

Rashi's Glosses on Isaiah in Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. lat. 16558*

Görge K. Hasselhoff
(Technische Universität Dortmund)

Abstract

Within the manuscript with the excerpts from the Talmud there is also a list of a little less than 170 snippets from Rashi's Bible commentaries. In this article these comments or glosses are briefly introduced and then the twelve glosses on Isaiah are analysed.

When in the 1240s in Paris some unknown translators started to translate Jewish writings, they did not focus on the Talmud as an old Jewish writing. They rather focused on the Talmud as a work of the Tosafist School of the eleventh and twelfth century as can be shown from the glosses that were translated with the excerpts of the Talmud. Most of these glosses stem from "Salomon", i.e. Rabbenu Shlomo Yitzhaqi – or abbreviated: Rashi –, the head of the academy in Troyes. Rashi commented on nearly all treatises of the Talmud and on nearly all books of the Hebrew Bible.¹ Therefore it is not wrong to state, as Talya Fishman some years ago did, that with his comments the textualization of (European) Judaism started.²

Yet, the Parisian translators did not only translate the Talmud with Rashi's glosses. As an appendix to the sequential translation we do not only find a Latin rendering of parts of a Jewish prayer book (*Liber Krubot*; Heb.: *Sefer Qerubôt*),³ but also some 167 excerpts from Rashi's comments on the Bible. Considering that Rashi commented on most Biblical books, that does not seem to be much, but it is more than nothing.

* Research was made possible within the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC Grant agreement n. 613694 ("The Latin Talmud and Its Influence on Christian-Jewish Polemic" at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona). – I thank the participants of the session at the 23rd International Medieval Congress in Leeds (4-7 July 2016), especially Eva Frojmovic, Leeds, for their comments and discussions.

1. For Rashi's life and oeuvre see Avraham GROSSMAN, *Rashi*, Oxford/Portland, OR, 2012; Johannes HEIL, "Raschi. Der Lebensweg als soziale Landschaft", in: Daniel Krochmalnik *et al.* (Eds.), *Raschi und sein Erbe. Internationale Tagung an der Hochschule für Jüdische Studien mit der Stadt Worms*, Heidelberg, 2007, pp. 1-22.
2. See Talya FISHMAN, *Becoming the People of the Talmud. Oral Torah as Written Tradition in Medieval Jewish Cultures*, Philadelphia, PA, 2011.
3. This translation will soon be edited by Wout van Bekkum and myself.

I.

Before I turn to the comments on Isaiah I will say something about the list of excerpts in general. First of all, quite telling are the remarks in the preface of the “thematic” version of the Latin Talmud⁴ where the compiler states that he translated nearly nothing from Rashi’s comments, because they were full of strange ideas (*mirabilia*). In addition, these comments were in large parts taken from the Talmud. By commenting the Old Testament from this Talmudic perspective, he neither meets a literal nor a spiritual meaning of scripture, but perverts its meaning and turns it into fables. Nonetheless the Jews attribute him great authority, even as if it were from the Lord’s mouth. His comments on the Talmud were quite often inserted into the sentences. Finally, the translator adds, his body has been buried with great honours, but his soul nonetheless rests in the outmost hell (*infernus novissimus*).⁵

Later on in the manuscript (fols. 224va-230rb) the above mentioned list of 167 excerpts follows. These excerpts are taken from all parts of his comments on the Bible although there are some peculiarities as can be shown by the distribution on the Biblical books: 93 of all these comments are taken from his comment on the Torah, i.e. about 60 percent. These comments itself are mostly on Genesis (41)⁶ and Exodus

4. On the relation of the two Talmud translations see Alexander FIDORA, “Textual Rearrangement and Thwarted Intentions. The Two Versions of the Latin Talmud”, in: *Journal of Transcultural Medieval Studies* 2/2 (2015), pp. 63-78; and the articles by him and Isaac Lampurlanés in this volume.
5. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. lat. 16558 (henceforth *P*), fol. 3rb-va: “De glosis uero salomonis trecensis super uetus t.[estamentum] pene nichil transtuli, licet sint ibi mirabilia infinita. Et de talmut magnam contineant partem. [*P* fol. 3va] Et quamuis taliter totum glosauerit uetus t.[estamentum], quod nichil penitas ibi relinqueret incorruptum, ita quod nec literalem nec spiritualementem intelligenciam seu sensum delinquat, sed totum peruertat et conuertat ad fabulas? Iudei tamen quicquid dixit auctoritatem reputant, ac si de ore domini fuerit eis dictum. Huius glose super talmut frequenter in sequentibus inueniuntur inserte. Sepultum est corpus eius honorifice trecis, et anima in inferni novissimo”. – Quoted after Erich KLIBANSKY, “Beziehungen des christlichen Mittelalters zum Judentum, I. Zur Talmudkenntnis des christlichen Mittelalters”, in: *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 77 (1933), pp. 456-462, at p. 457. – It needs further research to establish the relation of this version of the preface to the different one in the manuscript of Schaffhausen, Ministerialbibliothek, Ms. Min. 71, fol. 61v, which reads: “De glosis uero salomonis trecensis super uetus testamentum pauca transtuli uel excerpti, licet sint ibi mirabilia infinita et de talmut magnam contineant partem ut pote exinde sumpte. Dicitur enim in talmut in capitulo *helec*, quod qui detegit faciem in lege et non secundum *halaka*, i.e. qui glosat legem et non per talmut quamuis habeat in manu sua legem et bona opera non habebit partem in futuro seculo. Iste salomon licet tali modo totum uetus testamentum glosauit, quod nichil in eo relinqueret incorruptum, ita quod ulterius dimictat sanum spiritualementem intellectum ut pote qui totum peruertit et conuertit ad derisionem et fabulas. Iudei tamen quicquid scripsit et dixit auctoritatem reputant ac si de ore dei eis fuisset dictum. Glose ipsius super talmut frequenter in sequentibus inseruntur. Corpus eius a iudeis trocis est honorifice sepultum et a demonibus anima prout uiuerit in inferno”.
6. They are edited by Gilbert DAHAN, “Rashi, sujet de la controverse de 1240. Edition partielle du ms. Paris, BN lat. 16558”, in: *Archives Juives. Cahiers de la Commission française des Archives Juives* 14 (1978), pp. 43-54, at pp. 46-54.

(33),⁷ whereas the three other books are touched only briefly: Leviticus: 3 comments, Numbers: 7 comments and Deuteronomy: 9 comments.⁸ The missing roughly 40 percent of translations are distributed more or less equally to the other parts of the Bible: 40 (44) translations relate to the commentaries on the Books of Prophets,⁹ and 34 (30) translations to the *Ketuvim*. To be more precise, most translations of the *Ketuvim* are taken from the commentaries on Proverbs (14),¹⁰ Ecclesiastes (or Qohelet, 8) and Song of Songs (4), whereas Job (1), Psalms (2) and Lamentations (1) are more or less neglected.¹¹ The distribution of comments from the Books of Prophets is also remarkable. Most Earlier Prophets are represented by one to six translations (Joshua: 1, Judges: 5; I Samuel: 4; II Samuel: 6; I Kings: 1), leaving out only II Kings,¹² whereas the Later Prophets receive comparably little attention: From five of the comments on the Twelve Minor Prophets we find one to five translations: Jonah (1), Micah (1), Habakkuk (1), Obadiah (3), and Zechariah (5).¹³ There are no excerpts taken from the commentaries on Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Instead we find four excerpts on Daniel¹⁴ which, according to the Christian tradition, is counted among the prophetic literature whereas in the Hebrew Bible it belongs to the Writings. Finally we find altogether twelve excerpts from the *Commentary on Isaiah* to which I now will turn to.

II.

The book of Isaiah is by far the longest prophetic book of the Hebrew Bible and contains 66 chapters. To each of its chapters we find Rashi's comments, roughly

7. They are edited in Görgé K. HASSELHOFF, "Der Talmudprozess von 1240 und seine Folgen", in: Jochen Flebbe/Görgé K. Hasselhoff (Eds.), *'Ich bin nicht gekommen, Frieden zu bringen, sondern das Schwert'. Aspekte des Verhältnisses von Religion und Gewalt*, Göttingen, 2017, pp. 155-169, at pp. 161-166.
8. They are edited in Görgé K. HASSELHOFF, "Rashi for Latin Readers: The Translations of Paris, 1240; With an Edition of the Excerpts from Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy", in: Görgé K. Hasselhoff/Knut Martin Stünkel (Eds.), *Transcending Words. The Language of Religious Contact Between Buddhists, Christians, Jews, and Muslims in Premodern Times*, Bochum, 2015, pp. 103-110, at pp. 108-110.
9. It is 44 references including the book of Daniel which in the Christian tradition is part of the prophetic books and 40 references without Daniel. Correspondingly, it is 34 or 30 references to the "Writings" which in the Jewish tradition include Daniel.
10. They are edited in Gilbert DAHAN, "Un dossier latin de textes de Rashi autour de la controverse de 1240", in: *Revue des études juives* 151 (1992), pp. 321-336, at pp. 335-336.
11. The excerpts from Ecclesiastes through to Lamentations are edited in: Görgé K. HASSELHOFF, "The Parisian Talmud Trials and the Translation of Rashi's Bible Commentaries", in: *Henoch* 37 (2015), pp. 29-42, at pp. 37-40.
12. The excerpts from Judges and I-II Samuel are edited in: Görgé K. HASSELHOFF, "Rashi and the Dominican Friars", in: Charles Burnett/Pedro Mantas-España (Eds.), *'Ex Oriente Lux'. Translating Words, Scripts and Styles in Medieval Mediterranean Society*, Cordova/London, 2016, pp. 201-215, at pp. 211-215; the excerpts from Joshua and I Kings are edited in HASSELHOFF, "The Parisian Talmud Trials" (as in note 11), p. 37.
13. They are edited in: HASSELHOFF, "The Parisian Talmud Trials" (as in note 11), pp. 40-41.
14. They are edited in: HASSELHOFF, "Rashi and the Dominican Friars" (as in note 12).

every second to third verse is commented on.¹⁵ Compared with that, twelve translated comments are not that many. They nonetheless are interesting since they give some information on what was interesting or available for the translator.

So let us first have a look on the distribution. We find one excerpt from the comments on chapters 12, 23, 27, 34, 63, and 66 respectively, and two excerpts from the comments on chapters 24, 33, and 65 respectively. With other words, none of the messianic texts from the first eleven chapters and from the second part of Isaiah (“Deutero-Isaiah”) is translated. Compared to its length, the third part of Isaiah (the last seven chapters) receives relatively many comments (four, i.e. one third).

If we now focus on the texts translated, and compare them with what we find in today’s standard version as it is printed in the *Miqraot Gedolot* we discover further interesting aspects. Therefore I will now go through these comments and compare them with the translations.¹⁶

a) *Isaiah 12, 2*

On Isaiah 12, 2 (כִּי־עָזַר יְיָ וְיִצְרָאֵל יְהוָה הוֹשִׁיעַ לִי לְיְשׁוּעָה: – “for the strength and praise of the Eternal the Lord was my salvation”) Rashi’s explanation is as follows:

Until now His Name was divided, and with the downfall of Amalek, it became whole, and so Scripture states (Exodus 17, 16): “For the hand is on the throne of the Eternal (הַכֶּסֶּל),” implying that the throne is incomplete and the Name is incomplete until the Lord wages war against Amalek.¹⁷

The main point is: God’s name was divided, i.e. into Yah and YHWH, and had to be unified, but now, after the destruction of Amalek this division comes to an end. The Latin translator renders this as follows:

Fortitudo et laus mea dominus etc. [Is 12, 2]. Glosa: nomen domini modo dimidiatum est, non enim est ibi pro ezonay nisi ia, sed ad ruinam esau et generis sui, xristianorum, reintegrabitur.

At first sight this translation seems to be completely different. But it is not because if we leave aside the underlined parts we have a nearly verbal translation of

15. See, e.g., the comments printed in the *Miqraot Gedolot* series (see next note).

16. The Rashi’s Hebrew comments and their translations, as well as the Bible translations, are quoted after *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Isaiah, Translation of Text, Rashi and Other Commentaries*. Transl. A. J. Rosenberg, vol. 1-2, Brooklyn, NY, 5th printing 2007-2012; and after http://www.chabad.org/library/bible_cdo/aid/15932 (last visited on 25 July 2016); for the critical edition of the Latin texts see the appendix.

17. *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Isaiah* (as in note 16), p. 113 (English transl. *ibid.*, p. 114):

עד הנגה היה שמו חלוק ובמפלתו של עמלק נעשה שלם וכן הוא אומר כי יד על כס יי' (שמות י"ז) אין הכסא שלם ואין השם שלם עד שתהא מלחמה לה' בעמלק

the first half of Rashi's commentary. Only "Amalek" is replaced by "esau et generis sui" which might point to a different writing in the manuscript used or to a gloss by the translator.¹⁸ Whether the second half of the explanation is left out by the translator or whether it was not in the *Vorlage* cannot be decided.

What is interesting in the excerpt are the two glosses that are underlined at least in the oldest manuscript we use: Whereas "xristianorum" is simply an explanation of "esau" that can be found quite often in the excerpts from the Talmud as well as in the translation of the glosses, the other addition is more interesting. Here the translator or the commentator goes back to the Hebrew Bible text and explains his *modo dimidiatum* by pointing at the two divine names in the verse. God's undivided name is the unspeakable tetragrammaton which is rendered in the Ashkenazic pronunciation in *ezonay* (for *adonay*). Already Isaiah replaced it by *yah*.

b) Isaiah 23, 5

כְּאֶשֶׁר־שָׁמַע לְמִצְרַיִם יִזְדָּלוּ כְּשָׁמַע צָר:⁵

Like the report concerning Egypt, shall they quake at the report of Tyre

Rashi's comment on Isaiah 23, 5 is a bit longer and reads as follows:

Like the report concerning Egypt: which they heard about the Egyptians, that I had brought ten plagues upon them, and that they finally drowned in the sea. shall they quake: They shall be frightened.

at the report: When the listeners hear that the report concerning Tyre has been announced, for also the plagues of Tyre shall be in the same pattern as those plagues: "Blood and fire" (Joel 3, 3); (Isaiah 66, 6) "A voice of tumult from the city," like the croaking of the frogs, (Infra [Isaiah] 34, 9) "And its brooks shall be turned to pitch and its dust into sulphur," on the pattern of the plague of lice. (Ibid. 11) "But the pelican and hedgehog shall take possession of it," after the pattern of the plague of a mixture of noxious beasts. (Ezekiel 38, 22) "And I will hold judgment over him with pestilence and with blood," a pattern of the plague of murrain. (Zechariah 14, 12) "His flesh shall consume away," after the pattern of the plague of boils. (Supra [Isaiah] 18, 5) "And he shall cut off the tendrils," after the pattern of the hail and locusts; (infra [Isaiah] 34, 6) "And a great massacre in the land of Edom," corresponding to the plague of the first born. This system is true if this צִוֵּר is another city (Edom, Rome [Parshandatha]). If it is actually Tyre, because the sea inundated it, the prophet says about it, "Like the report concerning Egypt," and I say that the entire section, indeed, is talking about Tyre, because Zidon is near it. ([Other editions read:] And I say that the entire section is, indeed, talking about Tyre. Because Zidon is near it, he juxtaposes Zidon to it [Parshandatha].)¹⁹

18. Amalek was Esau's grandson (cf. Gn 36,12).

19. *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Isaiah* (as in note 16), pp. 184-185 (English transl. *ibid.*):

It is obvious that Rashi picks three terms of the Biblical verse and explains each of them in his typical manner. The first two explanations are typical of most of his commentaries: The Biblical expression is explained by rephrasing its content. To the first explanation it is added that the story relates to the ten plagues in Egypt. The third explanation illustrates the report by adducing several Biblical verses. The formulation in brackets gives a different wording of the last sentence.

The Latin rendering of that comment is much shorter and reads as follows:

Cum auditum fuerit de egypto dolebunt cum audierint de tyro [Is 23, 5]. [Glosa:] sicut auditum fuit de egypto quod percussi eos x plagis et in fine submersi sunt in mari ita terrebuntur cum audierint x plagas quas missurus sum super tyrum, si tyrus est roma, sanguinem et ignem et uocem tumultus ville sicut fuit plaga ranarum et conuertentur torrentes eius in picem et sulphur.

This version reads like putting together the first explanation and the first section of the third explanation. It is not clear whether the translator summarises Rashi or whether the comment used was as short as it appears. In any way, the emphasis of the translation lies on the equation of Egypt and Tyre which stands for Rome.

c) *Isaiah 24, 17*

¹⁷פַּחַד וּפְחַת וְנֶחַד עֲלֶיךָ יוֹשֵׁב הָאָרֶץ:

Fright and a pit and a trap [shall come] upon you, inhabitant of the land.

Two parts of this verse are explained briefly as follows:

Fright and a pit and a trap [shall come] upon you: upon the peoples dwelling in the land.
a pit: a hole in which to fall, as he goes on to state.²⁰

In the Latin version we find a different rendering that reads as follows:

כאשר שמע למצרים - אשר שמעו על מצרים שהבאתי עליהם עשר מכות וסוף טבעו בים
יחילו - יבהלו

כשמע - השומעים כשיצא שמע צור כי גם מכותיה של צור יהיו דוגמת אותן מכות דם ואש דוגמת מכת דם, קול שאון מעיר (לקמן ס"ו) זו קרקרו' הצפרדעים. ונהפכו נחליה לזפת ועפרה לגפרי' (לקמן לד) דוגמת מכת כניס. וירשוה קאת וקפוד דוגמת מכת ערוב. ונשפטתי אתו בדבר (יחזקאל ל"ח) דוגמת מכת דבר. המק בשרו (זכריה י"ד) דוגמת מכת שחין. וכרת הזוללים (לעיל י"ח) דגמת הברד והארבה. וטבח גדול בארץ אדום (לקמן ל"ד) כנגד מכת בכורות השיטה הזאת אם צור זו היא עיר אחרת ואם צור ממש לפי שכסה אותה הים הוא אומר עליה כאשר שמע למצרים ואני אומר שכל הענין מדבר בצו' העיר שהרי סמוך לה צידון.

20. *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Isaiah* (as in note 16), pp. 195-196 (English transl., p. 195):

פחד ופחת ופח עליו - על עמים יושבי הארץ
פחת - גומא ליפול בה כמו שמפרש ואומר

Formido et fouea et laqueus super te qui habitator es terre [Is 24, 17]. Glosa: hoc est super te esau qui modo dominaris, per edom et esau vbique in talmud significantur xristiani.

It seems that the translator picked the inhabitants of the earth and explicated them first with *super te esau* and than with his own comment *per edom et esau vbique in talmud significantur xristiani*, that was already alluded to. Noteworthy is that in this case the translator explicitly connects the explanation to the Talmud.²¹

d) Isaiah 24, 18

וְהָיָה הַיָּס מִקּוֹל הַפַּחַד יִפֹּל אֶל־הַפֶּחַת וְהָעוֹלָה מִתּוֹךְ הַפֶּחַת יִלְכַד בַּפֶּחַ כִּי־אֲרָבוֹת מִמְרוֹם נִפְתָּחוּ
וְיִרְעֲשׂוּ מוֹסְדֵי אֲרֶץ:

And it shall come to pass, that he who flees from the sound of the fright shall fall into the pit, and he who ascends from within the pit shall be snared in the trap, for windows from above have been opened and the foundations of the earth have trembled.

The first part of the explanation of Isaiah 24, 18, which reads as follows:

he who flees from the sound of the fright shall fall into the pit, etc.: Whoever escapes the sword of the Messiah the son of Joseph shall fall into the sword of the Messiah the son of David, and whoever escapes from there shall be snared in the trap of the wars of Gog.²²

is again rendered verbally into:

Et erit qui fugerit a facie formidinis cadet in foueam [Is 24, 18]. Glosa: qui euaserit gladium messie filii ioseph incidet in gladium messye filii dauid.

The second part is left out. Again it is likely that this part was missing in the manuscript used by the translator although it is also possible that he simply left it out.

e) Isaiah 27, 1

בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִפְקֹד יְהוָה בְּסוֹרְבוֹ הַקִּשְׁטָה וְהִגְדֹּלָה וְהַסּוֹזָה עַל לְוִיָּתָן נָחַשׁ בְּרִים וְעַל לְוִיָּתָן נָחַשׁ עֲקוּלָתוֹן
וְהָרַג אֶת־הַתַּנִּין אֲשֶׁר בַּיָּם:

21. See also above a (Is 12, 2).

22. *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Isaiah* (as in note 16), pp. 195-196 (English transl. *ibid.*):

הנס ממקול הפחד יפול אל הפחת וגו'. הנמלט מחרב משיח בן יוסף יפול אל חרב משיח בן דוד והנמלט משם ילכד בפח במלחמת גוג.

On that day, the Lord shall visit with His hard and great and strong sword on leviathan the barlike serpent, and upon leviathan the crooked serpent, and He shall slay the dragon that is in the sea.

On Isaiah 27, 1 today's version is divided into five segments:

on leviathan the barlike serpent: Jonathan renders: On the king who aggrandized himself like Pharaoh the first king, and upon a king who was as haughty as Sennacherib the second king. *קָרִיִּיָּהּ* is an expression of 'straight' like a bar, since he is the first. (The matter of simplicity is related to oneness. Since Pharaoh was the first great king, he is referred to as 'the barlike serpent,' a straight, penetrating serpent, that does not coil.) crooked: An expression of 'double,' since he is the second one. (I.e. the bend in the serpent indicates duality, thus the number two.) And I say that these are three important nations: Egypt, Assyria, and Edom. He, therefore, stated concerning these as he said at the end of the section (v. 13), "And those lost in the land of Assyria shall come, as well as those lost in the land of Egypt," and since the nations are likened to serpents that bite.

leviathan the barlike serpent: That is Egypt.

leviathan the crooked serpent: That is Assyria.

and He shall slay the dragon that is in the sea: That is Tzor that is the head of the children of Esau, and it is situated in the heart of the seas, and so Kittim are called the islands of the sea, and they are the Romans [according to certain manuscripts]. ([Some editions read:] They are the Greeks.)²³

Only the last part is translated as follows:

Et occidet cetum qui in mari est [Is 27, 1]. *Glosa*: hic est tyrus qui est caput domus esau et sedet in corde maris et roma similiter sedet in corde maris et insule maris dicuntur romani domus esau.

As already the translation indicates there are varieties in the manuscripts. Therefore I hold that the translator translates his *Vorlage* rather literally.

23. *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Isaiah* (as in note 16), p. 211 (English transl. *ibid.*):

על לוייתן נחש בריה וגו'. ת"י על מלכא דאתרברב כפרעה מלכא קדמאה ועל מלכא דאתגאי כסנחרב מלכא תנינא. בריה לשון פשוט כבריה הזה לפי שהוא ראשון
עקלתון - ל' כפול לפי שהוא שני ואומר אני לפי שאלו שלש אומות חשובות מצרים ואשור ואדום לכך אמר על אלו כמו שאמר בסוף הענין ובאו האובדים בארץ אשור והנדחים בארץ מצרים וע"ש שנמשלו עכו"ם ומזלות כנחשים הנושכים לוייתן נחש בריה הוא מצרים: לוייתן נחש עקלתון הוא אשור
והרג את התנין אשר בים. הוא צור שהוא ראש והוא יושבת בלב ימים וכן כתיים קרויים איי הים והן עכו"ם.

For the last sentence, the English translation, which records different manuscript traditions, translates the version given, e.g., by the Responsa Project, Version 24 Bar-Ilan University:

והרג את התנין אשר בים - היא צור שהיא ראש לבני עשו והיא יושבת בלב ימים וכן כתיים קרויים איי הים והן רומיים.

f) *Isaiah 33, 23*

נִשְׂאוּ חֲבֻלֵיךָ בְּלִי־חֲזָקוֹ כִּוְתַרְנָם בְּלִי־פְרָשׁוֹ גַּם אִם אָז חֲלַק עַד־שָׁלַל מִרְבֵּה פְסָחִים בְּזוֹ בּוֹ:²³
 Your ropes are loosed, not to strengthen their mast properly; they did not spread out a sail; then plunder [and] booty were divided by many; the lame takes the prey.

Rashi's comments on Isaiah 33, 23 are again seven very short remarks mostly consisting of one or two explanatory words:

Your ropes: that draw the ship, you sinful city. ([Mss. yield:] you, sinful Rome.)
 properly: prepared well.

a sail: Heb. סָג, the sail of a ship.

they did not spread out a sail: They will not be able to spread the sail that guides the boat.

then plunder [and] booty were divided: (עד) related to עֲדָאָה, plunder, in Aramaic.

by many: Many will divide the plunder of the heathens. ([Mss. yield:] the plunder of Edom.) ([Others:] the nations.) ([Still others:] Sennacherib.)

lame: Israel, who were weak until now.²⁴

Of these short explanations the translator picks two and renders them as follows:

Laxati sunt funiculi tui [Is 33, 23]. Glosa: funiculi tui roma peccatrix, et infra: claudi diripient rapinam [Is 33, 23]. Glosa: israel qui sunt quasi claudi, diripient predam tuam, per romam intelligunt ecclesiam.

The first explanation is clearly the one that the *Miqraot Gedolot* gives as a variant of the manuscripts; the second relates to the last explanation which seems to have been extended, using a comment by Rashi now lost. The underlined addition by the translator is again one that is known from other passages of the translation and equalises Rome with the Church.

g) *Isaiah 34, 5/35, 1*

גִּיּוֹרֹתַי בְּשָׁמַיִם חֲרָבֵי הַנֶּהַל עַל־אֲדוֹם תִּלְדוּ וְעַל־עַם חֲרָמֵי לְמִשְׁפָּט:⁵

24. *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Isaiah* (as in note 16), pp. 275-276 (English transl. *ibid.*):

נִשְׂאוּ חֲבֻלֵיךָ. הַמוֹשְׁכִים אֶת הַסְּפִינָה אֶת עִיר הַחַיִּיבַת {רוֹמֵי הַחַיִּיבַת}
 כֵּן. הַכֵּן הֵיטֵב
 תַּרְנֵם. תוֹרֵן הַסְּפִינָה
 בַּל פְּרָשׁוֹ נִס. לֹא יוֹכְלוּ לַפְרוֹס וַיִּלּוֹן הַמְנַהֵג אֶת הַסְּפִינָה
 אִז חוֹלֵק עַד שֶׁלֵּל. עֲדָאָה
 מִרְבֵּה. הַרְבֵּה יִחְלְקוּ שֶׁלֵּל הַעֲכוּ"ם {סַנְחַרִּיב}
 פְּסָחִים. {יִשְׂרָאֵל} שֶׁהוּ עַד עַכְשָׁיו חֲלָשִׁים

The variants here given in the curly brackets are from the Responsa Project, Version 24 Bar-Ilan University. I rely on the translator for the ulterior variants suggested in the translation.

For my sword has become sated in the heaven. Behold, it shall descend upon Edom, and upon the nation with whom I contend, for judgment.

אִישׁוּיִם מִדָּבָר וְצִיָּה וְתִגַּל עֲרָבָה וְתַפְרַח כְּתִבְצֵלָת׃¹

Desert and wasteland shall rejoice over them, and the plain shall rejoice and shall blossom like a rose.

Here, I change the order of my presentation and start with the Latin version that reads as follows:

Inebriatus est in celo gladius meus [Is 34, 5]. *Glosa*: quia nulla gens punietur hic inferius donec princeps eius, angelus qui ei preest, puniatur et postea populus sibi subditus punietur, et super destructionem edom et bosre, ecclesie, letabitur deserta inuia etc. [Is 35, 1] totum xxxiiij capitulum exponit de roma.

My sword has become sated in the heaven. Gloss: Because no people are punished here below, as long as his prince – i.e. the angel that rules them – becomes punished and afterwards the people that he has subjugated will be punished. And over the destruction of Edom and Bozrah, i.e. the Church, the desert will rejoice etc. – The whole 34th chapter talks about Rome.

There is only a thematic similarity with the explanation known to us as the standard version in *Miqraot Gedolot* that reads as follows:

[Is. 34, 5] For My sword has become sated in the heaven: To slay the heavenly princes, and afterward it shall descend on the nation Ishmael ([mss. and Kli Paz:] Edom) ([Warsaw ed.:] Babylonians) below, for no nation suffers until its prince suffers in heaven. the nation with whom I contend: (עַם הַרְמִי), the nation with whom I battle. This is a Mishnaic expression: (Keth. 17b) They taught this in connection with time of strife (הַרְמִי). Comp. (I Kings 20, 42) “The man with whom I contend (אִישׁ־הַרְמִי),” referring to Ahab. [Is. 35, 1] shall rejoice over them: (אִישׁוּיִם) This is usually the sign of the direct object, inappropriate here in the case of an intransitive verb. (like אִישׁוּיִם מֵהֶם, shall rejoice from them). Comp. (Jer. 10, 20) “My sons have gone away from me (אִישׁוּיִם)”. Also, (I Kings 19, 21) “He cooked the meat for them (בִּשְׁלָם),” equivalent to בִּשְׁלָם לָהֶם, “He cooked the meat for them”.

Desert and wasteland: Jerusalem, called ‘wasteland,’ and Zion, called ‘desert,’ they shall rejoice over the downfall of the mighty of the heathens and Persia ([Manuscripts yield:] of Edom and Bozrah). ([The Warsaw edition reads:] the mighty of Seir (and Bozrah).) and the plain shall rejoice: the plain of Jerusalem.²⁵

25. (Is 34, 5) *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Isaiah* (as in note 16), p. 278 (English transl. *ibid.*):

כי רותה בשמים חרבי - להרוג שרים של מעלה ואחר כך תרד על האומה ישמעאל למטה שאין כל אומה לוקה עד שילקה שר שלה במרום.

It seems that the translator had a different version.

h) Isaiah 63, 1

מִי־הוּא בָּא מֵאֶדוֹם תְּמוֹץ בְּגָדִים מִבְּצֻרָה זֶה הַדָּוָר בְּלִבּוֹשׁוֹ צִנְעָה בָּרַב כְּחוֹ אֲנִי מְדַבֵּר בְּצִדְקָה רַב לְהוֹשִׁיעַ:

Who is this coming from Edom, with soiled garments, from Bozrah, this one [Who was] stately in His apparel, girded with the greatness of His strength? "I speak with righteousness, great to save".

With the excerpt from the commentary on Isaiah 63, 1 we face a similar situation as before. The commentary is quite long and divided into four different sections, but it has no real equivalent to the Latin translation:

Who is this coming from Edom: The prophet prophesies concerning what the Holy One, blessed be He, said that He is destined to wreak vengeance upon Edom, and He, personally, will slay their heavenly prince, like the matter that is said (supra 34, 5), "For My sword has become sated in the heaven". And afterward, (ibid.) "it shall descend upon Edom," and it is recognizable by the wrath of His face that He has slain [them with] a great massacre, and the prophet is speaking in the expression of the wars of human beings, dressed in clothes, and when they slay a slaying, the blood spatters on their garments, for so is the custom of Scripture; it speaks of the Shechinah anthropomorphically, to convey to the ear what it can hear. Comp. (Ezek. 43, 2) "His voice is like the voice of many waters". The prophet compares His mighty voice to the voice of many waters to convey to the ear according to what it is possible to hear, for one cannot understand and hearken to the magnitude of the mighty of our God to let us hear it as it is.

Who is this coming from Edom: Israel says, "Who is this, etc.?" And He is coming with soiled garments, colored with blood, and anything repugnant because of its smell and its appearance fits to the expression of תְּמוֹץ, soiling.

from Bozrah: Our Rabbis said (see Makkoth 12a): "The heavenly prince of Edom is destined to commit two errors. He thinks that Bozrah is identical with Bezer in the desert, which was a refuge city. He will also err insofar as it affords refuge only for inadvertent murder, but he killed Israel intentionally". There is also an Aggadic midrash (see above 34, 6) that because Bozrah supplied a king for Edom when its first king died, as in Gen. (36, 33), "And Jobab the son of Zerah from Bozrah reigned in

עם חרמי - עם מלחמתי ל' משנה (כתובות יז) בשעת חירום שנו וכן (מלכים א כ) את איש חרמי דאהב (Is 35, 1) *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Isaiah* (as in note 16), pp. 282-283 (English transl. *ibid.*): ירושום. ישישו עליהם (כמו יושוו מהן) כמו (ירמיה י) בני יצאוני שפתרונו יצאו ממני וכן בשלם הבשר (מלכים א' יט) בשל להם הבשר

מדבר וציה. ירושלים הקרויה ציה וציון הקרויה מדבר הן יושוו על מפלתם של גבורי עובדי כוכבים ופרס ותגל ערבה. ערבתה של ירושלים

his stead,” and Bozrah is of Moab, according to the matter that is stated (Jer. 48, 24): “Upon Kerioth and upon Bozrah”.

this one: who was stately in His attire, צָנָה, and girded with the greatness of His strength. And the Holy One, blessed be He, replies to him, ‘It is I, upon Whom the time has come to speak of the righteousness of the Patriarchs, and of the righteousness of the generation of religious persecution, and My righteousness, too, is with them, and I have revealed Myself as being great to save.’ And they say, ‘Why is your clothing red? Why are your garments red?’²⁶

The Latin translation to that comment reads as follows:

Quis est iste qui venit de edom tinctis vestibus de bosra [Is 63, 1]. *Glosa*: israel querent hoc modo quia vestimenta dei tincta sanguine edom et bosre, et princeps rome, *Angelus ecclesie* errabit in tribus, credet enim quod bosra sit bosor in solitudine et in hoc errabit et eciam in hoc quod bosor non tuetur homines qui scienter occiderunt sed ignoranter et populus eius scienter israel interfecit, tercio in hoc errabit quod ciuitas illa ponita est in refugium non angelis sed hominibus.

Who is he who came from Edom with coloured clothing from Bozrah? Gloss: Israel asked that way because God’s clothing was coloured with the blood of Edom and Bozrah, and the prince of Rome, the Angel of the Church, erred in three things: [first,] he believed that Bozrah was Bezer in the desert and in that he erred, and [secondly] also in that that Bezer did not protect people [verbally: men] who knowingly murdered, but unwillingly, however his people killed Israel on purpose, thirdly he erred in that that this city offered shelter not to angels but to mankind.

It seems that the translation translates a different version from the third section which in itself is a rendering from bMakkot 12a, although it is also possible that he picked only those passages that fitted to his purpose.²⁷

26. *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Isaiah* (as in note 16), pp. 486-487 (English transl. *ibid.*):

מי זה בא מאדום. נתנבא הנביא על שאמר הקב"ה שעתיד לעשות נקמה באדום והוא עצמו בכבודו יהרג את שר שלהם תהלה כענין שנאמר כי רותה בשמים חרבי ואחר כך על אדום תרד ונכר בזעם פניו שהרגם הרג רב והנביא מדבר בלשון מלחמות בני אדם לבושי בגדים ובהרגם הרג הדם נתן על בגדיהם כי כן דרך הכתובים מדברים בשכינה כדרך בני אדם לשבר את האוזן מה שהיא יכולה לשמוע וכן וקולו כקול מים רבים דימה הנביא קול חזק שלו לקול מים רבים לשבר את האוזן כדרך שאפשר לה לשמוע שאין להבין ולהאזין ברוב גבורות אלהינו להשמיעה כמות שהיא מי זה בן מאשום. ישראל אומר מי זה וגו' ובא חמוץ בגדים צבועים בדם וכול דבר שהוא מתנאץ בדיחו ובמראיתו נופל בו ל' חימר

מבצרה, אמרו רבותינו (מכות י"ב ו) ושם איתא שלש) שתי טעיות עתיד שר של אדום לטעות כסבור הוא שבצרה היא בצר במדבר שהיתה עיר מקלט, וטועה משום שאין קולטת אלא שוגג והוא הרג את ישראל מזיד. ועוד יש מדרש אגדה על שהספיק בצרה מלך לאדום במות מלכה הראשון וימלך תחתיו יובב בן זרח מבצרה ובצרה ממואב היא כענין שנא' על קריות ועל בצרה זה. שהיה הדור בלבשו וצעה ונאור ברב כחו. והקב"ה משיבו אני הוא שעלתה לפני לדבר בצדקת האבות ובצדקת דורו של צרה וצדקתי גם היא עמהם ונגליתיה להיות רב להושיע והם אומרים מדוע אדום ללבושך מדוע בגדיך אדומים

27. I thank Ulisse Cecini for that suggestion.

j) *Isaiah 65, 11*

וְאַתֶּם עֲזַבְתֶּם אֶת־יְהוָה הַשֹּׁכֵחִים אֶת־הַר קְדוֹשֵׁי הָעֹרֵכִים לַגַּד שְׁלֵטָוֹן וְהִמְלֵאִים לִמְנֵי מִמְקָד:¹¹
 You who forsake the Lord, who forget My holy mount, who set a table for Gad and
 who fill mingled wine for a number.

Again the comment on Isaiah 65, 11 is fourfold and reads as follows:

who forsake the Lord: The wicked of Israel who adopted paganism and died in their wickedness.

who set a table for Gad: The name of a pagan deity on the name of the zodiac, and in the language of the mishnah, (Shabbath 67b) “May my fate be lucky (גַּד גְּדִי) and not fatigued”.

for a number: Heb. לִמְנֵי. According to the number of the computation of the priests, they would fill basins of mingled wine.

mingled wine: Heb. מִמְקָד, wine mingled with water as was customary. Comp. (Prov. 23, 30) “To search for mingled wine (מִמְקָד)”. Also (ibid. 9, 2), “She mingled (מִמְקָד) her wine”. Some interpret לִמְנֵי, to the pagan deities that you appointed (מְנִיחֵם) over yourselves, but וּמְנִיחֵי, which is not punctuated with a ‘dagesh,’ indicates that it is an expression of counting.²⁸

And again I do not find a parallel in the Latin translation:

Et vos qui dereliquistis dominum qui ponitis fortune mensam, et libatis super eam, hebreus qui implent domino mixturam [Is 65, 11]. Glosa: domino, i.e. monasterio, hoc est sancto quem sibi preposuerunt aut patronum fecerunt. Item alia glosa: qui implent domino mixturam secundum numerum hominum nam secundum numerum religiosorum implent vasa eorum vino, sed subiungit penam numerabo vos in gladio etc. [Is 65, 12].

And you, who forsake the Lord, who set a table for fate, and consecrate over it [the table], Hebrew: who fill mingled [wine] for the Lord. Gloss: the Lord, i.e. the monastery, that is the holy [one] that they put in charge or they made a patron. Also another gloss: who fill mingled [wine] for the Lord according to the number of people [literally: men]. In fact they filled a jar with wine according to the number of practicing [people], but he added a punishment: I will count you with the sword and so on [Is 65, 12].

28. *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Isaiah* (as in note 16), pp. 501-502 (English transl. *ibid.*):

עוזבי ה': רשעי ישראל שהחזיקו בעכו"ם ומתו ברשעם
 העורכים לגד. שם עכו"ם העשויים על שם המזל ובל' משנה יש גד גדי וסינוק לא
 למני. למניין חשבון הכומרים היו ממלאים אגנות מזג יין
 ממסך. יין מזוג במים כמשפטו כמו להקור ממסך (משלי כ"ג) מסכה יינה (שם ט') ויש פותרים למני לעכו"ם שמניתם עליכם
 אבל ומניתי אתכם שלא נקוד ומניתי דגש יורה שהוא לשון מניין

Nonetheless there is something remarkable in that excerpt: The Biblical verse ends verse with ‘et libatis super eam’, but now the translator adds ‘hebreus qui implent domino mixturam’, but it is not clear what is supplemented here. Does he want to say: *in hebraico* and give a – literally correct – variant reading for *qui dereliquistis dominum*?

k) Isaiah 66, 17

17 הַמְתַקְדָּשִׁים וְהַמְטַהְרִים אֶל־הַגְּנוֹת אַחַר (אֶחָד) [אֶחָת] בְּתוֹךְ אֲכָלֵי בֶשֶׂר הַחֲזִיר וְהַשְּׂקִזִּי וְהַעֲכָבֵר
יִהְיוּ יַסְפּוּ נְאֻם־יְהוָה:

“Those who prepare themselves and purify themselves to the gardens, [one] after another in the middle, those who eat the flesh of the swine and the detestable thing and the rodent, shall perish together”, says the Lord.

Also the last comment translated is fourfold in the standard version of Rashi’s comments and reads as follows:

Those who prepare themselves: Heb. הַמְתַקְדָּשִׁים. Those who prepare themselves, “Let you and me go on such-and-such a day to worship such-and-such an idol”.

to the gardens: where they plant vegetables, and there they would erect idols.

[one] after one: As Jonathan renders: a company after a company. They prepare themselves and purify themselves to worship, one company after its fellow has completed its worship.

in the middle: In the middle of the garden. Such was their custom to erect it.²⁹

In parts we find an equivalent in the Latin translation:

Qui sanctificabant et mundos se putabant in ortis etc. [Is 66, 17]. *Glosa*: qui se preparant et dicunt ad inuicem ego et tu ibimus illa die ad illam ecclesiam que sic vocatur, et preparant se vt vna societas veniat post aliam ego autem opera eorum et cogitationes eorum venio ut congregem cum omnibus gentibus et linguis [Is 66, 18] dicit dominus vermis eorum non morietur et ignis non extinguetur [Is 66, 24].

29. *Mikraoth Gedoloth: Isaiah* (as in note 16), p. 514 (English transl. *ibid.*):

המתקדשים. המזדמנים אני ואתה נלך ליום פלוני לעבוד עכו"ם פלונית אל הגנות. שזורעין שם ירק ושם היו מעמידין עכו"ם

אחר אחת. כמה שתירגם יונתן סיעה בתר סיעה מתקדשים ומטהרים לעבוד סיעה אחר שגמרה חבירתה את עבודתה בתוך. באמצע הגינה כן היה דרכם להעמידה

The first and the third section (the latter without the introduction) are translated and added by snippets of two further verses. Again it seems that the translator used a slightly different manuscript version.

III.

To conclude this brief survey: the number of excerpts is, admittedly, rather small and the translator covers only few of Rashi's comments. Nonetheless the translations themselves are quite interesting for various reasons.

Firstly, the translations of the Biblical texts do not always go with the Vulgate version – at least not with the version printed in Stuttgart. That means that the translator had the Hebrew Biblical text together with Rashi's comments at hand. Although he knew the Vulgate's text he was looking for a kind of *hebraica veritas*.

Secondly, in some cases we can give proof that the translator followed closely Rashi's text. In those cases he does not we have to ask: Did the translator have a different text? Did he skip some passages (of course, in some cases he seems to do)? Did he just summarise the argument? My preliminary conclusion is: He sometimes skipped passages in which he was not interested – as is the case with the translations from the Talmud³⁰ –, but in everything he translated he closely followed his *Vorlage*. Being that the case, we have an early witness for the state of Rashi's commentaries in c. 1240.³¹

Thirdly, the translator's glosses to Rashi's glosses do help readers from the middle ages to understand Rashi – at least, they were intended to do that. For us, these comments point to the circumstances and interest of the translator: He seems to have mainly looked for proof that Rashi wrote against Christianity and collected comments that contained notions and names such as Edom, Esau, Rome which were usually attributed to Christians and Christianity. But still we cannot explain the reason for his translations. Some excerpts might simply have caught his interest in the matter.

Finally, Rashi was a Jewish authority that Christians in the Paris of the 1240s had to know, as they had to know the Talmud or Maimonides.

30. See the articles by Óscar de la Cruz Palma, Ulisse Cecini, Alexander Fidora, and Isaac Lampurlanés in this volume.

31. The problem touched is that we do not really know which passages in Rashi's commentaries are "his" achievement and which are the additions by his students. See, e.g., René-Samuel SIRAT (Ed.), *Héritages de Rachi*, Paris; Tel Aviv, 2nd edition 2008; Devorah SCHOENFELD, *Isaac on Jewish and Christian Altars. Polemic and Exegesis in Rashi and the 'Glossa ordinaria'*, New York, 2013. All manuscripts with Rashi's comments are dated 13th century or later (see http://alhatolah.org/Commentators:R_Shelomo_Yitzchaki_%28Rashi%29/ManuscriptsandEditions [last visited on 25 July 2016]).

Appendix: *Glosse Salomonis in Isaiam*³²

The following edition is based on four manuscripts, none of them being the original one.³³

The oldest manuscript (*P*) is kept in the Bibliothèque nationale de France and seems to have been written in the middle of the 13th century. It is close to the original version. The scribe copied all marginal notes and references to the Biblical places and underlined all glosses which are added to Rashi's explanations. The marginal notes and the underlinings are here represented.

In the 17th century, the manuscript *P* was copied. The scribe of that manuscript (*M*)³⁴ is relatively careful, but sometimes inserted incorrect conjectures.

The other two manuscripts are a bit younger than *P* and represent a second tradition. Both seem to be copies of the hyparchetype of that second tradition. Both are of southern French origin. The manuscript from Carpentras (*C*) belonged to an Augustinian monastery in Aix³⁵ and was written towards the beginning of the 14th century and contains among others pieces from *Victoria Porcheti aduersus impios Hebreos*.³⁶ The manuscript from Girona (*G*) was copied together with Ockham's *Dialogi*; it therefore must also stem from the 14th century.³⁷ The manuscript might have been brought to Catalunya during the papacy of Pope Benedict XIII when he moved from Avignon to Penyiscola. Both manuscripts are closely related to each other but seem to be independent copies of the same *Vorlage*.

P = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. lat. 16558, fols. 224va-230rb, at 229rb-vb (13th century)

C = Carpentras, Bibliothèque municipale L'Inguimbertine, Ms. 153, fols. 74ra-76va, at 76ra-b (14th century)

G = Girona, Arxiu Capitular, Ms. 19b, fols. 79ra-81rb, at 81ra (14th century)

M = Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms. 1115, fols. 412r-421r, at 419v-420r (17th century)

32. I wish to thank Ulisse Cecini for his commentaries and corrections.

33. A final description of all manuscripts will be provided in the critical edition of the Latin Talmud that Ulisse Cecini and Óscar de la Cruz currently prepare.

34. For the edition of the Latin Talmud this manuscript has been given the siglum *Z*. Since in the other editions from Rashi this manuscript features as *M*, this siglum will be kept here.

35. See C. G. A. LAMBERT, *Catalogue descriptif et raisonné des manuscrits de la bibliothèque de Carpentras*, vol. 1, Carpentras, 1862, p. 85.

36. For further literature see Görge K. HASSELHOFF, "Die Drucke einzelner lateinischer Übersetzungen von Werken des Maimonides im 16. Jahrhundert als Beitrag zur Entstehung der modernen Hebraistik: Agostino Giustiniani und Sebastian Münster", in: Giuseppe Veltri/Gerold Necker (Eds.), *Gottessprache in der philologischen Werkstatt: Hebraistik vom 15. bis 19. Jahrhundert*, Leiden/Boston, 2004, pp. 169-188, at pp. 175-176 and 187.

37. The manuscript was described by José María MILLÁS VALLICROSA, "Extractos del Talmud y alusiones polémicas en un manuscrito de la Biblioteca Catedral de Gerona", in: *Sefarad* 20 (1960), pp. 17-49, and by Alexander FIDORA, "Die Handschrift 19b des Arxiu Capitular de Girona. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des lateinischen Talmud", in: Claudia Alraun *et al.* (Eds.), *Zwischen Rom und Santiago. FS Klaus Herbers*, Bochum, 2016, pp. 49-56. Both authors did not take into account that Ockham's treatise was copied on the same material.

yes. xii Nota	[P 229rb C 76ra G 81ra M 419v] Fortitudo ³⁸ et laus mea dominus etc. ³⁹ [Is 12, 2]. <u>Glosa:</u> nomen domini modo dimidiatum est, <u>non enim est ibi pro ezonay</u> ⁴⁰ nisi ia ⁴¹ , sed ad ruinam esau et generis sui, <u>xristianorum</u> , reintegrabitur ⁴² .
ys. 23	Cum auditum fuerit de egypto dolebunt cum audierint de tyro [Is 23, 5]. [Glosa:] sicut auditum [P 229va] fuit de egypto quod percussi eos x plagis ⁴³ et in fine submersi sunt in mari ita terrebutur cum audierint x plagas quas missurus sum super tyrum, si tyrus ⁴⁴ est roma, sanguinem et ignem et uocem tumultus ville sicut fuit plaga ranarum et conuertentur torrentes eius in picem et sulphur.
Nota ys. 24	Formido et fouea et laqueus ⁴⁵ super te qui habitator es terre [Is 24, 17]. <u>Glosa:</u> hoc est super te esau qui modo dominaris, <u>per edom et esau vbique in talmud significantur xristiani</u> .
	Et erit qui fugerit a facie formidinis cadet in foueam [Is 24, 18]. <u>Glosa:</u> qui euaserit ⁴⁶ gladium messie filii ioseph incidet in gladium messye filii dauid.
Nota ys. 27	Et occidet cetum ⁴⁷ qui in mari est [Is 27, 1]. <u>Glosa:</u> hic ⁴⁸ est tyrus qui ⁴⁹ est caput domus esau et sedet in corde maris et roma similiter sedet in corde maris et ⁵⁰ [M 420r] insule maris dicuntur romani ⁵¹ domus esau.
ys. 33 Nota	Laxati ⁵² sunt funiculi tui [Is 33, 23]. <u>Glosa:</u> funiculi tui roma peccatrix, <u>et infra:</u>
	claudi diripient rapinam [Is 33, 23]. <u>Glosa:</u> israel qui sunt quasi claudi, diripient predam tuam, [C 76rb] <u>per romam intelligunt ecclesiam</u> .
Nota ys. 34	Inebriatus ⁵³ est in celo gladius meus [Is 34, 5]. <u>Glosa:</u> quia nulla gens punietur hic inferius donec princeps eius, <u>angelus qui ei</u> ⁵⁴ <u>preest</u> , puniatur et postea populus sibi subditus punietur, et super destruccionem edom et bosre ⁵⁵ , <u>ecclesie</u> , letabitur deserta ⁵⁶ inuia etc. [Is 35, 1] totum xxxiiij ⁵⁷ capitulum exponit de roma.

38. C G add. mea

39. C G dicit

40. C eronay G edonay

41. M ya

42. C retegrabitur G corr. ex retegrabitur

43. C plagiis

44. C G ty

45. C laqus

46. M euasit

47. G corr. ex setum

48. C hoc

49. P que

50. P M om. et roma ... maris et

51. C G roma

52. C G lazari

53. P Inobriatus

54. C G enim

55. C b̄es vosre

56. C G cum Vg. add. et

57. P xxxiiij

Nota ys. 63	Quis est iste qui venit de ⁵⁸ edom tinctis ⁵⁹ vestibus ⁶⁰ de bosra ⁶¹ [Is 63, 1]. <u>Glosa</u> : israel querent hoc modo quia ⁶² vestimenta dei tincta sanguine edom et bosre, [P 229vb] et princeps rome, <u>Angelus ecclesie</u> errabit in tribus, credet enim quod bosra sit bosor in solitudine et in hoc errabit et eciam in hoc quod bosor non tuetur homines qui scienter occiderunt sed ignoranter et populus eius scienter israel interfecit, tercio in hoc errabit quod ciuitas illa ponita est in refugium non ⁶³ angelis sed hominibus.
Nota ys. 65	Et vos qui dereliquistis ⁶⁴ dominum qui ponitis fortune mensam, et libatis ⁶⁵ super eam, <u>hebreus</u> qui implent ⁶⁶ domino mixturam [Is 65, 11]. <u>Glosa</u> : domino, i.e. ⁶⁷ monasterio, hoc est sancto ⁶⁸ quem sibi preposuerunt aut patronum fecerunt. <u>Item</u> ⁶⁹ <u>alia</u> ⁷⁰ <u>glosa</u> : qui implent ⁷¹ domino mixturam ⁷² secundum numerum hominum nam secundum numerum religiosorum implent vasa eorum ⁷³ vino, sed subiungit penam numerabo vos in gladio etc. [Is 65, 12].
Nota ys. 66	Qui ⁷⁴ sanctificabant et mundos se putabant ⁷⁵ in ortis ⁷⁶ etc. ⁷⁷ [Is 66, 17]. <u>Glosa</u> : qui ⁷⁸ se preparant et dicunt ad inuicem ⁷⁹ ego et tu ibimus illa die ad illam ecclesiam que sic vocatur, et preparant se vt vna societas veniat post aliam ego autem ⁸⁰ opera eorum et ⁸¹ cogitationes eorum venio ut congregem cum omnibus gentibus et linguis [Is 66, 18] dicit ⁸² dominus vermis eorum non morietur et ignis ⁸³ non extinguetur ⁸⁴ [Is 66, 24].

58. C G ad

59. P cunctis

60. P C ve. G ves

61. P C bos. G corr. ex bos

62. C add. videbunt videbunt G add. videbuntur videbunt

63. P nec

64. M reliquistis

65. C G bibitis

66. P inpleuit

67. M in

68. C santo

69. C G in

70. C G vasa

71. M implent

72. C misturam

73. C G add. vasa

74. M Quia

75. M deputabant

76. M hortis

77. Om. C

78. C G quasi

79. C G add. et

80. C G in

81. Om. C G

82. G dixit

83. P ig.

84. C G P extin.