarity, not retained here. Passages from the present edition are duly punctuated and referred to by means of chapter and line number. Radbert is in the left column, Gilbert in the right. The orthography of the Radbert edition has otherwise been retained.

In the examples to follow, common text is set in roman type, with the exception of biblical quotations, which in both texts are set in italic; biblical

---

47 Further comparisons, including examples from the other four books not treated here, shed more light on the relationship of Radbert and Gilbert. The issue will be more fully developed in an article, ‘From propheta plangens to rhetor divinus: The Rhetoric of Threnody in Gilbert the Universal’s Gloss on Lamentations’, in the forthcoming volume Sapientia et Eloquenitia: Meaning and Function in Liturgical Poetry, Music, Drama and Biblical Commentary in the Middle Ages, ed. Gunilla IVERSEN.
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lemmata are set in SMALL CAPITALS. Agreements between Gilbert and his source are marked by bold face.

The following examples, which have been chosen arbitrarily and indiscriminately with regard to the three levels of exposition, will serve to demonstrate four loose categories of different renderings of the original. Various redactorial devices are used in all four categories: abbreviation, omission, rewriting and glossing.

4.3.2.1 Cases of abbreviation, omission and rewriting

The first aspect we will deal with is perhaps the most obvious: that of abbreviation. The fact has several times been stressed that Gilbert abbreviated his original. But in what way are these abbreviations made? Is it possible to trace any particular idea or method behind the obviously abbreviated passages? Let us begin with the very first section of the Gloss on Lamentations, prothema no. I, and its Radbertian counterpart, where the book of Lamentations is compared with the Song of Songs, the ultimate song of joy against the ultimate song of mourning:

**RADBERTUS**


**GILBERTUS**


Here, the primary difference consists in Gilbert reducing the prolixity of the original’s prose, though still retaining the general sense. Furthermore, two
words have been changed: abscessus has become absentia and magnis has been changed to multimodis.\textsuperscript{48}

An example of yet heavier abbreviation is the following passage on the soul who weeps in the night, that is in the blindness of her own sins:

**RADBERTUS**  
1, 2 (357–63) Ceterum iuxta tropologiam anima bene plorans plorat in nocte quae se intelligit caecitate delictorum suorum undique obfuscari. Quam sane peccati noctem idem propheta longe superius satis exsecreat et deplorat. De qua Iob ille dolens: Sit noc inquit ilia solitaria nec laude digna. Quando haec namque nocte anima inuolutur merito plorans plorare perhibetur et hoc non suo arbitrio sed Domini gratia.

In addition to reducing the prose to about a third, the redactor has chosen to alter the word delictorum into peccatorum, and to introduce a slight change of expression: he writes miserante Domino, an ablative absolute, instead of the ablative of cause Domini gratia. The soul weeps not thanks to her own merits, but to God’s. The sense of the passage is retained, but it is expressed in fewer words.

The following longer passage is heavily abbreviated from the source, which has induced the redactor also to change the vocabulary to fit the shorter form.

**RADBERTUS**  
1, 21 (1811–31) Nulli dubium quod omnes inimici Iudaeorum Isaia teste laetati sunt in eorum uastatione. Maxime quod uidebant eos Dei auxilio et consolatione destitutos de quo prius plurimum gloriebantur. Quia profecto Hierusalem sic sita erat inter hostes quasi nauis inter medios maris fluctus. A quibus quam sepe propellebantur tamen numquam

**GILBERTUS**  
2, 64–66 plorans ploravit in nocte: Anima, scilicet, in peccatorum caecitate, de qua dicitur: Sit noc illa solitaria nec laude digna. Sed non plorat suo arbitrio sed miserante Domino …

**GILBERTUS**  
21, 15–22 Gentes Ierusalem circumfusas captivitati eis insulasse non est, qui ambiguat. Desitutam enim Dei auxilio gaudebant, cui inter tot

\textsuperscript{48} It should be noted that when words of the source text are discussed, if not stated otherwise, no alternative manuscript readings exist according to the critical apparatus of the edition of PAULUS (1988).
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In this section, practically nothing remains the same. The contents, although basically corresponding, are described in less detail. Many references to existing places and occurrences – Cyrus and Babylon in particular – are omitted in the redaction, thus making the contents more generally applicable. Most important, though, is perhaps the different rendering of the final phrase, 'he speaks in the manner of those', etc., which will be treated below, in section 4.4. The section above is not so much cut into than abbreviated; the sense is retained, albeit expressed with fewer words. However, the boundaries between abbreviation and omission are not great as will be obvious from the following.

Occasionally, large portions of text are omitted. In the next piece, however, several words have also been exchanged, and a shift of aspect is introduced:
The verb *nascitur* has been replaced by *compungitur*, which is strengthened by *baptizatur*, which is said to occur by the means of her own tears. It is a new concept that is introduced: compunction must occur prior to the cleansing of tears, this self-inflicted baptism, which originates with the contrition of the heart, notions central to the theology of conversion, as developed by St Augustine. Furthermore, there is a shift of protagonist from Church to prophet, with the latter being the subject to *plorans ploravit*; in Radbert's text, it is the Church. Obviously, the whole section on *vita vivere* and *gaudio gaudere* and the relation of these expressions to *plorans plorare* has been abandoned. The expressions are of course Hebraisms, but as every word of Sacred scripture has to be accounted for, in Latin exegesis they obtain some importance. *De fonte* *intus* has been altered to the more dramatic and at the same time more concrete *de fonte cordis*. Finally, a change of aspect occurs with the change of the perfect participle of *reformatus* to the gerundive *reformandus*: the outward man in Radbert's text is cleansed, already ‘reshaped to his former self’, while in Gilbert's, he is, before his cleansing, ‘needing to be reshaped’. Radbert's more distanced text relates to a hypothetical case, while in Gilbert's version, the situation becomes more manifest and personal.
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4.3.2.2 Cases of reinterpretation

The following passages are all examples of different types of rewriting. A rather common feature in Gilbert's adaptation, not at all as frequent in Radbert's text, is the use of quasi or quasi dicat, followed by a faithful paraphrase or interpretation of the text, whereby the sense of the source text is abbreviated and reshaped into a fictional quotation, or makes the implicit meaning of the biblical text explicit, as in the following:

**Radbertus**
1, 5 (591–94) HEE siquidem ista interpretatur. Et est sensus quia relatiuum uel demonstratiuum est quod ista sunt iudicia adimpleta quae Moyses olim si peccauissent Domino comminabat.

**Gilbertus**
5, 25–27 Propterea preponitur He littera, que interpretatur 'ista', quasi dicat: 'Ista sunt iudicia, que Dominus olim per Moysen preixerat.'

Moses becomes, furthermore, the passive instrument of God – per Moysen – instead of the active utterer of his threats, as in Radbert.

Sometimes, as in the example below, a seemingly simple sentence can be made yet more simple by means of new words, added clarity and a slight shift of emphasis:

**Radbertus**
1, 5 (623–25) Alioquin si non suadentes misera infelixque anima prius audisset hostes nequaquam IN CAPITE essent.

**Gilbertus**
5, 41–43 Si enim misera anima vigilanter animadvertisset, HOSTES male suadentes IN CAPITE esse non permisisset.

The adverb vigilanter is added to stress animadvertisset – changed from audisset – and the hostes are no longer only suadentes but male suadentes. The enemies, furthermore, have in the second part of the clause changed from being subjects to become objects to the altered verbal construction: the simple essent, with hostes as subject, has become esse non permisisset with anima as subject.

In the next example, the sense has been widened by means of another category of people, canonici, a state in the ecclesiastical hierarchy not as common in the days of Radbert as in the later Middle Ages, but of particular interest to Gilbert, as he himself, as 'Autisio dorensis ecclesie diachonus', probably belonged to the chapter of Auxerre.

49 For an outline of the history of the canonici regulares in the early Middle Ages, and the difference between them and Benedictine monachi, see Dickinson (1950), pp. 12–25.
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RADBERTUS
1, 7 (781–84) Quod ualde monachis precauendum uei his qui saeculi actibus uacare uidentur ne forte uanis occupentur studiis et eorum sabbata non solum ab interno reprobentur iudice uerum derideantur ab hostibus.

GILBERTUS
7, 60–62 Quod canonici, monachis et omnibus, qui Dei vacant ministeris, valde cavendum, ne non solum ab interno iudice sabbata eorum reprobentur sed etiam ab hostibus rideantur.

What has to be watched out for (referred to by the initial quod) are the illicit thoughts of leisure, of which, according to Radbert, not only monks, but also those who are devoted to the ‘ways of the world’ (the Benedictine saeculi actibus), must be wary. This is, rather surprisingly, replaced in Gilbert’s version by Dei vacant ministeris, ‘those who are devoted to the ministry of God’. Furthermore, the hateful ‘vain studies’ of Radbert are entirely dispensed with in Gilbert’s text.

As will be obvious from the apparatus fontium in the present edition, many interlinear glosses in Gilbert’s text derive from the Lamentations commentary ascribed to Pseudo-Jerome. Occasionally, however, a passage in Radbert’s text has inspired or become an interlinear or middle gloss. The latter is the case in the following section:

RADBERTUS
1, 4 (483–88) Sicque iure lugere VIAE SION planguntur quatinus iuste Dei offensa contigisse eodem in populo intellegatur et tabularum quadrata intromittitur species secundum anagogen quod DELETH littera sonare dicitur. DELETH namque tabularum interpretatur. Quarum denique officio ecclesiae domus connexa quadrato culmine consurgit culmine.

GILBERTUS
4, 12–14 DELETH: Tabularum quadrata introducitur species secundum anagogen. Harum officio domus Dei connexa quadrato culmine consurgit, viis, scilicet, portis, sacerdotibus, virginitibus.

That the house has become the house of the Lord instead of the house of the Church is not a major issue; neither is the exchange of the synonyms intromittitur and introducitur. Interesting, though, is the additional explanation of the four ‘anagogical’ species within the genus tabularum, to which no counterpart is to be found in Radbert. Gilbert explains that the tabulae that support the house of the Lord are ‘the ways, gates, priests and virgins’.
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The following example, originally from St Jerome and subsequently used by Hraban Maur, again taken up by Radbert, is, in the end, to be rewritten with admirable clarity by Gilbert:

**RADBERTUS**

1, 8 (824–30) *Volens scribas et phariseos ostendere quos idem propheta exactores appellarat non magistros nec non et supra inluses qui propter munera quae excecant etiam sapientes non solum peccatores in populo non corripiebant uerum pro diuiniis atque sui commodis magnis efferebant laudibus. Et hinc e contrario **plebs delinquens beatos vocabat eos et columnnas domus Dei** ac cetera quae solent adulatoros proferre.

The original section on the tax-collectors and mockers and people who rejoice because of their riches is simply reduced to *qui lucri causa peccantem populum dicebant beatum*. Furthermore, the original adolators of Radbert, have in Gilbert begun to ‘despise each other having put their faith in low flattery’ which is missing in the source.

In the next example, a heavily abbreviated passage is combined with a newly added section supported by a biblical quotation (Mt 6:6) not in the source text:

**RADBERTUS**

1, 10 (1066–73) *… auferunt omnia** uirtutum ornamenta*. Nonnumquam uero primum *fides* enuerat Deique iudicia auferth thesaurus totius maiestatis Dei euacuat utrum mouet exactuit uirius. Deinde dum mens deliberat pulsantibus utrum aperiat quandoque spem immutat et pro spe sacram omnium inuisibilium quae non uidentur et creduntur futurae poenitentiae *spem* repromittit sibi carnalis delectatio iam inlecta. Sicque quasi securior anima primum *caritate* Dei ac proximi suique expolitatur.

**GILBERTUS**

8, 24–27 *Scribe scilicet et pharisei, qui lucri causa peccantem populum dicebant beatum, et everso **plebs delinquens beatos vocabat eos et columnnas in domo Dei**, sed modo invicem se spernunt, qui adulationibus crediderunt.*

**GILBERTUS**

10, 34–37 *… auferunt virtutum ornamenta — fides, spem, caritatem, discretionem &c. Quod iustus iudex fieri permittit, quia videt GENTES, pravas, scilicet, suggestiones, cogitationes et voluptates, INGRESSAS SANCTUARIUM anime, que debit ostium claudere et in cubiculo Patrem orare.*

---
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The virtue *discretio* (and ‘others’) specified by the quotation from St Matthew is furthermore added to the list of the three theological virtues enumerated by Radbert.

In a long passage, exuberant in its rhetorical style, Gilbert alters several words and adds some more of his own, to make the passage even more fluent:

**Radbertus**


**Gilbertus**

12, 45–55 *O vos omnes &c: Quia alia sunt, que pro his doleo, alia, que ab his, qui intus vel foris sunt, tolero. A patria differor, in exilio moror. Attendite ergo, quamvis ad braviurn vos indefessa rapiat devotio. Vide te dolorem meum. Filios educare volui et educere de miseria exilii et perducere ad gaudia celii, sed multi aberrant, multi exasperant, multi languent, pauci sunt, qui venire curent. Omnibus omnia sum, ut omnes lucrifaciam. Pro omnibus lugeo, pro omnibus uror. Vide te, ergo, si est dolor sicut dolor meus; Tendite oculum mentis ad extremitu tempus iudicii et videte, quoniam vindemivit, id est 'vindemiabit', me Dominus in die furoris sui, de quo dicitur: Domine, ne in furore tuo arguas me &c, UT LOCUTUS EST, quoniam reddet unicuique secundum opera sua.*
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The initial *ingemisco* is in Gilbert’s rendering changed to *doleo*. In the dramatic expression *A patria differor, in exilio moror* the only Radbertian element is *differor*. On the children, Radbert’s *produere* and *conpaginor* are collected in *educare*, and, playing with the words, a further *educere* is added, followed by a whole section, *de miseria exilii et perducere ad gaudia celii*, with no counterpart in Radbert. Not observing the grammatical shift, *spernentes* becomes *exasperant*, *elanguentes* becomes *languent*, *expediant iter* is transformed into *venire curent*. These are not merely arbitrary changes of words, but a striving towards individuality represented by the use of finite verb forms rather than the original participles. Furthermore, *ut omnes lucifaciem* is a new addition. The *omnibus in pro omnibus lgeo* encompasses the Radbertian *eos, qui peccaverunt et non egerunt penitentiam*. Finally, Gilbert writes *id est ‘vindemiabit’*, alluding to the common exegetical contrivance that in Scripture the perfect tense was used instead of the future when the prophets of the Old Testament spoke. This is adapted from the following section in Radbert’s text:

1, 12 (1241–45) Nec tibi uideatur lector absurdum quod preteritum super futurum interpretati sumus ex consuetudine prophetarum. Quia ea quae futura sunt apud Deum iam sic sunt ut futura sunt. Et ideo in Scripturis diuinis quam sepe preterita pro futuris accipiuntur.

The original rendering of this is found in St Jerome, *Commentarii in Esaiam* 2, 25 (CCSL 73, p. 81, 36–39) and St Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 103, sermo 2, 7, 7–9 (CCSL 40, p. 1494).

4.3.2.3 Cases of glossing

Two examples of additional glossing in Gilbert’s version – when a few words have been added to explain or further enlighten a passage in the source text – are the following:

**RADBERTUS**

1, 7 (789) Vnde si uacare uolumus

soli Deo uacemus

*Vacate …*

**GILBERTUS**

7, 64–65 Si ergo Deo *vacare*

soli Deo *vacemus* iuxta illud: *volumus*, ipsi soli corde et corpore *vacemus*, unde: *Vacate …*

Here, the words *corde et corpore* (with the variant reading *opere*) have been added by Gilbert to describe further how we should watch.
The enemy is ascribed with two present participles – *imputans* and *insultans* – explaining in what his evil deeds consist.

We may end this exposé with the observation that Gilbert has a liking for more picturesque language than his chief source:

Gilbert never alludes directly to his source, nor states that he has rewritten it; only the gloss headings reveal who lies behind the text. This is, however, hardly just to the redactor, since as we have seen it is simply not the same text; Radbert did not write the text of the Gloss on Lamentations, he merely supplied the ideas and the vocabulary. The rest was adapted and edited by Gilbert. Each gloss ought thus to be headed instead: *Paschasius et Gislebertus* or rather *Paschasius per Gislebertum*. As was stated earlier, however, employing the name of an *auctoritas* in itself gave authority to an exposition.

As a matter of fact, this method of reworking sources seems to be characteristic of the compilers of the Gloss. Whether this means that it is a question of only one redactor, namely Gilbert, I do not intend to say. It is interesting, though, to note that this method was obviously used in compiling other books of the Gloss. Zier describes, for instance, a similar procedure with regard to the compiler of the Gloss on Daniel:

*The anonymous author/compiler … has played copy editor to Jerome: he has reproduced the essence of Jerome’s commentary, but reduced the prolixity of his prose by about a third.*

The same circumstance has furthermore been observed by Wielockx in several books of the Gloss:
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Le procédé qui consiste à citer, tantôt l’original, tantôt l’abrégé d’auteurs carolingiens, a été constaté précisément dans les parties de la Glossa ordinaria qui, très probablement, sont l’œuvre de l’école d’Anselme de Laon … c’est, en effet, tantôt l’original (Paschase Radbert), tantôt l’abrégé (XIIe siècle), qui passe dans la Glossa ordinaria (évangile de Matthieu).52

Evidently a similar kind of adaptation had been used before at the monastic school at Auxerre by Heiric of Auxerre († c. 876–83) in compiling John Scot Eriugena’s Periphrseon. According to Jeanneau, ‘il sait adapter les textes qu’il emprunte à Jean Scot sans en trahir l’esprit’.53 Having seen Gilbert’s method of adaptation, and bearing in mind the fact that he was principally based at Auxerre, it all sounds very familiar.

Through the examples above, I have tried to bring to light the variations – in style, vocabulary, syntax and so on – that occur between Radbert’s text and Gilbert’s rendering of his source. By now, it seems obvious that Gilbert’s version is more than a mere compilation of another text, rather an active and conscious remoulding, an adaptation of a 300-year-old source text for a new readership and a changed intellectual climate. Furthermore, at once abbreviating and editing, Gilbert expounds his original in a very particular sense: for Gilbert, the Old Testament prophet’s laments become an exercise in classroom rhetoric.

4.4 RHETORIC

As the text of our present interest principally belongs to the genre of exegesis, it may seem rather odd to speak about rhetoric in this context. However, the Gloss on Lamentations is a text imbued with rhetoric; not only did its redactor view the biblical book of Lamentations as full of rhetorical devices according to the Ciceronian theory of embellished speech, but, according to the fashion of the time, the author appears rather self-conscious in his employment of the various forms of metrical cursus of the medieval ars dictaminis.54 Why did Master Gilbert choose Lamentations as a basic text for his rhetorical exegesis?

54 On the role of rhetoric in the twelfth century as both a Ciceronian heritage from antiquity and an art in its own right, see especially the works of John O. WARD; see also the brief but accurate synthesis by TILLIETTE (2000), pp. 25–34.
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Recent research has shown that the medieval use of Ciceronian rhetoric was much more pragmatic and original than has previously been believed.55 In fact, as Richard McKeon was already able to show in 1942, rhetoric was of fundamental importance to three ‘distinct lines of intellectual development’ – rhetoric itself, logic and theology. Especially in the twelfth century, rhetoric decisively influenced and shaped theology, particularly as it developed in the scholastic method.56 The predilection of copyists for the technical and practical rhetorical treatises *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium* to the detriment of the more philosophical and theoretical *De oratore* and *Institutio oratoria* is accountable to the superior usefulness of the former in the teaching and practice of rhetoric in the Middle Ages.

John O. Ward’s numerous studies on the subject have shown that the use of Ciceronian rhetoric in the Middle Ages was more like than unlike that of Antiquity. Medieval scribes who copied *De inventione* and composed new commentaries were addressing the real and contemporary needs of their audiences. Rhetoric was studied and used practically, not as an antiquarian exercise of times long gone, but as a tool and an aid to deliver a message; just like classical rhetoric, its medieval counterpart encompassed both oral and written discourse, and permeated a broader range of social practices than was enumerated in the treatises: to transmit doctrine and discover probable truth, as well as to impress, persuade and delight, and, of course, to incite the listeners to lead a Christian life.57

The rhetorical treatises *De inventione* and *Ad Herennium* were well known in the schools by the end of the eleventh century.58 Both Lanfranc and Manegold, figures we have already encountered as predecessors to Anselm and his school, were occupied with Ciceronian rhetoric.59 That rhetoric was taught at the school of Laon is testified to by the witness of Anselm’s pupil William of Champeaux, who is believed to have written important commentaries on Cicero’s *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.60

In the medieval schools, the study of Scripture followed that of the *artes liberales*, the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, in which rhetoric enjoyed a certain standing

---

55 See CAMARGO (2003) for a good overview.
58 GIBSON (1978), p. 49 and references listed there, n. 4.
59 See ibid., pp. 49–50.
60 See FREDBORG (1976).
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as a means to understand the language of the Scriptures. Since the time of St Augustine, rhetoric had always influenced the study of the Bible, as a means of understanding, to teach and preach what has been understood, and to refute objectors.

Thus Abelard, in his *Commentaria in epistolam Pauli ad Romanos*, formulated the rule that in accordance with the laws of rhetoric, every book of Scripture must be intended either to teach or to cause emotion, 'omnis scriptura divina more orationis rhetoricae aut docere intendit aut mouere'. Gibson has shown that Anselm in his *parva glossatura* on the Pauline Epistles also uses the text of the Bible for the teaching of rhetoric; commenting upon Romans 2:1–5, the word *existimas* (2:3) is given an interlinear gloss in this fashion: 'increpation cum ironia'. Thus rhetoric is also applied to the exposition of Scripture also in other parts of the Gloss.

In the Gloss on Lamentations, rhetoric is first encountered in the prothematia. Here, the two prothematia signed by the name *Gislebertus* both treat the inherent rhetoric in Lamentations: prothema no. XI refers directly to various *loci* that the redactor has spread throughout the text, 'in primo ergo alphabeto paucos indignationis et conquestionis locos assignando diligentiori et perspicatiori viam aperio lectori'. Indeed, the assertion in prothema XI is answered to: in the first book, there are 25 *loci* in all, 19 of them *conquestionis*, six *indignationis*. Here it must be noted that there is nothing of this in Radbert's text. What, then, are these *loci*? More or less all have been collected from Cicero's *De inventione*. They are here intended to be used primarily at the end of a speech, to amplify the *peroratio* or *conclusio*, either to evoke the pity of the judge (*conquestio*), or to arouse the hatred of the audience (*indignatio*). Describing a manuscript with the Gloss on Lamentations, a German scholar notes *à propos* the rhetorical glosses of Gilbert's, 'Die mit dem Namen des Gislebertus

---

64 Anselm's Gloss on the Psalter and the Epistles were to become known as the *parva glossatura*, in reference to the *media* and *magna glossatura* of Porretanus and Lombardus; see chapter 2 above, and *Gibson* (1992a), p. 19, n. 68.
66 Although not stated in the actual prothema, there are rhetorical glosses in the four other books of the Gloss on Lamentations as well. There are, furthermore, three marginal glosses, all on rhetoric, signed with the name *Gislebertus*. Two of these are found in book 3, and one in book 4, and thus not included in the present edition.
versehenen beziehen sich alle auf das äusserlich Rhetorisch und sind für des Verf. eigene (Schul-)Tätigkeit und Absicht bezeichnend.67

Apart from the two prothemata mentioned above, the first instance of a rhetorical gloss occurs already in the interlinear gloss on chapter 1, Aleph, where a rhetorical comment is made to the Bible text, in the manuscripts regularly tied only to the last word of the phrase, populo, but in reality indicating the entire sentence: ‘QUOMODO SEDET SOLA CIVITAS PLENA POPULO: ab opposito.’ According to this gloss, the answer to the question put by use of the interrogative pronoun quomodo must be looked for in a rhetorical use of the language: the city that once was full of people now sits solitary by means of the rhetorical device of contradiction.

Gilbert’s view of Lamentations as a rhetorical text was perhaps inspired by a passage in Radbert’s preface to the fifth book of his commentary. Here the text of the fifth book – the so-called Oratio Hieremiae prophetae – is said to be put forth in a rhetorical manner, as an epilogue of a speech, a peroratio, in which the prophet concludes and sums up the arguments briefly, making use of the various rhetorical topics of complaint and disdain offered by the Ciceronian rhetorical tradition.

5, prol. (4–11) Quintus igitur liber non eadem lege est editus qua praemissi quattuor. Sed eorum conclusio in hoc uno recapitulatur lege rhetorum qui sub epilogu in fine concludunt et determinant ac dinumerant singulas res breuiter quas attigerant. Agunt enim hoc reminiscendi causa dum res dispersas et diffusas uno in loco quasi sub aspectu subiciunt conquerendo ut indignationem uel clementiam moueant pii iudicis. Clementiam scilicet in se aut in suos, indignationem uero contra hostes …68

This idea is confirmed by Gilbert in stressing some points of rhetoric already made by Radbert at other places in the text. The following two passages in book I, mentioned by Radbert as perhaps having to do with rhetoric, are fully developed by Gilbert:

67 ROSE (1901), p. 182.
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RADBERTUS

1, 9 (936–37) more iuridico uult iudicem Deum excitare ad zelum et odium hostiam.

1, 21 (1830–31) More loquitur eorum qui sibi semper animos iudicum conciliari satagunt et contra hostes inligere.

GILBERTUS

9, 28–30 More rethorico conquestionem cum indignatione facit, ut iudicem contra hostes moveat et ipsa misericordiam suscipiat.

21, 21–22 Rethoricorum more loquitur, qui sibi iudicem conciliant et in adversarios concitant.

These rhetorical allusions are definitely picked up by Gilbert, who extends and develops them and declares a rhetorical sentiment to be valid for the whole of Lamentations, not just for the fifth book:

**VIII, 59–60** Lamentationes Ieremie membro patet orationis maxime distinguere vel dissoluto colorari.

This is said in the first prefatory gloss bearing Gilbert's name. In another Gilbertine gloss (from book 4), the book of Lamentations is described as being composed in 'severe style', with every word put in 'ornate language', rhetorical devices such as compassion and amplification constantly being used. The text of Lamentations is furthermore, according to the second prefatory gloss of Gilbert, so imbued with rhetoric that the perceptive reader unguided will teach himself the literary qualities of the text:

**XI, 96–99** Rethoricorum colorum splendorem et sententiarum gravitatem et elocutionis orationem me tacenti diligens lector non tacebit. Locorum quoque rethoricorum multitudo et dialecticorum raritatem et argumentorum subtillitatem gratis inveniet.

There is no question of the redactor's view on the rhetorical force of Lamentations; the text speaks for itself. By merely browsing the text, the reader will at once find Ciceronian heads of rhetoric in the book of Lamentations. Interpreting verses of the Bible text, Gilbert assigns to several of them a certain

---

69 For the complete text of the Gloss on Lamentations, the reader is referred to the forthcoming edition in CCCM.

70 The words 'head' and 'topic' will henceforth be used indiscriminately to render the Latin *locus* (Greek *topos*), as used in a rhetorical context.
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rhetorical ‘value’, and translates it into the terms of Ciceronian rhetoric. At the end of the last prothema, he says:

**XI, 109–10** In primo ergo alphabeto paucos indignationis et conquestionis locos assignando diligentiori et perspicatiori viam aperio lectori &c.

The more experienced reader will thus be able to teach himself by studying the figures of Lamentations, he ‘will teach, without instruction, the abjectness of the rhetorical complaint, and occasionally the severity of disdain, or the combination of both’ (XI, 99–101). The Master addresses a reader already skilled in the fundamentals of the antique rhetorical tradition, in particular those represented by works such as Cicero’s *De inventione* and the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. This reader must by himself be able to identify what is complaint (*conquestio*) and what is disdain (*indignatio*):

Non loquaci, sed dicaci; non studioso, sed perspicaci rethorica semina iacimus, ut quod aliquibus in locis Lamentationum facimus, faciat ipse in omnibus.

Unskilled readers, however, who do not know their Cicero by heart, are not discouraged from study. For those less experienced students, the Master sets forth the proper definitions of the rhetorical *loci* so important to the comprehension of the text:

**XI, 101–08** Rudibus tamen satisfaciendo conquestionem et indignationem rethoricam propriis diffinitionibus ad medium deducere non gravabor. Est enim, ut ait Tullius, ‘conquestio oratio auditorum misericordiam captans’, cuius primus locus est, per quem, quibus in bonis fuerimus et nunc quibus in malis simus, ostendimus, sicut hic: Quamodo sedet sola civitas &c. ‘Indignatio est oratio, per quam conficitur aut in hominem odium aut in rem offensio’, cuius primus locus est ab auctoritate, cum dicitur, quante cure ea res fuerit diis immortalibus &c, sicut hic: Candidiores Nazarei eius nive &c.

On this prothema, no. XI, *Rhetoricorum colorum*, Smalley states that ‘Gilbert himself writes carefully; he likes a sentence with a swing; and he can quote Cicero’. She then takes the quotations in the passage (such as ‘est enim, ut ait Tullius, conquestio oratio auditorum misericordiam captans’) to be from the *Ad Herennium*, where there are, of course, similar passages. As a matter of fact, the

---

72 This gloss is found at the end of book 3.
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passages are verbatim quotations from *De inventione*, which makes Smalley’s proposal that he ‘can quote Cicero’ all the more true.

After this brief introduction to the subject, anyone sufficiently learned in Latin, guided by the principles formulated in the passage above, could have a go at the text. The ‘seeds’ or heads of rhetoric are without exception\(^4\) collected from Cicero’s *De inventione*.\(^5\) These *loci conquestionis* or *indignationis* are according to the ancient rhetorical rules to be employed in the end and conclusion of a speech, the peroration, which consists of three parts: the summing-up, the *indignatio* or exciting of disdain or ill-will towards an opponent, and the *conquestio* or the arousing of pity and sympathy. Thus informed, the student may set out to investigate the various passages of complaint and disdain in the text of Lamentations. The first head to appear was noted above; the second is found in connection with verse two, beginning with the Hebrew letter *Beth*. It runs:

Plorans ploravit in nocte et lacrime eius in maxillis eius
Non est, qui consoletur eam ex omnibus caris eius
Omnes amici eius spreverunt eam et facti sunt ei inimici

To the longer exegetical glosses, determining according to the threefold exposition who is weeping and why – historically, the people of Israel taken captive; allegorically, the Church of Christ in her earthly tribulations; morally, the soul, enveloped in the blindness of her sins – Master Gilbert adds:

2, 21–23 OMNES AMICI EIU: Tercius decimus conquestionis locus, per quem cum indignatione conquerimur, cum ab his, a quibus minime conveniat, male tractemur.

The sense is clear enough: the people of Israel weep with indignation – the duplication of the initial verb: *plorans ploravit* – with the mouth of the prophet, that all those whom they thought were their friends and who were dear to them have abandoned them and thus indeed treated them badly – those who least ought to have done so. Let us venture a comparison with Cicero’s *De inventione*,

---

\(^4\) Only the manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 60, our *F*, provides a non-Ciceronian rhetorical gloss: on 5, 15, instead of the usual *octavus locus conquestionis*, *F* has ‘Tercius decimus locus, per quem multiplex ignominia et miseria demonstrantur, ut qui obsequi solebant, nunc dominentur’. I have not been able to find the source to this gloss.

\(^5\) The heads of complaint and of disdain are to be found in chapters 53 to 56 of the first book; there are 15 heads of complaint, and 16 of disdain: see *De inventione*, ed. STROEBEL (1915), pp. 70–75. The *De inventione* was in medieval terminology referred to as the *Rhetorica vetus* or *prima*, by analogy with Aristotle’s *Logica vetus*: see MURPHY (1974), p. 14.
from which the passage is taken. In book 1, paragraph 109, we find the corresponding passage:

Tertius decimus, per quem cum indignatione conquerimur, quod ab iis, a quibus minime conveniat, male tractemur, propinquis, amicis, quibus benigne fecerimus, quos adiutores fore putarimus, aut a quibus indignum est, ut servis, libertis, clientibus supplicibus.

As we have seen in the case of rendering the text of Radbert, abbreviating without losing the general sense seems to be a primary characteristic of Gilbert’s. So it is in the quoted passage: ‘friends’ obviously fall into the category of those who ought not to treat us badly.

In the first book, nearly every verse of Lamentations is allotted (at least) one such head of complaint or disdain. As was noted above, in the first alphabet there are 25 heads in all, 19 of complaint (conquestio) and six of disdain (indignatio). In comparison with the source, Cicero, they are often abbreviated. This brevity seems to have something to do with the level of the students’ knowledge. Students of exegesis ought to have spent several years in studying the arts, and would thus already be familiar with relevant grammatical and rhetorical devices. This is mirrored, for instance, in the rhetorical gloss on the verse 18, Sade, of the first book, where the rhetorical classification is rather scant: all that is written is ‘octavus conquestionis locus; virgines enim nec se possunt defendere nec alium ledere’. This is abbreviated from a much longer passage in De inventione (1, 103; the emphasis is added):

Octavus locus est, per quem demonstramus non vulgare neque factitatum esse ne ab audacissimis quidem hominibus id maleficium, de quo agatur; atque id a feris quoque hominibus et a barbaris gentibus et inmanibus bestis esse remotum. Haec erunt, quae in parentes, liberos, contuges, consanguineos, supplies crudeliter facta dicitur, et deinceps si qua proferantur in maiores natu, in hospites, in vicinos, in amicos, in eos, quibuscum vitam egeris, in eos, quibuscum vitam egeris, in eos, quibuscum vitam egeris; quibus ex omnibus acriter excitata indignatio summum in eum, qui violarit horum aliquid, odium commovere poterit.

The verse commented upon (18) is as follows:

Iustus est Dominus, quia os eius ad iracundiam provocavi
Audite, obscurus, universi populi, et videte dolorem meum
Virgines mee et iuvenes mee abierunt in captivitatem
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The city of Jerusalem laments the just judgement of God imposed on her; before, her children were taken away, but now even her stronger men and her virgins are captured. The crimes committed against Jerusalem’s young men and virgins correspond nicely with those numbered by Cicero, as do the victims of the crimes: ‘those who can neither harm another nor defend themselves.’ To extract this information out of the mere mentioning of the number of the locus is an indication of the degree at which these subjects were studied: memorisation was probably essential to actual performance.

Furthermore, the rhetorical figure of prosopopoia, or persona introducta, is applied most conspicuously in chapters 11–12 of the first book, when widowed Jerusalem enters the stage, ‘Vide, Domine, et considera, quoniam facta sum vilis’. Gilbert glosses this biblical line with ‘quartus decimus questionis locus’, without any further explanation. In De inventione (1, 109), the fourteenth head of complaint (which it is treated as here, and not as disdain) is explained as a head ‘qui per obsecrationem sumitur; in quo orantur modo illi, qui audiunt, humili et supplici oratione, ut misereantur’, which fits excellently with the Bible verse. Even the Christian understanding of the word oratio is applicable here.

The following verse, 12, begins with ‘O vos omnes, qui transitis per viam, attendite et videte, si est dolor si cut solor meus’, and Gilbert glosses accordingly, ‘duodecimus indignationis locus; indignari enim videtur, quod sibi hoc primum evenerit’; she, Jerusalem, laments that she is the first to have been subject to this kind of sorrow, of which she doubts there is an equal. The corresponding passage in De inventione (1, 104) is similar: ‘Duodecimus locus est, per quem indignamur, quod nobis hoc primum acciderit neque aliqui umquam usu venerit’.

Thus prepared with a few hints of what could be considered heads of complaint and disdain in the text of Lamentations, the apprehensive student, as Gilbert himself says at the end of prothema XI, could then adapt rhetorical loci to suit the verses of Lamentations of the other four books. The presence of these rhetorical loci throughout the text is evidence that Ciceronian rhetoric was taught and studied not in an antiquarian fashion (as in the later Renaissance) or as a mere classroom exercise, but to meet real and practical needs, sprung out of the communication with an audience. The loci are inserted into the text on the grounds of common sense, not unlike the rhetorical commentaries and opinions deriving from the environment of the school of Laon.\footnote{See Fredborg (1976).}
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4.5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this and the preceding chapters we have studied several aspects of Gilbert the Universal’s Gloss on Lamentations: the *milieu* in which it originated, the author, the sources, the methods of glossing and compiling and the influence from Ciceronian rhetoric. As demonstrated in the previous sections, a recurrent theme has been adaptation and remoulding: Gilbert’s work is marked by new approaches to old material. The result is a peculiar mixture of material from different environments, ranging from ancient Judea to the classroom of the early twelfth century, via Roman antiquity and the Carolingian revival.

Gilbert the Universal is too little known to be given a definitive characterisation; he belonged to the school of Laon, for sure, but what exactly was that school? He was indeed a rhetorician, but which were his fields of action? He was also a theologian, but who were his predecessors, upon whose thinking did he rely, and of what did this thinking consist? But even without firm answers to these questions, there remains a remarkable coherence between rhetoric (William of Champeaux), the approach to biblical studies of the school of Laon (Anselm and Ralph), and Gilbert the Universal. Taken together, all facts point toward the great enterprise of the Gloss; only if the Gloss receives more scholarly attention, first and foremost through critical editions of its various books, will more light be shed on its compilers, including Gilbert the Universal, and perhaps also on the school of Laon. It remains to be seen whether Ciceronian rhetoric also permeated other books of the Gloss, or if it was applied to the Gloss on Lamentations in a special way. Perhaps, in like fashion, the other glossed books display their own specialities.

The Gloss on Lamentations seems to be a product of Gilbert’s teaching effort, and was perhaps used for such purposes even before it was incorporated into the *Glossa ordinaria* corpus of texts. The fact, mentioned earlier, that this part of the Gloss is the only book of the Gloss to bear its compiler’s name may be a sign of this. The strong emphasis on rhetoric also points in that direction. The Gloss as a whole was clearly a book intended for use in the schools, the Gloss on Lamentations, given its rhetorical content, perhaps in a unique way; the glossators were teachers, Gilbert the Universal apparently of both theology and rhetoric as well as of canon law. Both biblical scholar and canon lawyer, perhaps Gilbert compiled this commentary for the use of his students when teaching the *trivium* at Auxerre. As he says in prothema no. XI, ‘to satisfy the unskilled … I shall not unwillingly explain the rhetorical complaint and disdain by their proper definitions’.
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When working with the glossing of the other biblical books, especially the Greater Prophets, he may very well have included his own old reliable exposition. It would, however, be difficult for us to judge his practical concerns, needs and purposes from his compilations. A relevant opinion would nevertheless come from those masters who were the successors to the glossators – immediate or more remote in time – who had used the Gloss as a set text when lecturing to their pupils. In Gilbert’s case, I am speaking of a St Albert the Great, a Hugh of St Cher, and also of a St Thomas Aquinas,77 all of whom wrote expositions of Lamentations, all of whom used the Gloss in their own studies, and all of whom applied the loci conquestionis and indignationis, the Ciceronian heads of rhetoric first introduced to the exegesis of Lamentations by Gilbert the Universal. But that is quite another story.

77 See Albertus Magnus, In Threnos Jeremiae Commentarii, ed. BORGNET (1893); Hugo de Sancto Caro, Postillae super Threnos Jeremiae, in Opera omnia in universum Vetus et Novum Testamentum, 8 vols, 4 (Pezzana, 1732), pp. 283–310; Thomas Aquinas, In Threnos Hieremiae, ed. BUSA (1980).
CHAPTER 5

The Textual Witnesses

5.1 THE MANUSCRIPTS

The 86 manuscripts listed below all contain the *Glossa ordinaria in Lamentations Ieremie prophete*. A number of them have been listed before, by Friedrich Stegmüller in his *Repertorium biblicum medii aevi* (1950–80), but the major part have been collected by the present editor.1 To arrive at the final list, manuscript catalogues for the major libraries in Europe were examined, as well as for minor libraries in France and England, to see whether the manuscripts listed in Stegmüller and other repertoria do in fact contain the *Glossa ordinaria* on Lamentations, or if another gloss hid under that name.2 In the course of this survey, many manuscripts not listed in Stegmüller were found to contain the present text. The list makes no claims of being exhaustive; manuscripts have a

---

1 Other references to and occasional descriptions of glossed Lamentations manuscripts can be found in, for instance, DE HAMEL (1984), PETKE (1995) and SHEPPARD (1997).

2 A number of manuscripts are listed in library catalogues as *Lamentationes glosati*, but contain glossed Lamentations other than ours. Such manuscripts are, for instance, London, British Library, Royal 2 E VIII and Royal 2 C VIII. The first is a collection of heavily abbreviated glossed books of the Old Testament, and was mentioned above, in table 2, in the list of spurious works by Gilbert the Universal: the Lamentations commentary is found on fols 119v–121v – hardly two pages – and ends at Lam 1:4. The second is a collection of compilations of glossed books of the Old Testament made by Peter the Chanter. In this work, listed in STEGMÜLLER, RB, 6487, the commentary on Lamentations ends with the note, ‘Gillebertus antiochensis ecclesiæ diaconus exponens lamentationum [sic] ieremia ordinavit. Expliciunt glose lamentationum’; on this manuscript in general, see SYLWAN (1992), pp. xix–xx and xxiii. It would seem that in both manuscripts the abbreviations have been made from the Gloss on the biblical books in question. The manuscript Cambridge, Jesus College, Q G 29 does indeed contain a gloss on Lamentations, as stated in the catalogue, but not the Gloss: it too seems to be an abbreviation, this time from various sources of which the Gloss on Lamentations is one. It ends with the colophon, ‘Lamentationes a Ieronimo sunt expositae’. No such commentary by St Jerome is known, and it is not the text attributed to Pseudo-Jerome in PL 25.
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tendency of suddenly appearing when one least expects it. Nevertheless, its
division by century may serve as a mirror of the diffusion and occurrence of the
Gloss on Lamentations.

In the list, sigla have been assigned only to manuscripts collated for the
present edition. The principles behind the choice of these manuscripts will be
given below in section 5.2. The manuscripts collated for the edition will be
described in detail in section 5.3 below.

Table 3: A list of manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Angers, Bibliothèque municipale, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brugge, Stadsbibliotheek, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College, B 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica, Pal. lat. cod. 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Como, Seminario Vescovile, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>Hereford, Cathedral Library, P IV 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>Hereford, Cathedral Library, O IX 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek, 2° Ms. Theol. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Leeds, Brotherton Library, Ripon Cathedral 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba</td>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 15 B XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 3117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud lat. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 2578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Siena, Biblioteca Comunale, F IV 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>Siena, Biblioteca Comunale, F II 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Zwettl, Stiftsbibliothek, 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 The following four twelfth-century manuscripts came to my attention after the
completion of the present edition: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud lat. 19 and Salisbury,
Cathedral Library, 51 (both kindly drawn to my attention by the palaeographer Michael
Gullick), Brugge, Stadsbibliotheek, 72 and Como, Seminario Vescovile, 16. All four will,
however, be consulted for the forthcoming edition of the entire Gloss on Lamentations.
5. The Textual Witnesses

**Saec. xii** - xiii

*Ca*
- Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale, 319 (301)
- Durham, Dean and Chapter Library, A III 19
- Eton, College Library, 19
- Lincoln, Cathedral Library, 116 (A V 6)
- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 226

*Pb*
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 576
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, nouv. acq. lat. 1568
- Praha, Universitní knihovna, 692
- Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q 51

**Saec. xiii**

*Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 415*
*Alençon, Médiathèque de la communauté urbaine, 81*
*Baltimore, Walters Art Museum, 388*
*Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Theol. fol. 190*
*Bologna, Biblioteca dell’Università, 2664*
*Brugge, Stadsbibliotheek, 91*

*Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 68.35*
*Chartres, Bibliothèque municipale, 187*
*Clermont-Ferrand, Bibliothèque municipale et interuniversitaire, 11*
*Durham, Dean and Chapter Library, A III 18*

**D**
- Durham, Dean and Chapter Library, A III 21

*Lb*
- Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, 43
- Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 65
- Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 69

*Be*
- London, British Library, Royal 4 B VIII
*Be*
- London, British Library, Royal 4 D XIII
*Be*
- London, British Library, Royal 8 B XIV

*Melk, Bibliothek des Benediktinerstifts, 207*
*Melk, Bibliothek des Benediktinerstifts, 295*
*Milano, Capitolo Metropolitano, E II 24*
*München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 3803*
*München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 7785*
*München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 13085*
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München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 14453
München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, c.l.m. 14454
Padova, Biblioteca dell’Università, 919
Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 138
Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 99
Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 100
Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 101
Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 102
Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 140
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 148
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 8876
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14406
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 16290
Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica, Pal. lat. cod. 86
Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque municipale, 220
Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque municipale, 221

Ra Stockholm, Riksarkivet, Fr 8720
Tours, Bibliothèque municipale, 76
Troyes, Médiathèque de l’agglomération troyenne, 231
Troyes, Médiathèque de l’agglomération troyenne, 436
Troyes, Médiathèque de l’agglomération troyenne, 922

U Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket, C 97
Warszawa, Biblioteka Przezdziecki, fol. 79
Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 1045
Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 1287

Saec. xiv

Dublín, Trinity College, 123
Évreux, Bibliothèque municipale, 108
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 151
Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 1554
Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, 429 (Helmst. 394)
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5.2 Principles for the choice of manuscripts for the present edition

The textual tradition to the Gloss on Lamentations, when compared with other texts from the same and earlier periods, is remarkably stable, a circumstance that applies, according to scholars who have studied other books of the Gloss, to the entire Glossa ordinaria. This is probably accountable to the fact that the lion’s share of the manuscripts was copied between the mid-twelfth and first half of the thirteenth century. Throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Glossa ordinaria, though widely available, and perhaps because of this, was not regularly copied. From the mid-twelfth century, the production of glossed books was almost an industrial enterprise, and thus the text underwent little contamination or evolution. As was mentioned earlier, after 1200 only an occasional prothema or stray interlinear gloss was added to the standard text.

The Gloss on Lamentations, however textually stable, provides an interesting variation of this textual consistency. As was briefly mentioned in chapter 1, the collation of the manuscript witnesses reveals that the Gloss on Lamentations is extant in two textual recensions, one seemingly preceding the other in time, dating from the early twelfth century, the other deliberately produced in the mid-twelfth century on the basis of the older recension. The extant manuscripts can thus be divided into two types, according to the recension of the text they display, those of the first recension and those of the second. These designations are applied here not only for the sake of convenience, but also because they reflect in practice the relative occurrence in time of the two recensions.

5.2.1 The first recension and reasons for its being edited here

Several arguments speak in favour of our assumption that the first recension precedes the second in time. Perhaps the most important, and at the same time most obvious reason is the fact that all the earliest extant manuscript witnesses display the texts and readings of the first recension. Indeed, the earliest datable manuscript of any part of the Gloss known today, our K, displays the text of the first, and not of the second recension, which is in itself enough to silence any doubts about the priority of the first recension. We have thus good reason to assume that the first recension of the Gloss on Lamentations is the version most closely associated with its author, Master Gilbert the Universal.

5 These arguments will be accounted for in this and the following section (5.2.2).
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The choice to edit the Gloss on Lamentations in its first recension coincides with Beryl Smalley’s sketch for a programme to edit the entire Glossa ordinaria. She argues that by locating and classifying the very oldest manuscript copies of the books of the Gloss, scholars ‘seraient à même d’éditer la glose ordinaire dans la forme qu’elle prit en sortant des mains de maître Anselme de Laon et de son équipe’. This suggestion is cautiously specified by the abbé Bernard Merlette as an edition ‘précritique’ of carefully selected manuscripts from Laon, St Victor, St Amand and Clairvaux. Patricia Stirnemann has also suggested a similar approach. According to this view, an edition of the Gloss as it was when it left the hands of Master Anselm and his équipe would provide an excellent point of reference for further studies of the shaping of the Gloss and the development it subsequently underwent. Another method, proposed by Mark Zier, who has devoted himself to the study of the Gloss on Daniel, would be to edit the Gloss as it was at the height of its popularity and diffusion, i.e. c. 1250, when the text had stabilised and no more additions were made to it. This would indeed seem the most fruitful approach in the case of books of the Gloss where the prospect of a proper critical edition is ruled out, and the Lachmannian method falters, for instance where the number and selection of glosses vary considerably between different stages of development, and where contamination between manuscripts has crept in.

With the Gloss on Lamentations, however, this approach is unnecessary, as it is possible to edit the first recension of its text critically. Two arguments speak in favour of this decision: first, Zier’s suggestion may very well be applicable to anonymous parts of the Gloss; however, since the Gloss on Lamentations is signed, and its author relatively known, it is both possible and desirable to aim at reconstructing the author’s original text. Second, in

7 Merlette (1975), p. 46.
10 Here, a central chord of the ‘Gloss problem’ is struck: do we have to assume the perpetual anonymity of the Gloss, or will it be possible, by means of critical editions, to identify the individual glossators (if there indeed were individual glossators for other books) and the methods they used? If this should prove possible, then editions should perhaps aim to furnish a text as close to the author’s as possible, rather than in the form most widely diffused. This is the classical philologist’s view; the historian of ideas and mentalities would probably prefer the version of the text that reached the most people. The method adopted here, to make a critical edition of the first recension of the Gloss in question, providing also a ‘semi-critical’ edition of its second and more diffused recension, may not be applicable to other parts of the Gloss.
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comparison with other books of the Gloss, the Lamentations underwent particularly little change in terms of additions of new glosses; as a matter of fact, no new prothema or marginal gloss was ever added to the basic text with the aim of further developing it. As is evident from the manuscript collation, the changes imposed on the first recension of the text with the redaction here referred to as the ‘second recension’ consisted in the exchange and transpositions of words, and occasional addition and omission of interlinear glosses. As will be seen below, the readings of the first recension are generally better than those of the second, and furthermore they are more in accordance with the text of the source to the Gloss on Lamentations, Paschasius Radbertus’s commentary (on which see chapter 4 above), which may be taken as yet another sign of its originality.

Since the first recension of the text can be synthesised in the form of a stemma codicum, it will be possible to make a critical evaluation of each witness or group of witnesses and thus to make reasonable and coherent choices of readings from the often numerous variants offered by the individual manuscripts. Of the manuscripts in the list above, the following preserve the readings and text of the first recension: A, Ba, F, Ha, Hb, K, L, M, Pa, Pb, R, T, V, Z and partly Bb, Sa and Sb.

5.2.2 The second recension – Ψ

Judging by the collation of manuscripts undertaken for the present edition, it seems probable that the major bulk of manuscripts copied after 1200 contains the second recension. Recentiores, it is true, may well be carriers of original readings from earlier, now lost, manuscripts, but given the fact of the development of the Gloss during the second half of the twelfth century (outlined in chapter 2 above), it comes as no surprise that once it had become stabilised, it was subsequently the second recension that was copied. There are, of course, exceptions to this, some of which will be discussed below. Thus, at quite an early stage the second recension came to replace the first, which implies that the major portion of the manuscripts with the Gloss on Lamentations is witness to the second recension. Eventually, this recension, with a few editorial variants, was printed in 1480/81 by Adolph Rusch of Strasburg.

The text of the second recension differs from that of the first in the deliberate exchange, addition or omission of occasional words and glosses, as well as a number of transpositions of single words or phrases. No substantial elements of text, though, have been wilfully added or omitted. Based on a
branch of the first recension (see below, section 5.6), and never entirely becoming another text, the second recension distinguishes itself from the first by over 300 such variations in the prothemata and first book alone. It cannot simply be a question of ordinary variant readings and errors developed only in the course of copying the first recension, as is shown by the sudden appearance of the second recension, and by the consistency with which its readings are adopted in almost all extant manuscripts copied after 1160. Of course, some of the variations of the second recension may have been the result of scribal mistakes or misinterpretations, such as for instance at X, 80, where the original *scelesti* of the first recension has become *celestis* in the second, or at 16, 61 where the original reading *huius mundi* has been transformed into *huiusmodi*.\(^1\)

However, the variations resulting from a deliberate redaction and inferred by the second recension are often of a marked and clearly distinguishable nature. An indication of this is that the readings of the second recension often deviate from those of the source text, the commentary of Paschasius Radbertus. A full list of the readings of the second recension is given in appendix II as well as in the critical apparatus to the Latin text. Here it will suffice to indicate by means of a few examples, and in comparison with the relevant counterpart in Radbert's base text, the character of the changes arising in the second recension:

Table 4: Deviations of the second recension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radbert(^1)(^2)</th>
<th>First recension</th>
<th>Second recension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II, 16</td>
<td>lugeat</td>
<td>lugeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV, 37</td>
<td>replicat</td>
<td>replicat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, 53</td>
<td>repletus</td>
<td>repletus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 39</td>
<td>introeant</td>
<td>introeunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 39</td>
<td>introire</td>
<td>introire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 45</td>
<td>effugere</td>
<td>effugere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 53</td>
<td>facinora</td>
<td>facinora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 33</td>
<td>quaeque</td>
<td>quevis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 33</td>
<td>multiplicem</td>
<td>multiplicem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 44</td>
<td>premonstrant</td>
<td>minantur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) As may be recalled from chapter 4 above, references to the text of the present edition are of two kinds: the prothemata are indicated with a Roman numeral (I–XI) followed by a line number, and a chapter, or verse, of the expository text by its (Arabic) number (1–22) followed by line number. See further chapter 6 below.

\(^2\) Radbert's readings are found at 1 (119), (64), (148); 1, 4 (507), (507); 1, 5 (627); 1, 7 (768); 1, 11 (1112); 1, 18 (1654), and 1, 22 (2030–31) respectively.
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Obviously, the tendency is towards lectio facilior: there is a wish, if not to simplify, then at least to explain and make seemingly difficult passages more easily readable. Not infrequently, though, a reading that was intelligible in the first recension, albeit perhaps somewhat demanding, has been 'corrected' into a less intelligible, or even unintelligible version in the second recension. Some examples of such Verschlimmbesserungen follow.

At 7, 51, the established text, quod putabat securius stare – 'that which she thought stood more firm', referring to the following divina percussum ultione – has with the second recension become qui putabat se securius stare, without an obvious referent. It could hardly be anima, which in both recensions is the subject of the clause. Perhaps it is supposed to refer to the preceding manus diaboli, which does not make much sense, especially since it is in the plural. In Rusch, qui has been altered to que, and percussum to peruissa, at least making the phrase intelligible.

At 7, 53, a presumed error has been corrected by the second recension: the original recordatio has been changed into recordatur, probably due to the difficulties of finding a predicate to recordatio. However, the phrase is wholly understandable if one takes recordatio together with its attribute afflictionis pessime – 'remembrance of affliction most wicked' – and supplies an occurrit from the facta occurrit on the line above. In fact two manuscripts, Bb and Hb, have supplied the 'missing' verb.

The addition of esse to the predicate demonstrat at 8, 18 indicates a misunderstanding of what is the subject of the clause: peccatum singulare – 'One sin, alone of its kind, designates the reason for such misery'.

At 11, 18, the prophet has gone from being subject in the text of the first recension, to the object in the second: Nota, quid propheta profuerit – 'Note, how the prophet was useful' – has become Nota, quid prophete profuerit – 'Note, what was useful for the prophet'. In the light of what follows, this is a rather grave misinterpretation, as the prophet was of use (to Jerusalem and his people) when he lamented that Jerusalem had not lamented herself; he was hardly of use to himself in that situation.

At 13, 36, the dative of purpose, solatio, is in the second recension changed into solatia, to be taken to belong to the preceding que, a reading which is clearly facilior.

At 20, 41, a finite verb seems to be missing. The corresponding passage in Radbert, 1, 20 (1796–98), reads, 'quia sicut proles in utero sic cogitationes in mente generantur et sicut in uentre cibi ita et in mente continetur'. Aware of the possibility that something is lacking, the second recension adds cibi concipiuntur et in ventre. The phrase may, however, in its first recension version stand without predicate, in a more proverbial fashion.

These are but a few examples of original readings that have deliberately been changed, occasionally quite unnecessarily, sometimes into something less comprehensible. Further instances may be deduced from the list of the readings.
of the second recension available in appendix II, or from the readings reported in the critical apparatus.

As was mentioned above in chapter 2, the elaboration of the second recension was most probably performed in Paris in the mid-twelfth century, at a time when the success of the Gloss as a whole was well established and the copying of its various manuscripts had gained momentum.\(^\text{13}\) In favour of this assumption speaks the fact that the earliest extant manuscript with the Gloss on Lamentations in its second recension, our \(C\), dated c. 1170, was manufactured in Northern France, probably Paris.\(^\text{14}\) The time at which the second recension occurs furthermore coincides with the development in page layout described above as the ‘alternate-line’ gloss format (see section 2.4 and 2.5). There is, to my knowledge, no manuscript of the Gloss on Lamentations produced on the continent and written according to the alternate-line format which does not also contain the second recension of the text.\(^\text{15}\) Mutatis mutandis, there is, again to my knowledge, no manuscript ruled and copied with the alternate-line format that contains, in a strict sense, the first recension. All first-recension manuscripts are found ruled and copied according to older methods of planning the writing space (with the exception of those few which employ the ‘newer’ C-type format; see section 2.5.2 above).

Since the second recension, being a deliberate redaction of the first, constitutes a textual tradition with an ‘archetype’ of its own, very little seems to be gained from an exhaustive collation of manuscripts from this group for the purposes of establishing the original text. However, to give the reader access to both recensions of text of the Gloss on Lamentations, a collation of a selection of second-recension manuscripts has been performed, the consensus of which is printed in appendix II and the critical apparatus to the edited text. This consensus has been achieved in the following way. Five manuscripts – \(Ca\), \(D\),

\(^{13}\) This is not the place to examine whether a similar redaction also took place with the other glossed books of the Bible. This may very well have been the case: Stephen Langton, for instance, in his commentary on Isaiah 7:14, as extant in the manuscript Paris, BnF; lat. 14417, on fol. 181\(^r\), shows that Peter the Lombard made use of a version of the Gloss that Langton regarded as faulty in some respects: ‘nota quod ista interlinearis non est de originali et ubi nos habemus in interlineari AFFECTIBUS Lombardus habet ASPECTIBUS, ex quo verisimile est quod littera sit corrupta, et vera littera sit ista: que nunquam viorum patet aspectibus’ (quoted from S. MALLEY (1937), p. 400). Whether this results from textual corruption, as Langton suggests, or is another recension of the text can be established only by means of an examination of the textual tradition of the Gloss on Isaiah.

\(^{14}\) See the manuscript descriptions below, section 5.3.

\(^{15}\) Some English manuscripts provide an exception to this: see below, section 5.4.5.
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Lb, U and C – containing the second recension have been collated exhaustively, and sample collations of a further ten randomly chosen thirteenth-century manuscripts have been made. The text of the second recension given as a point of reference in the present work is not an entire critical edition of that recension, but rather, as has already been said, a collection of consensus readings from the manuscripts of the second recension that have been collated. In the critical apparatus, the Greek letter ψ has been assigned to represent this consensus.

The edition presented here is thus both traditionally critical (of the first textual recension), as well as providing the reader with a ‘semi-critical’ edition of the second recension.

5.3 The Manuscripts of the Present Edition

Out of the seventeen manuscripts of the first recension that have been collated – A, Ba, Bb, F, Ha, Hb, K, L, M, Pa, Pb, R, Sa, Sb, T, V and Z – five have been chosen to establish the text of the first recension of the Gloss on Lamentations – Ha, K, L, R and T (on this choice, see chapter 6 on editorial principles below). The Italian twelfth-century manuscripts, Sa and Sb, have after collation proved, in addition to being severely contaminated by the second recension, to provide nothing of interest to the reconstruction of the archetype of the first recension, and have therefore been excluded from the selection.16 Bb, though partly contaminated by the second recension, shows some interesting variants and additional sections which point to a Laonnoise origin, and has been included in the collation. In one or two cases one of the other nine first-recension manuscripts has preserved a better reading than the five chosen manuscripts. On the occasional use of these manuscripts, see chapter 6 below. All the first-recension manuscripts used for the present edition will be described in detail below, and their interrelations will be examined and established in section 5.5.

A description follows of the fifteen first-recension manuscripts used for the present edition, as well as the manuscript C, the earliest extant manuscript to contain the second recension. The descriptions discuss primarily the physical aspects of the codices; questions arising from textual discrepancies will be addressed in the subsequent discussion of manuscript interrelations (section

16 Generally speaking, it would seem that the Gloss did not enjoy such popularity south of the Alps as it did in the North: see Gibson (1992b), p. vii.
5.5). A separate section, 5.4, has been devoted to aspects of the manuscripts which do not fit either the descriptions or the interrelations.

In the descriptions, which in the case of Ba, Bb, C, Ha, Hb, Pa and Pb are based on inspection in situ, and in the case of A, F, K, L, M, R, T, V and Z on microfilms or microfiches, first the city and the library where the manuscript is preserved today are given, then its shelfmark. In the outer margin, next to this ‘rubric’, is printed the siglum used in the present edition. Below the rubric is given summary information about the general contents of the manuscript, its provenance, date and measurements. A list of contents follows, upon which the detailed description follows containing information on physical aspects of the manuscript: ruling, binding, decoration, gloss format, as well as notes on its possible origin and provenance. Last, under the heading ‘Bibliography’, will be found earlier descriptions of the manuscript in question. When a detailed description has already been published elsewhere, I have not repeated all the available information, but noted my own observations as well as supplying further references. As a rule, I have omitted references to old or very brief descriptions when they have been replaced by later and better ones. The manuscripts are described in alphabetical order of the sigla assigned to them.

A Angers, Bibliothèque municipale, 54

Glossed Lamentations ~ parchment ~ 63 fols ~ 265 × 190 mm ~ Western France (Saint-Aubin) ~ saec. xiiex

Contents: 1. fols 1r–63r Glossed Lamentations
   fols 1r–2r Prothema (additional prothema on fols 2r–2v)
   fols 2r–16r Liber primus
2. fol. 63v Probationes pennae, ‘Dominus dixit ad me, filius meus; Confitemini Domino quoniam bonus quoniam’

Gloss format: type C.

Physical description: text written continuously in two columns comprising both Bible text and glosses (interlinear and marginal) throughout the manuscript. ‘Middle’ glosses inserted where convenient, either in connection with the Bible text or among the marginal glosses. The same hand copies both Bible text and glosses throughout the entire codex. Corrections made by the same or a very similar (contemporary) hand. The scribe uses the cedilla, ampersand and dotting of ys; very few abbreviations. No decoration.

Distinctive features and flaws: on fol. 2r, after the ordinary prothema, follow the additional prothema also found in the manuscript L, of which some also
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occur in *Bl*, *Ha* and *Pa*, ‘Liber iste’, ‘(Pascasius) In his lamentationibus’, ‘Notandum est quod’, ‘Duo genera canticorum’, ‘Sicut inter omnia’, ‘Fuerunt he lamentationes’, ‘Sicut testante Salomone’, ‘Agit autem Jeremias’, ‘Similiter ecclesia’ (see appendix I and section 5.4.3 above). On fol. 63r is the lengthy gloss on the genealogy of the kings of Judah, which is also to be found in *L*, see section 5.4.4 below.

*Origin and provenance:* ex libris in eighteenth-century hand on fol. 1r: ‘Ex libris Monasterii S. Albini andegavensis Congregationis S. Maurij’.

*Bibliography:* *Catal. gén.*, vol. 31, p. 206; *STEGMÜLLER, RB*, 2544.

**London, British Library, Royal 15 B XI**

Glossed Lamentations and various geographical treatises ~ parchment ~ 101 + i fols ~ 247 × 180 mm ~ Rochester Cathedral Priory ~ 1165–90

*Contents:* 1. fol. 2r ‘Incipit liber Pergesis, i.e. de situ terre Prisciani grammatici’ *(saec. xii)*17 2. fol. 12r *De mirabilibus mundi*, by Iulius Solinus *(saec. xii)*18 3. fol. 57r ‘Incipit epistula Corneli ad Salustium Crispum in Troianorum hystoria que in Greco a Darete hystoriographo facta est. Hystoria Daretis Troianorum Frigii de Greco translata in Latinum a Cornelio Nepote’ *(saec. xii)*19 4. fol. 67r ‘The tenth Sibyl’s prophecy’20 5. fols 70r–101v *Glossed Lamentations* (on a larger vellum) fols 70r–70v Prothemata fols 70r–77v Liber primus

*Gloss format:* type A with marginal glosses extended into L-shapes when required.

*Physical description:* the codex consists of several booklets; unless otherwise stated, the following description pertains to item 5. Artwork and initials are French, typical of the Angevin, ‘channel’ school; the palaeographical features are English. Two different hands may be discerned, the first using the cedilla, rounded *g*, *p* and *d*, with only slight indications of breaking the letters *r* and *b*. Very neat, especially the interlinear glosses. Later, the cedilla becomes rarer, but

---

18 Ed. MOMMSEN (1864).
19 Pseudo-Nepos; see WARD (1883–1910), vol. 1, p. 13.
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its use continues occasionally until fol. 82r, where the ink changes from brown to a crisp black and a new hand continues. This second hand slants somewhat to the left, especially when writing capitals; final s with a swing, g not as round as first hand; not using the cedilla, not even when writing ecclesia. Application of sloping feet to minims, giving a prickly angular appearance, ‘which is associated with S.E. English centres, such as Canterbury and Rochester, of s. xii1, this style disappearing from c. 114021 (a fact that would imply that this and other manuscripts are survivors of an older way of writing). Number of columns varies between two and three; if two they are c. 70–75 mm wide; if three, c. 31 mm (left column), 40 mm (lemma) and 65 mm (right column).

Decoration: on fol. 70v an illuminated initial, a dragon as tail of letter Q; letter otherwise flourished in red and blue. Initials and Latinised Hebrew letters beginning verses are usually coloured in red, blue or green, or, for the Latinised Hebrew letters commencing each verse, in two or more of the mentioned colours. On fol. 93v, the tail of the illuminated Q is in the shape of a mermaid. On fols 74v–76r, four of the Hebrew letters are provided with neumes of petits carrés form, in campo aperto, in keeping with an English provenance. The melodies shown correspond to the musical settings of the Hebrew letters in the Tenebrae liturgy of Holy Week.22

Origin and provenance: England, last quarter of saec. xii; belonged to Rochester Cathedral Priory, as can be seen from a note on fol. 3r, ‘Liber de claustro Roffensi per W. Roffensem episcopum’, which probably refers to Walter de Merton (bishop of Rochester 1274–77).


Bb London, British Library, Harley 3117

Glossed Lamentations, Commentary on Canticles, sermons, glosses on Proverbs, prayers ~ parchment ~ 57 fols ~ 206 × 129 mm ~ Northern France ~ 1150–75

Contents: 1. fols 1r–37v Glossed Lamentations
          fols 1r–2r Prothema
          fols 2r–7v Liber primus

2. fol. 37v A continuous commentary on the Canticles

3. fol. 45v A sermon, ‘Dicite pusillanimes confortamini …’

21 BROWN (1990), p. 76.
22 On the medieval notation of Lamentations, see LUDWIG (1971).
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4. fol. 48v A sermon on Advent, ‘Hodie fratres celebremus adventum . . .’
5. fol. 51v A gloss on Proverbs 31:10
6. fol. 53v A gloss on Proverbs 1:7
7. fols 53v–57r Various verses and prayers

*Gloss format:* seemingly a mixture of A and B (alternate-line) with some interesting variations.

*Physical description:* modern binding. Columns varying from one single (for e.g. prothemata and lengthier glosses) via two with Bible text on one side, to three with Bible text in the centre. Individual solutions for planning the writing space have been adopted for nearly every page. Width of columns varies from 30 to 70 mm. Horizontal and vertical ruling. Writing of one very neat but informal hand of the third quarter of the twelfth century (1150–75), not using the cedilla. A few skeletal letters; dotting of y; no crossing stroke of tironian et ('7'; the crossed form appears in England from the second half of the century). The hand is clearly French. Additions in later hands (saec. xiii) of quite large portions of text, mostly in the margins, where there seems to have been ample space, perhaps resulting from irregularities of the *mise-en-page.*

Decoration consists of initials in red and silver (now oxidised). Occasional floral decoration. On fol. 49v there is a lion at the bottom of the page; on fol. 48v an initial H comprises a demon biting a pillar; on fol. 50v a man’s head.

In addition to the usual prothemata are on fols 1v–2r three additional texts (see section 5.4.4 below), upon which follow the additional forewords, ‘Sicut inter omnia’, ‘Fuerunt he lamentationes’, ‘In his lamentationibus’, ‘Notandum quod quadruplici’, which are also extant in A, Ha, L and Pa (see appendix I and section 5.4.3 below).

The colophon is, as usual, found last in the text (on fol. 37v); Gilbert is here promoted to archidiaconus instead of the usual diaconus of the church in Auxerre.

*Distinctive features and flaws:* a very small manuscript (only 206 × 129 mm); perhaps damaged by damp, as the script gives a somewhat blurred impression. Several quaternions in the middle are missing; thus the text in book 1 from chapter 9 to chapter 14 is omitted, the historical interpretation in the commentary to chapter 9 excluded. Punctures on fols 23, 24, 25 and 33, the last repaired.

*Origin and provenance:* artwork and script suggest a provenance of Northern France or perhaps South-East England.

*Bibliography:* Harley MSS, vol. 3, p. 4; STEGMÜLLER, RB, 2544.
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C Cambridge, Trinity College, B 11

Glossed Jeremiah and Lamentations ~ parchment ~ 206 fols ~ 273 × 197 mm ~ Northern France? ~ c. 1170

Contents: 1. fols 1–150 f Glossed Jeremiah
2. fols 150v–205v Glossed Lamentations (second recension)
   fols 150v–151v Prothema
   fols 151v–165v Liber primus
3. fol. 206r originally blank. A crusader hymn added saec. xiii,
   'Inter trenos ieremie vere lugent …'23

Gloss format: a good example of the alternate-line type (B). See plate II.

Physical description: text in central column of variable width, gloss on either side, but 2 columns for prefaces on fols 150v–151v. Ruled for 38 lines of gloss, the text written mainly on every other line, beginning on the second or the third ruled line; gloss written above top line. ‘One scribe wrote both text and gloss in a clear, upright, regular hand c. 1160, possibly continental. Characteristics are a trailing tail to x, a very straight-backed a, e, c and t, and unclosed loop to g.’24 Flourishes may, however, imply a slightly later date.

Decoration consists of initials in alternate red and blue, clearly and completely executed, for the most part with well executed but simple flourishes in the contrasting colour. The binding is of saec. xvi and is fully described by Sheppard.

A peculiar feature is that on several occasions a hand of saec. xiii25 has made corrections of readings typical of the second recension back into readings of the first, even deleting clarifying additions of the second. For instance, to chapter 13, 46, verius, the second recension adds in eis which is then expunged in C.

Origin and provenance: ex libris on fol. 1v, ‘liber sancte Marie de Buldewas’, in a very large, upright hand of saec. xiv. ‘The scribal hand and the decoration suggest that the book was made in France.’25 The manuscript was probably a gift to the monks at Buildwas, perhaps donated by Master Robert Amiclas.26 The book is annotated and punctuated throughout by an annotator of saec. xiii, whose notes are also found elsewhere in the glossed books once at Buildwas.

23 Printed in full in JAMES (1900–04), vol. 1, pp. 1–3.
25 Ibid., p. 218.
26 On this man, see THOMSON (1995).
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The manuscript was probably procured in Paris by Master Robert Amiclas, whose annotations are found at least on fols 162v and 169v.


Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 60

Glossed Jeremiah and Lamentations ~ parchment ~ i + 138 fols ~
310 × 205 mm ~ Abbaye de Fontenay ~ saec. xiiimed

Contents: 1. fols 1r–106v Glossed Jeremiah
2. fols 107r–138v Glossed Lamentations
   fol. 107r–v Prothema
   fols 108r–115r Liber primus

Gloss format: type A with variations of the latter part of the period, i.e. L-shaped marginal glosses, marginal glosses written ‘diagonally’; sometimes text of marginal glosses is written between the lines of the lemma.

Physical description: Bible text and glosses, interlinear as well as marginal, very neatly written by a single scribe, using the cedilla. Generally three columns, but two for the prothema. Prickings in outer margins.27 The Hebrew letters in Latinised form are later added in the margins to act as a system of reference. Otherwise, no use is made of signes-de-renvoi (tie-marks; see above, section 2.5.1), and text spilling over from one page to another is continued without any indication. On fol. 138v, the usual colophon (‘sufficient hec’ etc.) is augmented by the words, ‘Finito libro sit laus et gloria Christo’.

Decorations consist of a historiated initial, V, a basilisk with a Babylonian-looking head and long tail, on fol. 1r, and coloured initials beginning the first word of each verse.

Origin and provenance: from the library of M. de Paulmy, ‘Théologie, 98 C’. Before that, from the library of the Abbey of Fontenay, diocese of Autun, shelfmark ‘G 6’, following the ex libris (saec. xii?) on fol. 138v, ‘Liber Sancte Marie de Fontenetio’. Textual features suggest a dating c. 1150–60.

Bibliography: MARTIN (1885), vol. 1, p. 28; STEGMÜLLER, RB, 2544.

---

27 Prickings in the outer margins only are a feature more often found in manuscripts before 1170, whereas manuscripts from that date onwards often (but not always) display prickings in both margins: see DE HAMEL (1984), p. 29.
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Hereford, Cathedral Library, P IV 3

Glossed Lesser Prophets and Lamentations ~ parchment ~ 189 fols ~ 286 × 190 mm ~ Herefordshire ~ saec. xii\textsuperscript{med}

Contents: 1. fols 2r–152v Glossed Lesser Prophets (the authorship of which is ascribed to Gilbertus Universalis by Robert of Bridlington)\textsuperscript{28}
2. fols 153r–189r Glossed Lamentations
   fols 153r–154r Prothemata
   fols 154v–161r Liber primus

Gloss format: type A.

Physical description: one main scribe, a ‘very clear and expert English protogothic bookhand, using the cedilla and ampersand’\textsuperscript{29}, additions made by at least two later hands. The text is generally written in three columns of which the middle is reserved for the Bible text with interlinear glosses. For the prothemata only two columns are used. There are normally 15 lines to a Bible text column, and approximately 54 lines to a fully written marginal column. Not all columns are fully written, though, and, as usual for the A-type, not every line is used, occasionally creating an impression of incompleteness.

Decoration: illuminated initials: on fol. 3r, a \textit{V} in which the Lord and Hosea are depicted, local style in blue, gold, red, green, white and brown. On fol. 39r, a \textit{V} in blue and gold against a dark blue sky with stars in white. On fol. 93r, an \textit{O} in which there is an elderly man with light coloured beard, staff or spear in hand, hair parted in middle. Colours grey, white, blue, green and gold. The stylistic features point to a Herefordshire provenance.\textsuperscript{30}

Distinctive features and flaws: both the historical and allegorical glosses to book 1, chapter 11 are missing; in a more recent hand the following words are added, where one would have expected the missing glosses: ‘hic deficit glossa hystorice idem et allegorice.’ Additional prefaces (see appendix I and below, section 5.4.3).

\textsuperscript{28} See Smalley (1935), pp. 248, 259–61, and above, section 2.2.3.
\textsuperscript{29} Mynors & Thomson (1993), p. 91.
\textsuperscript{30} See Kauffmann (1975), p. 93.
5. The Textual Witnesses

Origin and provenance: apparently Herefordshire; ‘Of presumably local origin, a Cathedral book by c. 1200’,31 ‘P IV 3 … certainly comes from Herefordshire’.32 West Country rustic capitals have been used for display script. On fol. 1r, in a hand of saec. xiii, is written ‘Liber Herefordie ecclesie’, and in another hand (c. 1300), ‘xii profete. preci dimidii marci’. On fol. 1v is a list of contents, saec. xv. At the head of fol. 2r, ‘xii profethe minores glsati prec. xx s’. The Herefordian provenance seems not entirely secure, though, with Thomson mentioning Ha among ‘some of the noticeably early glossed books, often written in continental hands, which came to Hereford Cathedral during the twelfth century’.33


Hereford, Cathedral Library, O IX 11

Glossed Jeremiah and Lamentations ~ parchment ~ ii + 118 fols ~ 336 × 228 mm ~ Herefordshire ~ saec. xii

Contents: 1. fols ii–89v Glossed Jeremiah
2. fols 89r–117v Glossed Lamentations
   fols 89r–95r Liber primus
   fols 117r–117v Prothemat

Gloss format: type A, of a later stage of development with L-shaped glosses and abbreviated lines of Bible text where necessary.

Physical description: ‘One expert English protogothic bookhand, still using the cedilla, writing the gloss smaller, but a little less formally than the text’.35 Later additions in three different hands. The number of columns varies throughout the manuscript. Generally in the Gloss on Lamentations (item 2), the text is written in three columns, of which the middle is the widest and is reserved for the Bible text with its interlinear glosses. There are c. 21 lines to a Bible text

32 DOVE (1997), p. 26, n. 40; on p. 13, in discussing the manuscript Hereford, Cathedral Library, P I 8 (Glossed Song of Songs), she says that its extended paragraphs are ‘very similar to those in P IV 3’; she dates P I 8 to 1135–45.
33 THOMSON (1995), p. 240. Of course, the ‘continental hand’ could very well arise from the scribe having been educated abroad.
34 On p. 13, DOVE (1997), claims erroneously that the manuscript Hereford, Cathedral Library, P I 7 also contains inter alia Glossed Lamentations; see MYNORS & THOMSON (1993), pp. 68–69.
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column, and c. 50 lines to a fully written marginal column. The inner marginal column is regularly narrower than its outer counterpart. Sometimes the marginal gloss totally encompasses the Bible text, which has been reduced to about 15 lines and a narrower column width. A later hand has made paragraph signs in the margin.

On fol. 88v, just after the end of the Gloss to Jeremiah, a later hand has added: 'R[ubrica?] Lamentatio Ieremie que est in titulo chicot [i.e. quînôt – see above, section 4.1] cum absolutione litterarum hebraicarum. Et factum est postquam in captivitatem est ductus est Israel, et Ierusalem destructa est, sedit Ieremias flens et planxit lamentacione hac in Jerusalem et dixit.'

The colophon (on fol. 116v) ends quite abruptly with ‘Gislebertus’ in rustic capitals followed by a ‘;’. The main scribe of Hb usually ends a passage with a full stop. The usual reference to Gilbert as a deacon from Auxerre is thus left out here: perhaps the scribe was able to identify the author of the work he was copying with the Gilbert who until quite recently had been bishop of London?

Frequent corrections made by at least two later hands.

The order of the prothema is the same in Hb as in Ha (and T and F, see section 5.4.1 below), the only difference being that in Hb they are located at the end of the codex.

Origin and provenance: ‘At the Cathedral from manufacture’. The manuscript is still in its original contemporary Hereford binding (tawed skin over flush, slightly chamfered oak boards; conjoint pastedowns …; 3 spinebands and endbands), with the title ‘IEREMIAS’ (saec. xii) up the spine in Lombardic capitals. On fol. 1r, in a hand of saec. xv, ‘ieremias glosatus 2 fo. precii xs’; on fol. 118v, ‘Ieremias glosatus precii vs’ (saec. xiv).


Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek, 2° Ms. Theol. 6

Glossed St Mark and Lamentations ~ parchment ~ 90 fols ~ 255 × 180 mm ~ Riechenberg bei Goslar ~ 1131

Contents: 1. fols 1r–44v Glossed St Mark (fol. 45r A defective beginning of Glossed Lamentations)
2. fols 46r–90r Glossed Lamentations
   fols 46r–56v Liber primus
   fols 89r–90r Prothema

36 Ibid., p. 63.
37 Ibid., p. 63.
5. The Textual Witnesses

*Gloss format:* item 1: type A. Item 2: a variant of type A, the biblical text with interlinear glosses is written in the inner column; the marginal glosses in the outer column, occasionally also above and/or below the biblical text.

*Physical description:* the manuscript consists of two booklets. Originally, items 1 and 2 were separate codices, bound together later, probably in the fifteenth century when the present binding was made. Unless stated otherwise, the following observations pertain to the second booklet only. Very neatly written, in no haste. ‘Die schöne Schrift gehört dem schrägovalen Stil an und ist insgesamt leicht nach rechts geneigt’. The same scribe wrote Bible text and glosses, interlinear as well as marginal. Scribe uses mainly ampersand, very rarely tironian *et* (‘?') and then in its uncrossed form, cedilla (e-caudata), dotted *y,* ‘H’-shaped *enim,* both straight-backed and uncial *d,* *u*-ligatures at line-ends, *u*-ligatures at ends of an occasional *Paschasius and eius,* occasional very peculiar *b*-like letter *ζ* of the ‘bajuwarische’ shape. Text written in two columns; Bible text in inner column, 8–10 lines, with interlinear glosses; marginal glosses in outer column, surrounding biblical text on up to three sides. Inner and outer prickings for 32–51 lines of text (marginal glosses), depending on the amount of glossing the page holds. An extreme case is fol. 55r with only 23 lines of marginal glosses, due to the lacking tropological marginal gloss. The Bible text is written in the inner column on both recto and verso sides, creating a symmetrical appearance. Normally one verse of Lamentations is copied per page, which occasionally creates large empty spaces, but greatly enhances the overall readability of the text. Occasional instructions for the rubricator are left on the outer edges of the page (e.g. fol. 52 recto and verso).

Display script consists of Latinised Hebrew ‘titles’ in Uncial, section rubrics (‘Pascasius historice,’ etc) and occasional ends of sentences in nicely executed Rustic capitals. Decoration consists of a flourished 12-line initial *Q* on fol. 46, and a similar 15-line *R* on fol. 85.

On fol. 46, there is a note (saec. xvi/xvii) explaining who Paschasius was, namely ‘Abbas Corbiensis Anno domini 880’. On fol. 89, right after the colophon, the wording of which here is somewhat unusual, ‘Sufficient he ad lamentationis expositionem ieremie, que de patrum fontibus hausi ego Gysilbertus antissiodorensis ecclesie diaconus’, a much later hand (saec. xvi/xvii) has commented, ‘claruit 1090’.

---

39 Ibid., p. 263.
40 Ibid., p. 265.
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The Lamentations verses 15–19 (fols 53r–55r) are provided with semi-diastematic German neumes of a somewhat idiosyncratic style. The neumes were added after the interlinear gloss, apparently by a different hand, which has also added in the margins the words ‘Zameth’ (fol. 53r) and ‘Iherusalem, iherusalem, convertere ad dominum deum tuum’ (fol. 55r), in both cases with neumes. As with Ba (see above), the neumes show the chant used in the Tenebrae liturgy of Holy Week.

In reality, two scribes have been at work on the manuscript. The scribe who wrote the colophon on fol. 45v (see below) is clearly not the same as the scribe who wrote the major part of the Gloss on Lamentations, but apparently did write the four lines at Lam 4:17 (fol. 83r). Petke has identified the scribe of the Lamentations gloss as the Riechenberg scribe ‘RE’ (Siegfried), and the scribe of the colophon and the four lines at 4:17 as the scribe ‘RC’.41 It is to be noted in this context that the scribe of the colophon wrote ‘Scripsit’ and not ‘scripsi’.

Prothemata are found at the end of the codex, after the glossed text.

Distinctive features and flaws: the text of the Gloss begins with the verse Aleph on fol. 46r, the second folio of a quaternion. On the first folio of the same quaternion (45r), there is a first attempt at copying the Gloss on Lamentations, comprising the verses Aleph–Beth (Lam 1:1–2) with incomplete interlinear glosses. The marginal glosses are in this first attempt entirely missing. The scribe then jumped one folio and began anew. On the verso of his first attempt, he left the note given under ‘origin and provenance’ below. The first attempt at the text, on fol. 45r, includes the middle gloss, ‘Aleph doctrina … subiacuit’, which in the second and completed attempt is missing. Interlinear glosses missing in the first attempt are ‘affectuose’ and ‘ammirative’ to the word ‘Quomodo’; ‘habitu plorantis’ to ‘seder’, probably due to the omission of the words ‘Quomodo sedet’ from the Bible text; the gloss ‘doctrina’ to Aleph is missing in both attempts; from the words ‘ex omnibus caris eius’ to the end of the verse, interlinear glosses are entirely lacking. Thus at the first attempt a different exemplar seems to have been used.42 The interlinear gloss of the unfinished attempt (fol. 45r) is very small in comparison with that of the completed text (fol. 46r and onwards).

The whole marginal gloss 19, Coph moraliter (fol. 55r), is omitted. There is ample space left on the page.

41 Ibid., pp. 277–96.
42 See ibid., p. 263.
5. The Textual Witnesses

*Origin and provenance:* from the Augustiner-Chorherrenstift Riechenberg bei Goslar in the diocese of Hildesheim. On fol. 45v, a scribal note, ‘Liber sancte Marie in richenberch quem scrisit sigefridus eiusdem ecclesie subdiaconus anno incarnationis domini MCXXXI’. These words were written not by the scribe of the codex himself, but probably by his superior, whose hand also copied a few lines of Bible text at Lam 4:17 on fol. 83v (see above). The diocese, situated south-east of Hanover, had close contacts with Northern France. K is the oldest extant dated manuscript of any part of the Gloss, ‘Nach derzeitigem Wissen schuf er [Siegfried the subdeacon] damit den ältesten absolut datierten Textzeugen eines Teils der künftigen Glosse’.43


Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, 71

Glossed St Matthew and Lamentations, with a treatise on ecclesiastical calculation ~ parchment ~ 92 fols ~ 230 × 160 mm ~ Vauclair, 1170 (item 3), Laon? 1140–50 (items 1 and 2)

*Contents:* 1. fols 1r–49v Glossed St Matthew
  2. fols 50r–89r Glossed Lamentations
     fol. 50r–50v Prothemata
     fols 50v–59r Liber primus
     fol. 89r Additional prothemata
  3. fols 89v–92v A treatise on ecclesiastical calculation

*Gloss format:* type A.

*Physical description:* seems rather quickly made, pages rashly planned and executed. The following observations pertain to item 2 only, unless otherwise stated. Three ruled columns, the outer somewhat broader than the inner and middle. A single scribe throughout the text. Corrections by the same or a contemporary hand; many letters ë have been corrected into ë, and ß has often been added to proper names on I such as I(h)erusalem and I(h)eremias. The heading *historie* has by the means of an inserted ë furthermore consistently been corrected to *historie*. Probably the same correcting hand has also clarified blurred letters and written them above the line, occasionally solving abbreviations and writing them out in full. Intricate system of reference
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between Bible text and interlinear (and sometimes marginal) glosses, consisting both of minuscule letters and signs of various shapes (crosses, gibbets etc).\textsuperscript{44}

Decoration consists of a simple monochrome flourished initial \textit{Q} on fol. 50\textsuperscript{r}. Flourished gibbets on occasion.

\textit{Distinctive features and flaws:} on fol. 50\textsuperscript{r}, written as a rubric, ‘Glose perutiles in lamentationes iheremie compilate a magistro Gisleberto universali’. On fol. 89\textsuperscript{r}, right after the end of book 5, follow in what appears to be the same hand, written in one single column, the additional forewords of \textit{A}, some of which also occur in \textit{Ha}, \textit{Bb} and \textit{Pa}, namely, ‘In istis lamentationibus’, ‘Notandum est quod’, ‘Duo genera canticorum’, ‘Sicut inter omnia’, ‘Fuerunt hee lamentationes’, ‘Sicut testante Salomone’, ‘Agit Ieremias propheta’, ‘Similiter ecclesia vel’ (‘Liber iste’ is to be found on fol. 50\textsuperscript{r}, after the regular prothemata; see appendix I and section 5.4.3 below). Then follows this gloss:

\begin{quote}
Nabucodonosor interpretatur os laguncule, quia universos inebriat malicia, quod cum venit diabolo, et sonniator interpretatur.
\end{quote}

Upon which follows the section on the kings of Judah also found in \textit{A} (see section 5.4.4).

\textit{Origin and provenance:} to judge from scriptual and decorative features, the manuscript (items 1 and 2) is of Cistercian origin, written in the late second quarter or middle of the twelfth century. This date is further supported by the small size of the manuscript (230 × 160 mm). On fol. 92\textsuperscript{v}, near the end of the treatise on ecclesiastical calculation, there is a note, ‘Et hoc anno transacto erit indictio iii et anni ab incarnatione Domini mille clxx’; this date pertains to the third item only. On fol. 49\textsuperscript{r} and the inside back cover, in contemporary hands, ‘Liber Sancte Marie Vallis Clare’ (Vaucclair).

\textit{Bibliography:} RAVAISSON, vol. 1, p. 83; STEGMÜLLER, RB, 2544.

\textbf{M Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 540}

Glossed Lamentations ~ parchment ~ 149 fols ~ 215 × 145 mm ~ Admont? ~ saec. xii\textsuperscript{ex}

\textit{Contents:} 1. fols 1\textsuperscript{r}–149\textsuperscript{r} Glossed Lamentations  
\hspace{1cm} fols 1\textsuperscript{r}–6\textsuperscript{r} Prothemata (with some additional texts, see below)  
\hspace{1cm} fols 6\textsuperscript{r}–37\textsuperscript{v} Liber primus

\textsuperscript{44} An interesting feature considering the remark made by DE HAMEL (1984), p. 31, that ‘although tie-marks linked glosses from page to page, scribes did not use any marks to link individual glosses to the text’ (i.e. from Bible text to marginal gloss), which seems to be the case with this manuscript. The tie-marks may, of course, be a later addition.
5. The Textual Witnesses

2. fol. 149r Probationes pennae, ‘Probatio incausti bonum esse potest’

Gloss format: type C.

Physical description: the manuscript is continuously written in a semi-formata hand of the late twelfth century, at one column per page, c. 23 lines to a column. Script is rather simple, quite abbreviated and of a generally smearable appearance. The composition of the manuscript is very similar to that of Z. On fol. 149r, the usual colophon is augmented by the following: ‘Expliciunt Threne [sic] Lamentationum Hieremie vatis’.

Decoration: on fol. 6r, a fine initial, an anthropomorphic Q, containing a grave-looking prophet Jeremiah supporting his chin with his hands. On fol. 113r, the initial Q is zoomorphic (a fox or a dog?).

Distinctive features and flaws: just as in Z, the interlinear glosses are collected and written continuously at the end of each verse/chapter. These sections are usually preceded by the rubric color, obviously referring to the rhetorical content. M displays the same additional forewords as Z, namely on fol. 1r, ‘Iustitiam accidentem’, and ‘Pamphilus. Incusatur Origenes’ (see section 5.4.4 below). On fols 4r–6r are found two short biographies of the prophet Jeremiah, same as in Z.

Origin and provenance: Admont; ‘Admontes arbeit aus der zweiter Hälfte des XII. Jahrs’.45


Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 2578

Glossed Lamentations with additional preface and interlinear glosses as an appendix ~ parchment ~ 132 fols ~ 250 × 155 mm ~ Bournet ~ saec. xiiimed

Contents: 1. fol. 2r ‘Plebs namque Iudaica’
2. fol. 3r Additional prothemata
3. fol. 3v ‘Quam difficile sit’
4. fols 4r–10r Exposition of ‘Et factum est’
5. fols 10v–112r Glossed Lamentations (Bible text + marginal gloss)
   fols 10v–13r Prothemata
   fols 13r–34r Liber primus

45 BUBERL (1911), p. 55.
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6. fols 113r–131v Glossed Lamentations (Bible text + interlinear gloss)
   fols 113r–118v Liber primus (On fol. 113r, there is also the interlinear gloss to the additional preface ‘Et factum est’)
7. fol. 132v Ex libris

Gloss format: type C; continuous text (Bible text and marginal glosses) with Bible text and glossa interlinearis as an appendix. See plate III.

Physical description: the manuscript is continuously written (Bible text without interlinear gloss followed by continuously written marginal glosses); Bible text (a second time) together with interlinear glosses are copied as a separate appendix at the end of the codex. At least five hands took part in the copying of the manuscript. Some additions made by a later (saec. xiii/xiv?) hand. All five hands in the Carolingian tradition; four of them are rather provincial and old-fashioned, and the fifth, pointed hand more avant-garde. All hands write the letter c instead of t, which is a typical French old-fashioned feature. Occasionally one scribe boxes marginalia, which is an earlier way of marking readings in liturgical manuscripts.

Distinctive features and flaws: on fol. 2v (a half-folio) is the following text:

Plebs namque Iudaica, quam sibi Deus ex omnibus mundi gentibus elegerat, quam ex Egipto eductam cunctis nationibus potentiorem effecerat, quam legis sue preceptis et mysticis sacramentis imbutam sacraverat, propter ydolatriam et legis divine transgressionem a Creatore destituta, templo incenso, Iherusalem destructa et omni regione ipsorum devastata, Caldeis captivantibus fuerat subiugata, et ad ultimum Romanis seu cunctis gentibus propter vindictam Dominici sanguinis, quem seviens fundere non timuit, miserabili servitute noscitur mancipata.

On fol. 3r, five of the additional prothematata of A, Bh, L and Ha, ‘Sicut inter omnia’, ‘Fuerunt et he lamentationes’, ‘Similiter ecclesia vel’, ‘(Notandum est quia) in his lamentationibus’, ‘Notandum est quod’ (see appendix I and section 5.4.3, below). Upon which (fol. 3v) follows a passage beginning ‘Quam difficile sit prophetas intelligere’, which continues on fol. 4r and ends ‘… exterius visa coniunxit dicens: Et factum est postquam’ (see section 5.4.4 below). Before ‘Et factum est’ is written in a hand of saec. xiii/xiv, ‘incipit explanacio Gisliberti in Lamentacionibus Jeremii prophete’. Hereafter follows (fols 4v–10v) a lengthy historical, allegorical and moral exposition on the verse ‘Et factum est’, which shows influence from St Jerome and St Gregory the Great. No decoration except flourished initials on fols 3r, 10v and 13r. Fol. 2 is a half folio. Stains on fol. 3r make the text difficult to read.
5. The Textual Witnesses

*Origin and provenance:* Bournet, diocese of Angoulême, in Western France, as can be understood from a note on fol. 132r, where it is written in contemporary Uncial-looking capitals, ‘In hoc volumine continentur Lamentaciones Iheremie prophete, quas de opusculis patrum collegit Gislebertus diaconus ecclesie Autisiodorensis. Et est hic liber de ecclesia Bornetensi’.

*Bibliography:* STEGMÜLLER, RB, 2545.

**Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 576**

Glossed Lamentations, various sermons and treatises ~ parchment ~ ii + 130 fols ~ 220 × 150 mm ~ Northern France? ~ saec. xiiex/xiiiin

**Contents:**
1. fol. i◦  Incription in French (see section 5.4.4 below)
2. fols ii◦–87r  Glossed Lamentations
   - fols ii◦–1◦  Epistula 30 of St Jerome to Paula (§§ 5–14)
   - fols 1◦–3◦  Prothematata
   - fols 3◦–22◦  Liber primus
3. fols 87r–106r  De sacramento Dominice passionis by Drogo
   (= Gaufridus of Auxerre), ‘Incipit soliloquium domini Drogonis prius abbatis S. Iohannis Laudunensis … de sacramento dominice passionis’
4. fol. 106r  Sermo ad Henricum Senonesium archiepiscopum de S. Bernardo
5. fol. 118r  ‘Mediator Dei et hominum’ (Anselm of Laon?)
6. fol. 126r  Anselm of Canterbury
7. fol. 128r  Gilbert Foliot?
8. fol. 130r  ‘Ibo mihi ad montem mirre’ (Hugo of St Victor?)

**Gloss format:** type C.

**Physical description:** the following observations pertain to item 2. One scribe wrote both Bible text and glosses – marginal and interlinear – continuously in one column throughout item 2. The Bible text with interlinear glosses is placed at the beginning of each verse. Script is of a somewhat angular, very ‘protogothic’ appearance; a few skeletal letters, dotted ys; both open and closed second loop to g, both Uncial and straight-backed d; the scribe uses the tironian et (uncrossed) almost exclusively, in preference to the ampersand, which may be found occasionally in the Bible text, and then slanting severely to the right.

Decoration consists of an 8-line R on fol. 1◦ with flourishes; on fol. 3◦ a 14-line decorated Q; regularly occurring coloured, sometimes flourished litterae notabiliiores of 2–6 lines.
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Distinctive features and flaws: on fol. i, there is an inscription in French of perhaps saec. xviii/xix, beginning ‘Ces Commentaire …’ (see section 5.4.4 below). On fol. 4 is a large puncture, which later has been mended. The same occurs on fols 10 and 70. 

Origin and provenance: palaeographical features suggest Northern France.

Bibliography: STEGMÜLLER, RB, 2544.

Leeds, Brotherton Library, Ripon Cathedral 4

Apocalypse and Glossed Lamentations ~ parchment ~ 85 fols ~ 230 × 150 mm ~ Ripon Cathedral ~ saec. xii\textsuperscript{med}

Contents:  1. fols 1–60 Contiuous commentary on the Apocalypse. Begins imperfectly
   2. fols 61–85 Glossed Lamentations (ends imperfectly at Lam 4:12)
   fol. 61 Title leaf, ‘Treni Jeremie’ in a contemporary, slightly later hand
   fols 61–62 Prothemata
   fols 62–69 Liber primus

Gloss format: type A. See plate I.

Physical description: the following observations pertain to item 2 only. Very neatly written by a single scribe. Page is ruled for 12 lines of Bible text, surrounding glosses independently ruled, up to 59 lines per page. Script displays characteristically English features such as a round open g and straight-backed ampersand, which is used together with tironian uncrossed et. Signes-de-renvoi of elaborate design. Scribe using cedilla, dotting of y. The page seems ruled only for the Bible text. Prothemata text in two columns, gloss text in three, of which the outer is the widest. Orthography very consistent, hardly any ci are written for ti.

Decoration consists of Latinised Hebrew letters in red. Huge 16-line flourished initial Q on fol. 62: red, green and brownish-yellow on blue and green ground, filled with finely drawn foliage, on green, mauve and brownish yellow grounds. On fol. 69, a rather faint 8-line flourished initial Q, brownish yellow with red and green ornament. Fine flourished initial E with ends shaped as dragon heads on fol. 76.

Distinctive features and flaws: the text is remarkably correct, with only small omissions here and there. The sole exception to this is the omission of the entire allegorical gloss at 8, 30–36. Codex is mutilated; the text ends imperfectly on fol. 85 with book 4, chapter 12.
5. The Textual Witnesses

*Origin and provenance:* the previous dating, made by Ker, was on basis of item 1. Item 2: scribal features suggest an English provenance of the mid-twelfth century, perhaps Ripon. The decorative features of item 2, especially the use of green colour, would tend to refine this dating to rather earlier than later in the period, perhaps c. 1140.


**Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14781**

Glossed Daniel, Ruth, Lamentations, an earlier glossed Job ~ parchment ~ 209 fols ~ 255 × 175 mm ~ Paris (St Victor?) / Laon ~ saec. xiiimed

**Contents:**
1. fol. 1r Ex libris in hand of saec. xii. List of contents in a hand of saec. xiiimed, ‘In hoc volumine continentur Daniel, Ruth, Treni, Job’
2. fol. 2r List of contents (?) to Daniel (saec. xiv)
3. fols 3r–62v Glossed Daniel
4. fols 62r–72v Glossed Ruth
   (fol. 73r left blank)
5. fols 73r–126v *Glossed Lamentations*
   fols 73r–74r Prothemata
   (fol. 74r left blank)
   fols 75r–85v Liber primus
6. fols 127r–208r Glossed Job (not the *ordinaria*) on a new vellum
   (fol. 208v left blank)
7. fol. 209r Scribblings about Job (saec. xiv)
   (fol. 209v very dirty, but blank)

**Gloss format:** type A with some L-shaped marginal glosses. Occasional abbreviation of the Bible text (e.g. fol. 111v).

**Physical description:** same hand wrote items 3–5. Item 6 is written in a somewhat earlier, distinctively Laonnoise script. The following observations pertain to item 5, unless otherwise stated. Writing is very neat and orderly. Well planned pages, nearly all glosses to a verse finished on the same page; glosses in good order with historical interpretation on top of page. Three columns, even for the prothemata. Orthography very consistent; hardly any *ci* for *ti*. Use of cedilla and ampersand. Simple feet and serifs, ending in an upwards turn of the pen.

Decoration consists of large, flourished *A* on fol. 4r. On fol. 62r, a huge 30-line *I* with two nearly naked climbing human beings. Flourished *Q* on fol.
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75r. These decorations are all in the Henrician style.\textsuperscript{46} On fol. 127r, an illuminated zoomorphic $V$ in the Laon style.\textsuperscript{47}

Distinctive features and flaws: item 5 on newer vellum. Text lacks several interlinear glosses, which appear in $Ha$ and the other manuscripts of the $a$-family. See section 5.5.3 below.

Origin and provenance: Paris. The book belonged to St Victor, as the ex libris on fol. 1r reads (in hand of saec. xii) ‘Iste liber est sancti Victoris par. quicumque eum furatus fuerit vel celaverit vel titulum istum deleverit anathema sit’. Stirnemann argues for a Parisian origin, and dates the manuscript to around 1140–50.\textsuperscript{48} Zier states early twelfth century and ‘inc. XII c’.\textsuperscript{49} Last item (6) in codex is bound in later, and is probably from Laon.


\textit{V} Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica, Pal. lat. cod. 85

Glossed Lamentations ~ parchment ~ 48 fols ~ ‘in 8’ ~

Central/Northern France ~ saec. xii\textsuperscript{med}

Contents: 1. fols 1r–48v Glossed Lamentations

~~

fols 1r–2r Prothema

fols 2r–12r Liber primus

Gloss format: type A.

Physical description: neatly written by a French scribe, featuring a sharp upwards strike of minims and a closed second loop to the $g$. Corrections made by a somewhat later hand, of faults which are also to be found in $Ba$. Decoration consists of a flourished 6-line $Q$ on fol. 13r, and a similar $R$ on fol. 44r.


\textsuperscript{46} The young Prince Henry, who on entering Clairvaux in 1146, donated a set of glossed books to the monastery, all decorated in a distinctive style. See Stirnemann (1994), p. 266.

\textsuperscript{47} See Stirnemann (1994), Plate IIb, p. 289.


\textsuperscript{49} Zier (1993), p. 6 and 16.
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**Origin and provenance:** Central or Northern France, as suggested by scribal features and artwork.

**Bibliography:** STEVENSON (1886), vol. 1, p. 14.

**Zwettl, Stiftsbibliothek, 36**

St Jerome, Hraban Maur, Glossed Lamentations, etc. ~ parchment ~ 200 fols ~ 340 × 250 mm ~ Zwettl, 1180/1190

**Contents:**
1. fol. 1* Various verses in honour of the Blessed Virgin, ‘de femina’ etc. (In hands of saec. xiii and later)
2. fols 2r–95v St Jerome, In Hieremiam prophetam (CCSL 74)
3. fols 96r–121r Hraban Maur, Explanatio in Lamentationes Hieremiæ prophetæ (PL 111)
4. fols 122v–170v Glossed Lamentations
   - fols 122v–123v Prothema
   - fols 123v–134v Liber primus
5. fols 170r–188r Bernardus Morlanensis, De contemptu mundi
   - ‘A synodo bellus bene dicitur iste libellus’
7. fols 192r–197v Augmentum psalmorum
8. fols 197v–199v Altmannus Rahewino. A poem on the martyrdom of St Affra
9. fol. 199v A verse: De contemptu mundi

**Gloss format:** type C.

**Physical description:** neatly and fluently written in two columns by a scribe using *n*- and *s*-ligatures at the end of lines. Consonants within words are frequently duplicated, as *cottidie*. Sometimes the descenders of the letters written on the bottom line of the page are heavily extended, occasionally reaching over the frame (e.g. fol. 167 recto and verso). No decorations apart from a 12-line flourished initial *Q* on fol. 123r.

**Distinctive features and flaws:** interlinear glosses abbreviated and written together after each chapter/verse, often headed by the rubric *color*. The regular prothema are preceded by two forewords (see section 5.4.4 below, and also the description of *M* above). Following the regular prothema are two brief ‘biographies’ of the prophet Jeremiah, the first taken from Hraban Maur, De universo libro, liber 5, caput 3 (PL 111, cols 114C–115A), and the second from

---

50 On the various text of this manuscript, see ZIEGLER (1992), p. 79.
INTRODUCTION

Isidore, *De ortu et obitu patrum qui in Scriptura laudibus effereunt*, caput 38 (PL 83, cols 142D–143A).

*Origin and provenance*: Zwettl.

*Bibliography*: STEGMÜLLER, RB, 2544; ZIEGLER (1992), pp. 77–79.

5.4 NOTES ON THE MANUSCRIPTS

This section will discuss certain aspects of some of the manuscripts, which do not fit either among the manuscript descriptions or the chapter on interrelations.

5.4.1 The order of prothemata

The order in which the prothemata are copied varies among the manuscripts. Although not decisive for establishing relationships between manuscripts, the order of prothemata displayed by the various manuscripts may help in sorting them. It has been especially helpful in deciding the probable original order to find that the oldest, most significant manuscripts share the same order of prothemata. There seems to be little reason for a scribe to divert from the order in the manuscript exemplar he is copying.

Thus, the prothemata of the manuscripts L, R, K, M and Z of the β family (see section 5.5.4 below) all follow the same order; as three of these (LRK – see chapter 6 below) are among the manuscripts chosen as basis for the present edition, the order of the prothema of these manuscripts is adhered to in the edition. The α family of manuscripts – F, Ha, Hb and T (see section 5.5.3) – also display the same prothema, but in the following order: I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VIII, IX, X, XI and VII.

There seem to have been dissenting opinions of where to place one prothema in particular, no. X, which in some manuscripts can be found as a marginal gloss to verse 1, *Aleph*, instead of among the usual prothema.

The order of the prothema in second-recension manuscripts is generally more varied than in manuscripts of the first recension. It is interesting to note that with the second recension, prothema II and III are consistently written together as one single section (‘Ieremias precipue sub quadrato celi cardine …’). This arrangement is retained in the *editio princeps*, which also lumps other prothema together, reducing the total number to seven.
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5.4.2 The role and importance of *K*

The fact that the earliest datable Gloss manuscript is of German provenance, and not French, is an indication of that the Gloss may have been on the market earlier than has been previously believed. This view is further enhanced by the fact that this manuscript, *K*, is not faultless. Indeed, the type and number of errors displayed by *K* indicate that at least two generations of manuscripts had been in existence before *K* was copied in 1131 (see the tentative *stemma codicum* at section 5.8 below). Still, being the earliest dateable copy of the Gloss, *K* can be used to strengthen our hypothesis of which of the two recensions was the more original. The readings of *K* are clearly of the first recension, and so this ought to have been the first version of the text that was subsequently developed in the form which has come down to us. *K* can, furthermore, help us establish the original contents of the interlinear gloss, indicating which elements were there from the beginning and which have been added later.

5.4.3 The additional prothemata of *ABbHaLPa*

In addition to the ordinary eleven, a number of first-recension manuscripts display additional prothemata. *A, Bb, Ha, L* and *Pa* all contain a number of additional texts, either in direct connection with the usual prothemata or found copied together elsewhere in the manuscript. Four of these additional prothemata are extant in all five manuscripts; two of these four seem to derive from the commentary ascribed to Pseudo-Jerome discussed above (section 4.3.1).

In *Ha*, the additional prothema follow directly after the ordinary ones, for which too much space had been planned (the eleven usual prothemata occupying only two of the three allotted pages). Since in *Ha*, produced according to the oldest gloss format (see above, section 2.5.2), the entire codex had already been planned and ruled beforehand, and the Bible text written out, the scribe, after copying the eleven usual prothemata, was faced with one blank folio page. In order not to waste any precious parchment, this thoughtful scribe copied what he had at hand of Lamentations exegesis on the remaining page, explaining his venture before proceeding:

> Hec ad introitum lamentationum a Gilleberto Altisiodorensis ecclesie diachono conscripta superficie pagine calamo nos impressisse sufficiat. Sequentia autem, que ad carte aream, ne vacua et inutilis appareret et iaceret, complendam litterarum apicibus annotata sunt, de utilitate veteris glosature sumpta, diligens lector attende. In primis itaque de hebreicarum litterarum interpretationibus hec considera: Aleph nanque interpretatur doctrina, Beth
domus, Gimel plenitudo, Deleth tabularum, He ista, Vau et, Zay hec, Heth vita, Teth bonum, Ioth principium, Caph manus, Lameth disciplina sive cor, Men ex ipsis, Nun sempiternum, Samech adiutorium, Ayn fons sive oculus, Phe os, Sade iusticie, Coph vocatio, Res capitis, Sen dentium, Tau signa.

The result is six additional prothemata. The scribe claims he has taken his additional material from a vetus glosatura, which he obviously had easily to hand. I have not been able to identify the exact composition of this text, but it obviously contained, as we shall see below, segments from the text of Pseudo-Jerome found in PL 25 (see section 4.3.1 above).

Four of the additional prothemata of Ha are also to be found in Bb and Pa, the latter of which adds one of its own. All these five additional prothemata with an additional four (totalling nine) are copied at the end of the text of L, and after the regular prothemata in A. The respective occurrence of these additional prothemata can be visualised by the means of the following table. For the full text of the additional prothemata, the reader is referred to appendix I of the present volume, where the texts will be found critically edited.

Table 5: Additional prothemata

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The additional texts common to all five manuscripts are thus 13, 14, 16 and 17.

12 = Liber iste, etc. 13 = In his lamentationibus, etc.
14 = Notandum est quod quadruplici, etc. 15 = Duo genera canticorum, etc.
16 = Sicut inter omnia canticum, etc. 17 = Euerunt he lamentationes, etc.
18 = Sicut testante Salomone, etc. 19 = Agit autem Lernias, etc.
20 = Similiter ecclesia vel, etc.

The additional prothemata deriving from Pseudo-Jerome are 16, 17 and 20. As can be seen from the table, 16 and 17 are shared by all five manuscripts. The interesting question how it could be that representatives of the two families of the tradition, independently of each other, copy the same additional prothemata into their copies of the Gloss on Lamentations will be addressed on another occasion.
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5.4.4 Additional texts

As has been indicated in the manuscript descriptions, several codices contain additional texts, either together with other manuscripts as we have seen in section 5.4.3, or independently, as for instance \( Bb \), which includes a short biography of the prophet Jeremiah, found on fols 1v–2r:

Ieremias iste filius fuit Helchie, qui fuit unus de sacerdotibus illis, qui fuerunt in Anathot in terra Beniamin. Est autem Anathot vicus distans tribus milibus a civitate Ierusalem, ut dicit beatus Ieronimus. Fuit autem Ieremias ipse sacerdos ex sacerdotibus, qui sanctificatus in utero matris sue cepit prophetare a puericia sua captivitatem urbis et Iudee, quam ipse vidit non solum spiritualibus oculis sed etiam carnalibus, quam scripto notatam ipse Ieremias transmisit postea legenda Sezechie tunc temporis regnanti Iherosolimis. Sedecheias autem graverit hoc ferens conbussit quartam illam et ipsum etiam Iheremiam conclusit in carcerem, quia eladem illam prophetavaret. Tunc ipse Sedecheias postea extraxit eum a carcere rogonis ipsum, quatus oraret ad Deum pro sancta civitate, cum ipse Sedecheias imminere Nabugodonosor regem Babiloniorum. Sed hec fecit ipse nimium sero nimiumque tarde, namque nia fame imminente civitas tandem capta est post duo annos et in iiiii menses; taliter quod princeps ipsius civitatis et filii regis Sedecheipso patet vidente interfecti et ad extremum ipsum Sedecheias erutis sibi oculis ductus est in captivitatem Babilonie, ubi ipse fuit in merore usque ad exitum sua vitae. Post istam autem destructionem Naburzadan, princeps malicie [sic] Nabugodonosor, illud tantillum dignitatis et religionis quod adhuc supererat Iero solimis ex toto delevit transferens ad Babilonios per tres vices ii mi milium Iudeorum et sexcentos viros de tota Beniaminia tribu et de dimidia tribu Iude traductos.

Thereafter follows a section on the fate of the ten tribes of Israel that were taken captive and brought to Babylon by Nabuzardan, notorious princeps militiae of the king Nebuchadnezzar:

Iam autem tribus decem Israel translate crant ab Assiriis ad Medos\(^{52}\) per Salmanasar regem Assiriorum sub Ezechia rege Ierosolimorum. Tunc Nabuzardan predictus ex precepto sui regis fecit obcionem ipsi Ieremie, ut, si vellet transsire, transsiret cum alius captivis in Babiloniam et nihil mali pateretur ibi vel, si ipse Ieremias vellet, remaneret pocius Ierosolimis cum Godolia quodam Iudeo viro iustissimo, quem rex Nabugodonosor prefecerat pauperibus et infirmis quibusdam Iudeis in terra illa remanentibus. Remansit itaque Ieremias iste cum Godolia, quem postea admonentem Iudeos

\(^{51}\) See St Jerome, Prologus in libro Hieremiae prophetae, Vulg., Ed. minor, p. 1166, lines 4–8.
\(^{52}\) See ibid., lines 8–9.
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quoscumque residuos, ut servirent regi Babilonie, interficet Ismael quidam Iudeus, unus de illis principibus Iudeorum, qui dispersi sunt per gentes pro timore Nabugodonosor, cui servire nolebant. Postea autem Ioannem, inter principes Iudeorum non minimus, qui in dispersione gentium erant, ut predictum est, timens potenciam Nabugodonosor fugiens in Egiptum traduxit secum Ieremiam prophetam et quoscumque Iudeos potuit, qui adhuc Ierosolimis residui erant. Tandem ipse Ieremias reprehendens Iudeos de idolatria ab eisdem in Egipto lapidatus est sed inde Ieremias Spiritu sancto conexcitante iterum descripsit cladem illam addens quaedam que prius non dixerat.

A last additional section in Bb is obviously some sort of accessus to the text to be commented upon (i.e. Lamentations), explaining the intention of the author (Jeremiah), his subject-matter and the purpose of his mourning:

Est enim sua intencio hic nos vel quoscumque hortari ad penitentiam pro peccatis agendam. Materia vero sua est hic populus Iudaicus et Babilonius. Finis vero vel utilitas est nos quamvis peccatores tamen revocari posse ad nostrum celestem patriam post peractam penitentiam, sicut illi sunt revocati ad suam terrenam post penitentiam peractam; cetera autem satis patent omnes me tacente.

Common to the manuscripts A (on fol. 63r) and L (fol. 89r) is a brief genealogy of the kings of Judah, including the incident with Nebuchadnezzar and the Babylonian captivity, central features of the background to the book of Lamentations:

Iosias iustus tres filios habuit Ioachaz, Ihetoniam, Sedechiam; Iosias vero devictus est a pharaone Necao rege Egipti, dum veniret ad expugnationem Moabitarum. Quibus devictis, dum rediret Iherusalem et inveniret Ioachaz a Iudeis regem constitutum, a regno illum diecit et illum vincitum in Egiptum duxit; fratrem vero Iheconiam regem constituit, quem Ioachim vocavit, qui et Eliachim alio nomine dictus fuit. Iste autem annis xi regnavit et a Nabugordonosor Iherusalem ascendendae captus et sepulchra asini sepultus fuit cuius filium eisdem nominibus vocatum regem sustinuit et tribus mensibus in regno transactis eundem Nabugordonosor in Babilonem duxit; prius Reblata iii occisis filiis et effossis eius occulis; tunc etiam Nabuzardan princeps milicie eius Iherusalem totam combuxit et muros destructit et, ut terra inculta remaneret, iunctores et cultores agrorum dimisit et Godoliam eis prefecit. Explicit glose in lamentationes Iheremie.
5. *The Textual Witnesses*

The manuscript *Pa* contains several further commentary texts: one most interesting (fols 4r–10v) on the short prologue to Lamentations, *Et factum est* (see section 4.1 above), divided into historical, allegorical and tropological expositions, too long to be printed here. Preceding that (on fols 3v–4r) is the following section on the difficulty of understanding the ways of expression employed by the Old Testament prophets:

Quam difficile sit prophetas intelligere, psalmista figurate innotuit cum ait: *Tenebrosa aqua in nubibus aeris* [Ps 17:12], quia obscura est scientia in prophetis.53 Solent tamen plerique querere quidnam sit, quod aliqui prophetarum ab ‘et’ orationem suam incipient, cum manifeste appareat ‘et’ partem subiunctivam esse, quamvis subiungi aliquid non possit nisi alicui rei precedentis. Quibus breviter respondendum est quia Spiritus sanctus, qui per ipsorum ora quasi per organum suum loquebatur, sic eos de illis, in quibus erudiebat, certos reddebat, sicuti nos certi sumus de his, que corporeis occultus videmus. Unde plerique futura quasi preterita nunciabant, ut David: *Homo natus est in ea: et ipse fundavit eam Altissimus* [Ps 86:5], et Ieremias: *Post hec in terra visus est, et cum hominibus conversatus est* [Br 3:38]. Et Iohannes in Apochalipsi, dum de duobus Domini testibus loqueretur, diciens: *Post tres dies, et dimidium, spiritus vitae a Deo intrabit in eos*, protinus addidit: *Et steterunt super pedes suos* [Apc 11:11], quasi dicatur: ‘Homo nascebitur ex ea’ et ‘post hanc in terram videbitur’ et ‘stabant super pedes suos’, morem sanctarum tenens scripturarum, quem preteritis uti solent pro futuris. Ut vero enucleatius intelligerent quam vera de futuris sentire deberent, aliquando eorum corda spiritus prophetiae de presenti tetigit, sicuti anime prophete quando dixit: *Ingredere uxor Ieroboam. Quare te esse aliam simulas? Ego missus sum ad te durus nuncius* [3 Rg 14:6]. Et Iacob, dum caligans occultis obligatis manibus figuram sancte crucis exprimens: *Dexteram super Effraim, sinistram autem super Manasses posuit* [cf. Gn 48:14], cum Manasses esset ad dexteram, Effraym autem ad sinistram. Hac de causa visionem exteriorem visioni intime conjoinxerunt, ut Iezechiel, qui ait: *Et factum est in triiesimo anno* [Ez 1:1], et Ionas: *Et factum est verbum Domini ad Ionam filium Amathi* [Jon 1:1]. Sic et Ieremias eis, que intus cognovit, exterius visa conjunxit diciens: *Et factum est …*

The subject of the prophets using perfect tense when expressing future events is here touched upon, the same subject (re-)occurring in the allegorical gloss on chapter 12 (see 12, 53 in the edition below).

The manuscripts *Z* (on fol. 122r) and *M* (fol. 1r) share the following texts preceding the regular prothemata:

53 See St Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Hierocleum prophetam*, 1, 6, 1 (CCSL 142, p. 67).
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Origenes. Iusticiam accidentem quis habere potest, unde decidere eam possibile est.

Pamphilus. Incusatur Origenes, qui Dei filium innatum dicit et per placionem in subsistenciam venisse secundum fabulam Valentini et secundum Arthemam vel Paulum Samosatenum purum hominem fuisse et, que ab eo gesta sunt, tantum allegorice intelligenda; duos quoque christos eum dicere aiant et hystorias, que per omnes scripturas leguntur, eum negare in re fuisse affirmant. Resurrectionem quoque non credere credunt, nec penas impiorum. Opinionis quoque eius de anima reprehendunt, et quod animas rationales dicit transire in pecudes vel serpentes, et quod anime mutorum animalium rationales sint.

Apart from in M and Z, these two texts occur also in the manuscript Bd, on fol. 156v.

Finally, it is interesting to note that in the manuscript Pb, on fol. iv, before the actual text commences, a fairly modern hand of perhaps saec. xviii/xix has noted the following observations in French on the contents of the manuscript:

Ces Commentaire sur Les Lamentations de Jeremie est de Gilbert Chanoine de l'Eglise de Lion, et Diaire de celle d'Auxerre. C'esi ce que j'ai decouvert par un Manuscrit de l'Abbaye de Cuissi, ordre de Prémontré au Diocese de Laon, qui contient ce même Commentaire, dont le premier feuille manque, mais qui finit ainsi: Sufficient haece ad expositionem Lamentationum Jeremiae, quam de patrum fontibus hausi ego Gillibertus Altitidorensis Ecclesiae Diaconus. Explicit. – D'ailleurs cet authot se cite une fois en lettres rouges à la seconde ligne de la sixieme page de ce Manuscrit: Gillebertus. Lamentationes Iheremiae membro patet orationis, &c. Il se cite egalement au meme endroit et à l'article suivant dans le Ms. de Cuissi. Ce Gilbert de Diacre d'Auxerre devint ensuite Evêque de Londres. Il fut sacré le 22. Janvier 1128 et mourut six ans erdami aprés au delà des Alpes le 10. du mois d'Août 1134 en allant à Rome. Il passe pour un des plus grands Scholastiques de son tems. On prétend qu'il eit particulierement lié avec St Bernard, et qu'il a fait des Commentaires sur tout l'ancien Testament: mais il n'y en a aucun d'imprimé. Celui ci à l'exception de quelques apostilles tout à fair scholastiques, n'ef qu'une compilation des passages de differens Peres de l'Eglise sur les Lamentations, surtout de St Paschase Radbert qu'il ne copie pas mot à mot, mais qu'il abrège, et dont il ne rend que le sens en conservant aurant qu'il est possible les propres formes.

The manuscript referred to as being ‘de Cuissy’ is today Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, 43, our Lb. At the beginning of this manuscript, someone (in a

54 See DENZINGER, no. 453, p. 158.
55 See ibid., no. 298, p. 105.
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hand of saec. xviii/xix) has compared it with Pb and written down notes from the comparison. The contents of the passage above may be compared with what has been said in chapters 3 and 4 above.

5.4.5 An English reluctance toward the second recension?

Judging by the extant manuscripts, the two major areas of diffusion for the Gloss on Lamentations are Northern France and England. In fact, a third of the earliest extant manuscripts derives from England. Most interestingly, the first recension appears to have survived as the standard longer in England than elsewhere; there seems to have been a resistance in England against the second recension. This is shown by manuscripts such as Ba and Hb, both copied in the latter half of the century, but still according to an old-fashioned mise-en-page and both giving the first recension of the text.

Furthermore, in contradiction of the general assumption for continental manuscripts that all ‘later’ (post-1150) manuscripts contain the second recension, there is no proper English copy of the second recension until c. 1200 (our D). C, it is true, preserved in Cambridge and once bequeathed to Buildwas Abbey in Shropshire, is the earliest extant copy of the second recension, but is not in origin an English manuscript. It was copied in France, probably at Paris, but was surprisingly annotated on its arrival in England by a scribe who changed the readings of the second recension back into those of the first.

A sample collation of later English manuscripts (saec. xiii onwards) has furthermore revealed that even these manuscripts follow the text basically of the first recension, displaying only occasional influences from the second, thus ignoring the current in vogue on the continent. These hybrid manuscripts not completely incorporating the readings of the second recension seem to present a discrete insular tradition, showing obvious similarities with the manuscript R.

Such a manuscript is Bd, a glossed Isaiah, Jeremiah and Lamentations, a fairly late manuscript (early or mid-thirteenth century) displaying all the characteristics of a second-recension manuscript, the most obvious of which is the alternate-line gloss format. The text, though, is a peculiar mixture of readings from both the first and second recensions. It moreover contains the same extra prothema as Z, ‘Origenes. Iusticiam accidentem’ and ‘Pamphilus. Incusatur Origenes’ (see above, section 5.4.4). Another interesting feature is that the gloss ‘Recapitulat tamquam’, which is clearly Radbertian in origin, at the beginning of the fifth book, is here ascribed to Gislebertus.

Another hybrid is Bc, from St Katherine, Lincoln, containing inter alia Glossed Lamentations, Parables, Ecclesiastes, Canticles and Wisdom. Its script
is very cursive, and it is in alternate-line format. The text, however, is again a mixture of first and second recensions. The text of the prothemata clearly follows a first-recension manuscript, sharing the reading *pro desiderio* at IV, 33 with R and the *a*-family. The gloss text, though, is mostly of the second recension, albeit with certain exceptions.

The manuscript *G* is written in an early-twelfth-century hand, its pages carefully planned, ruled and executed according to the alternate-line format, which would normally be an indication of a second-recension version of the text. On the other hand, though, it shares a hybrid reading with *Bd* (and *Z*) above, *cum quibusque* at 2, 71 (where the first recension has *causque*, the second *cum uniuscuiusque*). Otherwise, it displays more readings from the first than from the second recension. For instance, at 4, 39 it retains the readings *introeunt* and *introire* of the first recension. Surprisingly, at II, 15 and IV, 33 it gives the two original readings *plangamur* and *pro desiderio*, otherwise only extant together in the manuscript R.

It seems, therefore, that the first recension had a longer life in England than on the continent. Perhaps this had something to do with a wish to preserve the text as it was in the manuscripts that Gilbert the Universal, bishop of London, brought with him from France. Such speculations cannot satisfactorily be answered here, but deserve to be addressed in the future.
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5.5 The interrelations of the manuscripts

The following investigation is based on a collation of the fifteen witnesses of the first recension chosen for the present edition as described above (section 5.3). The tradition of these manuscripts falls into two families, derived from a common archetype, \( \omega \). One of the two families is represented by four manuscripts and designated \( \alpha \), while the remaining eleven manuscripts form the other family, \( \beta \). No manuscript has been proved to derive directly from another, and none can therefore be eliminated on the grounds of such immediate relationship. The common or separative errors and variants of the manuscripts are listed both to prove their affinities and to show their respective character. It is to be noted that none of the lists in this chapter is necessarily exhaustive, but merely representative, unless stated otherwise. In some cases, the number of errors reported may seem somewhat higher than necessary to prove or disprove affinity between manuscripts. However, the lists in this section may serve as an illustration of the nature of the errors in the individual manuscripts.\(^{56}\)

In order to follow the relations between the manuscript families and branches, the reader is referred to the tentative stemma codicum at section 5.8 below.

5.5.1 The archetype of the first recension

In general, the transmitted text of the Gloss on Lamentations is very homogeneous; the archetype is probably quite close (in time) to the author's original. There are no greater common lacunae or similar conspicuous errors in the tradition to base stemmatic relations upon, which of course makes the task of editing the text much more hazardous and uncertain. There are, on the other hand, many lesser omissions and errors, which indeed, if extant in a good enough number in two or more manuscripts, are valuable to prove affinity between the manuscripts in question. All the manuscripts examined, however, contain individual errors. Thus the archetype is lost. Traces of archetypal errors appear in the following cases:

I, 5 ac scripsi, aut \( \omega \): According to the critical edition (Paulus, 1988, p. 4, line 35) Radbert writes \( ac \) at the corresponding place, which gives a better

\(^{56}\) The fact must here be taken into consideration that this is an edition of the first of five books of a single text. Future investigations may further enlighten the relationships between the manuscript families. However, if the textual tradition is correctly analysed at this stage, the collation of the entire text would probably confirm rather than upset the conclusions drawn here.
understanding of the phrase and the makes the subjects (sponsus and sponsa) correspond better with the verb fruuntur.

**IX, 71** pretendunt scripsi, recondunt Hb, extendunt F, retenditur Ψ Rusch, retendunt cett.: Radbert (Paulus, 1988, p. 6, line 101) has praetendunt. Retendo means ‘to slacken’, praetendo ‘to extend’, which is clearly the most suitable meaning to fit the current phrase. An initial p could very well have been dropped at an early stage of the transmission.

**X, 82** iure sola scripsi, sola iure ô: the wording of the manuscripts makes the sentence rather unclear, however far from unintelligible; perhaps a confusion as to the order of the words originating in the archetype.

### 5.5.2 Possible readings of the archetype

The text of the archetype ô can be reconstructed by weighing the textual evidence of the α- and β-families against each other; if they agree, we have the text of ô. If they disagree, then either, or neither, of the two readings may be the text of ô. We may in these cases – which are, however, comparatively few – have recourse to the text of the source, Radbert, to help obtain the reading of ô, but only if we have good reason to assume that Gilbert followed Radbert at the occasion in question. That one particular reading here is different from its counterpart in Radbert’s text does not of course imply that it is wrong. As has been discussed to some extent in chapter 4 above, Gilbert has in several places deliberately altered the text of his source, and there is no firm evidence that he should not have done the same in the places referred below.

The following are such variants to the archetype, either of which may be the reading of ô. They have been divided into those readings to which there is a counterpart in Radbert – normally texts of the prothemata or the marginal glosses – and those which seem to have originated with Gilbert the Universal, preferably consisting of interlinear glosses, but also prothemata, marginal glosses where the contents have been thoroughly rewritten, and longer glosses written by the author himself.

As it seems plausible that if one family of the stemma preserves the reading of Radbert, that reading ought to have been in the archetype, and that there seems to have been little reason for the compiler to alter the text of his source in these cases – also quite insignificant to the establishment of the text – I have generally chosen to follow the reading suggested by Radbert.
Table 6: Variants of the hyparchetypes

| Established text | α | β | Radbert
|------------------|---|---|-----------
| III, 26 subsistimus | consistimus | subsistimus | subsistimus |
| III, 28 corporumve | corporumque | corporumve | corporumve |
| 5, 45 non valeamus | non valeamus | nequeamus | non valeamus |
| 9, 55 nequeas | non queas | nequeas | nequeas |
| 12, 23 concremantur | cremantur | concremantur | concremantur |
| 13, 28 queque fortia virtutum | queque fortia virtutum | fortia virtutum | omnia virtutum fortia |
| 17, 18 valet | potest | valet | ualens |
| 21, 20 annuntiavit | nuntiavit | annuntiavit | adnuntiat |
| 21, 43 congruit | convenit | congruit | congruunt |
| 22, 13 littera | littera | om. | litteram |

A number of variants consist of mere transpositions of two or three words. Although of no decisive importance for stemmatic connections, they have still to be taken into consideration when establishing the text. The same guiding principles as above have been adhered to in making the choices between the transposed readings.

Table 7: Transpositions of the hyparchetypes

| Established text | α | β | Radbert
|------------------|---|---|-----------
| 1, 45 pubertatis sue | pubertatis sue | sue pubertatis | pubertatis sue |
| 2, 40 tamen versatur | tamen versatur | versatur tamen | tamen … versatur |
| 5, 30 sit intelligentie | intelligentie sit | sit intelligentie | sit … intelligentiae |
| 5, 45 auxilio Dei Iudeorum | auxilio Dei Iudeorum | Dei auxilio Iudeorum | auxilio Dei Iudeorum |
| 7, 28 sabbata Iudeorum ecclesiam | sabbata Iudeorum ecclesiam | sabbata Iudeorum ecclesiam | sabbata Iudeorum ecclesiam |
| 17, 27 scilicet ecclesiam | scilicet ecclesiam | ecclesiam scilicet | ecclesiam scilicet |
| 22, 20 omnia illa | illa omnia | omnia illa | omnia illa |

57 These readings are found at 4, prol. (17), (27); 1, 5 (627); 1, 9 (1021); 1, 12 (1169); 1, 17 (1573); 1, 21 (1827), (1881); 1, 22 (1932) respectively.

58 These readings are found at 1, 1 (251); 1, 2 (284); 1, 5 (600–01), (627); 1, 7 (722); 1, 17 (1588); 1, 22 (1958) respectively.
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On two occasions, neither hyparchetype has been followed, both being deemed faulty, and a reading from $\Psi$ has been adopted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established text ($\Psi$)</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX, 77 causas et ruinas</td>
<td>causas ruinas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 45 et presentis</td>
<td>presentis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At both places, the readings of $Pa$, presentisque (-que being written supra lineam) and, together with $Bb$, causas ruinasque have been judged as later interpolations and consequently as unoriginal.

To sum up, it might seem that the hyparchetype $\beta$ has preserved the original readings of Radbert in more cases than $\alpha$, and that these readings were probably also retained by Gilbert. $\alpha$, though, if not quantitatively preserving Radbert’s readings, at least retains traces of some Radbertian, and therefore presumably Gilbertian, readings that $\beta$ seems to have dropped at an early stage. In the light of this, I have made a number of choices of readings extant only in $\alpha$, which to me seem of primordial character, such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established text ($\alpha$)</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2, 11 pravis affectibus</td>
<td>vel affectibus privatis et post angelis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 16 sepe et om.</td>
<td>penitentia et om.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 6 cum penitentia et gemitu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variant at 9, 6 is also shared by $\Psi$. None of these variants is of fundamental importance to the understanding of the text, but partly because of this, they are perhaps more likely to have been dropped by the other manuscripts at a later stage than added at an earlier. In the choice of readings where no such corrective as Radbert exists, choices have been made under guidance of the usual principles for editing texts, where no such principle has been at hand, the choice has been made in accordance with the reading of the best manuscript(s). On this, see chapter 6 on editorial principles below.

5.5.3 The family $\alpha$ ($FTHaHb$)

$\alpha$ is a clearly distinguishable family, defined by a number of conjunctive errors and interesting variant readings, which may be indicative of a rather early version of the text. Of especial significance for this family is the error at 8, 39, super peccatum, for the correct supra petram, which does not occur in any other

branch of the tradition. In addition, the following errors, which \textit{FTHaHb} have in common, separate them from the rest of the tradition:

- \textit{III, 26} subsistimus\textbackslash{} consistimus
- \textit{III, 27} nos \textit{om.}
- \textit{VI, 46} Treni + autem
- \textit{VI, 49} aut\textbackslash{} nec
- \textit{IX, 69} lamentationes \textit{post Absalon et super} \textit{om.}
- \textit{XI, 104} per quem\textbackslash{} cum
- \textit{1, 12} Aleph … 13 subiacuit \textit{om.}
- \textit{8, 39} supra petram\textbackslash{} super peccatum
- \textit{9, 55} nequeas\textbackslash{} non queas
- \textit{12, 23} concremantur\textbackslash{} cremantur
- \textit{21, 20} annuntiavit\textbackslash{} nuntiavit
- \textit{21, 43} congruit\textbackslash{} convenit
- \textit{22, 12} Dominii\textbackslash{} Christi

The manuscripts of the \textit{a}-family also have the same order of prothemata in common (see section 5.4.1 above), although in \textit{Hb}, the prothemata are positioned at the end of the codex. The family \textit{a} consists of two branches, \textit{F} and \textit{γ}.

5.5.3.1 The manuscript \textit{F}

\textit{F} is to some extent the black sheep of the \textit{a} family. Though very neatly written and with a pleasing appearance, it bristles with peculiar errors, most of which arise from various types of scribal mistakes. The following errors separate \textit{F} from the manuscripts belonging to the branch \textit{γ}:

- \textit{2, 36} sub … durius\textbackslash{} subito durius dum est in nocte et vaspasiano
- \textit{2, 36} patientia\textbackslash{} patientibus
- \textit{6, 7} utriusque\textbackslash{} virtusque
- \textit{7, 18} iuncta\textbackslash{} dicta
- \textit{7, 51} corrue\textbackslash{} corrumpere
- \textit{12, 24} polluantur\textbackslash{} ponuntur
- \textit{12, 24} omnia … contaminantur \textit{om.}
- \textit{13, 21} voluptates\textbackslash{} novitates
- \textit{14, 53} contra\textbackslash{} propter
- \textit{18, 28} publica Dei \textit{om.}
- \textit{18, 50} intercessores\textbackslash{} confessores
- \textit{20, 33} ergo\textbackslash{} hostis
- \textit{21, 38} optaverunt\textbackslash{} obtinerunt
- \textit{22, 18} que … sunt \textit{om.}
- \textit{22, 22} ut … 23 signa\textbackslash{} \textit{om.}
- \textit{22, 47} significata\textbackslash{} significantia
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The manuscript F occasionally provides interesting surprises, such as the substitution of one rhetorical locus with another, not extant in any other manuscript, nor in Cicero:

5, 15 Octavus … locus] Tercius decimus locus, per quem multiplex ignominia et miseria demonstrantur, ut qui obsequi solebant nunc dominentur

F shows, furthermore, an inclination to write loquitur instead of dicitur, which is evident, for example, at 6, 23 and 13, 16.

5.5.3.2 The branch γ (THaHb)
The three manuscripts of this branch share the following errors, which separate them from F:

I, 6 sponsi om.
I, 8 lamentationibus … 9 abducte] lamentationes … adducte
IV, 35 pie] proprie
1, 37 operibus] opibus
6, 28 eos om.
6, 29 gregem] populum
8, 19 quo² … dimittuntur om.
13, 7 consilio] filio
16, 7 oculus dicitur] est oculus
16, 7 fontem lacrimarum om.
18, 20 parvulos] pueros
18, 32 natura] naturam
21, 11 despiiciunt] decipiunt

About these errors, the following remarks may be made: the omission at 8, 19 is clearly made on account of a saut de même au même; that at I, 8–9 is more interesting and ought to have arisen from a syntactical misunderstanding: lamentationes with the attributes diverse adducte seems to have become subject to planguntur, and in this to hint at an implicit lamentationibus. Thus, with some effort, the clause can be made understandable, though it is rather far-fetched, and lacks its counterpart in Radbert. To the list above, moreover, may be added numerous transpositions that are found only in THaHb, a selection of which may be found in the critical apparatus to the text. This branch can further be divided into T on the one hand, and the branch η (HaHb) on the other.

5.5.3.2.1 The manuscript T
T has some separate errors of its own, mostly consisting of omissions of between two and five words, or as in 2, 21–23, of an entire rhetorical locus:

VI, 46 apud Hebreos om.
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XI, 104 cuius] cum
2, 21 Omnes … 23 tractemur om.
8, 8 concessio … postulat om.
8, 12 ad² … 13 exciderat om.
13, 34 non preirem om.
19, 5 Egiptios … carnis om.
19, 5 Egiptus … auxiliatur om.

T thus cannot be the direct ancestor of either Ha or Hb. HaHb therefore form a branch of their own (η).

5.5.3.2.2 The branch η (HaHb)

Either γ, described above, or η – the exemplar of Ha and Hb, both of presumable Herefordian provenance as well as origin – was brought to England from France after T had been copied from it. In any case, Ha and Hb were copied from their exemplar probably in the scriptorium at Hereford Cathedral. The exemplar then disappeared. The following common errors separate this branch from T:

1, 6 et om.
1, 27 Ieremias] Jerusalem
1, 36 sordidatur] formidatur
7, 37 manu] manibus
10, 9 sacerdos] sacerdotes
19, 10 deberent prohibere] deberent defendere Hb, defendere Ha

5.5.3.2.2.1 The manuscript Ha

Characteristics of this manuscript are its tendency towards a more classical spelling, orthography and accidence, examples of which are the spelling rhetoricorum at XI, 98, the rather consistent use of ti instead of the more common medieval spelling ci, and at 20, 32 the composite form signata esset instead of the hyper-correct signata fuisset. The old age of Ha is a sign that this part of the Gloss reached England very quickly. Its age and quality would furthermore make it a fine ancestor to Hb, but, as the following errors in Ha show, this cannot be the case:

1, 9 quas … 10 seilicet om.
5, 21 advena] ad vera
6, 5 que filie sunt om.
6, 8 rationales] rationabiles
6, 28 minare] invitare
7, 32 mesticia] tristicia
11, 14 Paschasius historice … 23 coaniment om.
11, 24 Allegorice … 31 habetur om.
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12, 19 estimare| existimare
15, 5 irruentibus Romanis om.
18, 48 quorum ... feramus om.
22, 18 quot ... 19 sunt om.

After its completion, a ghost corrector has been at work with Ha, adding for instance the word petram above the erroneous peccatum at 8, 39 (on fol. 157; this error is common to the entire family α), and to the Bible text of chapter 10 (line 4, fol. 168) the missing words ne intrarent; all of which would imply that the corrector had access to another copy of the Gloss on Lamentations which was complete in at least these parts.

5.5.3.2.2.2 The manuscript Hb

Hb is definitely of Herefordian origin, as it still is in its original contemporary Hereford binding. Several hands have been at work after the completion of the manuscript, sometimes correcting, sometimes adding remarks, such as these:

II, 16 ubi legitur om. sed ubi dicitur supra lin. add. m. rec.
7, 53 recordatio + supra lin. occurrit scilicet
8, 32 vagatur + in marg. per diversos scilicet errores m. rec.

The second example above (at 7, 53) also occurs in Bb, but without scilicet; as the variant reading recordatio: recordatur of Ψ shows, there seem to have been difficulties as to how to interpret the clause in question. Apart from its later date of composition, the following errors in Hb show that it cannot be the direct ancestor of Ha, or any other manuscript in the tradition:

III, 18 celi ... quadrato om.
VIII, 63 et ... 64 rethorico om.
IX, 71 pretendunt] recondunt
X, 93 crescente] credentes
2, 61 quia ... spernit om.
5, 52 renitentem] revertentem
7, 16 locus] prima participio
9, 11 Sordes ... 13 &c om.
13, 45 et presentis vite om.

Ha and Hb thus seem to share a common exemplar.

5.5.4 The family β (RBaVbALPaPbKMZ)

Compared with α, this family is much less homogeneous, and an early division into several branches is easily detectable, yet rather difficult to establish with certainty. In the family β, there is a general lack of really significant conjunctive errors. The errors are rather of a sort which are simple to make, also
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independently of another manuscript, but are also easy for a cunning scribe to detect and emend. The family consists of French, English and German (Austrian) manuscripts. As against the family \(\alpha\), the family \(\beta\) displays the following errors:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{IV, 33} & \text{ pro om. (exc. R)} \\
\text{2, 11} & \text{ pravis affectibus vel affectibus privatis et post angelis} \\
\text{2, 16} & \text{ sepe et om.} \\
\text{5, 45} & \text{ non valeamus] nequeamus} \\
\text{7, 65} & \text{ opere] corpore (\textit{ex opere} corr Bh, exc. Pa)} \\
\text{9, 6} & \text{ penitentia et om.} \\
\text{13, 8} & \text{ de vitii] sic praeum. RBaVPbK, sicut praeum. AL, et sic praeum. Pa} \\
\text{19, 16} & \text{ me om.} \\
\text{22, 13} & \text{ littera om.}
\end{align*}
\]

Here, a word of warning is necessary. As the list above does not contain any severely detrimental conjunctive error, such as a good omission, for us to adduce as evidence for stemmatic connections, but consists mainly of variant readings to the family \(\alpha\), the following divisions must inevitably be regarded as rather hypothetical. The hyparchetype \(\beta\) must most probably not be understood as representing one single manuscript, direct exemplar to all branches of the family, but rather as a common denominator for the manuscripts of this family.

Nevertheless, it is possible to divide this family further into five branches, each displaying the peculiar errors listed above as against the family \(\alpha\), and in addition each showing peculiar errors of its own. These branches are \(R\) as a branch of its own, \(B\alpha V\) as the branch \(\delta\), \(Bb\Lambda L\) as \(\epsilon\), \(PaPb\) as \(\zeta\), and \(KMZ\) as the branch \(\kappa\). The hyparchetype \(\beta\) can therefore be reconstructed: 1) where any two of the witnesses \(R\alpha\epsilon\zeta\kappa\) agree; 2) where any one of these witnesses agrees with \(\alpha\).

For reasons which will be obvious further down, the second recension (\(\Psi\)) originated with a manuscript from the \(\kappa\) branch, thus originally forming part of the \(\beta\) family. As the medieval editors responsible for the second recension most certainly had several manuscripts of different branches before their eyes, I have chosen to include \(\Psi\) as deriving from in between the \(\kappa\) and \(\lambda\) branches of the family \(\beta\) in the stemma codicum (see section 5.6 and 5.8 below). It is clear, however, that the erroneous readings of \(MZ\) crept into the second recension and stayed there. Only one of the manuscripts in the stemma, \(Bb\), is clearly contaminated at a later stage by \(\Psi\).

Below, a survey will be given first of the five branches, \(R\alpha\epsilon\zeta\kappa\), thereafter of the second recension (\(\Psi\)).
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5.5.4.1 The manuscript R

R shares no substantial errors with the rest of the tradition, but some affinities with the a family, together with the lack of certain errors peculiar to the β family, could give R a place in the stemma either as an early offshoot of the β-family or as the sole representative of a family of its own, in either case making it an important carrier of variants. Its remarkably correct text would perhaps speak for the latter. However, since R shares some of the errors common to the β family, it is here treated as belonging to that family, albeit in an extraordinary position. Together with Pa, Pb and K, R is the only manuscript to preserve the Radbertian reading plangamur at II, 15. With a, it shares the following variants (the first is a correct reading, the second in fact an error), thus separating it from the other manuscripts of the β family:

IV, 33 desiderio] pro desiderio
21, 48 Anxiēte] anxietate a R Ba

R displays a few peculiar errors of its own, including two substantial lacunae, which show that it cannot be the ancestor of any other manuscript in the tradition:

III, 29 ut om.
IV, 39 moventur] morientur
VIII, 61 dicitur om.
IX, 72 dampna om.
2, 68 sedere] sedem
8, 30 Allegorice … 36 retrorsum om.
15, 18 significat om.
15, 36 predicatorum om.
17, 38 que … intrinsecus om.

The last omission, 17, 38, a clear sunt de même au même, is also shared by Bb.

5.5.4.2 The branch δ (BaV)

Ba and V, the one French (V) and the other (Ba) from Rochester Cathedral Priory in the South East of England, have many things in common, among others the attribution of the rhetorical prothema VIII, 59–65 to ‘GR’ (probably Gregorius) instead of to Gilbertus. That V was corrected against another manuscript after having been copied from δ is evident from its many corrections and supplementations of missing words supra lineas. The following common errors separate this family from the rest of the tradition:

1, 41 et + tandem
1, 41 immortalitas + recipiat
2, 60 consolationem om. (red paste at supra lin. suppl. V)
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3, 36 vagatur captiva] captivatur
5, 30 penuria om. (sed postea in marg. suppl. V)
9, 12 Nec … 13 est] quia non est salus recordare
9, 14 in … 15 misereantur om. (sed postea suppl. m. rec. V)
10, 30 preputium ex precipium corr. V, precipium Ba
10, 31 circumcisonem ex crucifixionem corr. V, crucifixionem Ba
11, 25 Verbi … panem?] verbum Dei panis est
12, 65 Celestia amisi om. (sed postea supra lin. suppl. V)
14, 19 torpentinibus] dormientibus
16, 46 inebratius om. (sed postea in marg. suppl. V)

5.5.4.2.1 The manuscript Ba

The text of Ba, a neatly written manuscript very much in the style of South-East-English scriptoria, is characterised by its many lesser omissions of one or two words. Moreover, sometimes (e.g. 19, 14 and 22, 22) the word interpretatur has been misunderstood and instead written in tempore, not an uncommon error in the manuscript tradition of this text. Some major individual peculiarities are, however, at hand:

4, 53 de quibus dicitur … 54 gens iusta] sunt et iusticia, et in Ysaia: Aperite portas et ingredietur gens iusta, et: Aperite mihi portas iusticie
10, 7 sancta sanctorum] sacrosanctorum
13, 33 eam post vanitates] amplius vanitates sequar

Furthermore, the allegorical exposition of verse 18 is abruptly interrupted at line 31, and the whole section from indicem to line 40 credatur is omitted. The following separative errors in Ba further show that it cannot be the ancestor of V:

I, 8 persone … diverse.] om.
II, 14 igne … elementis om.
2, 75 fiant om.
4, 13 quadrato om.
7, 29 delictorum] Iudeorum
8, 43 Iesum] Jerusalem
12, 11 perl … Romanos om.
18, 31 indicem … 40 credatur om.
19, 26 seviunt] senciunt
20, 6 capitis … mentis om.
20, 31 non … 32 tuum om.
22, 10 pluraliter] populi
22, 31 nostrum … sanguinen om.
22, 41 iratus om.
5.5.4.2.2 The manuscript $V$

Proving that one manuscript is the direct exemplar of another can be a rather hazardous enterprise. If there are enough significant separative errors in both manuscripts, such as omissions of words that can by no means have been supplied later, it is a clear case. None is the parent of the other. The problem, however, arises when the errors are no longer clearly significant: some words could be supplied by a competent scribe, wrong words could be corrected, and so forth. That $V$, though very near to $Ba$, is not its parent is shown by the following (significant) separative errors:

\[
\begin{align*}
&VI, 48 \text{ prenotantur} \mid \text{ ponuntur} \\
&5, 10 \text{ principatur} \mid \text{ mancipatur} \\
&5, 42 \text{ vigilanter om.} \\
&11, 39 \text{ multitudine} \mid \text{ mundi} \\
&11, 42 \text{ ecclesiam om.} \\
&12, 43 \text{ agmine} \mid \text{ animo} \\
&12, 47 \text{ tolero} \mid \text{ doleo} \\
&12, 66 \text{ festinare} \mid \text{ sustinere} \\
&13, 30 \text{ ex ipsis om.} \\
&18, 31 \text{ iustum iudicem om.} \\
&20, 23 \text{ repletur om.} \\
&21, 6 \text{ id … cogitationum om.} \\
&21, 17 \text{ resistenti invidebant} \mid \text{ resistebant}
\end{align*}
\]

Thus, it seems probable that $Ba$ and $V$ share a common exemplar.

5.5.4.3 The branch $\varepsilon$ ($Bb AL$)

The inclusion of $Bb$ in this branch is due to the following errors, which are shared by all its three manuscripts:

\[
\begin{align*}
&2, 5 \text{ ecclesia anima om.} \\
&2, 7 \text{ anime om.} \\
&2, 12 \text{ ei} \mid \text{ ei} \\
&2, 12 \text{ angeli + sancti; virtutes} \\
&2, 19 \text{ inimicis post exterioribus} \\
&3, 9 \text{ captivitas} \mid \text{ captivitatem et} \\
&4, 8 \text{ angelorum + sanctorum} \\
&8, 10 \text{ vel om.} \\
&16, 51 \text{ eius om.}
\end{align*}
\]

The mentioned common errors also separate this branch from the rest of the tradition. $Bb$, however, displaying readings basically from the first textual recension as well as many of the changes inferred with $\Psi$, is clearly contaminated by the latter. Exactly how this contamination happened is
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impossible to say. The errors listed above, common with $A$ and $L$, at least hint that the exemplar of $B_b$ was a very good manuscript in the Laon tradition. For this speaks also the evidence of the additional prothemaata which $B_b$ displays together with $A$ and $L$ (and partly with $H_a$ and $P_a$; see above, section 5.4.3).

This branch can be further divided into $B_b$ on the one hand, and the branch $\theta$ ($AL$) on the other.

5.5.4.3.1 The manuscript $B_b$

$B_b$, a rather small manuscript of bad quality, with major parts of text missing, and obviously contaminated by the second recension, is still possible to connect to the chief centre of the early development of the Gloss, Laon, primarily through the four additional prothemaata it shares with $A$ and $L$. Apart from its extensive omissions in the interlinear gloss, the following errors separate $B_b$ from the manuscripts belonging to the branch $\theta$:

1, 3 sunt$^2$ om.
IV, 35 divina] diversa
VIII, 64 membris[ modis
XI, 102 diffinitionibus] distinctionibus
1, 45 contempsit] dimisit
2, 40 ad + angelorum
3, 11 Amorcorum] corum
3, 43 pregnantium] peregrinantium
4, 56 Egrediamur + amaritudine viciorum
8, 21 in … noluerunt om.
8, 33 Hos … 35 detestantur] horum dum catholici viri heresim destruunt et conculant populi qui prius glorificabant eos vano affectu spernunt et detestantur
15, 31 Israel] Jerusalem

$B_b$ thus cannot be the ancestor of either $A$ or $L$. $A$ and $L$ therefore form a branch of their own ($\theta$). It should again be noted that, due to possible contamination in $B_b$ by $\Psi$, nothing can with absolute certainty be said about this branch of the stemma.

5.5.4.3.2 The branch $\theta$ ($AL$)

The following common errors separate this branch from $B_b$ and the rest of the tradition:

III, 21 et ebdomade[ et noctis
2, 22 cum ab his] quod ab illis
2, 51 erroris] cordis vel erroris
5, 30 sit + in eis
INTRODUCTION

8, 33 Hos] hi
11, 36 dederit + tamen
14, 50 et sceleribus] sceleribusque
14, 52 abluere] delere
17, 18 quod2 … 19 consolatore om.
18, 4 iuvenes mei + gl. forci ores
20, 18 persecutoris + foris interficit me
21, 20 certissime] certissimam
21, 38 suggestionem] suggestiones
22, 17 est] autem
22, 47 mirabilia] miracula

5.5.4.3.2.1 The manuscript A

Many minor additions, petty corrections and transpositions are a personal trait of the scribe of A. Furthermore, the text is strewn with additional glosses, both to the prothemaata as well as to the marginal and interlinear glosses. For instance:

III, 19 numerus (prothema) + id est quatuor
5, 12 miserendum (interlinear) + id est pueri et senes qui nequeunt se defendere a demonibus
6, 25 corrumpitur (marginal) + et cupiditate prelatorum ecclesia

The following errors in A show that it cannot be the ancestor of L:

III, 25 germina] gramina
XI, 103 misericordiam] memoriam
1, 17 olim … gloriosa om.
3, 12 vel demonibus om.
5, 15 Facti … locus om.
7, 29 compensatio] compassio
7, 60 pertrahunt] pertranseunt
14, 52 manibus] conspectu
15, 5 quod omnino om.
20, 25 excoquuntur + cibi
20, 43 exterius + monemur

5.5.4.3.2.2 The manuscript L

The following separative errors in L show that it cannot be the ancestor of A:

III, 21 quattuor + ex
III, 22 omnia + ita
III, 30 Syon + cum
XI, 108 sicut … &c om.
2, 18 similiter + pro
2, 62 discordare + creature
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9, 29 et … 30 suscipiat om.
10, 18 solis om.
13, 19 affligant[ ] affligantur
13, 40 pro peccatis[ ] peccans
16, 34 porcorum[ ] peccatorum
16, 38 Cui[ ] cius
20, 32 unde … tuum om.

In addition to these errors, L displays (together with A) some interesting peculiar readings, for example quod ab illis (which is almost the correct reading from Cicero) at 2, 22 instead of cum ab his of the other manuscripts.

Thus A and L seem to share a common exemplar.

5.5.4.4 The branch ζ( PaPb)

The manuscript Pa displays readings principally common to the first recension. On the one hand, it shares no greater errors with any manuscript in the tradition, and on the other, it displays some significant separative errors of its own, which makes its parentage from another extant manuscript impossible. It has some errors in common with Pb, separating this branch from the rest of the tradition, namely:

X, 89 semper + enim
1, 6 Ierusalem + vel
1, 33 noluimus ex nolumus corr. Pa, nolumus Pb
2, 21 Omnes … eius[ ] Et facti sunt ei inimici
6, 31 altario[ ] altari
10, 9 ecclesiam + vel
11, 34 virtutes[ ] virtutem
18, 13 preponitur[ ] proponitur
18, 13 et om.
21, 49 quod[ ] quia

5.5.4.4.1 The manuscript Pa

Pa is recognisable primarily by its odd mise-en-page with the entire interlinear gloss (together with the Bible text) written as an appendix at the end of the codex. This appendix is furthermore enhanced with several glosses, and expansions of the text of the already present interlinear gloss. These extensions, or additional glosses, are often collected from the commentary text to the chapter in question: for example, at 14, 6 the gloss sempiternum to the verse Nun is augmented by the following gloss:

14, 6 sempiternum + subaudis: impegit in interitum iusto Dei iudicio propter cor impenitens
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At 14, 43-46, the allegorical expositions runs as follows:

\[ \text{ita ex iugo INIQUITATUM NUN, quod 'sempiternum' interpretatur, impegit in} \]
\[ \text{interitum, ut justo Dei iudicio secundum impenitens cor suum sempiternum} \]
\[ \text{incurrat supplicium} \]

Apart from this, the following individual errors show that \( Pa \) cannot be the direct ancestor of \( Pb \) or of any other known manuscript:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{VI, } &5 \text{ singularum]} \text{ singulariter} \\
\text{IX, } &71 \text{ genus}\text{[]} \text{ vocantur et} \\
\text{IX, } &75 \text{ captivitatem} \text{ om.} \\
2, &74 \text{id}\text{[]} \text{ ... 75 delectationis om.} \\
5, &34 \text{fidel} \text{[]} \text{ ... defendere om.} \\
11, &23 \text{ut sibi]} \text{ ubi sancti} \\
16, &60 \text{impenitentem]} \text{ in puteum} \\
22, &13 \text{Ω)} \text{[i.e.} \text{ ω} \text{ το} \text{ μεγα}] \\
22, &13 \text{ultima} \text{ ... 14 omega om.} \\
22, &15 \text{significat} \text{ ... 16 itaque om.} \\
\end{align*} \]

5.5.4.4.2 The manuscript \( Pb\)

\( Pb\), the latest extant manuscript to carry the text of the first recension, displays many variant readings of its own. In addition, the following errors preclude its parentage to \( Pa\) or any other extant manuscript:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{III, } &25 \text{paradisi om.} \\
2, &57 \text{plorat}\text{[]} \text{ ... omnibus om.} \\
4, &42 \text{regimen]} \text{ tegmine} \\
14, &38 \text{ornamentis]} \text{ donis} \\
16, &9 \text{Caldeus} \text{ ... diabolus om.} \\
\end{align*} \]

5.5.4.5 The branch \( \kappa \) (\( KMZ \))

This last of the branches of the \( \beta \) family consists of manuscripts from the eastern part of medieval Europe, i.e. present-day Germany and Austria. Among them is \( K\), the earliest extant manuscript of any part of the \Glossa ordinaria.\n
The following errors are shared by \( KMZ\) and do not appear in any other manuscript of the tradition:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{III, } &19 \text{materialis]} \text{ metricalis} \text{(exc. M)} \\
\text{VIII, } &63 \text{auferuntur]} \text{ afferuntur} \\
\text{XI, } &99 \text{preterea]} \text{ proptera} \\
1, &57 \text{plangentis]} \text{ plorantis} \\
4, &30 \text{suis om.} \\
5, &6 \text{ANTE FACIEM]} \text{ a facie} \\
9, &24 \text{sua om.} \\
\end{align*} \]
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9, 48 Ierusalem om.
16, 18 solus\(^1\) om.

This branch can further be divided into K and \(\lambda\) (MZ).

5.5.4.5.1 The manuscript K

That K, although the earliest datable witness in the tradition (1131), cannot be ancestor to any other extant manuscript, is evident through the following separative errors:

X, 86 crevit] civitatis
2, 68 plorasset] planxisset
3, 9 traderet] tradidisset
3, 24 fugitivos] fuggiti vos
4, 22 furguris] fulgare
7, 27 recutilat] irrita
8, 10 heretici … 11 viri om.
8, 26 columnnas] columnas
10, 33 mittit manum suam] mittere presumit manum (presumit supra lin.)
11, 16 Iosephus] Iosue
14, 34 demonstrant … ornamenta om.
19, 30 Moraliter … 35 manus om.

In particular, the major lacuna at 19, 30–35 precludes its parentage to any other manuscript in the tradition. Together with R, Pa and Pb, K has kept the original reading "plangamur at II, 15.

5.5.4.5.2 The branch \(\lambda\) (MZ)

M and Z are very close, both with respect to text and to external appearances. A peculiar feature of both M and Z is that they gather the interlinear glosses, abbreviated and sometimes reorganised, in sections after each verse, headed by the word color. The marginal glosses, furthermore, constituting the bulk of the text, are written continuously down each page. The following errors separate M and Z from the rest of the tradition and establish their close relationship:

3, 39 peccata om.
9, 32 non … iracaris om.
10, 38 coquorum + destruxit muros ierusalem id est
11, 18 profuerit] profecerit
11, 34 delectationem] gloriament
12, 53 id est vindemiabit om.
16, 28 probamus] reprobamus
16, 28 Iudaicam] Judeorum
16, 34 porcorum] pomorum
16, 63 solus + cum suis satellitibus
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The gloss format of \(M\) and \(Z\) may have been inspired by the two-column format of \(K\). For the obvious connection with the second recension, see section 5.6 below.

5.5.4.5.2.1 The manuscript \(M\)

That \(Z\) cannot be copied from \(M\) is proved by the lacuna in \(M\) at 7, 55–58: although consisting of a biblical quotation, it is rather long to have been supplied by a scribe who did not know directly that it should be there. Errors further strengthening this fact are:

- 9, 23 propri| prophete
- 12, 26 bona om.
- 12, 52 extrem| extremum
- 14, 51 flletibus om.

5.5.4.5.2.2 The manuscript \(Z\)

\(Z\) is in error against \(M\) and the rest of the tradition at the following instances:

- 12, 19 minus| nimis
- 12, 41 teneros| teneres
- 13, 43 suis om.
- 14, 16 torpore| corpore
- 14, 24 intret| intraret
- 14, 33 pendentes| dependens
- 15, 18 ablati| oblati

Therefore, it seems probable that \(M\) is a not a copy of \(Z\), but that they both shoot from the same branch.

5.6 THE SECOND RECENSION (\(\Psi\))

The consensus edition of the second recension has been achieved through the collation of five randomly chosen manuscripts, and the sample collation of a further ten.

Sample readings from the second recension have already been given above (see section 5.2.2; further readings are found in appendix II, as well as being reported in the critical apparatus to the text). There it was shown that these readings are often less original than those of the first recension, particularly as they regularly differ from the readings of the source text of Paschasius Radbertus. It is thus rather difficult to establish which of these readings are
deliberate redactional changes and which are proper errors committed by a certain scribe. Some ‘pure’ errors may however be discerned. That the ‘archetype’ manuscript of the second recension was not immaculate is shown by the following errors, which are extant in every manuscript of the second recension collated for the present edition:

13, 17 quibus … 18 est om.  
14, 37 iure ergo in regno

It was furthermore noted above that Ψ originates with a manuscript (or manuscripts) of the family β. Evidence of this is shown in matters of transposition and such variant readings, where Ψ often gives the reading of β, as against that of α.

More specifically, as the following common errors show, it would seem that Ψ was organised from a manuscript very close to the branch ζ-λ. Errors common to ζ Ψ are:

X, 86 enim] autem  
1, 53 est om.  
5, 45 ipse + Dominus  
19, 18 qu] quia  
19, 26 crudelius] peius  
22, 22 eadem + signa

Errors common to λ Ψ are:

7, 46 ir] erident  
7, 54 aggerationem] exaggerationem  
9, 49 est + ut  
12, 20 equari] coequari  
12, 57 videt] videns  
14, 41 tradentur] traduntur  
14, 50 subdidit] subdit  
16, 26 perpetue] eterne  
16, 46 aquam] fontem  
16, 50 recurrat] recurrunt  
21, 38 viderunt] audierunt

Ψ was possibly organised from two or more exemplars. The errors listed above suggest that at least one of them stemmed from the ζλ-branch. In the *stemma codicum* (see below, section 5.8), this is symbolised by a line emanating from the line connecting ζ and λ, thus indicating its unclear point of departure.

Furthermore, checking against one or more manuscripts, the redactors of Ψ were able to correct a number of errors extant in MZ, in addition to developing other readings as described in section 5.5.4.5.2 above.
5.7 THE EDITIO PRINCEPS (Rusch)

*Rusch* Biblia Latina cum glossa ordinaria [Strasburg: Adolf Rusch for Anton Koberger, 1480/1481]


The first edition has been sufficiently described several times, for instance in the following:

GW no. 4282; HAIN (1826) no. *3173; POLAIN (1932–78) no. 682 and 682A.

A facsimile reprint was published in 1992, RUSCH (1480; 1992), with an introduction by FROEHLICH, pp. xii–xxvi. The latter mentions 180–250 still extant copies.

There is no preface to the edition by the printer, no mention of co-operators, no title, no colophon, no dedication. Thus nothing is known of the manuscripts from which the text was set and printed. The general prefatory material consists of the prologues of St Jerome, which also was a standard feature of plain Bibles, followed by *argumenta*, often taken from St Jerome’s Epistle 53 *ad Paulinum* (‘Frater Ambrosius’), and the standard prothemata, usually typographically integrated into the marginal gloss.

The following observations apply to the Gloss on Lamentations: the prothemata are printed in two columns, their sources named (i.e. ‘Paschasius’ or ‘Gilibertus’). The prothemata II and III, and V, VI and VII are integrated, thus forming two prothemata instead of five. The biblical text is printed in two columns in a central window and the marginal gloss around it on the outer and inner margins. Repeated lemmata link marginal gloss and biblical text. The interlinear glosses are arranged between the lines of the Bible text, with an intricate system of *signes-de-renvoi* linking interlinear glosses and biblical text wherever the gloss does not appear immediately above the Bible word or words to be glossed.

The text of Rusch’s *editio princeps* was reprinted eleven times in the years 1495–1634 (and twelve if Migne’s severely truncated version in *Patrologia Latina* of 1852 is counted), never as a simple reprint, but always with additional material of some kind. The history of these reprints is sketched by Froehlich (1992).

There is no question that the editorial work behind the *editio princeps* was extraordinary. When preparing the printing of the Gloss on Lamentations, Adolf Rusch (or whoever edited and set the texts from manuscripts) obviously had several manuscripts to work from. As the following extracts show, the bulk
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of his text is taken from one or more manuscripts belonging to the second
textual recension:

**Table 8: Readings common to Ψ and Rusch**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established text</th>
<th>Ψ and Rusch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II, 14 existimus elementis</td>
<td>elementis consistimus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III, 29 litterarum lamenta</td>
<td>elementa litterarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 12 Deum et se</td>
<td>se ipsum et Deum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 71 cuiusque</td>
<td>cum uniuscuiusque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 33 bonis</td>
<td>rebus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 44 impietatis</td>
<td>infidelitatis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 36 solatio</td>
<td>solatia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The common readings of *Rusch* and Ψ are numerous; the list above is far from
exhaustive. Furthermore, Adolf Rusch made some changes and additions of his
own, not extant in the manuscript tradition:

2, 16 patientibus] patientes
3, 20 pro multitudine] propter multitudinem
5, 11 concessio + vel confessio, quia factum non excusat sed ignosci postulat
(+ vel confessio Ψ)
7, 17 tercius decimus] undecimus
12, 45 excelsioribus] excellentioribus
16, 20 patiens] moriens

As all subsequent editions reprinted Rusch’s text without any further collation
of manuscripts, the textual variants, examples of which were given above, are
present in the entire printed legacy up to Migne in 1852, who omitted to print
the Gloss on entire books, one of them being Lamentations.
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5.8 A TENTATIVE STEMMA CODICUM

\[ \omega = \text{consensus omnium codicum} \]
\[ \alpha = \text{FTTHaHb (5.5.3)} \]
\[ \beta = \text{R} \delta \varepsilon \zeta \kappa \ (5.5.4) \]
\[ \gamma = \text{THaHb (5.5.3.2)} \]
\[ \delta = \text{BaV (5.5.4.2)} \]
\[ \epsilon = \text{BbLA (5.5.4.3)} \]
\[ \zeta = \text{PaPb (5.5.4.4)} \]
\[ \eta = \text{HaHb (5.5.3.2.2)} \]
\[ \theta = \text{LA (5.5.4.3.2)} \]
\[ \xi = \text{KMZ (5.5.4.5)} \]
\[ \lambda = \text{MZ (5.5.4.5.2)} \]
\[ \Psi = \text{consensus codicum alterius recensionis} \]

It should be noted that the position of the hyparchetypes in the stemma codicum is merely practical and that nothing can be presumed about their possible dating.
CHAPTER 6

Editorial Principles

6.1 Principles for Establishing the Text

The aim of the present critical edition is, as far as possible, to reconstruct the text of the archetype of the Glosa ordinaria in Lamentationes Ieremia prophete by Gilbert the Universal. In section 5.2 the existence of two textual recensions of the Gloss on Lamentations was established, and reasons for editing the text of the first recension were presented. The manuscripts adhered to in order to obtain this end were presented and described in section 5.3. In that same section it was mentioned that five manuscripts, T, Ha, R, L and K – T and Ha from the family α of the stemma, and R, L and K from the family β – have been chosen to form the basis for the text of the edition.

The reasons for choosing these manuscripts are the following. K is the oldest of all extant manuscripts of the Gloss on Lamentations, but still seems, on account of a number of peculiar errors, to be at least at two generations’ distance from the archetype. Nevertheless, K retains some good readings which are absent from the other older manuscripts, for instance, at II, 15, where K, together with R (and Pa and Pb), preserves the correct reading plangamur.

Because of its age, K also gives us valuable information on what the original interlinear gloss contained.

In spite of the omission of an entire marginal gloss, the manuscript R displays a text of very good quality, sharing some variant readings with the family α, for instance the correct pró desiderio at IV, 33, which is omitted by all the other manuscripts; these two circumstances give R an exceptional place as the sole representative of a branch of the stemma. The manuscript L, of Laonnoise origin, displays some interesting, perhaps original, variants. To quote a few examples: at 4, 35, L preserves dicuntur as against most of the older manuscripts, which read dicitur; at 8, 44, L preserves the correct plangitur against plangit of α, R and the other older manuscripts; and at 17, 44, L (together with F, A and Pb) preserves a quibus for quibus of the other manuscripts.
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Together, \( K \), \( L \) and \( R \) enable us to reconstruct the hyparchetype \( \beta \). To reconstruct the hyparchetype \( \alpha \), the manuscripts \( Ha \) and \( T \) have been used; \( Ha \) carries some peculiar errors of its own, and despite its omitting two marginal glosses has an overall sound text. The manuscript \( T \) is a rather early specimen from St Victor, Paris, which has, among other things, supplied a continuation of a biblical quotation not extant in any other manuscript (16, 16–17).

In section 5.5.2, choices under guidance from the source text between readings from the two hyparchetypes \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) were discussed. Among the five principal manuscripts no ranking has been deemed necessary, and sensible readings have been chosen from them in an eclectic fashion. This principle applies also to cases where there has been a choice of where to place an interlinear gloss; in such cases, the joint testimony of the five main manuscripts has been paid heed to.

The other ten twelfth-century manuscripts have occasionally been used to supply or to clarify a reading, when the five main manuscripts fail to do so. For instance, at 8, 46, a reading from \( Pa – inveniet \) – has been adopted where all other manuscripts have either \( invenit \) or an abbreviation (\( inveñ \)) from which it is impossible to tell whether \( invenit \) or the grammatically more correct \( inveniet \) was intended. \( Pa \) has furthermore been used to supply an occasional word \( locus \) or \( indignationis/conquestionis \) to a rhetorical middle gloss when these are lacking in the rest of the tradition. The remaining manuscripts of the families \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) do not have much to offer that is not already found in the branch \( \gamma \) and in the manuscripts \( R \), \( L \) and \( K \). The same is true for the branches \( \delta \) and \( \kappa \). The manuscript \( Bb \) might not be of any use in establishing the text but, due to its additional prothemata, still shows considerable Laonnoise influence. Its readings are occasionally reported in the critical apparatus (on which see below).

As was shown in section 5.5.2, on two occasions, when no first-recension manuscript displays a satisfactory reading, readings from the second recension have been adopted in the text.

For the present edition, the editio princeps of 1480/81 has been collated, the text of which principally follows the readings of the second recension. On some occasions, however, traces from the first recension can be discerned, as may be discerned from the critical apparatus.
6. Editorial Principles

6.1.1 The apparatus fontium

The sources of the Gloss on Lamentations being principally the same as those of Radbert's commentary (see section 4.3 above), the apparatus fontium owes a great deal to Beda Paulus's edition. As was seen in sections 4.3.1 and 4.4, in some cases, Gilbert has expanded his original with more quotations, generally from Scripture, but, perhaps more significantly, from Cicero and Pseudo-Jerome. Such sources, as well as sources common to Radbert and Gilbert, for instance St Jerome, Hraban Maur and St Gregory the Great, are noted in the apparatus fontium. Further sources not identified in Paulus's edition have moreover been identified for this edition. As Gilbert based his entire text on Radbert's commentary, references to this principal source are normally not given in the apparatus fontium. Besides, Gilbert reworked his text to such an extent that one can no longer reasonably speak about it as Radbert's commentary (see section 4.3.2). Occasionally, however, to enlighten a passage or to justify a choice of reading in the text, or in cases where the paraphrased text has become too brief or obscure, its Radbertian counterpart has been given in full in the apparatus. Again, such quotations from Paulus's edition have not been supplied with syntactical punctuation.

As for the italicising of quotations in the text, the following principles have been applied. Only verbatim quotations are italicised. As such are counted lesser transpositions of words and small deviations in spelling, as long as they adhere to the grammatical form of the original. Occasionally, the author has wanted to adapt a quotation to the syntax of his own text, and subsequently inflected one or more words differently from the original. Such words are left unitalicised. Non-verbatim quotations and allusions have not been italicised, and the reference in the apparatus is preceded by confer (cfr).

Regarding quotations from Scripture, it is by no means certain that the text to which the author wished to make a reference or an allusion is always the portion actually written down: in some cases the allusion may be to the following, unquoted part of the citation. Not infrequently such biblical quotations are abbreviated ‘&c’. To quote an example from X, 89, ‘… et Stephanus: Dura, inquit, servius &c'; the continuation of the biblical text is essential to the understanding of why the passage is quoted, ‘et incircumcisi cordibus et auribus vos semper Spiritui sancto resistis sicuti patres vestri …’ (Act 7:51). In the manuscripts, biblical quotations are normally abbreviated differently from other texts: after the first two or three words of the quotation
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have been written down in full, the rest of the text is referred to with only the first letter of each word, often with dots in between. This quotation technique speaks for the fact that biblical knowledge was learned by heart, and needed but a few main points to be recalled from memory. Variations in the text of the manuscripts arising from this procedure have not been noted in any apparatus.

6.1.2 The apparatus criticus

As for the critical apparatus, the following general principles have been adhered to. Generally, the critical apparatus is negative; occasionally, however, for the reader to determine which manuscripts do display the reading of the established text without having to count manuscripts on his fingers, such references in the apparatus are positive. Variants in orthography are not reported, nor are minor variants in quotations from the Bible, such as differences in rendering the biblical lemma in full or abbreviating it by writing ‘&c’. Variants in writing the headings (‘Paschasius historice’ etc.) are not reported if not of special interest. Minor scribal errors such as duplication of words, or transpositions which have been reversed (cases of ‘turbata’) are not recorded either. When a manuscript adds a new interlinear gloss directly to the Bible text, the reference in the apparatus is preceded by ‘+ gl.’ If a new gloss is added to a piece of Bible text to which there already exists a gloss, the addition in the apparatus is made to that gloss by means of an ordinary ‘+’ sign.

The readings of the various manuscripts reported in the critical apparatus are, of course, a selection made by the editor. It should be kept in mind that no conclusions must be drawn e silentio from the apparatus except in the case of the five manuscripts on which this edition is based. In addition to the general principles outlined above, and according to the relative significance of the manuscripts, the specific principles for excluding and including variants are divided into three categories:

1. The fundamental witnesses (THaRLK)

The readings found in the manuscripts T, Ha, R, L and K are always reported in the apparatus, including transpositions of two or more words, additions of common text above the line, corrections of words, and so forth.

2. Other first-recension manuscripts (FHbBaVABbPaPbMZ)

With regard to the manuscripts containing the first recension but not strictly fundamental for establishing the text (F, Hb, Ba, V, A, Bb, Pa, Pb, M and Z), the following specific principles apply. Variants and minor omissions of single
manuscripts are generally not reported, if not of specific interest. Accounts of
errors typical to a manuscript will, though, be found in the section on
manuscript interrelations (5.5). However, if a branch of two or more
manuscripts shares a variant, this variant is then duly reported. Additions of an
established text *supra lineam*, corrections of an erratic word into a correct one or
vice versa, transpositions of two or three words, are not recorded. One
exception to these principles is the interlinear glosses of Pa, the variants of
which, on account of their individuality, are reported in the critical apparatus.
Furthermore, the abbreviated interlinear glosses of M and Z have not been
reported in the critical apparatus.

3. The second recension (*Ψ Rusch*)
The consensus readings of the second recension, Ψ, are fully reported, so that
the reader has access to the text of the first as well as to the second
recension. The readings of the *editio princeps* (*Rusch*) are also reported primarily
when coinciding with Ψ, but its individual readings are occasionally reported in
the apparatus, and a selection of such readings can also be found in the chapter
on manuscript interrelations (5.7). The inclusion of both these texts will enable
the reader to see the dissimilarities with the first recension as well as the
similarities between the second textual recension and the first print.

In the critical apparatus, the Greek letters (with the exception of Ψ) that
represent groups of manuscripts are always given before all individual
manuscripts, without consideration of position in the stemma. Thereafter
follow the testimonies of the manuscripts in the following order: first the
fundamental witnesses THaRLK; then in the order of the stemma
FHbBaVABBPaPhMZ, and lastly Ψ and Rusch. The reader is referred to the
chapter on the interrelations of the manuscripts and the *stemma codicum* (sections
5.5–5.8 above) in order to follow the presentation of the manuscript families.
For the abbreviations used in the critical apparatus, see the *conspectus siglorum*.

6.2 PRESENTATION OF THE TEXT
The traditional gloss format of the manuscripts (described above, section 2.5)
offers the reader the complete Bible text, furnished with interlinear glosses, and
with the marginal glosses written in columns surrounding the Bible text. The
reader thus has access to all three levels of text at the same time. The present
edition strives to preserve this strategy.
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As was mentioned above in section 1.2, two interesting efforts to solve the problem of printing the *mise-en-page* of the manuscripts have been made, by Mark Zier and Mary Dove. The method employed by Zier is to my mind the more successful of the two. In his *specimen criticum*, Zier prints the Bible text to the one side of the page, in large bold characters. The glosses, marginal as well as interlinear, are then printed by the side of and parallel to the Bible text. No distinction is thus made between the two types of glosses, 'since the status of a gloss as “marginal” or “interlinear” varies somewhat from manuscript to manuscript’ (p. 6). This is in fact the disadvantage with the method, which becomes even more clear with the Gloss on Lamentations. Here, the marginal glosses are, principally on account of their length, specific character and exegetical classification (historical, allegorical or tropological), in all manuscripts clearly distinct from the interlinear; a marginal gloss never turns up between the lines. True enough, occasionally in some manuscripts an interlinear gloss is written in the margin, but this is then due to lack of space between the lines, and the gloss is always headed by the relevant biblical lemma. The only glosses that vary in position on the page are the ‘middle’ glosses described above (see section 4.2.2.4), which seem to live a life of their own.

6.2.1 Transposing the *mise-en-page* of the manuscripts

The text of the edition follows the verses of the biblical Book of Lamentations, and thus, the disposition in the manuscripts. Each verse begins a chapter in the exposition. At the beginning of each chapter, the biblical lemma is printed in capital letters. Beneath the lemma follow the interlinear glosses, which have been printed not between the lines of the lemma but one after the other with suprascript letters of reference assigned to each, corresponding to the relevant words of the Bible lemma. The disposition of the interlinear glosses, i.e. which gloss belongs to which word or words in the lemma, is made in accordance with the five fundamental manuscripts. Basically, these place each gloss with the same word or words, but when they do not, as occasionally happens, common sense has been the guide as to where to place the gloss. One must bear in mind that in the case of the interlinear glosses, the fact that a gloss is extant in a manuscript is more important than where the gloss is placed. A single letter indicates that this gloss refers to one single word, two letters linked by a stroke (e.g., a–a) that the words of the lemma between the letters in question are referred to. For example, with the lemma *CIVITAS*⁵, the suprascript letter refers to the text after the corresponding letter in the interlinear gloss below:
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= Jerusalem, ecclesia vel anima

If the lemma is ‘OMNES PERSECUTORES EIUS’, where the suprascript letters surround a phrase, the surrounding letters are found before the relevant interlinear gloss, in this fashion:

= domini, quos fugiebant, apprehenderunt crudeler; sequentes quasi fugitivam; Caldei, Romani

The semicolon (;) generally corresponds to the gibbets of the manuscripts and is used for separating different glosses to the same lemma.

Beneath the interlinear glosses, and separated by a ‘flosculus’ ( ), are found the ‘middle glosses’, regardless of where they are placed in the manuscripts and generally preceded by the biblical lemmata to which they refer. For the sake of clarity, I have placed here all such glosses which consist of more than a couple of words and are found in varying positions in different manuscripts, or those having a rhetorical content.

Thereafter follows the general expository text divided in historical, allegorical and tropological glosses according to the fashion of the manuscripts. In chapter 16, the Bible text commented upon is not that of verse 16 but of the preceding verse, 15, ‘Torcular calcavit’. This seems to arise from some early misunderstanding of which lines belong to which verse in the Lamentations text, and is also at hand in Radbert’s exposition.²

The chapters have been numbered with bold-faced Arabic numerals. In a similar manner, Roman numerals have been assigned to the prothema. References in both apparatuses are made with chapter and line number for the first reference of the chapter in question, and thereafter only with line number.

6.2.2 Orthography and punctuation

The orthography of the manuscript R is followed as closely as possible in the edition. The reason for choosing R is that it displays a consistent orthography and close to a faultless text. Where readings from other manuscripts have been used in the text, they have, if necessary, been adapted to the spelling of R. Thus, in the edition, the letter e is to be found for the e caudata, representing the diphthongs æ and . For the letter-combination -ti-, both -ti- and -ci- are used in the manuscript R and, consequently, in the edition. The letter v represents the consonantal, u the vocalic and semi-vocalic sounds in the edition. An

epenthetical $p$ is to be observed in words such as *dampnum, sollemnitas*. As for assimilated or non-assimilated prefixes, the usage found in the manuscript R, generally preferring assimilated forms, has been adhered to, such as *opprobrium, annuntiavit*.

To avoid confusion, the spelling of Biblical names – *Isaias, Syon, Moyses*, etc. – has been standardised throughout the text. The spelling of such names often vary greatly, even within a single manuscript. Headings (‘historice’, ‘allegorice’, etc.) and the biblical lemmata that are found at the beginning of each marginal gloss, have been adapted from R; whenever possible, they have been retained, but occasionally, when the context so demands, I have adopted a heading from another manuscript, thus also reflecting my understanding of the text.

I have introduced a modern, syntactic punctuation in the text. The use of majuscules and minuscules has been normalised to modern standards.

6.2.3 Critical signs

The critical signs used in the text are ( ) round brackets enclosing headings for the division of the text added for the convenience of the reader; the sign ‘&c’ is consistently used for ‘et cetera’; and as was mentioned above, the sign ‘[‘ has been used for separating the interlinear glosses from the middle glosses, and the middle glosses from the marginal glosses, as a help to distinguish between the different levels of text.

6.3 NOTES ON THE TRANSLATION

The Latin text of the edition is accompanied by a parallel English translation. The translation is included to serve two purposes. First, a translation may fill the twin role of commentary and glossary; thus, like the addition of modern punctuation, it demonstrates how the editor has understood the logic of the text. As a kind of exegesis, the translation will provide the reader with a means to know and judge how the editor has interpreted the text, and on some occasions, illustrate his reasons for choosing certain readings. This first purpose applies to those readers already skilled in the Latin language. The second purpose is aimed at interested readers not fluent in Latin. In the interest of both these groups of readers, it has seemed useful to stay rather close to the Latin text. The translation thus has no other literary ambition than to render the Latin text as clearly and comprehensively as possible.

The translations of the Lamentations verses and the other biblical texts are based on the English Douay-Reims translation of 1568 and 1582, which has
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been slightly modified for the present purpose. The reason for using this quite ancient translation is that it is relatively true to the Latin Vulgate of St Jerome. The fact that the language of the Vulgate must have appeared rather archaic even to the medieval reader is thus mirrored in the somewhat archaic English of the Douay-Reims translation.
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IEREMIE PROPHETE
PROTHEMATA ET LIBER I
CONSPECTUS SIGLORUM

Codices

\(\omega\) = consensus omnium codicum

\(a\) = consensus codicum \(FTHaHb:\)

\(F\) = Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 60, Fontenay, s. xii\textsuperscript{med}

\(\gamma\) = consensus codicum \(THaHb:\)

\(T\) = Paris, BnF, lat. 14781, St Victor?, s. xii\textsuperscript{med}

\(\eta\) = consensus codicum \(HaHb:\)

\(Ha\) = Hereford, Cathedral Library, P IV 3, Hereford, s. xii\textsuperscript{med}

\(Hb\) = Hereford, Cathedral Library, O IX 11, Hereford, s. xii\textsuperscript{2}

\(\beta\) = consensus codicum \(RBaVbALPaPbKMZ:\)

\(R\) = Leeds, Brotherton Library, Ripon Cathedral 4, s. xii\textsuperscript{med}

\(\delta\) = consensus codicum \(BaV:\)

\(Ba\) = London, British Library, Royal 15 B XI, Rochester, 1165–90

\(V\) = Città del Vaticano, Bibl. Apostolica, Pal. lat. cod. 85, France, s. xii\textsuperscript{med}

\(\epsilon\) = consensus codicum \(BbAL:\)

\(Bb\) = London, British Library, Harley 3117, Northern France, 1150–75

\(\theta\) = consensus codicum \(AL:\)

\(A\) = Angers, Bibliothèque municipale, 54, Saint-Aubin, s. xii\textsuperscript{ex}

\(L\) = Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, 71, Vauclair/Laon?, 1140–50

\(\zeta\) = consensus codicum \(PaPb:\)

\(Pa\) = Paris, BnF, lat. 2578, Bournet, s. xii\textsuperscript{med}

\(Pb\) = Paris, BnF, lat. 576, Northern France?, s. xii\textsuperscript{ex}/xiii\textsuperscript{a}

\(\kappa\) = consensus codicum \(KMZ:\)

\(K\) = Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek, 2\textsuperscript{5} Ms. Theol. 6, Riechenberg, 1131

\(\lambda\) = consensus codicum \(MZ:\)

\(M\) = Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 450, Admont, s. xii\textsuperscript{ex}

\(Z\) = Zwettl, Stiftsbibliothek, 36, Zwettl, 1180/1190

\(\Psi\) = consensus codicum alterius recensionis, i.e. \textit{CCaDLbU} et alii complures

Editio princeps

\textit{Rusch} = \textit{Biblia Latina cum glossa ordinaria}. Adolph Rusch, Strasburg, 1480/81.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>add.</td>
<td>addidit/addiderunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cett.</td>
<td>ceteri codices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cfr</td>
<td>confer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corr.</td>
<td>correctio, -ionis etc., correxit/correxerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>del.</td>
<td>delevit/deleverunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>exempli gratia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>et cetera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exc.</td>
<td>exceptus, -a, -um etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exp.</td>
<td>expunxit/expunxerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fort.</td>
<td>fortasse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gl.</td>
<td>glossa, -ae etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e.</td>
<td>id est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind.</td>
<td>indicavit/indicaverunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscr.</td>
<td>inscribit/inscribunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interl.</td>
<td>interlinearis, -is etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leg.</td>
<td>legitur/leguntur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lin.</td>
<td>linea, -ae etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litt.</td>
<td>littera, -ae etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. rec.</td>
<td>manus recentior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marg.</td>
<td>margo, -inis etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om.</td>
<td>omisit/omiserunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praem.</td>
<td>praemisit/praemiserunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ras.</td>
<td>rasura, -ae etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scil.</td>
<td>scilicet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scr.</td>
<td>scrisit/scripserunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suppl.</td>
<td>supplevit-suppleverunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transp.</td>
<td>transposuit/-posuerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vid.</td>
<td>videtur/videntur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ verbum vel verba (quae sequuntur) add.

&c et cetera

Paschasius

I There are Canticles of Canticles; there are also Lamentations of Lamentations. The book of Solomon is called the ‘Canticles of Canticles’, Jeremiah’s Threni the ‘Lamentations of Lamentations’. For as the Canticles excel, in which the bridegroom or the bride enjoys sweet embraces, so do the Lamentations, in which the bridegroom’s absence from the bride is deplored by many ways of weeping, whence it is said: How doth the city sit solitary &c. In those Canticles, several persons are introduced to wedding bliss; in these Lamentations, many are deplored who have been taken away. Canticles are proper in the heavenly fatherland, lamentations in this life’s misery. Therefore, David says: A hymn becometh Thee in Zion, O God, and elsewhere: Blessed is the man whose help is from thee, in his heart be bath disposed to ascend by steps, in the vale of tears, in the place which he bath set.

Paschasius

II He laments by means of a fourfold alphabet, as both we and the world consist of four elements – fire, air, water, earth – in order that we who are made of four elements, should grieve by way of four alphabets. That the prophet laments not only the present, but also the future and the past, the Book of Proverbs reveals, where you read that the entire Judaea and Jerusalem mourned Joshua, and Jeremiah in particular.

III Beneath the four cardinal directions he laments by means of a fourfold alphabet the trespasses of the present world, inviting everyone to wailing. For this number is material, since both man and the world are composed of four elements. Four are the seasons, four the climates; our age likewise consists of four parts: both of the day, the week, the month and the year. Therefore this
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mensis et anni. Hic ergo numerus quasi materialis et quadratus et solidus omnia sibi, ut subsistant, quadrat non solum terræ sed et celestia. Quatuor sunt evangeliste, quatuor virtutes egregie, unde ceteræ oriuntur, quibus quasi quatuor paradisi fluminibus omnia virtutum germina irrigantur. Quia ergo quatuor elementis subsistimus, qui interius exteriusque delinquimus, iustum est, ut cum propheta quaternario numero defleamus et materiali numero nos intus exteriusque renovemus, ut singulis morum corporumque corruptionibus singula opponantur litterarum lamenta, ut, qui super flumina Babilonis tenemur, absoluæ penitentia et gratia in nostra Syon vera libertate perfruamur.

Paschasius

Prohemata

number, somehow material and square and solid, matches everything with itself, not only worldly things, but also celestial, so that they will stand firm. Four are the evangelists, four the excellent virtues, whence the others originate, by which, as by the four rivers of paradise, all the germs of virtue are watered. Since, therefore, we, who do wrong within and without, consist of four elements, it is just that we together with the prophet lament in a fourfold number, and by means of a material number renew ourselves inside and outside, that the single wailing of the letters should be opposed to the single degradations of morals and bodies, that we, who are held captive upon the rivers of Babylon, absolved by penitence and grace, shall enjoy true liberty in our own Zion.

Paschasius

IV It is an accepted fact that there are many kinds of wailing, many diversities of tears. We bemoan our own detriment differently from another’s. In one way we lament owing to our yearning for the heavenly fatherland, in another way because of the immensity of our offences and in dread of hell. We lament differently on account of the distress of heart than we do of love for pious recollection. Divine Scripture explains these diversities of weeping in different places, when it describes the various passions and lamentations of individuals. Hence David: My tears have been my bread day and night &c, and elsewhere: I have laboured in my groanings, every night I will wash my bed: I will water my couch with my tears. And Jeremiah: My eye is troubled through indignation &c. The faithful are moved by these passions, who have recalled to their minds that whole volume of Ezekiel, in which there had been written lamentations and songs and woe.

volumen Ha | traiecerunt] trahiciunt Ψ Rusch 41 scripte om. Ψ
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Paschasius

V Tam terrne civitatis ruinam quam ecclesie dampna et animarum discrimina in lamentationibus exponere et pro oportunitate locorum ad tria tempora sensus decretimur dirigere.

VI Treni, sicut ait Ieronimus, metrica lege apud Hebreos conditi sunt, unde apud Latinos in singulis sententiarum principiis singule Hebreorum littere prenotantur, a quibus in propria lingua unusquisque versus incipitur. Nec tot littere vacant a misterio, cum nec unus apex aut unum iota de lege preteriri debeat. Unde singularium litterarum intelligentia singulis sententiis est aptanda.


Gislebertus

VIII Lamentationes Ieremie membro patet orationis maxime distinguui vel dissoluto colorari. Res enim breviter absoluta sine totius demonstratione sententie dicitur, que alio orationis membro excipitur, sicut hic est: Plorans ploravit in nocte &c. Interdum vero more dissoluti conjunctiones de medio auferuntur; partes separate efferuntur hoc modo: Quomodo sedet sola civitas &c, et more rherorico aliquando duobus membriis, aliquando tribus vel pluribus constatur oratio.

Prothemata

Paschasins

V In Lamentations, we have decided to expound the ruin of the earthly city as well as the forfeit of the Church and the hazard of souls and, owing to the suitability of the passages, direct the meanings according to three times.

VI The Threni, as St Jerome says, were in Hebrew composed by means of the rules of metre. Hence, in Latin, the single Hebrew letters, with which, in Hebrew, every verse takes its beginning, are put before every separate sentence, and not so many letters lack mystical sense, since not one tittle, nor one jot of the law shall pass away. Thus, the understanding of every single letter should be adapted to every single sentence.

VII Aleph is interpreted as ‘doctrine’. The true doctrine is, however, that by which God is known and the state or weakness of each and everyone is not ignored. Hence Isaiah: Glorify ye the Lord in instruction. Then Jeremiah, in a spirit of grief, says: How doth the city sit solitary &c. He does not lament the walls of the city but, figuratively, his people taken into captivity. Hence Isaiah: And the daughter Zion shall be left as a covert in a vineyard, and as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, and as a city that is laid waste. This is a forceful prophet’s outcry, full of wailing, full of pain, full of astonishment and dismay.

Gilbertus

VIII It is manifest that the Lamentations of Jeremiah are in a special way punctuated by the clause of speech, or coloured by means of asyndeton. For the case is said to be briefly completed without a presentation of the whole sentence, which is succeeded by another clause of the speech, as this is: Weeping she has wept in the night &c. Occasionally, by way of asyndeton, connecting particles are removed, separate parts are brought forth in this fashion: How doth the city sit solitary &c, and in a rhetorical manner the speech sometimes consists of two clauses, sometimes of three or more.
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Paschasius

IX Lamentatio est – aut ex merore presentis vite aut ex desiderio eterne – cordibus humanis dono Spiritus sancti infusa compunctio. Legimus David lamentationes super Saul et Ithanon et super Absalon. Flevit Ezechias fl
tetu magno, flevit Petrus amare. Sed he merito 'Lamentationes lamentationum' vocantur et sic genus pretendunt ad speciem, ut aliquando species ad genus extendatur. Sic terrene Ierusalem et populi excidium deploratur, ut presentis ecclesie dampnæ defleantur. Sic generalitas novi populi et veteris, qui a fide corruentes captivantur, ut uniuscuiusque anime, que templum fuit Spiritus sancti, ruina plangatur. Sic ad presentem captivitatem, sub qua fit hec prophetia, lamentationes intendunt, ut, que facta est sub Tito et Vespasiano, penitus non omittant. Omnes denique vite presentis causas et ruinas cernens propheta et gemit et plorat ad singula, ut discant singuli de flere propria, cum de fleat ipse communia et aliena delicta.

X Quomodo sedet sola civitas: Subversionem misere civitatis et ruinam scelesti populi non solum sub Caldeis accidisse verum sub Tito et Vespasiano plenius complendam pronuntiavit. Ante ultimam enim captivitatem non iure sola sedere dicitur, nisi forte per doloris exaggerationem. A Caldeis enim pauperes terre cultores relictæ leguntur, quibus Godolias preesse iubetur, nec civitas omnino destruatur sed post mortem Christi vastanda differtur, ut nec lapis super lapidem nec populus in ea reliquatur. Reversis enim a captivitate crevit virga furoris, quia per monita et correptiones prophetarum non sunt ad Dominum conversi sed


Prohemata

Paschasius

IX A lamentation is a compunction, infused by the gift of the Holy Ghost in the hearts of men, either due to moaning over the present life or yearning for the everlasting. We read David’s laments over Saul and Jonathan and over Absalon. Ezekias wept with much weeping, Peter cried bitterly. But these are justly called the ‘Lamentations of Lamentations’ and so extend genus to species, as sometimes species is extended to genus. So the ruin of the earthly Jerusalem and of the people are deplored, that the detriments of the present Church may be bewailed. So the new people’s community with the old, who, dashing from the faith, are being captured, is lamented, as is the ruin of each and everyone’s soul, which used to be the temple of the Holy Ghost. So Lamentations allude to the present captivity, under which this prophecy takes place, that the captivity under Titus and Vespasian may not be entirely forgotten. Finally the prophet, considering all the adversities and ruins of present life both wails and moans individual things, so that the individuals may learn to deplore their own, while he pities common and foreign offences.

X How doth the city sit solitary: He proclaims that the overthrow of the poor city and the fall of the crooked people not only took place under the Chaldeans, but were to be fulfilled to even greater extent under Titus and Vespasian. In fact, before the final captivity, she is not rightly said to be sitting alone, if not perhaps due to some exaggeration of pain. They are said to have been left by the Chaldeans as poor cultivators of the land, over whom Godolias is put in charge, and the city is not entirely destroyed, but is, after the death of Christ, dispersed to become desolated, so that neither stone upon stone, nor the people, shall be left in her. For against them, returned from captivity, grew the rod of anger, since they were not turned towards the Lord through the prophets’

Gislebertus

XI Rethoricorum colorum splendorem et sententiarum gravitatem et elocutionis ornationem me taente diligens lector non tacebit. Locorum quoque rethoricorum multitudinem et dialecticorum raritatem et argumentorum subtilitatem gratis inveniet. Preterea rethoricam questionis humilitatem et interdum indignationis asperitatem vel utriusque commixtionem nullo docebit. Rudibus tamen satisfaciendo questionem et indignationem rethoricam propriis diffinitionibus ad medium deducere non gravabor.

Est enim, ut ait Tullius, 'conquestio oratio auditorum misericordiam captans', cuius primus locus est, per quem, quibus in bonis fuerimus et nunc quibus in malis simus, ostendimus, sicut hic: Quomodo sedet sola civitas &c.

'Indignatio est oratio, per quam conficitur aut in hominem odium aut in rem offensio', cuius primus locus est ab auctoritate, cum dicitur, quante cure ea res fuerit diis immortalibus &c, sicut hic: Candidiores Nazarei eius nive &c.

In primo ergo alphabete paucos indignationis et questionis locos assignando diligentiori et perspicatiori viam aperio lectori &c.


Prohemata

admonitions and reproofs, but had always been ungrateful to the mercies of God. Hence Moses: *For I know thy obstinacy, and thy most stiff neck, you have always been rebellious against the Lord,* and Stephanus said: *You stiffnecked &c.* Therefore, although often torn by the lashes of the scourge, overpowered by the enemies, afflicted by every evil, *they believed not,* but *provoked the most high God.* So, with ten tribes already captured in Assyria, the two that had remained, following David home and worshipping God according to their kind, eventually, with malevolence increasing, were for the first time captured in Chaldea, wherefore the city is here lamented: *How doth the city sit solitary.*

**Gilbertus**

**XI** Albeit I say nothing, the careful reader will not pass in silence over the splendour of the rhetorical colours, the weight of the sentences and the adornment of speech. For nothing, he will also find the multitude of heads of rhetoric, the choice dialectic and the plainness of the arguments. Moreover, he will teach, without instruction, the abjectness of the rhetorical complaint (*conquestio*), and occasionally the severity of disdain (*indignatio*), or the combination of both. To satisfy the unskilled, however, I shall not unwillingly explain the rhetorical complaint and disdain by their proper definitions.

‘Complaint’, as Tully says, ‘is speech seeking to arouse the pity of the audience’. Its first head is that by which we show what prosperity we once enjoyed and what misery we are in now, as it is here: *How doth the city sit solitary &c.*

‘Disdain is speech by which either hatred is aroused against some person or offence at some event’; the first head of which is from authority, when it is related of how much concern this event has been to the immortal gods &c. As it is said here: *Her Nazarites were whiter than snow &c.*

In the first alphabet I therefore show the more careful, penetrating reader the right way by denoting a few heads of complaint and disdain &c.
(Liber I)

1. ALEPH

QUOMODO SEDET SOLA CIVITAS PLENA POPULO
FACTA EST QUASI VIDUA DOMINA GENTIUM
PRINCPS PROVINCIARUM FACTA EST SUB TRIBUTOM

5 a ‘doctrina’ b admirative, affectuose c habitu plorantis; humiliata d auxilio Dei et angelorum; olim populosa e Ierusalem, ecclesia vel anima f ex gentibus et tribubus et linguis congregata g h ab opposito h non vere i regibus, sacerdotibus; Dei auxilio, absente sposo j devictarum; vitiorum k in prelatis; in maioribus l ecleiariam, sensuum; quas tributarias fecerat, FACTA EST SUB TRIBUTO,

10 Caldeorum scilicet m demonum, vitiorum, Caldeorum

AHELPH: ‘Doctrina’, ut et Deum et se cognoscat homo. Hane plebs Iudeorum non habuit; ideo hostibus subiacuit.

Paschasius historice

QUOMODO SEDET SOLA CIVITAS: Ierusalem, scilicet, populo spoliata, ignominia plena, inter hostes humiliata, olim populosa et inter hostes gloriosa; FACTA EST QUASI VIDUA DOMINA GENTIUM, regibus destituta, sacerdotibus desolata, templo prophanato et vasorum gloria explosa, auxilio Dei destituta; DOMINA GENTIUM, quas ante subverterat aut subiugaverat.


172
(Book one)

1. ALEPH

HOW b DOTH THE CITY c SIT d SOLITARY e THAT WAS FULL f OF PEOPLE g

HOW IS THE MISTRESS h OF THE GENTILES i BECOME AS j A WIDOW k

THE PRINCESS l OF PROVINCES m MADE TRIBUTARY n

a ‘doctrine’  b with admiration, with affection c after the fashion of one crying; d humiliated e of the help from God and his angels; once populous f Jerusalem, g the Church or the soul h assembled of people and tribes and tongues i by contradiction j not really k by her kings and priests; from the aid of God; l her spouse absent m the subdued; sins n among prelates; among ancestors o churches, p senses; whom she had made tributary, she was made tributary, that is to the Chaldeans q to demons, vices or the Chaldeans

ALEPH: ‘doctrine’, that man may know both himself and God. This, the Jewish people did not have and were thus subject to the enemies.

Historical interpretation

HOW DO THOTH THE CITY SIT SOLITARY: that is to say Jerusalem, deprived of its people, full of disgrace, humiliated among her enemies, once populous and glorious among her enemies; THE MISTRESS OF THE GENTILES IS BECOME AS A WIDOW, deserted by her kings, forsaken by her priests, the temple profaned and the glory of the vessels repudiated, deprived of God’s assistance; THE MISTRESS OF THE GENTILES, whom she before had overthrown or forced under the yoke.


173
Paschasius allegorice

Lacrimosius plangenda est ecclesia culpis exigitibus, sponsi absentia viduata. QUOMODO SEDET SOLA CIVITAS Dei et angelorum auxilio desolata! Si enim sponsus cum ipsa esset, lugenda non esset, quia non possunt filii sponsi lugere, quamdiu cum illis est sponsus, sed gaudio gaudent propter vocem sponsi. Cum vero matrem, id est ecclesiam, a sponso viduatam senserint, non solum filios sed et omnes amicos flere convenit. Unde Ieremias pro omnibus et pro omnibus flebat non ruinam saxorum sed hominum.

QUOMODO SEDET SOLA CIVITAS: Plorantis demonstrat habitum, unde et Iob in sterquilinio sedisse perhibet ur, ut dolentis exprimeretur affectus, qui et ipse ‘dolens’ interpretatur. De hac captivitate dicitur: Super flumina Babilonis, illic sedimus et evimus. Qui, scilicet, in throno regni et in summo vertice celi stare noluimus, iure super flumina temptationum sedentes dolorem, unde Isaias: Descende, sede in pulvere, filia Babilon, sede in terra, non est solium filie Caldeorum. Ita, Ierusalem nostra cum in peccatorum confusionem venerit, non est ei solium dignitatis, sed sordidatur terrenis vitiis, unde Ieremias plangit, non modo quia sedet terrenis operibus sordidata, sed quia SOLA, et sola, quia QUASI VIDUA; vidua, quia pro feditate turpitudinis a sponso derelicta. QUASI VIDUA: Non vere vidua, scilicet; etsi enim a sponso ad tempus despicitur, sponsalitatis tamen iura retinuntur, ut, si redire per penitentiam voluerit, sponsum recipiat, cum satisfecerit, et vestem immortaliatis. Qua re vestita nullius tributo subiacebit, unde Paulus: Nemini quicquam debeat, nisi ut invicem diligatis.
Liber I – Cap. 1. Aleph

Allegorical interpretation

The Church is to be lamented with more tears than her sins require, being made a WIDOW due to the absence of her spouse. HOW DOTH THE CITY SIT SOLITARY, forsaken by the assistance of God and the angels! If the bridegroom were together with the bride, the bride need not be mourned for, since the children of the bridegroom cannot mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them, but they rejoice with joy because of the bridegroom's voice, but when they noticed that their mother, that is to say the Church, had been widowed from the bridegroom, it was fit that not only the sons cry, but also all their friends. Hence Jeremiah deplored more than everyone and on behalf of everyone not the ruin of boulders but of men.

HOW DOTH THE CITY SIT SOLITARY: this shows the disposition of the crying, hence, for the mourner's emotion to be expressed, also Job is said to have sat on a dunghill, who himself is interpreted ‘mourning’. Of this captivity it is said: Upon the rivers of Babylon, there we sat and cried. Namely we, who did not want to stand in the throne of the kingdom and in the supreme height of heaven; by rights we wail when we sit on the rivers of temptation, whence Isaiah: Come down, sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon, sit on the ground: there is no throne for the daughter of the Chaldeans. Thus, for our Jerusalem, when she has landed in the shame of her sins, there is no throne of dignity, but she is defiled with mortal offences, whence Jeremiah laments, not only because of her being contaminated with worldly undertakings, but because she sits SOLITARY, and solitary because she is AS A WIDOW, and a widow because she is deserted by her spouse for the sake of the ugliness of her nefarious actions. AS A WIDOW, not really a widow, namely, for if she at times is despised by the bridegroom, nevertheless the rights of matrimony are retained, so that, if she should wish to return by means of penitence, she would recover her spouse, when she has made satisfaction, and the raiment of immortality, clad anew in which she will yield to the tribute of no one. Hence St Paul: Owe no man any thing, but to love one another.
Anima SOLA SEDET QUASI VIDUA bonis exuta virtutum, que se subiecit dominio Caldeorum et *pubertatis sue* contempsit sponsum. *Caldei* ‘captivantes’ interpretantur; hi sunt demones, qui de solio celestis patrie animam revocant et in potestatem suam captivant, unde: *Intra in tenebras, filia Caldeorum*; quia, scilicet, filia Dei, in luce virtutum stare noluisti, intra mutato nomine in tenebras ceceatis! Unde Ieremias gemens exclamat: QUOMODO SEDET SOLA CIVITAS. 

Anima, scilicet, quondam virtutibus et suffragii sanctorum quasi CIVITAS POPULO PLENA, desolata, que prius pollebat divinis opibus inter frequentias sodalium, nunc inter hostes sedet squalida, cui nulla est societas sanctorum, nulla communio sacramentorum, nulla cum sponso participatio, sed redacta est in tributum viatorum, unde: *Multis me pater meus creditoribus reliquit obnoxium*, quibus, etsi cotidie laboro, non satisfacio. Multa sunt delictorum tributa, quibus est anima obnoxia, donec per penitentiam ad libertatem redeat, unde: Plange quasi virgo accincta sacco super virum pubertatis tue. Unde vox plangentis sequitur: PLORANS PLORAVIT IN NOCTE.

---


The soul sits solitary as a widow, divested of the goods of virtue, since she has submitted herself to the lordship of the Chaldeans and defied the spouse of her youth. The Chaldeans are interpreted ‘they who take captive’; they are demons, who recall the soul from the seat of the heavenly fatherland and capture it in their power. Hence: Get thee into darkness, O daughter of the Chaldeans. Since, namely, you, daughter of God, refused to stay in the light of virtue, go, change your name and enter into the shadows of blindness! Hence Jeremiah exclaims with sighs: How doth the city sit solitary, that is to say the soul, once full of virtues and approbations of the saints as a city full of people, now desolate, she who previously, among the throngs of friends, was mighty by divine aid, now sits wretched among enemies. For her there is no fellowship with the saints, no communion with the sacraments, no partaking with her spouse, but she is brought back to pay tribute to vices. Hence: My father left me subject to many creditors, whom, even if I should labour every day, I would not satisfy. Many are the tributes to offence, to which the soul is subject, until it, through penitence, returns to liberty. Hence: Lament like a virgin girded with sackcloth for the husband of her youth. Thus follows the voice of the one lamenting: Weeping she has wept in the night.
2. BETHA

PLORANS ecclesia anima intus domus Dei populus Israel exteriur qui non licet in die mundi adversitate peccatorum cecitate aliena a vera luce

e-\text{\textit{e}} prelatis conscientiis doctoribus quorum officio cibus anime ad minores trahicitur minus est IN NOCTE; Hoc proprie ad ultimam captivitatem pertinet. Ex tunc enim nec principes habuerunt nec sacerdotes. In Babilone autem consolatores habuerunt Danielem Ezechielem et alios multos prophetis sacerdotibus regibus amicis prius blandientibus pravis affectibus sanctis vel angelis quem Deus spernit cui Deus offensus est dum subtrahunt auxilium

15 PLORANS PLORAVIT: Quartus locus conquestionis, per quem res turpes et humiles et indigne patientibus proferuntur, qui hic sepe et sepissime frequentatur.

OMNES AMICI EIUS SPREVERUNT EAM: Similiter ecclesia non numquam pro peccatis suis affligitur et contemnitur tam ab interioribus inimicis quam ab exterioribus.
2. Beth

weeping she has wept in the night and her tears are on her cheeks
there is none to comfort her among all them that were dear to her
all her friends have despised her and have become her enemies

weeping she has wept: the fourth topic of complaint, in which shameful, mean and ignoble acts are recounted before the suffering, which is very often the case here.

All her friends have despised her: similarly the Church is sometimes afflicted for her sins and spurned by interior as well as exterior enemies.
Omnes amici eius &c: Tercius decimus contestationis locus, per quem cum indignatione conquerimus, cum ab his, a quibus minime conveniat, male tractemur.

Paschasius historice

Plorans ploravit in nox: Que sit, que ploret, Beth littera interpretatione sua ostendit, que interpretatur 'domus', que, scilicet, cum Iacob in Egyptum est ingressa et Domini clementia egressa secundum illud: In exitu Israel de Egypto domus Iacob, sed rursus exiguibus peccatis in Babilonem captivatur, unde plorans plorat in nox, quia in die non dat requeis eis, ut saltem suis consolentur lacrimis et sero oculos ablueant, quos prius ad idola levabant, et, quod gravius est, ex omnibus amicis prius blandientibus NON EST, QUI CONSOLETUR EAM.

Lacrimae in maxillis, ut magis inter hostes confundantur et suis saturentur opprobriis. Propter idolatriam enim populus in captivitatem ductus ab hostibus affligebatur, sed sub Tito et Vespasiano durius, quem diu patientia Dei sustinuit, sed impenitens iram in die furoris thesaurizavit.

Paschasius allegorice

Plorans ploravit: Christi ecclesia plorat in nox, id est inter adversa huius vite, quia, licet sit ad gloriam predestinata, tamen versatur inter caligines ignorantiae et cecitatis discrimina. Plorat, que foris tolerat; plorat intus infirmitates sue erumpnas sed plorans plorat, quia intus prius compungitur et sic exterius propriis lacrimis baptizatur, que de fonte cordis producuntur.
Liber I – Cap. 2. Beth

All her friends &c: the thirteenth topic of complaint, by which we complain with indignation, when we are badly treated by those by whom it would be least becoming.

Historical interpretation

Weeping she has wept in the night: what it is she bewails, the letter Beth makes clear through its interpretation, 'house', that house, namely, that entered into Egypt with Jacob and went out by the mercy of the Lord, according to this: When Israel went out of Egypt, the house of Jacob. But on the other hand, because of her sins, she is taken captive in Babylon, and therefore weeping she weeps in the night, because in the day, rest is not given to them, that they at least may be consoled by their own tears and, at a late hour, cleanse their eyes, which they previously used to raise to idols and, which is worse, there is none to comfort her of all her friends previously flattering her.

Her tears are on her cheeks, so that they may be more confused among the enemies and be content with their own disgrace. By means of idolatry, however, the people, brought into captivity, was harshly shattered by its enemies, but even harsher by Titus and Vespasian; the people, who for long have been upheld by God's patience, but, being impenitent, have treasured up anger towards themselves in the day of wrath.

Allegorical interpretation

Weeping she has wept in the night: the Church of Christ weeps in the night, that is to say among the adversities of this life, since she, although predestined to glory, nevertheless abides in the obscurity of ignorance and the hazards of blindness. She weeps what she endures without; within she weeps the hardships of her infirmity; but she weeps weeping, because she is previously punctured on the inside and thus baptised on the outside with her own tears, which are produced from the spring of her heart, and of whose
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

Quarum ubertatem insinuans propheta ait: PLORANS PLORAVIT. Hoc modo non minus exterior quam interior homo reformandus abluitur, unde sequitur:

LACRIME EIIUS IN MAXILLIS EIUS: Qui sciunt et sua et aliena delicta plangere, non detegere, de quibus in Canticis dicitur: Gene tue sicut fragmen mali punici abisse eo quod intrinsecus latet, in his enim ecclesia pulcritudo ostenditur, et ipsorum predicacione in corpus ecclesie trahicimur. Qui sicut plus ceteris in corpore Christi laborant, plus gemunt et plorant eos, quos vident in nocte delictorum versari et in cecitate erroris. Plorat ecclesia IN NOCTE, quia Deus spernit, et FACTI SUNT EI INIMICI, cui Deus inimicus, a cuius equitate non possunt discordare.

NON EST QUI CONSOLETUR EAM EX OMNIBUS CARIS EIUS, sanctis, videlicet, vel angelis, nisi recipiat consolationem sponsi. Unde: OMNES AMICI EIUS SPREVERUNT EAM, quia Deus spernit, et FACTI SUNT EI INIMICI, cui Deus inimicus, a cuius equitate non possunt discordare.

Paschasius moraliter

PLORANS PLORAVIT IN NOCTE: Anima, scilicet, in peccatorum cecitate, de qua dicitur: Sit nox illa solitaria, nec laude digna. Sed non plorat suo arbitrio sed miserante Domino, unde in persona Domini plangens propheta dicit: Quomodo sedet sola civitas plena populo &c. Nisi enim Dominus misericordia motus eam


abundance the prophet makes allusion when he says: WEEPING SHE HAS WEPT. In this fashion the outward man needing to be reshaped is cleansed no less than the inward, whence it follows:

HER TEARS ARE ON HER CHEEKS: those who know to mourn and not conceal their own faults nor those of others, of whom it is spoken in the Canticles: Thy cheeks are as a piece of a pomegranate, besides that which lieth bid within. Indeed, in these the beauty of the Church is shown and through their proclamation we are drawn to the body of the Church. Just as those who labour more than others in the body of Christ, they mourn more and lament those whom they see abide in the night of wrongs and in the blindness of error. The Church weeps IN THE NIGHT and does not ignore the shadows of her sins. She carries her tears ON HER CHEEKS, with which she every day renews her beauty. To be sure, Mary is of benefit to Martha being troubled, when she weeps WEEPING at the Lord's feet. The bride weeps far away from her spouse's embrace, and she weeps in the valley, that is to say IN THE NIGHT of this ignorance. WEEPING SHE HAS WEPT, namely of desire for the heavenly fatherland and for her own sins and the sins of others in this world. She weeps for those who are dead to the world, she weeps for virgins, for widows, she weeps for all who confess themselves pilgrims and visitors to this earth.

THERE IS NONE TO COMFORT HER AMONG ALL THEM THAT WERE DEAR TO HER: that is to say the saints or the angels, unless she receiveth the comfort of her spouse. Hence ALL HER FRIENDS HAVE DESPISED HER, since God scorns her, AND HAVE BECOME HER ENEMIES, to whom God is an enemy, with whose justice they cannot be at variance.

Moral interpretation

WEEPING SHE HAS WEPT IN THE NIGHT: that is to say the soul, in the blindness of sin, of which it is said: Let that night be solitary, and not worthy of praise. But she does not weep on her own decision, but due to the Lord's compassion, whence the prophet, wailing in the person of the Lord, says: How doth the city sit solitary
solam sedere vidisset, ipsa se minime plorasset. Respexit Dominus Petrum, et flevit amare.

70 LACRIME EIUS IN MAXILLIS EIUS: Maxilla anime conscientia est. Vultus in maxillis formatur; cuiusque qualitas in conscientia monstratur. Conscientia vero, que novit peccata sua, semper debet fonte lacrimarum irrigari, unde David: Peccatum meum contra me est semper. Aliter NON EST QUI CONSOLETUR EAM vero consolatore amisso, id est Spiritu sancto, cum presertim OMNES AMICI, id est affectus prave delectationis, fiant EI INIMICI, cum in die iudicii secundum apostolum insurgant cogitationes miseram conscientiam accusantes aut defendentes et demones, pessimi persuasores, qui nunc decipiundo blandiuntur.


184
&c. For lest the Lord, moved by pity, had seen her sit solitary, she had hardly lamented herself. *The Lord looked on Peter, and he wept bitterly.*

*Her tears are on her cheeks:* the cheek is the conscience of the soul. The face is formed by the cheeks; the character of everyone is shown in the conscience. The conscience, however, that is aware of its sins, should always let itself be watered from the spring of tears, whence David: *My sin is always before me.* Alternatively *there is none to comfort her,* the true Paraclete being dismissed, that is the Holy Ghost, especially as *all her friends,* i.e. the desires for perverted pleasure, *become her enemies,* when, according to the Apostle, on Judgement Day thoughts will rise, accusing or defending the poor conscience, and demons, most wicked persuaders, who now flatter by deceiving.
3. GIMEL₃
MIGRAVIT IUDA b PROPTER AFFLICTIONEMᵇ ET MULTITUDINEM SERVITUTIS HABITAVIT INTER GENTESᶜ NECᵈ INVENIT REQUIEMᵉ 'OMNES PERSECUTORES EIUSᶠ APPREHENDERUNT EAMᵍ INTER ANGUSTIASᵇ

a ‘plenitudo’; Pro plenitudine enim delictorum suorum migravit Iudas in captivitatem, que sibi accumulando provocavit Dei ultionem. Aliter enim gentem sibi dilectam et gloriason non traderet Deus in captivitatis ignominiam, qui se nondum Amorreos posse tradere dicit, quia nondum sunt completa peccata Amorreorum b–b quia fugit iugum Domini leve et onus suave e alias; gentiles vel demones vel vitia d sic e–e vitis instantibus vel demonibus ἑ–ἑ domini, quos fugiebant, apprehenderunt crudeliter; sequentes quasi fugitivam; Caldei, Romani ἑ fuga et afflictione angustiatam h peccatorum, afflictionum

MIGRAVIT IUDA: Decimus conquestionis locus, per quem inopia, infirmitas, solitudo demonstratur.

Paschais ins historice

MIGRAVIT IUDA &c: Pro multitudine peccatorum, scilicet, captivati sunt. Non solum usque in Babilonem sed inde tamquam fugitivi servi PROPTER AFFLICTIONEM SERVITUTIS ad alias gentes migraverunt sed nec ibi requiem invenerunt. Unde sequitur: OMNES PERSECUTORES EIUS APPREHENDERUNT EAM &c, qui, scilicet, fugitivos persequebantur et ante angustatos affixerunt crudelius. Iure enim, qui leve iugum Domini fugerant, dura afflictione premuntur


JUDAH HAS MIGRATED because of her affliction and the greatness of her servitude

She has dwelt among the gentiles and she has found no rest. All her persecutors have taken her in the midst of straits.

‘fullness’; for due to the fullness of their sins, Judah has departed into captivity, through the accumulation of which she has provoked the vengeance of God. For otherwise God would not have delivered his cherished and glorious people to the disgrace of captivity, he who says that he cannot yet deliver the Amorites, as yet the iniquities of the Amorites are not at the full because she refused to carry the sweet yoke and light burden of the Lord foreign; gentiles or demons or vices thus with vices or demons threatening the lords, from whom they fled, have cruelly captured them; pursuing as a fugitive; Chaldeans, Romans distressed due to flight and affliction of sins, of afflictions

JUDAH HAS MIGRATED: the tenth topic of complaint, by which helplessness, weakness and loneliness are revealed.

Historical interpretation

JUDAH HAS MIGRATED &c: that is to say, due to their manifold sins they have been led into captivity not only to Babylon but thence, on account of the sufferings of servitude, as runaway slaves they have migrated to other peoples, but not even there have they found rest. From which follows: All her persecutors have taken her &c, namely those who pursued the fugitives and previously more cruelly had shattered the distressed. In fact, those who had fled the light yoke of the Lord, are justly being overwhelmed by heavy sufferings,
et, qui libertatem in Christo promissam vilipendebant, afflictione servitutis merito laborabant. MIGRAT IUDA de alii hostibus ad alios crudelitatem dominorum fugiens. Sicut Cain fratricida vagi et profugi habitant Iudei INTER GENTES nullam REQUIEM invenientes, confusionis sue ignominiam circumferentes, quia Christum fratrem suum occidere non timuerunt.

Paschasius allegoricc

MIGRAT IUDA &c: Ecclesia Christi libertate omissa sepe in servitutem gentium et afflictionem vitiorum migrat et nullam INVENIT REQUIEM sed de loco in locum fugiens a persecutoribus deprehensa graviori afflictur angustia. Sepe autem historialiter sic captivatur et afflictur Ierusalem nostra et inter hostes vagatur captiva, sicut historialiter presignabat Ierusalem terrena.

Moraliter

MIGRAT IUDA &c: Anima, scilicet, que Deum debet laudare et se accusando peccata aperire, afflictia vitiorum servitute de vitiis migrat ad vitia NEC INVENIT REQUIEM. Unde apostolus: Video aliam legem in membris meis repugnantem legis mentis et captivantem me in legi peccati. Evadendi autem nulla est via, nisi quam ipse demonstrat gratia Dei per Iesum Christum. Sed misera anima a persecutoribus suis INTER ANGUSTIAS peregrinantium more tandem fessa deprehenditur, unde: Ve pregnantibus et nutrientibus in illa die.

---

and those who despised the liberty promised in Christ, deservedly laboured in the sufferings of servitude. **JUDAH HAS MIGRATED** from one kind of enemy to another, fleeing the unmercifulness of her lords. As Cain the fratricide wandering about and banished, so the Jews dwell amongst the gentiles finding no rest, carrying about the disgrace of their confusion, because they did not fear to kill Christ, their brother.

**Allegorical interpretation**

**JUDAH HAS MIGRATED &c:** liberty lost, the Church of Christ often migrates into the servitude of the gentiles and the suffering of vices, and finds no rest, but fleeing from place to place and seized by her persecutors, she suffers worse anguish. Often, however, our Jerusalem is in this way historically captured and suffers and roams captive among enemies, just as the earthly Jerusalem foreshowed historically.

**Moral interpretation**

**JUDAH HAS MIGRATED &c:** namely the soul, who ought to praise God and, accusing herself, unfold her sins, afflicted by the slavery of her sins, she wanders from vices to vice, and **SHE HAS FOUND NO REST.** Hence the apostle: *I see another law in my members, fighting against the law of my mind and captivating me in the law of sin that is in my members. There is no way to escape, unless the one he himself shows through the grace of God, by Jesus Christ.* But the miserable soul, exhausted at last in the manner of pregnant women, is caught by her persecutors **IN THE MIDST OF STRAITS,** whence: *Woe to them that are with child and that give suck in those days.*
4. DELETH*

VIE\textsuperscript{b} SYON\textsuperscript{c} LUGENT EO QUOD NON SINT QUI VENIANT\textsuperscript{d} AD SOLLEMPNITATEM\textsuperscript{f}

\textsuperscript{a}OMNES PORTE EIUS\textsuperscript{f} DSTRUCTE \textsuperscript{s}SACERDOTES EIUS\textsuperscript{s} GEMENTES\textsuperscript{h}

\textsuperscript{b}VIRGINES EIUS\textsuperscript{i} SQUALIDE\textsuperscript{j} ET IPSA OPPRESSA\textsuperscript{k} AMARITUDINE\textsuperscript{l}

\textsuperscript{a}‘tabularum.’ De imputribilibus enim tabulis cedrinis et sethim constructa erat domus Dei b predicatores c celestis d pedibus mentis e patrie celestis, unde:

Constituite diem sollempnem in condensis usque ad cornua altaris; angelorum f – g que debent
ornari h – i qui debent gaudere j pro peccatis k caste intentiones; que debent
fulgere l quia a vitiis corrupte m plebs subdita n vitiorum

DELETH: Tabularum quadrata introductur species secundum anagogen. Harum
officio domus Dei conexa quadrato culmine consurgit, visis, scilicet, portis,
sacerdotibus, virginibus.

VIE SYON &c: Octavus locus conquestionis, per quem dicitur factum, quod non
opportuerit, non factum, quod opportuerit.

Paschaisi historice

VIE SYON LUGENT &c: Premisso genere transit ad singularum species
personarum, ut, dum genus per species dividitur, et species in genus
redeintegrantur, luctus amplior multiplicetur, et quia Treni lege metrica
componuntur, secularis eloquentie figuris interdum ornantur et per
methaphoram rhetorica proprietate distinguntur. Unde hic dicitur: VIE SYON

De … 7 Dei] cfr Rg 6:10, 6:16–18; cfr Dt 10:3. 8 Constitute … altaris] PsG 117:27
Octavus … 16 oportuerit\textsuperscript{r}] cfr Cic., inv. 1, 108. 20 dum … 21 redeintegrantur] cfr Radbert.,
Lett. 1, 4 (467–8): ‘dum et genus per species diuiditur et species redeintegrantur in genere.’

4, 2 non om. Ha 5 oppressa + est δ A 6 tabularum] praeem. interpretatur \textsuperscript{Ψ}Rasch | cedrinis
+ scilicet δ \textsuperscript{θ} α R \textsuperscript{Hb} \textsuperscript{Ψ}Rasch | erat] est δ A 7 predicatores] id est praeem. et vel virtutes add.
Pa, predicaciones Bb 8 usque … altaris om. \textsuperscript{Ψ}Rasch | angelorum + sanctorum e, et add. et
post patrie celestis transp. Pa, angelicam Ph | debent] debeerent T 9 ornari + sunt Pa
debet\textsuperscript{[1]} debeerent K F | gaudere + sunt Pa | pro peccatis + quia vie lugent, quibus
transueutes afferebant eis obligationes A | caste] praeem. id est Pa | que … 10 fulgere om. Pa,
que deberet fulgere et ad lemma ipsa transp. K 10 fulgere] ornari \textsuperscript{θ} a vitiis \textsuperscript{η} Pa, intus \textsuperscript{Ψ}
Rasch | corrupte + quia porte destructe scilicet, per quas intrabant illi, quorum adventu
4. DELETH

THE WAYS OF ZION MOURN

BECAUSE THERE ARE NONE THAT COME TO THE SOLEMN FEAST

1 All her gates are broken down, her priests sigh
1 Her virgins are foul, and she is oppressed with bitterness

DELETH: a fourfold species of planks is introduced according to anagogy. Through the service of which the house of the Lord rises, joined together in a fourfold cupola, namely by the ways, gates, priests and virgins.

THE WAYS OF ZION &c: the eighth topic of complaint, in which something is said to have happened which ought not, or that something did not happen, which ought to have happened.

Historical interpretation

The ways of Zion mourn &c: from the general term set before he moves to the species of the single persons, for the grief to multiply more amply, as the general term is divided into species and the species are collected anew in the general term, and, since Threni are composed according to the rules of metre, they are occasionally adorned with figures of secular eloquence and by means of rhetorical devices distinguished by metaphors. Hence it is said here: The
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

LUGENT &c, non quod vie sentiant aut lugeant, sed in solitudinem redacte luctum transeuntibus excitant, eo quod non sint qui ad sollemnitatem veniant. Simile est, quod Moyses dicit: Audite celci, que loquor &c. Isaias quoque celum et terram in testimonium vocat, ut cuncta cognoscant elementa Deum iuste iratum ad iracundiam provocatum.

**Allegorie**

VIE SYON LUGENT. Quotiens ecclesia intus forisve pro peccatis suis repletur furoris Dei amaritudine, merito LUGENT VIE, PORTE iacent DESTRUCTE, gemunt SACERDOTES, SQUALIDE sunt VIRGINES, ut totius tabulatura domus quaternario numero designata concussa videatur. Unde alibi Ieremias: State in viis et videte et interrogate vias Domini &c. Vie sunt prophete, patriarche et alii, per quo ad Christum, qui vera luce Christo, sic ‘vie’ possunt dici ab ipso, unde Abraham prima credendi via appellatur. Hi sunt VIE SYON, id est celestis civitatis; he LUGENT et gemunt, quod NON SINT QUI VENIANT ad sollemnia celestis patrie, quia PORTE DESTRUCTE. Qui enim presunt officio, nec ipsi introeunt nec alios introire permittunt. SACERDOTES GEMENTES, quia, scilicet, LUGENT VIE; VIRGINES SQUALIDE, quia DESTRUCTE PORTE. Iure autem sacerdotes virginibus copulantur, quia virginitate sacerdotum pollet, et virginitas regimine sacerdotum eget, quibus constupratis gradibus sequentium turba commoritur. Unde generaliter sequitur: Et ipsa oppressa amaritudine, quia, si patitur unum membra, compatiuntur omnia.

---

WAYS OF ZION MOURN &c, not that the ways should feel or mourn, but brought into solitude, they excite grief in those who pass by, BECAUSE THERE ARE NONE THAT COME TO THE SOLEMN FEAST. In a similar way Moses says: Hear, O ye heavens, the things I speak &c. Also Isaiah summons heaven and earth as witnesses, for every element to know that God is justly enraged and provoked to wrath.

The ways of Zion mourn &c: as often as the Church, due to her sins, is filled within and without with the bitterness of God’s wrath, the ways deservedly MOURN, the gates lie BROKEN DOWN, the priests SIGH, the virgins are FOUL, so that the whole flooring of the house, arranged according to a fourfold number, looks violently agitated. Hence Jeremiah elsewhere: Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the ways of the Lord. The ways are the prophets, patriarchs and others, through whom one reaches Christ, who is the true way. For as they are named ‘light’ from the light, Christ, so can the ways be named from him, whence Abraham is called the first way of believing. They (the patriarchs and prophets) are the ways of Zion, that is of the heavenly city; they (the ways) MOURN and groan, BECAUSE THERE ARE NONE THAT COME TO the feasts of the heavenly fatherland, because the gates are BROKEN DOWN. For those who preside over the office neither enter themselves, nor permit others to enter. HER PRIESTS SIGH, because the ways MOURN; HER VIRGINS ARE FOUL, because the gates are WRECKED. The priests, however, are rightly united to the virgins, since the priesthood is strong through virginity, and virginity is in need of guidance from the priesthood, with which states ravished, the throng of followers comes to a halt. From which generally follows: AND SHE IS OPPRESSED WITH BITTERNESS, as, if one member suffers, all the members suffer with it.
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

Moraliter

VIE SYON LUGENT: Virtutes, scilicet, ad supernam Jerusalem ducentes AD SOLLEMPNITATEM anime, cui sponsus ablatus est, cum anima de arce superne intentionis ad exteroxiae labitur actiones. sollemnitas eius est vite celestis intima contemplatio, sed non sunt, QUI VENIANT AD SOLLEMPNITATEM; affectus, scilicet, prioris vite non veniunt ad sollemnia contemplationis divine, quia PORTE sensuum DESTRUCTE sunt. Sunt enim porte mortis; sunt et iusticie, de quibus dictur: Aperite mihi portas iusticie &c; et in Isaia: Aperite portas, et ingredietur gens insta. Sed quia mors intravit per fenestras nostras, squalet anime virginitas, et gemit regale sacerdotium, dum pro virtutibus replemur amaritudine vitiorum. Egrediamur ergo de portis mortis et portas vite reedificemus interrogantes, que sit Domini porta, ut ambulemus in ea.
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Moral interpretation

THE WAYS OF ZION MOURN &c: that is to say, the virtues, namely those leading to the Jerusalem above, to the SOLEMN FEAST of the soul, from whom the spouse is removed, when the soul slips from the summit of supernal intention to outward actions. Her solemnity is the intimate contemplation of heavenly life, but THERE ARE NONE THAT COME TO THE SOLEMN FEAST; the desires, namely, of prior life do not reach to the solemnities of divine contemplation, since the GATES of the senses ARE WRECKED. Indeed, there are gates of death, and of justice, of which it is said: Open ye to me the gates of justice &c; and in Isaiah: Open ye the gates, and let the just nation enter in. But, as death has entered through our windows, the soul’s virginity is filthy and the Kingly priesthood groans, while we, instead of with virtues, are filled with the bitterness of sin. Let us therefore march out from the gates of death and rebuild the gates of life, enquiring which gate is the Lord’s, for us to walk through.
5. \textit{He\textsuperscript{a}}

\textit{FACTI SUNT \textsuperscript{b}HOSTES EIUS\textsuperscript{b} IN CAPITE\textsuperscript{c} INIMICI EIUS \textsuperscript{d}LOCUPLETATI SUNT\textsuperscript{d}}

\textit{QUIA \textsuperscript{e}DOMINUS LOCUTUS EST\textsuperscript{e} SUPER EAM\textsuperscript{f}}

\textit{PROPTE MULTITUDINEM INIQUITATUM EIUS}

\textit{\textsuperscript{g}PARVULI EIUS\textsuperscript{b}DUCTI SUNT\textsuperscript{b} IN CAPTIVITATEM}

\textit{ANTE FACIEM TRIBULANTIS\textsuperscript{i}}

\textit{\textsuperscript{a}‘ista’, predicta sunt, scilicet, in Deuteronomio, et sic impleta. Quasi: ‘Quia Deo, qui eis gentes subiecerat, obedire noluerunt, merito gentibus subiecti sunt.’ \textsuperscript{b}– \textsuperscript{b}demones, heretici \textsuperscript{c}qui ante in cauda; Cum bonum opus corrupta mente concipimus, diabolus in principio principatur \textsuperscript{d}– \textsuperscript{d}diminutione boni, assiduitate peccandi \textsuperscript{e}– \textsuperscript{e}in Deuteronomio \textsuperscript{f}opprimendam; concessio \textsuperscript{g}– \textsuperscript{g}pusillanimes; quibus bene \textsuperscript{h}fi

\textit{\textsuperscript{i}Qui tribulant me, exultabunt, si motus fuero}

\textit{\textsuperscript{5, 7}ista	extsuperscript{cfr}Hier., epist. 30, 5. | \textsuperscript{7}ista … Deuteronomio\textsuperscript{cfr}Dt 27:11–14; \textsuperscript{cfr}Radbert., Ier. 1, 5 (568–72): ‘Nam de hac sententia legimus in Deuteronomio quod praeceperit Moyses stare Ruben ceterasque tribus super montem Hebal ad maledicendum si Dei noluerint audire et custodire mandata sicuti e regione alios ad benedicendum si oboedierint nec declinauerint ab eius preceptis.’ | predicta … impleta\textsuperscript{cfr}Ps. Hier., in Lam. 1, 5 (789C). | \textsuperscript{Quia … 8 noluerunt\textsuperscript{cfr}Dr 28:15. | \textsuperscript{11}Deuteronomio\textsuperscript{cfr}Dt 29:13. | \textsuperscript{13}Qui … fuero\textsuperscript{Ps 12:5. | \textsuperscript{15}Octavus … locus\textsuperscript{cfr}Cic., inv. 1, 108. | \textsuperscript{19}Tradat … 20 terre\textsuperscript{Dt 28:25. | \textsuperscript{20}Filii … 21 populo\textsuperscript{Dr 28:32. | \textsuperscript{21}Advena … 22 caudam\textsuperscript{Dr 28:43–44.}}}}
5. Her adversaries have become her lords; her enemies are enriched, because the Lord has spoken against her for the multitude of her iniquities. Her children are led into captivity before the face of the oppressor.

Her adversaries have become: the eighth topic of complaint.

Historical interpretation

Her adversaries have become her lords; her enemies are enriched, because the Lord has spoken through Moses, namely, saying in Deuteronomy: The Lord make thee to fall down before thy enemies, and be scattered throughout all the kingdoms of the earth. May thy sons and daughters be given to another people; and somewhat later: The stranger that liveth with thee in the land, shall rise up over thee, and trouble me, will rejoice when I am moved.
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES


*Allegorice*

FACTI SUNT HOSTES EIUS: Heretici, scilicet, aut pagani aut mali catholici; LOCUPLETATI SUNT disputandi facundia, cum sit intelligentie penuria. Unde dicitur: *Mittam in eos non famem panis neque sitim aequæ sed audiendi verbum Dei,* quod cum tollitur, hostes ecclesie IN CAPITE sublimantur et scripturarum divitis locupletantur PROPTER MULTITUDINEM INIQUITATUM nostrarum. Tunc vero canes muti non valentes latrare fi dem non possunt defendere aut debitam doctrinam subditis ministrare, unde PARVULI, qui non habent doctrine perfectionem, ducentur IN CAPTIVITATEM non habentes rectores aut defensores ANTE FACIEM TRIBULANTIS, hostis, scilicet, visibilis aut invisibilis, vinculis delictorum constricti.

*Moraliter*

FACTI SUNT &c: Demones, scilicet, principantes, de quibus dicitur: *Si spiritus potestatem habentis ascenderit super te, locum tuum ne dimiseris.* Si enim misera anima vigilantem animadvertisset, HOSTES male suadentes IN CAPITE esse non permisisset.

LOCUPLETATI SUNT: Contra nos, scilicet, invalescunt usu vitiorum crescente, ut nisi auxilio Dei effugere non valeamus. Sed et ipse iratus est, qui propter iniquitatem nostram hanc vindictam locutus est, qui *semel loquitur et secundo id*
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shall be higher. He shall be as the head, and thou shalt be the tail. This, however, the Lord has said due to the iniquity of Jerusalem, not to incite her to sin by commanding, but by warning to recall her from sin. But, as she was unwilling to obey, the prophet laments that all this has happened, though by God’s just judgement. Accordingly, the letter He, which is interpreted ‘those’, is put before, as if he were saying: ‘those are the judgements, that the Lord once had foresaid through Moses.’

Allegorical interpretation

HER ADVERSARIES HAVE BECOME: that is to say, heretics or pagans or bad catholics; THEY ARE ENRICHED with the eloquence of preaching, as there is want of intelligence. From which it is said: I will send forth a famine into the land: not a famine of bread, nor a thirst of water, but of hearing the word of the Lord, because, when this is removed, the enemies of the Church are elevated to LORDS and are enriched with the treasures of Scripture FOR THE MULTITUDE of our INIQUITIES. But then like dumb dogs not able to bark, they cannot defend the faith, nor provide the due teaching to their subjects. Hence HER CHILDREN, who have not the perfection of the teaching, are led INTO CAPIVITY, not having masters or defenders, BEFORE THE FACE of THE OPPRESSOR, that is to say the enemy, visible or invisible, and tied by the chains of blemish.

Moral interpretation

THEY HAVE BECOME &c: the ruling demons, to wit, of whom it is said: If the spirit of him that hath power ascend upon thee, leave not thy place. In fact, if the poor soul watchfully had taken heed, she had not allowed HER ADVERSARIES, wickedly urging, to become HER LORDS.

THEY ARE ENRICHED: against us, namely, they prevail with their habit of vices growing, so that we cannot escape, unless with God’s help. But he too is furious who on account of this our iniquity has spoken to punish, he who speaketh once, and repeateth not the selfsame thing the second time. One must not despair,
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

*ipsum non repetit.* Desperandum tamen non est aut a lucta cessandum, quia PARVULI tantum, id est pusillanimes non fortes, captivantur ANTE FACIEM TRIBULANTIS, multis, scilicet, laqueis irretiti, a quibus tantum Deo miserante solvuntur. Instant enim HOSTES FACTI fortiiores, aliquando IN CAPITE ipsam boni intentionem polluentes, aliquando longioriusu voluptatum animam renitentem prepedientes, secundum illud Salomonis: *Qui servum suum a puercia nutrit in deliciis, postea sentiet eum contumacem.* Ab his tanto difficilis liberamur, quanto in capite superiores et locupletiores dominantur.

52 Qui ... 53 contumacem] Prv 29:21.

however, nor cease from mourning, as but HER CHILDREN, that is to say the faint of heart and not the strong, are captured BEFORE THE FACE OF THE OPPRESSOR, ensnared in many fetters, that is, from which they are nevertheless set free by God showing pity. For her adversaries, made more potent, threaten, sometimes AS LORDS defiling the good intention itself, sometimes by a longer use of pleasure entangling the resisting soul, according to this saying of Solomon: He that nourisheth his servant delicately from his childhood, afterwards shall find him stubborn. We are set free from them with greater difficulty, the more superior and the more enriched they dominate as lords.
6. Vau\(^a\)

ET EGRESSUS EST A\(^b\) FIIA SYON\(^b\) OMNIS "DECOR EIIUS"
FACTI SUNT\(^d\) PRINCIPES EIIUS VELUT ARIETES NON INVENIENTES PASCUA\(^c\)
ET ABIERUNT\(^g\) ABSQUE FORTITUDINE\(^f\) ANTE FACIEM SUBSEQUENTIS\(^b\)

5 a ‘et’ b\(^b\) ecclesia vel anima, que filis sunt celestis Ierusalem c\(^c\) sacerdotium, templi ornamentum; puritas fidei; virtutum d\(^d\) pastores, rectores, qui utroque cornu urbi usque testimoni subditos debent defendere et rebellantes percutere; motus rationales e scripturarum f ligati g virtutum h ante suggestionem diaboli

\(\infty\)

10 ET EGRESSUS: Quintus questionis locus, per quem ante oculos singula ponuntur incommoda, quod fere ubique notandum.

\(\infty\)

Paschasius historice

ET EGRESSUS EST A FIIA SYON: Huic sententie V AU preponitur quae ‘et’ interpretatur, quasi et ista, que premissa sunt superius, iusto Dei iudicio in vindictam adnexitur. Obsessa quippe Ierusalem exterius omnem decorem pulcritudinis et interius iocunditatis amiserat; divitiis ablatis, templo et sacerdotio prophanatis ipsa fame et pestilentia laborabat. Et qui subveniret, non erat, quia FACTI SUNT PRINCIPES EIIUS VELUT ARIETES NON INVENIENTES PASCUA dissolutis viribus, pavido corde non defensionem sed fugam meditantes.


6, 5 textum \(\zeta\), intet. buis capituli om. Bb | et om. FAPb, + siclicet ista illis, que sunt premissa, iusto iudicio adnexitur Pa | ecclesia] sinagoga vel praeam. Pa | vel om. Ha | que … sunt om. Ha | file sunt a, file Syon K \(\Psi\), fila est Syon Ruscb | sacerdotium et + Ha, sacerdotum Ruscb 6 puritas fidei om. R | utroque cornu om. Pb 7 utroqueque] virtusque F debent] deberent Ha \(\Psi\) Ruscb 8 motus rationales om. \(\zeta\), motus rationales animi \(\Psi\) Ruscb, motus rationables Ha | scripturarum] scripturam Pb | virtutum + siclicet Ha | ante om. Ruscb | ante … diaboli] diaboli vel prave suggestionis Pa | diaboli + Nabugordonosor; Romanorum A 10 Quintus + supra lin. decimus L | ante om. Ha 11 ponuntur] ponimus \(\Psi\) Ruscb | notandum + est \(\delta\) \(\zeta\) 0 Z \(\Psi\) 14 et om. \(\lambda\) F, etiam A | interpretatur et \(\Psi\) Ruscb 15 quasi + dicat Ruscb | et om. K | ista + supra lin. et Hb, + supra lin. illis Pa | ista que]
6. VAU

AND FROM THE DAUGHTER OF ZION all HER BEAUTY IS DEPARTED
HER PRINCES HAVE BECOME LIKE RAMS THAT FIND NO PASTURES
AND THEY HAVE GONE AWAY WITHOUT STRENGTH BEFORE THE FACE OF THE PURSUER

a 'and' b–b the Church or the soul, who are daughters of the heavenly Jerusalem
c–c the priesthood, the ornament of the temple, purity of faith; of virtues
d–d herdsmen, masters, who ought to defend their subjects with both horns of the
two testaments and repel the rebels e of the scriptures f tied g of virtues
h before the temptation of the devil

AND IS DEPARTED: the fifth topic of complaint, by which all disadvantages are
brought separately before the eyes, which is to be noted almost everywhere.

Historical interpretation

AND FROM THE DAUGHTER OF ZION IS DEPARTED: before this sentence is put
VAU, that is interpreted ‘and’, as if those set before above are connected as a
punishment by God’s just judgement. Indeed, Jerusalem besieged had lost all
the ornament of her beauty without, and within that of delight; her riches taken
away and the temple and the priesthood desecrated, she herself labours in
hunger and pestilence. And there were none who would come to her aid,
because HER PRINCES HAVE BECOME LIKE RAMS THAT FIND NO PASTURES, with
virtues dissolved and trembling hearts they are not considering defending
themselves but fleeing.
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

Allegoric

ET EGRESSUS EST A FILIA SYON: Ecclesia, scilicet, de qua in Canticis dicitur: 
Ecce tu pulchra es amica mea. Ab ea decor egreditur, quando hereticorum rabie 
corrumpitur, de qua dicitur: Confessionem et decorem induisti.

FACTI SUNT PRINCIPES EIUS &c: Pastores, scilicet, et rectores in scripturis 
PASCUA vite non INVENIENTES ABIERTUM ABSPUE FORTITUDINE: divini verbi, 
quocumque eos error impellit ANTE FACIEM SUBSEQUENTIS, ut, qui minare 
gregem Domini ad pascua vite negligunt, ipsi ad pascua mortis ligati vadunt 
absque robore virtutum. Decor enim ecclesie in omnibus fidibus est, sed 
maxime in sacerdotibus et altario servientibus et in virginitibus, que iam supra 
squalide memorantur.

Moraliter

ET EGRESSUS EST A FILIA SYON: Anima, scilicet, malis moribus illecta, que 
perdit decorem suum, id est virtutum ornamentum. Nec subveniunt principes, 
animi, scilicet, motus rationales vel scripturarum defensiones, quibus retrudere 
debuit persequentes, sed magis fatigato robore virtutum astricta nexibus 
delictorum propellitur in foveam eternae confusionis.

M., in evang. 34, 3 (1247C). 29 pascua vite] Greg. M., in evang. 34, 3 (1247C). 31 que … 32

23 Ecclesia scilicet om. Bb | Canticis + canticorum A 24 egreditur] egredietur Rusch 
quando] quia Pa, quoniam η A 25 corrumpitur + et cupiditate prelatorum ecclesia fedatur A 26 
sicilicet om. δ Ph, sunt K | et om. Ha | scripturis + sanctis V, + velut arietes Rusch 
27 pascua + eternae V | vite om. λ | invenientes] inveniunt V | divini verbi fortitudine Ha 
28 cos om. γ | minare] invitare Ha 29 gregem] populum γ | gregem Domini post pascua vite 
Ψ Rusch | vite om. λ | vadunt] vadant δ R Ψ 30 robore] labore R | est om. K 31 altario] 
altari ζ K Rusch | in2 om. δ (scr. sed posta exp. V) 32 memorantur] commemorantur Ha, 
memorabantur Ψ Rusch 34 Et om. λ | Anima] ab praem. Pa 35 perdit] perdidit Bb Rusch 
ornamentum] ornamenta Hb | Nec] nunc Bb 36 rationales + id est ira, prudentia, 
consilium &c A | retrudere] retundere Rusch 37 persequentes] persecutores ε, 
persequentem Ψ
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Allegorical interpretation

And from the Daughter of Zion is departed: namely the Church, of which it is said in the Canticles: Behold thou art fair, O my love. Beauty departs from her, when her faith is corrupted by the rage of heretics, of which is said: Thou hast put on praise and beauty.

Her princes have become &c: that is to say the sheperds and herdsmen not finding the pastures of life in the Scriptures have gone away without strength of the divine word, whithersoever error urges them, before the face of the pursuer, so that they themselves, who neglect to drive the Lord’s flock to the pastures of life, rush bound to the pastures of death, without the strength of the virtues. Indeed, the beauty of the Church lies in all her faithful, but most of all in her priests and those assisting at the altar, and in her virgins, who are mentioned above as being foul.

Moral interpretation

And from the Daughter of Zion is departed: the soul, that is to say, allured by malicious customs, who has lost her beauty, that is the ornament of virtues. And her princes, namely the rational operations of the soul or the defences of Scripture, have not come to her aid, with which she ought to thrust back her pursuers, but, with the strength of virtue more wearied and tied by the clasps of her transgression, she is hurled into the pit of eternal confusion.
7. ZAI

**ET RECORDATA EST IERUSALEM** b DIERUM c AFFLICTIONIS SUEc ET PREVARICATIONIsd

CUM CADERETb POPULUS EIUSt IN MANU HOSTiliE

VIDERUNT EAM HOSTESl ET mDERISERUNT SABBATA EIUSt

a 'hec'  b ecclesia vel anima  c – c corporalis vel spiritualis  d pro qua afflicto;

VIDERUNT EAM HOSTES: Tercius decimus indignationis locus, quia cum injuria contumelia iuncta.

**Paschaisius historice**

ET RECORDATA EST IERUSALEM &c: Non recordatur ad consolationem DESIDERABILIUM SUORUM sed ad multiplicandum dolorem, cum cadat POPULUS EIUSt IN MANU HOSTili, unde preponitur ZAI, que interpretatur 'hec'.

---


7, 2 Et om. Rasch 3 prevaricationis + et Ψ 5 habuerat habuit K 7 Et] eo quod Pb | esset| est Ab Bh 9 textum gl. interl. eius capitulii om. Bh | hec| id est hec F, + subaudis: est iusta delictorum recompensatio cadere in manus hostium Pa | ecclesia| id est praeem. Pa | velc om. Ha | pro qua afflictione L, pro qua afflictionem A, per quam afflictio Pa, pro qua prevaricatio sc. sed vel afflictio supra lin. add. V 10 bonorum + scilicet Pa | e] eis HaK F Ph Ψ Rasch | in Egipto Deus K | et ... 11 Egipto om. Ψ Rasch | egregesetur| egregentur K
ZAI

AND JERUSALEM HAS REMEMBERED
THE DAYS OF HER AFFLICTION AND PREVARICATION
OF ALL HER DESIRABLE THINGS
WHICH SHE HAD FROM THE DAYS OF OLD WHEN HER PEOPLE FELL INTO THE ENEMY'S HAND
AND THERE WAS NO HELPER

THE ENEMIES HAVE SEEN HER AND HAVE MOCKED AT HER SABBATHS

ZAI: first topic of complaint.

THE ENEMIES HAVE SEEN HER: the thirteenth topic of indignation, because insult has been added to injury.

Historical interpretation

AND JERUSALEM HAS REMEMBERED &c: she remembers HER DESIRABLE THINGS, not for consolation, but to multiply the pain, when HER PEOPLE fall INTO THE ENEMY'S HAND. Hence ZAIN, that is interpreted 'this', is put before.
Hec enim est ultio perfecta, ut de bonis perditis doleat et prevaricationis conscientia et de malis, que incesanter tolerat, quasi: ‘Hec est divina ultio et perfecta’, quam legislator predixerat, scilicet: CUM CADERET IN MANU hostium, nullus subveniret. Insuper VIDERUNT EAM HOSTES &c, sicut nos hodie recutita sabbata Iudeorum deridemus, quia eum pereremur, in quo verum sabbatum habere debuerunt. Hec est autem iusta delictorum compensatio: cadere in manus hostium, recordari iugiter DIERUM non solum AFFLICTIONIS sed et PREVARICATIONIS et ad rerum desiderabilium usus ex recordatione inhiare, ut de afflictione novus dolor increscat, de prevaricatione confusionis mesticia, de bonis perditis inardescat irremediabilis concupiscentia, de officio sue religionis obprobrium urat.

**Allegorice**

ET RECORDATA EST IERUSALEM &c: Sepe enim intuetur ecclesia populum suum cadentem IN MANU hostium, id est demonum; alius per avariciam, alius per luxuriam cadit, alius per carnis oblectionem. Pro his omnibus et similibus ecclesia continue deplorat. Recordatur OMNIUM DESIDERABILUM, que nobis in celis promissa sunt, unde et nos prolabinur, et ipsa peregrinatur. Sabbata quoque nostra, id est festivitates, non minus a nobis violantur quam ab hostibus deridentur, unde: Ubi est Deus eorum? et alibi: Fuerunt mihi lacrime mee panes die ac nocte, dum dicitur mihi cotidie: Ubi est Deus tuus?

VIDERUNT EAM HOSTES &c: Sepe pro peccatis vel paganis vel hereticis vel vitiiis traditi prevaricationis nostre recordamur, et tunc demones sabbata nostra irrident, cum a bono nos feriari vident, unde: Qui tribulant me exultabunt, si motus fuero.

---

42 Ubi … eorum] Idr 7:21; Ps 78:10, 113:10; Ioel 2:17. 43 tus] Ps 41:4.
46 Qui … fuero] Ps 12:5.
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For this is the perfect revenge, that she is in pains about her lost goods and about the consciousness of her prevarication and about the evil things she has suffered incessantly, as if 'this is the divine and perfect revenge' that the legislator had declared, namely, when she FELL INTO THE enemies’ HAND none would come to her assistance. Moreover, THE ENEMIES HAVE SEEN HER &c: just as we today deride the circumcised sabbath of the Jews, because they slayed him in whom they should have had the true sabbath. This is nevertheless a just balancing of transgressions, to fall into the enemies’ hands, continually to remember the days not only of affliction but of prevarication, and, out of remembrance, to gaze eagerly at the use of the desirable things, for a new pain to rise from the affliction, and from the prevarication a sorrow of confusion, from the lost goods to kindle a desire beyond cure, from the duties of her religion to set aflame scandal.

Allegorical interpretation

AND JERUSALEM HAS REMEMBERED &c: in fact, the Church often beholds her people falling into the hands of the enemies, that is to say the demons; one falls through avarice, the other through luxury, yet another through delight of the flesh. For all those and alike, the Church continuously laments. She remembers ALL HER DESIRABLE THINGS which have been promised us in heaven, from which place also we fall away, and she herself sojourns abroad. Also our sabbaths, that is feasts, are dishonoured no less by us than they are derided by our enemies, whence: Where is their God? And elsewhere: My tears have been my bread day and night, whilst it is said to me daily: where is thy God?

THE ENEMIES HAVE SEEN HER &c: delivered either into the hands of pagans or heretics or to vices, we often, for the sake of our sins, remember our prevarication, and then the demons mock at our sabbaths, when they see us being disengaged from good. Hence: They that trouble me, will rejoice when I am moved.
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

Moraliter

Et recordata est Ierusalem: Anima, licet sero, recordatur desiderabilium, dum conspicit se artari undique et in manus diaboli affectus suos corruere et, quod putabat secures stare, divina percussum ultione. Tunc prevaricationis facta occurrunt, tunc afflictionis pessime, qua per multa oberraverat facinora, recordatio non ad consolationem sed ad peneaggerationem iuxta illud, quod in inferno impii dicturi sunt: Erravimus a via veritatis, et iusticie lumen nobis non luxit, sol non est ortus nobis. Laxati sumus in via iniquitatis et perditionis; ambulavimus vias difficiles. Quid nobis profuit superbia ac divitiarum opulentia? Transierunt omnia tamenque umbra mortis. In malignitate nostra consumpti sumus

Viderunt eam hostes &c: Maligni spiritus vacationis nostre ocia ad cogitationes illicitas pertrahunt et sic deludunt. Quod canonicis, monachis et omnibus, qui Dei vacant ministeriis, valde cavendum, ne non solum ab interno iudice sabbata eorum reprobentur sed etiam ab hostibus rideantur. Si autem pro vanis cogitationibus nostris sabbata deridentur, quid de illis putandum, qui, cum Deo vacare debeant, etiam flagitiosa committere non formidant? Si ergo Deo vacare volumus, ipsi soli corde et corpore vacemus, unde: Vacate et vident, quoniam ego sum Deus.


AND JERUSALEM HAS REMEMBERED: the soul remembers, although too late, her desirable things, when she observes that she is curtailed everywhere and that her compassions fall into the hands of the devil and that which is struck by divine vengeance, which she thought stood more firm. Then the deeds of prevarication occur, then remembrance of affliction most wicked, on account of which she had roamed through many crimes, not for consolation, but for increasing of the punishment according to that which the wicked will say in hell: We have erred from the way of truth, and the light of justice hath not shined unto us, and the sun hath not risen upon us. We wearied ourselves in the way of iniquity and destruction, and have walked through hard ways. What hath pride profited us? or what advantage hath the boasting of riches brought us? All those things are passed away like a shadow of death; we are consumed in our wickedness.

THE ENEMIES HAVE SEEN HER &c: the malicious spirits lead astray and thus deceive the leisure of our freedom into illicit thoughts, which canons and monks and everyone who is devoted to the ministry of God, must very much beware of, lest their own sabbaths not only be disapproved of by the judge within, but also laughed at by the enemies. If, however, our sabbaths are mocked for the sake of our vain thoughts, what is one to think of those people, who, when they ought to be devoted to God, do not fear even to commit disgraceful things? If we therefore wish to be devoted to God, let us with heart and deed be devoted to Him alone, whence: O taste and see because I am the Lord.
8. HETH

PECCATUM HETH a PECCAVIT IERUSALEM PROPTEREA INSTABILIS FACTA EST

OMNES QUI GLORIFICABANT EAM SPREVERUNT ILLAM

QUONIAM VIDEREUNT IGNOMINIAM EIUS

IPSA AUTEM GEMENS ET CONVERSA RETRORSUM

a 'vita', quod ad hoc respicit GEMENS ET CONVERSA RETRORSUM; idecirco enim Dominus tribulationem inducit, ut peccator convertatur et vivat

b infidelitatis concessio, quia non factum excusat sed, ut ignoscatur, postulat per diversa vita, per diversas terras scribe et pharisei, qui beatificabant populum, unde:

Populus meus, qui te beatum dicunt, ipsi te decipiunt; heretici applaudentes vel angeli et sancti viri captivam vel convictam, heresi confusam vel vitii constupratam peccatum agnoscens per penitentiam ad Deum, quem reliquerat; ad conversionem celi, unde exciderat

Paschasius historice

PECCATUM PECCAVIT IERUSALEM: Causam tante miserie demonstrat peccatum singulare, quo omnia tenentur, quo absente omnia dimittuntur – hoc est incredulitas, unde: Audite rebelles et increduli. Ex incredulitate enim Deum semper exacerbaverunt, idola coluerunt, in Christum credere noluerunt, unde: Si non

Paschasius historice

PECCATUM PECCAVIT IERUSALEM: Causam tante miserie demonstrat peccatum singulare, quo omnia tenentur, quo absente omnia dimittuntur – hoc est incredulitas, unde: Audite rebelles et increduli. Ex incredulitate enim Deum semper exacerbaverunt, idola coluerunt, in Christum credere noluerunt, unde: Si non

8, 6 vita cfr Hier., epist. 30, 5. | idecirco … 7 vivat cfr Ps. Hier., in Lam. 1, 8 (790A).

8, 3 illam] cfr Hier., epist. 30, 5. | 4 quoniam] cfr L. Ψ 5 conversa + est x Ψ 6 quod] cfr Ps. Hier., in Lam. 1, 8 (790A).
8. Heth a
Jerusalem has grievously b sinned therefore has d she become unstable c
all who honoured her e have despised her f
because they have seen her shame
but she is sighing g and b turned backward h

a ‘life’, since to this she gazes sighing and turned backward; the Lord infers
tribulation for that reason, namely, that the sinner may convert and live b the sin
of infidelity c a concession, because he does not excuse the fact, but asks that it be
pardoned d–d through various crimes, through different lands e–e scribes and
Pharisees, who blessed the people, whence: O my people, they that call thee blessed, the
same deceive thee; heretics applauding or angels and holy men f captive or
conquered, perplexed by heresy or defiled by vices g recognising her sin
h–b through penitence to the Lord, whom she had left; to the life of heaven, whence
she came

All who honoured: the thirteenth topic of complaint.

Historical interpretation
Jerusalem has grievously sinned: one sin, alone of its kind, designates the
reason for such misery, a sin through which everything is fettered and without
which everything is released, that is incredulity, whence it is said: Hear, ye
rebellious and incredulous. For out of incredulity they have always provoked God,
worshipped idols, refused to believe in Christ, whence: If I had not come and
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

venisset et locutus eis non fuissem, peccatum non haberent. PROPTEREA INSTABILIS FACTA EST, nec relictus est in ea lapis super lapidem.

OMNES QUI GLORIFICABANT EAM: Scribe, scilicet, et pharisei, qui lucrī causa peccantem populum diecibant beatum, et eversum plebs delinquens beatos vocabat eos et columnnas in domo Dei, sed modo invicem se spernunt, qui adulationibus crediderunt. GEMENS ET CONVERSA RETRORSUM: Captivorum exprimit habitum, qui, dum abducuntur, retro aspiciunt natale solum plorantes et gementes.
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Allegorica

PECCATUM PECCavit IERUSALEM &c: Ecclesia in membris suis aliqua heresi polluta peccatum infidelitatis peccat ideoque INSTABILIS vagatur et nulla fidei soliditate fundatur, que prīus fundata erat supra firmam petram. Hos autem populi, qui vano affectu glorificabant, videntes heresim eorum a catholicis detectam et conculcatam spernunt et detestantur. Ipsi autem gementes conversi sunt RETRORSUM.

Moraliter

PECCATUM PECCavit IERUSALEM &c: Quasi: Anima pro peccato in delitatis peccat ideoque INSTABILIS vagatur et nulla dei soliditate fundatur, que prīus fundata erat supra petram. Hos autem populi, qui vano affectu gloriabant, horum dum catholici viri heresim destruunt et conculcat populi qui prius glorificabant eos vano affectu spernunt et detestantur. Ipsi + eos Rausch qui + eos Rausch vano vana KZ, vario Rausch, novo F aucto + Deum A glorificabant [glorificant Phb] detectan Rausch Ipsi ipsa V Ipsi ... 36 retorserum om. Pa conversi ... 36 retorserum om. Rausch, conversi retorserum L. Phb, et conversi retorserum Ba, et conversa retorserum V A (et add. Z)
spoken to them, they would not have sin. THEREFORE HAS SHE BECOME UNSTABLE, and not stone upon stone is left in her.

ALL THAT HONOURED HER: namely the scribes and the Pharisees, who for the sake of filthy lucre, called the sinful people blessed, and the transgressing people, on the other hand, called them blessed and pillars in the house of the Lord, but in a moment they despise each other having put their faith in low flattery. SHE IS SIGHING AND TURNED BACKWARD: these words express the habit of captives, who, when they are taken away, look back to their native soil, weeping and sighing.

**Allegorical interpretation**

JERUSALEM HAS GRIEVOUSLY SINNED &c: the Church, defiled in its limbs with some heresy, sins the sin of infidelity and for this reason roams UNSTABLE and is founded on no solidity of faith, she who previously was built upon a firm rock. But the people, who honoured them with vain affection, seeing their heresy being revealed and crushed by Catholics, despise and detest them. They themselves SIGHING are TURNED BACKWARD.

**Moral interpretation**

JERUSALEM HAS GRIEVOUSLY SINNED &c: as if: the soul, because of the sin of infidelity, is carried off through different vices, since she had not secured her steps on the rock of virtue. Hence the angels or holy men, who previously honoured her, disdain her, that she finally may bewail her sin and return to God, hearing a voice calling from behind, whence Isaiah: *Thy ears shall hear the word of one admonishing thee behind thy back*. Thereupon Mary, TURNED BACKWARD, found Jesus, whom she was looking for, but could not find. Likewise Jerusalem,
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IERUSALEM, que hic pro peccato impietatis plangitur, si cognoverit et crediderit
CONVERSA RETRORSUM et ingemiscens, in lege, quem mortuum existimabat,
inveniet. Qui vero increduli sunt nec aspiciunt retrorsum, usque hodie sicut
Cain instabiles sunt et portant confusionis sue signum et in Babylonem, id est in
confusionem, tendunt.

47 Babylonem ... 48 confusionem] Aug., in psalm. 64, 2, 2 (823); Ps. Hier., in Lam. 1, 10
(790D); cfr Hier., nom. hebr. 819–20.

44 impietatis] infidelitatis \( \Psi \) Rusch | plangitur] plangit a \( \alpha \) \( \varepsilon \) \( \beta \) \( \Pi \) | si] se \( \delta \) | cognoverit]
cognovit \( \beta \) | crediderit] credidit \( \beta \) | 45 conversa + est \( F \) | existimabat] existimabat \( H \) a
46 inveniet ex invenit corr. \( \Pi \), invenit vel inveñ \( a t t \).
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that is here lamented for the sake of the sin of infidelity, if she, TURNED BACKWARD and SIGHING, knows and believes, will find in the law the one she thought was dead. But those who are incredulous and do not look backward, even until this day, are, like Cain, unstable and carry the sign of their confusion and march to Babylon, that is to confusion.
9. TETH

SORDES EIUS IN PEDIBUS EIUS NEC RECORDATA EST FINIS SUI

DEPOSITA EST VEHEMENTER NON HABENS CONSOLATOREM

VIDE DOMINE AFFLICTIONEM MEAM QUONIAM ERECTUS EST INIMICUS

a ‘bonum’, unde: VIDE DOMINE AFFLICTIONEM MEAM &c; Bonum est enim peccatori se cognoscere et cum penitentia et gemitu exclamare: VIDE DOMINE &c

b—b doctoribus, a quibus debuit portari, vel affectibus c—c Christi vel judicii futuri vel captivitatis d—d a solio regni e Spiritum sanctum f—f vox ipsius captive; ut miserearis g non iniquitatem h contra te superbiens

SORDES EIUS &c: Tripliciter plangit eam: Quia contra Dominum peccavit, quia non penituit, quia post flagella ad Dominum redire noluit, unde: NEC RECORDATA EST FINIS SUI &c.

VIDE, DOMINE &c: Quartus decimus conquestionis locus, in quo orantur, qui audiant, humili et simplici oratione, ut misereantur.

Paschasius historice

SORDES EIUS &c: Quasi: Ierusalem instabilis facta est et longa via fatigata SORDES IN PEDIBUS portat, quod magis de interiori homine quam de exteriori deplorat. Pedes synagoge doctores legis sunt, qui per viam, que Christus est, eam ducere debuerunt, sed hi pedes sordibus scelerum inquinati sunt. NEC RECORDATA EST FINIS SUI, id est Christi, qui est finis legis ad instiiciam omni credenti. Ideo DEPOSITA


9. TETH

HER FILTHINESS IS ON HER FEET AND SHE HAS NOT REMEMBERED HER END

SHE IS VIOLENTLY CAST DOWN NOT HAVING A COMFORTER

BEHOLD O LORD MY AFFLICTION BECAUSE THE ENEMY IS LIFTED UP

‘good’, whence: BEHOLD, O LORD, MY AFFLICTION &c; for it is good for the sinner to know himself and exclaim with penitence and sighs: BEHOLD, O LORD &c b–b teachers, by whom she should have been carried, or desires c–c Christ or the future judgement or the captivity d–d from the throne of the kingdom e the Holy Ghost f–f the captive’s own voice; that you may show pity g–g not my iniquity h being haughty against thee

HER FILTHINESS &c: he bewails her in a threefold way: since she has sinned against the Lord, since she has not repented, since she after the stings of conscience did not want to return to the Lord, whence: AND SHE HAS NOT REMEMBERED HER END &c.

BEHOLD, O LORD &c: the fourteenth topic of complaint, in which they are implored, who hear, in a humble and sincere address, to have mercy.

Historical interpretation

HER FILTHINESS &c: as if: Jerusalem has become unstable and, exhausted after a long journey, carries HER FILTHINESS ON HER FEET, because she laments more over interior man than over exterior. The feet of the synagogue are the teachers of the law, who ought to lead her along the way, who is Christ, but these feet have been soiled by the filth of crime. AND SHE HAS NOT REMEMBERED HER END, that is Christ, who is the end of the law, unto justice to every one that believeth.

**Allegorice**


---


Therefore she is violently cast down. Hence Jerusalem cries out with her own voice: BEHOLD, O LORD &c. For indeed, from the beginning hitherto the prophet has lamented, but henceforth she herself bewails her own distress, humbled and having confessed her sin, which is meant by the letter TETH, that is interpreted ‘good’, whence: It is good for me, O Lord, that thou hast humbled me. She herself being humiliated, however, no longer bears with the prophet, but cries out with sighs and tears: BEHOLD, O LORD &c. In a rhetorical manner, she performs the lamentation with indignation, to move the judge towards her enemies and receive pity herself. Hence she adds: BECAUSE THE ENEMY IS LIFTED UP, namely against you, and he does not reckon your justice, but his own arrogance. As if: ‘BEHOLD first MY AFFLICTION, that you may show pity, not my misdeeds, because of which you become angry, and second, because THE ENEMY IS LIFTED UP, that you may punish.’

Allegorical interpretation

HER FILTHINESS &c: the Church carries HER FILTHINESS ON HER FEET, because in the misery of this life there is none who would march along without some foulness of vice at least on his feet, with which the earth is touched. From that, the Lord washes the feet of the disciples and bids us mutually to do the same, and he says to the apostles: SHAKE OFF THE DUST FROM YOUR FEET. Nevertheless he washed their feet for them to become excellent and clean and thus to run about the whole world to preach. Of these feet it is said: HOW BEAUTIFUL ARE THY STEPS IN SHOES, O PRINCE’S DAUGHTER! And elsewhere: FEET SHOD WITH THE PREPARATION OF THE GOSPEL OF PEACE. HER FILTHINESS, however, IS ON HER FEET, the false life in the preachers, who do not remember their end, the future judgement. Hence they are violently cast down before the eyes of God, not having the Paraclete, they who ought to console others. Accordingly, turned back and humiliated, they call: BEHOLD, O LORD &c.

+ scilicet Pa, scilicet iudicii λ, id est iudicii Rausch, nec (nec supra linc.) iudicii L. | deinonuntur| deponentur THb 43 consolatorem] consolationis δ 44 deberent] debent δ | clament| clamant λ
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Moraliter

SORDES EIUS IN PEDIBUS EIUS: Anima SORDES habet IN PEDIBUS, sordes videlicet vitiorum, que celestis vite et pristine conversationis candorem perditid, unde: Consurge, Ierusalem, excutere de pulvere. Anima enim, que terrenis intendit actibus, SORDES necesse est habeat IN PEDIBUS, id est affectibus, unde:

Humiliata est in pulvere anima nostra. Ab his cotidie pedes lavandi sunt, ne contingat, quod sequitur: Oblita est FINIS SUI, DEPOSITA EST VEHEMENTER NON HABENS CONSOLATOREM. Sed dicat anima, dicat ecclesia: 'VIDE DOMINE AFFLICTIONEM MEAM, non peccatum, ut dampnes, sed AFFLICTIONEM, ut liberes, QUONIAM ERECTUS EST INIMICUS sibi imputans, tibi insultans, quasi nequeas liberare.' Unde David: Multi dicunt anime mee: Non est salus ipsi in Deo eius.
Liber I – Cap. 9. Teth

Moral interpretation

Her filthiness is on her feet: the soul has its filthiness on her feet, namely the filthiness of her vices, she who has lost the splendour of heavenly life and of her former way of life. Hence: Shake thyself from the dust, arise, sit up, O Jerusalem. Indeed, it is necessary that the soul, who seeks earthly acts, has filthiness on her feet, that is on her desires. Hence: For our soul is humbled down to the dust. From this the feet ought to be washed daily, for that not to happen, which follows: She has forgotten her end, she is violently cast down, not having a comforter. But let the soul say, let the Church say: Behold, O Lord, my affliction, not my sin, that you may condemn me, but my affliction, to set me free, because the enemy is lifted up, reckoning himself, abusing you, as if you are unable to set free. Hence David: Many say to my soul: there is no salvation for him in his God.
10. IOTH

bMANUM SUAM misit hostis ad omnia desiderabilia eius

QUIA VIDIT gentes ingressas sanctuarium suum

bDE QUIBUS PRECEPERAS NE INTRARENT IN ECCLESIAE TUAM

5 'principium', malorum, scilicet, quia vidit Deus gentes ingressas sanctuarium suum b–h operationem, suggestionem c Caldeus vel diabolus d–i regnum, sacerdotium, sancta sanctorum; vasa preciosa, fide, baptismum, corpus Christi &c; virtutes e Dominus f carnales vel vita, vel quia Judei cultum idolorum in templum intulerant g–i templum, ecclesiam, animam h–b sacerdos, in quocunque fuerit macula, non accedat offerre

MANUM SUAM MISIT HOSTIS: Quintus decimus questionis locus, per quem non nostras sed nostrorum fortunas deploramus, sicut sepe Ieremias populi fortunam deploret.

Paschasiae historice

MANUM SUAM MISIT HOSTIS: Caldeus, scilicet, misit MANUM ad sancta sanctorum, ad quæ non licebat nisi solis sacerdotibus introire et semel in anno et cum sanguine. Vasa decoris abstulit et sanctuarium prophanavit, cuius rei causa redditur: QUIA VIDIT Dominus gentes ingressas sanctuarium suum, id est Iudeos gentiliter viventes et sanctuarium polluentes, quo id ipse prohibuerat. Unde sequitur: DE QUIBUS PRECEPERAS &c, unde alibi: Tradidit in captivitatem virtutem eorum et pulcritudinem eorum in manus inimici, conclusit in gladio populum suum &c.

10. JOD

THE ENEMY HAS PUT OUT HIS HAND TO ALL HER DESIRABLE THINGS

FOR HE HAS SEEN THE GENTILES ENTER INTO HIS SANCTUARY

OF WHOM THOU GAVEST COMMANDMENT THAT THEY SHOULD NOT ENTER INTO THY CHURCH

a ‘beginning’, of evils, namely, FOR the Lord HAS SEEN THE GENTILES ENTER INTO his SANCTUARY b–b an action, a suggestion c the Chaldean or the devil d–d the kingdom, priesthood, holy of holies; precious vessels, faith, baptism, the body of Christ &c; virtues e–e the Lord f carnal or vices or because the Jews have brought the worship of idols into the temple g–g the temple, the Church, the soul b–b a priest, whosoever hath a blemish, shall not approach to offer

THE ENEMY HAS PUT OUT HIS HAND: the fifteenth topic of complaint, in which we lament not our own ill fortune but that of our dear ones, as Jeremiah often bemoans the ill fortune of his people.

Historical interpretation

THE ENEMY HAS PUT OUT HIS HAND: that is to say the Chaldean has put out his hand to the holy of holies, which it was not allowed but for priests to enter, and that once a year and with blood. He took away the vessels of beauty and violated the sanctuary, the reason for which is rendered, FOR the Lord HAS SEEN THE GENTILES ENTER INTO HIS SANCTUARY, that is the Jews, living as heathens and defiling the sanctuary, which he had himself forbidden. Hence it follows: OF WHOM THOU GAVEST COMMANDMENT &c, whence also elsewhere: And he delivered their strength into captivity: and their beauty into the hands of the enemy. And he shut up his people under the sword &c.
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**Allegorice**

MANUM SUAM MISIT HOSTIS &c: Hostis antiquus ad DESIDERABILIA ecclesie manum mittit in membris suis fidelem contaminans, baptisma rescindens, doctrinam corrumpens, corpus et sanguinem Domini indigne contractans et vasa preciosa, id est ovem Christi, quasi lupus devastans. Et causa tanti mali redditur: QUA GENTES, carnem, silecit, amantes, quasi preputium retinentes et Christi circumcisionem non habentes, ministri altaris efficiuntur.

30

**Moraliter**

MANUM SUAM MISIT HOSTIS &c: Diabolus audacter mittit MANUM SUAM ad anime DESIDERABILIA et aufert virtutum ornamenta – idem, spem, caritatem, discretionem &c. Quod iustus iudex eri permittit, quia videt GENTES, pravas, scilecit, suggestiones, cogitationes et voluptates, INGRESSAS SANCTUARIUM anime, que debuit ostium claudere et in cubiculo Patrem orare. Tunc pudicicia corrumpitur, abstinentia evertitur, et princeps coquorum omnes anime muros, id est virtutes, evertere conatur. Sic vindemiatam omnibus bonis animam sine consolatore relinquit.


Liber I – Cap. 10. Ioth

Allegorical interpretation
THE ENEMY HAS PUT OUT HIS HAND &c: the old enemy puts out his hand to the Church's desirable things, corrupting the faith in its limbs, abolishing baptism, falsifying doctrine, handling the body and blood of our Lord unworthily and devastating the precious vessels, that is Christ's sheep, just as a wolf. And the reason for such an evil is rendered: FOR THE GENTILES, that is those finding pleasure in the flesh, almost still retaining their foreskin and not being in possession of the circumcision of Christ, are made ministers of the altar.

Moral interpretation
THE ENEMY HAS PUT OUT HIS HAND &c: the devil rashly puts out his hand to the desirable things of the soul and takes away the ornaments of virtue: faith, hope, charity, prudence &c. The just judge allows this to happen, since he sees the GENTILES, namely vicious intimations, thoughts and passions, ENTER INTO the SANCTUARY of the soul, who ought to close her door and pray to the Father in her bedchamber. Then chastity is violated, abstinence subverted and the prince of cooks tries to overthrow all the walls, that is virtues, of the soul. Thus harvested of all its goods, he leaves the soul without a comforter.
11. CAPH

bOMNIS POPULUSb EIUS GEMENSb ET QUERENS PANEMd
DEDERUNT "QUEQUE PRETIOSA PRO CIBOö AD REFOCILLANDAMö ANIMAMö
bVIDE DOMINEb ET CONSIDERA QUONIAM FACTA SUM VILISi

5 a 'manus', ex cuius tactu clamat: VIDE DOMINE &c  b-h vox prophete  c angustia belli  d verbi Dei  e-c celestia pro terrenis  f non satiandam  g animalitatem b-h vox sinagoge vel ecclesie vel anime; facturam tuam, non iniquitatem meam
i vilis efficitur ecclesia, cum crescente numero malorum non summa petit et celestia sed infima et terrena

OMNIS POPULUS: Quartus conquestionis locus.

VIDE DOMINE: Quartus decimus conquestionis locus.

Paschasius historice

15 OMNIS POPULUS EIUS GEMENS &c: Quantam famem et pestilentiam Iudei passi sunt, historie non tacent, et Iosephus precipue manifestat, unde: POPULUS GEMENS ET QUERENS PANEM &c; AD REFOCILLANDAM ANIMAM, id est corporalem vitam. VIDE DOMINE &c: Nota, quid propheta profuerit, dum se non plangentem Ierusalem planxit, que tamen supra quasi nobilioribus membris plangens inducit. Nunc vero quasi vitali spiritu recepto omnis populus plangere perhibetur. VIDE DOMINE ET CONSIDERA &c: Sicut enim gallina fovet ova sua et coanimat, sic spirituales viri subditos suos paulatim vel monendo vel plangendo fovent, ut sibi coaniment.


11. CAPH

All her people b sigh c and seek bread d
They have given e all their precious things for food g
To relieve f the soul h

See o lord h and consider for I have become vile i

All her people: the fourth topic of complaint.
See o lord: the fourteenth topic of complaint.

Historical interpretation

All her people sigh &c: how great the hunger and pestilence the Jews suffered, the histories do not pass over in silence, and Josephus manifests it in particular. Hence: All her people sigh and seek bread &c; To relieve the soul, that is corporeal life. See o lord &c: note how the prophet was useful, when he lamented Jerusalem not lamenting herself, who nevertheless was introduced above, bewailing as it were in her more noble limbs, but now the whole people, as if having received some life-bringing spirit, is said to be lamenting. See, o lord &c: just as the hen cherishes and kindles her eggs, so spiritual men gradually cherish their subjects, either by instructing or lamenting, to breathe life into them.
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Allegorice

25 OMNIS POPULUS EIUS GEMENS ET QUERENS PANEM verbī Dei, panem, qui de celo descendit. In angustia famis ecclesia hunc panem a doctoribus querit nec invenit, quia DEDERUNT PRECIOSA QUEQUE PRO CIBO, celestia scilicet pro terrenis, eterna pro caducis, AD REFOCILLANDAM ANIMAM, non satiandam, quia innumeris desiderīs accensē refocillāre possunt, non satīre. Hinc quoque POPULUS GEMENS ET QUERENS PANEM dicitur, quia pravi affiguntur et cruciantur, quia non ad votum deliciose vitae affluentia habetur.

Moraliter

OMNIS POPULUS EIUS GEMENS: Quevis anima PRECIOSA PRO CIBO donat, quando virtutes mentīs ad transitoriam delectationem inclinat et refocillārit, dicitur, dum diversīs desiderīs satisfacere machinatur. Unde POPULUS GEMENS ET QUERENS PANEM plangitur, quia, quamvis PRECIOSA PRO CIBO dederit, concupiscentiē affects non satiātur visū, gustū et ceterīs sensibus. Unde, si qua virtūs forte redeat, et Spiritū Deī anima recreatā convalescat, iure cum electorum multitudine plangendo exclamāt: VIDE DOMINE ET CONSIDERA &c, quasi dicat: 'FACTA SUM michi VILIS, humilis in oculis meis,quia manus Domini tētigit me.' CAPH enim 'manus' interpretatur; cum manus Domini vel puniendo vel relevando supplicia vel instruendo animam vel negligentem ecclesiam tētigerit, mox ad se rediens et ingemiscens dicit: VIDE DOMINE &c, quasi: 'CONSIDERA fabricam tuam, quantum sit vilis.' Anima, que prius oblectata vitiis gloriābatur, manu Domini tacta vilem se procondita est creatorīs.
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Allegorical interpretation

All her people sigh and seek the bread of God's word; the bread which cometh down from heaven. In the distress of hunger the Church seeks this bread from the teachers, and does not find it, because they have given all their precious things for food, that is to say divine things for earthly, eternal for perishable, to relieve the soul, not to satisfy it, since they, ablast with innumerable desires, can relieve it, but not satisfy it. Also from this the people is referred to as sighing and seeking bread, since the vicious are afflicted and tortured, because they do not at will have the abundance of voluptuous life.

Moral interpretation

All her people sigh and seek bread: any soul gives its precious things for food when it inclines the virtues of the mind toward transitory pleasure, and strives to be relieved, when it schemes to satisfy different desires. Hence the people laments, sighing and seeking bread, as although it has given its precious things for food, the desire for concupiscence is not satisfied by sight, taste and the other senses. Hence, if any virtue perchance returns and the soul reshaped by the Spirit of God regains health, it would, together with the multitude of the elect, wailing, exclaim: See O Lord &c. As if it would say: ‘I have become vile to myself, humiliated before my own eyes, because the hand of the Lord has touched me.’ For CAPH is interpreted ‘hand’; when the hand of the Lord either by instruction, or by punishment, or by alleviating the punishment has touched the soul or the neglectful Church, soon returning to itself and sighing, it says: See O LORD &c. As if it would say: ‘consider your creation, how vile it is become.’ The soul, who previously was amused by vices and bragged, as soon as she is touched by the hand of the Lord, declares herself vile, who is shaped to the likeness of her Creator.
12. LAMECH*  
O VOSb OMNES ´QUI TRANSITIS´ PER VIAMD 
ATTENDITEc ET VIDETEd ´SI EST DOLOR SICUT DOLOR MEUSg QUONIAM hVINDEMIAVIT MEh UT ´LOCUTUS EST´ DOMINUSj IN kDIE IRE FURORIS SUIk 

a 'disciplina' vel 'cordis'; quod enim propheta luget alius disciplina est et cordis contrito, ut lugeant simili modo b sancti c-c non habentes hic manentem civitatem; celeriter d Christum; Ego sum via, veritas et vita; virtutum e compatienti corde f caritatis intentione g Quis infirmatur, et ego non infirmor? Quis scandalizatur, et ego non uror?; Pro terrenis celestia perdidi b-h bonis virtutum; qui debuit defendere; vel 'vindemiabit'; per Caldeos vel Romanos i-i per prophetas j qui non mentitur k-b quia exacerbavi eum; iudiciei 

O VOS OMNES &c: Duodecimus indignationis locus; indignari enim videtur, quod sibi hoc primum evenerit. 

Paschasius historice  
O VOS OMNES QUI TRANSITIS &c: Proprium est miserorum tanto maiorem estimare dolorem suum, quanto alienum minus intelligere studuerunt et, quo magis dolorem suum sentiunt, alienum sibi equari non consentiunt. Sed verius reliquie, que salve funt, contritio cordis deplorant, quando sanctificatio destruitur, templum prophanatur, alta ria evertunt, lumen candelabrorum
12. LAMECH

O ALL YE THAT PASS BY THE WAY

ATTEND AND SEE IF THERE BE ANY SORROW LIKE TO MY SORROW

FOR HE HAS MADE A VINTAGE OF ME AS THE LORD SPOKE IN THE DAY OF HIS FIERCE ANGER

a 'discipline' or 'of the heart'; for what the prophet bemoans, is discipline for others and contrition of heart, that they may lament in a like fashion the saints c-e not having a permanent abode here; quickly d Christ; I am the way, and the truth, and the life; of virtues e with compassionate heart f with the intention of charity g-g Who is weak, and do I not know? Who is scandalized, and do I not hear? I have lost heaven for corporeal goods b-h by the goods of virtue; he who ought to defend; or he will make a vintage; through the Chaldeans or the Romans b-k through the prophets

He who does not lie k-k since I have provoked him; of judgement

O ALL YE &c: the twelfth topic of indignation; for he seems to be displeased, because it has happened to him first.

Historical interpretation

O ALL YE THAT PASS BY &c: it is characteristic of the unfortunate to estimate by so much more their own suffering, as they so much less care to comprehend a foreign one, and the more they perceive their own pain, they do not agree to comparing a foreign one with their own. But more truly a remnant that is saved laments such things with contrition of heart, when the sanctification is destroyed, the temple is desecrated, the altars are overturned, the light of the

O ALL YE &c: the twelfth topic of indignation; for he seems to be displeased, because it has happened to him first.
extinguitur, libri concremantur, sacerdotes et levite captivantur, virgines et
uxores hostili libidine polluuntur, omnia sancta contaminantur. Pro his et
huiusmodi reliquie, que salve facte sunt, non inmerito lugent, cum gentem suam
non minus terrena quam celestia bona perdere vident. Sic enim VINDEMIAVIT
eam Deus iusto iudicio, sicut in lege et prophetis locutus est.

Allegorica

O VOS OMNES &c: Nostra Syon, cuius conversatio in celis est, de celo in terris
posita membra sua conspicit et, que patientur cotidie, de excelsa prospicit,
unde miseranda proclamat: O VOS OMNES, sancti, scilicet, de quibus David
dicit: Euntes ibant et flebant. Hi eunt per viam, que Christus est, vestigia eius
sequentes neque ad dextram neque ad sinistram declinantes. Vocati enim ad
paschales dapes et paschalia vota celebrantes agnum secundum legem
dependent neque ad dexteram neque ad sinistram declinantes. Vocati enim ad
paschales dapes et paschalia vota celebrantes agnum secundum legem
comedunt festinantes. Hos conspicit ecclesia via regia ad patriam gradientes, que
multis filorum curis prepedita ingemit et clamat: O VOS OMNES QUI TRANSITIS
per viam, non ut retrahat a viam sed ad compatiendum moneat; ATTENDITE
mente, VIDETE intuitu caritatis, SI EST DOLOR SICUT DOLOR MEUS.

Mulier, cum parit, tristiciam habet, unde apostolus: Filiioli mei, quos iterum parturio.
Ecclesia enim, que parit et generat, nutrit et lactat, pro omnibus contristatur, unde:
Quis infirmatur, et ego non infirmor? Quis scandalizatur, et ego non uror? Sic ecclesia teneros
lactat, aversos revocat, pigros expectat, precipites, ut prevideant, castigat, ne quaemlibet hostis extra castra inveniat, dum ipsa ordinato agmine ad patriam
festinat. Unde: Que est ista, que ascendit per desertum sicut aurora consurgens &c.
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chandeliers is extinguished, the books are burned, the priests and Levites are captured, the virgins and wives are defiled by hostile lust, all things holy are contaminated. For these things and things of this kind the remnant that have been saved lament not without cause when they see their people lose earthly goods no less than heavenly. So has the Lord indeed MADE A VINTAGE of her according to his just judgement, just as he has spoken in the law and the prophets.

Allegorical interpretation

O ALL YE &c: our Zion, whose conversation is in heaven, sees from heaven her limbs placed on earth, and beholds from the highest what they undergo every day, whence she, worthy of pity, cries out: O ALL YE THAT PASS BY THE WAY, the saints, to wit, of whom David says: Going they went and wept &c. They walk on THE WAY, that is Christ, following his steps, neither declining to the right nor to the left, for, summoned to the Paschal feast and celebrating the Paschal offerings, they consume the Lamb according to the law in baste. The Church looks at them, walking on the king's highway that leads to the fatherland, she mourns, impeded by the many troubles of her children, and exclaims: O ALL YE THAT PASS BY THE WAY, not to withdraw them from the way, but to incite them to pity: ATTEND with the mind, SEE with the intuition of charity, IF THERE BE ANY SORROW LIKE TO MY SORROW. A woman, when she is in labour, has sorrow, whence the apostle: My little children, of whom I am in labour again. Indeed, the Church, who labours and begets, nourishes and gives suck, is sorrowful for everyone, whence: Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is scandalised, and I am not on fire? So the Church gives suck to the tender, recalls the alienated, awaits the lazy, chastises the inconsiderate, for them to discern beforehand that the enemy will not find anyone outside the camp, when she, with her army well ordered, hurries to the heavenly fatherland. Hence: Who is she that goeth up by the desert as the morning rising &c.

43 quemlibet| quem Ψ Rusch | hostis post castra H1a | agmine| animo V  44 consurgens &c om. K Ψ Rusch
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

Ad ascendentes ergo vel transeuntes ab excelsioribus membris dicitur: ‘O VOS OMNES &c. Quia alia sunt, que pro his doleo, alia, que ab his, qui intus vel foris sunt, tolero. A patria differor, in exilio moror. ATTENDITE ergo, quamvis ad bravium vos indefessa rapiat devotio. VIDETE dolorem meum. Filios educare volui et educere de miseria exilii et perducere ad gaudia celi, sed multi aberrant, multi exasperant, multi languent, pauci sunt, qui venire curent. Omnibus omnia sum, ut omnes lucrifaciam. Pro omnibus lugeo, pro omnibus uror. VIDETE dolorem meum. Filios educare volui et educere de miseria exilii et perdu cere ad gaudia celi, sed multi aberrant, multi exasperant, multi languent, pauci sunt, qui venire curent.

Omnibus omnia sum, ut omnes lucrifaciam. Pro omnibus lugeo, pro omnibus uror. VIDETE dolorem meum. Filios educare volui et educere de miseria exilii et perdu cere ad gaudia celi, sed multi aberrant, multi exasperant, multi languent, pauci sunt, qui venire curent.

Moraliter

O VOS OMNES &c: Anima vitiis pregravata, non tamen omnino cecata, videt alios cum desiderio ad patriam festinantes et per viam virtutum gradientes. Cum ingenti merore exclamat: O VOS OMNES &c. Quasi: ‘VIDETE, quibus sauciata vitiis, quibus sollicita periculis, quibus afflicta tribulationibus, quibus subiaceam passionibus, QUONIAM VINDEMIavit ME DOMINUS. Bona, scilicet, virtutum iusticii iudicii diem alicuique secundum opera sua.’

O VOS OMNES &c: Anima vitiis pregravata, non tamen omnino cecata, videt alios cum desiderio ad patriam festinantes et per viam virtutum gradientes. Cum ingenti merore exclamat: O VOS OMNES &c. Quasi: ‘VIDETE, quibus sauciata vitiis, quibus sollicita periculis, quibus afflicta tribulationibus, quibus subiaceam passionibus, QUONIAM VINDEMIavit ME DOMINUS. Bona, scilicet, virtutum iusticii iudicii diem alicuique secundum opera sua.’

236
Therefore, to the ones advancing or passing by, by the more noble limbs it is said: 'O ALL YE THAT PASS BY. Because there are different things, that I grieve for on their account. Different still, that I tolerate from those, that are without or within. I am forced abroad; in exile I linger. ATTEND, therefore, although unwearied devotion carries you to the prize. SEE my affliction. I wanted to rear children and bring them out of the misery of the exile and lead them to the joys of heaven, but many wander astray, many are obdurate, many are weary, there are few who care to come. I became all things to all men, so that I may gain every one. For every one I lament, for every one I am on fire. SEE, therefore, IF THERE BE ANY SORROW LIKE TO MY SORROW. Pitch your mind's eye to the time of the final judgement and see, FOR the Lord HAS MADE A VINTAGE, that is he will make a vintage, OF ME IN THE DAY OF HIS FIERCE ANGER, of which it is said: O Lord, rebuke me not in thy indignation &c, as he SPOKE, for he will render to every man according to his works.'

Moral interpretation

O ALL YE &c: the soul, burdened by vices, yet not fully blinded, sees others with desire hurrying to the heavenly fatherland and pacing the way of virtue, and with tremendous sorrow she cries out: O ALL YE THAT PASS BY THE WAY. As if: ‘see, with which vices I am wounded, with which dangers I am alarmed, with which tribulations I am dejected to which passions I am subject, FOR the Lord HAS MADE A VINTAGE OF ME. That is to say, he has, by his just judgement, taken away the goods of virtue, with which he adorned me like a bride, IN THE DAY OF HIS ANGER, provoked by my evils. YE, therefore, THAT PASS BY THE WAY, you, that is, who disdain the present life, aiming towards the true way, that is Christ, SEE IF THERE BE ANY SORROW LIKE TO MY SORROW. I have lost the heavens, I have gathered up wrath for myself on Judgement Day and, burdened by my evils, I cannot hurry together with you to the joys of heaven.'

Liber I – Cap. 12. Lamech
13. MEN

DE EXCELSO MisIT IGNeM IN OSSIBUS MEIS ET ERUDIVIT ME
EXPANDIT RETE PEDIBUS MEIS CONVErTIT ME RETRORSUM
POSUIT ME DESOLATAM TOTA DIE MERORE CONFECTAM

5 'ex ipsis', donis, scilicet, Spiritus sancti, eruditur; Incendium templi et regalium
domorum et totius civitatis fugientumque oppressionem et desolationem significat
alto consilio Spiritus; Apparuerunt illis dispersi lingue tamquam ignis &c
d fortioribus sic doctrine & voluntatibus de vitis ad virtutes, de infidelitate ad fidem; ut audirem vocem post tergum monentis terreno solatio
10 tempore presentis vite dolore et desiderio future; Fuerunt michi lacrime mee panes
die ac nocte.

DE EXCELSO: Quintus questionis locus.

Paschasius historice

DE EXCELSO MISIT IGNEM, supernam vindictam, de quo in Iob dicitur: Ignis Dei
descendit de celo; IGNEM, aerias, scilicet, potestates, quibus cruciandi Iudeos
usque hodie potestas est. IN OSSIBUS MEIS, ut fortia, scilicet, interius exteriusque
affigant et sic erudiant, qui Deum blandientem audire noluerant, unde addit:

ET ERUDIVIT ME.

EXPANDIT RETE PEDIBUS MEIS, ne post voluptates et desideria vana usque ad
finem vite iarent. CONVERTIT ME RETRORSUM per angustias et tribulationes.

POSUIT ME DESOLATAM: Desolati sunt Iudei usque in finem seculi et MERORE
confecti.

possessa, flagellis erudirentur. Qui pia Dei monita prius noluerant audire …'
13. **Men**

*From above*[^a] he has sent *fire*[^c] into *my bones*[^d] and chastised[^e] me.  
He has spread a *net*[^f] for *my feet*[^h] he has turned me back[^h]  
He has made me desolate[^i] wasted with sorrow[^k]  
^j*All the day long*[^j]  

[^a]: *‘from them’, by the gifts of the Holy Ghost, namely, she is chastised; it signifies the burning of the temple and the royal houses and the seizure and desolation of the whole city and of the fleeing by supreme judgement the Spirit; And there appeared to them parted tongues, as it were of fire the stronger thus of doctrine into my pleasures b–b from vices to virtues, from infidelity to faith; that I may hear the word of one admonishing behind the back (deprived) of earthly comfort all the time sorrow for the present life and longing for the future, whence: My tears have been my bread day and night &c.

From above: the fifth topic of complaint.

**Historical interpretation**

From above he has sent fire, of heavenly revenge, of which it is said in the Book of Job: *The fire of God fell from heaven* &c. Fire, namely the aerial powers, who until this day have the power of tormenting the Jews. INTO MY BONES, so that the forces, namely, afflict and chastise them within and without, who would not hear God soothing, whence he adds: AND HE HAS CHASTISED ME.

He has spread a net for my feet, so that they should not go after pleasures and vain desires all the way to the end. He has turned me back through anguish and tribulations. HE HAS MADE ME DESOLATE: the Jews are desolate until the end of the world, and wasted with sorrow.
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

25

**De excelsō misit ignem &c:** Qui de Iudeis crediderunt vel de gentibus et una ecclesia facti sunt, merito dicit: De excelsō misit ignem, id est de celo Spiritum sanctum, quo corroborantur queque fortia virtuum, et eruditur divinitus ecclesia, ne ultra idolis serviat vel mundi delicias querat, quod significat men littera, que interpretatur 'ex ipsis', donis, scilicet, Spiritus sancti. Quibus gratulabunda se eruditam dicit ecclesia, ut caste amat, caste timeat, et ex ipsis erubescit vitiis, quibus deservierat: 'Expandit rete, predicationis scilicet, ne eam post vanitates errorum et concupiscientias. Convertit me retrorsum, ut post ipsum irem, non preirem.' Hoc rete apostolis commissum est, ut de mari huius mundi pisces extrahant. Pedibus meis, unde: Ab omni via mala prohibui pedes meos. Posuit me desolatam presentibus bonis, que michi prius solatio fuerant. Tota die merore confectam: Dolore, scilicet, presentium tribulationum et amore futurorum bonorum.

30

**Moraliter**

De excelsō misit ignem &c: Dum anima pro peccatis a Domino corripitur, ad se rediens salubriter compungitur et in ossibus suis, id est cogitationum medullis, a Domino venisse ignem testatur. Unde divinitus castigatur et eruditur et, quia sentit doctrine Dei retia coram pedibus suis expansa, convertitur retrorsum. Abstinet ab illicitis, luxum voluptatis et concupiscientiam in lacrimas convertit et tanto fortius merore confecta plangit et presentis vitae consolationem non recipit, quanto verius per varia desideria se considerat aberrasse.
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Allegorical interpretation

From above he has sent fire &c: those of the Jews, or of the gentiles, who believed and became one Church, rightly say: From above he has sent fire, that is the Holy Ghost from heaven, through whom every force of virtue is invigorated, and the Church is chastised from above, for it not any more to serve idols and look for the pleasures of the world, which the letter MEN signifies, that is interpreted ‘from them’, namely the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Congratulating herself for which the Church calls herself chastised, to love chastely and to fear chastely, and she feels ashamed on account of those vices, to which she had zealously been devoted: ‘He has spread a net, of preaching, that is, so that I should not go after errors of vanity and pleasures. He has turned me back, for me to go after him, and not before.’ This net is entrusted to the apostles, for them to draw out fishes from the sea of this world. ‘For my feet, whence: I have restrained my feet from every evil way. He has made me desolate of present goods, that previously were of comfort to me. Wasted with sorrow all the day long: of pain, namely, for present tribulations and of love for the goods to come.’

Moral interpretation

From above he has sent fire &c: while the soul is blamed by God for her sins, but coming to herself she is salubriously goaded by the stings of conscience and testifies that fire has come from the Lord into her bones, that is into the marrow of her thoughts. Hence she is corrected from above and chastised and, as she senses the nets of God’s doctrines spread before her feet, she is turned back. She abstains from things unlawful, she turns concupiscence and debauchery of pleasure into tears and, wasted with sorrow, the stronger she laments and receives no comfort from the present life, the more earnestly she considers herself to have erred through various desires.
14. Nun\(^a\)

**Vigilavit\(^b\) Iugum\(^d\) Iniquitatum mearum\(^d\) in manu eius\(^c\)**

\(^a\) *‘sempiternum’; concessio*

\(^b\) *Quasi: Vindicata punit, que dormire videbatur; me dormiente; provocans Dominum ad vindictam*

\(^c\) *superponendum michi*

\(^d\) *que ex me e-\(\text{-}\) insolubili vinculo f tamquam suffocature g sicut laqueus lude h-h ut non possim resistere i-i justo iudicio j Caldei vel potius Romani hostis vel diaboli*

\(^e\) *DE qua non potero surgere*

\(^f\) *unde: Non adiet, ut resurgat virgo filia Israel.***

INFIRMATA EST &c: Sextus locus questioni s, quia, cum a Domino bonum exspectaret, in summas decidit miseras.

Paschasius historice

**Vigilavit Iugum &c:** Iugum iniquitatis dormire est, in torpore nequitie secure et inpune quiescere, sed vigilat in manu Domini, unde Ieremias: *Virgam vigilantem ego video*, cui Dominus: *Vigilabo ego super verbum meum, ut faciam illum.* Nobis enim torpentibus peccata latent sed IN MANU Domini vigilant, dum nos ad vindictam iuste retributionis accusant, unde: *Vox sanguinis fratrii tui clamat ad me de terra.* CONVOLUTE SUNT quasi pondus ad premendum ET IMPOSITE COLLO MEO. Pro torque aurea funiculo iniquitatis circumdatur, unde: *Funibus pecatorum suorum quisque constringitur.* Data est ergo in manus peccatorum nec poterit surgere, *donec intret plenitudem gentium, quod significat Nun,* quod

---

14, 6 sempiternum\[^{cfr}\] Hier., epist. 30, 5. 10 Non ... Israel\[^{cfr}\] Am 5:1–2; cfr PsG 40:9; Is 24:20. 12 Sextus ... 13 miserias\[^{cfr}\] Cic., inv. 1, 108. 16 dormire ... 17 quiescere\[^{cfr}\] Hrab., in Ier. 18 (1192b). 17 Virgam ... 18 illud\[^{cfr}\] Ier 1:11–12. 20 Vox ... 21 terra\[^{cfr}\] Gn 4:10. 22 Funibus ... 23 constringitur\[^{cfr}\] Prv 5:22. 24 donec ... gentium\[^{cfr}\] Rm 11:25. | Nun ... 25 sempiternum\[^{cfr}\] Hier., epist. 30, 5.

14, 5 potero\[^{cfr}\] possum M 6 sempiternum + subaudis: impiegat in interitum iusto Dei iudicio propter cor impenitens Pa | concessio om. Pa, confessio F \(\Psi\) | Quasi + dicat \(\delta\) | Quasi ... videbatur om. Bb | que] qui \(\Psi\) | me dormiente om. Bb \(\Psi\) 7 provocans ... vindictam om. BbPb | Dominum\[^{Deum FBa Rauch} \|^{cfr} vdindictam\[^{juditium Ha}] | superponendum\[^{subponendum Pa Rauch} | superponendum michi om. K 8 me + sunt \(\Psi\) Rauch | insolubili\[^{indissolubili Ha}] | insolubili vinculo + in retributione Domini \(\Psi\) Rauch, + iniquitates V
14. NUN

THE YOKE OF MY INIQUITIES HAS WATCHED IN HIS HAND. THEY ARE FOLDED TOGETHER AND PUT UPON MY NECK.

MY STRENGTH IS WEAKENED. THE LORD HAS DELIVERED ME INTO A HAND OUT OF WHICH I AM NOT ABLE TO RISE.

**Historical Interpretation**

THE YOKE HAS WATCHED: THE YOKE of iniquity is to sleep, to rest securely and unpunished in the numbness of negligence, but it watches in the HAND of the Lord, whence Jeremiah: *I see a rod watching*, to whom the Lord: *I will watch over my word to perform it*. Indeed, the sins are skulking for us being sluggish, but they watch in the HAND of the Lord, when they accuse us as revenge of just retribution. Hence: *The voice of thy brother's blood crieth to me from the earth*. THEY ARE FOLDED, just as a weight to press, AND PUT UPON MY NECK. Instead of a golden necklace she is encircled by a cord of iniquity, whence: *Everyone is fast bound with the ropes of his own sins*. Thus, she is given into the hands of the sinners, and she would not be able to rise, until the fullness of the gentiles enters, which

---

Glossa Ordinaria in Lamentationes

interpretatur 'sempiternum'. Sempiternum enim est iugum eius, et captivitas perpetua.

Allegorie

VIGILAVIT IUGUM &c: Dum ecclesia temptationibus quatitur, vigilat in MANU Domini IUGUM INIQUITATUM eius, et hostibus tam visibilius quam invisibilius subicitur amissis monilibus, que dedaret ei in ornamentum sponsus, unde ingemens ait: CONVOLUTE SUNT ET IMPOBSITE COLLO MEO. Unde Isaias ait, quia SION ambulaverunt extento collo, auferenda esse omnia ornamenta et inter cetera torque et monilia. Torques in pectus pendentes intelligiam mentis demonstrant. Monilia omnia ornamenta significant.

Quibus amissis viri ecclesiastici muliebris affectu ambulant extento collo et nutibus oculorum locuntur plaudentes manibus et pedibus, ut composito incedant gradu seculi gloriam sectantes. Iure ergo iugo INIQUITATUM premitur, que tantis virtutum ornamentis spoliatur, unde CONVOLUTE iniquitates funiculo insolubili planguntur et IMPOSITE COLLO eius, que quedam membra suffocantur, sicut Iudam se laqueo suspendisse legimus.

INFIRMATA EST VIRTUS MEA &c, quia in eternum tradentur impii in interitum, ubi vermis eorum non moritur, et ignis non extinguitur.


30 monilibus ... ornamentum] cfr Ez 7:20. 31 qui ... 33 monilia] cfr Is 3:16–19.

35 Quibus amissis viri ecclesiastici muliebris affectu ambulant extento collo et pedibus, ut composito incedant gradu seculi gloriam sectantes. Iure ergo iugo INIQUITATUM premitur, que tantis virtutum ornamentis spoliatur, unde CONVOLUTE iniquitates funiculo insolubili planguntur et IMPOSITE COLLO eius, quibus quedam membra suffocantur, sicut Iudam se laqueo suspendisse legimus.

40 Nun ... interpretatur] cfr Hier., epist. 30, 5.
42 Men ... 43 ipsis] cfr Hier., epist. 30, 5. 44 Nun ... interpretatur] cfr Hier., epist. 30, 5.
Nun signifies, that is interpreted ‘everlasting’. Indeed, her yoke is everlasting, and her captivity eternal.

Allegorical interpretation

The yoke has watched &c: when the Church is disturbed by temptations, the yoke of her iniquities watches in the hand of the Lord, and she is subjected to her enemies, invisible as well as visible, the collars being dismissed with, that the bridegroom had given her for decoration, whence she says sighing: They are folded together and put upon my neck. Hence Isaiah says: Because the daughters of Zion have walked with stretched out necks, one ought to strip her of all embellishment and among other things chains and necklaces. Chains hanging on the breast show the understanding of the mind. Necklaces signify every embellishment, which when disposed of, the men of the Church in an effeminate affection walk about with stretched out necks, they speak with winks of the eye, clapping their hands and feet, to step with ordered pace, pursuing wordly glory. She is therefore justly burdened by the yoke of her iniquities, who is deprived of such embellishments of virtue, whence her iniquities, folded with an indissoluble cord and put upon her neck, are lamented, with which some limbs are suffocated, as we read that Judas hanged himself with a halter. Hence is added: My strength is weakened &c, because the impious will be given to everlasting death, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not extinguished. For just as the sentence above, which is entitled Men, that is ‘from them’, which, namely, the Lord sends from heaven, turns her to penitence, so Nun, that is interpreted ‘everlasting’, drives her to destruction because of the yoke of her iniquities, so that, by the just judgement of God and according to her impenitent heart, she will fall into everlasting punishment. She charges herself and deplores, not that the Church, predestined to life, is given to these punishments, but that it happens to her own limbs.
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

Moraliter

VIGILAVIT IUGUM &c: Vigilat IUGUM anime IN MANU Domini, que se vitiiis et sceleribus subdidit, nisi cotidie penitendo ponat ea coram oculis suis, unde: Peccatum meum coram me est semper. Voluit enim David vigilare et peccata fletibus abluere, ne vigilaret iugum eorum in manibus Domini, unde: Averte faciem tuam a peccatis meis &c. Quasi: ‘Nolo in manu tua vigilent, sed ego contra peccata mea vigilem et fletibus purgem, ne convolutas iniquitates imponas collo meo nec des me IN MANU DE QUA NON POTERO SURGERE.’

51 Peccatum ... semper] cfr Ps 50:5. 52 Averte ... 53 meis] Ps 50:11.

49 Vigilat post animé Ψ Rusch | iugum vigilat v | et sceleribus| sceleribusque θ 50 sceleribus| secularibus F | subdidit| subdit λ Ψ Rusch | penitendo cotidie K | ea om. K, eam Rusch
51 Peccatum meum ex peccatorum meorum corr. R | me om. R | enim supra lin. T
56 potero] poterit Ψ
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Moral interpretation
THE YOKE HAS WATCHED &c: THE YOKE of the soul watches in THE HAND of the Lord, the soul, who has subjected herself to vices and evil deeds, unless she by making daily satisfaction puts them before her own eyes. Hence: My sin is always before me. For David wanted to watch and wash away his sins with tears, for their yoke not to stand watch in the hands of the Lord, whence: Turn away thy face from my sins &c. As if: ‘I wish not they would stand watch in your hand, but I watch against my sins and I atone for them with tears, for you not to put folded iniquities upon my neck, nor to deliver me ME INTO A HAND OUT OF WHICH I AM NOT ABLE TO RISE.’
15. Samech

Abstulit Omnem magnificos meos Dominus de medio mei
Vocavit adversum meum tempus ut conterat electos meos
Torcular calavit Dominus virgini filie Iuda

5 a 'adiutorium', Dei, scilicet, quod omnino ablatum est b irruentibus Romanis
c-reges, sacerdotes, prophetas vel ecclesie doctores vel sensus d qui diu distulerat;
iiustu iudicio e merementem f vindicte, que non fit a Deo, nisi in tempore. Non punit
ante peccatum, non coronat ante victoriam g principes vel qui videbantur
virtutibus eminentes vel conatus mentis excellentes h crucis, unde: Torcular calavit
solus &c i ii-sinagoge vel ecclesie, que est filia sinagoge, vel anime confidenti

Vocavit adversum me: Quartus locus questionis.

Paschasius historice

15 Abstulit omnem magnificos &c: Hec plenius in extrema captivitate
acciderunt, qua opprimente nec prophete nec sacerdotes remanserunt. In
captivitate enim Babilonica Danielem, Ezechiel et multos consolatores
habuerunt. In hac vero omnes magnifici ablati sunt, quod SAMECH significat,
que interpretatur 'adiutorium'. Unde Isaia: Auferam ab Ierusalem validum et
fortem, omne robur panis et omne robur aquae, principem et

12 Quartus . . . questionis] cfr Cic., inst. 1, 107. 16 In . . . habuerunt] cfr Dn 3; vide Lam
1:2 cum gl. interl. 18 Samech . . . adiutorium] Hier., epist. 30, 5. 19 Auferam . . . mistici
] cfr Hier., in Is. 2, 3, 4 (47).

15, 3 conterat contereret omnes L, contereret λ Rusch 4 Torcular . . . Iuda ad initium versus
Ain infra transp. Pa, et hic et ad initium versus Ain sc. glossa interlinear utroque loco addita Ph
calvavit + mihi Bb, + in me T | Iuda] Syon Ha 5 textum gl. interl. huius capituli (praeter gl.
Rusch | irruentibus Romanis om. Ha | Romanis] malis Ph 6 vel1 . . . doctores] doctores vel
ecclesie Ψ Rusch | sensus + spirituales Pa | qui . . . distulerat] quia distulit diu Ha, qui
distulerat T Rusch, silicet qui diu distulerat Pa 7 merementem om. Ψ | vindicte + subaudis Pa,
pream. id est tempore accepto affixit me Rusch | a Deo om. K | Non + enim Pa | punit +
Deus Pa 8 victoriam] iustitiarn Pa 9 eminentes] eminentiores Ψ Rusch | conatus] coronatus
R | excellentes] excellentis η | Torcular post solus Ψ 10 sinagoge1] hoc est pream. Pa | est
Pa | Vocavit . . questionis om. A 16 acciderunt] accidunt Ha | qua] que T
15. SAMECH

THE LORD HAS TAKEN AWAY ALL MY MIGHTY MEN OUT OF THE MIDST OF ME

HE HAS CALLED AGAINST ME THE TIME TO DESTROY MY CHOSEN MEN

THE LORD HAS TRODDEN THE WINEPRESS

FOR THE VIRGIN DAUGHTER OF JUDAH

a ‘aid’, namely God’s, which is utterly taken away b by the invading Romans
c–c kings, priests, prophets or doctors of the Church or senses d he who long had scattered; by his just judgement e mourning f of vengeance, which does not happen from God, if not in time. He does not punish before the sin, nor crowns before the victory g–g princes or those who are distinguished through their virtues, or the excellent strivings of the mind h of the cross, whence: I have trodden the winepress alone i–i the Synagogue or the Church, that is the daughter of the Synagogue, or a penitent soul

HE HAS CALLED AGAINST ME: the fourth topic of complaint.

Historical interpretation

THE LORD HAS TAKEN AWAY ALL MY MIGHTY MEN &c: these events took place during the last captivity, under which neither prophets nor priests were left. In fact, during the Babylonian captivity they had Daniel and Ezekiel and many other comforters, but in this all the MIGHTY MEN are taken away, which SAMECH signifies, that is interpreted ‘aid’. Hence Isaiah: I shall take away from Jerusalem the valiant and the strong, the whole strength of bread, and the whole strength of water. The captain over fifty, and the skillful in eloquent speech &c. Hence we read that
prudentem eloquii mystici. Hinc ipsos angelos in portis Ierusalem clamasse legimus: Transeamus ex his sedibus.

Allegorice

ABSTULIT OMNES MAGNIFICOS &c: Spiritus Ierusalem, quotiens tribulationibus premitur, quotiens persecutionibus agitat vel hereticorum hostibus impugnatur, merito plangit dicens: ABSTULIT DOMINUS DE MEDIO MEI OMNES MAGNIFICOS MEOS. Sepe enim in toto orbe pauci remansere magnifici, qui sana doctrina defenderent causam fidei.

VOCAVIT ADVERSUM ME TEMPSU: Peccatis exigitibus tempus vindicte adducit Dominus, UT CONTERAT ELECTOS eius, quia non est, qui defendat vel murum pro domo Israel opponat.

Moraliter

ABSTULIT OMNES MAGNIFICOS &c: Sensus, scilicet, virtutum, quos in se anima sensit captivos, unde Dominus contra eam tempus vindicte adducit, cum divinum adiutorium abducit. Quo ablato inimicus in confusionem erroris captivam ducit et, dum predicatorem doctrinam oblivisci facit, electos mentis conatus content, ut eam virtutibus spoliatam quasi in terra aliena possideat, ne per recordationem sani dogmatis et meliorationem vite ad pristinum statum redeat.

21 ipsos … 22 sedibus] cfr Ioseph., Bell., 5, 1, 1, 2; cfr Hier., in Matth. 4, 27, 51 (275); Heges. 5, 44, 1 (392–93); Hier., epist. 120, 8, 2–3 (489–90). 28 sana doctrina] cfr 2 Tim 4:3. 35 inimicus … 39 redeat] cfr Hrab., in Ier. 18 (1193B).

Liber I – Cap. 15. Samech

the angels themselves called in the gates of Jerusalem: Let us pass from these abodes.

Allegorical interpretation
He has taken away all my mighty men &c: spiritual Jerusalem, as often as she is burdened by tribulations, as often as she is battered by persecutions, or is assailed by hordes of heretics, by rights she cries saying: The Lord has taken away all my mighty men. Indeed, in the whole city often few mighty men remained, who would defend the cause of faith on the grounds of sound doctrine.

He has called against me the time: faults requiring, the Lord brings forth the time of vengeance, to destroy her chosen men, because there is none to defend nor to set a wall before the house of Israel.

Moral interpretation
The Lord has taken away all my mighty men &c: that is to say the senses of the virtues, which the soul discerns being held captive in herself, whence the Lord brings forth the time of vengeance against her, when he takes away his divine aid. When this has been removed, the enemy brings her as a captive into the confusion of error, and, while he makes her forget the preachers’ doctrine, he destroys the chosen efforts of the mind, so that he more easily may be master of her, deprived of virtues, as if in a foreign country, lest she would return through remembrance of sound dogma and an improvement of life to her original state.
16. AIN\textsuperscript{a}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item IDCIRCO EGO PLORANS\textsuperscript{b} ET \textsuperscript{c} OCULUS MEUS\textsuperscript{d} DEDUCENS AQUAM\textsuperscript{d}
\item QUA LONGE FACTUS EST A ME CONSOLATOR\textsuperscript{e}
\item CONVERTENS\textsuperscript{f} ANIMAM MEAM\textsuperscript{g}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item FACTI SUNT FILII MEI PERDITI\textsuperscript{b} QUONIAM INVALUIT INIMICUS\textsuperscript{1}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}

\begin{footnotesize}
\[a\] ‘fons’ vel ‘oculus’
\[b\]–\[b\] vox sinagoge vel prophete vel ecclesie vel anime
\[c\]–\[c\] alludit littere, que ‘oculus’ dicitur
\[d\] fontem lacrimarum
\[e\] paraclitus
\[f\] ad bonum
\[g\] vagantem et errantem
\[h\]–\[h\] ad litteram, vel opera vel quos ecclesia parit cotidie
\[i\] Caldeus vel Romanus vel diabolus
\end{footnotesize}

\textit{Paschasius historicus}

\begin{footnotesize}
\[10\]
IDCIRCO EGO PLORANS: Septimus indignationis locus; factum enim crudele et tirannicum et violentiam hostium ostendit.
\end{footnotesize}

\begin{footnotesize}
\[15\]
\end{footnotesize}

\textit{Paschasius historicus}

\begin{footnotesize}
\[16, 6\] fons … oculus\textsuperscript{[Hier., epist. 30, 5.]}\textsuperscript{11} Septimus … 12 ostendit\textsuperscript{cfr Cicer., inv. 1, 102.}
\[16\] Quare … 17 torculari\textsuperscript{[Is 63:2.]}\textsuperscript{17} Torcular … 18 solus\textsuperscript{[Is 63:3.]}\textsuperscript{18} quo … 21 contereret\textsuperscript{cfr Hier., in Is. 17, 63, 3–6 (723).}
\end{footnotesize}

\textit{Paschasius historicus}

\begin{footnotesize}
\[16, 1\] A\textsuperscript{11} + Torcular calcavit Dominus virgini\textsuperscript{[Pa]}\textsuperscript{3} filie Iuda\textsuperscript{Pa} consolator a me\textsuperscript{K} 5 invaluit + in me\textsuperscript{L} 6 textum gl. interl.\textsuperscript{Bb} huiss capitul\textsuperscript{om. Bb} fons … oculus\textsuperscript{om. Pb} oculus + vel oris\textsuperscript{Ls} + fons videlicet, qui de Christi latere profluxit, de quo lacrimis inebriatur oculus mentis\textsuperscript{Pa} vox … anime\textsuperscript{om. T} prophete … ecclesie\textsuperscript{[prophete \textit{Psi} Rusch]}\textsuperscript{7} oculus dicitur\textsuperscript{[est oculus \textit{y}]}\textsuperscript{[fontem + scilicet Pa]}\textsuperscript{[fontem lacrimarum om. \textit{y}, lacrimarum fontem K]}\textsuperscript{K} paraclitus\textsuperscript{[id est \textit{praeu. Pa}]}\textsuperscript{8} et om.\textsuperscript{y} \textsuperscript{[ad litteram + quidem ita ludeis contigit Pa]}\textsuperscript{8} ad cotidie\textsuperscript{om. Pb} vel\textsuperscript{1} + ad\textsuperscript{Rusch} parit ecclesia\textsuperscript{Rusch} cotidie parit\textsuperscript{\eta} 9 Caldeus … diabolus\textsuperscript{om. Pb} 11 IDCIRCO … 12 ostendit\textsuperscript{om. FHb} enim\textsuperscript{om. Ha} crudele\textsuperscript{H} incredule\textsuperscript{Ha}
\end{footnotesize}
16. Ain


Therefore do I weep and my eyes run down with water because the comforter is far from me converting my soul.

My children are desolate because the enemy has prevailed.

Therefore do I weep: the seventh topic of indignation; it displays a cruel and tyrannical deed and the violence of the enemies.

Historical interpretation

He has trodden the winepress &c: the winepress signifies vengeance and punishment for sin, whence Isaiah: Why then is thy apparel red and thy garments like theirs that tread in the winepress &c; he introduces the Lord having answered the enquiring angels: I have trodden the winepress alone &c, that, namely, with which punishments for the wicked and rewards for the just are trodden. This the Lord has trodden alone, as he had no helper, for neither angel nor archangel had assumed a human body, so that he, suffering for our sake, would crush and destroy the strength of our adversary. This winepress the Lord has trodden in his passion for the virgin daughter of Judah, that he would produce rewards for the believers and for the faithless and torturers punishments of perpetual captivity and everlasting damnation. The prophet, however, seeing the obduracy of the Jews, laments, because the Lord has trodden the winepress for the...
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

Quod enim Dominus patiebatur ad ipsius remedium, convertit sibi in tormentum extreme captivitatis et perpetue damnationis. Unde ipsius sinagoge plorantis inducit personam: IDICIRCQ EGO PLORANS &c. LONGE FACTUS EST CONSOLATOR &c: Hoc sepe probamus, si Iudaicam perfidiam et duriciam inspiciamus.

Metaphorice autem dicitur TORCULAR CALCavit DOMINUS &c: Metaphoricos vineam suam Dominus de Egypto eduxit et in terra promissionis plantavit, que diu sterilis et infructuosa permansit secundum illud: Expectavi, ut faceret uvas, et fecit labruscas. Ideo DOMINUS TORCULAR CALCavit, vinum sibi reservavit, acinar porcorum perpetua captivitate pressit.


DAUGHTER OF JUDAH. For that which the Lord suffers as her own remedy, she
turns for herself into the torment of final captivity and everlasting damnation.
Hence he introduces the person of the weeping Synagogue herself:
THEREFORE DO I WEEP &c. THE COMFORTER IS FAR FROM ME &c: This we
often demonstrate, if we consider the faithlessness and obduracy of the Jews.

Metaphorically, however, it is said THE LORD HAS TRODDEN THE WINEPRESS
&c: figuratively, the Lord brought his vine out of Egypt and planted it in the
land of promise, which for long remained barren and fruitless, according to
this: I looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it hath brought forth wild grapes.
Therefore THE LORD HAS TRODDEN THE WINEPRESS, he has reserved wine for
himself, he pressed the grape of swine through eternal captivity.

Allegorical interpretation

THE LORD HAS TRODDEN THE WINEPRESS &c: when, namely, through his
passion he brings the aerial powers under his Church. But she is really the
virgin daughter of Judah, for the law hath come forth from Zion, and the word of the
Lord from Jerusalem. For her THE LORD HAS TRODDEN THE WINEPRESS, that is
the yoke of oppression, that she might be free. But since the Lord is treading,
many become the dregs of oil, therefore the prophet says weeping: MY EYES
RUN DOWN WITH WATER, and thus AIN is put in between, that is interpreted
‘fountain-head’ or ‘eye’. For when he pressed the winepress of the cross, a
spring flowed out from his side, whence: and immediately there came out blood and
water. In this spring the bride is gained and cleansed to be united to the
embraces of her spouse, and with this she is endowed, that she might rejoice,
that she might adhere to the spouse only, love him only, who has loved her so
much. And, since AIN also is interpreted ‘eye’, the eye, inebriated from this
spring, has not without cause run down with the water of tears, whence: My eyes
have sent forth springs of water &c.
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

LONGE FACTUS EST CONSOLATOR &c: Quotiens ecclesia tribulationibus afficitur, quotiens auxilio Dei desolatur, ad lacrimas quasi ad consueta arma recurrat. Dum autem doctore exterus monente non adest Paraclitus, qui eam instruat et erudiat interius, propterea fiunt FILII eis PERDITI, et INVALECIT INIMICUS. Quisquis ergo doctorum ecclesiam sibi comissam minus converti viderit, de fonte amoris hauriat, unde lacrimas producat, donec consolantem et convertentem Paraclitum reducat. Alioquin invalescecente inimico fiunt FILII eis PERDITI, qui, scilicet, nondum ablacati, nondum in virum perfectum perducti.

Moraliter
TORCULAR CALCavit &c: Sterili anime virtutibus et operibus vacue DOMINUS TORCULAR calcat, quando eam quasi sterilem et ociosam affigit pena condigna. Unde ait: IDCIRCO PLORANS &c, quia sentit se amisisse consolatorem et impenitentem ruere, ubi erit flatus et stridor dentium, unde ingens anime descriptur, ut sciat sibi post huius mundi vanam leticiam omnem defuturam. Ibi filii perduntur, quia fructus malorum operum dissipabitur, et solus invalescet INIMICUS.


63 et om. Rusc | solus + cum suis satellitibus λ | invalescit HbZ Ψ

256
THE COMFORTER IS FAR &c: as often as the Church is inflicted with tribulations, as often as she is forsaken by the help of God, she ought to revert to tears, as if to accustomed defences. When, however, a teacher giving instruction without and the helper is not present, who would furnish and educate her within, therefore ARE her CHILDREN DESOLATE and THE ENEMY HAS PREVAILED. Accordingly, any of the teachers who would have seen that the Church, entrusted to him, convert herself less, would drink from the spring of charity, whence he would produce tears, until he would have brought back the comforting and converting Paraclete. Otherwise, with the enemy prevailing, her CHILDREN shall become DESOLATE, who namely, not yet weaned, have not yet been brought to the perfect man.

Moral interpretation
He HAS TRODDEN THE WINEPRESS &c: THE LORD treads THE WINEPRESS for the unfruitful soul, empty of virtues and works, when he strikes her, as if sterile and idle, with a wholly desirable expiation. Hence she says: THEREFORE DO I WEEP &c, because she sees that she has lost the comforter and that she falls impenitent, where there will be wailing and rattling of teeth. From which a great lamenting of the soul is described, that she might know that after the vain delight of this world all consolation will be wanting. There the children will be desolate, as the fruit of their evil deeds will be dispersed, and the enemy alone shall prevail.
17. PHE

**EXPANDIT SYON** MANUS SUAS NON EST QUI CONSOLETUR EAM

**MANDAVIT DOMINUS ADVERSUM IACOB IN CIRCUITU EIUS HOSTES EIUS**

**FACTA EST IERUSALEM QUASI POLLUTA MENSTRUIS INTER EOS**

5 a ‘oris’ terrena vel ecclesia vel anima quasi parturiens, ut, quod non valet ore, significet manuum expansione amisso vero consolatore iuste dispensando solo nomine gloriantem Caldeos vel Romanos vana gloria; Dum nobis bona tribuimus, ipsa vanitate sicut menstruus quicquid tangimus, polluimus

10 **EXPANDIT SYON MANUS SUAS:** Quartus conquestionis locus.

**Paschasius historice**

**EXPANDIT SYON MANUS &c:** Dolorem signifcat quasi parturientis, unde alibi: Sicut expandit natans ad natandum manus suas, sic et Syon inter angustias, et Isaias angustia, inquit, possidebit me, sicut angustia parturientis. Angustia quidem est cordis, que in expansione manuum exprimitur plus quam exclamacione oris, unde FE prescribitur, que ‘oris’ interpretatur, quia, dum ‘SYON EXPANDIT MANUS SUAS inter angustias’, signifcat, quod ore non valet exprimere, quod patitur in corde, cum sit sine consolatore, unde: Recedite a me, amare flebo, nolite incumbere, ut consolemini me &c.

**MANDAVIT DOMINUS ADVERSUM IACOB:** Iusto Dei iudicio et Caldei et Romani adducti sunt. Non enim consurget gens adversus gentem nisi precipiente Deo.
17. PHE

**ZION** has spread forth *her hands*<sup>c</sup> there is none to comfort her<sup>d</sup> the earthy or the Church or the soul<sup>c</sup> as if giving birth, so that what she is not able to do with her mouth, she signifies with the extension of her hands<sup>d</sup> when the true comforter has been dispelled<sup>e</sup> justly disposing<sup>f</sup> Chaldeans or Romans<sup>b</sup> with vain glory; allotting good things to ourselves, through vanity itself we pollute whatever we touch, like menstruous women

---

**Jerusalem is polluted**<sup>b</sup> as a MENSTRous woman AMONG them

---

*ZION has spread forth her hands* the fourth topic of complaint.

---

**Historical interpretation**

*ZION has spread forth her hands* &c: this signifies pain as that of a woman in labour, whence it is said elsewhere: *As he that swimmeth stretcheth forth his hands to swim*, likewise also *Zion in the midst of straits*, and Isaiah says: *Anguish hath taken hold of me as the anguish of a woman in labour*. Indeed, it is the straitness of the heart that is expressed in the extension of the hands, more than with a cry from the mouth. Hence PHE is written before, that is interpreted ‘of the mouth’. Because, when ‘ZION has spread forth her hands in the midst of straits’, she shows that which she cannot express with her mouth, namely that she suffers in her heart, when she is without a comforter, whence: *Depart from me, I will weep bitterly: labour not to comfort me* &c.

**The Lord has commanded against Jacob** &c: with the just judgement of God, both the Chaldeans and the Romans have been brought in, for a people shall not arise against another unless God has previously given order.
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

QUASI POLLUTA MENSTRUIS: Sicut abominabilis est mulier, dum menstrua patitur, sic Iudei ubique terrarum habentur.

25 Allegorice

EXPANDIT SYON MANUS SUAS &c: Quo[tiens ecclesia hereticorum vallatur exercitu, DOMINUS ADVERSUM Iacob, scilicet ecclesiam, que debet vitia supplantare, mandat contra eam inimicorum exercitus, quia Spiritum sanctum consolatorem et doctorem amisit, sine quo nullus ad fidem eruditur, nullus a vitiis relevat. Ideo EXPANDIT MANUS SUAS inter dolores et pressuras, nec est ei ulla vox oris digna, qua possit hostium dogmata vincere et sua defendere. Unde sepe fit POLLUTA feditate carnalium operum et sanguine carnalium desideriorum inter hostes, quibus intus exteriusque impugnatur. Unde: \(Ve\) pregnantibus et nutrientibus in illa die.

30 Moraliter

EXPANDIT SYON MANUS SUAS &c: Anima, que fuerat speculum Dei et vitiorum supplantatrix, cum pro iniquitate traditur spiritualibus nequitiis, frustra querit consolatorem extrinsecus, que spiritualem perdidit intrinsecus. Merito ergo MANDAVIT DOMINUS ADVERSUM Iacob &c, id est contra animam quondam vitia supplantantem, nunc solo nomine gloriantem, unde IN CIRCUITU HOSTES spiritualus eam obsident, ne possit effugere. Que sepe videns se vallatam EXPANDIT MANUS SUAS inter cogitationum angustias, nec est ei vox oris nec ullo excusatio sermonis, quia MENSTRUIS POLLUTA, id est cruentis operibus maculata, a quibus sine consolatore numquam liberatur, cum etiam propheta testetur, quod omnes iusticie nostre si sunt coram eo, quasi pannis menstruae.
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AS A MENSTROUS WOMAN: just as a woman is abominable, when she undergoes menstruation, likewise the Jews are looked upon over the whole world.

Allegorical interpretation

ZION HAS SPREAD FORTH HER HANDS &c: as often as the Church is surrounded by the army of heretics, THE LORD commands AGAINST JACOB, that is to say, the Church, who ought to overthrow her vices, the enemies' armies against her, because she has dismissed the Holy Ghost, her teacher and comforter, without whom no one is educated to the faith, no one is freed from vices. Therefore HAS she SPREAD FORTH HER HANDS, in the midst of pressures and pains, and there is no worthy voice of the mouth for her, with which she would be able to overcome the dogmas of the enemies and defend her own, whence she is often polluted with the foulness of her carnal works and with the blood of her fleshly desires among the enemies, by whom she is afflicted within and without. Hence: Woe to them that are with child, and that give suck in those days.

Moral interpretation

ZION HAS SPREAD FORTH HER HANDS &c: when the soul, who used to be a mirror of God and an overthrower of vices, because of her iniquity is delivered to spiritual wickedness, she looks in vain for a Comforter without, who has lost the spirit within. Justly therefore, THE LORD HAS COMMANDED AGAINST JACOB &c, that is against the soul, once overthrowing her vices, now bragging of the name only, whence her spiritual ENEMIES besiege her AROUND, that she cannot escape. She who often sees her surrounded, spreads FORTH HER HANDS in the midst of straits of thoughts, and there is no voice of the mouth for her, nor any excuse for speaking, because she is A MENSTROUS WOMAN, that is, stained with bloody deeds, from which she is never freed without the Comforter, when also the prophet testifies to that all our justices are before him as the rag of a menstruous woman.
18. SADE

b) IUSTUS EST DOMINUS b) QUA IUSTUS AD IRACUNDIAM PROVOCAVI
d) AUDITE OBSECRU UNIVERSI POPULI ET VIDETE DOLOR EM MEUM
b) VIRGINES MEE ET IUVENES MEI ABIERUNT IN CAPTIVITATEM

5 a) ‘iusticie’; deprecatio b) in omnibus viis suis c)–c verbum Patris vel prophetas vel
predicatores vel presentiam d) peccando e) aure cordis f)–f non transeuntes viam ut
supra g) diligentem h)–h caste intentiones i) Babilonis

VIRGINES MEE: Octavus indignationis locus; virgines enim nec se possunt
defendere nec alium ledere.

Paschais historice

IUSTUS EST DOMINUS &c: SADE, que preponitur et ‘iusticie’ interpretatur,
significat, quia iusticie Domini recte, quod bene his verbis ostenditur: IUSTUS EST
DOMINUS, QUA OS EIUS AD IRACUNDIAM PROVOCAVI. Quasi: ‘Oris iudicium
iuste pertuli, unde conteri, quia IUSTUS EST DOMINUS, non distuli.’ Et
notandum, quia supra transeuntes per viam quasi pauciores nunc Ierusalem vel
propheta ad considerandum dolorem suum omnes invitat communiter, ut
eorum sit una passio, quorum una nature conditio. Superius enim virgines
squalidas et parvulos luget captivos, nunc etiam robustiores IUVENES et captivatas
VIRGINES, et quanto malum cumulatur, tanto luctus multiplicatur.
18. Sade

**The Lord is just**

**For I have provoked His mouth to wrath**

**Hear**

**I pray you all ye people**

**And see my sorrow**

**My virgins and my young have gone into captivity**

- a 'of justice'; a deprecation
- b-h in all his ways
- c-e the word of the Father or the prophets or preachers or the present
- d by sinning
- e the ear of the heart
- f-g not passing by the way as above
- g diligently
- h-i chaste intentions
- i the Babylonian

My virgins: the eighth topic of indignation; for virgins cannot defend themselves nor hurt another.

**Historical interpretation**

The Lord is just &c: Sade, which is put before, and is interpreted 'of justice', means that the justices of the Lord are right, which is well portrayed in these words: The Lord is just, for I have provoked His mouth to wrath, as if she would say: 'I have duly submitted to the judgement of his mouth. Hence I have not put off confessing that the Lord is just.' And note that above Jerusalem or the prophet invites them who passed by the way, as being rather few, to examine her pain, but now everyone is invited together, that theirs be one suffering, whose natural condition is one. Above he lamented the virgins in affliction and the children taken captives, but now also the stronger young men and the captured virgins, and the more evil is accumulated, the more sorrow is increased.
GLOSSA ORDINARIA IN LAMENTATIONES

AUDITE OBSECRO UNIVERSI POPULI ET VIDETE DOLOREM MEUM: Magno enim intuitu et acuta consideratione hæc discernuntur.

Allegorice

IUSTUS EST DOMINUS &c: Ecclesia, que superius oris iudicium pertulit, que OS Domini in scripturis sanctis AD IRACUNDIAM provocavit, didicit confestim: IUSTUS EST DOMINUS &c. Nichil enim sine causa fit super terram, et in magna re publica Dei nichil sine providentia fit.

QUIA OS EIUS &c: Non quod humana membra habeat Deus, sed sicut tropice ascribuntur ei humani affectus, ita et membra. Per OS verbum de ore patris progenitum signatur, ac si dicat: ‘Flagiciis meis iustum iudicem provocavi et natura clementem compuli contra me duram ferre sententiam.’

AUDITE ergo UNIVERSI POPULI &c: Calamitatem suam multiplicem et inestimabilem pensat, unde omnes ad condolendum invitat, ut multorum compassione anxietas levior sit. VIRGINES, de quibus dicitur: Despondi enim vos uni viro virginem castam exhibere Christo, IUVENES, quos in fonte baptismi genuit mater ecclesia: hi, cum aut heretica pravitate corrumpuntur aut vitiis constuprantur, non loco sed mente in Babilonem, id est confusionem, captivantur.

Qui enim adharet meretrici, unum corpus eficitur. Inde tantus luctus tantusque dolor cumulatur, ut vix ab universis videri vel intelligi credatur.

Moraliter

IUSTUS EST DOMINUS &c: Anima, que ex oris iudicio castigatur, merito conflatetur, quia IUSTUS EST DOMINUS, quia pravis desideriis OS Domini provocavit AD IRACUNDIAM, ut duram contra se proferat sententiam, qui iustus

---

25 superius ... pertulit| supra vide lin. 15–16. 27 sine ... terram| cfr Iob 5:6. 28 re ... Dei| cfr Aug., in psalm. 103, 1, 15 (1488). 29 humana ... 30 membra| cfr Hrab., in Ier. 18 (1195A). 31 Flagiciis ... 32 sententiam| cfr Hrab., in Ier. 18 (1195A). 33 Calamitatem ... 35 fiat| cfr Hrab., in Ier. 18 (1195B). 35 Despondi ... 36 Christo| 2 Cor 11:2. 38 Babilonem ... confusionem| Aug., in psalm. 64, 2, 2 (823); Ps. Hier., in Lam. 1, 10 (790D); cfr Hier., nom. hebr. 819–20. 39 Qui ... efficit] 1 Cor 6:16. 44 iustus ... 45 suis| cfr Ps 144:17.
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HEAR I PRAY YOU ALL YE PEOPLE AND SEE MY SORROW: with great respect and acute consideration, these things are separated.

Allegorical interpretation

THE LORD IS JUST &c: the Church, which above submitted to the judgement of his mouth and which in the divine Scriptures provoked the mouth of the Lord to wrath, is taught to confess: THE LORD IS JUST &c. Indeed, nothing upon earth is done without a cause, and nothing in God's great commonwealth takes place without providence.

FOR I HAVE PROVOKED HIS MOUTH &c: not that God should have human limbs, but just as human passions are metaphorically ascribed to him, so are also limbs. With MOUTH is signified the Word, brought forth from the Father's mouth, as if he would say: 'with my importunity I have provoked the just judge, and I have forced one of gentle nature to pass a grave sentence against me.'

HEAR, therefore, ALL YE PEOPLE &c: she rates her harm manifold and inestimable, whence she invites everyone to suffer together, so that with the compassion of the many, her anguish may be the lighter to bear. Her VIRGINS, of whom it is said: For I have espoused you to one husband that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ &c; her young men, whom Mother Church has begotten in the water of baptism, who when being corrupted by heretical crookedness, or defiled by vices, are captured, not in the place but in the mind, and taken to Babylon, that is to confusion. For he who is joined to a harlot, is made one body, then so much grief and so much affliction is accumulated, that he hardly is believed seen, or understood, by all.

Moral interpretation

THE LORD IS JUST &c: the soul, who is chastised by the judgement of his mouth, rightly confesses that THE LORD IS JUST, because with her shameful desires, she has provoked the mouth of the Lord to wrath, that he would put forth a grave sentence against her, he who is just in all his undertakings. Hence,
est in omnibus operibus suis. Unde confusione sua perfusa non audet oculos ad iratum iudicem levare sed universos invitat, ut audiant et videant dolorem suum. Talis est quippe humane nature affectus, ut doloris nostri vel gaudii consortes queramus, quorum participatione facilius feramus, unde: Congratulamini mi chi, quia inveni omen, quae perierat. Querit ergo anima multiplices intercessores, quia ad iudicem, quem offendit, etiam oculos levare metuit.

VIRGINES MEE ET IUVENES MEI &c: Mundas, scilicet, cogitationes et affectus robustiores quasi sobolem et sper uteri sui hoste vastante deperire cernit et sper future generationis amittit.


imbued with her confusion, she dares not raise her eyes towards the angry judge, but invites every one to hear and see her affliction. Indeed, such is the passion of human nature that we seek partners in our pain or happiness, with whose partaking we endure more easily, whence: Rejoice with me, because I have found my sheep that was lost. The soul, therefore, is seeking several mediators, because she dares not even raise her eyes towards the judge, whom she has displeased.

MY VIRGINS AND MY YOUNG MEN &c: she sees her clean thoughts and her firmer desires perish, as if with the enemy ravaging the progeny and hope of her womb, and she loses her hope of future generations.
19. COPHA

VOCAVI AMICOS MEOS &c: C OPH interpretatur 'vocatio', unde continuo subiunxit: VOCAVI AMICOS MEOS, Egiptios, quorum Iudei freti amicicia et auxilio, sed ipsi DECEPERUNT ME, quia in tempore prime vel ultime captivitatis nullum auxilium prebuerunt. Unde Isaias:

'Erit terra Iude Egipto in die vastitatis eorum in formidine &c. Iure autem decepti sunt, qui magis in Egiptiis quam in Deo speraverunt. S ACERDOTES MEI &c: Hec sub Romanis accidisse nulli dubium est.

5 a 'vocatio' b–b Egiptios vel hereticos vel affectus carnis c–c Egiptus vane auxiliatur d–d regale sacerdotium e–e maturitas consilii f Ierusalem vel ecclesia vel mente g lucra terrena vel vana desideria h–h animalitatem

VOCAVI AMICOS MEOS: Undecimus indignationis; ab his enim factum est, qui, si alius faceret, deberent prohibere.

ET IPSI DECEPERUNT ME: Quartus conquestionis.

Paschasia historice

VOCAVI AMICOS MEOS &c: C OPH interpretatur 'vocatio', unde continuo subiunxit: VOCAVI AMICOS MEOS, Egiptios, quorum Iudei freti amicicia et auxilio, sed ipsi DECEPERUNT ME, quia in tempore prime vel ultime captivitatis nullum auxilium prebuerunt. Unde Isaias:

'Erit terra Iude Egipto in die vastitatis eorum in formidine &c. Iure autem decepti sunt, qui magis in Egiptiis quam in Deo speraverunt. S ACERDOTES MEI &c: Hec sub Romanis accidisse nulli dubium est.


268
19. COpH

I CALLED FOR b MY FRIENDS b BUT c THEY DECEIVED ME e
d MY PRIESTS d AND e MY ANCIENTS e PINED AWAY IN THE CITY f
WHILE THEY SOUGHT THEIR FOOD g TO RELIEVE b THEIR SOULS b

\[ a \text{ ‘a calling’} \quad b - b \text{ Egyptians or heretics or desires of the flesh} \quad c - c \text{ The Egyptian helps in vain} \quad d - d \text{ a kingly priesthood} \quad e - e \text{ maturity of counsel} \quad f \text{ Jerusalem or the Church or the mind} \quad g \text{ earthly profit or vain desires} \quad b - h \text{ animality} \]

I CALLED FOR MY FRIENDS: the eleventh topic of indignation; the act is committed by them, namely, who had been expected to prevent it if done by another.

BUT THEY DECEIVED ME: the fourth topic of complaint.

Historical interpretation

I CALLED FOR MY FRIENDS &c: COpH is interpreted ‘a calling’, whence he immediately has added: I CALLED FOR MY FRIENDS, the Egyptians, on whose friendship and aid the Jews had been relying, but they DECEIVED ME, as they did not offer any help in the time of the first or the last captivity. Hence Isaiah: The land of Judah shall be a terror to Egypt in the day of their calamity &c. They were justly deceived, who trusted more in the Egyptians than in God. MY PRIESTS &c: there can be no doubt that this happened under the Romans.
Glossa ordinaria in Lamentationes

**Allegorise**

VOCAVI AMICOS MEOS &c: Ecclesia sepe amicos vocat, quos in fide socios putat, sed ipsi decipiunt, qui fidem corrupserunt aut intus latendo aut in apertam heresim prorumpendo. Mali quoque catholici in potestatibus constituti, in quibus sepe ecclesia confidit quasi amicis, sepe decipiunt eam. Quodque peius est: tunc crudelius seviunt, cum SACERDOTES et SENES fame verbi Dei CONSUMPTI SUNT. Qui sequentes lucra carnalis vite magis querunt cibum animalis vite quam celestem de Salomonis ferculo vel evangelico prandio vel sapientie convivio, ad quod omnium vocatio in COPH littera designatur.

**Moraliter**

VOCAVI AMICOS &c: Dulces carnis affectus; sed ipsi animam sibi intentam decipiunt, et, quia in ea regale perit sacerdotium et senile maturitatis consilium, vanis illecta desideriis laborat ad refocillandam concupiscientiam carnis. Egyptus vane auxiliatur, quia mundus transit et concupiscientia eius, qui est baculus barundimens super se innitenti perforans manus.
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Allegorical interpretation
I CALLED FOR MY FRIENDS &c: the Church often calls for her friends, whom she regards as fellows in faith, but they deceive, who have corrupted the faith, either by hiding it within, or by bursting forth into open heresy. Also bad Catholics with power and authority, in whom the Church trusts as friends, often deceive her, and what is worse, they then rage more cruelly, when HER PRIESTS AND ANCIENTS PINED AWAY out of hunger for the word of God. Those pursuing the profit of the life of the flesh seek more the food of animal life than the celestial food from Solomon’s dish or from the Gospel feast or from the banquet of wisdom, everyone’s calling to which is denoted in the letter COPH.

Moral interpretation
I CALLED &c: the sweet passions of the flesh, but they deceive the soul who is eager for them, and, since in her perishes the _kingly priesthood_ and the aged counsel of ripeness, she struggles, enticed by vain desires, to relieve the concupiscence of the flesh. _The Egyptian helps in vain_, because _the world passeth away and the concupiscence thereof_, that is _a staff of a reed_ piercing the hands of him who rests upon it.
20. RES

**VIDE DOMINE QUONIAM TRIBULOR CONTURBATUS EST**

**VENTER MEUS**

**SUBVERSUM EST COR MEUM IN MEMETIPSA**

**QUONIAM AMARITUDINE PLENA SUM**

**FORIS INTERFICIT GLADIUS ET DOMI MORS SIMILIS EST**

*a* ‘capitis’, id est mentis  
*b*–*b* mens  
*c* persecutorum  
*d* in mente  
*e* suggestionum

VIDE DOMINE: Quartus decimus conquestionis vel potius quintus, quia singula iudici exponit incommoda, ut, quasi res ipsas videat, non modo verba audiat, ad misericordiam descendat.

**Paschasius historice**

VIDE DOMINE &c: Aliquando Ierusalem pudore confunditur, aliquando de misericordia presumens sublevatur, unde ait: VIDE DOMINE QUONIAM TRIBULOR, ut pium iudicem cruciatu s flectat ad misericordiam, pudor ad veniam. VENTER MEUS CONTURBATUS EST quasi parturientis. PLENA SUM: Non ex parte se tactam sed AMARITUDINE doloris et meroris plenam se signifi cat.

SUBVERSUM EST COR MEUM pondere tribulationis; GLADIUS persecutoris, MORS SIMILIS pro amaritudine tribulationis.

**Allegorice**

VIDE DOMINE &c: RES ‘capitis’ interpretatur. Conturbatio enim ventris vel subversio cordis est gemitus mentis, que in capite designatur. Iure ergo conturbatio ‘capitis’ dicitur, dum ecclesia suorum casibus amaritudine repletur,
20. RES

BEHOLD O LORD FOR I AM IN DISTRESS; MY BOWELS ARE TROUBLED MY HEART IS TURNED WITHIN ME FOR I AM FULL OF BITTERNESS ABROAD THE SWORD DESTROYS AND AT HOME THERE IS DEATH ALIKE

a ‘of the head’, that is of the mind b-b the mind c of the persecutors d in the mind e of suggestions

BEHOLD, O LORD: the fourteenth or rather fifth topic of complaint, as all misfortunes are presented to the judge one by one, so that he, as if he saw the things themselves and not only heard the words, should be moved to pity.

Historical interpretation

BEHOLD, O LORD &c: sometimes Jerusalem is perplexed with shame; sometimes, trusting in compassion, she is raised up, whence she says: BEHOLD, O LORD &c, that her affliction may turn the pious judge to compassion, shame to mercy. MY BOWELS ARE TROUBLED, like a woman in labour. I AM FULL: she points out, not that she is entirely touched, but that she is full of the BITTERNESS of sorrow and pain. MY HEART IS TURNED WITHIN ME by the weight of tribulation; THE SWORD of the persecutor; DEATH ALIKE, for the bitterness of tribulation.

Allegorical interpretation

BEHOLD, O LORD &c: RES is interpreted ‘of the head’. For the disorder of the bowels or the destruction of the heart is a sighing of the mind that is denoted in the head. Therefore it is justly said confusion ‘of the head’, when the Church is
que dolorem et tribulationem suam cotidie elementissimo iudici exponit. Venter omnium escarum receptaculum est, in quo excoquuntur, per quem illi intelliguntur, qui panem, *qui de celo descendit*, intus recondere et ruminare non omittunt sicut munda animalia. Hunc cibum recipiunt per fidem, decoquunt per caritatem et legis Dei meditationem, unde Isaias: *A timore tuo, Domine, concepimus et peperimus spiritum salutis.* Hunc ventrem ecclesia conturbatum lamentatur, cum variis temptationibus alliditur et intus atque foris gravatur.

**Subversum est cor meum**: Quia, scilicet, super cor suum non posuit Dei signaculum, unde: *Pone me ut signaculum super cor tuum.* Si enim signata fuisset, hostis eam non subvertisset. Feritur ergo foris gladius persecutionum, intus doctrina hereticorum aut improbitate morum, que felle amariora sunt.

**Moraliter**

**Vide Domine &c**: Anima variis doloribus vexata ventrem, id est mentem, turbatam gemit, unde: *Lucerna Domini spiraculum hominis, que investigat omnia secreta ventris,* id est mentis. Bene ergo est captitis iste gemitus; mens enim in capite designatur. Inde alibi Jeremias ait: *Venter meum doleo, ventrem meum doleo,* et exponens adiunxit: *Sensus cordis mei conturbati sunt.* Venter enim mentem significat, quia sicut in ventre proles, sic in mente cogitationes. Fidelis enim anima temptationibus fatigata intus et foris se attritam deplorat; foris persecutionibus, intus doloribus. Cum enim flagellis externis atterimur, intus carnis suggestionibus fatigamur, unde addit: *FORIS INTERFICIT GLADIUS ET DOMI MORS SIMILIS EST.*
filled with bitterness due to the falling of her own, she who daily exhibits her pain and tribulation before the most clement judge. The bowels are the reservoir of all food, in which it is digested; by which those are understood, who do not neglect to conceal within and ruminating the bread, which cometh down from heaven, just as clean flesh. They receive this food through faith, digest it with charity and meditating God's law, whence Isaiah: Of fear, O Lord, we have conceived, and have brought forth wind. The Church deplores these bowels being disturbed, when she suffers various temptations and is vexed within and without.

MY HEART IS TURNED WITHIN ME: namely because she does not put the seal of God upon her heart, whence: Put me as a seal upon thy heart. Indeed, if she had been sealed, the enemy would not have overthrown her. Thus, she is struck without by the sword of the persecutors, within by the doctrine of the heretics or the depravity of morals, which are more bitter than gall.

Moral interpretation

BEHOLD O LORD &c: the soul, troubled by various pains, mourns her bowels, that is her mind being disturbed, whence: The spirit of a man is the lamp of the Lord, which searcheth all the hidden things of the bowels, that is of the mind. This sighing of the head is therefore good, as the mind is represented by the head, whence Jeremiah says elsewhere: My bowels, my bowels are in part, and adds explaining: The senses of my heart are troubled within me. For the bowels signify the mind, because as in the bowels the offspring, so the thoughts in the mind. To be sure, the faithful soul, wearied by temptations, deplores herself weakened within and without; without by persecutions, within by pains. Indeed, when we are weakened on the outside by scourging, on the inside are we wearied by suggestions by the flesh, whence he adds: ABROAD THE SWORD DESTROYS, AND AT HOME THERE IS DEATH ALIKE.
21. Sin\textsuperscript{a}

AUĐIERUNT\textsuperscript{b} QUIA 'INGEMISCO EGO'\textsuperscript{c} ET NON EST \textsuperscript{d}QUI CONSOLE\textsuperscript{e}TUR ME\textsuperscript{d} OMNES INIMICI ME\textsuperscript{e} AUDIERUNT \textsuperscript{f}MALUM MEUM\textsuperscript{f}

LETATI SUNT QUONIAM TU FECIST\textsuperscript{g}

\textbf{ADDUXISTI\textsuperscript{h} DIEM\textsuperscript{i} CONSOLATIONIS ET FIERT SIMILES MEI\textsuperscript{j}}

\textsuperscript{a} ‘dentium’, id est predicatorum vel cogitationum \textsuperscript{b} inimici \textsuperscript{c}–c absente sponso \textsuperscript{d}–d fugato Spiritu \textsuperscript{e}–e demones, heretici, mali catholici \textsuperscript{f}–f afflictionem \textsuperscript{g} iusto iudicio permisisti \textsuperscript{h} id est ‘adduces’ \textsuperscript{i} iudicii \textsuperscript{j}–j captivi, afflicti

10 AUDIERUNT: Secundus indignationis locus; ostendit enim, ad quem precipue res ista pertineat, id est ad ipsum Deum, quem hostes in suis despiciunt, unde: \textit{Ingrediatur omne malum &c.}

\textit{Paschasius historice}

15 AUDIERUNT &c: Gentes Ierusalem circumfusas captivitatis eius insultasse non est, qui ambigat. Destitutam enim Dei auxilio gaudebant, cui inter tot procellas resistenti invidebant. QUONIAM TU FECISTI: Dei iudicio imputat, a quo omnia ordinari non ignorat.

ADDUXISTI DIEM CONSOLATIONIS: Verba prophete sunt, qui consolationem venturam, quia certissime previdit, quasi preteritam annuntiavit in consolationem captivati populi. Rethoricorum more loquitur, qui sibi iudicem conciliant et in adversarios concitant.

THEY HAVE HEARD "THAT I SIGH" AND THERE IS NONE TO COMFORT ME

ALL MY ENEMIES HAVE HEARD OF MY EVIL

THEY HAVE REJOICED THAT THOU HAST DONE IT

THOU HAST BROUGHT A DAY OF CONSOLATION, AND THEY SHALL BE LIKE UNTO ME

"of teeth", that is of preachers or of thoughts, the enemies with the spouse absent with the Spirit gone demons, heretics, wicked catholics affliction thou hast allowed by thy just judgement that is thou shalt bring captives, afflicted

THEY HAVE HEARD: the second topic of indignation; for it shows to whom this act principally pertains, that is to God himself, whom the enemies have despised in their own affairs, whence: Let all their evil be present &c.

Historical interpretation

THEY HAVE HEARD &c: there is none who doubts that the gentiles, surrounding Jerusalem, abused her captivities. In fact, they rejoiced that she had been deprived the help of God, whom they envied standing firm among so many tempests. THAT THOU HAST DONE IT: she brings God's judgement into the reckoning, from which she does not ignore that all things are ordered.

THOU HAST BROUGHT A DAY OF CONSOLATION: these are the words of the prophet, who announces the forthcoming consolation to comfort the captured people as if it were something past, because he sees it so clearly. He speaks in a rhetorical manner, to procure the favour of the judge and to instigate against the enemies.
Audierunt &c: Deplorat ecclesia sua et suorum mala, unde preponitur SIn
littera, que ‘dentium’ sonat. Hic est dentium fleus, de quibus in Canticis legitur:
Dentes tu iuicet greges tonsarum &c. Hi sunt, qui non lacte infantie indigent sed
manducant solidum panem, unde Petro dictum est: Macta et manduca, quasi:
‘Non solum panem tibi manducandum apposui sed reptilia.’ Tales enim
doctrinam acumine sciunt vitium mactare et reptilia in corpus Christi trahicere.

Dentium autem diversum est officium: Alii dividunt, alii minuunt, alii voces
formant; sic dentes mistici alii sunt, ut greges tonsarum, qui vetustate spoliati
fetibus suis lacte candidiores pulcritudine officii sui decorati ad summam subtilitatem
Verbum ministrant, unde apostolus: Perfectorum est solidus cibus, qui exercitatos
habet sensum. Audierunt qui a ingemisco ego: Audiunt inimici sponsam plorantem,
que sentit sponsum absentem, qui, etsi semper adest per maiestatem, patitur tamen
sponsam temptationibus concuti, ut semper sollicita sit et timida, ne corruptoris
suggestionem suscipiat. Viderunt, quia ingemisco, quod semper optaverunt,
quod nunquam suspicati sunt. Non est qui consoletur me, quia spiritus
discipline effugit et cotidie multiplicatur malum meum. Demones sunt
ecclesie inimici et heretici et falsi christiani. Quoniam tu fecisti, unde: Ego
Dominus faciens pacem et creans malum, id est iusto iudicio permittens. Adduxisti
diem consolationis: Hoc magis ecclesie congruit, quia post ultimam
captivitatem nulla consolatio restat Iudeis. In die iudicii reddet Dominus
consolationem bonis et supplicia malis.

Allegorical interpretation

They have heard &c: the Church deplores her own troubles and those of her friends, whence the letter Sin, which means ‘of teeth’, is placed before. This is the gnashing of teeth, of which it is read in the Canticles: Thy teeth as flocks of sheep that are shorn &c. They are those who do not need the milk on infancy but who chew solid bread, whence it is said to Peter: Kill and eat. As if: ‘I have served you not only bread to eat but creeping things.’ For such persons know, with the acuteness of doctrine, to kill vice and to lead creeping things to the body of Christ. Different, however, is the function of the teeth: Some divide, some diminish, others form words; thus others are mystical teeth, such as flocks of sheep that are shorn, who, deprived of old age, provide their offspring with the milk of doctrine and the garments of virtue. Others, whiter than milk, furnished with the beauty of their service, serve the Word to the utmost subtlety, whence the Apostle: Strong meat is for the perfect: for them who have their senses exercised.

They have heard that I sigh: the enemies hear the weeping spouse, who feels her absent husband, who, although always present through his majesty, suffers that his spouse is agitated by temptations, so that she is always alarmed and weak, that she may yield to the suggestion of the seducer. They have seen that I sigh, which they always have wished, which they never have suspected. There is none to comfort me, as the spirit of discipline shuns falsehood, and daily my evil is multiplied. The demons are the enemies of the Church and heretics and false Christians. That thou hast done it, whence: I am the Lord, I make peace, and create evil, that is allowing it by thy just judgement. Thou hast brought a day of consolation: this is more fit for the Church, because after the final captivity no consolation is left for the Jews. On Judgement Day, the Lord will render consolation for the just and punishments for the wicked.
Moraliter


48 Anxiate ... 50 hostes] cfr Hrab., in Ier. 18 (1197B–C).
53 Qui ... 54 eum] Ps 70:10–11.
55 in ... 56 sperare] cfr Bened., reg. 4, 90.
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Moral interpretation

They have heard &c: the soul deplores that the enemies have heard the evils she endures. There is none to comfort: it is an increase of pain to the anxious soul, because the one she puts her hope in postpones his succour. In addition, she suffers inutterably from the fact that the invisible enemies, who formerly flattered her, now mock her. Indeed, her conscience, by more seriously blaming, insults her, and the vices that used to seem sweet, become bitter. Those, however, who before seemed to be her friends and who ought to have shown pity, if they happened to know our crimes, now scorn her as if enemies. Hence David: They that watched my soul have consulted together, saying: God hath forsaken him. But the soul has teeth, that is virtues; thoughts, that know how to separate fortunate things from unfortunate and require the comforting Spirit and to hope for the pity of God, whence he adds: Thou hast brought a day of consolation. Indeed, the forceful soul knows that after the straits, the penitents will be given indulgence, and the insolent repayed with punishments.
22. TAU

INGREDIATUR OMNE MALUM EORUM CORAM TE
ET DEVINDEMIA EOS SICUT VINDEMIASST ME

PROPTER INIQUITATES MEAS

MULTI ENIM GEMITUS MEI ET COR MEUM MERENS

‘signa’ quod videris nescire futuris bonis presentibus per eos iuste, scilicet quia multi excessus

Paschasius historice

INGREDIATUR OMNE MALUM &c: TAU ‘signa’ interpretatur pluraliter, quia hoc signo illud monstratur, ad quod multa significantia referuntur. Unde: Signa Tau in frontibus virorum gementium &c. In hoc crux Domini significatur, sicut ipsius figura testatur, et sicut apud Grecos Ω ultima est littera, sic apud Hebreos TAU, unde Dominus ait: Ego sum alpha et omega, initium et finis. Similiter ergo TAU significat crucem, qua frontes signantur, ne ab interfectoribus interficiantur. TAU itaque signa sunt crucis, immo pene ipsa crux est, unde in frontibus dolentium positum est, sed tunc erat signum future crucis, nunc est ipsa crux. Preterea TAU finis est Hebraicarum litterarum, que totidem sunt, quot libri veteris testamenti, quorum ipse signa sunt. Sicut enim TAU omnium elementorum finis est, sic eorum librorum crux Christi, qui est finis legis ad iusticiam, et omnia illa librorum signa Dominice incarnationis et nostre redemptionis sunt sacramenta. Ideo iure TAU interpretatur ‘signa’, ut per eadem hoc unum annuntietur, in quo


22. TAU

LET ALL THEIR EVIL BE PRESENT BEFORE THEE
AND MAKE VINTAGE OF THEM AS THOU HAST MADE VINTAGE OF ME
FOR MY SIGHTS ARE MANY AND MY HEART IS SORROWFUL.

Historical interpretation

LET ALL EVIL BE PRESENT &C: TAU is interpreted ‘signs’ in plural, as that is shown with this sign, to which many significant things refer. Hence: Mark Tau upon the foreheads of the men that sigh. In this the cross of Christ is understood, just as its own shape testify to, and as in Greek omega is the final letter, so in Hebrew TAU, whence the Lord says: I am Alpha and Omega: the Beginning and the End. Likewise TAU therefore signifies the cross, with which the foreheads are signed, as not to be slain by the killers. TAU are therefore the signs of the cross, or rather it is the cross itself, whence it is placed upon the foreheads of the men that mourn, but then it was the sign of the future cross, now it is the cross itself. Besides, TAU is the last of the Hebrew letters, which are as many as the books of the Old Testament, for which they stand as signs. Indeed, as TAU is the last of the alphabet, so is the cross of Christ for those books, he who is the end of the law unto justice, and all those signs in the books are secrets of the Lord’s incarnation and our redemption. Therefore, by rights TAU is interpreted ‘signs’, so that through the same signs one thing may be announced, in which all signs
omnia reserantur signa, nec non lamentationum, in quibus multa concurrunt signa iudiciorum Dei. Dignus est finis, ut gementibus et dolentibus, in quorum frontibus crux signatur, merces laborum a Domino compensetur, et his, qui tribulaverunt eos nec signa tanti operis voluerunt agnoscre, digna ultio tribuatur. Hinc est, quod dicitur: INGREDIATUR OMNE MALUM EORUM CORAM TE &c, et ad litteram sic factum est. Lege prophetas et omnia completa invenies.

Allegoric

INGREDIATUR OMNE MALUM &c: Quasi: ‘Quare, Domine, non vindicas sanguinem nostrum? Et vindica, Domine, sanguinem servorum tuorum, qui effusus est &c.’


Moraliter

INGREDIATUR &c: Anima in conspectu Dei expansa rogat: ‘INGREDIATUR OMNE MALUM &c, quod, siclicet, intus forisque ingerunt. INGREDIATUR CORAM TE, ut evadam tuo auxilio, qui in me non confido. DEVINDEMIA EOS ab omnibus fraudibus suis, ne fructum meum auferant michi, SICUT ME VINDEMIASTI, cum dona tua iratus subtraxisti PROPTER INIQUITATES MEAS.’

Quasi: Iustus est, Domine, et rectum iudicium tuum. Et hec sunt signa, propter que omnia signorum facta sunt miracula, unde: Dedisti metuentibus te significationem, ut fugiant a facie arcus. Qui autem noluerunt precavere, incurrent ea, que minantur scripture, unde: Excita furorem et effunde iram, festina tempus et memento finis. Quasi:
are revealed, also of Lamentations, in which many signs of the judgements of God are gathered. In the end it is proper that the weeping and the suffering, in whose foreheads the cross is signed, have their toil made up for by the Lord, and for those who have persecuted them or have not wanted to recognise the signs of such a work, a worthy vengeance is bestowed. Hence it is said: LET ALL THEIR EVIL BE PRESENT BEFORE THEE, and to the letter it happened so. Read the prophets and you will find everything complete.

Allegorical interpretation

LET ALL EVIL BE PRESENT &c: as if: ‘why, O Lord, dost thou not revenge our blood? And revenge, O Lord, the blood of thy servants, which has been shed &c.’

MAKE A VINTAGE OF THEM &c: this will be fulfilled on Judgement Day, when the evil will receive what they deserve. But here, the impious take away temporal goods; in the future they will lose the eternal and just as they oppressed the saints, with the permission of God, they will, with God crushing, endure eternal afflictions. Which the Church fears and adds: FOR MY SIGHS ARE MANY &c.

Moral interpretation

LET BE PRESENT &c: the soul, unfolded in the presence of God, asks: LET ALL EVIL BE PRESENT, namely that they heap up within and without. LET it BE PRESENT BEFORE THEE, that I may evade by your succour, I who have no confidence in myself. MAKE A VINTAGE of all their deceit, that they may not take away my fruit from me, AS THOU HAST MADE VINTAGE OF ME, when you have withdrawn your gifts in anger FOR ALL MY INIQUITIES. As if: Thou art just, O Lord: and thy judgment is right. And these are signs through which all signs’ facts are miracles, whence: Thou hast given a warning to them that fear thee: that they may flee from before the bow. They, however, who do not want to take heed, rush upon this, that the Scripture threatens with, whence: Raise up indignation, and pour out wrath, hasten the time, and remember the end. As if: ‘O that the saints would not
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48 prophetando futura Ψ Rusch
Liber I – Cap. 22. Tau

always be assailed, that each and every one would receive what he has done’, as if: *Work new miracles*, revealed according to the signs. Therefore, at the end of and before this lamentation, he has put the letter **TAU**, that is ‘signs’, and filled with tearful verses by foretelling the future.
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<td>9:47</td>
<td>14, 41–42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:17</td>
<td>2:4–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:17</td>
<td>2:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:17</td>
<td>2:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:17</td>
<td>20:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:17</td>
<td>14, 41–42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:17</td>
<td>17, 33–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:17</td>
<td>17, 33–34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secundum Lucam (Lc):</th>
<th>Ad Romanos (Rm):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:79</td>
<td>2:15–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:16</td>
<td>7:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:16</td>
<td>7:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:13</td>
<td>2:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:2</td>
<td>7:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:38–40</td>
<td>9, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:28</td>
<td>9, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:6</td>
<td>12, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:9</td>
<td>12, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:44</td>
<td>14, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X, 85–86</td>
<td>13:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 23</td>
<td>1, 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Romanos (Rm):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:38–40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Corinthios I (1 Cor):</th>
<th>Ad Philippenses (Phil):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:1–2</td>
<td>16, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21, 26–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:16</td>
<td>12, 50–51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:22</td>
<td>10, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:27</td>
<td>4, 44–45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:26</td>
<td>1, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Corinthios II (2 Cor):</th>
<th>Ad Colossenses (Col):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>9, 43–44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10</td>
<td>22, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:2</td>
<td>18, 35–36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*11:29</td>
<td>12, 9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*11:29</td>
<td>12, 40–41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Galatas (Gal):</th>
<th>Ad Hebraeos (Hbr):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:4</td>
<td>21, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4:19</td>
<td>12, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:26</td>
<td>1, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:31</td>
<td>3, 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Ephesios (Eph):</th>
<th>Apocalypsis Iohannis (Apc):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:23</td>
<td>2, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>16, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>21, 41–42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:13</td>
<td>16, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:8</td>
<td>22, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:12</td>
<td>17, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:15</td>
<td>9, 40–41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistula Petri I (1 Ptr):</th>
<th>Epistula Iohannis I (1 Io):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:9</td>
<td>2:17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Timotheum II (2 Tim):</th>
<th>Epistula Petri I (1 Ptr):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:8</td>
<td>4:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Timotheum II (2 Tim):</th>
<th>Epistula Petri I (1 Ptr):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19, 23</td>
<td>19, 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Timotheum II (2 Tim):</th>
<th>Epistula Petri I (1 Ptr):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19, 34</td>
<td>19, 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Timotheum II (2 Tim):</th>
<th>Epistula Petri I (1 Ptr):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19, 34</td>
<td>19, 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liber Ezrae IV (4 Esr):</th>
<th>Apocalypsis Iohannis (Apc):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:21–23</td>
<td>6:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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On account of its underlying ubiquity in the present edition, no references are given in this index to Paschiasius Radbertus' commentary on Lamentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Augustinus</th>
<th>Cic., <em>inv.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>in psalm.</em></td>
<td>20, 26–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36, 3–5</td>
<td>*1, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64, 2, 2</td>
<td>20, 26–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*103, 1, 15</td>
<td>20, 26–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103, 2, 7</td>
<td>*1, 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benedictus</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>inv.</em></td>
<td>12, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 61</td>
<td>*1, 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, 55–56</td>
<td>3, 16–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 46–47</td>
<td>8, 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cicero</th>
<th>Gregorius Magnus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>de orat.</em></td>
<td><em>off.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 73</td>
<td>1, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, 56–57</td>
<td>IV, 32–33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>inv.</em></th>
<th><em>in evang.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1, 100</td>
<td>XI, 106–07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1, 101</td>
<td>XI, 107–08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, 10–11</td>
<td>39, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1, 102</td>
<td>16, 11–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1, 103</td>
<td>18, 9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1, 104</td>
<td>19, 9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1, 105</td>
<td>7, 17–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1, 106</td>
<td>12, 14–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1, 107</td>
<td>XI, 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI, 104–05</td>
<td>23, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 15–16</td>
<td>11, 7–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 10–11</td>
<td>*27, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 16</td>
<td>30, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 11</td>
<td>*32, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 13</td>
<td>15, 11–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, 10</td>
<td>*32, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, 11</td>
<td>IX, 68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*27, 42 | IX, 68 | 15, 21–22
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieronymus</th>
<th>Hier., in Ezech.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>epist.</td>
<td>prol. (4, 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30, 5</td>
<td>II, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII, 51</td>
<td>* (787B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 5</td>
<td>2, 21, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 5</td>
<td>2, 21, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 6</td>
<td>2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 7</td>
<td>2, 3, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 25–26</td>
<td>2, 3, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 5</td>
<td>2, 3, 19–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 14–15</td>
<td>2, 5, 25–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 9</td>
<td>12, 44, 24–28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 23</td>
<td>14, 52, 7–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 6</td>
<td>17, 63, 3–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 5</td>
<td>21, 19–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 25–26</td>
<td>16, 18–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 5</td>
<td>4, 27, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 5</td>
<td>nom. hebr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 41</td>
<td>819–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 6</td>
<td>8, 47–48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 5</td>
<td>18, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 6</td>
<td>1166, 10–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 42–43</td>
<td>732, 33–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 44</td>
<td>quaest. hebr. in gen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 5</td>
<td>45, 29–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 18–19</td>
<td>10, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 6</td>
<td>Pseudo-Hieronymus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 45</td>
<td>in Lam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, 5</td>
<td>*(787A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, 16–17</td>
<td>*(787A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 5</td>
<td>1, 2 *(788A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 13</td>
<td>*(788A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, 5</td>
<td>*(788B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, 14</td>
<td>*(788B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, 29</td>
<td>*(788B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 6</td>
<td>*(788C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 21</td>
<td>1, 3 *(789A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, 6</td>
<td>1, 4 *(789A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, 24–25</td>
<td>1, 5 *(789C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 6</td>
<td>1, 6 *(789D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 10</td>
<td>1, 7 *(790A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 22</td>
<td>*(790A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120, 8, 2–3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 21–22</td>
<td>*(790A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ps. Hier., *in Lam.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auctor</th>
<th>Ps.</th>
<th>Hrab., Univ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(790A)</em></td>
<td>7, 14</td>
<td>10, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(790b)</td>
<td>7, 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 8 <em>(790A)</em></td>
<td>8, 6–7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 9 <em>(790C)</em></td>
<td>9, 5–6</td>
<td>1, 54–55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(790c)</em></td>
<td>9, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(790c)</em></td>
<td>9, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 10 <em>(790d)</em></td>
<td>8, 47–48</td>
<td>15, 21–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(790d)</em></td>
<td>10, 6</td>
<td>IX, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(790d)</em></td>
<td>10, 7</td>
<td>X, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(790d)</em></td>
<td>18, 38</td>
<td>2, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 12 <em>(791A)</em></td>
<td>12, 11</td>
<td>1, 54–55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(791A)</em></td>
<td>12, 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 13 <em>(791A)</em></td>
<td>13, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(791B)</em></td>
<td>13, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 17 <em>(791c–d)</em></td>
<td>17, 5–6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 21 <em>(792A)</em></td>
<td>21, 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(792B)</em></td>
<td>21, 8</td>
<td>1, 30–31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 22 <em>(792B)</em></td>
<td>22, 10</td>
<td>20, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 <em>(1187A)</em></td>
<td>4, 48–49</td>
<td>20, 38–39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1188D)</em></td>
<td>6, 16–21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1188c–d)</em></td>
<td>6, 35–38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1189B)</em></td>
<td>7, 54–60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1190A–B)</em></td>
<td>8, 24–26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1191A)</em></td>
<td>11, 7–9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1191A)</em></td>
<td>11, 15–16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1191B)</em></td>
<td>11, 30–35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1191C)</em></td>
<td>12, 18–20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1192A)</em></td>
<td>13, 40–41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1192A–B)</em></td>
<td>13, 44–47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1192B)</em></td>
<td>14, 16–17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1193B)</em></td>
<td>15, 35–39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1194B)</em></td>
<td>17, 32–33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1195A)</em></td>
<td>17, 36–38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1195B)</em></td>
<td>18, 29–30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1195C)</em></td>
<td>18, 31–32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1196B)</em></td>
<td>18, 33–35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1197B–C)</em></td>
<td>18, 47–48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1197B–C)</em></td>
<td>18, 52–53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1196B)</em></td>
<td>20, 16–17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1196D)</em></td>
<td>20, 41–43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1197B–C)</em></td>
<td>21, 48–50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hrabanus Maurus

*in ler.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auctor</th>
<th>Hrab., Univ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(1187A)</em></td>
<td>4, 48–49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1188D)</em></td>
<td>6, 16–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1188c–d)</em></td>
<td>6, 35–38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1189B)</em></td>
<td>7, 54–60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1190A–B)</em></td>
<td>8, 24–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1191A)</em></td>
<td>11, 7–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1191A)</em></td>
<td>11, 15–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1191B)</em></td>
<td>11, 30–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1191C)</em></td>
<td>12, 18–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1192A)</em></td>
<td>13, 40–41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1192A–B)</em></td>
<td>13, 44–47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1192B)</em></td>
<td>14, 16–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1193B)</em></td>
<td>15, 35–39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1194B)</em></td>
<td>17, 32–33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1195A)</em></td>
<td>17, 36–38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1195B)</em></td>
<td>18, 29–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1195C)</em></td>
<td>18, 31–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1196B)</em></td>
<td>18, 33–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1196B)</em></td>
<td>18, 47–48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1196C)</em></td>
<td>18, 52–53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1196B)</em></td>
<td>20, 16–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1196D)</em></td>
<td>20, 41–43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1197B–C)</em></td>
<td>21, 48–50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

Additional Prothemata of *AbbHaLPa*

XII Liber iste Hebraice Phinoth, Grece Treni, Latine Lamentaciones dicitur.

XIII In his lamentationibus quatuor alfabeto reperiuntur. Sicut enim puere elementis nutritur, sic istic lamentationibus vita nostra moresque formantur. Ut enim docetur Israel peccata lamentari, ne captivetur, sic nos, ne insidiis diaboli decepti patriam nostram, id est celestem Ierusalem, perdamus. Ploramus ergo mala, que fecimus, et plorando non faciamus dicentes: *Quomodo sedet sola civitas plena populo &c.*

XIV Notandum est quod quadruplici plangit alfabeto. Verisimile est hoc ideo fieri, quia corpora humana quatuor constant elementis, quibus gravantur, dum in hac vita pluribus obligantur peccatis. Conveniens quoque est, ut quatuor anime virtutes mundana delectatione sauciata quadruplici ordine lamentatio restituat.

XV Duo genera canticorum scriptura testatur: Unum quod cantavit Moyses pro populo liberato ab Egiptiis; alterum quod Ieremias pro populo captivando a Caldeis. Hoc autem canticum cum sit a Ieremia ad correctionem oblatum rex Joachim legisset, comempto Deo igne crevavit, ut autem secundum

---

1 XII AL, om. cett. | Phinoth] Prehmorth A
8 XIV AbHHaLPa | est om. BohHa | alphabo plangit Bb | est2 + enim Pa | 9 elementis constant L | gravantur] aggravatur HaPa | dum ... 10 vita om. Ha, et Bb | 10 est ut] fuit ut Boh, ut Hal, est A | 11 delectatione om. Ha | sauciata] vic legi potest Bb, sauciatas Ha | ordine + facta BohHa | lamentatio om. Pa
prophetiam suam omnia ostenderet evenisse. Post captivitatem lamentationes suo libro inseruit, ut Israel de peccatis penitenciam ageret.

**XVI** Sicut inter omnia cantica veteris et novi testamenti canticum Salomonis per excellentiam Canticum Canticorum appellatur, sic lamentationes Ieremie inter omnes Lamentationes Lamentationum vocantur.

**XVII** Fuerunt hee lamentationes apud Hebreos metri ratione composite, quod in translatione servari non potuit. Habent quoque in principio singularum sentenciærurum singulas alfabeti litteras ordinatas, quod translator servare non potuit, sed singula elementa singulis sentenciæs seorsum preposuit, quorum interpretatio propriis inheret sententiæs. Possunt autem hec istorialiter referri ad Judaicam plebem, spiritualiter ad ecclesiam, moraliter ad unamquamque animam.

**XVIII** Sicut testante Salomone triplex funiculus cito solvi non potest, ita hee lamentationes cum tria hic notantur – istoria, allegoria, moralitas.

**XIX** Agit autem Ieremias propheta in his lamentationibus et de Caldeorum captivitate propter occisionem Zacarie occisi inter templum et altare, et occasione Christi Isu a Tito et Vaspasiano.

**XX** Similiter ecclesia vel quelibet anima a Deo propter peccata desolata adeo in captivitatem rapitur, et que super omnem terram princeps constituta fuerat.
Additional prothema

iuxta illud: *Constitues eos principes super omnem terram*. Et domina gentium, id est genti viciorum imperabat diabolo tributaria viciis servire cogitur.

36 *Constitues ... terram* PsG 44, 17. | *Et ... cogitur* cf. Ps. Hier, *in Lam.*, 788A.

36 *domina ... est om. Pa* 37 *genti* gentibus *Pa*
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The Common Text of the Second Recension (Ψ)

The following readings constitute the consensus text of the second recension as ‘semi-critically’ edited from above all the manuscripts C, Ca, D, Lb and U. Occasionally readings from Ψ may be shared by other manuscripts. Such readings are nevertheless included in the list below, so that the complete text of Ψ may be reconstructed from it.

II, 14 constamus] consistimus
II, 14 existimus elementis] elementis consistimus
II, 15 verum] sed
II, 16 lugeat] deploret
II, 17 luxerunt] luxerint
II, 17 et] sed
III, 19 est post numerus
III, 20 quatuor² + sunt
III, 21 climata] elementa
III, 21 partibus constat] constat partibus + scilicet temporis
III, 21 et ebdomade om.
III, 21 et³ om.
III, 23 conquadrat] quadrat
III, 24 evangeliste] evangelia
III, 24 oriantur] egrediuntur
III, 26 qui + vel quod
III, 29 litterarum lamenta] elementa litterarum
IV, 32 esse multa] multa esse
IV, 33 pro om.
IV, 37 replicat] explicat
IV, 37 panes om.
IV, 40 illud volumen] volumen illud
IV, 40 traeceerunt] trahicint
IV, 41 scripte om.
VI, 46 conditi] compositi et post lege
VII, 53 Inde] unde
VII, 53 repletus] plenus
VII, 55 Et] quia

VIII, 59 vel] et
VIII, 60 demonstratione sententie] summe demonstratione
VIII, 63 efferuntur] offeruntur
VIII, 64 vel] aliquando
IX, 69 lamentationes] lamentatum
IX, 71 pretendunt] retenditur
IX, 74 templum fuit] fuit templum
IX, 77 omittant] omittantur
IX, 77 vite presentis] presentis vite
IX, 78 gemit + et plangit
X, 80 scelesti] celestis
X, 83 per … exaggerationem] pro … exaggeratione
X, 86 nec populus om.
X, 86 enim] autem
X, 87 correptiones] correctiones
X, 87 Dominum] Deum
X, 87 convers] reversi
X, 88 semper + fuerunt
X, 89 Dominum] Deum
X, 90 &c] et incircumcisi corde
XI, 99 preterea + et
XI, 101 satisfaciendo + et
XI, 104 nunc post malis
XI, 109 indignationis et conquestionis] conquestionis et indignationis

1, 12 doctrina + scilicet
1, 12 et³ om.
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1, 12 Deum et se] se ipsum et Deum
1, 12 Hanc + doctrinam quia
1, 13 non habuit] habere noluit
1, 13 ideo] ideo merito
1, 18 domina gentium om.
1, 20 subverterat] subvertit
1, 20 subiugaverat] subiugavit
1, 22 lacrimosius] prae. Quomodo sedet sola civitas
1, 24 lugenda non esset] non esset lugenda
1, 26 a + vero
1, 32 celi om.
1, 34 Babilon] Babilonis
1, 35 ei] eis
1, 36 sordidatur + in
1, 37 sola quia om.
1, 38 feditate turpitudinis] turpitudinis feditate
1, 39 scilicet om.
1, 41 om. 1, 41 qui
1, 49 movens exclamat] exclamavit dicens
1, 51 desolata] prae. rumen
1, 53 est om.
1, 54 reliquit post multis me
1, 56 est om.
2, 5 eccl. + vel
2, 6 adversitate + vel
2, 8 Ex tunc enim] nam ex tunc
2, 9 habuerunt post sacerdotes
2, 11 amicis om.
2, 11 pravis affectibus] vel affectibus privatis et post angelis
2, 12 quam] qui
2, 12 spernit] sprevit
2, 12 cui] quasi his quibus
2, 16 et] om.
2, 16 qui] que
2, 16 sepe et om.
2, 19 contemptitur] consternatur
2, 19 abs] om.
2, 19 inimicus post exterioribus
2, 26 interpretatione sua om.
2, 40 tamen versatur] versatur tamen
2, 41 plorat] plorans plorat
2, 41 que foris] foris que
2, 42 infirmitatis] cecitatis
2, 42 intus prius] prius intus
2, 43 fonte cordis] cordis fonte
2, 46 et] om.
2, 47 detegere] tegere
2, 51 que] quia
2, 55 huius ignorantie] ignorantie huius
2, 57 plorat] om.
2, 60 sponsi] spiritus sancti
2, 71 cuiusque] cum uniueiusque
2, 74 id est] scilicet
2, 75 delectionis] dilectionis
2, 75 eis
2, 76 insurgent] surgent
2, 76 conscientiam] animam
3, 2 Iuda] Iudas
3, 7 Pro om.
3, 8 gentem sibi] sibi gentem
3, 11 leve … suave] suave … leve
3, 11 onus + eius
3, 12 domini] cum prae. om.
3, 13 apprehenderunt] comprehenderunt
3, 13 crudeliter + cos
3, 15 iugum Domini] Domini iugum
3, 32 &c] id est
3, 34 amissa] amissa
3, 33 migrat] migravit
3, 36 presignabat] prefigurabat
3, 39 migrat] migravit
3, 41 et … peccati om.
3, 41 est via] via est
3, 43 more tandem] tandem more
4, 6 cedrinis + scilicet
4, 8 usque … altaris
4, 10 a vitis] intus
4, 10 plebs] et ipsa plebs
4, 12 Deleth om.
4, 13 Dei] Domini
4, 13 consurgit] surgit
4, 13 viis scilicet] scilicet viis
4, 16 oportuerit + oportuerit] oportuit … oportuit
4, 21 redintegratur] redintegratur
4, 27 Deum iuste] iuste Deum
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4, 28 iratum + et
4, 30 pro peccatis suis post ecclesia
4, 33 Unde + et
4, 35 via est] est via
4, 35 pervenitur] venitur
4, 36 possunt dici] dici possunt
4, 36 credendi via] via credendi
4, 38 sollemnia] sollemnitatem
4, 39 introcunt] intrant
4, 40 constupratis] consumptis
4, 45 omnia] omnia membra
4, 52 sunt1 om.
4, 57 Domini porta] porta Domini
5, 7 scilicet om.
5, 11 concessio + vel confessio
5, 12 nature] etatis
5, 19 scilicet om.
5, 19 dicentem] dicens
5, 20 filie + tue
5, 22 hoc] hec
5, 23 sed + ut
5, 24 quia + Deo
5, 24 Dei iudicio] iudicio Dei
5, 26 Dominus olim] olim Deus
5, 30 sit intelligentie] intelligentie sit
5, 35 doctrine] vite
5, 42 vigilanter om.
5, 44 invalescunt] invalescent
5, 45 effugere] fugere
5, 45 non valeamus] nequeamus
5, 45 ipse + Dominus
5, 49 tantum] tamen
5, 50 hostes facti om.
5, 51 boni + operis
6, 5 filie sunt] filia Syon
6, 7 debent] deberent
6, 8 rationales + animi
6, 11 ponuntur] ponimus
6, 11 notandum + est
6, 14 et interpretatur] interpretatur et
6, 16 exterius post pulcritudinis
6, 19 non? … 20 pascua om.
6, 29 gregem Domini post pascua vite
6, 29 vadunt] vadant
6, 31 altarii
6, 32 memorabuntur] memorabuntur
6, 37 persequebantur] persequem
7, 3 prevaricationis + et
7, 10 et … 11 Egypto om.
7, 11 et1 … desert△ post promissionis et et2 om.
7, 12 anima om.
7, 12 condita erat] erat condita
7, 13 poterat + et
7, 14 ludeos deridemus] deridemus ludeos
7, 17 iuncta + est
7, 22 cadat] cedit
7, 29 cidom om.
7, 26 legislator predixerat] legis predixerat lator
7, 26 hostium + et
7, 27 recita] recitata
7, 29 cadere post hostium
7, 33 bonis] rebus
7, 37 manu] manus
7, 39 desiderabilium + suorum id est
7, 39 in celis promissa sunt| prosmissa sunt
in celis
7, 40 et nos om.
7, 44 vel vitis om.
7, 45 et om.
7, 46 irruent] derident
7, 46 bono] bonis
7, 50 manus] manu
7, 51 quod putabat] qui putabat se
7, 53 oberraverat] erraverat
7, 53 facinora] vitia
7, 53 recordatio] recordatur
7, 54 aggerationem] exaggerationem
7, 55 iusticie + et
7, 55 luxit] illuxit
7, 61 cavendum + est
7, 61 ne] ut
7, 62 repromption] expromption
7, 62 rideantur] derideantur
7, 63 cogitationibus nostris] nostris
7, 63 nostra sabba] sabbata nostra
8, 4 quoniam] quia
8, 5 conversa + est
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8, 6 conversa + est
8, 7 infidelitatis peccatum infidelitatis
8, 8 factum peccatum
8, 8 ut peccatum
8, 9 beatificabant beatificant
8, 10 applaudentes om.
8, 9 et vel
8, 11 vel om.
8, 12 per penitentiam post reliquerat
8, 13 conversionem conversationem
8, 18 demonstrat esse
8, 19 hoc que
8, 20 dico populum dicebant
8, 25 Dei Domini
8, 26 quis quia
8, 29 et om.
8, 34 vano vario
8, 35 conversi ... 36 retrorsum om.
8, 39 rapit rapitur
8, 39 qui quia
8, 41 audient et audiat
8, 41 et om.
8, 42 verbum post tergum post tergum verbum
8, 42 unde unde
8, 43 querebat + prius
8, 43 sic et
8, 44 infidelitatis
9, 5 enim om.
9, 6 peccatoris peccatorem
9, 6 cognoscere cognoscere
9, 11 Dominum Deum
9, 12 Dominum Deum
9, 12 nec quia non
9, 15 simplici supplici
9, 16 deplorat plorat
9, 29 hostes hostem
9, 30 inimicus + meus
9, 30 nec non
9, 32 quibus vide quibus
9, 35 gestat portat
9, 38 ut et
9, 39 orbem mundum
9, 42 quia quia
9, 48 Jerusalem om.
9, 49 est et
9, 55 nequas + nos
10, 8 &c virtutes et ceteras virtutes
10, 9 intulerant contulerant
10, 9 quocumque quo
10, 13 populi fortunam fortunam populi
10, 17 scilicet om.
10, 17 manus om.
10, 22 unde om.
10, 23 corum om.
10, 23 conclusit ... 24 &c om.
10, 27 suis ipsius
10, 30 carnem scilicet scilicet carmen
10, 33 mitit manum suam manum mittit
10, 35 viderit vidit et post suggestiones
10, 35 pravas scilicet scilicet pravas
10, 37 et quia
10, 38 anime post id est
10, 39 omnibus suis
11, 6 verbis verbum
11, 8 ecclesia om.
11, 9 infima infirma
11, 15 et pestilentiam om.
11, 16 unde + hic omnis
11, 18 propheta prophete
11, 19 quasi + in
11, 26 a doctoribus quereit quereit a doctoribus
11, 31 deliciose post affluenterat
11, 33 Quevis infelix
11, 33 preciosa + queque
11, 35 diversis + vitis et
11, 36 quamvis pretiosa pretiosa queque quamvis
11, 38 virtus forte forte virtus
11, 40 michi vilis vilis mihi
11, 41 manus Domini
11, 43 tetigerit tetigit
11, 45 vilen se se vilen
11, 46 est creatoris creatori erat
12, 6 cordis contritio
cordis contritio
12, 8 Christum unde
12, 8 veritas vita om.
12, 11 vel vindiemiatitem om.
12, 19 dolorem suum suum dolorem
12, 20 sibi equari non consentiunt
non consentiunt sibi coequari
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12, 21 sanctificatio] sanctuarium
12, 26 bona om.
12, 29 in celis est] est in celis
12, 30 prospicit] conspicit
12, 31 miseranda] miserando
12, 32 Christus est] est Christus
12, 35 festinantes] festinat
12, 40 generat + et
12, 41 Quis … uxor om.
12, 42 adversos] adversus
12, 43 que] qui
12, 44 quoniam] quando
12, 45 est + Dominus in die furoris
12, 46 venisse ignem] ignem venisse
13, 49 terius + in eis
13, 46 varia] vana
14, 6 confessio] confessus
14, 6 que] qui
14, 6 me dormiente om.
14, 8 me + sunt
14, 8 insolubili vinculo + in retributione
15, 9 iudicio + Dei
14, 10 Israel] Syon
14, 12 quia] qui
14, 16 torpore nequitie] nequitie torpore
14, 18 vigilanter] vigiluum
14, 25 est post perpetua captivitas
14, 29 iunxitam] iunxitatis
14, 30 subicitur] subditur
14, 32] sibi suberat
14, 33 et] Torques om.
14, 36 incedant gradu] gradu incedant
14, 37 iure ergo] in regno
14, 40 se laqueo] laqueo se
14, 41 traduntur] traduntur
14, 41 impii post quia
14, 42 titulatur] titulatur
14, 43 de celo mist] mist de celo
14, 47 imputatur] imputatur
14, 49 Vigilat post anime
14, 50 subicitur] subditur
14, 53 sede + ut
14, 53 sed + ut
14, 54 des me] me des
14, 55 potero] poterit
15, 5 ablatur] sublatur
15, 6 vel ecclesie doctores] doctores vel ecclesie
15, 7 merentem om.
15, 9 eminentes] eminentiores
15, 9 Torcular post solus
15, 19 de] quod
15, 20 fortem + et
15, 25 primitur] quatuor
15, 31 opponat] ponat se et post murum
15, 33 scilicet om.
16, 6 prophete ... ecclesie] ecclesie ... prophete
16, 22 et post premia
16, 23 vero] ergo
16, 24 calcaverit Dominus] Dominus calcaverit
16, 26 perpetue] eterne
16, 28 re publica Dei] Dei re publica
16, 39 fons vel oculus] oculus vel fons
16, 46 aquam] fontem
16, 50 recurrit] recurrit
16, 53 intus exteriusque] exterius interiusque
16, 57 perducti] deducti sunt
16, 59 se amississe conolatorem] conolatorem sc amississe
16, 60 unde] ubi
16, 61 huius mundi] huiusmodi
16, 62 fructus post operum
16, 63 invalescit] invalescit
16, 65 possedebat] possedit
16, 66 in om.
16, 67 valet] potest
16, 68 consurget] consurget
16, 69 inimicorum exercitus] exercitus inimicorum
16, 71 Spiritum sanctum] Spiritus
16, 72 suus] scilicet
16, 74 quia] que
16, 75 intus exteriorumque] exteriorum interiusque
16, 77 pro iniquitate] propter iniquitatem
16, 79 hostes] spiritualiter
16, 84 effugere] fugere
16, 85 cogitationum] angustias
16, 88 liberatur] liberabitur
18, 5 prophetas ... 6 predicatores] predicatores ... prophetas
18, 6 viam + tantum
18, 7 diligenter + considerate
18, 9 possunt defendere] defendere possunt
18, 10 nec ... ledere post virgines enim
18, 11 quia] quod
18, 18 invitatio communiter] communiter invitatio
18, 20 captivatas] captivas
18, 22 obsecro] ergo
18, 28 re publica Dei] Dei re publica
18, 33 multiplicem] duplicem
18, 34 inestimabilem] ineffabilem
18, 37 fructus post operum
18, 41 &c ... scilicet] abierunt tunc scilicet mundas
19, 4 animam suam] animas suas
19, 5 vel2 om.
19, 6 vel1 om.
19, 6 mente] anima
19, 10 alius faceret] ali facerent
19, 16 auxilio] consilio
19, 19 vel] et
19, 18 formidin] fortitudine
19, 18 qui] quia
19, 18 Egyptis] Egypto
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19, 23 corruperunt] corrumpunt
19, 25 sepe ecclesia] ecclesia sepe
19, 26 tunc + quoque
19, 26 crudelius] peius
19, 31 ipsi om.
19, 34 qui] que
19, 35 innitenti] nitenti
19, 35 perforans] perforat
20, 3 memetipsa] memetipso
20, 8 Quartus decimus] quintus decimus
20, 9 non ... audiat et
20, 15 cruciatus post misericordiam
20, 25 escarum] ciborum
20, 26 recondere et ruminare] ruminare et recondere
20, 31 Dei] Deus
20, 36 varis doloribus] doloribus varis
20, 39 designatur] significatur
20, 39 inde] unde
20, 41 ventre + cibi concipiuntur et
20, 42 foris1 + temptationibus
20, 42 se attritam] attritam se
21, 6 dentium] id est praeum.
21, 7 demones + vel
21, 7 heretici + vel
21, 10 precipeue res ista] res ista precipeu
21, 16 enim + erat
21, 22 concitant] incitant
21, 28 ibi + ad
21, 28 apposui] proposui
21, 33 summam subtilitatem] subtilitatem
21, 36 etsi et
21, 38 Viderunt] audierunt
21, 38 ingemisco + ego
21, 47 quia] quoniam
21, 48 consoletur + cam
21, 49 hoc] hec
21, 52 scelea nostra] nostra scelea
21, 53 decenters ... 54 cum om.
21, 54 anima habet] habet anima
21, 57 penentitibus post angustias
21, 58 rettribui] tribui
22, 3 devindemia] vindemia
22, 7 seilicet om.
22, 11 illud monstratur] monstratur illud
22, 11 Unde + in Ezechiele
22, 12 frontibus] fronte
22, 13 sic] ita
22, 15 frontes] in fronte
22, 16 iaque] namque
22, 16 signa sunt] signum est
22, 16 est om.
22, 16 dolentiurn] dolentibus
22, 17 est2 om.
22, 19 finis est] est finis et post Tau
22, 22 iure Tau] Tau iure
22, 23 referentur] referentur
22, 23 multa om.
22, 25 crux + Christi
22, 26 signa tanti operis] operis tanti signa
22, 27 tribuatur] retribuatur
22, 31 sanguinem + suum
22, 31 est &c om.
22, 34 pressuras] penas
22, 40 me vindemiasit] vindemiasit me
22, 41 dona ... iratus] cum tu iratus dona tua
22, 44 arcus + ut liberentur dilecti tui
22, 44 minantur] minant
22, 46 recipiunt] recipiat
22, 46 quasi] et
22, 46 immuta] in multa
22, 48 futura prophetando] prophetando futura
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<td>Notice et extraits du Manuscrit Q 19 (XVIe S.) de Strängnäs.</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gustaf Holmér</td>
<td>Le sermon sur Esau. Discours allégorique sur la chasse de Pierre de Marini. Editian critique.</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Herbert Adolfsson</td>
<td>Liber epistularum Guidonis de Basochis.</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>VIII+317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hedda Roll</td>
<td>Hans Brask. Latinsk korrespondens 1523.</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tore Janson</td>
<td>Prose Rhythm in Medieval Latin from the 9th to the 13th Century.</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ritva Jonsson</td>
<td>Corpus Troporum I. Tropes du propre de la messe. 1 Cycle de Noël.</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>361; 31 pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Olof Marcusson</td>
<td>Corpus Troporum II. Prosules de la messe. 1 Tropes de l’alleluia.</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>161; 4 pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

