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Abstract

This thesis investigates an aspect of the first complete translation of the Bible into French. It shows how the study of the Gospels glosses, hitherto considered of secondary importance by scholars, increases our understanding of the date and context of this translation.

This thesis takes two complementary approaches to the gloss material: (a) a study of the likely Latin sources for these glosses, and (b) an investigation into their recurring themes and rhetorical construction, as a way of showing how far they fit into the tradition of Latin exegesis.

Chapter one surveys existing scholarship and presents the methodology of the thesis. Chapter two is a handlist of Latin commentaries consulted. In chapters three to six, the main body of the thesis, a comparison is made between Latin gloss material from these commentaries and corresponding glosses in the French Gospels. Chapter seven presents the broad patterns which have emerged from this study, discussing the use of material and rhetorical techniques, as well as identifying remaining problems, namely, those of other types of source-text, and the question of multiple translators.
Chapter eight contains a summary of the conclusions reached, and discusses the implications of these for our knowledge of this Bible translation. The glossator is revealed as someone with access to exegesis from several different traditions, not just commentaries, and as a person trained in Latin commentary technique, which he adapted for writing in the vernacular. The glossator is shown not to have copied literally from commentaries or other texts, but to have used material thoughtfully, and reworked it for his own purposes. That the glossator was learned, and that his glosses fit into the Latin exegetical tradition, are the major findings of this thesis, challenging previously-held views as to the fundamental worthlessness of these glosses.
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It would be good to be able to begin this thesis with some generally acknowledged truth about the thirteenth-century French Bible, such as it was translated in the year \( X \), by \( Y \), at \( Z \). No such statement can be made, however. The known facts about this Bible fit into a few lines; it was first treated as a single, coherent translation by Berger in 1884\(^1\); it seems to have been made some time in the thirteenth century\(^2\), probably in northern France\(^3\), and was probably translated from the Vulgate\(^4\). The earliest extant manuscript containing part of it is Paris, BN fonds fr.899, also known as the De Thou Bible, which has been variously dated c. 1250\(^5\), c.1260\(^6\), and c.1280\(^7\). The questions raised by the text, 'what is it?', 'who wrote it?', 'when?', 'where?', 'why?' and 'for whom?' remain largely unresolved\(^8\).

Different parts of the translation have been studied at different times by different people. Berger, building on the clues provided by Reuss\(^9\), seems to have been the first to discuss BXIII in depth. Indeed it was Berger in *La Bible Française au Moyen Âge* (Paris 1884) who christened this translation the 'Bible du treizième siècle', shortened for convenience to BXIII by Robson\(^10\). Next, there followed critical editions of Tobit\(^11\), Judith\(^12\) and St Mark's Gospel\(^13\), all of which remain unpublished, and work by De Poerck on Bible translations.
before 1300. Robson looked at the translation for his article in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* (Cambridge 1969), and Sneddon prepared a critical edition of the Gospels (also unpublished) for his thesis. The most recent addition to BXIII studies has been the critical edition of Genesis by Quereuil, published in 1988.

All these scholars looked at the text from slightly different points of view. Berger, Robson and De Poerok considered the translation as a whole and tried to find internal evidence for dating and authorship. Sneddon and Quereuil edited different parts of the text and, by comparing different manuscript copies and examining the manuscript traditions involved, tried to find answers to the same questions as the earlier researchers. Yet such studies of the internal evidence of the text done so far have resulted in very little agreement amongst scholars, although it is striking that both Sneddon and Quereuil regard the text of Paris, BN fonds fr.899 to be secondary and do not use it as their base manuscript. This presumably means that Sneddon and Quereuil believe that the original text is not the one found in the oldest extant manuscript (Paris, BN fonds fr.899) which in turn implies that the Gospels and Genesis at least, and perhaps all of BXIII, are older than the dating of the oldest extant manuscript would suggest. Not only is more internal evidence needed before more can be known about BXIII, but we should also consider the role of external evidence, and assess what this can tell us too.
external evidence has already been brought to bear on BXIII; Berger tried to use what we know about events in Paris in 1239 to help establish a *terminus ad quem*, and Sneddon has tried to apply the 1242 ruling of the Dominican chapter general to the question of who produced BXIII, and for whom it was produced.

A detailed study of the glosses in BXIII, as undertaken here, is one way of amassing both more internal and more external evidence, in such ways as the following:

(a) There has been a certain amount of debate as to whether BXIII was conceived of and executed as a single, coherent project (which is what Berger and Sneddon, for example, believe) or whether it was, to quote Robson, a 'publishing venture' which brought existing translations together, filled in the gaps, and thus produced a complete French Bible from both new and existing separate parts. This would be a parallel process to that which produced the *Bible Historiale completée* from BXIII and Guiart des Moulins's *Bible Historiale* at the beginning of the fourteenth century. A study of the glosses, in those BXIII books which are glossed, of the techniques and rhetoric used, and of the types of lemma and themes commonly glossed, would help identify whether the glosses were written with any underlying principles and intentions in mind. If this should prove to be so, then it would be evidence to support the 'single, coherent project' theory; if the opposite should prove to be the
case, then we might feel that this suggested rather a 'publishing venture'. Furthermore, studying the glosses, identifying similarities and differences in the glosses from book to book, or section to section, may help identify passages likely to be the work of a different translator, and any consequent difference in intentions in glossing. This is one way in which studying the glosses in BXIII would give us more valuable internal evidence.

(b) Another way in which the glosses would provide more external evidence is through a study of their Latin sources. This presupposes that it would be possible to identify direct sources, which is problematic. Unless the Old French gloss is close enough to the Latin material to be considered a translation, describing a Latin commentary or other text as a direct source would be extremely difficult. However, Sneddon believes that it is possible to identify sources, and if this could be done, it might help with the problem of dating BXIII. If, for example, it could be shown that the commentaries by the Dominican exegete Hugh of St Cher were a source used by the BXIII glossator, then this would mean that BXIII could not have been produced before these commentaries, themselves dated to 1230-36. Arguments the other way, e.g. if Hugh's commentaries can be shown not to have been used, are arguments from silence and would not necessarily suggest that BXIII predates Hugh.
(c) Another way in which identifying the source commentaries may provide external evidence is that they may all be shown, for example, to be by Dominican commentators. If this turned out to be the case, it might be evidence in support of Sneddon's hypothesis that BXIII was produced by Dominicans.

To find out more about BXIII, and to come closer to answering the six questions posed by the text and outlined above, we need to maximize both the evidence which can be gleaned from the text itself and any external evidence which might shed light on BXIII. One way of doing this is by studying the glosses; and such a study is the focus of this thesis.

As stated above, then, the student of BXIII is faced with six key questions: 'what is it?', 'who wrote it?', 'when?', 'where?', 'why?' and 'for whom?'. The question 'when' is in part dependent on the 'what is it' one.

I La Bible française du treizième siècle

By general consensus, the earliest extant dateable manuscript containing any part of this translation is Paris BN MS fonds fr.899, dated c.1250 by Berger, c.1260 by Branner and c.1280 by Robson. The earliest dated manuscript containing any part of BXIII is Paris BN MS fonds fr.12581, which has a copy of the Gospels;
another of the texts it contains, the Trèsor of Brunetto Latini, is dated 1284. Complete surviving copies of BXIII are of a later date. The two earliest of these are the two-volume BL MS Harley 616 and MS Yates Thompson 9, and the now single-volume New York Pierpont Morgan Library MS M 494, both of which date from the end of the thirteenth century. We can be moderately certain that the Gospels were completed by 1284. Sneddon believes that Paris BN MS fonds fr.12581 was written by two scribes, both of whom worked on the Gospels, with the implication that the colophon on the Trèsor is acceptable for the complete manuscript. The complete Bible would seem to have existed by the end of the thirteenth century.

If we go by the dates suggested for the earliest extant manuscript, Paris BN MS fonds fr.899, then a terminus ad quem of c.1250-80 may or may not hold for the translation as a whole. This depends very much on the view taken of the text, and there are two possibilities here.

Berger believes that BXIII can be seen as a single, coherent project; that is, as a single enterprise undertaken by several translators working in a workshop or scriptorium under supervision. This is a plausible hypothesis; Smalley considers that it was not unusual for the mendicant orders to work in teams on the production of a text, and cites Hugh of St Cher's postills on the Bible as an example. If the mendicant orders worked in
teams, presumably other people did too. Only part of the translation, however, is found in the earliest manuscript, and this raises questions as to the status of that copy. Paris BN MS fonds fr.899 could be an originally complete but now mutilated copy of BXIII, or it could be an abridged version, or it could represent an early stage in the compilation of the text. Sneddon has collated this manuscript and has shown that all the books which are now missing could have been present originally; he attributes its present incomplete state to 'physical mutilation'. However, as complete books are missing, the possibility that it is an abridged or incomplete early version cannot be dismissed.

If we accept Berger's view of the text, that it is a single, coherent project, then the dating of Paris BN MS fonds fr.899 can be seen as providing a terminus ad quem for the whole of BXIII. Robson, however, does not accept this view of the text. He considers BXIII to be a 'publishing venture', whereby existing translations of the different books of the Bible were brought together over a period of years 'in the second or third quarter of the century', beginning with the Ootateuch and the Gospels and finally completed some time between 1280 and 1300. This presupposes that Robson was satisfied that he knew exactly which books were included in the completed BXIII. For him Paris BN MS fonds fr.899 reflects this compilation, being an early stage in the development of what was to become the completed BXIII.
towards the end of the century. For Robson, the dating of Paris BN MS fonds fr. 899 provides a *terminus ad quem* for only those books of the Bible that it contains, and not for the rest.

Thus: the *terminus ad quem* for all or part of BXIII seems to depend on the dating of Paris BN MS fonds fr. 899. Berger seems finally to accept c. 1250, in spite of arguing for 1239 at one point. The art historian Branner dates it to c. 1260, and Sneddon accepts this date as his *terminus ad quem* for the translation. Robson dates this manuscript c. 1280, which date he takes as his *terminus ad quem* for those books it contains, with 1280-1300 as his *terminus ad quem* for the rest, given that the earliest complete manuscripts, BL MS Harley 616 and Yates Thompson 9, plus New York Pierpont Library MS M 494, are dateable to the late thirteenth century, and that Paris BN MS fonds fr. 12581, which contains a copy of the Gospels, is actually dated 1284.

A working *terminus ad quem* for this thesis depends on the paleographical evidence of the early manuscripts, especially Paris BN MS fonds fr. 899. Not being a paleographer myself, I must depend on the work of other, more qualified, scholars as outlined above. This gives a *terminus ad quem* of c. 1250-80 for at least those books of the Bible in Paris BN MS fonds fr. 899 including the Gospels for which independent evidence for a *terminus ad*
quem also exists, and one of c.1250-1300 which is plausible for the rest.

There is very little evidence for a *terminus a quo* for the translation. Clues which do exist are the recension of the Vulgate that BXIII was translated from, and the system of chaptering that has been used for it.

It is generally agreed⁴⁶ that BXIII was made from the early thirteenth-century Parisian recension of the Vulgate. It is important, therefore, for a *terminus a quo* for BXIII, to be satisfied as to the probable date of this Vulgate recension. Berger, taking literally a comment by Roger Bacon writing in 1266 that the Parisian recension of the Vulgate was carried out some forty years earlier⁴⁷, suggests 1226 as a date for this text. Sneddon does not take Roger Bacon literally here⁴⁸. His view as to the date of this recension is based on the fact that it had Langton chaptering, and he writes 'this recension ... is more prudently dated between 1206, when Langton ceased teaching in Paris, and 1231, the date of Paris, Mazarine 29, the earliest known dated manuscript⁴⁹. The use of Langton chaptering is certainly one of the features by which a copy of the Parisian recension of the Vulgate may be identified⁵⁰. However, Light has noted that early copies of this recension did not use the Langton chapters within the text, but used old chaptering systems instead, with the Langton chapters frequently marked in the margins⁵¹. As
she says, 'Il est malheureusement très difficile de
déterminer si ces indications sont d'origine, ou si elles
ont été ajoutées ensuite.'22. She believes that 'Dans
certains cas cependant, il est probable qu'on les a
ajoutées très tôt,'23 giving Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 70,
a glossed Bible which she believes is dateable on
stylistic grounds 'des vingt premieres années du
siècle,'24 as an example of one copy in which she
believes the Langton chapters 'sont d'origine.'25 Her
next example is Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 5, a probably
English Bible dating before 1231, which she believes 'est
egalement un bon exemple de cohabitation d'un ancien et
du nouveau système.'26 These comments would all seem to
suggest that the earliest copies of the Paris recension
did not use Langton chaptering as part of the text. If
this suggestion is accepted, it follows that the Parisian
recension may pre-date Langton's chapters, which
themselves can be dated towards the end of his teaching
period, that is, towards 120627. Langton's chaptering,
however, was adopted at an early stage in the text's
history. How early is attested by Light's examples; she
believes the Langton chaptering to be an original part of
a French copy dating from the first twenty years of the
century and this would suggest that the Langton
chaptering had been adopted into the Parisian Vulgate by
c.1220. Langton chaptering must certainly have been
adopted some years before 1231, by which date it had
crossed the English Channel. Light's evidence suggests
that in Sneddon's dating of the Paris recension to
between 1206 and 1231, 1231 is too late. The fact that the early copies of the Parisian recension used older chaptering systems in the text suggests that this recension may pre-date Langton's chapters, and that the date of 1206 may be too late and should be earlier. The fact that his chapters are part of a copy of the Parisian recension dating between 1200 and 1220 suggests that 1231 is too late. It would seem prudent in the light of this to suggest a date of between 1200 and 1220 for the Parisian recension of the Vulgate. This would give a terminus a quo of c.1200 for BXIII.

It would probably be worthwhile, however, to check other Vulgate recensions which could have been used for BXIII as there is a small amount of evidence which suggests that it may not have been translated from the Parisian Vulgate. Berger has pointed out that there are differences between the BXIII Psalter and the Parisian Vulgate Psalter, especially in that there are discrepancies in the way material is separated into individual psalms. Furthermore, the Strasbourg manuscript known to Reuss but destroyed in 1870 would seem not to have had Parisian Vulgate chaptering, i.e. Langton chaptering, although Berger thinks this underpins the text. Langton chaptering was certainly in circulation by the 1220s, and the suspicion must be that any Bible not having Langton chaptering pre-dates it. We can add to this the knowledge that Glunz and Haarstrup have, admittedly on limited data, shown links
between the text used for twelfth-century glossed Bibles and the Parisian Vulgate text; as Light says 'Bien que préliminaires, les travaux publiés d'Haarstrup laissent néanmoins entendre que le lien postulé par Glunz entre le texte glose et celui qu'on trouve dans les Bibles du XIIIe siècle est important.' Given this, and given the presence in BXIII of glosses, it seems necessary to wonder how far scholars have proven conclusively that BXIII was translated from the Parisian Vulgate. The suspicion must be that BXIII resembles the Parisian Vulgate because they are both based on the same text themselves. To the best of my knowledge, no one has ever compared BXIII to anything other than the Parisian recension of the Vulgate. Given that there is a suspicion, be it only a faint one, that BXIII may not always have had Langton chaptering, a comparison with the twelfth-century text used for the Glossa Ordinaria would seem of value.

Sneddon believes that another theoretically possible candidate for the source of BXIII may be the Vulgate revision carried out by Hugh of St Cher. Berger dates this revision to c.1248-56, and accepting his terminus ad quem of c.1250, it would have been produced too late to have been the source for BXIII. For Sneddon, with a terminus ad quem of c.1260, it is just about possible that it was Hugh of St Cher's revision that was used for BXIII. As no one has, yet, compared BXIII with this recension, we are in no position to come to any
conclusions as to how alike they are. Sneddon has not
tested this hypothesis, and has, in fact, expressed
himself 'satisfied in general that a Parisian thirteenth-
century Latin Bible is the source of BXIII'\textsuperscript{67}. All the
evidence to date is for the Parisian recension, and given
this it is probably safe to reject a \textit{terminus a quo} of
\textit{c.1256}, which is what we would have if Hugh of St Cher's
revision had been used.

Robson rejects Berger's \textit{terminus a quo} as being far too
early, believing that the 'movement leading to the
constitution of BXIII belongs to the latter half of the
century'\textsuperscript{68}. However, he seems here to be confusing the
dating of the text with the dating of the manuscript
(Paris, BN fonds fr. 899) and it is as well to quote him
in full\textsuperscript{69}:

Of the various abridged bibles and selections
from the Old Testament described above, only
two were known to Berger in 1884, the Acre
Bible and the De Thou Bible, and both of these
he seriously misdated. Unaware of the near
eastern origins of the former, he was baffled
by the costumes depicted in the Byzantine
miniatures, and attributed them, for want of a
better explanation, to direct imitation of lost
Carolingian prototypes; he placed this
manuscript around the year 1200, and regarded
the De Thou Bible as contemporary with the
Latin bible of the Paris Dominicans, \textit{fonds
latin} 16719-22, \textit{c.1250}. He dated BXIII soon
after the Parisian revision of the Vulgate in
1226, and assumed that the De Thou Bible was a
subsequent abridgement of it. The whole of this
chronology is unacceptable since the researches
of Vitzthum and his successors on Parisian and
non-Parisian manuscript decoration; whereas the
Acre Bible is dated \textit{c.1250-4}, the whole of the
remaining corpus of material under discussion is
not earlier than \textit{c.1280}. 
His thinking runs as follows: Berger has 1226 as a terminus a quo for BXIII with Paris, BN fonds fr. 899 as an abridged copy; paleographical evidence suggests that Paris, BN fonds fr. 899 is much later than this; therefore 1226 is far too early to be a terminus a quo for BXIII. The paleographical evidence of the earliest manuscript provides no evidence for the terminus a quo for the text it contains and Robson himself proposes no more precise date than 'the latter half of the century'.

To summarize: the terminus a quo for BXIII is dependent on the dating of the Parisian recension of the Bible, which Berger dates to 1226 (his terminus a quo for BXIII) and Sneddon to 1206–31, which presumably implies a terminus a quo of 1231. Light's more recent evidence on the Parisian recension seems to suggest a date between 1200 and 1220 for this text, which in turn implies a terminus a quo of c. 1200–20 for BXIII.

The dating of BXIII, then, would seem to be as follows: a terminus ad quem of anywhere between 1250 and 1280 for those books of the Bible in Paris BN MS fonds fr. 899, and of anywhere between 1250 and 1300 for the rest, and a later possible terminus a quo of c. 1220, c. 1226, c. 1231 and 'the latter half of the century'. Taking the latest possible dates suggests that some of the books in BXIII were written any time between c. 1220 and c. 1280, and that the rest were written between c. 1220 and 1300.
One way of refining these dates is through the external evidence which a study of the sources of the glosses would provide. The glosses in Genesis are, by general consensus, from the Glossa Ordinaria, although the very fact that Quereuil would seem to have identified patristic sources for some of the Genesis glosses suggests that the Genesis glossator did not use a single source for his glosses. It remains to be seen whether these patristic sources were used directly or not. Some of the Gospel glosses also seem to be from the Glossa Ordinaria. Sneddon compared the Gospel glosses to the Glossa Ordinaria, the Historia Scholastica, and the Gospel commentaries by Hugh of St Cher, and came to the conclusion that "it seems to me probable that Hugh is a source for the BXIII Gospels." Hugh's commentary on the Bible has been dated to 1230-676, and it is this which leads Sneddon to suggest a terminus a quo of c.1235 for BXIII. If Hugh's commentaries were used for the BXIII Gospel glosses, then Berger's terminus a quo of 1226, plus a terminus a quo of c.1220, would both be too early. Robson's later dating remains possible still.

Sneddon's suggestion is, however, arguable and in his notes to his edition he recognizes this. Something which needs to be considered is the interminable 'who copied whom' of the thirteenth century. An important question raised by Smalley is that of the originality of Hugh's commentaries. Her own work on some of his Old Testament commentaries has shown that they are
essentially compilations, and that for these Hugh used both the *Glossa Ordinaria* and the Fathers, complemented with extracts from twelfth- and thirteenth-century commentators, listed by Smalley as the Victorines, Peter the Chanter, the *Historia Scholastica*, Stephen Langton and William of Auvergne. Nor does she think this list is an exhaustive one. Her more recent work on the Gospels showed that for these Hugh used, as well as Peter the Chanter and Peter Comestor already listed, her anonymous commentator 'B', St John Chrysostom, John Scot Erigena, Gilbert de la Porée, Bernard and Pseudo-Bernard and St Anselm of Canterbury. Sneddon may well have shown that there are similarities between the BXIII Gospel glosses and Hugh's postills; however, given Hugh's own wide range of sources, these similarities may be due to some shared source thus:

```
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or sources:
The most that Sneddon's admittedly cursory check of the BXIII Gospel glosses against Hugh does is to indicate that there would seem to be identifiable sources which might help date BXIII. If this present study of the glosses succeeds in identifying direct sources, then it could add valuable information to this debate on date.

The next question to consider is: 'who wrote it?'

As a translation of the Vulgate, BXIII is very uneven and it is almost certainly true that different parts of it were translated by different people, perhaps on a book by book, or part by part basis. Berger accounts for this by suggesting that BXIII was produced by a team of translators working in a scriptorium or workshop under supervision. He sees the existence of two copies of the Epistle to Titus copied consecutively in some BXIII manuscripts, namely Brussels Bibliothèque royale MSS 10516 and 9634, and Paris BN MS fonds fr.6258, as proof of this supervision. He believes that this shows that the supervisor was unhappy with the first translation, and ordered that it be done again. However, the Epistle to Titus which occurs second in these manuscripts is actually that which is found in other BXIII manuscripts, and Sneddon believes this is the earlier in terms of date. For him, the Epistle which occurs first in these manuscripts represents a later addition. Even without a supervisor, Berger's idea of teamwork is a
sound one; this is how Hugh of St Cher's postills may have been produced.

Robson is silent on the question of the authorship of BXIII. Given that he believes BXIII to be a collection of translations, he presumably supports a multiple-authorship theory but says nothing as to who the individual translators might have been. He is equally silent on the possible identity of the editors responsible for bringing together existing translations and commissioning new ones. For him they are 'anonymous editors financed by a group of stationers'.

Berger's belief that BXIII was produced by a team of translators, plus Smalley's belief that the mendicants produced texts in teams, plus Sneddon's belief that Hugh of St Cher is a possible source for the Gospel glosses, lead Sneddon to try and link the production of this Bible with the Dominicans. A further piece of evidence for this hypothesis, cited by Sneddon, is the ruling of the Dominican chapter general in 1242, which ordered the friars not to get involved in the affairs of Dominican nuns and tertiaries and not to translate Latin Holy Scripture into the vernacular. The very fact that such translation is prohibited suggests that it was happening or had been happening, although it gives us no idea as to which texts were being translated and we can have no idea if any of them survive. This evidence leads Sneddon to speculate that BXIII was translated by a team of
Dominicans some time around 1235, for the benefit of Dominican nuns and tertiaries. Again, if the present thesis identifies direct sources, and these turn out to be predominantly Dominican, then we would have evidence supporting Sneddon's suggestion.

Even if this study does not allow us to pinpoint any particular group of people as being likely to have been responsible for BXIII, it should still give us valuable information about authorship. Any study of how the glossator used Latin material in his glosses, whether he used this directly or not, may identify a system of glossing. Once such a system of glossing has been identified, places where it seems to break down or change could also be found, thus helping to suggest the work of a different person. Even if we find evidence of the work of different translators/glossators, the glossing may be coherent enough within books to suggest agreement on what the role is of the glosses. Once we know this for any book, it gives us information to compare with other books, perhaps allowing us to add to the debate over whether BXIII was a single, coherent text or not. A study of the glosses may also give us information on the translator/glossator, and help to place him in a wider, thirteenth-century, context, and assess his background and level of learning.

There is no doubt that BXIII was translated by more than one person. Berger has pointed out that BXIII is 'mélee
et inégalé' and that sometimes the translation 'parait l'œuvre d'un homme de talent, tantôt d'un scribe sans mérite' . The fact that several translators worked on BXIII could reflect either a group of translators all working in the same place on a single project, or might suggest BXIII is a series of translations of individual books which have been brought together to form a whole.

Berger and Sneddon, believing in the essential unity of BXIII, believe it was produced by a team of translators. For Berger, this team is working under supervision, in the University; Sneddon would not wish to exclude the possibility of Dominican involvement. Robson has nothing to say about what for him would be the translators of the individual books forming BXIII, and those responsible for its compilation remain 'anonymous editors financed by a group of stationers' .

Evidence from the glosses may be useful here, in that identifying the sources will help confirm or undermine the theory of Dominican authorship. Nor is it inconceivable that these sources, once identified, will suggest a different group of authors.

The next question that needs to be addressed is: 'where?'.

Robson and Berger, with their different views as to the composition of BXIII ('publishing venture' as opposed to
'single, coherent project'), agree that BXIII may have had its origins in Paris. For Robson, BXIII was 'financed by a group of stationers in Paris or Picardy'\textsuperscript{105}, while Berger is keen to situate the translation of BXIII in Paris; Sneddon agrees with the latter opinion.

Berger's evidence for BXIII having been produced in Paris is based on the language of Paris, BN MS fonds fr.899, of which he says 'le langage de notre meilleur manuscrit paraît être celui qui était parlé à Paris au milieu du XIII\textsuperscript{e} siècle.'\textsuperscript{106} To this, he adds his belief that Paris, BN MS fonds fr.899 is so like what he believes to be the autograph copy of Hugh of St Cher's revision of the Vulgate (Paris, BN MSS fonds lat.16719-22) that it must have been produced in the same place, and at around about the same date\textsuperscript{107}. He believes that Paris, BN MSS fonds lat. 16719-22 was copied in the University very little before 1250\textsuperscript{108}. The linguistic evidence, plus the paleographic evidence of Paris, BN MS fonds fr.899, lead Berger to conclude that BXIII was made not only in Paris, but in the University\textsuperscript{109}.

Sneddon has considered the linguistic evidence of the manuscripts he used to establish his edition\textsuperscript{110}. The language of two of these manuscripts, Paris, BN MS fonds fr.899 and Rouen Bibliothèque municipale MS A 211 (Sneddon's base manuscript), is Central Old French\textsuperscript{111}. All of his other manuscripts show some dialectal
features, however few. Bern Burgerbibliothek MS 28 has 'a certain number of features which suggest it was written in Northern France rather than Paris' although 'Central spellings are used most of the time.' Northern forms are also found in Paris Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 35, which Sneddon describes as being in a Northern scripta strongly influenced by Central French. Another of Sneddon's manuscripts is written in an Eastern scripta, this being Paris BN MS fonds fr.12581 (Robson's 'Champenois miscellany') of which Sneddon says 'Despite the numerous non-Central forms, a surprisingly high number of Central forms agreeing with MS A [Rouen Bibliothèque municipale MS A 211] are to be found.' Finally, Oxford Christ Church Library MS 178 is described by Sneddon as 'written in Central French with the occasional appearance of features which suggest it was written in Northern France rather than in Paris, though the manuscript also contains Eastern and possibly Western features.' Robson believed that this manuscript was produced in a 'non-Parisian atelier.'

Of Sneddon's manuscripts, therefore, he can only be certain that two (Rouen Bibliothèque municipale A 211 and Paris BN MS fonds fr.899) are in Central Old French; one (Bern Burgerbibliothek MS 28) may have been 'written in Northern France rather than Paris' and another (Oxford Christ Church Library MS 178) is probably non-Parisian, and was probably written in northern France too. The remaining two are not in Central Old French.
one (Paris BN MS fonds fr.12581) being from eastern France and the other (Paris Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 35) being northern. The evidence of these manuscripts suggests that while BXIII may have been produced in the Central Old French area, there is an almost equal chance of it having been produced in northern France instead. However, Sneddon believes that this diffusion evidence suggests 'that the translation was undertaken, as Berger thought, in Paris (and not in Picardy, which Mr. Robson did not wish to exclude)' 121. Robson was aware that Guyart des Moulins's Bible Historiale was written in Picardy but was quickly diffused from Paris122. To me, this evidence is not strong enough to exclude a northern French origin. Whichever way it is argued, however, this evidence does attest to the almost immediate popularity of BXIII, whether it was produced in Paris and spread out from there, or produced in Picardy and quickly adopted in the capital.

It is possible that a study of the sources of the glosses may help here too, although any evidence is likely to do no more than reinforce what is already believed. Sneddon believes that his work on the Gospel glosses to date has shown that Hugh of St Cher, the Glossa Ordinaria and the Historia Scholastica were all used as sources and this presupposes the translator had access to 'a reasonably well-stocked library'123. If direct sources are identified, the number used may well be a clue as to the size and wealth of the library to which the translator
had access, and this may in turn suggest the sort of place or 'institution' he was working in, and may even go so far as to suggest where in the country this may have been. The evidence to date suggests that BXIII (whatever view one has of the text) could only have been produced in a place with relatively extensive resources and this alone suggests a Parisian origin. A wide range of sources, or of material of different types, would probably support such an opinion. A very restricted range would not necessarily undermine it.

The next question, asking why this translation was made in the first place, is inextricably linked with ideas as to its likely audience.

There is no evidence at all, either in the translation itself or in the glosses, that BXIII was ever anything other than a completely orthodox text. The theology in the glosses is perfectly orthodox; we need look no further for examples of this than the glosses on the nature of the Trinity on John 10.30 and John 14.9\textsuperscript{124}, and that on John 15.26\textsuperscript{125}, which actually condemns the heretical opinion that the Holy Spirit comes only from the Father: 'sont heretiques cil qui croient et afferment que li sainz Esperiz ist seulement del Pere et non mie del Fill.' Sneddon has looked at the evidence of the famous letter of Innocent III on the Metz heretics of 1199 and various statutes from then until 1246\textsuperscript{126}, and come to the conclusion that translations of the
Scriptures are only condemned when 'they are used as a basis for rejecting the authority of the Church. They are not to be condemned as such.'\textsuperscript{127} More recently, Boyle has reassessed the Innocent III letter of 1199 and come to the conclusion that Innocent does not seem to be attacking translations of Scripture in themselves, but rather the misuse of Scripture by those not trained to use it.\textsuperscript{128} Church-approved translations of Scripture may have existed. In itself, BXIII would seem to have been produced for an audience which was not composed of heretics.

So what evidence do we have which can help us decide why the translation was made, and for whom? As Quereuil says, 'Un ouvrage d'une telle ampleur n'a pu être entrepris que s'il se trouvait un public prêt à l'accueillir et à en faire usage.'\textsuperscript{129} There was presumably a perceived 'gap in the book market' that BXIII was supposed to fill. Clues as to its original intended audience, and to the intended use of BXIII, might come from the early BXIII manuscripts.

Berger noticed that the letters \(a, b, c, e, g, h, k, o, p, r\) and \(s\), followed a short distance later by the word \textit{fins}, appear in red in the margins in Paris, \textit{BN MS fonds fr. 899}.\textsuperscript{130} He believed that these letters ' désignent les \textit{leçons} des dimanches et des fêtes'.\textsuperscript{131} Decoo studied these letters too,\textsuperscript{132} and he has shown that they seem to be used in sequence, \(a, b, c, e\) for the Gospels, \(g, h, k\)
for the Epistles and α, β, γ, δ for Saints' days.

Sneddon has found similar marginal marks in copies of the fourteenth-century *Bible Historiale Complétée* and extrapolates from this thus:

It is therefore possible to assert that BXIII and BHC manuscripts were used either for personal devotion or, just possibly in the case of the relatively small thirteenth-century BXIII manuscripts, for following the service as Books of Hours could be used. More importantly, it becomes reasonable to suggest, from the evidence of fr.899, that personal devotion may have been one of the uses intended by the translators for BXIII.

The evidence that we have for this opinion (that is, the marginal letters) is found in only one BXIII manuscript, although the manuscript is an early one. Sneddon's idea of 'personal devotion' is an interesting one, and such evidence as there is for it is referred to in his article.

The next clue that we have to the possible use intended for BXIII consists of the annotations found in London BL Harley MS 616. In his description of this manuscript, Sneddon says the annotations are in Latin, and that corrections have been made to the Psalms in French (although he subsequently described these annotations as 'glosses' and discussed them thus: 'Although the glosses are in French, this may suggest a purely linguistic motive for glossing the BXIII text.') In London BL Harley MS 616, these annotations do not mark lectionary passages, and Sneddon is less convinced that
this sort of annotation provides evidence for the intentions of the translators than in the case of marking lectionary passages, largely because annotation of this type occurs very infrequently, and seems to be most frequent in manuscripts which have been in England.'

This is probably a fair conclusion to reach from the very disparate evidence he cites (London, BL Add. MS 40619-20 is dateable to the late thirteenth century, with 'Nota' written by the scribe against certain Old Testament passages and with individual glosses in English in a fifteenth-century hand, and London, BL Add. MS 15247, which is a BHC manuscript and which has lectionary passages marked in a fifteenth-century Secretary hand). However, if marginal marks found in only one BXIII manuscript (Paris, BN MS fonds fr. 899) are accepted as being possible evidence of the translator's intention, then different marks which are only found in another one (London, BL Add. MS 40619-20) cannot be dismissed from being evidence of the same thing, especially when the manuscript dates from the thirteenth century.

More evidence to support the idea that BXIII was used for personal devotion may come from evidence of the early history of the text. Sneddon, in preparing a critical edition of the Gospels, has shown that there may be as many as five distinct recensions of the text, and that each of these recensions seems to derive from 'a renewed consultation of the Vulgate'. Sneddon believes that this shows two things: firstly, that it was a text 'in
which its purchasers were clearly interested. It
certainly means that repeated attempts were made to
remove the results of scribal error, so that the text
should be comprehensible; and secondly that 'This
implies some form of devotional reading'.

We need now to consider who owned BXIII manuscripts, and
this is something about which very little is known.

We know nothing about the ownership of BXIII in the
thirteenth century, but a clue may be Paris BN MS fonds
fr.12581, which has a copy of the BXIII Gospels bound
along with secular and devotional texts such as the
Trésor of Brunetto Latini, La Queste del saint Graal, a
Traité de Fauconnerie, La devisions des foires de
Champaigne, Moralités, (a translation of the Moralia
dogma philosophorum by William of Conches), Les quatre
âges de l'homme by Philippe de Novare and a verse
translation of the Disciplina Clericalis by Pierre
Alphonse. To me, this particular collection suggests
a possibly quite devout secular owner, and the intriguing
text in this case would be the Disciplina Clericalis. It
is hard to see what a secular owner would want this text
for; yet what would a cleric want with a treatise on
falconry? It is possible that some might have gone
hunting. Sneddon says that this 'at least reminds us
that prospective buyers are likely to be people with
secular interests.' This is probably too broad a
generalization to make about thirteenth-century owners,
although it is almost certainly the case with the fourteenth-century owners, about whom we know more.

It is to Sneddon that we must turn for what is known about the ownership of BXIII manuscripts, and all of the evidence is about fourteenth-century owners at the earliest, and mostly owners of BHC¹⁴⁷ rather than BXIII. The fourteenth and fifteenth-century owners that have been identified are from among 'the wealthy and relatively wealthy royalty and aristocracy'.¹⁴⁸ Sneddon recognizes that this does not accord with his idea of BXIII having been produced for Dominican nuns¹⁴⁹, but believes that there may have been a shift towards aristocratic ownership once BHC had been produced¹⁵⁰, and notes that the less luxurious BHC manuscripts are those containing BXIII books only¹⁵¹. This leads him to conclude that 'It seems likely that the first public of BXIII was not financially or socially particularly distinguished and may well have included devout bourgeois';¹⁵² it may be presumed that he envisages this group as including Dominican nuns and tertiaries. People who were 'not financially or socially particularly distinguished' and the 'devout bourgeois' would certainly have had secular interests, but the evidence of the thirteenth-century Paris BN MS fonds fr.12581 would, by including the aristocratic pursuit of falconry, seem to fit in with what we know about fourteenth-century ownership and does not suggest people who were 'not
financially or socially particularly distinguished' or the 'devout bourgeois'.

To summarize: we know very little about why BXIII was produced or for whom it was produced. It may have been produced for personal devotion; it may have been produced for Dominican nuns; it may have been produced for devout bourgeois; it seems to have been owned predominantly by members of the nobility and aristocracy in the fourteenth century; it may have been produced in the university; it may have been produced by Dominicans. The only thing we can be relatively confident about is that it was not produced by, or for, heretics.

A study of the sources of the glosses, and of the glosses themselves, may help here, in that such a study would place the glosses in a wider theological context which would highlight theological material included and excluded. This might, in turn, suggest an audience, or a particular use for, the text.

Scholars have come a certain way, then, towards answering the six key questions posed by BXIII. We know that the translation was done in the thirteenth century, although whether this was earlier in the century or later remains at this stage unclear. We know that the translation is uneven, and that it was made by more than one person, but we do not know if 'more than one person' means a team working on a single project, or individuals whose work
has been collected together at some later date. We know it was produced north of the Loire, but we do not know whether this was Paris, Picardy, or somewhere else. We do not know who wrote it; Berger's opinion that it was done in the university seems to hang on the likeness of one manuscript (Paris BN MS fonds fr.899) to another (Paris BN MS fonds lat.16719-22); Sneddon's suggestion that it may have been made by Dominicans is based on, amongst other things, the fact he has found similarities between the postills of Hugh of St Cher and the Gospel glosses, and the existence of the 1242 prohibition of translation by the Dominican chapter general. However, the possibility of Hugh and the BXIII glosses having a common source and the impossibility of identifying BXIII with any translation referred to in the 1242 prohibition means that we do not know for whom it was done. Sneddon is the only one to address this question, and he has had to confine himself to speculation. We do not know what use the translators thought BXIII would be put to; the idea of personal devotion rests on very little evidence.

It is because we know so little that this study has been undertaken. A study of the glosses - of the internal evidence they provide and the external evidence that can be applied to them - would tell us more about BXIII and may help us answer some of he questions posed above. If we succeed in identifying any direct sources of the glosses, then we may be able to date BXIII with more certainty. The number of sources used may suggest the
resources the translator had at his disposal, and thus suggest where he might have been working. Even if it is impossible to identify direct sources, identifying the type and range of theological material used by the glossator will help fit BXIII into a wider thirteenth-century theological context. A study of the nature of the glosses, the form they take, the things they say, and the theological material they contain, will help uncover any intentions the translator may have had in producing the text in the first place. Any difference in the nature of the glosses from book to book may reflect different intentions on the part of the different translators, and may help us decide how far BXIII is a single, coherent piece of work, and how far it is a collection of what are very individual translations. Identifying the translators' intentions may provide valuable clues as to whom they were writing for, and why. BXIII studies can go no further until the evidence of the glosses has been assessed. This is what this thesis aims to do.

II The Glosses

The aim of this thesis, as detailed above, is to try to solve some of the outstanding problems that BXIII poses by studying the glosses. It will of necessity include two main areas of study. The first of these will be an examination of the possible sources of the glosses, and
the second will be an examination of the glosses themselves. Before we can begin, however, we need to assess the work which has been done on them to date.

Very little work has been done on any type of glossing in Old French, and certainly no previous scholar has set out to study the BXIII glosses themselves. They have only ever been discussed briefly as part of more general work on BXIII.

The first point to make is that not all of the books in BXIII are glossed. Those which contain glosses are Genesis, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Job, the Psalter, the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles. However, not all of these books are glossed to the same extent. Genesis, as Quereuil says, is 'entièrement glosé, au point que les commentaires occupent bien plus de place que le texte lui-même.'154; Judges, to quote Berger, is 'accompagné de gloses très longues et très nombreuses'155; while Job is 'glosé brièvement'.156

Scholars have commented both on the content and nature of the glosses, and on their probable sources. Reuss and Berger, and much more recently Quereuil, have all identified the glosses in Genesis as derived from the Glossa Ordinaria. As Quereuil says 'La confrontation entre la glose latine et la glose de la Genèse de notre Bible montre que la plupart des commentaires sont effectivement traduits ou adaptés de la glossa
ordinaria. What Quereuil has done is to compare the Genesis glosses with two copies of the *Glossa Ordinaria*, the first being a seventeenth-century printed edition and the second the text in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. He has noticed that there are discrepancies between the glosses in Genesis and the *Glossa Ordinaria* as given in these two editions, and accounts for glosses which are in BXIII but not in the *Glossa Ordinaria* by citing the instability of the *Glossa* text, and suggesting that the translator wrote some of the glosses himself. This may also suggest that the glosses in Genesis had multiple sources, although Quereuil does not believe Hugh of St Cher to have been one of them.

The *Glossa Ordinaria* would also seem to be a source for some of the glosses in the Gospels. Sneddon has compared the Gospel glosses with the *Glossa Ordinaria*, the *Historia Scholastica* and the commentaries of Hugh of St Cher and in his notes to his edited text marks those glosses where a similar gloss occurs in any of these texts. Even such a cursory check of three Latin texts is fraught with problems, given how much commentators quoted each other and the difficulty of identifying any direct source. Peter Comestor is actually mentioned as the source in the gloss on Luke 2.21, as 'Li mestres qui fist les estoires'. Comestor's *Historia Scholastica* was a 'set book' in the schools, and 'the Master of the Histories' would seem to have been a common way of referring to him, although we cannot be certain that the
reference was to the *Historia Scholastica* rather than to one of his commentaries. Sneddon then looked at Hugh of St Cher and, initially in his thesis, similarities between the BXIII Gospel glosses and Hugh's commentaries led him to suggest:

> Despite the difficulty of identifying sources which are so freely treated and which may be available from the original work rather than a compilation, it seems to me probable that Hugh is a source for the BXIII Gospels. The notes to the text give about 100 glosses which occur in some form in Hugh, but not in the Glossa or Comestor. The majority are paraphrased, or refer to such a short gloss that it is impossible to show that direct translation has occurred, but some do seem to show that the BXIII translator is following Hugh.

However, even if there are similarities between the BXIII Gospel glosses and Hugh of St Cher's commentaries, we cannot be sure whether this is because the BXIII translator used Hugh, or because he used a commentator or commentators who were also used by Hugh. Sneddon says that Hugh is still valuable because he 'provides convenient access to commentators on the Bible who wrote after the compilation of the Glossa.' This may well be true; Hugh may well provide such access. But we are no closer to knowing which commentators the BXIII glossator used because, as Smalley has pointed out, quotations in Hugh are 'difficult to spot because they are so often anonymous.' Sneddon has suggested that 'a few of the glosses on the Gospels may conceivably derive from a commentary of Hugues de Saint-Cher on the Vulgate,' and this means that there is still progress
to be made beyond Sneddon's admittedly cursory work in this area.

Both Sneddon and Quereuil have discussed the form the BXIII glosses take on the page and the way they are integrated into the text. What we have here is not the Bible text with glosses written in the margins, or perhaps between the lines, but the Bible text with the glosses actually written into it, so that text and gloss read consecutively. As Quereuil has noticed, the end of the gloss and the return to the text is marked by the copyist of his base manuscript by a capital letter and often by 'la présence fréquente de l'adverbe adcertes' 173. It is the use of this adverb in non-glossed books in this manuscript which leads him to suggest that they were originally glossed, but that the glosses were deleted by the copyist 174. In general, the gloss follows the lemma, but Quereuil has noticed that it is not unknown, in Genesis, for a gloss to precede the lemma; he gives as an example the gloss on 27.20, which actually applies to 27.27-9 175.

Sneddon and Quereuil have also touched on the rhetoric used in the glosses. Sneddon has mentioned briefly the repetition of the text within the gloss, and the use of transitional phrases, as ways in which the translator integrates his glosses into the text 176; and Quereuil has discussed the different ways in which the Genesis glosses are introduced into the text, noting that one of these
ways, i.e., an opening question formed by the verb 'demander', reflects the Latin *quaestio*. No Latin equivalents have been identified for any of the other rhetorical devices noticed by Sneddon and Ouereuil.

The content of the glosses has been touched upon in a similarly brief manner. For Berger, the glosses in the Gospels are 'absolument nulles au point de vue religieux'. He sees them as reflecting the morality of their period, as being above all 'une exhortation à la pénitence et aux bonnes œuvres'. He describes the glosses in Judges as being 'avant tout moral et mystique, c'est à dire appliqué à Jésus-Christ', and the glosses in Ruth as 'mystique et bien peu littérale'. In general he believes the glosses to be 'ce qu'il y a de moins bon dans l'ouvrage entier'. Robson reflects this opinion, describing them in some places as being 'trivial or absurd'.

Ouereuil discusses the content of the Genesis glosses in more depth, and gives examples of literal, allegorical, moral and anagogical glosses occurring in BXIII. These tend to occur individually in the Genesis glosses, and not together; as Ouereuil says 'Dans notre glose de la Genèse, toutefois, il est exceptionnel de trouver la superposition des quatre sens à propos d'un passage donné.' We do, however, get two senses together in a gloss; Ouereuil notes that Hebrew names are often given both a literal and an allegorical
interpretation, and that the allegorical interpretation is very often prefigurative\textsuperscript{186}, as in the gloss on 14.20, from the \textit{Glossa Ordinaria}\textsuperscript{187}:

\begin{quote}
Melchisedech, qui vaut autretant comme roi de joustice, et est appelez roi de pes, senefie Jhesu Crist par qui nos sommes reconcilié, qui en la fin du siecle fera a chacun droit jugement.
\end{quote}

Quereuil also discusses the morality in the Genesis glosses, making a distinction between what he calls 'morale implicite'\textsuperscript{188}, which suggests proper Christian behaviour and interprets various biblical characters as representing virtues and vices, and 'morale explicite'\textsuperscript{189}, which is much more concerned with instructing people on how to behave. He also distinguishes what he calls 'morale spirituelle'\textsuperscript{190}, which he describes as occurring when 'la tropologie fait suite à l'allegorie, sa charge mystique devient beaucoup plus forte, elle se fait morale spécifiquement chrétienne.'\textsuperscript{191} This can best be illustrated by one of Quereuil's own examples\textsuperscript{192}, part of the gloss on 19.26:

\begin{quote}
La fame qui se regarde senefie ceuls qui ont esté appelez a la grace Dieu, puis se regardent arrières et veullent revenir aus choses qu'il ont lessiees. ... Par ce qu'il leur est desfandu a resgarder arrières doit l'en entendre que cil qui par la grace Dieu sunt regenernez de l'eau de baptesme et veullent eschaper du feu d'enfer ne doivent pas returner a leur ancienne vie ... 
\end{quote}

Quereuil finishes his discussion of the glosses by considering those which are anagogical in content. He
distinguishes here between 'anagogie et eschatologie' and 'anagogie et vie contemplative'. Examples will help make it clear what these terms mean, and I shall again use those quoted by Quereuil in his own discussion. 'Anagogie et eschatologie' can be illustrated by the Genesis gloss on circumcision on 21.5; after an allegorical interpretation of circumcision prefiguring Christ, there follows an anagogical and eschatological interpretation, which I quote:

Par ce que Ysaae est circoncis a l'ustisime
dor est senefie l'ustisime age du siecle,
quant la general resurrection des sainz sera celebree.

An example of 'anagogie et vie contemplative' is the gloss on 27.27:

... Par les viandes sunt entendues les oeuvres
de la vie active, et par le vin qui enyvre
est entendue la vie contemplative, qui
estreange les pensees aus bons de l'amour du
siecle...

Quereuil's conclusions about the Genesis glosses are very general. He points out that it is not always easy to decide which category a gloss belongs to, and that in any case distinctions between the four senses are not always clear. This is a fair thing to conclude, but Quereuil has not considered how far the use of the four senses reflects what is in the supposed gloss sources, and how much is original to the BXIII translator. This at least would have identified any material the translator had omitted from his sources, and material he may have added on his
own initiative. If Quereuil had considered the glosses from this point of view, he would have had the data to be able to consider whether the translator simply copied the material in his sources, or whether he treated it in a way which may reveal something about his intentions and the intended use of BXIII. There is still clearly progress to be made here. Quereuil's main intention, after all, was, like Sneddon's, to edit the text.

The work that has been done on the glosses to date, then, is far from exhaustive. We know that the *Glossa Ordinaria* is where most of the Genesis glosses would seem to come from, and that this text may be where some of the Gospel glosses come from too; the *Historia Scholastica* and Hugh of St Cher's commentaries have also been proposed as possible sources for the Gospel glosses. However, there are many other Latin texts - many more commentaries, Biblical vocabularies, collections of *questiones*, sermons - which would need to be examined in the light of the BXIII glosses before we can be confident that we have found the Latin texts, or if we cannot identify texts, then the types of material used, which the BXIII Gospel/Genesis translator used for his own glosses. This also needs to be done for all the other glossed books in BXIII. Quereuil has begun to discuss the nature and content of the glosses in Genesis, but has not taken this as far as he could. What is needed for all BXIII glosses is a systematic study of how they treat material in their source texts, or theological material of the period, what
material they use, and what they choose to omit. We also need to identify those glosses or parts of glosses which would seem to have been written by the translator. We can only do this when we know if he copied material or not. Only when we know what material, if any, was deliberately left out of the BXIII glosses, and what material the glossator added on his own initiative, will we be in a position to decide what the glossator thought he was trying to do in his glosses. Even if we fail to identify direct sources, we will still be able to assess his intentions, judging from his attitude to material available to him. We will have information allowing us to put the glossator into a wider context as a theologian, and may be better equipped to decide why BXIII was produced, and for whom it was produced. If the nature of the glosses proves to be different from book to book, then we will have evidence to contribute to the debate on whether BXIII is a single, coherent project, or a publishing venture.

Practically everything, therefore, remains to be done for the glosses in BXIII. It would be far too much, however, to cover every aspect of them in a single thesis, and the number of glosses studied needs to be restricted without similarly restricting the usefulness of the findings; furthermore, we need to select glosses which will allow us to discover as much as possible without making the project unwieldy. The Latin texts used for any of the glosses should provide information for the questions of wider
context, glossator attitudes towards theological material, authorial intentions and perhaps the dating problem; hence any of the glosses could be studied here. The glosses in more than two books need to be considered if we are to get any information to help us decide on the nature of BXIII (although it is of course possible that a single book was translated by more than one person). The glosses in a single book may highlight a single translator's (or several translators') intentions in that book only; and, if we are to have data to compare for BXIII in general, then we need glosses from at least two books here.

As has already been said, there are glosses in Genesis, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Job, the Psalter, the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles. Berger says of the Pauline Epistles 'Elles sont accompagnées d’un très petit nombre de glosses'\(^\text{197}\); they will not, therefore, yield as much information as the other books. This narrows the choice slightly. The next consideration is how accessible the different texts are. There are a large number of extant manuscripts containing all or part of BXIII\(^\text{198}\), and to use glosses in a book which has not been edited would in effect mean preparing an edition before work on the glosses could begin. It would be prudent, therefore, to use glosses in books which have been edited. Quereuil had started work on his edition of Genesis when I began this thesis, but this was only published in 1988. Furthermore, the Genesis glosses have always been considered to derive from the *Glossa Ordinaria*\(^\text{199}\), and did not seem to be such
fertile ground as, for example, the Gospels, with glosses which might be from the Glossa, the Historia Scholastica and Hugh of St Cher. The only editions of glossed BXIII books that had been done when work began for this thesis were Deoo's edition of the Gospel of Mark and Sneddon's edition of all four Gospels. To produce any data which would allow us even to consider the problems of the coherence of the text, it was obviously necessary to consider more than one Gospel, and it was most straightforward in these circumstances to use the Gospels as prepared by Sneddon for his edition.

There are approximately seven hundred glosses in the Gospels, and this is an enormous number to check against several Latin texts. I have, therefore, used approximately one third of these glosses for this study. This third includes all of the glosses of any considerable length on the grounds that these glosses are those most easily compared to an equivalent Latin gloss, and most likely to show where, and how, Latin gloss material has been used by the glossator. The rest of the glosses used were chosen on a chapter by chapter basis, to cover both narrative and miracle material. The decision was taken to exclude the glosses in the first and last chapters of the Gospels (apart from any glosses included on the grounds of their length) on the grounds that it was the first and last chapters which would be most likely to have suffered mutilation and be missing from Latin texts and manuscripts. This rarely proved to
be the case, however, and with hindsight I regret not including the glosses in the first chapters, these being rather more intensively glossed than subsequent chapters. The crucifixion chapters were chosen on the grounds that there would be a lot in them to gloss. All of the glosses used for this study are given in Appendix I.

III The methodology of the thesis

The aim of this thesis is to contextualize the Gospel glosses and, if it should ever be possible, to identify direct sources. It should be said right at the outset, however, that I have not with any absolute certainty identified any direct Latin source for any of the Gospel glosses. The Gospel glosses seem never to have been direct translations of Latin glosses, and it is impossible to say that gloss X is a translation of part of a gloss in the Glossa Ordinaria, gloss Y a translation of a gloss in the Historia Scholastica and gloss Z a translation of a gloss in Hugh of St Cher. In this thesis, therefore, the term source is used in the broadest possible sense, and should be understood to include analogue, parallel, equivalent, counterpart, model, antecedent and ancestor. For convenience source is used, in this thesis, as a portmanteau expression for all of these. Any Latin text described as a 'source' for a BXIII gloss shares material with that gloss, but, it is impossible to say whether the Latin was a direct source
or not. The BXIII glossator may have used Latin glosses as his sources in the broadest sense, but it is nevertheless clear that the material in his glosses is part of a corpus of traditional twelfth- and thirteenth-century exegetical material.

There are many different types of Latin theological text which could contain material comparable to the gloss material in BXIII, including commentaries, sermons, Biblical vocabularies, treatises and collections of questiones. However, an exhaustive study of all the texts falling into these categories would be too extensive for such a study as is undertaken here, in which it was initially hoped to be able to identify direct sources. In the first instance, therefore, the Latin texts studied were limited to Gospel commentaries and Gospel Harmony commentaries. A study of a large number of commentaries showed not only that it seemed extremely unlikely that any direct source existed, even if we could discover it, but also that the range of material in the Gospel glosses was wider than that typically found in commentaries. The study was therefore extended to include some texts from other genres to complement the study of the commentaries done here and to begin to fill in lacunae. The reasons for which genres other than Bible commentaries were studied will now be discussed in detail.
Gospel Harmony commentaries, such as the *Historia Evangelica* in Comestor's *Historia Scholastica*, have very much the same type of gloss material as is found in Gospel commentaries, but as they are based on a Gospel Harmony, narrative lemmas occur only once. For example, the crucifixion is covered in all four Gospels, but a Gospel Harmony will only need to cover this once, combining material from all four Gospels. This means that Gospel Harmony commentaries are likely to have as much commentary material in them as Gospel commentaries, but in less space. Nor should we assume that the order of the material in a Gospel Harmony would have made this text difficult for the BXIII translator to use, or that he could not have found the passage likely to have the appropriate gloss material even if the order of the narrative were not exactly the same as in the Gospel he was working on. Even if the translator could not find his way around a Gospel Harmony without difficulty, it is possible that he had access to an early verbal concordance, especially if we assume he was working after c.1235 (Sneddon's *terminus a quo*) by which time the verbal concordance produced by the Dominicans in Paris was well under way. Whenever he was writing he would have had access to one of the standard canon tables of parallel passages, which are found much earlier and appear also in the glosses of some late twelfth- and early thirteenth-century commentators, including Langton; these seem to have been the forerunners of the verbal concordance. Given this, it would be
extremely unwise not to check Gospel Harmony commentaries.

Texts of other genres, such as sermons, theological treatises and collections of *questiones* seemed, in the first instance, to be unlikely have been used by the glossator or to have provided material for his glosses. One reason for this is their arrangement. The BXIII translator wrote his glosses as he worked through his translation. This much is clear from the fact that the translation and glosses appear on the page as, and would seem to be intended to be read as, continuous text. Assuming that he had direct sources, he would have needed these conveniently close by, ready to be consulted as each lemma occurred. They may even have been open on his desk, so that he could see which lemmas were glossed in them, and decide whether such a gloss should go into his translation or not. In the case of the Gospels, this all suggests that he was using texts which followed the narrative order. Any theological text not ordered like the Gospels would have been much harder to use, necessitating searching for suitable material and applying it to the appropriate lemma. This would inevitably have been more time-consuming than using commentaries arranged in the same order as the Gospels, and sounds a less plausible scenario. Any direct use made of texts other than commentaries would mean the glossator would need to identify lemmas for himself, and this is another thing that commentaries would have done
for him, if we accept, with previous scholars, that BXIII was not translated from a twelfth-century glossed Vulgate.

This was the basis on which the decision to study commentaries was taken, although this study did show later that we could not at all assume that the glossator used commentaries, or indeed any of his sources, directly. The situation proved to be somewhat different, and the very assumptions of how the glossator was likely to have worked were revised. This should become clear from the rest of this study, which describes the work done, the conclusions reached, and further work required.

Once having decided to check commentaries and Gospel Harmony commentaries, a list of these was compiled from Stegmüller's *Repertorium Bibliorum Medii Aevi*. Such a list can be made using the indices of incipits provided, but the problem with this process is that any text with the beginning missing would not necessarily be listed under the correct incipit. To be sure of identifying every commentary, therefore, there really is no alternative but to go through the volumes of the RB looking methodically for commentaries. By this means as many extant commentaries as have been catalogued (by Stegmüller) can be identified.
This does not mean, however, that all Latin commentaries identified need to be studied. Many could be excluded on grounds of date. Commentaries written after BXIII, especially after the Gospels, could be excluded\textsuperscript{208}. No commentary written after the \textit{terminus ad quem} for the Gospels, 1284, needs to be studied here. This poses no problem when a commentary has an attributed author who can be dated with some certainty, although there will inevitably be borderline cases, such as Nicholas Gorran, 'working at the end of the thirteenth century' (Smalley)\textsuperscript{209}, and perhaps writing c.1281-32\textsuperscript{10}. Such commentaries could not safely be excluded, and were therefore checked.

It poses more of a problem with anonymous commentaries as it is always possible that earlier material only survives in later commentaries. There are, however, enough commentaries surviving from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to make this subject to the law of diminishing returns, and excluding in general commentaries surviving in fifteenth-century manuscripts did not seem too hazardous a decision to take.

We can easily accept 1284 as being the date after which no commentary needs to be considered for the purposes of this study, but it is more difficult to decide on a date before which no commentary need be considered. The first problem is that of commentaries by the Church Fathers. It would have greatly expanded the scope of this thesis.
if all of these commentaries were to be checked, so the rather arbitrary decision to exclude them at this time had to be taken. Bede, Ambrose, Gregory and Origen are all named at times^211, although rarely, in the BXIII Gospel glosses, and it is in a way unfortunate that they had to be excluded. It is possible that the attributions in some of the BXIII Gospel glosses come from a more modern source that the glossator was using rather than because he used patristic commentaries directly. Smalley believes that it is possible that even the compilers of the Glossa Ordinaria did not use patristic sources directly; she says that 'the glossators started from earlier apparatus rather than from the original patristic sources'212. If this is the case with the Glossa Ordinaria, which, as Smalley says is 'a representative selection of extracts from Fathers and masters from the third century to the early twelfth'213, then it is much more likely to be the case with the glosses in the BXIII Gospels, which are clearly not on the same scale as the glosses in the Glossa Ordinaria. It does, therefore, seem reasonable to conclude that excluding patristic commentaries from this study is not likely to prove a problem, and it is probably reasonable to assume that patristic material in the BXIII Gospel glosses, as in the Glossa Ordinaria, came through some intermediary source, perhaps even through the Glossa Ordinaria ('a representative selection of extracts from Fathers') itself.
Commentaries by the Fathers, then, have not been included in this study, and the same is true of commentaries by Carolingian exegetes, such as Alcuin and Rabanus Maurus, another decision imposed by the time constraints of the project. After the Carolingian period, there seems to be a pause in the writing of commentaries, as Smalley says 214:

The scholars of the eighth and ninth centuries had laid down the two lines, 'questioning' patristic authorities, and studying Hebrew, on which medieval exegesis would develop. Then came a sudden interruption. After the death of Remigius of Auxerre, about 908, there is no important commentary, and a dearth even of compilations, for about a century and a quarter. Holy abbots, as their biographers tell us, were still devoted to lectio divina, and we have unverifiable references to their study of Hebrew; they left very little written exegesis. The cathedral schools, which were improving their organization at this time, did as little for biblical studies as the monastic.

Glossing would again seem to have become something pupils and teachers would do with the teaching of St Fulbert of Chartres (d.1038) 215. From then on progress seems to have been gradual until c.1100, when Anselm was teaching in Laon 216, and the compilation and writing of the Glossa Ordinaria began 217. There is no question but that this is a text which must be checked, and so all commentaries from c.1100 have been checked for this study.

To sum up so far: commentaries written between c.1100 and c.1284 formed the initial group of texts to study, posing a problem of dating only in the case of anonymous
commentaries. Decisions concerning whether to include these or not were clear when the commentary survives in twelfth- or thirteenth-century manuscripts. Texts surviving in fourteenth-century manuscripts posed more of a problem; these were checked where possible (i.e. when time and access were no problem). Texts surviving in a very few fifteenth-century manuscripts were also checked.

After eliminating commentaries, the list of those needing checking was considerable, and the project was still unmanageable. The next step taken was to reduce the number of glosses to be checked against the commentaries by selecting a representative sample from all four of the Gospels. The sample from one Gospel (Luke) was checked against as many commentaries as possible to identify those commentaries which had the sort of material likely to have been used by the BXIII glossator, which subset of commentaries could then be checked for the remaining three Gospels. Luke was chosen for this initial study because it is the longest Gospel and contains both narrative and miracle material. It also has a certain amount of material in common with the other Gospels, especially Matthew and Mark, and is not so distinctive in character as John. The sample glosses in Luke, then, were checked against the corpus of commentaries, and if the results seemed promising then a commentary would be checked for the other Gospels. The criterion adopted for deciding how 'promising' results seemed, consisted of assessing the amount of material found in the Luke
glosses and that Latin commentary only, i.e. BXIII gloss material found in that Latin commentary alone. If a Latin commentary had such unique material for three or more glosses, then it was considered for checking for glosses in the other Gospels. 'Three' is undoubtedly an arbitrary number, but a single unique gloss would seem unlikely to be significant, and if the number were higher than three, then important commentaries may have been missed given the relatively large amount of gloss material that Latin commentaries could share.

Where a commentary existed for only one Gospel, it would need to be checked anyway.

The method of data-analysis adopted was as follows:

Each sample gloss was compared against glosses on the same lemma in the Latin commentaries, and a note was made of those Latin glosses which had material which was like the BXIII gloss in having the same theme, giving the same information, and using the same vocabulary. Two examples will illustrate this process.

An example of a Latin gloss which has the same theme as a BXIII gloss and which uses similar vocabulary is the gloss on Matthew 26.7(1), which gives a definition of 'alabaster'. A definition of this is found both in BXIII and in the Historia Scholastica, and the use, in the Historia Scholastica, of words such as 'marmor' matching
BXIII's 'marbre' and 'unguentum' matching BXIII's 'oignemenz' needs to be noted as a vocabulary link.

The gloss on Matthew 2.5 is an example of a gloss where the information provided by the BXIII gloss is the same as that provided by a Latin gloss. The BXIII gloss provides the information that the prophet in question in the lemma "... en tel maniere est il escriit par le prophete" is 'Michee'. This is also information which is found in Hugh of St Cher, and needs to be noted as such.

Once such data have been collected, the relationship between the French and Latin glosses can be discussed in more detail, and this is what is done in chapters three to six. These chapters, one for each Gospel, discuss the glosses in gloss-by-gloss order. The format for the discussion of what has been shown for each gloss is kept the same so that it is straightforward for the reader to follow. Each discussion opens with a brief description of what the BXIII gloss says or what it does to its lemma. This is followed by a comparison of the BXIII gloss to its Latin equivalents, and I have, wherever possible, tried to decide which Latin commentary was the most likely to have been its source (*source* that is, in the broadest possible sense as outlined above). Any pattern, of glossing technique and themes, emerging from this detailed comparison of the glosses with Latin commentaries have been discussed in chapter seven. The
patterns which emerged also suggested two major areas requiring further consideration, namely other possible sources for some of the BXIII gloss material, and the likelihood that more than one translator worked on the Gospels. These two subjects, as stemming from the detailed discussion of patterns in chapter seven, are included in the same chapter. Any conclusions which can be reached from this study, and how far these affect what we know about BXIII, are discussed in chapter eight.
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Chapter Two: THE LATIN GOSPEL COMMENTARIES
CONSULTED

Latin Gospel commentaries referred to in this thesis have been identified using Stegmüller's *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*; where editions exist for these commentaries, I have tried to use these rather than manuscripts. Establishing a reliable and authentic text for each of the Latin commentaries I have consulted is not something which could be done for this thesis. For the most part, I have consulted one manuscript for each text. The exception to this is those Gospel commentaries which have been attributed in some sources to Peter Comestor and in others to Stephen Langton. These commentaries present major and complex problems, discussed in part by Smalley, who has done considerable work on some of the manuscripts involved in her work on Peter Comestor. However, to the best of my knowledge, she has not discussed the relationships between what she accepts as being Comestor commentaries and the commentaries in Avranches Bibliothèque municipale MS 36, listed in the RB as being the same text. The texts in the Avranches manuscript would appear not to be the same as those in other Comestor manuscripts. For example, even though the Luke commentary is listed in the RB as being in the Avranches manuscript and in Durham Cathedral MS A I 9, the results obtained from comparing the BXIII glosses to the commentaries in these manuscripts are
similar but far from being exactly the same. It is not possible to clarify such relationships in this thesis.

We know very little about many of the commentaries consulted for this study, although work has been done on some of them. What follows consists for the most part of brief descriptions of the text and the copy consulted. The possible dates of the commentaries are important for this study, so an attempt is made where possible to suggest dates for anonymous texts. Most of the time there is no more evidence than the date of the manuscript they survive in; in such cases I give either the catalogue date for this manuscript or that given in the RB. For some texts, the evidence of the chapter divisions used may be a significant clue for the dating of the text. If a commentary does not use Langton chaptering then it probably predates this system of chaptering which was in circulation by the 1220s. I have, therefore, noted those anonymous commentaries, especially those which survive in fourteenth or fifteenth century manuscripts, which do not seem to use the Langton chapter divisions.

Most of the commentaries are, for convenience, referred to by the numbers Stegmüller assigned them in the RB, e.g. 'RB 10891'. However, some of the commentaries which are by an identified author, or which have a widely accepted title, are, for the convenience of the reader and to simplify the discussion, referred to by a short
title or abbreviation. These are explained below and listed in the list of abbreviations used. Commentaries by an author or with an accepted title are listed first for the most part (alphabetically by Christian name in the case of the authors), and then anonymous ones beginning with the commentaries in Avranches Bibliothèque municipale MS 36, with the rest following by RB number. There are a certain number of cross-references where doubts about attributions exist.

The number of unique glosses is given only for those commentaries checked for Luke, as this was the criterion on which the decision to study a commentary further was, in general, based.

**Albertus Magnus ('Albt')**

Albertus Magnus' commentaries on the Gospels belong to the 1260s, and his commentary on Luke (RB 998) was consulted in Oxford Balliol College MS 187 f.2-241. This commentary has unique material for only two glosses, and his commentaries on the other Gospels were not therefore checked for the BXIII glosses in the other Gospels.

**Alexander of Hales ('Alex')**

His commentary on Luke (RB 1153) was consulted in Durham Cathedral Library MS A II 22 f.109-156. As this
commentary contained no unique material, Hales' commentaries on Matthew (RB 1151), Mark (RB 1152) and John (RB 1154) were not checked for the glosses in these Gospels.

Anselm of Laon see RB 1359

Bonaventure ('Bon')

Bonaventure's commentary on Luke (RB 1776) was consulted in Durham Cathedral Library MS A IV 9 f. 56f-197v. As this commentary contained unique material for one gloss only, Bonaventure's commentaries on the other Gospels were not consulted for the glosses in these Gospels.

Geoffrey Babion see RB 2604

Glossa Ordinaria

Smalley says that the edition of this text in Migne Patrologia cursus completus, series latina vol. 113 is 'worthless'. It is for this reason that, rather than use the Migne edition, I have consulted an early edition which has the Glossa text on one page and the postills of Nicolas of Lyra on the facing page, published in Lyon in
1520, and edited by Jacobi Mareschal. This text has been consulted for all four commentaries. Quotations given from this text are not indicated as being 'interlinear' or 'marginal'.

**Historia Scholastica** see Peter Comestor

**Hugh of St Cher ('Hugh')**

The Gospel commentaries by Hugh of St Cher, have been consulted in an early printed edition, *Opera Omnia in Universum Vetus et Novum Testamentum* vol. 6 Venice 1600.

**Nicholas Gorran ('Gorr')**

Gorran's commentary on Luke (RB 5780) was consulted in Cambridge Pembroke College MS 172 f. 3-146. This commentary contained unique material for only one gloss, so Gorran's commentaries on Matthew (RB 5777), Mark (RB 5778) and John (RB 5781) were not consulted for glosses in these Gospels.

**Nicolas of Tournai ('Tour')**

Nicolas of Tournai (master in Paris c.1226-9 and deacon of Tournai c.1230-9) wrote a commentary on Luke (RB 6030)
which survives as a fragment (1.1-12.54) in Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 7938 f.1r-69r. This manuscript also contains an anonymous commentary on John (RB 9920).

Peter the Chanter ('PCh')

The 'Unum ex quattuor' of Peter the Chanter (RB 6504-7) has been consulted in Oxford Merton College MS 212. Smalley dates this text to between 1187 and the Chanter's death in 1197. The Chanter used the Glossa, Comestor and 'B' (RB 2604) for this text. As it contains unique material for only two glosses in Luke, it was not checked for the other Gospels.

Peter Comestor

1. Historia Scholastica ('HS')

This has been consulted using the edition in Patrologia cursus completus, series latina vol.198 cols.1537-1644.

2. Gospel Commentaries

Peter Comestor's Gospel commentaries (RB 6575, RB 6576, RB 6577 and RB 6578) survive in several manuscripts and
there are problems with being able to know which manuscripts contain reliable copies of these commentaries. Smalley has discussed some of the manuscripts, and it is from her work that we know that several reportationes and defective copies would seem to survive. The situation is made more complicated because of the alternative attribution of these commentaries to Stephen Langton, and they are duly listed a second time in the RB under Langton, as RB 7900, RB 7901, RB 7902 and RB 7903.

I have been able to consult three possible copies of the Comestor commentary on Luke, those in Durham Cathedral Library A I 9 f.81r-142 ('PComD'), in Paris BN MS fonds lat.620 149-218v ('PComP') and in Avranches Bibliothèque municipale MS 36 f.111r-147r. The results obtained from these three copies are different, in the case of the text in the Avranches manuscript noticeably so. I have, therefore, kept the results from these copies separate. In the case of the copy in the Avranches manuscript, I have treated the text as anonymous rather than being by Comestor on the grounds it would seem to be the odd one out of the three Luke texts, and that it is the Avranches manuscript which it has been suggested might be by Langton (for which see my discussion of Avranches Bibliothèque municipale MS 36 below).

The situation for Comestor, therefore, is as follows: I have checked Luke in three manuscripts (as listed above)
and have checked Matthew and Mark in the Avranches manuscript (see below) which I treat as anonymous although they may well be by Comestor. I have been unable to check Comestor on John. I would also wish to check other copies of Comestor on Matthew and Mark to see whether the differences observed between the Avranches text and the other texts on Luke exist for these commentaries too. Assessing the different copies of Comestor's Gospel commentaries, and especially assessing the importance and significance of the texts in the Avranches manuscript, are not issues that I have been able to go into in this thesis.

Robert of Worcester ('Robt')

His commentary on Luke (RB 7501) was consulted in Paris BN MS fonds lat.16794 f.126-211. This manuscript also contains commentaries on the other Gospels (RB7496-7502) which Stegmüller attributes to the same author. Smalley, however, disputes this attribution and believes that the commentary on Matthew may be another copy of her anonymous commentary (*which is one of the sources for her A* 13, RB 1359 in this study).

The commentary on Luke contains unique material for one gloss, and as a result the commentaries on Matthew, Mark and John were not consulted for this study. However, given Smalley's opinion on the attribution of these
commentaries to Robert of Worcester, it seems likely that these commentaries should have been treated as if they were individual anonymous commentaries and should probably all have been consulted. The manuscript they survive in dates from the twelfth century\textsuperscript{14}, and the commentary on Matthew would certainly seem to date from the early twelfth century\textsuperscript{15}.

Stephen Langton

1. RB 7899 see RB 1359
2. RB 7900-2 see Avranches Bibliothèque municipale MS 36
3. "Glosa in Historiam Scholasticam"\textsuperscript{16}

This text survives in two reportationes, one survives in Paris BN MS fonds lat. 14414 f.1-190 (RB 7743) and the other in Paris BN MS fonds lat. 14417 f.1-315 (RB 7730). Considerable work has been done on these texts by Lacombe, who believes that the text in Paris BN MS fonds lat. 14414 is the second of these two commentaries in date, composed in 1193\textsuperscript{17}, while the copy in Paris BN MS fonds lat. 14417 dates from some years earlier, certainly before c.1187\textsuperscript{18}. Another copy of the text in Paris BN MS fonds lat. 14414 is preserved in Avranches Bibliothèque municipale MS 36 f.176-201.
The texts in the two Paris manuscripts were both checked for the glosses in Luke, and only the text in Paris BN MS fonds lat.14417 (LB) had any material which could be compared to any of the BXIII glosses, and then only with one gloss. Nor was this material unique. Neither of these texts, therefore, was checked for the glosses in Matthew, Mark and John.

Thomas Aquinas

Thomas Aquinas has left commentaries on Matthew and John, as well as the Catena aurea, which Smalley describes as:

'a collection of extracts from the Fathers and Church councils, both in Latin and Greek translation, on all four Gospels, with the aim of providing a much more thorough aid to study than had been available hitherto on both literal and spiritual senses'.

Given the constraints of time, and the fact that the Catena aurea survives for all four Gospels and might, therefore, prove valuable for glosses in all four BXIII Gospels, I decided to concentrate on this text rather than the two commentaries (on Matthew and John only). We also know that this text was very popular; as Smalley says, it 'underlies many later medieval Gospel commentaries' and it is not unreasonable to imagine that if the BXIII Gospel glossator were working after this text had been completed (and it belongs to 1263–72)
he may well have used it for his own glosses. The
commentaries belong to different years, that on Matthew
having been written after 1263, and probably to 1269-
72^2, while the commentary on John probably belongs to
1270-1273.

The *Catena aurea* was consulted in the edition by S E
Freté in *Opera Omnia* vol. 17^24 and the material in it
was compared to the BXIII glosses in Luke. This text has
no unique material and it was not, therefore, consulted
for the BXIII glosses in the other three Gospels.

**Zacharias Chrysopolitanus ("ZC")**

His Gospel Harmony commentary (RB 8400) was consulted in
Oxford Bodleian MS Bodley 209 (SC 2035) f.1-185E. This
commentary has unique material for one gloss and was not,
therefore, checked for the BXIII glosses in the other
Gospels.

**Avranches Bibliothèque municipale MS 36 ("Av 36")**

"Av 36" is the abbreviation used for commentaries on
Matthew, Mark and Luke found in Avranches Bibliothèque
municipale MS 36; Matthew is in f.69E-111E, Luke is in
f.111E-147E and Mark is in f.147V-175E. These three
commentaries are all listed twice in the RB, once
attributed to Peter Comestor (RB 6575 (Matthew), RB 6576, 2 (a copy of Mark RB 6576) and RB 6577 (Luke)), and a second time attributed to Stephen Langton (RB 7900 (Matthew), RB 7901 (Mark) and RB 7902 (Luke)).

Lacombe thought it possible that these commentaries are by Langton. He says:

We have in this ms. Avranches 36 three glosses on the Gospel, on St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. Mark. These belong to the period in which Langton lived; they are the lectures of a master who lived toward the end of the XII century. . . . Without affirming that these three Glosses on the Gospels are Langton's, I feel certain that they will repay further study.

Lacombe also noted that the commentary on Matthew in this manuscript is 'very much inspired by Strabo's Glossa Ordinaria'26; the attribution of the Glossa to Strabo has long been discredited27, but the similarities that Lacombe noted between Matthew in the Glossa and the Avranches manuscript remain.

Lacombe, however, recognized that there was a problem with the authorship of these commentaries in that they might be attributed to Peter Comestor28. Smalley believes that Langton left no commentaries on the Gospels29, and that the commentaries on Matthew (RB 6575) and Luke (RB 6577) are by Comestor, as is the commentary on Mark listed as RB 657630. She does not, however, discuss the commentary on Mark listed as RB 6576, 2, found
in the Avranches manuscript. Nor does she discuss this manuscript in her discussion of Peter Comestor\textsuperscript{31}.

While it is possible that the commentaries in the Avranches manuscript are by Comestor, the differences observed between the copy of Luke found in this manuscript and in other Comestor manuscripts\textsuperscript{32}, as well as the possible attribution of the texts in the Avranches manuscript to Langton, mean that I prefer to treat them as anonymous and refer to them as 'Av 36'. They may well be by Comestor, but until more thorough work comparing them to other copies of Comestor's Gospel commentaries has been done, it seem fairer to treat them as anonymous.

\textbf{RB 1359}

This commentary on Matthew, consulted in a thirteenth-century manuscript\textsuperscript{33}, Paris Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal MS 87 f.1-59\textsuperscript{V}, listed twice in the RB, as RB 1359 attributed to Anselm of Laon, and RB 7899 attributed to Stephen Langton. It is not clear where Stegmüller gets the attribution to Stephen Langton from, and this is not a text studied by Lacombe and Smalley in their work on Langton\textsuperscript{34}. The attribution to Anselm of Laon may be wrong too\textsuperscript{35}. Smalley has done considerable work on this text (it is her anonymous commentator 'A\textsuperscript{36}'). She believes it to date from the early twelfth century and that it is 'a post-Anselmian product of the Laon
milieu. However, the possibility that this commentary is by Anselm himself has more recently been raised again by Ballentyne, who believes that the case against his authorship of this commentary is at least unproven. Whoever wrote this commentary, it would certainly seem to have been influential. Smalley has shown that it was a principal source of her anonymous commentator 'B', referred to in this study by its RB number, RB 2604.

RB 1744

This fragment of a commentary on John (1.1-11.56) survives in Vatican Library MS Vat. lat. 5723 f.15v-195f and is attributed by Stegmüller to Bernard of Trilia. Bernard of Trilia was born in Nîmes c.1240, and was a lector at various universities in the south of France until moving to Paris c.1280; he died c.1292. Given his dates, this commentary may be post 1284 if the attribution is correct.

RB 2604

This commentary on Matthew was consulted in Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 22258 f.15v-107f. It is also printed, without the prologue, in Migne *Patrologia cursus completus*, series latina vol. 162, cols. 1227-1500, where it is attributed to Anselm of Laon.
Stegmüller attributes this commentary to Geoffrey Babion. Smalley has studied this commentary and disputes this attribution. She believes that the commentator (her anonymous commentator 'B') wrote this commentary c.1140, and that his sources include her anonymous commentator 'A' (referred to in this study as RB 1359) the *Glossa Ordinaria* and other Laon material. This commentary was in turn used by Peter Comestor.

**RB 8532**

This fragment of a commentary on Matthew (1.1–6.16) survives in Bamberg Staatsbibliothek MS Theol. 56 (0, IV.28) f.1r–12v (1.1–3.16) and f.296v–306v (3.17–6.16). The manuscript is fifteenth century.

**RB 8717**

This commentary on John survives in Paris BN MS fonds lat.15599 f.53v–111v. The manuscript is thirteenth-century, and contains a fragment of another commentary on John (RB 10619) also consulted for this study.
RB 8829

This commentary on John survives in a fourteenth-century manuscript, Braunschweig Stadtbibliothek MS 112 f.23v-164v.

RB 8830 RB 8831

These commentaries on Mark (RB 8830) and Luke (RB 8831) survive in Braunschweig Stadtbibliothek MS 113 f.1v-58v (Mark) and f.59v-168v (Luke). I think that the manuscript is probably fourteenth-century like Braunschweig Stadtbibliothek MS 112 (RB 8829). The text itself may be earlier; chapters are only marked in the margins and would appear to have been added later.

RB 8893,5 RB 8893,6

These two commentaries, on John (RB 8893,5) and Matthew (RB 8893,6) survive in Brno Státní Vědecká knihovna MS R 400 f.1v-82v (John) and f.82v-177v (Matthew). Stegmüller lists this manuscript as being fifteenth-century.
This commentary on John survives in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Cambridge University Library MS ii IV 29 f.1-11 (or f.2-12 as there are two systems of foliation).

This fragment of a commentary on Matthew was consulted in Oxford Bodleian Library MS e Mus.29 (SC 3505) f.1-173. Stegmüller lists the manuscript as being thirteenth-century.

These commentaries on Matthew (RB 9437), Mark (RB 9438), Luke (RB 9439) and John (RB 9440; 1.1-10.12 only) survive in a fifteenth-century manuscript, Kiel Universitätsbibliothek MS Bordesholm 61 f.1-77v (Matthew), f.78r-94r (Mark), f.94v-136r (Luke) and f.136v-168v (John).

The only commentaries to have material which could be compared to the BXIII Gospel glosses were the commentaries on Mark and Luke.
This fragment of a commentary on Matthew (1 and 5-7) survives in a fourteenth-century manuscript, Klosterneuburg Stiftsbibliothek MS 269 f.212-241.

The text had no material in it which could be compared to the BXIII Gospel glosses.

This fragment of a commentary on John (2.1-8.9) survives in Klosterneuburg Stiftsbibliothek MS MS 768 f.37r-162v. I believe the manuscript to be fifteenth-century. The text was consulted for this study but had no material which could be compared to the BXIII Gospel glosses.

This 'Glossarium Biblicum' survives in Copenhagen Kongelige Bibliotek MS E Don.var.23,4°. f.1v-46v. The manuscript is fifteenth-century and this text has some words and phrases in German written amongst the Latin.

It was consulted for all four Gospels but only had material which could be compared to the glosses in Mark.
This commentary on Matthew was consulted in a twelfth-century manuscript, Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek MS 432 f.129r-191v. It is listed as anonymous in the RB, but the catalogue says this commentary is by Rabanus Maurus. However, a comparison of only a couple of glosses in this manuscript with the equivalent glosses in the copy printed in Migne Patrologia cursus completus, series latina vol. 107 col. 729 ff. has shown that the commentaries would appear not to be the same. For want of a more detailed comparison between the two versions, the only clues we have as to the possible date of the text in this manuscript copy are the date of the manuscript and the evidence of any chaptering. The codex actually contains two manuscripts bound together, of which the one concerned here is twelfth-century. The commentary is written using a chaptering system which is not Langton's, suggesting that it predates this system. This commentary was certainly in existence by c.1200, although how much before that I am unable to say.

RB 9920

This commentary on John is found in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 7938 f.70r-102v. The manuscript also contains a commentary on Luke by Nicolas of Tournai (RB 6030).
The commentary on John may be earlier than the thirteenth century; it has chapter divisions marked in the text but these are not Langton's. Different chapter divisions have been marked in the margins (they appear to have been added later) and these more or less correspond with the Langton chapters. The discrepancies are only minor; for example, chapter three is marked as beginning 'nisi fuerit Deus', which is actually 3.2 in the Langton chaptering system. The lack of Langton chapter divisions within the text suggests that it may predate the introduction of these.

**RB 9939**

This fragment of a commentary on Luke (2.1-24.53; chapters 22 and 23 are missing) survives in a fourteenth-century manuscript, Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 14244 f.1r-111v.

**RB 9946**

This fragment of a commentary on Matthew (1.1-6.1) was consulted in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 14455 f.93v-100r.
RB 9954

This fragment of a commentary on Matthew (1.1-14.1) survives in Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 17047 f.4v-18v. It is listed in the RB with a possible attribution to Stephen Langton, and the manuscript is dated by Stegmüller as either twelfth- or thirteenth-century.

RB 9955

This fragment of a commentary on Luke (1.1-2.32) survives in Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 17047 f.19v-26v, believed by Stegmüller to be thirteenth-century. It was consulted for this study but the material in it showed no particular similarities with the material in the B XIIII Gospel glosses.

RB 9956

This fragment of a commentary on Luke (1.1-8.29) survives in Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 17047 f.27v-42v, believed by Stegmüller to be twelfth-century. It was consulted for this study but the material in it showed no particular similarities with the material in the B XIIII Gospel glosses.
RB 9957

This fragment of a commentary on Matthew (27.52-28.20) survives in Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 17047 f.43r-46r. Stegmüller dates this part of the manuscript as twelfth-century.

RB 9958

This fragment of a commentary on John (1.1-21.8) survives in Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 17047 f.46r-103r. Stegmüller lists this part of the manuscript as being twelfth-century.

RB 9959

This fragment of a commentary on Luke (21.25-23.36) survives in Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 17047 f.107r-110v. Stegmüller lists this part of the manuscript as being twelfth-century.

RB 9978  RB 9979  RB 9980  RB 9981

These texts are listed by Stegmüller as being 'vocabula' on Matthew, Mark, Luke and John respectively. They survive in Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 22258
f.107V-8V (Matthew), f.108V (Mark), f.108V-9V (Luke) and f.109V (John). The manuscript appears to be twelfth-century. The catalogue lists the Matthew text as being 'super prologis Ieronymi', and the other texts as being 'inicium sancti evangelium'. The texts are very short and are certainly not commentaries. They give definitions of individual words, mainly proper names and the names of Jewish feasts and customs. Many of these names and customs are ones explained in the BXIII Gospel glosses.

RB 10072

This fragment of a commentary on Luke (9.1-21.38) survives in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Oxford Bodleian MS Laud. misc. 390 (SC 1371) f.78-101V. This commentary was consulted for this study but had no material which could be compared to the material in the BXIII Gospel glosses.

RB 10109

This anonymous Gospel Harmony commentary survives in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Oxford Bodleian MS Auct. D. 18 (SC 2761) f.1-100. This commentary has material for three of the Luke glosses, but as this material is
not unique to this commentary it was not checked for the other three Gospels.

RB 10328

This commentary on John survives in a fourteenth-century manuscript, Paris BN fonds lat.644 f.3r-115r.

RB 10397

This fragment of a commentary on Luke (1.1-4.23) survives in a twelfth-century manuscript, Paris BN MS fonds lat.3702 f.116r-131v. The text has no chapter divisions.

RB 10519

This commentary on Luke survives in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Paris BN MS fonds lat.14434 f.48r-65v.

RB 10521

This commentary on John survives in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Paris BN fonds lat.14438 f.1-83v.
RB 10608

This fragment of a commentary on Matthew (5.32-7.17) survives in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Paris BN MS fonds lat.15591 f.52v-57v. It was consulted for this study but the material in it showed no particular similarities with the material in the BXIII Gospel glosses.

RB 10617

This fragment of a commentary on Luke (1.1-11.19) survives in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Paris BN MS fonds lat.15593 f.122v-157v. Delisle attributes the commentaries in this manuscript to John of La Rochelle and Nicolas Gorran.

RB 10619

This fragment of a commentary on John (1.1-3.16) survives in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Paris BN MS fonds lat.15599 f.113v-134v. The manuscript also contains another commentary on John (RB 8717) consulted for this study.
RB 10855

This commentary on Luke was consulted in the incomplete (1.1-24.43) Vatican Library MS Ross. 147 ff.12-135v. This manuscript is fifteenth-century, but the text may be thirteenth-century at the latest as it seems also to survive in thirteenth-century manuscripts (for a full list of which, see the RB).

RB 10891

This Gospel Harmony commentary, surviving in a fourteenth-century manuscript, Prague University Library MS 671 (IV D17) f.127v-148v, is part of what Stegmüller calls 'Historia veteris et novi testamenti'. It would seem to be a Historia Scholastica-type text, and is listed as anonymous in the RB. In the catalogue this text is listed as being the 'Historia biblica' of Peter of Poitiers.

Peter of Poitiers taught in Paris between 1169 and 1193 and was probably responsible for adding Acts and a genealogy to the Historia Scholastica. However, this text does not seem to be a copy of the Historia Scholastica; the text is shorter, and the glosses do not seem to be the same.
This commentary has material which has been compared to the glosses in Matthew, Mark and Luke, but has no material for the glosses in John.

**RB 10916  RB 10917**

These two fragments of commentaries on Matthew (RB 10916; 1-25) and John (RB 10917; 1-13) survive in a fourteenth-century manuscript, Prague University Library MS 762 (IV G 30) f.35v-59r (Matthew) and f.60r-86r.

There is material in the John commentary which can be compared to the BXIII Gospel glosses, but none in Matthew.

**RB 10933**

This text contains a collection of *quaestiones* on the first four chapters of Matthew. The *quaestiones* are quite short, are interspersed with frequent quotations from the Bible text, and have references to the *Glossa Ordinaria* (actually called this), Bede and Augustine. The text survives in a fifteenth-century manuscript, Prague University Library MS 1904 (X E 3) f.209v-230r. It was consulted for this study but has no material which can be compared to the BXIII Gospel glosses.
RB 11374

This commentary on Luke survives in a thirteenth-century manuscript, Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek MS C 139 f.1-120. The text is written in the middle of the page, with the glossing inserted around it and in between the lines, very much like the Glossa Ordinaria. The text is linked to the glossing by a series of symbols, and is divided up into sections which are smaller than the Langton chapters. These chapter divisions suggest that the text predates the Langton chapter divisions.

RB 11544  RB 11545

These fragments of commentaries on Luke (RB 11544; 11.9-24.53) and John (RB 11545; 1.1-21.3) survive in a twelfth-century manuscript, Vatican Library MS Ottob. lat.278 f.1Γ-22ν (Luke) and f.22ν-50Γ (John).

The commentary on John was the only one of the two to have material which could be compared to the BXIII Gospel glosses.

RB 11654

This fragment of a commentary on Matthew (1.1-21.46) survives in Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek MS
1309 f.1-121v. Stegmüller lists the manuscript as being fourteenth-century but the text itself may be earlier. There are no chapter divisions of any sort, which may suggest that the text predates Langton chaptering. There are frequent references to the *Glossa Ordinaria*.\(^{31}\)

**RB 11682  RB 11683**

These two fragments of commentaries on Matthew (RB 11682; 1.1-4.11 and RB 11683 1.1-5.3) survive in a fifteenth-century manuscript, Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek MS 3967 f.1-52 (RB 11682) and f.53-66 (RB 11683). RB 11682 seems to be a commentary; Stegmüller says that RB 11683 is a collection of *quæstiones*, but the text is much more like a brief summary of what happens in the Gospel.

There is material in RB 11682 which can be compared to the BXIII Gospel glosses, but none in RB 11683.
Chapter Two: Footnotes


5. See above, p.52-3.


7. It is not the place here to discuss the development of this text or the problems of its manuscript tradition, already addressed by other scholars. A brief bibliography of this text would include:

(i) B Smalley, 'Gilbertus Universalis, Bishop of London (1128-34) and the problem of the Glossa Ordinaria', in *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, viii 1936 pp.24-60.


16. This is the title given to this text by Lacombe in
G Lacombe and B Smalley, *Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton* reprinted from the *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* (v) 1930; part one (pp.1-151) is by Lacombe and part two (pp. 152-182) by Smalley, with indices of rubrics and incipits of Langton's *quaestiones* (pp.183-266) by A Gregory.

17. Lacombe (1930: 23).
25. Lacombe (1930: 149).
32. See the discussion of Peter Comestor's Gospel commentaries on pp.70-2 above.
33. Smalley (1985: 16); see also H Martin, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal*, vol.1 Paris 1885.
34. Lacombe (1930: 149) says that this Arsenal manuscript contains another copy of Langton's commentary on Matthew found in Avranches Bibliothèque municipale MS 36 (RB 7900
and RB 6575), but by this I presume he does not mean the commentary on f.1-59\(^v\) which we are discussing here (RB 7899 and RB 1359), but that on f.60\(^v\)-127.


40. See below, pp.81-2.


44. Two examples which illustrate the differences are the glosses on 2.5 and on 2.20:

2.5

**RB 9577** Scriptum est per prophetam Michee (f. 135\(^v\)).

PL 107 Micheae utuntur testimonio in quo arguuntur nimiae oblivionis, quod non eisdem verbis quibus propheta dixerat. (col.758 B).

2.20

**RB 9577** quia sacerdotes et scribe tam bene querebant enim interficere. (f.136\(^v\)).
PL 107 Ex hoc loco intelligimus non solum Herodem, sed et sacerdotes et scribas, jam eo tempore nem Domini fuisse meditatos. (col. 754).

45. f.74f.
47. Smalley (1985: 103).
49. See, for example, the glosses on 'alabaster' on Mark 14.3(2) and Matthew 26.7 in the HS and RB 10891 in Appendix I.
50. For the Glossa Ordinaria see f. 229V, for Bede see f. 224V and for Augustine see f. 223V.
51. See, for example, the gloss on Matthew 13.3 in Appendix I.
Chapter Three: MATTHEW

1.25

This BXIII gloss is in two parts. The first part of the gloss is an explanation of 'et ne la conut pas' as 'il ne jut charnelment o lui, enprés ne devant'. The second part is an explanation of why Christ is called 'premier né', and this is a gloss which is also found on Luke 2.7. Both parts of this gloss, however, deal with the same potentially complicated subject, that is, the perpetual virginity of Mary. 'Il ne jut charnelment o lui' is an explanation of 'et ne la conut pas'; 'enprés ne devant' emphasizes the negative. Joseph did not 'jut charnelment o lui' either before or after Christ's birth, and this is explained by the statement that it was the custom in Israel to call whoever was the first-born child of his parents 'premier né', whether other children were born after him or not. The glossator felt that the lemma 'et ne la conut pas desi a tant qu'ele ot enfanté son enfant premier né' was far too ambiguous, perhaps even dangerous to be left unglossed because a mistaken understanding of it could lead to heresy.

Three commentaries, Av 36, the Glossa and the HS, have material which can be compared to the second part of this BXIII gloss. Av 36 has, quoting Jerome, 'primogenitus patris et matris dicitur qui de patre vel matre nemo
genitus ante illum', and the Glossa has what is practically the same thing, with 'unigenitus dei patris vel Marie dicit'. The HS has 'non post quem alius, sed ante quem nullus', which is found in the Glossa as 'ante quem nullus, nec post quem alius', and in Av 36 as 'ante quem nullus et post quem alius'. This is also gloss material which is found on this lemma on Luke 2.74, and which may be attributable to Bede5. This gloss has, to quote Hugh, 'Beda, non post quem alius, sed ante quem nullus'. This quite clearly states that 'primogenitus' means that none were born before him, but does it also mean that none were born after him, and that 'primogenitus' is to be interpreted as being synonymous with 'unigenitus'? Or is this gloss saying that 'primogenitus' does not mean that there was no one born after him, with the implication that some were? Bede's gloss is well balanced stylistically, with 'post' balancing 'ante', 'alius' balancing 'nullus', and 'quem' in both parts, but the 'non' balancing 'sed' leads to a problem of interpretation. If this gloss is really to be interpreted as meaning that no one was born before him and no one was born after, then 'non' might have been better balanced by 'et'. Given the ambiguity in this Bede gloss, it is hardly surprising that the Latin glossator's may try to clarify its meaning. The Glossa tries to do this by changing the 'sed' to 'nec' and the Avranches glossator does so by changing the order of the two phrases and substituting 'et' for 'sed', thus making it clear that 'primogenitus' means that other children
are born after the first, and that, if this is not the case (i.e., if no more are born), then the living child should be called 'unigenitus' or 'monogenes'.

'primogenitus patris vel matris proprie namque dicitur primogenitus ante quem nullus et post quem alius. Proprie autem dicitur unigenitus patris vel matris per quo genitus dicitur monogenes'. 'Unigenitus' is also found in the Glossa.

The BXIII glossator also seems to have recognized that there is a problem not only with the meaning of 'primogenitus', but also with the interpretation of a Latin gloss on this lemma. In the BXIII gloss, 'non pas por ce que sainte Marie sa mere enfantast autres enfanz enprés lui' would seem to be based on 'non post quem alius', but with what the BXIII glossator thought to be its proper meaning made clear. This is further clarified by 'il estoit lors costume en Israhel que toute chose qui premiers nessoit, ja soit ce que autre ne nasquist mie enprés, estoit apelee premier nee'. The glossator does not confuse the issue by pointing out that 'unigenitus' or 'monogenes' would have been more accurate descriptions of Christ.

It seems likely, therefore, that the source for this BXIII gloss was either the Av 36 or the Glossa. The glossator would have taken the basic gloss from his Latin source, and would also have learnt from it that this gloss itself is ambiguous and needs further
clarification. The interpretation he chose, that Mary had no more children after Christ, is present in his Latin source. The BXIII glossator rejects the Avranches commentator's explanation that the idea that Mary had no other children is better expressed by 'unigenitus' and 'monogenes', but rather chooses to emphasize that 'primogenitus' could mean 'only begotten', and in fact was customarily used like this in Israel at the time. Whether this was a real custom or not is irrelevant; the point is that the glossator claims it was a custom to support the interpretation of 'primogenitus' which would lead to the orthodox belief in the perpetual virginity of Christ's mother.

In the light of this it seem unnecessary to look any further for a source for the first part of this BXIII gloss, 'il ne jut charnement o lui, ne enpres ne devant', as it expands its lemma in a way which stresses the interpretation of 'primogenitus' which follows. This part of the gloss, therefore, is likely to be the glossator's own, and either Av 36 or the Glossa would have been the source for the rest.

2.2

This gloss expands the lemma "en orient" as 'quant nos estions en orient'. This gloss makes it clear that it
was not the star which was in the East, but the magi who were in the East when they saw the star.

There are three Latin commentaries, RB 9577, RB 9954 and Av 36, which have glosses on this lemma which may be compared to the BXIII gloss. The gloss in RB 9954 is probably the least likely of the three to have been the source for the BXIII gloss. It has 'potuit esse quod stellam in orientem', which is not the gloss given in BXIII. RB 9577 is closer; it has 'potest intelligi vel nos existentes in oriente vidimus stella circa Jerusalem'. The ambiguity of the Latin lemma 'in oriente' is clear from the gloss in Av 36, which gives both possible interpretations, 'vel vidimus enim existentes in oriente post item quod vidimus eam in oriente'.

Of these three Latin commentaries, then, RB 9577 and Av 36 contain the interpretation of the lemma found in the BXIII gloss. It is possible that it was Av 36 which was used rather than RB 9577, because the commentator's point that this lemma is ambiguous may have prompted the glossator to include his own gloss in his translation. All he would then have to do would be decide which of the possibilities given in the Av commentary he was going to put in his own gloss.
2.4

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

2.5

This BXIII gloss, on the lemma 'le prophete', identifies the prophet in question as being 'Michee'.

Eight Latin commentaries, the Glossa, RB 1359, RB 2604, Hugh, RB 8893,6, RB 9577, RB 11682 and RB 8532, also identify this prophet as Micah. Any of these commentaries, therefore, could have been the source for this BXIII gloss.

2.6

This BXIII gloss does two things. It expands 'n'est pas petite' as 'n'es mie la menor' and 'ne la mains vaillanz', and it interprets 'les princes de Juda' as 'des citez qui sont en la terre de Juda'.

Two Latin commentaries, the Glossa and RB 9577, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Both of them gloss the lemma 'minima' as 'parva', and this could have been the source for BXIII's 'la
menor', although BXIII seems to have put 'parva' in the text and 'minima' in the gloss. They both also gloss 'in principibus Iuda'. The Glossa interprets this as 'in milibus Iuda'. RB 9577 would seem to quote the Glossa here, and also has 'in milibus Iuda'. This commentary, however, later makes this clearer, with 'inter milia civitatum'.

Of these two commentaries, then, RB 9577 is the most like the BXIII gloss, and therefore the most likely to have been the source for this gloss. This commentary, however, has no direct parallel for 'ne la mains vaillanz' in the BXIII gloss, but this could be the glossator expanding his source gloss for emphasis. RB 9577, therefore, is a possible source for this BXIII gloss.

2.7

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

2.20

This BXIII gloss expands the lemma "qui queroient la mort de l'enfant" as 'qui queroient l'enfant a ooirre'.
The BXIII translation of the lemma already includes gloss material. The Vulgate reading of this lemma is 'defunctori sunt enim qui quaerent animam pueri', which the BXIII glossator translates as 'oil sont mort qui queroient la mort de l'enfant'. In translating 'animam pueri' as 'la mort de l'enfant' the glossator is treating 'animam' metaphorically and giving it a concrete translation, and is therefore already glossing his source text.

The expansion of the lemma in the BXIII gloss makes it clear that Herod was not simply waiting for Christ's death, but was actively seeking to kill him.

Six Latin commentaries, the Glossa, RB 1359, RB 2604, Hugh, RB 9577 and RB 11682, all have glosses on this lemma. The problem is that the simplest glosses gloss 'animam', itself glossed in BXIII by being translated as 'mort'. This is the case, for example, with the gloss in the Glossa, which is 'quia scribunt pharisei mortem Christi meditabantur cum Herode'. 'Meditabantur' is not very much like 'ocirre', but then the differences between the Latin and BXIII gloss are due to the fact that the central point of the Latin gloss, that 'animam' means 'mortem', is covered in the actual translation of the lemma in BXIII. This is also the case with the glosses in RB 1359, Hugh, and RB 11682. These commentaries would not seem to have been likely sources for this BXIII gloss, but, in that the text itself contains gloss
material found in these commentaries, it would probably be unwise to dismiss them.

Two Latin commentaries, RB 2604 and RB 9577, have very similar glosses which do not have 'mortem' as a gloss on 'animam'. These glosses have, to quote RB 2604, 'quia sacerdotes et scribe tum bene (RB 9577 'tamen unde') querebant eum interficere'. The 'interficere' in this gloss is a possible source for BXIII's 'ocirre'.

The idea that Herod was actively seeking to kill Christ, comes out in the glosses in the Glossa, RB 1359 and Hugh. RB 1359 has, 'non solum Herodem sed et sacerdotes et scribas eodem', and the Glossa and Hugh have more or less the same thing, with, to quote the Glossa, 'quia scribe et pharisei mortem Christi meditabantur cum Herode'.

If all we need to look for here are Latin commentaries which provide material for the gloss, then RB 2604 and RB 9577 are the most likely commentaries to have been the source for this BXIII gloss. If, however, we are looking for Latin commentaries which provide the gloss material used in the actual translation of the lemma from the Vulgate, then the Glossa, RB 1359, Hugh and RB 11682 are all possible. It is also possible that 'interficere' in his gloss source could have prompted 'mort' as a translation of 'animam'.
2.23

This BXIII gloss interprets 'Nazarien' in the lemma as meaning 'de Nazareth'.

Three Latin commentaries, RB 8893.6, RB 9954 and Av 36, all have 'Nazareth' in their glosses on this lemma, and so could have been the source for this BXIII gloss. They all provide the information used by the glossator.

5.7

This gloss does two things. First of all, it expands the lemma "il avront misericorde" as 'Dex lor fera misericorde'; the glossator then glosses 'misericorde' as 'paradis'.

The first part of the gloss has no identified Latin source, and may be the glossator's own expansion. It allows him to do two things, the first being to change the emphasis slightly; 'il avront misericorde', and it is from 'Dex' that this will come. The second thing it allows him to do is to change the grammatical construction in preparation for the second part of the gloss. Glossing 'il avront misericorde' as 'Dex lor fera misericorde' allows him to prepare the gloss structure for 'il lor dorra paradis', thus allowing the second part
of this gloss to be a straightforward substitution of 'paradis' for 'misericorde'.

One Latin commentary, RB 8893.6, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to the second part of the BXIII gloss. It has 'in celestis', which could possibly have suggested 'paradis' to the BXIII glossator, but is not an obvious source for the gloss.

5.13

This gloss does two things. Firstly, it re-writes the lemma '"se le sel de la terre s'esvanist, en quoi salera l'en"', as 'se le sel defect, de quoi porra l'en saler'. This allows the glossator to include an interpretation of 's'esvanist' as 'defaut'. Then the glossator glosses his own gloss with 'se vostre doctrine defect, qui ensaignera autre de vos', in which he introduces interpretations of 'sel' as 'doctrine', and 'saler' as 'ensaigner'.

Six Latin commentaries, the Glossa, RB 1359, RB 2604, Hugh, RB 9577 and Av 36, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss, and they all have material for both parts of it.

The first part of the BXIII gloss is the replacement of the lemma 's'esvanist' by 'defaut'. All six Latin commentaries use some form of the verb 'deficio' in their
glosses, and this is a likely source for BXIII's 'défaut'. 'Deficio' is used in either of two ways. Four commentaries, the Glossa, RB 1359, Hugh and Av 36, link it with 'tribulatio', three of them, the Glossa, RB 1359 and Hugh, in 'in tribulatione defecerit', Av 36 with 'in tribulatione oportet deficere'. The other two commentaries, RB 2604 and RB 9577, have 'Si ergo defecerint'. It is quite clear from the phrase preceding this that the subject of 'defecerint' is 'doctores', which means that RB 2604 and RB 9577 are closer to this part of the BXIII gloss than the other four Latin commentaries. RB 2604, however, is closer still; it also has 'Si sal evanerit id est defecerit', and this is most like the first part of the BXIII gloss in both content and structure. RB 9577 is almost as close in content and the other four commentaries are not very different. It is RB 2604, however, which is the Latin commentary most likely to have been the source for this part of the BXIII gloss.

The second part of the BXIII gloss interprets 'sel' as 'doctrine' and 'saler' as 'ensaigner'. In the Latin commentaries, 'sal' is variously glossed as 'fortitudo' (RB 1359), 'doctor' (the Glossa, Hugh and Av 36), 'praedicator' (Hugh), 'doctrina' (Av 36), and the 'apostoli' themselves described as 'principium doctrine nec habent super se alios doctores' (RB 2604 and RB 9577). Of these, 'doctrina' is the most likely source for BXIII's 'doctrine', and this occurs in three
commentaries, Av 36, RB 2604 and RB 9577. Only one Latin commentary has any material which could have been the source for BXIII's interpretation of 'saler' as 'ensaignier', and this is RB 2604, which has 'Si ergo defecerint quis saliet eos. ita quis instruxerit autem eos'. This is very like BXIII's 'se vostre doctrine defaut, qui ensaignera autre de vos'. RB 2604, therefore, has the interpretations of 'sel' and 'saler' found in the BXIII gloss. Since it is the only commentary to do so it is the most likely source for this part of the gloss.

It is also interesting to point out that the Latin commentator in RB 2604 approaches the items to be glossed in a way which is not dissimilar to that used by the BXIII glossator. Just as the BXIII glossator carefully constructs his gloss by glossing the points individually, glossing first 's'esvanist', then 'sel', and finally 'saler', so the commentator in RB 2604 does the same, although in a different order. In RB 2604, it is 'sal' which is glossed first. Once this interpretation has been given, the commentator can then proceed to introduce 'deficio' for 'evanesco', and gloss 'saliert' as 'instruxerit'. It is after this has been done that the commentator states that 'deficio' is a gloss on 'evanesco'. The order of glossing the elements in the Latin commentary is different, but the essential approach to the elements to be glossed, as well as the interpretation to be given to each of those elements, is
substantially the same in both Latin and French glosses.
RB 2604 is a good source for this BXIII gloss.

5.21(1)

This gloss expands the lemma "'Vos avez oi qu'ii fu dit pieca'", as 'vos avez oi et savez qu'il fu comandé en la loi'. This gloss, therefore, expands two parts of the lemma. "'Vos avez oi" becomes 'vos avez oi et savez', thereby making it clear that, if one has heard, then one knows; and "'qu'il fu dit" is expanded as 'qu'il fu comandé en la loi'.

Three Latin commentaries, RB 9954, RB 8532 and Hugh, all have 'lex' in their glosses on this lemma, and so are all possible sources for 'loi' in the BXIII gloss. No commentary has any material which may have been the source for the expansion of the first part of the lemma in this gloss, but this may not be a problem. The only actual information in this BXIII gloss for which a source may have been needed is the knowledge that 'il fu comandé en la loi', and this material could have come from any of the three commentaries listed above. The expansion of "'Vos avez oi" to 'vos avez oi et savez' may well be the glossator's own expansion. It brings out the logical implication of 'oi'; if one has heard, then one knows. This is also an expansion which begins to deal with morality and proper behaviour. If one has heard, then
one understands and should act accordingly. However, this is never made clear in the gloss. Such moralizing is common in BXIII Gospel glosses, and seems not to have come from commentary sources but from another textual tradition.

5.21(2)

This gloss is on the lemma "cil qui oicrra sera corpables de jugement", and it does two things. First of all, it expands 'jugement' as 'doit estre jugiez a mort'; secondly, it makes explicit the link between 'corpables' and 'jugement'. People who kill are not only 'corpables' of being judged, but they are 'corpables' of being judged as meriting death.

Five Latin commentaries, the Glossa, RB 1359, Hugh, RB 11654 and Av 36, have glosses on this lemma which may be compared to the BXIII gloss. 'Accusatione' occurs in all but one of the commentaries (RB 11654), but this is a general word and would not seem to be particularly close in meaning to BXIII's 'mort'. Av 36 also uses 'damnatione', and this is closer, but not as close as RB 11654's 'reus erit iudicio id est mortis', with 'mortis' matching BXIII's 'mort'. The idea that 'jugement' means 'jugiez a mort', then, is most closely mirrored by RB 11654.
However, the Glossa, and Hugh quoting the Glossa, make explicit the link between accusation and punishment, much as the BXIII gloss makes explicit the link between being 'corpables' and 'jugiez a mort'. Both Latin commentaries have the same gloss here, the only difference being one of word order. To quote Hugh, 'Accusatione legis ut iudicio puniatur legis'. It is 'ut' in the Latin which links the two clauses, and this is more precise that BXIII's 'et', although there is not really any difference of meaning involved.

The conclusion for this gloss, then, is that 'mortis' in RB 11654 matches BXIII's 'mort', and that either the Glossa or Hugh is needed to make the link between accusation and punishment explicit, reflecting the link the BXIII glossator makes between 'corpables' and 'jugiez a mort'.

5.22, 5.24 and 5.30

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

5.32

This gloss changes the lemma 'il la fet estre fornicaire' to 'il li fet fere fornicacion'. This is a
synonymic gloss which does nothing other than allow the
glossator to replace 'fornicaire' with 'fornicacion'.

Three Latin commentaries, RB 9577, RB 9947 and RB 9954,
all have the word 'fornicatio' in their glosses on this
lemma, and it is possible that the BXIII glossator got
the idea of using the noun 'fornicacion' from this. It
could also have come from the phrase preceding the lemma
in the actual text. Any of these three Latin
commentaries, then, could have been the source for this
gloss. Even the change in syntax in the BXIII gloss may
only be reflecting the form of the word found in the
Latin source.

5.35

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this
gloss.

5.39

This gloss is an expansion of "que vos ne contrestez mie
au mal" as 'se tribulacion vient sor vos, que vos la
recevez debonement et sanz contredit'. Two things are
happening here. First, there is an expansion of the
final element in the lemma which becomes the first in the
gloss, of "mal" as 'se tribulacion vient sor vos'. The
second part of this gloss is the expansion of "que vos ne contrestez mie" as 'que vos la recevez de bonerement et sans contredit'. This is typical BXIII Gospel-gloss material, in that it instructs people how to act.

The first part of this gloss has not been found in any Latin commentary, but there may never have been a source needed here. The glossing of 'mal' as 'tribulacion' may be glossing by synonymity. However, it also allows him to introduce 'vient sor vos', thus making the 'tribulacion' directly relevant. It is not just 'tribulacion' in general, but 'tribulacion' which is 'sor vos'.

Two Latin commentaries, the Glossa and RB 1359, have material in their glosses on this lemma which can be compared to the second part of the BXIII gloss. The gloss in RB 1359 is quite clear that returning evil for evil is wrong, and instructs people to 'non accipere hic peccatum'; it has 'Infirnus concensum est malum per malo reddere sed perfectionis doctrine doctor dico et principio vobis non tunc talionem reddem sed ipse nulli malo resistere malum non accipere hic peccatum'. The gloss in the Glossa exhorts people to be calm and humble; it has 'iusticia evangeli (que ducit homines ad regnum) est non resistere malo. Non resistere ut ipse idem Discite a me, quia mitis sum et humilis corde'. Like the BXIII gloss, therefore, both of these Latin commentaries have a strong moralistic element in them, and where such
material existed in his source, the BXIII glossator has probably adapted it for his own gloss. The Glossa's 'mitis' and 'humilis' are, of the material in these two commentaries, most like BXIII 'debonerement' and 'sanz contredit', although even these are far from being perfect matches for the French material.

No very likely source has been identified for this gloss. No commentary has material matching the first part of the gloss, and the second part is not very likely to have come from the Glossa.

5.40 and 5.41

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

8.5

This gloss gives a definition of 'centuriens', and is also found on Mark 15.398.

Two Latin commentaries, RB 8893,6 and RB 11654, give definitions of 'centurio' in their glosses on this lemma. RB 8893,6 has 'dicitur autem centurio quia habebat .c. homines in armis sub se ad custodias illius', and RB 11654 has 'centurios habens sub se .c. milites'. Either
of these commentaries could have been the source for the fundamental part of the definition of 'centuriens' given in the BXIII gloss 'avoit ... pooir sor .c. chevaliers'. Neither of these commentaries, however, has anything which could have been the source for BXIII's 'li bailliz', but this is probably not a problem. 'Bailliz' is probably an attempt by the BXIII glossator to try and give as close an Old French equivalent as possible for 'centuriens', and the fact it is far from being an adequate translation is borne out by the glossator then glossing this term as 'qui avoit baillie et pooir sor .c. chevaliers'. Both 'baillie' and 'pooir' would seem to be dittological additions to his Latin source gloss, and expansions of 'sub se'. The point he seems to be making here is that 'li bailliz' had both administrative power ('baillie') and full command ('pooir') over his men. The glossator's 'chevaliers' also marks a change made to his source text. If his source was RB 8893,6, then 'chevaliers' reflects 'homines in armis'; if his source was RB 11654, then it reflects 'milites'. Both of these might have been more accurately translated as 'guerreor', rather than the noble but anachronistic term 'chevaliers'. However, the use of 'chevalier' is a common anachronism in Old French texts and its use here may need no further explanation.

The conclusion for this gloss, then, is that either RB 8893,6 or RB 11654 could have been the source for this
gloss, but that whichever was used was quite heavily adapted by the glossator.

8.15, 8.28 and 8.29

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

8.33

This gloss expands 'qui orent les deables' as 'qui Nostre Sires avoit gitez fors les deables', thus reminding the BXIII audience that 'cels qui orent les deables' are the men exorcised of devils by Christ, introduced in 8.28.

One Latin commentary, RB 8893,6, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. The Latin gloss seems to be doing the same thing as the BXIII gloss, that is, glossing 'eis qui daemonia habuerant' as 'quia Christus dimittebat eis illos curatos a demonibus ad corum[sic]'. Both the Latin and French glosses gloss their lemmas in the same way, and given this, RB 8893,6 could be the source for this BXIII gloss.
No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

This gloss interprets the lemma 'paraboles' (translating 'parabolis') as 'semblance de paroles', and can be compared to the gloss on Luke 20.19(2), which has 'semblance' in the translation and 'parabole' in the gloss.

Two Latin commentaries, the Glossa and RB 11654, have glosses on this lemma which could have been the source for the BXIII gloss. In fact, they have the same explanation of the lemma, and RB 11654 actually says that it is quoting the Glossa here. The gloss they have is 'similitudinibus', which could clearly be the source for 'semblance'; 'de paroles' may be the glossator adding to his source material for the sake of total clarity.

This gloss explains 'en cheminee de feu' as meaning 'en feu tres ardanz'.
Av 36 has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Its 'ad calorem ignium' is a possible source for BXIII's 'feu tres ardanz', both commentators emphasizing the idea of the intense heat of the fire.

13.49

This gloss explains 'la consonmacion' as 'la fin'.

Three Latin commentaries, RB 1359, RB 2604 and Av 36, all gloss the lemma 'in consummatione saeculi', using 'finis'. RB 1359 has 'in finem seculi', RB 2604 has 'ita licus finem seculi', and Av 36 has 'litus finis seculi'. All of these commentaries provide 'finis', which becomes 'la fin' in BXIII, and so any of them could have been the source for this gloss.

20.9, 20.13, 20.14, and 20.15

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

23.2

This gloss expands the lemma "Li sage de la loi et li phariseu ont sis sur la chaiere de Moysi" as 'il ont
ensaigne la doctrine que Moyses enseigna, mes il n'ont mie fait les huevres qu'il fist'. This gloss, then, is in two parts. The first part explains that "sis sor la chaire de Moysi" means 'il ont ensaignié la doctrine que Moyses enseigna', and the second part explains that the Pharisees do not apply this 'doctrine' to their own lives, that 'il n'ont mie fait les huevres qu'il fist'. This is not unlike the gloss on Luke 20.47, which likewise makes a distinction between what the Pharisees know and what they actually do.

Five Latin commentaries, the Glossa, RB 1359, RB 2604, Hugh and Av 36, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Four of these commentaries, the Glossa, RB 1359, RB 2604 and Av 36, have material for the first part of the BXIII gloss. They all interpret 'oathedram' as, to quote Av 36, 'doctrinam Moysi', the full gloss in this commentary being, 'doctrinam Moysis quia ... docent quam docuit Moyses'. The Glossa has 'doctrinam quam docuit Moyses', and RB 1359 and RB 2604 have the same gloss, with 'id est in magisterio doctrine quam docuit Moyses'. Any of these glosses, with what is essentially the same material, could have been the source for the first part of the BXIII gloss.

Three Latin commentaries, Hugh, RB 1359 and RB 2604, have material for the second part of the gloss. Hugh, claiming John Chrysostom as his source, has 'pauci in
opere', which, like the BXIII gloss, makes the point that the Pharisees' 'works' were defective. The glosses in RB 1359 and RB 2604 are again the same; to quote RB 2604, 'sederunt scribent pharisei quae scilicet recte mores instruunt sed secundum quam doceunt non aguunt'. The gloss in Hugh, 'pauci in opere', is rather vague, simply suggesting that the Pharisees' works were poor. The gloss in RB 1359 and RB 2604 is not so vague; the Pharisees teach 'recte mores', but do not themselves live according to them, 'sed secundum quam doceunt non aguunt'. The gloss found in RB 1359 and RB 2604 is more definite, and therefore closer to the BXIII gloss than the gloss in Hugh.

Only RB 1359 and RB 2604 have likely source material for both parts of this BXIII gloss and are, therefore, the most likely Latin commentaries to have been the source for the BXIII gloss. It is interesting to note that the parts of their glosses which may have been the source for the BXIII gloss are, in fact, identical.

23.3

This gloss continues the theme raised in the preceding gloss, which made the point that the Pharisees taught what Moses taught, but did not live according to this teaching as he did. This is made explicit in this gloss, and is also made explicit in the lemma "il dient et ne
font pas", which is glossed as 'il ne font mie ce qu'il ensaignent'.

Five Latin commentaries, the Glossa, RB 1359, RB 2604, Hugh and RB 9577, gloss this lemma in a way which can be compared to the EXIII gloss. The glosses on this lemma in the Glossa, RB 9577, RB 1359 and RB 2604 are essentially the same. The Glossa has 'non concordat vita cum doctrina'; the others all have 'non concordat doctrina eorum et vita'. Hugh is the only commentary on this gloss not to have a similar gloss; it has, claiming Augustine as its source, 'Bene dicere et male vivere', which makes the same point but not as explicitly. The Glossa, RB 9577, RB 1359 and RB 2604 all have 'doctrina', which, even though it is a noun, is a possible source for EXIII's 'ensaignment', and they all make the distinction between the Pharisees' teachings and their lives, as does the EXIII gloss. Hugh's gloss, that they say good things but do bad, is not as explicit, although the same basic point is made. It is the gloss in the Glossa, RB 9577, RB 1359 and RB 2604 which is the more likely Latin source for this EXIII gloss.

23.4(1)

This gloss expands the lemma "Il lient granz fes et neant portables" as 'il comandent grieves penances, qui pueent a paines estre fetes'.
One Latin commentary, RB 1359, has a gloss on this lemma which is similar to the BXIII gloss; there is a strong content link between the two. RB 1359 has 'quia eas fuisse viribus nullus implere potest legis mandata vocat onera importabilia'. 'Nullus implere potest' is very like 'qui pueent a paines estre fetes', but there is no suggestion of 'peneances' in the Latin gloss.

RB 1359 is a possible, but perhaps not very likely, source for this BXIII gloss.

23.4(2)

This gloss explains the lemma 'et ne les vuelent mie movoir a lor doi' as 'il ne vuelent mie fere neis legiere peneance'.

The gloss in RB 2604 can be compared to this BXIII gloss. It has 'penitentiam', which could have been the source for BXIII's 'peneance', which forms the basis of the BXIII gloss. RB 2604, then, is a possible source for this BXIII gloss.

23.5

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.
This gloss expands the lemma "et estre aplevé mestre des homes" not only by adding 'aiment' to it, but also by changing the passive voice in the lemma into an active one in the gloss; thus the gloss reads 'et aiment que li home les apelent mestres'. The 'aiment' in fact occurs in the Bible text itself and would need no other source. At the beginning of verse six, it introduces the whole passage of which the lemma is a part: "il aiment les premiers sieges es ceines, et les premiers chairies es synagogues, et les saluemenz es marchiez, et estre aplevé mestre des homes'. The glossator repeats 'aiment' in his gloss because it is really part of his lemma and can serve to introduce the rest of his gloss, and also because, being a verse away, it may not be uppermost in his audience's minds and he wants to remind them of it. The change from the passive voice in the text to the active voice in the gloss is not unusual in BXIII glosses, and seems to be done for clarity and emphasis.

Two Latin commentaries, the Glossa and Av 36, have material in their glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Both of them use the verb 'vocar'. The Glossa has 'voceris', which, like 'vocari' in the Vulgate, is in the passive voice. Av 36, however, has 'voceaverit', which, like 'apelent' in the BXIII gloss, is the active voice.
Although changing a passive voice in the text into an active voice in the lemma is sufficiently common in BXIII to suggest that the glossator may be doing it on his own initiative, it is however possible that when there is a Latin source which does the same, the glossator would seem to be following the Latin source. Given this, Av 36 is a possible source for this BXIII gloss.

23.11 and 23.14(1)

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

23.14(2)

This gloss takes the lemma 'por ce recevroiz graindre jugement', and explains that it means 'por ce seroiz vos plus damné'. This gloss, then, explains that 'graindre jugement' really means greater damnation, thus giving the lemma a more precise meaning.

Hugh has 'id est maiorem damnationem' on this gloss, which the BXIII glossator only needed to change into a verb phrase to make more like the syntax of the lemma he was following, and hence suitable for his own gloss. Hugh, then, is a possible source for this BXIII gloss.
No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

This gloss interprets the lemma "qui fetes meneor des autres et estes avugles" as 'qui devez mener les autres par exemples de bones huevres, et vos avez poiors huevres que n'ont li autre'. This is a typical BXIII gloss in that it raises the issue of proper behaviour. In this gloss, blindness is the failure to act properly.

The gloss on this lemma in Av 36 can be compared to this BXIII gloss. This Latin gloss is not very close to the BXIII gloss. It contains the word 'fraudulentia', and in that the Pharisees should lead others through the example of their good works, but in fact do worse things than other people, they are indeed frauds.

If the glossator used the material in Av 36 here, then it would have needed considerable expansion. It is hardly surprising that this expansion should be concerned with good works and the failure of the Pharisees to do the good works required of them, given that the theme of 'good works' is a common one in the BXIII Gospel glosses. However, this theme would seem to have come not from the
commentary tradition\textsuperscript{13}, and so a commentary source may not have been needed here. Av 36 is the only commentary with any material on this lemma, and can be considered a possible, but not very likely, source for this BXIII gloss.

23.23

This gloss expands the lemma "qui dismez" as 'qui donez et rendez disme'. This changes the verb 'dismez' into a phrase which uses two more common verbs, 'donez' and 'rendez' and the noun 'disme'. On the face of it, this gloss is purely dittologioal in that it takes a word and substitutes others for it. Such a gloss could easily be interpreted as being written on the glossator's own initiative, and as depending on the French text for its basis. It is unlikely, perhaps, to have had a Latin source.

However, six Latin commentaries, the Glossa, the HS, Hugh, RB 8893,6, RB 9080 and Av 36, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Even in Latin, the meaning of the lemma 'decimatis' is far from clear; both the HS and Hugh state of it that, to quote Hugh, 'Sensus dubius est', and this is the premise from which both the Latin and BXIII glosses start.
The Latin glosses on this lemma are like the BXIII gloss, dittological glosses in that they replace a single word in the lemma with a word or other words. They do, however, have different meanings for 'decimatis', and all but one, the Glossa, give alternative meanings. The Glossa has 'queritis' and 'exigitis', both of which imply the receiving of 'deoimae' by the subject. The alternative, that 'decimo' means giving, is found in RB 9080, which glosses 'decimatis' as 'dabant/dare' and 'offerebant' as 'offere'. All the other commentaries gloss 'decimatis' as meaning both receiving and giving 'deoimae'. The HS has 'accipit' and 'dat', the verb 'do' also being found in three other commentaries, namely Hugh, RB 9080 (already discussed), and Av 36. In Hugh, the idea of receiving, rendered by 'accipio' in the HS, is expressed by 'exigitis', as it also is in the Glossa and Av 36. Av 36, as well as having 'do' for the idea of giving, also has 'exibo', thus two verbs for giving and only one, 'exigo', for receiving. RB 8893,6 has a completely different pair of verbs, with 'recipio' for receiving and 'reddo' for giving.

In the BXIII gloss, we only have one interpretation of the verb 'dismer' rather than two. The BXIII glossator opted for the idea of giving in his gloss, using 'donez' and 'rendez'. As we have seen above, 'do' is found in four commentaries, the HS, Hugh, Av 36 and RB 9080, so these commentaries must be the ones which could have been the source for BXIII's 'donez'. 'Reddo', for BXIII's
'rendez', is found in RB 8893,6. This suggests that the glossator used two commentaries for his gloss on this lemma, one of the HS, Hugh, Av 36, RB 9080 group, plus RB 8893,6. Another suggestion is that the glossator had just one of these sources, but followed the pattern of that source in giving two synonyms.

The conclusion for this gloss is that BXIII, like its possible source, is a dittological gloss, and that the choice of words to use was governed by what the glossator found in his sources. These likely sources are the HS, Hugh, Av 36, RB 9080, or RB 8893,6.

23.24

This gloss interprets "qui solez le vuiet et gloutissiez le chameil" as 'qui fetes forces es petites choses et lessiez ailer les granz'.

Six Latin commentaries, the Glossa, the HS, Hugh, RB 9577, RB 2604 and Av 36, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. These six commentaries all contain one of two glosses on this lemma. One of these glosses, found in the Glossa, RB 9577, and RB 2604 is, to quote the text of the Glossa, 'opinione religionis in minimis quae lucrum habent diligentiam ostenditis sed magna praecipita de iudicio fides et misericordia devoratis et neglegitis'. The
second gloss, found in the HS, Hugh and Av 36, seems to have allowed more variation, but all three Latin commentaries make essentially the same point, that, to quote Av 36, 'excolantes culicem id est minora subtiliter disquirentes camelum glutientes id est maiora subficientes'. Hugh has 'excolantes culicem id est minora disquirentes ...camelum autem glutientes id est subficientes maiora', and adds 'maiora peccata videntes tacent'. The gloss in the HS is along the same lines, although some of the phrases are slightly different, and it seems to bear some link to the gloss found in the Glossa, RB 9577 and RB 2604; it has 'Minima, sicut culicem, diligenter inquiritis, ut decimas, majora, scilicet misericordiam et judicium absconditis ... Minora peccata subditorum diligenter arguitis, projicitis granora'.

It is the phrases 'minora subtiliter disquirentes ... maiora subficientes' in Av 36 and Hugh, and 'minora peccata subditorum diligenter arguitis, projicitis granora' in the HS, which are the likely sources for BXIII's 'fetes forces es petites choses et lessiez aler les granz'. The gloss found in the Glossa, RB 9577 and RB 2604 is longer and more detailed, and would seem to belong to a different tradition of glossing for this lemma. It is not as likely a source for this BXIII gloss as the one in Hugh, the HS and Av 36, into which tradition the BXIII gloss would seem to fit.
This gloss identifies the 'Abel juste' in the lemma as 'le martyr Abel juste'.

The gloss on this lemma in Av 36 identifies 'Abel' in much the same way as the BXIII gloss, in that it too describes him as a martyr in part of a longer gloss on two different types of martyr. It has on this type 'martires laici igitur per Abel pastorem'. All that the glossator would have needed from his source commentary is the information that Abel was a martyr, and this is certainly found in Av 36. Av 36 is, therefore, a possible source for this BXIII gloss.

This gloss, like the preceding one, also identifies a character from the text. In this case, it is 'Symon le liepreus' who is identified as 'Symon qui avoit esté mesel et que Jhesus avoit curé'. This gloss is also found on Mark 14.3(1)14.

Five Latin commentaries, the Glossa, the HS, RB 2604, RB 9577 and RB 10891, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. All of them have the same basic information, that Simon was cured by the Lord or by God. The glosses in RB 2604 and RB 9577 are
exactly the same, having 'Symon iste leprosus fuerat sed curatus a Domino'. The gloss in the HS is almost the same, the only difference being that 'sanatus' is used instead of 'curatus', giving 'Simon fuerat leprosus, et a Domino sanatus'. The gloss in RB 10891 is a little different. It has 'Symonis scripsi leprosus quidem fuit sed curatus a Deo'. The Glossa, finally, is different again, making explicit that Simon was cured because he believed in the Lord, 'credidit Domino et curata est'.

It is unlikely that RB 10891 was the source for this gloss, as 'Deo' is less likely than 'Domino' to have prompted the BXIII glossator to write 'Jhesus' in his gloss. 'Dominus', however, was ambiguous in meaning, as it could mean both God the Father and God the Son, and could have led to the glossator using 'Jhesus' in his own gloss.

Four Latin commentaries, the HS, RB 2604, RB 9577 and RB 10891, state quite clearly that Simon had been a leper; 'leprosus fuerat', to quote RB 2604 and RB 9577. This phrase, or perhaps RB 10891's 'leprosus quidem fuit', may have been the source for BXIII's 'qui avoit esté mesel'. Seeing that his source stated clearly that Simon had been a leper probably prompted the BXIII glossator to put a similar statement in his own gloss, but rather than repeat 'lieprous', he glossed this with the synonym 'mesel'. No Latin commentary has anything which could have been a more direct source for this 'mesel'.

Those commentaries, then, which are the most likely to have been the source for this BXIII gloss, are those which have 'Domino' rather than 'Deo', and a phrase such as 'leprosus fuerat' to prompt 'qui avoit esté mesel', namely, the HS, RB 2604 and RB 9577. The Glossa, with a different emphasis, and RB 10891, with 'Deo', can probably be excluded.

26.7(1)

This gloss gives an explanation of what 'alabastre' is, and claims to be quoting Bede. This gloss is also found on Mark 14.3(2)\textsuperscript{16}. It seems likely that rather than using Bede directly, the glossator would have used a more recent Latin commentary which reproduced the Bede gloss, with an attribution of the gloss to Bede.

Ten Latin commentaries, the Glossa, RB 9577, RB 2604, RB 10891, RB 1359, RB 9978, RB 8893,6, the HS, Hugh and Av 36, gloss this lemma. A study of them reveals that there were three points about alabaster that a Latin commentator might want to make. The first point is a definition of what alabaster actually is, the second is the reason why it was used for precious ointments, and the third was what exactly it was used to make. All three are found in the BXIII gloss.
The first point, a definition of alabaster, is found in nine commentaries, namely the Glossa, RB 9577, RB 2604, RB 10891, RB 1359, RB 9978, RB 8893, 6, the HS and Hugh. They range from short definitions, such as 'genus marmoris' in the Glossa, 'genere marmoris' in Hugh and 'marmoris candidi' in RB 8893, 6, through a fuller definition in RB 9978, 'marmor variis coloribus intertinotum', to the fullest definition of which the HS is typical, 'est genus marmoris candidi, et perlucidi variis coloribus intertinoti', found in exactly the same form in RB 10891, and without 'et perlucidi' in RB 9577, RB 2604 and RB 1359. BXIII's 'est une maniéré de blanc marbre' would need only 'genus marmoris candidi' in its Latin source, suggesting that any of these nine commentaries apart from the Glossa and Hugh (which have only 'genus/genere marmoris') could have been the source for this part of the gloss. Av 36 is the only commentary not to have any definition of alabaster in its gloss on this lemma.

The second point made in many of these Latin commentaries is why alabaster was used for precious ointments. This point is made in eight Latin commentaries, namely the Glossa, RB 9577, RB 2604, RB 10891, RB 9978, RB 8893, 6, the HS and Hugh. Five of these, RB 9577, RB 2604, RB 10891, RB 9978 and the HS, with a little variation in word order and verb tenses, have the following formula, 'quod incorrupta servat unguenta', to quote the HS. This is stressed more forcefully in RB 9577 and RB 2604, which
have 'quod optime servare ea incorrupta dicatur'. The Glossa makes the same point but in different words, with 'servantur unguenta sine detrimento', as does Hugh, with 'unguenta servantur illibrata'. RB 8893.6 merely has 'conservat unigenta'. This point is also made in the BXIII gloss, which has 'por ce qu'il les garde lonc tens sansz corrupcion et sansz enpoirier'. It seems likely that the glossator slightly expanded his source commentary for his own gloss; 'enpoirier' would seem to be an addition. It also seems likely that BXIII's 'corrupcion' was prompted by 'incorrupta' in the source commentary, suggesting that the source for this, the second part of the gloss, was a commentary using 'incorrupta', namely RB 9577, RB 2604, RB 10891, RB 9978 and the HS. Again, Hugh and the Glossa seem less likely sources.

The third point made by some of these Latin commentaries, is what exactly alabaster was used to make. Eight Latin commentaries, RB 9577, RB 2604, RB 9978, RB 10891, RB 9993.6, the HS, Hugh and Av 36, have something on this in their glosses on this lemma. Seven of these commentaries use the word 'vas', or its diminutive 'vasoulum', in their glosses. Six commentaries, RB 9577, RB 2604, RB 9978, RB 10891, Hugh and Av 36, all give the use of 'vas' for ointments, either as 'vasa unguentaria', as in RB 2604, RB 9577, RB 9978 and RB 10891, or as 'vas plenum unguenti', as in Hugh and Av 36. RB 8893.6 is the only one of these commentaries not to do this, having just 'vasoulum'. Hugh and Av 36 also give other uses of
alabaster, namely, 'vas vini, vel oler', to quote Hugh. The HS does not use 'vas', but has instead 'pyxidem', and 'scyphum vini, scyphum lactis'. BXIII has 'del quel l'en fet boistes et vesseax por mestre precius oignemenz'. 'Boistes' is found in the lemma, and would not need any other source, and 'vesseax' is best matched by 'vas' or 'vasculum'. Any of the six commentaries which state that alabaster was used for 'vas' or 'vasculum', themselves used for 'unguenta', namely, RB 9577, RB 2604, RB 9978, RB 10891, Hugh and Av 3 6 , could have been the source for this part of the BXIII gloss.

The situation for this BXIII gloss is as follows. The possible sources for the first part of the gloss are: RB 9577, RB 2604, RB 10891, RB 1359, RB 9978, RB 8893, and the HS; for the second part, these are: RB 9577, RB 2604, RB 10891, RB 9978 and the HS, and for the third: RB 9577, RB 2604, RB 9978, RB 10891, Av 36 and Hugh. The only commentaries which could have been source for all three parts of the BXIII gloss, therefore, are RB 9577, RB 2604, RB 9978 and RB 10891. It is these four commentaries, then, of the ten which gloss this lemma, which are the most likely to have been the source for the BXIII gloss. However, none of them claims Bede as its own source, so while the material in this BXIII gloss is well attested in Latin commentaries, no possible source has been found for the attribution of this material to Bede, suggesting that none of the Latin commentaries could have been a direct source for this BXIII gloss.
Both RB 9577 and RB 2604 are very close to the gloss on alabaster given in Bede’s commentary on Mark\(^1\), and it is perhaps not impossible to imagine that the BXIII glossator used such a commentary in a copy which perhaps had 'Beda', or merely 'B', marked in the margin.

26.7(2)

This gloss identifies 'sælæ fæme' as 'sainæ Marie Magdalaena'.

Five Latin commentaries, the Glossa, RB 2604, RB 9577, RB 10891 and RB 1359, all identify this 'mulier' as Mary Magdalene. Any of these Latin commentaries, therefore, could have been the source for this BXIII gloss.

26.10

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

26.16

This gloss explains 'covenabletæ' as 'tens et leu covenable'. The theme of the proper time for things to happen is one of the recurring themes in BXIII\(^2\).
The gloss in Hugh on this lemma can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Hugh has 'loci, et temporis et societatis', his 'loci' and 'temporis' clearly being likely sources for BXIII's 'leu' and 'tens'.

26.17

This gloss explains what is meant by 'jorz des azimes', and is also more or less the same as two other glosses on Luke 22.7 and Mark 14.12\(^1\)\(^9\), which are on the same lemma. The 'jorz des azimes' is defined as being the day on which 'li Juyf se gardoient de mengier chose ou levisins fuer'. The only difference between this gloss and that in Luke on 22.7, is that the latter gloss also claims that the Jews did not eat any 'miel' on that day either.

Five Latin commentaries, the Glossa, the HS, RB 9577, RB 1359 and Av 36, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. Three of them, the Glossa, RB 9577 and RB 1359, all use the same phrase in their glosses on this lemma, 'quando fermento abieoto', to quote RB 9577. The gloss in Av 36 is different; it has 'fermentum tollerbatur de dominibus hebreorum'. Of these two alternatives, 'abjicio' is closer to BXIII's 'se garder' than is Av 36's 'tollo'. Both 'abjicio' and 'se garder' imply action or thought on the part of the Jews not to eat yeast; 'tollo' implies it was physically removed out of their way, and they did not need to think
about avoiding it. The gloss in the HS is not as close. It has 'id est ea in die, cujus vespere agnus erat immolandus, et edendus cum azymis', which could be taken to imply that as leaven was eaten on the eve of this day, that it was not eaten on the day itself. This is not a very likely source for this gloss.

The conclusion for this gloss, then, is that the Glossa, RB 9577 and RB 1359 are more likely to have been its source than Av 36 and the HS.

26.19

This gloss gives quite a lengthy description of what happens at Passover, taken from the account given in Exodus 12.1-20, and more specifically in Exodus 12.6-11. The question here is whether the glossator took his gloss directly from the account in Exodus, or whether he took it from a Latin commentary which gave this account as part of its own gloss on the lemma.

One Latin commentary, Av 36, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Two others, the HS and the Glossa, have a small amount of relevant material in their glosses on Matthew 26.17, on 'azymis'.

All three commentaries contain the information that the lamb was sacrificed in the evening, found in the BXIII
gloss, and, of course, in Exodus\(^{20}\). This information reading 'agnum immolant ad vespam', is all that the Glossa has which is relevant to this BXIII gloss. The gloss in the HS has this information, plus another detail, reading 'ea die, in oujus vespers agnus erat immolandus, et edendus cum azymis'; 'edendus cum azymis', however, is not a detail found in the BXIII gloss\(^{21}\). The gloss in Av 36 is the fullest, and most like the BXIII gloss. It has 'agnus immolatus est quartaeoima luna' and 'vespere quartaeoimae lune per consequem cenam'. This provides source material for BXIII's 'et estoit oois au quatorzieme jor au vespre', and 'cenam' may have suggested 'mengiez'. This is more than the Glossa and the HS provide.

Of these three commentaries, then, Av 36 is the most likely to have been the source for this BXIII gloss.

However, the BXIII gloss is full of details which are not found in any of these Latin commentaries, but are found in the account given in Exodus 12.1-20. The BXIII gloss is, in fact, a synopsis of the Exodus account of the first passover. The glossator has taken the information in Exodus and re-ordered it slightly, dealing with the killing of the lamb first (Exodus 12.6), then the eating of it (Exodus 12.9-10), then what must be done with its blood (Exodus 12.7), followed by how it is to be cooked (Exodus 12.9), and finishing with the instruction that it is to be eaten in haste, with one's shoes on, and with one's staff in one's hand (Exodus 12.11). Exodus 12.6-
11 then, would seem to be the source for this BXIII gloss. The BXIII gloss includes most of the material in this part of Exodus. The glossator only left out the details of who is to kill the lamb (Exodus 12.6), that of it being eaten with unleavened bread (Exodus 12.8, also in the gloss in the HS), and also with 'lactucis agrestibus' (also 12.8). The account in Exodus 12.8 contains details that are not necessary to make sense of the story, and were perhaps left out from the BXIII gloss on the grounds that too many details would detract from the main point of the gloss, which is to explain what the Jews do at Passover. The information in Exodus 12.6, 'immolabitque eum universa multitudo filiorum Israel', may have been left out for another reason. The glossator has kept his gloss 'historical' in that he explains what happens at Passover. There is not the slightest suggestion in his gloss that any other interpretation is possible, and that the lamb may be interpreted as Christ, as in, for example, Av 36, 'agnus verus id est Christus'. Such an interpretation would mean that the phrase in Exodus 12.6 could be interpreted as prefiguring the crucifixion of Christ. This is a level of interpretation which is not very common in the BXIII Gospel glosses, although it does occur in the gloss on John 19.14, and is far more common in BXIII's Genesis glosses. It is possible, therefore, that the information in Exodus 12.6 was deliberately left out of his gloss by the glossator on the grounds that it raised issues he did not want to discuss in his gloss.
The source for the information in this BXIII gloss, then, is Exodus 12.6-11. However, the fact that three Latin commentaries give some, admittedly very little, of this information in their own glosses on, or near, this lemma, suggests that a Latin commentary may have been the source for the BXIII gloss in that its presence suggested that a gloss was necessary to the glossator. The most likely Latin commentary to have done this is Av 36, its gloss being on the same lemma as the BXIII gloss. Had the glossator used either the Glossa or the HS, then his own gloss would most likely have been on 26.17, as are their glosses. Another point in favour of Av 36, is the fact that it interprets the lamb as Christ. This may have suggested to the glossator that, given this interpretation, the information in Exodus 12.6 would be best omitted. What may have happened with this BXIII gloss, is that the gloss in Av 36 suggested to the BXIII glossator that a gloss was necessary here and suggested the line his gloss could take, that is, a description of what happens at Passover. However, the glossator, wanting to write a more historical gloss than was in his source commentary, may have used a concordance to identify or locate the account of the first Passover in Exodus 12.6-11 as a source of information; he would have been fully aware that, as in his source commentary, allegorical interpretations of Passover were possible, and anything prompting such as interpretation had no
place in his own Gospel gloss. This would account for the exclusion of some of the information in Exodus 12.6.

26.24(1)

This gloss expands "si come il est esct de lui" as 'si come les prophetes prophecierent de lui'.

The gloss on this lemma in Av 36 has 'prophetas', which is a likely source for BXIII's 'prophètes'. 'Prophecierent' would then be a gloss on 'esctit', done perhaps on the glossator's own initiative, but prompted by 'prophetas/prophètes'.

26.24(2)

This gloss takes the lemma "Las a celui par qui il sera traiz et bailliez" and expands "celui par qui il sera ... bailliez" as 'cil qui le bailler a en la main des Juys', following this expansion with another, of "las", as 'sera pardonment en enfer'.

No Latin commentary has any material which may be considered the source for the first expansion in this gloss; but three, the HS, Hugh and Av 36, have material which can be compared to the second. They all have essentially the same material. The HS has 'aeternam
nolat damnationem, et est: Prebit aeternaliter'; Hugh has 'aeternae damnationis'; and Av 36 has 'eterna dampnatio erat homini illi'. Any of these glosses could have been the source for BXIII's 'oil ... sera pardurablement en enfer'.

The first expansion in the BXIII gloss allows the glossator to add 'en la main des Juys', but this is material which does not occur in his Latin source. It was perhaps material added by the glossator on the grounds that this was a point which it would be as well to make clear to avoid misunderstandings. It also allows him to stress that it is the Jews who were responsible for the crucifixion of Christ. This is the sort of addition for which the glossator may not have needed a source text; there is no material in it that cannot be derived from the Bible. It is possible that the first part of this BXIII gloss is the glossator's own, and that the second part comes from the HS, Hugh or AV 36.

26.24(3)

This gloss explains both clauses of the lemma "bone chose fust a lui, se il n'eust onques esté nez", and is almost the same as a gloss on Mark 14.21(2). The second part of the lemma is dealt with first, the glossator explaining that "se il n'eust onques esté nez" means 's'il eust esté morz el ventre sa mere'. The
glossator then explains how this would have been better for him, because 'il eust en enfer molt menor paine'.

Four Latin commentaries, the Glossa, the HS, RB 1359 and Av 36, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. Two of these commentaries, the Glossa and RB 1359, have very little in common with the BXIII gloss. Their glosses, in fact, are the same on this point, having 'Multo melius esset omnino non esse quem male esse'. This, like the BXIII gloss, gives a reason why it would have been better not to have been born; however, it is not the same reason as that given in the BXIII gloss, and so is an unlikely source for it. The glosses in the HS and Av 36 are more like the BXIII gloss. They both have material for both parts of the gloss, and, like the BXIII gloss, they both gloss the second part of the lemma first. The gloss in Av 36 has 'melius esset ei quia decederet', which could have been the source for BXIII's 's'il eust esté morz'. The HS, however, is even more like the BXIII gloss in that, as well as having 'periisset' for this part of the gloss, it also has 'utero', a likely source for BXIII's 'el ventre sa mere', in 'melius esset ei, si non esset natus de utero, sed periisset in utero'. The HS then goes on to explain why this would have been better, with 'tunc enim pro solo originali peccato damnatus esset', which implies that his sufferings in hell would have been less because he would only have had original sin to atone for. The gloss in Av 36, however, makes this point explicit, with
'melius esset ei quia deoedert tamen oun originali et sic mitius puniretur'. This is closer to the BXIII gloss. 'Mitius puniretur' is a possible source for BXIII's 'molt menor paine', with 'en enfer' being perhaps an addition by the glossator for clarity. The idea of 'originali' in the source is omitted, perhaps to limit the subject treated in the gloss and avoid complicating the issue.

The commentaries most likely to have been the sources for this BXIII gloss, then, are the HS for the first part of the gloss, and Av 36 for the second part. The Glossa and RB 1359 would not seem to have been used for this gloss.

26.25 and 26.28

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

26.29

This gloss explains that, '"el regne de mon Pere"', means 'el ciel'.

One Latin commentary, RB 2604, has 'celestem' in its gloss on this commentary, and this is a possible source for the BXIII gloss.
26.31

This gloss also occurs on Mark 14.27\textsuperscript{25}. No commentary source has been identified for the gloss in either Gospel.

26.33 and 26.35

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

26.38

This gloss explains why it is Christ says ""M'ame est tristre desi a la mort"", with 'ge', that is, 'myself', an expansion of 'tristre' as 'ne ... liez ne joieus', and an explanation of how Christ's death will make him happy.

Two Latin commentaries, the Glossa and RB 9577, have glosses on this lemma which could have been the source for this BXIII gloss. The Glossa is the only one of the two to have any material for the interpretation of 'ame' as 'ge'; it glosses 'anima' as 'Christus', which, like 'ge', suggests the whole person, and not just the soul.
Neither commentary has anything which could have been the source for the expansion of 'tristre' as 'ne ... liez ne joieus'. Both commentaries have material for the rest of the BXIII gloss. In fact what they have is very much the same material (taken, according to the Glossa, from St Hilary) but presented in a slightly different order. They have, to quote the version in the Glossa, 'Non propter mortem sed donec apostolos sua liberet passione. Non mors sed tempus mortis in metu est, quia post virtutem resurrectionis fides est firmanda ordecentium'. BXIII's 'ge aie rachete ... par ma mort et par ma resurrection' could be a translation of 'liberet passione'; 'l'umain lignage' could be an expansion by the glossator of 'credentium'.

Both commentaries, then, are equally likely to have been the source for the second part of the BXIII gloss; but only the Glossa, with 'Christus' as an interpretation of 'anima', has any material to match BXIII's interpretation of 'm'ame' as 'ge'. The expansion of 'tristre' could have been done by the glossator without a Latin source; it seems unlikely that 'tristre' would not have been understood by his audience, and it is possible that this expansion is there solely for emphasis. The conclusion for this gloss is that the Glossa is the source for most of it, and that either the source for the expansion of 'tristre' has not been identified, or it may be the glossator's own.
This gloss expands two parts of the lemma. First, it expands "‘ostezi moi cest henap’" as 'destornez ceste mort', thus interpreting 'henap' as 'mort', and then expands "‘que ge ne le boive’", as, 'qu'il ne la me coviegne souffrir'. It is more or less the same as the gloss on Mark 14.36.

Two Latin commentaries, the Glossa and Av 36, have material in their glosses on this commentary which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. Both of them interpret 'calix' as 'mors', and so could be the source for the interpretation of 'henap' as 'mort' in the first part of the BXIII gloss. The gloss in Av 36 adds 'si possible est sine morte mea temporali genus humanum salvari', but this is an unlikely source for BXIII's 'qu'il ne la me coviegne souffrir'.

Either the Glossa or Av 36 could have been possible sources for the first part of this BXIII gloss, and no possible source has been identified for the second part.

26.41 and 26.45

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.
This gloss explains what is meant by "tuit oil qui prendront espee pour ferir periront par espee". The first part of this lemma, "tuit oil qui prendront espee pour ferir", is expanded as 'tuit oil qui seront homicide ou par fet ou par volenté', which explains that 'homicide ... par volenté' is as bad as 'homicide ... par fet', and worthy therefore of the same punishment. The second part of the lemma, "periront par espee'", is expanded as 'periront par le droiturier jugement Nostre Seignor', thus interpreting the second "espee" as 'le droiturier jugement Nostre Seignor'.

Two Latin commentaries, the Glossa and Hugh, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Neither of these commentaries has any material which may have been the source for the first part of the BXIII gloss. They both rather concentrate on the different possible interpretations of 'gladio'. The Glossa interprets the second 'gladio', in 'gladio peribunt', as 'igneus veritatem ante paradisum, id est divine vindicte', and as 'verbi dei'. 'Verbi dei' forms part of the gloss in Hugh on the first 'gladio', 'qui acceperint gladium verbi Dei ad defendendum errores suos, vel gladium excommunicationis propter iram, vel odium, vel gladium vindictae'; Hugh interprets the second 'gladio' as, 'sententia divina'. 'Divine vindictae', 'verbi Dei' and 'sententia divina' could all have suggested the idea
of 'le droiturier jugement Nostre Seignor' to the glossator; this means that either the Glossa or Hugh could have been the source for the second part of the BXIII gloss.

No possible Latin source has been identified for the first part of the gloss. If the glossator used either the Glossa or Hugh, then he would have needed some other source for the first part, or would have added it himself. This first part of the gloss is moralistic in that it explains that 'homicide .. par volenté', wishing someone dead, is as bad as 'homicide .. par fet', actually killing someone. The glossator is, therefore, dealing with the issue not only of how people should act (i.e., they should not kill others), but also how people should think (i.e., they should not wish others dead).

This forms a good introduction for the second part of the gloss, which promises that people will be judged by 'le droiturier jugement Nostre Seignor', the whole gloss going on to suggest that people will be judged according to their thoughts and deeds. This is the sort of material that occurs elsewhere in the BXIII Gospel glosses, and may have had a source other than the commentary tradition.
No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

This gloss does two things. First of all it expands the lemma "Il a dit blasphème" as 'il a dit ledenge contre Deu', which provides a definition of 'blasphème'; it then explains the sentence preceding this lemma, 'Lors despeca li princes des prestres sa vesteure', by explaining that this was a custom. A definition of blasphemy, although one using different words, is also given on Mark 2.729.

No Latin commentary identified has any material which could have been the source for the first part of the BXIII gloss, the definition of 'blasphème'. However, five, the Glossa, Hugh, the HS, RB 2604 and RB 1359, have material which can be compared to the second part of this gloss.

All five of these commentaries explain that the ripping of clothes was a Jewish custom, all of them, apart from the HS, using essentially the same phrase, 'mos erat (Glossa 'est') Iudaorum'. The HS has 'consuetudinis Judaicae', which means the same thing. Either phrase
could be the source for BXIII's 'Il estoit lors costume'. All five commentaries also explain that the Jews rip their clothes when they hear something blasphemous, all of them using 'audio' and 'blasphemia', as in 'cum audiebant aliquid blasphemia' in RB 1359. Again, any of these five commentaries could have been the source for BXIII's 'quant aucuns disoit blatenge', in which the glossator changes a passive construction in his source to an active one in his own gloss, but keeps the meaning of his source commentary. Only one commentary, however, has anything to match BXIII's explanation of why the Jews should act like this. The explanation in Hugh, 'in signum quid corda eorum similiter scindebantur', is not like BXIII's 'en tesmoing de la blatenge' but it does nevertheless show that such an explanation of the Jews' behaviour could form part of a gloss on this lemma. It is interesting to note that in the Old Testament, the rending of clothes seems usually to have been a sign of sorrow or mourning, and this may account for why such an explanation would be needed here. In this case, the rending of clothes is 'en tesmoing', without specifically referring to mourning. It is perhaps because of this slight change in significance that 'en tesmoing' is given in the BXIII gloss and in Hugh. 'En tesmoing de la blatenge' is probably the simplest explanation possible for this Jewish custom.

The first part of this BXIII gloss, which gives a definition of 'blaspheme', is not found in any commentary...
consulted to date, and may be the glossator’s own, prompted by a knowledge that ‘blaspheme’ is a technical word, meaning ‘ledenge contre Deu’ and not just ‘ledenge’, and best explained as such to avoid any misunderstanding on the part of his audience, or may be from a different type of text\textsuperscript{31}. The same could be true of the explanation that this ripping of clothes was ‘en tesmoing de la blatenge’, or this could have been prompted by an explanation of this point in his source, Hugh. The existence of an explanation of this point in Hugh does not make this text a more likely source for this BXIII gloss, as the explanation is not the same. Given the instructions on what to do in cases of blasphemy in Leviticus 24.13-16, it is extremely unlikely that the glossator went directly to the Old Testament in this instance.

26.66

This gloss explains that ‘“Il est corpables de mort”’ means that ‘il a mort deservie’, and is found in a slightly different form on Mark 14.64\textsuperscript{32}.

The gloss in the Glossa can be compared to this BXIII gloss. It has ‘ideo morti addixerunt’. ‘Addico’ is not unlike ‘deservie’, both implying that ‘mort’ is what is deserved, or judged to be deserved. The Glossa, then, could well be the source for this BXIII gloss.
27.6 and 27.15

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

27.24

This gloss explains that "Ge sui innocenz" means "ge ne sui mie corpables".

The gloss on this lemma in Av 36 includes the word 'culpa', and this is a possible source for BXIII's 'corpables'. The glossator may not have wanted to include the rest of the gloss on the lemma in Av 36 in his own gloss, but may have felt that even such a straightforward synonymical gloss as he put in was necessary, probably for emphasis; the presence of 'culpa' in his source may have prompted him to use 'corpables'.

27.25

This gloss explains the lemma "Son sanc soit sor nos et seur noz enfanz" as meaning 'la colpe de ce qu'il est traitié a mort soit seur nos et seur noz filz', thus offering an interpretation of "Son sanc". 'Sanc' clearly implies 'traitié a mort', for which no Latin source may have been needed.
The gloss in Av 36 has 'culpa et pena', with 'culpa' matching BXIII's 'la colpe'. 'Pena' does not relate to the BXIII gloss at all, but 'culpa' may have been all that the glossator needed from his source.

27.53

This gloss interprets 'la sainte cité' as, 'Jerusalem'.

Three Latin commentaries, the Glossa, RB 2604 and RB 9957, also interpret this lemma as 'Jerusalem'. Any of these commentaries, therefore, could have been the source for this BXIII gloss.

27.62

This gloss explains what is meant by 'Paraceve'. It explains this briefly as being 'la preparacion, que li Juyf avoient fet lor apareillement a lor Pasque', that is, 'la preparacion ... a lor Pasque'. This gloss is not very different from the gloss on the same lemma on Mark 14.16, although it is much shorter, and consequently much less detailed, than one on John 19.1433.

Six Latin commentaries, the Glossa, the HS, RB 2604, RB 1359, RB 9957 and RB 8893,6, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. They all use
some form of the word 'preparatio' in their glosses, which is all the information found in this BXIII gloss. Any of these commentaries, therefore, could have been the source for this BXIII gloss.

27.65

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.
Chapter Three: Footnotes

1. In the following chapters, all quotations from BXIII are given with the punctuation from Sneddon's edition; this means that the glosses are given in parentheses. Also, I only quote those parts of the gloss, and of the Latin source, which are necessary for the discussion; full quotations are given in Appendix I. Where I refer to a particular meaning of a word, I have used the following dictionaries: for French, Tobler-Lommatzsch, *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, and Wartburg, *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, and for Latin, R E Latham and D R Howlett, *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, (for A - H), and where this is not available, D du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infirmae Latinitatis*, (1883-7 edition, edited by Niort and revised by L Favre), and R E Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources*.

2. For this gloss, see below, pp.210-11.


4. See the glosses in Hugh and the HS on this gloss.

5. This gloss is attributed to Bede in Hugh in his gloss on Luke 2.7.

6. See below, pp.367-71, and pp.461-89

7. See below, pp.367-71.

8. For this gloss, see below p.205.

9. For this gloss, see below pp.254-6.
10. For this gloss, see below pp.265-6.
11. See below, pp.410-11.
13. See below, pp.451-89
14. For this gloss, see below, pp.199-90.
15. See also the glosses on Luke 20.42 (below, pp.261-4) and Luke 2.22(3) (below, pp.217-20), and also the glosses on John 1.1-5 in Sneddon (1978: II 285).
16. For this gloss, see below, pp.199-92.
17. In his commentary on Mark, Bede has 'Est autem alabastrum genus marmoris candidi, variisque maculis intertincti, quod ad vasa unguentaria cavari solet, eo quod optime servare ea incorrupta dicoatur' (Migne, Patrologia cursus completus, series latina, vol. 92 col. 263 A. I have not consulted the commentary on Matthew attributed by Migne to Bede as this would seem to be an erroneous attribution (for which, see C Jenkins, 'Bede as exegete and theologian' in Bede, his Life, Times and Writings, edited by A Hamilton Thompson, Oxford 1935, p.195).)
18. See below, p.370.
19. For these glosses, see below, pp.266-70 and pp.193.
21. It is, however, in the account in Exodus 12.8.
22. For this gloss, see below, pp.336-41.
23. There are many examples of prefiguration in the Genesis glosses; see, for example, the glosses on 2.20, 4.8 and 21.5 in Quereuil (1988: 107, 121-1, 206).
24. For this gloss, see below, pp.195-6.
25. For this gloss, see below, p. 196.
26. For this gloss, see below, p. 196.
27. See below, pp. 367-71, and pp. 461-89.
28. For this gloss, see below, p. 166.
29. This explanation is not, however, what is given in the instructions on what do on hearing blasphemy, found in Leviticus 24.13-16, which are, not to rend one's clothes, but to put one's hand on one's head. It is possible that the Latin commentators misinterpreted the significance of rending one's clothes, for which, see the following note. If it is a misinterpretation, it would seem to have been relatively widespread.
30. See, for example, Genesis 37.34, when Jacob, believing Joseph to be dead, rends his clothes, or, again, Genesis 44.13, with Benjamin's brothers rending their clothes when Joseph's silver goblet is found in Benjamin's pack, or 2 Samuel 13.31, where David rends his clothes on hearing that Absalom has murdered all the royal princes, all of which are examples of the rending of clothes in sorrow or mourning. Ahab, in 1 Kings 21.27, rends his clothes as a sign of humility before the Lord's anger over his stealing of Naboth's vineyard. It can be seen from these examples, that the rending of clothes is being glossed slightly differently in BXIII, and indeed in Hugh.
31. See below, pp. 419-61, especially p. 439.
32. For this gloss, see below, p. 199.
33. For these glosses, see below, p. 194 and pp. 336-41.
Chapter Four: MARK

2.7

This gloss, on the lemma "Il blaspheme", gives a definition of 'blasphemy', with 'Il parole contre la Devineté'. A definition of blasphemy, although one which uses slightly different words, is also found in the gloss on Matthew 26.65. In the Matthew gloss, the definition of blasphemy is followed by an explanation of how the Jews rip their clothes when they hear it. No Latin commentary source has been identified either for this part of the gloss in Matthew, or for the gloss here in Mark, but it is possible that it is from a different type of text.

2.10

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

2.14

This BXIII gloss identifies 'Levi' as 'Matheu'.
Three Latin commentaries, Av 36, RB 9979 and RB 9471, do the same. The glosses in RB 9979 and RB 9471 are practically the same, with, to quote RB 9979, 'Levi Alphaeipse est Matheus ex tribu unde ortus est Levi vocatus'. The gloss in Av 36 is slightly different, 'Levi ... Matheu fuit'. All of these three commentaries identify 'levi' in the same way as the BXIII glossator, and any of them, therefore, could have been the source for the BXIII gloss.

2.26

This gloss defines 'les pains de proposicion' as 'les pains qui estoient saintefie'.

One Latin commentary, the Glossa, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. It has 'panes sanctificatos comedunt: significat sacerdotalalem olibum', its 'sanctificatos' being an excellent match for BXIII's 'saintifie'. Given this, the Glossa is a likely source for this BXIII gloss.

5.33

This BXIII gloss, like another on Luke 8.48\(^3\), identifies the woman suffering from haemorrhages, whom Christ cured, as being 'sainte Marthe'. To make this identification
more precise, the glossator adds that she was 'sereur sainte Marie Magdaleine et sereur saint Ladre que Nostre Sires resuscita'. The glossator also claims Ambrose as his authority here.

One Latin commentary, the HS, has the same identification in its gloss on this lemma, and the Latin commentator also claims Ambrose as his source. It has 'Ambrose in sermone De Salvatore dicit hanc fuisse Martham'. The Latin commentator then goes on to quote Ambrose on how Christ helped Martha, Mary and Lazarus, the part on Lazarus being relevant to our BXIII gloss, 'corpus redivivi spiritus calore constringit in Lazaro'. In the HS, 'redivivi', although an adjective, is a good match for 'resuscita'. The only parts of the BXIII gloss which are not in this Latin gloss are the point about Martha being the sister of Mary and Lazarus, and the information that she was Christ's 'ostesse'. These details, however, would not have needed a Latin commentary source, as they are part of the story as it is given in John⁴, and the glossator could have taken them from there.

The conclusion for this gloss, then, is that the HS is a likely source for this gloss. It is possible that the glossator took his gloss directly from Ambrose, but I think this is unlikely, as had he used Ambrose in general for his glosses, he would probably have put in more attributions to him. Furthermore, the attribution in the
BXIII gloss is not one to suggest that it is Ambrose is whom he is quoting. 'Meesmement sainz Ambroises l'afersme', added at the very end of the gloss, seems rather to be there to give the gloss authority. The gloss begins 'Aucuns croient', which implies that not everyone believes what follows; that there is good authority for believing it, however, is shown by saying that Ambrose believed it to be true. This, added to the fact that Ambrose is mentioned and quoted in the HS (which seems to have been a regular source for the BXIII glosses) suggests that the glossator was using the HS, and that he copied the attribution of this gloss to Ambrose found there and took the information he needed from his gloss as quoted there.

5.39

This gloss explains that when Christ said '"La pucele n'est mie morte, ainz dort"', he was not lying, that the girl was sleeping 'quant a lui', but dead 'quant as autres'.

One Latin commentary, Hugh, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. It has a gloss which compares the case of this girl to that of Lazarus in John 11.11, with, 'Simile Io. 11.b.5 Lazarus amicus noster dormit. Et hoc est verum licet mortuus quo ad nos, non tamen quo ad Deum, aut facile est eum vel eam
suscitare ac si dormirent'. This is close to most of the BXIII gloss, with 'Et hoc est verum licet mortuus quo ad nos, non tamen quo ad Deum' for BXIII's 'ele dormoit tant seulement quant a lui et estoit morte quant as autres', and 'aut facile est eum vel eam suscitare ac si dormirent' changed slightly for, 'as autres, qui ne poeient mie susciter ne esveillier del dormir de mort'. This Latin gloss has nothing, however, for BXIII's 'Jhesus, qui onques ne menti'. This would seem to be rather an obvious point to make, but it may be there to emphasize that what happened really is true. Hugh does have 'Et hoc est verum', matching, 'Jhesus ... discit verité', suggesting that the veracity of this story is a point Hugh felt he needed to state clearly too. BXIII's 'Jhesus, qui onques ne menti', may be an expansion of the Latin source gloss for emphasis.

The conclusion must be that Hugh was a likely source for this gloss.

5.43(1)

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.
This gloss explains why it is that Christ commanded that the girl be given something to eat. It explains first of all that getting her to eat something was a sign that she was really alive, and then explains why this should be a sign, when talking and walking are not. Magicians, who could make corpses walk and talk, could not make them eat.

Two commentaries, Hugh and the HS, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. The gloss in Hugh has 'In signum verae resurrectionis', which matches BXIII's 'por demoustrer que ele estoit veraiement resusciitee'. The HS makes this point too, with 'Hoc enim est verum experimentum verae resurrectionis'. The BXIII gloss then explains why getting the girl to eat is a sign of her being alive, while just getting her to walk and talk would not be; 'Aucun enchanteor furent jadis, qui fescient par lor charmes les cors des morz aler et parler; mes il ne les pooient mie fere mengier'. Hugh has nothing for this in its gloss, but the HS has 'Magi enim mortuos suscitant quibusdam characteribus alligatis sub utraque assella, et loqui eos, et inoedere faciunt, sed comedere nequa quam possunt'. This is very much the explanation given in the BXIII gloss, and is, therefore, a likely source for it.
It is the HS. with material for all of this BXXIII gloss, which is its likely source, though the HS is not unique for the first part of the gloss.

7.28

This gloss is on the lemma "ce n’est mie buen de prendre le pain que ses filz doivent mengier et doner as chiens!", which occurs a verse earlier, on 7.27. The first thing the gloss does is to explain that the Jews called 'les paiens' dogs because they were not circumcised and did not keep the law given to Moses. It then explains that some Christians call the Jews dogs because they have not received baptism. It then repeats the lemma, explaining 'pain' as 'grace', and repeating the identification of 'chiens' as being, in this instance, 'les paiens'. The next part of the gloss explains why Christ said "ce n’est mie buen de prendre le pain que ses filz doivent mengier et doner as chiens!", when the Phoenician woman asked him for help, when elsewhere in the Gospels (Matthew 7.7-8) he had said "Tuit oil qui quierent truevent, et qui demande receit, et l’en overra aceñui qui boutera a l'uis". What the glossator wants to do here is to explain away a seeming anomaly in what Christ said in different places in the Gospels.
Two Latin commentaries, Av 36 and the HS, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. The gloss in Av 36 identifies the dogs as being 'infideli', and the HS identifies them as 'gentiles'. Both 'gentiles' and 'infideli' are like BXIII's 'paiens'. Av 36 also has 'ovem', in 'de cane fecit ovem id est de infideli fidelem'. This may have suggested the passage from Matthew 10.5-6, given in this gloss as 'qu'il n'alassent mie en la voie des genz et qu'il n'entrassent es citez de Samarie, ainz alassent oincois as oeilles de la mesniee Israel qui estoient peries'. If the presence of 'ovem' in Av 36 suggested this to the glossator, then he could easily expand his source by using this passage from Matthew directly.

This is all either of the commentaries has of the information which is in the BXIII gloss. They do not mention that some Christians call the Jews dogs because they have not received baptism, but this may be an expansion of his Latin source by the glossator; just as 'les paiens' reject the law of Moses and his covenant with God, symbolized by circumcision, so do the Jews reject the new covenant, symbolized by baptism. Nor do they mention what the BXIII glossator perceives as a contradiction which needs to be resolved. The BXIII glossator often explains people's motives, or the reasons they say what they do, and this part of the gloss may fall into this category. He is, after all, doing nothing more than identifying what he thinks is a problem, using
a quotation from Matthew 7.7-8, and then explaining Christ's motives for why he says what he does in Mark 7.28 using another quotation, this time from Matthew 10.5-6. He would not need a Latin source commentary for these quotations, but may have had access to a concordance which would allow him to identify related passages elsewhere in the Gospels.

Of the two commentaries glossing this lemma, it is Av 36 which is most like the BXIII gloss, in that it provides 'infideli' and 'ovem'. The expansion of the Jews being called dogs may be the glossator's own, and 'ovem', or a concordance may have suggested that he look at Matthew 10.5-6 for part of his gloss, but the perception that there is a contradiction between what Christ said in Matthew 7.7-8, and what he says here, in Mark 2.28, has not been found in any Latin commentary.

9.1

No Latin source has been identified for this gloss, which is a quaestio and which gives an allegorical interpretation of the 'regne Deu' as being 'sainte yglise en cest present tens'.

This gloss explains that 'Helyes' is John the Baptist, and that he 'estoit Helyes quant a la vertu qu'il avoit del saint Esperit, mes il n'estoit mie Helye quant a la personne'. After the initial glossing of 'Helyes' as 'saint Johan Baptiste', the glossator uses a quotation from John 1.21 to ask 'Coment puet ce donques estre, que ce que Jhesus afferme, sainz Johans noie?'. To explain this, the glossator then takes a quotation from Luke 1.17, giving the angel's prophecy to Zacharias and the idea of 'en l'esperit et en la vertu de Helye', which in turn introduces the idea of 'vertu' which is expanded to answer the question raised by the glossator.

Two Latin commentaries, the Glossa and Av 36, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. The crux of the BXIII gloss is given at the end of it, as 'Lors est donc verité que Johans estoit Helyes quant a la vertu qu'il avoit del saint Esperit, mes il n'estoit mie Helyes quant a la personne'. This is found in both Av 36 and the Glossa. Av 36 has 'in spiritu et virtate [sic]', and the Glossa has 'De venturus est Helias ipse in corpore sed etiam venit in spiritu et virtute scilicet Johannes'. It is the Glossa which is most like BXIII here. Both the Glossa and Av 36 have, to quote the Glossa, 'in spiritu et virtute', for BXIII's 'Johans estoit Helyes quant a la vertu qu'il avoit del saint Esperit'. The problem with this material is that
'in spiritu et virtute' is the actual phrase used in the prophecy about John, and the glossator could, therefore, have derived this information from Luke 1.21 directly rather than through an intermediary gloss. The prophecy in Luke, however, says nothing about John the Baptist not being Elijah 'quant a la personne', found in BXIII. Material matching this is only found in the Glossa, which has 'De venturus est Helias ipse in corpore'. Although this is not exactly like the BXIII gloss, it does juxtapose 'in corpore' and 'in spiritu et virtute' and may have given the glossator the idea of doing the same. In this particular case, the Glossa has more of the material found in BXIII than the Vulgate.

Av 36 is the only commentary to mention the prophecy about John directly, 'sicut scriptum est id est prophetatum de Iohanne', but this might only have suggested the idea of using it to the glossator if he had failed to recognize that 'in spiritu et virtute' is a quotation from it in the first place. The glossator would seem to use a certain amount of New Testament material and quotations on his own initiative, his use of John 1.21 would seem not to have been prompted by a Latin commentary, after all, and it is probably safe to conclude that he would have been able to recognize where 'in spiritu et virtute' was from.

The conclusion for this gloss, is that the Glossa would seem to be the most likely source for this BXIII gloss.
If we accept that the glossator would have been able to identify 'in spiritu et virtute' as the prophecy about John, then he would not have needed Av 36 to suggest that he use it. Alternatively, the glossator may have used Av 36 as well.

10.4

No Latin commentary source has been found for this gloss.

10.6

This BXIII gloss explains 'masle' as meaning 'home' and 'femele' as meaning 'feme', and is a gloss by synonymity. No Latin commentary source has been identified for this BXIII gloss.

10.19

This gloss expands 'les comandemenz' as 'les comandemenz qui furent comandé en la loi'.

One Latin commentary, Av 36, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. It has 'precepta legis' ('the commandments of the law'), in
which 'legis' mirrors BXIII's 'en la loi', although the focus of the two glosses differs.

10.27

This BXIII gloss does not follow its lemma, which is in 10.25, "Plus legiere chose est que li chamels puisse passer par le pertuis d'une aguille, que riche home entre el regne des ciels". The gloss expands this lemma by providing the information that 'Pertuis d'Aguille' was a very small gate in Jerusalem, which camels had to be unloaded to pass through. This item of historical information then allows the glossator to explain the image.

Two Latin commentaries, the HS and Av 36, both explain that there was a small gate in Jerusalem called 'Acos', which loaded camels could not pass through, meaning that they had to be unloaded beforehand. The HS has nothing to match BXIII's 'li chamels sueffre bien et consent que l'en li oste sa charge', and the material in Av 36 is different. It has 'oportebat primus honera deponere quod laboriosum erat', which looks at the unloading of the camels from the point of view of the people doing the unloading, rather than the camels being unloaded, who presumably just stood there, which is what we get in BXIII. Even though its description of the unloading is different from that in BXIII, it could have suggested a
point to the BXIII glossator. That the camels 'sueffre bien et consent' to having their loads removed allows the BXIII glossator to emphasize that the rich do not do the same as far as their riches are concerned.

Both Latin commentaries explain the image. The HS has 'Oportet enim avarum amorem opum dimittere, si vult ingredi ad vitam', which is not very close to BXIII's 'mes li riches ne velt mie oster ses riches qui li sont comme charge por entrer el regne des ciels'. The gloss in Av 36 is much closer, 'similiter amator divitiarum nihil posita honere divitiarum non potest intrare ad patriam'. 'Patriam' is presumably being used figuratively here for 'regnum Dei'.

The conclusion for this gloss is that Av 36 is the most likely of the two Latin commentaries to have been the source for this BXIII gloss. It has all the information for the historical aspect of the gloss, and makes the image clear in the same way as the BXIII gloss.

10.29

This BXIII gloss explains that when Christ says "por moi et por l'evangile", he means 'por estre mon mesage d'annoncier ma parole'. 
One Latin commentary, Hugh, glosses 'Evangelium' as 'praedicandum'. The idea of 'preaching the Gospel' is what is behind the BXIII gloss, although this is not stated explicitly. "Por moi" means being 'mon mesage', and what the 'mesage' is to do is 'annoncier ma parole', which is the glossator's expansion of 'evangile'.

Hugh can only be considered the source of this BXIII gloss in that, in glossing 'Evangelium' as 'praedicandum', it may have given the BXIII glossator the essential idea of 'annoncier ma parole'.

10.33(1) and 10.33(2)

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

10.38(1)

This gloss explains the image in the lemma, interpreting 'henap' as 'mort' and 'boivre' as 'souffrir', and gives reasons as to why it is that death should be suffered. James and John would suffer death for love of Christ and for his name, and Christ will suffer death for love of the world and to save it.
Two Latin commentaries, Hugh and Av 36, both gloss 'Calicem' as 'passio'. There is no direct equivalent of this in the BXIII gloss, but it is the idea behind it. If the glossator used 'passio' as his source, then what he has done is to expand the idea contained in it as 'itel mort ... por l'amor que ge ai au monde et por lui rachater'. Given that 'henap' means death, it is reasonable to expand 'boivre' as 'soffrir', and this may not have needed a Latin source.

Christ's 'henap' is interpreted as 'mort ... por l'amor que ge ai au monde et por lui rachater'. The 'henap' of James and John would be different, and this is interpreted as 'pour l'amor de moi et por mon non'. Just as 'passio' is what is implied in the interpretation of Christ's 'henap', so the implication behind 'pour l'amor de moi et por mon non' is martyrdom. The idea of a death similar to the passion is found in both Latin commentaries. Hugh, quoting 2 Corinthians 1.7, has 'Sicut socii passionum estis', and Av 36 has 'passionem eius fuerit imitatus calicem id est passionem'. These both imply 'martyrdom', as does the explanation in the BXIII gloss.

Either of these Latin commentaries could have been the source for this BXIII gloss. They both interpret 'calicem' as 'passio', which the glossator expanded for his own gloss, and both talk about a death which will be
similar to the passion, which he expanded into death
'pour l'amor de moi et por mon non'.

10.38(2)

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this
gloss.

10.39(1)

This gloss repeats the interpretations of 'henap' and
'boivre' given in a gloss a verse earlier, on 10.38(1)
above, in a simplified form. 'Henap' is again
interpreted as 'mort', but this time without the
implications of 'passion' or 'martyrdom', and 'boivre' is
again interpreted as 'soffrir'.

One Latin commentary, the Glossa, has a gloss on this
lemma which mentions the deaths by martyrdom of James and
John, but this is material which can be compared to the
next BXIII gloss (10.39(2)) rather than this one.
Neither Hugh, nor Av 36, which both have material for the
initial interpretation of 'henap' and 'boivre', repeat
their interpretations here. For this particular BXIII
gloss it seems likely that the glossator did not have a
Latin source, but used the material in his own gloss a
verse earlier.
This BXIII gloss falls into two sections. The first section is an interpretation of 'baptesme' as 'le saint esperit', which 'vos nestoiera des pechiez veniax' from which 'hom mortiex ne se puet mie garder tant come il est en ceste mortel vie'. The second section forms a discussion of martyrdom, and itself can be divided into several parts. The first part is a rhetorical question which asks why John did not die a martyr like James, who was beheaded by Herod. This is followed by a second rhetorical question, which asks how is it that Christ was right when he said "'Vos sofferroiz martyre come ge ferai'", which introduces an interpretation of 'henap' as 'martyrdom' not found in the gloss on that lemma itself, but given just before this gloss. The third part of the gloss explains that John was beaten and put in boiling oil, and that even though these torments did not kill him, they do constitute martyrdom 'en repost'. The fourth part explains that John therefore suffered martyrdom several times in his life and that this is greater than if he had died through being martyred. The fifth and final part repeats Christ's words "'Vos bevroiz mon henap'" and glosses 'henap' as 'martire'.

This is an unusual gloss. The two main sections do not seem to be linked together in any way, and the second section would seem to be on an earlier lemma, that of 'vos bevroiz a mon henap', rather than the one here.
This second section would have been a lot clearer if the interpretation of 'henap' as 'martyrdom' had been introduced earlier. It is implied in the gloss on 10.38(1), but it is completely omitted from the gloss on 10.39(1), on the lemma "vos bevroiz mon henap", where it could conveniently have been given.

Four Latin commentaries, RB 8830, the HS, the Glossa, and Av 36, have glosses which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. None of them interprets 'baptismo' as the Holy Spirit. The HS glosses it as 'baptisma morte signat' and 'baptismo Joannes enim non martyrium', and Av 36 glosses it 'baptismo baptizabitur id est occidetur'. This is not at all what is found in the BXIII gloss, but they do suggest why the two sections on 'baptesme' and martyrdom have been put together in the same gloss. The Glossa and RB 8830 offer no such explicit interpretations of 'baptismo'. As the BXIII glossator does not gloss 'baptesme' in either of the ways the Latin commentators do, the link between baptism and martyrdom is in the event completely lost in his gloss. It may be, however, that the actual gloss on 'baptesme' in BXIII at this point is an afterthought by the BXIII glossator, and replaced an earlier gloss along the lines of the HS and Av 36.

The first part of the second section of the gloss asks why John did not die a martyr like James, who was beheaded by Herod. No Latin commentary asks anything
like this, but the story of James' martyrdom is found in
the Glossa and Av 36, both of whom quote Bede; to quote
the Glossa, which gives the fullest account, 'Beda,
Iacobus ab Herode capite truncatus'. Also, Av 36 is the
only commentary to say a little later on its gloss that
John did not die a martyr 'non martirio vitam finivit',
and this information, combined with that about James in
the Glossa and Av 36 may have prompted the rhetorical
question on the part of the BXIII glossator. The second
part has a rhetorical question not found in any Latin
commentary, but its interpretation of 'henap' as
'martyre' is implied by the gloss in RB 8830, which has
'penam mortis gladio' and stated more explicitly in the
Glossa and Av 36. These both talk about 'calicem
confessionis', which Av 36 says can be distinguished from
'calicem passionis'. Three commentaries, the Glossa, the
HS (perhaps directly cited here as the 'Estoires') and Av
36, have material for the third part of the gloss, which
explains that John was beaten, and put in boiling oil.
None of them gives the detail that this happened at the
Lateran Gate, which may have come from what the glossator
calls 'sa Vie'. The story that John was beaten along
with the other apostles is not found in any of them, but
given that the glossator acknowledges Acts as his source
here, it is likely to have been taken directly from Acts
5.40, which gives this story. Two commentaries, the
Glossa and the HS, say that John can be considered a
martyr in that his spirit did not avoid martyrdom; to
quote the HS, 'Et dicunt Joannem animo fuisse matryrem,
quia animo non defuit martyrium, et in ferventis olei
dolium missus est'. This is not the same as BXIII's 'en
repost', but it is possible that this is the glossator's
interpretation of the contrast in his sources between
spiritual martyrdom but not death through being tortured.

The idea of John suffering a lot is found in the HS,
which has 'passiones multas circa mortem sustinuit', in
Av 36, which has 'persecutiones multas' and in RB 8830,
which has 'varias passionum per amore Christi voluntarie
tolleratas'. No commentary says that this makes John a
greater martyr, though this would not be an unreasonable
conclusion to draw from them. The final part of the
gloss points out that, given everything, John can be
called a martyr, and it repeats the interpretation of
'henap' as 'martire'. This does not happen in any Latin
commentary, but then it is an expansion which may come
from the form of the BXIII gloss, and in particular the
rhetorical question asked at the beginning of the second
section.

No Latin commentary gives the interpretation of
'baptesme' found in the first section of this BXIII
gloss, although the glosses on it in the HS and Av 36 do
make clear the link between a gloss on 'baptismo' and one
on martyrdom. This is a link which is now completely
lost in the BXIII gloss, in which there are, to all
intents and purposes, two separate glosses on two
separate lemmas. If the glossator was using the HS or Av
as his source here, then he has either deliberately chosen to ignore this link, or has not understood it. Given the extreme rarity of any other instance of the glossator not understanding his source, it may be better to conclude either that he has chosen to ignore this link by taking a more general view of baptism which relates it to the descent of the Holy Spirit and the cleansing effect of the baptismal water, or that neither of these texts was his source. The second section of the gloss, which could have been better constructed by our glossator, is much better attested in the Latin sources. Of these, RB 8830 may be discounted; it has material for only one part of the gloss, and this material is attested in other commentaries which have a lot more BXIII-type material than it has. Both the Glossa and the HS contain material also found in Av 36, but neither has any original material not found in Av 36 except the idea which they share that John can be considered a martyr in that his spirit did not avoid martyrdom, which may have prompted BXIII's 'en reposit'. Av 36, of all the commentaries, has most of the material in the BXIII gloss, and the knowledge that John did not die a martyr is found in it alone. The only material in a Latin source other than Av 36 is the prompt for 'en reposit', and the story that John was beaten with the other apostles. This latter could be straight from Acts 5.40, and so does not present a problem. The possible prompt for 'en reposit' could come from either the Glossa or the HS. The conclusion for this gloss would seem to be that
Av 36 may have been its source, complemented by Acts 5.40 and either the Glossa or the HS. The situation is complicated, however, by the fact that the glossator claims so many sources for this gloss. 'Les fets des Apostres' is obviously Acts, the 'Vie' is presumably a Latin life of St John, and the 'Estoires' is presumably the Historia Scholastica. It has never been possible to identify which lives of St John should be checked against the BXIII gloss, but it seems likely, given the specific reference to it that the 'Vie' that was used included the detail of the Lateran Gate, so far untraced. The real problem is the use of the Historia Scholastica which the evidence suggests was not a very likely source. As it is named, however, it cannot be excluded, suggesting that it was the HS rather than the Glossa that was used in conjunction with Av 36. The probable conclusion for this gloss, then, is that the glossator used Av 36 plus the HS and Acts 5.40, as well as a so far unidentified life of St John.

10.40

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.
This BXIII gloss interprets 'Jericho' as meaning 'lune'.

Three Latin commentaries, the Glossa, Hugh and Av 36, all do the same. Any of these commentaries, therefore, could have been the source for this gloss.

This gloss, which is an expansion of 'sauf' as 'sane et gari', is also found in a gloss on Luke 18,43, which has this dittological expansion of the lemma as part of a much longer gloss on how faith saves. No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

This gloss identifies 'Symon li liepreux' as being 'Symon qui avoit esté meseaux, mes Jhesus l'avoit curé'. This is a gloss which is also found on this lemma on Matthew 26,611.

Five Latin commentaries, the Glossa, the HS, RB 10891, Hugh and Av 36, have commentaries which can be compared
to this gloss. Four of them, the HS, RB 10891, Hugh and Av 36, all say that, to quote the gloss in Hugh, 'leprosus enim fuerat, sed a Domino curatus erat'. The only possibly significant difference any of these commentaries has is that the HS uses 'sanatus' instead of 'curatus'. The Glossa is a bit different, and has 'Simon essi obediens dicitur. Nomen pristinum manet et virtus curantis appeat'. This is not as much like the BXIII gloss as the other four commentaries. Of these other four, all of them have 'leprosus' or 'leprus' for BXIII's 'meseaux', and three of them have 'curatus' for 'curé'. The HS, with 'sanatus' for 'curé' is probably not as close, although the meaning is obviously the same.

The conclusion for this gloss is that RB 10891, Hugh or Av 36 was the most likely source for this BXIII gloss.

14.3(2)

This gloss explains what 'alabastre' is, and is also found on Matthew 26.7(1)12. It can be divided into three parts, the first being the description of alabaster as 'une maniere de blano marbre', the second being a description of what it is used for as 'del quel l'en fet boistes et auttres vesseaux a metre precieuos oignemenz', and the third being an explanation of why such things are made from it, as 'por ce qu'il i durent longuement sanz
corrupcion'. As in the gloss on Matthew 26.7(1), the glossator claims Bede is his source here.

Four Latin commentaries, the HS, RB 10891, the Glossa and Hugh, all have definitions of alabaster in their glosses on this lemma. They all have material for the first point, with either of two phrases 'et est genus marmoris candidi', in the HS and RB 10891, and 'Alabastrum marmor candidum' in the Glossa and Hugh. Hugh acknowledging the Glossa as his source. The second part of the gloss is again found in all four commentaries. The Glossa and Hugh have only part of the material, 'unguenta' for 'oignemenz'. The HS and RB 10891 have this, plus something corresponding to BXIII's 'boistes et autres vesseaux'. The HS has 'id est pyxidem de alabastro plenam unguento nardi. Sicut enim dicimus scyphum vini, scyphum lactis'. RB 10891 has 'vasa unguentarium'. Of these 'vasa' is the closest match for BXIII's 'vesseaux', and 'pyxidem' is probably the closest to 'boistes', although 'boistes' occurs in the lemma and needs no other source. Given this, RB 10891 is the most likely source for this part of the gloss. The third part of the gloss is again found in all four commentaries, and again, either one of two phrases is used. The HS and RB 10891 both have 'quod incorrupta servat unguenta', and the Glossa and Hugh both have a shortened version of this, 'incorrupta servat'.
The conclusion for this gloss is that RB 10891 has material for all of the BXIII gloss, whereas the HS, the Glossa and Hugh do not, and so are less likely to have been the source for this BXIII gloss. However, there is no mention of Bede as the source for this gloss material in RB 10891 (or any Latin gloss on this lemma), hence it is extremely unlikely that this text was used as a direct source for this BXIII gloss, unless the glossator used a copy of it with 'Beda' or perhaps 'B' marked in the margin.

14.4

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss, which changes 'perte' in the lemma to 'perdu' in the gloss, and which makes it clear that what is being lost is 'oignemenz'. 'Perdu' reflects 'perditio' in the Vulgate lemma, and 'oignemenz' reflects 'unguenti' in it. Given that all of the material for this BXIII gloss is in the Vulgate lemma, it is unlikely that the glossator would have needed any other source than this.

14.6

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.
This gloss explains that the 'premier jor des azimes' is the 'premier des jorz que li Juyf menjoient nule chose ou il eust levain'. This is a gloss which occurs elsewhere in BXIII, on Matthew 26.17 and Luke 22.7.13.

Three Latin commentaries, the HS, Hugh and Av 36, have material which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. The gloss in the HS is not the same as that in BXIII. It has 'id est ea die, in cujus vespera agnus erat immolandus, et edendus cum azymis'. This, by saying that leaven was eaten on the eve of this day, may imply that it was not eaten on the day itself, but this is not very close.

Both Hugh and Av 36 have 'fermentum' in their glosses on this lemma, and this could be a source for 'levain'; 'fermentum' replacing 'Azyma' and 'levain' replacing 'azimes' are both examples of glossing by synonymity. Hugh also says that this was the first day in which 'non erat fermentatum in dominibus eorum', which expresses the idea of leaven being proscribed. This is the most like 'que li Juyf menjoient nule chose ou il eust levain' of all three commentaries.

The conclusion for this gloss, is that Hugh is the most likely to have been the source used for it.
14.16

This gloss explains that 'apareillerent Pasque' meant 'apareillerent l'aignel del quel il devoient fere Pasque'. It is a gloss which occurs in more or less the same form elsewhere in the BXIII glosses, on Matthew 27.62 and John 19.14.

One Latin commentary, Av 36, has 'agni paschales', which matches BXIII's 'l'aignel del quel il devoient fere Pasque'. Av 36, therefore, seems to be a possible source for this BXIII gloss.

14.21(1)

This gloss explains what is meant by ''Las'' in the lemma ''Las a cel home par qui il sera trai''. It is explained as meaning 'il sera en enfer pardurablement'.

One Latin commentary, the HS, has 'aeternam nolat damnationem, et est: Peribet aeternaliter'. This is very like the BXIII gloss, and is, therefore, a possible source for it.
This gloss explains the lemma "bone chose fust a lui s'il n'eust mie este nez" as meaning 's'il fust avortez et fust morz nez, il n'eust mie si grant paine el dampnement d'enfer come il avra'. This is essentially the same as another gloss, that on Matthew 26.24(3)15.

Three Latin commentaries, RB 8830, the HS and Av 36, all have material which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. The gloss in RB 8830 explains how it is that he may not have been born as 'Si enim in ... utero decessisset sine peccato mansisset', but has nothing for the idea of this leading to less suffering in hell. Both ideas are found in the HS, 'id est melius esset ei, si non esset natus de utero, sed periisset in utero. Tunc enim pro solo originali peccato damnatus esset', and in Av 36, 'Bonum erat si natus non fuisset supple de utero id est si mortuus esset abortivus quia tunc puniretur pro solo originali'. The idea of dying in the womb is in both of these, and Av 36's 'abortivus' is an excellent match for BXIII's 'avortez'. BXIII's 'et fust morz nez' is an expansion of one of the implications of this, although it could also be an expansion of 'periisset in utero' in the HS. The HS, however, has nothing as close to BXIII as Av 36's 'abortivus'. In their statements that he will only be condemned for original sin, the HS and Av 36 imply what is made explicit in the BXIII gloss, that 'il n'eust mie si grant paine el dampnement d'enfer come il avra'.
Rather than raise the issue of original sin, the glossator has chosen to be explicit as to what it means in practice.

The conclusion for this gloss, is that its likely source was Av 36.

14.27

This gloss is also found on Matthew 26.31\textsuperscript{15}. No commentary source has been identified for it here in Mark.

14.35

No commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

14.36

No Latin commentary has been found which glosses this lemma here. This gloss, however, also occurs on Matthew 26.39\textsuperscript{17}, with only insignificant differences in wording, and two Latin commentaries, the Glossa and Av 36, gloss it in Matthew. It is possible, therefore, that the BXIII glossator used the Glossa or Av 36 for his gloss on this lemma in Matthew, and then simply repeated his own gloss here in Mark.
This gloss expands the lemma "Symon, dorz tu" as 'coment oses tu dormir qui me prametoies que tu morroies por moi se mestiers en estoit'. This gloss explains the implications behind Christ's words to Peter.

One Latin commentary, the HS, has a gloss which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. It has 'Vel ait Petro sic ironice, quasi dicit: Sic erat faciendum?' This may well be the source for the first part of the BXIII gloss, 'coment oses tu dormir'. The gloss in the HS then glosses the next verse, which makes the point that the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak, and relates this to the ability to die for Christ, 'Spiritus quidem promptus est, subaudi, vester, quasi promptulum habuistis spiritum, in promittendo mori etiam pro me, sed nunc patet carnis infirmitas'. This questioning of the ability to die for Christ is what we have in the BXIII gloss, which questions Peter's ability and readiness to die for Christ if this should be required, 'tu ... qui me prametoies que tu morroies por moi se mestiers en estoit'. The HS, therefore, conflates lemmas here to bring out the idea of people perhaps not being able to die for Christ; and, in that this is essentially what we have in the BXIII gloss, it may have been the source for it.
14.38

This gloss expands the lemma 'la char est enferme' as 'la char redoute le torment'.

One Latin commentary, the HS, has a passage which can be compared to this BXIII gloss at this point. This passage combines gloss material and text on this lemma, and on 14.37, to make the point that the spirit is willing and the flesh weak, which is in turn used to doubt the ability to die for Christ, glossed in BXIII on 14.37. It has 'Spiritus quidem promptus est, subaudi, vester, quasi promptulum habuistis spiritum, in promittendo mori etiam pro me, sed nunc patet carnis infirmitas', which is the idea found in this BXIII gloss. If the glossator used the HS as his source here, then what he has done is to take the essential idea from it, and rewrite it simply as 'la char redoute le torment'.

The HS is certainly a possible source for this BXIII gloss.

14.41, 14.44 and 14.61

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.
14.64

This gloss is very much like another, that on Matthew 26.6618. No commentary source has been identified for this gloss on Mark, and it is possible that the glossator took it from his own gloss on Matthew, which may have been taken from the Glossa.

14.69

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

15.6

This gloss identifies the 'jor de feste' in the lemma as being 'Pasque'.

One Latin commentary, Av 36, has 'sollemnitate pasche'. This, in providing 'pasche' for BMIII's 'Pasque', could have been the source for this gloss.

15.7 and 15.8

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.
15.16

This gloss defines 'pretoire' as 'la meson ou l’en tient plez et ou l’en fet jugemenz'.

One Latin commentary, Av 36, has a gloss on this lemma which also gives a definition of 'praetorium'. It has 'pretorium appellat domum pretoris in qua sedebat Pilatus pro tribunal'. This has 'domum' as a direct source for 'la meson', and 'tribunali' for what happens there. Rather than just use 'tribunali' in his gloss, the glossator has said what this means, and has expanded it to 'tient plez' and 'fet jugemenz'. He has, therefore, taken a single word directly from his source, and adapted the rest by glossing its meaning.

Av 36 is, therefore, a possible source for this BXIII gloss.

15.22

This gloss gives a definition of the name 'mont Escauvaire', and follows this definition with an explanation of why this place should be called this.

Four Latin commentaries, the Glossa, the HS, Hugh and Av 36, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to
the BXIII gloss. For ease of comparison, the BXIII gloss can be divided into several parts.

The first part is the initial definition of 'Escauvaire' as 'Cauvaire est proprement l’os de la teste esnué de tout en tout de char' which is best matched by the material in the HS, Hugh and Av 36. The HS has 'Calvaria est propries os capitis humani nudum', and Hugh and Av 36 have very similar glosses; Hugh has 'Calvaria autem proprie dicitur os capitis carne, et cappillis nudatum', and Av 36 'Calvaria proprie dicitur os capitis nudatum carne' and 'a carne et a capillis nudabantur'. The material in the Glossa is the least like that in the BXIII gloss, having 'truncabant capita dampnatorum', and is not a likely source for this part of the gloss.

The next part of the BXIII gloss is 'qui a lono tens jeu en terre', which is not found in any Latin commentary. This is followed by 'come l’en voit souvent es oymetires gesir'. The HS has something for this, 'Et quia ibi decollabantur rei, et multa ossa capitum ibi aspersa erant', and the Glossa has something similar, 'Calvarie decollatorum loca diquuntur', but neither of these is as much like the BXIII gloss as Hugh and Av 36, which both have 'solet inveniri in sepulchris mortuorum'. Hugh and Av 36 are the possible sources for this part of the gloss.
Three Latin commentaries, the HS, Hugh and Av 36 all say that it was because of the skulls lying there that Clavary got its name. The HS has 'et multa ossa ibi aspersa erant, dicebatur locus Calvarie', Hugh has 'solet inveniri in sepulchris mortuorum: sed quia frequenter homines ibi decollabantur, et remanebant ibi capita, ideo locus dicebatur Calvaria', and Av 36 has 'solet inveniri in sepulchris mortuorum quamvis ipsum capites vel frons dicitur Calvaria'.

Two commentaries, the HS and Av 36, raise the question of whether it was the site of the 'cauvaire Adam'. The HS presents this as being from Ambrose, but Av 36 says this is not from Ambrose, but from Bede. The HS also quotes Jerome, and finishes by saying that the view of Ambrose, and 'multa alia', is wrong. Either of these two commentaries, then, could have been the source for the idea as given in the BXIII gloss. 'Aucun dient' is a standard formula in BXIII19, and could have been prompted by proper names in his source, or by phrases such as 'multa alia'. The HS is probably closer to this part of the BXIII gloss, though, as it does finish by condemning this idea like the BXIII gloss does.

Overall, the HS and Av 36 are the most detailed Latin glosses on this lemma, and the most like the BXIII gloss. To get the best possible coverage for this gloss, however, both of them are needed as they both have material, admittedly only one item each, which is not
found in the other. The conclusion for this gloss, then, is that the BXIII glossator used both the HS and Av 36.

15.26

This gloss, on the lemma 'Et li tytres de sa cause estoit escrit: "Rois des Juys"', explains that it was a custom to put an inscription over the head of a person being crucified, with the reason for that person's crucifixion written on it.

Two Latin commentaries, the HS and Av 36, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Both of them explain that this inscription gave the reason for the crucifixion. Av 36 has 'Vide quia titulis causae continet causam crucifixionis eius', and the HS has more or less the same thing, 'Scripsit autem Pilatus titulum causae ejus, id est in titulo causam mortis ejus'. The BXIII glossator both gave 'causa' in his gloss as 'la cause', and also glossed it using a synonym, 'le forfet'. The gloss in Av 36, with 'causam crucifixionis' for 'la cause ... por quoi il estoit crucifiez', may be slightly closer to the BXIII gloss than 'causam mortis' in the HS. However, the general subject here is so obviously the crucifixion that the glossator would probably not have needed this in his source for him to use it in his gloss. The HS later adds that this was placed over Christ's head, but the
glossator would not have needed a Latin source for this as it is part of the story as given in both Matthew 27.37 and Luke 23.38. Neither commentary has anything about this being a Jewish custom.

The conclusion for this gloss, then, is that the source for it was either the HS or Av 36, although neither of these would have provided the BXIII glossator with the information that this was a Jewish custom.

15.36

This BXIII gloss explains that it is believed that giving people who are being crucified sour wine to drink makes them die more quickly.

One Latin commentary, the HS, has a gloss which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. It has 'Fuerunt qui dicerent, crucifixos citius mori, si acetum cum felle biberent ... si citius morerentur, quos crucigiferent'. This is the material found in the BXIII gloss.

The HS is, therefore, a likely source for this BXIII gloss.
This gloss defines 'li centuriens' as 'celui qui avoit poeste seur .o. chevaliers', and a similar definition is also found in the gloss on Matthew 8.520.

Two Latin commentaries, Av 36 and Hugh, give a definition of 'centurio' in their glosses on this lemma. They both have the same definition, which is, to quote Hugh, 'Centurio est miles habens centum in potestate'. This is the same gloss as the BXIII gloss, allowing for the use of 'chevaliers' for 'miles'. This use of 'chevaliers' is not quite accurate. 'Miles' meant a 'foot-soldier', and this is not what 'chevalier' means. The glossator may have decided to use this word with a knowledge of his audience in mind; 'chevalier' is certainly a noble term. This is the only thing in his source that the glossator has changed.

Both Av 36 and Hugh are, therefore, possible sources for this BXIII gloss.

This gloss identifies 'Marie Joseph' as being 'Marie mere Joseph'. 
One Latin commentary, RB 9438, does the same, 'et Maria
Ioseph ... qui erat mater Ioseph'. This commentary is,
therefore, a possible source for this BXIII gloss.
Chapter Four: Footnotes

1. For this gloss, see above, pp.157-9.
2. See below, pp.419-61, especially p.439.
3. For this gloss, see Sneddon (1978: II 211-2).
4. Martha, Mary and Lazarus are identified as being sister and brother in John 11.1-2, and Mary is Christ's hostess in John 12.2.
5. The quotation is actually from John 11.11.
6. See below, pp.373, 405.
7. For use of the *quaestio* in the BXIII Gospel glosses, see below pp.403-5.
8. See below, p.391-2.
9. The BXIII Gospel glosses are usually carefully constructed, for which, see below, pp.407-10.
10. For this gloss, see below, p.252.
11. For this gloss, see above, p.136-8.
12. See above, pp.138-42.
13. For these glosses, see above, pp.143-4, and below, pp.266-70.
14. For these glosses, see above, pp.161-2, and below pp.336-41.
15. For this gloss, see above, pp.149-51.
16. For this gloss, see above, p.152.
17. For this gloss, see above, pp.154.
18. For this gloss, see above, p.159.
19. See below, pp.397-8.
20. For this gloss, see above, pp.120-2.
21. See the gloss on Matthew 8.5 on pp.120-2 above.
2.1

This gloss replaces the 'describit' of the text with 'nombre', with no change of grammar. Four Latin commentaries, the Glossa, RB 10519, the HS and RB 10855, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. All four commentaries have 'numerum' (the probable source for BXIII's 'nombre') in their glosses on this lemma. The difference in grammar ('nombre' is a past participle, and 'numerum' is an accusative noun) is not significant given that 'nombre' is necessitated by the syntax of the lemma. The 'fussent' in the gloss is repeated from the lemma, and needs no other source; the presence of a subjunctive in the Glossa and RB 10519 is not significant here.

Otherwise, the commentaries all contain material not found in the BXIII gloss, all of them explaining what it is that is to be described. There seem to be two types of explanation here; the Glossa and RB 10519 both have '... census datu est ut sciret rex numerum hominem et magnitudinem', that is 'the number of men and their extent', while the HS and RB 10855 (quoting the HS as its source) have, to quote the HS, 'Volens Caesar scire numerum regionum in orbe quae Romanae suberant ditiani
numerum etiam civitatum in qualibet regione', that is 'the number of regions in the world under Roman rule, and also the numbers of citizens in every region'. Nothing like this is given in the BXIII gloss, but this is because this material has been incorporated into the actual translation of the Vulgate. The BXIII translation of the Vulgate's 'ut desoriberetur universus orbis', is 'que tuit li home qui estoient el monde fussent descrit', in which 'tuit li home' is a gloss on 'universus orbis'.

It is the BXIII translation which incorporates 'numerum hominem' from the Glossa and RB 10519, and 'numerum etiam civitatum' from the HS and RB 10855.

In that all four commentaries have 'numerum' for BXIII's 'nombré', any one of them may be considered to be a possible source for this BXIII gloss. However, given that the translation itself includes gloss material, the source may be a Latin commentary which provided not only the material for the gloss but also material for the translation. There are two possibilities here; either the glossator used 'numerum etiam civitatum', found in the HS and RB 10855, or he used 'numerum hominem', found in the Glossa and RB 10519. The word that was chosen for the translation was 'li home', matching 'hominem' in the Glossa and RB 10519. The conclusion for this gloss, and for the translation of the lemma, must be that the most likely source used by the glossator was the Glossa or RB 10519.
This BXIII gloss is in two parts. The first part is 'qui fu premièrement que home fust fet' which seems to be on the lemma 'premier né'. The second part of this gloss, on the same lemma, is the explanation of why Christ can be called 'premier né'.

The second part of this gloss is very much a repetition of the gloss on Matthew 1.25. This latter gloss is on the same lemma, 'primogenitus', and it makes the point that 'primogenitus' means that no children were born either before or after Christ. This is the point the gloss on Luke 2.7 makes, in almost the same words. However, the gloss in Matthew is more detailed than the gloss in Luke, in that it explains that it was a custom for 'primogenitus' to be used of an only child. The gloss in Luke does not do this. The meaning of 'primogenitus', with its importance for believing in the perpetual virginity of Mary, needed to be made in both places, but the explanation that such a meaning was customary in Israel is a detail which does not affect this belief, and so need not be repeated.

The sources for these two BXIII glosses seem to have been very similar. The gloss on 'primogenitus' on Matthew 1.25 used Av 36 for its source, and this commentary, like BXIII, also glosses this lemma on Luke 2.7. In his
commentary on Matthew 1.25, the Avranches glossator seemed to be aware of the Bede gloss on Luke 2.7, and the ambiguous nature of what it seemed to be saying. In his gloss on Luke 2.7, the Avranches commentator has, 'primogenitum ... Ioseph genuerit alios filios post Christum de alia uxor', and 'non post quem alii quid non dicitur primogenitus quid alii post eum sicut geniti'.

Even though he does not quote the Bede gloss in full, his commentary seems to have it as its basis. Av 36 is one possible source for the BXIII gloss on Luke 2.7, and there are four others, the HS, PCh, Hugh and RB 9439. The HS and Hugh both quote the Bede gloss, although only Hugh acknowledges that it is Bede, 'non post quem alius, sed ante quem nullus'. PCh and the commentator writing in RB 9439 seem also to have been aware that 'primogenitus' is a difficult word; the gloss in RB 9439 makes its meaning clear with 'primogenitus non quoniam post istum Maria alios filios habuit ... filius unigenitus offerebatur domino', and PCh has 'unigenitus patris vel matris'. The phrase 'unigenitus patris vel matris' is one also found in glosses on 'primogenitum' in Matthew.

The glosses in PCh and RB 9439 are the closest to the BXIII gloss in that they make it clear that in this case 'primogenitus' is synonymous with 'unigenitus', which is the meaning of the word stressed in the BXIII gloss. However, the BXIII glossator may not have needed another
Latin source for this gloss, given that his gloss here is a repetition of his gloss on Matthew 1.25.

2.8

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

2.11

This gloss does two things. First of all, it identifies 'la cité de David' as 'la citez de Bethleem', and then it explains why it is that Bethlehem is called 'la cité de David'.

Eleven Latin commentaries, the Glossa, PCh, RB 10397, Alex, Hugh, Bon, Albt, Gorr, RB 11374, RB 10109 and RB 9939, all have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Of these, ten (the Glossa, PCh, RB 10397, Hugh, Bon, Albt, Gorr, RB 11374, RB 9939 and RB 10109) mention Bethlehem, eight (the Glossa, PCh, Alex, Hugh, Albt, RB 11374, RB 10109 and Bon) say that David was born there, or, in the case of Bon, that he had his beginnings there, and seven (the Glossa, PCh, Hugh, Bon, Albt, RB 11374 and RB 10109) have both points.

It is one of these seven commentaries with both points which is the most likely to have been the source for this BXIII gloss. Bon has 'ortus' rather than 'natus', but
this does not make it a less likely source than the others as it is difficult to see what 'ortus' would be translated by if it is not 'nez'. The conclusion for this gloss is, then, that any one of the Glossa, PCh, Hugh, Albt, Bon, RB 11374 and RB 10109, could have been its source.

2.12

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

2.21

This gloss gives a popular story about circumcision, about how Christ’s foreskin was given to Charlemagne, and it also gives a definition of 'prepuce'. The definition of 'prepuce' is found in another BXIII gloss, that on John 7.22, and this latter gloss also gives a popular story about circumcision, about how the knife used was made from the stone with which David killed Goliath.

No Latin commentary has any gloss on this lemma which includes a definition of 'prepuce'. It is always possible that, with recurring glosses, the glossator used one gloss as the source of another, and it is possible that the glossator used his gloss on circumcision on John...
7.22 as the source for the definition of 'prepuce' given in Luke 2.21. However, no Latin source has been identified for this part of the John gloss. An alternative is that there may be a definition of 'prepuce' given in a description of the circumcision ceremony in one of the Jewish law books in the Old Testament, and the relevant passages to consider here are Genesis 17.11-4 and Leviticus 12.3. Neither of these passages, however, gives any definitions of 'prepuce', and so cannot be considered as the source for the glosses on Luke 2.21 and John 7.22. Yet another possible source for this gloss, is the gloss on circumcision in the BXXIII version of Genesis\(^5\), which does at least have, 'qu'il fust circoncis ou mambre'. Had the Gospel glossator used this gloss as the source for his own Gospel glosses, it would at least have given him the word 'mambre', which he could then expand as 'secre membre', and to which he could then add, 'le bout ... que l'en trenche a cel qui l'en circoncit'. A concordance would have allowed the glossator to identify and locate the appropriate Old Testament passage to use. It is possible that 'mambre' could have given rise to the expansion found in the Luke gloss, but given that to use it would have sent the glossator to yet another text, and given that 'mambre' needed considerable expansion to get the full definition given in Luke and John from it, it seems unlikely that the glossator used this Genesis gloss for his definitions of 'prepuce'. It is interesting to note here that
'prepuce' is given a full definition in the glosses on Luke and John, but not in that on Genesis.

It is also possible that this definition of 'prepuce' is from a different type of text, and is not the glossator's expansion of Old Testament material.

The story about an angel giving Christ's foreskin to Charlemagne occurs in one Latin commentary, in the HS, which the BXIII glossator himself claims is his source.

The conclusion for this gloss, therefore, is that the HS was the source for the story about Charlemagne being given Christ's foreskin, but that no commentary source has been identified for the definition of 'prepuce'.

2.22(1)

The gloss explains the lemma, 'de la purgacion Marie', as, 'que Marie fust purifiee'. There are two things happening here. There is, first of all, a change of word, the change from 'purgacion' to 'purifiee', and secondly, there is a change of syntax, the change from a noun in the lemma to a pluperfect subjunctive construction in the gloss.

This is an interesting gloss in that the glossator did not keep the syntax of the lemma by using the noun
'purification'. Two things could be happening here; either the glossator felt that a change of word alone was not enough to explain the lemma, and introduced the change of syntax, or he is reflecting what was in his Latin source.

Ten Latin commentaries, PComD, Alex, Hugh, Bon, Albt, Gor, RB 10617, RB 10855, RB 9439 and Av 36, have some form of the words 'purificatio' or 'purificare' in their gloss on this lemma. Of these ten commentaries, seven, PComD, Hugh, Alex, RB 10617, RB 10855, RB 9439 and Av 36, use the noun and three, Bon, Albt and Gor, use the verb. None of those using a form of the verb has it in the pluperfect subjunctive, which is the form in the BXIII gloss. Bon has the past participle 'purificato', Albt has the perfect 'purificavit' and Gor has the passive present infinitive 'purificari'. It cannot really be argued, then, that any one commentary is closer to the BXIII gloss on grounds of syntax. That 'purificatio' and 'purificare' are found in ten commentaries attests to its being a common gloss on the lemma 'puratio'. The glossator may have felt that changing the syntax emphasized the gloss, and therefore emphasized that 'Mary should be purified'. The change of syntax is, it would seem, the glossator's own.

The conclusion for this gloss, then, is that any of the ten Latin commentaries with 'purificatio' or 'purificare'
in their glosses on this lemma could have been its source.

2.22(2)

This gloss identifies the 'il' in 'il portèrent Jhesum en Jerusalem' as Joseph and Mary.

Two Latin commentaries, RB 10891 and Gorr, give the same information. One of these, RB 10891, simply restates the Vulgate text supplying the subject of the verb which is left unstated in the actual text, 'Ioseph et Maria tullerunt puer'. The other commentary, Gorr, has a little more detail, with 'Maria mater eius et Ioseph pater eius'. Both of these commentaries have the information found in the BXIII gloss, and either of them could have been the BXIII glossator's source.

2.22(3)

There are two parts to this BXIII gloss. First of all, it glosses the lemma 'presentassent' as 'offrissent', and secondly it glosses the lemma 'Nostre Seignor' as 'Deu le pere'.

Thirteen Latin commentaries, the Glossa, ZC, PCh, Tour, Hugh, Gorr, RB 10109, RB 10855, RB 11374, RB 10891, Av
36, PComP and the HS, have some form of the verb 'offero' in their glosses on this part of the text, and thus could be the source for BXIII's 'offrissent'. There is some variation in the form of the verb found in the different commentaries, with the third person plural of the future tense, 'offerrent', found in ten commentaries (the Glossa, ZC, PCh, Tour, Hugh, Gorr, RB 10109, RB 10855, RB 11374 and RB 10891), the third person plural of the imperfect, 'offerebant', found in one (Av 36), the third person singular of the passive imperfect, 'offerebatur', also in one (the PComP), and a dative gerundive in the phrase, 'id est offerendo praesentarent', in another (the HS). These differences are not important; the tense in the BXIII gloss, a third person plural subjunctive, is taken directly from the tense of the lemma 'presentassent', which in turn is taken directly from the Vulgate 'sisterent'. Any of the thirteen commentaries using the verb 'offero' could, therefore, have been the source for this part of the BXIII gloss.

The second part of the gloss, which changes 'Nostre Seignor' to 'Deu le pere', has not been found in any of the Latin commentaries consulted, suggesting either that its source has not been identified, or that the glossator's wrote this himself. As a gloss on the lemma, 'Nostre Seignor', it is explaining exactly what this term means, as the glossator realized that (like the word it translates, 'dominus') it is ambiguous. 'Dominus' meaning 'the Lord' is usually used of Christ, but can be
used of God the Father, as it is here. It is perhaps because of this ambiguity that the glossator felt that he needed to state clearly that 'Nostre Seignor', which could often mean 'Christ', here means 'God the Father'. This is a point glossed elsewhere in the BXIII Gospel glosses, on Luke 20.427 and John 1.1-58, to give two examples. It is interesting to note that the Vulgate reading 'Christum Domini' in Luke 2.26, is translated as 'Christ le fill Deu'9 rather than 'Christ le fill Nostre Seignor', which would have been a more literal translation. The phrase 'le fill Deu' identifies 'Christ' in the translation of Luke 2.26 in the same way as the gloss on Luke 2.22. Although no Latin source has been identified for the gloss on Luke 2.22, it should be pointed out that the gloss on Luke 20.42 does have attested Latin sources10.

There is a final point to make about this part of the text, that the BXIII translation of the Vulgate itself introduces gloss material. The Vulgate reading is 'ut sisterent eum Domino'. This is translated in BXIII as 'qu'il le presentassent ilueo a Nostre Seignor el temple'. There is no mention of the 'el temple' in the Vulgate text. This, however, is material which is found in Latin commentaries. Three of those consulted for this gloss, PComP, Tour and Av36, give this information. PComP has 'defererebatur puer ad templum', Tour has 'offerrent eum in templo', and Av 36 has 'in templo offerebantur'. If we are looking for commentaries which
provide not only a possible source for the material in glosses proper, but also material which has been incorporated into the actual BXIII translation, then these three commentaries must be seen as stronger candidates than the other ten commentaries. On the evidence of the gloss alone, all thirteen commentaries are equally likely to have been the source for this BXIII gloss.

2.24

This gloss explains that 'la loi Nostre Seigneur' is 'la loi que Nostre Sires comanda et dona a Moysi'.

Two Latin commentaries, RB 10617 and Albt, contain this information. Albt has 'Moysi scriptum est' and RB 10617 has 'lex Moysi'. Both, then, have 'Moysi', which matches BXIII's 'Moysi'; the expansion 'que Nostre Sires comanda et dona' is the glossator's own. Either of these two Latin commentaries could have been the source for this BXIII gloss.

2.25

This gloss explains the text's 'justes et cremeutes', as 'il redoutoit forment a trespasser les comandemenz de la loi'. The reason for this gloss in BXIII is clear;
'timoratus' means 'full of reverence or awe for God', and this is not apparent from 'cremeteus', the BXIII translation of this word, which means rather 'timid', or perhaps 'fearful'. The glossator presumably felt that 'cremeteus' was not an adequate reflection of the Vulgate on its own, and, in the gloss, added the reason for Simeon being 'cremeteus' in the first place.

One Latin commentary, Av 36, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. It has, 'timore legis', which has 'legis' as a match for BXIII's 'loi'. Otherwise, this is not particularly close to the BXIII gloss, but it does suggest that 'timoratus' was a lemma which some commentators felt needed to be explained, and it likewise suggests how such an explanation might be couched, i.e., that 'timoratus' has got something to do with 'legis', as is found in the BXIII gloss. It is quite likely that the glossator needed no more source than this, and that given the briefest of information he could produce his own gloss. Av 36 is, therefore, a possible source for this BXIII gloss.

2.29

This gloss explains 'or leras tu ton serjant en pes', as 'or morrai ge de mort corporel'. One Latin commentary, Hugh, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to
this BXIII gloss, with 'in pace, id est nexibus corporis
absolvere'. For the BXIII glossator, 'pes' means 'dying
a bodily death', the implication presumably being that
this leaves the spirit at peace, a point made more
clearly in Hugh. Hugh is, therefore, a possible source
for this BXIII gloss.

2.33

This gloss is in two parts. The first part identifies
the 'pere' and 'mere' of the text as 'Joseph' and
'Marie', and the second part adds that Joseph was
believed to be the father of Jesus.

Four Latin commentaries, RB 10397, the Glossa, ZC and RB
9439, identify the 'pater' and 'mater' of the text as
Joseph and Mary. Three of them, the Glossa, ZC and RB
9439, have some equivalent for the second part of the
gloss, i.e. an explanation of why Joseph was called
Christ's father, 'Joseph, que l'en ouidroit qui fust son
pere'. The Glossa has 'Ioseph qui ad conservandam famam
Marie pater est ab hominibus reputatus', ZC has 'Ioseph
... secundum opinione vulgi pater salvatoris appellatur',
and RB 9439 has 'Ioseph qui meruit vocari pater Christi'.
Of these three, the first two, the Glossa (that Joseph
was reckoned by men to be the father of Christ) and ZC
(that he was called the father of the saviour in the
opinion of people generally), are closer in content than
the third commentary, RB 9439 (that he merited being called the father of Christ), although there is nothing in the BXIII gloss suggesting the preserving of Mary's good name. Of the four commentaries with glosses on this lemma it is perhaps the Glossa and ZC which would seem to have been the most likely sources for this BXIII gloss, even though not all of the material in these texts was used in the BXIII gloss.

2.41

This gloss, like the one on Luke 2.33 above, identifies the 'pere' and 'mere' in the text as 'Joseph' and 'Marie'. One Latin commentary, RB 10891, does the same, with 'ibant autem Ioseph et Maria'. As this is essentially the same gloss as the preceding one, it is always possible that the glossator would not have needed any other source than his own gloss. It is only in BXIII that this gloss is repeated; RB 10891 does not gloss Luke 2.33, and the commentaries which gloss Luke 2.33, the Glossa, ZC, RB 10397 and RB 9439, do not gloss Luke 2.41. The repetition of this material would seem to be original to the BXIII glossator, and may be due to his wanting to emphasize these identifications, especially that of Joseph being Christ's father, the more potentially complicated identification of the two.
There are, therefore, two conclusions for this gloss. Either the glossator used his own previous gloss as the source for this gloss, or he used RB 10891, which has the necessary identification of the appropriate lemma.

2.48 and 2.49

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

2.50

This gloss expands the lemma 'cele parole qu'il lor dist', explaining that the 'parole qu'il lor dist' is 'qu'il apelast Deu son pere' and 'qu'il se tenist por filz Deu'.

One Latin commentary, PCh, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to the BxIII gloss. The material in this gloss, however, is not close to that in the BxIII gloss, and the most that could have happened here was for the glossator to use this text for the information that a gloss was required, even though he rejected its content. It is unlikely that this commentary was the source for this BxIII gloss.
No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

This gloss has two parts. The first part explains how the genealogy of Christ is worked out, working backwards from son to father as far as Adam. The second part explains that Adam is called the son of God, and gives the reason for this.

The first part of the gloss, explaining how the genealogy is worked out, has not been found in any Latin commentary. Material for it could perhaps have come from a gloss on the genealogy as given in Matthew 1.1-16, although there is no comparable gloss on this in the BXIII translation of Matthew. This part of the gloss is certainly linked to the translation of this genealogy in BXIII, in which the Vulgate 'fuit', as in 'qui fuit Adam, qui fuit Deu', is regularly translated as 'qui fu filz', as in 'qui fu filz Adam, qui fu filz Deu'. The use of 'filz' is already a use of gloss-type material in the translation, presumably to make the relationship between the names absolutely clear. This point is then taken up in the gloss, probably simply for emphasis, with 'cil qui vient devant est filz a celui qui vient enprés'. The glossator then repeats the beginning of the genealogy in
an expanded form 'li quiex', with, 'Jhesus ... qu'il fust filz Joseph, li quiex Joseph fu filz Hely, li quiex Hely fu filz Mathat; et en tel maniéré doit l'en construire en montant par ordre dell fill au pere desi a Adam'. This first part of the gloss, then, would seem to complement the translation of the genealogy as given in BXIII.

The second part of the gloss is found in three Latin commentaries, Av 36, PComP and Hugh, which all have material which could have been the source for this part of the gloss. All three commentaries have the same gloss, with only a little variation; to quote Av 36 'Adam qui est dicitur filius terrae, quia non patrem habuit sed de terra materialiter conditus'. Hugh and PComP both have 'hominem' in their glosses, and this adds emphasis to them. This emphasis does not however appear in the BXIII gloss, which has 'Adam est dit filz Deu por ce que Dex le fist et forma de terre et qu'il n'ot mie autre pere'; Hugh and PComP seem less likely to have been the source for this gloss than Av 36. This, however, is an argument from silence, and can only remain speculation. Since the material that the glossator needed for this part of his gloss is in all three Latin commentaries, any one of them could have been the source for this part of the gloss.

The conclusion for this BXIII gloss is that, while no possible Latin source has been identified for the first
part of the gloss, Av 36, Hugh and PComP are all possible sources for the second part.

4.13

This is another gloss with two parts to it. The first part expands the text's, 'au tens', as 'au tens de sa passion', and the second gives what Bede says in his commentary on Tobit about the devil coming and sitting on the cross and looking for, and failing to find, any sins.

The first part of this gloss is, 'au tens de sa passion', is found as 'passionis' in eleven Latin commentaries, the Glossa, Robt, PComD, PCh, Alex, Hugh, Bon, Albt, RB 10855, RB 9439 and Av 36. Three of these, Hugh, PComD and Av 36, even claim Bede as their source for this gloss, and this may have prompted the glossator to write the second part of his gloss.

This second part, containing the story about the devil as told by Bede in his commentary on Tobit, is not found in any Latin commentary, although there is a hint of it in Alex, who has 'scilicet passionis quo astitit super crucis brachia suggerens ut passio differetur'. This is not the same as Bede's story, but its appearance suggests that such a gloss might once have been found in a Latin commentary glossing this lemma. It is unlikely that the
glossator would have consulted Bede's commentary on Tobit just to write one gloss, and far more likely that he got this gloss through some intermediary source. A second possibility is that the glossator had read, heard or studied Bede's commentary at some earlier period in his life, and remembered at least this part well enough to incorporate it into his BXIII glosses.

Any of the eleven commentaries with 'passionis' in their glosses on this lemma could have been the source for the first part of this BXIII gloss. Of these Alex, or perhaps Hugh, PComD or Av 36 might have suggested the second part of the gloss to the BXIII glossator.

12.1

This BXIII gloss explains the text's "Gardez vos del levain des phariseus qui est ypocrisie", as 'gardez que vos ne faciez voz huevres par ypocrisie come il font'. This explains what the Pharisees' hypocrisy means, namely that their works and actions are governed by hypocrisy. This gloss instructs people how to act, and such a moral element is typical of BXIII Gospel glosses.

No Latin commentary has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. Some, such as PComD, Gorr and Av 36, interpret 'fermentum' as 'corruptionem', and one, LB, as 'malicia et ypocrisi', but there is
nothing closer than this in any of the other commentaries consulted.

It is possible that the presence even of such a gloss in his commentary source suggested the gloss to the glossator, but it is also possible that this is material which comes from a tradition other than the commentary tradition\textsuperscript{12}.

12.3(1)

This gloss expands, 'en lumiere' in the text twice, as 'apertement', and then as 'oiant plusors'.

Four Latin commentaries, Gorr, the Glossa, Av 36 and Albt, have material in their glosses on this lemma which can be compared to BXIII. Of these, Gorr, the Glossa and Av 36, have material which can be compared to the first part of the gloss, BXIII's 'apertement'. Gorr has 'in aperto', the Glossa has 'aperte' as an interlinear gloss, and Av 36 has 'in evidentia'. The Glossa's 'aperte', an adverb, is an exact match for BXIII's 'apertement', which is also an adverb, but 'in aperto' and 'in evidentia' cannot be excluded as possible sources for 'apertement'.

Three commentaries, the Glossa, Av 36 and Albt, have material which can be compared to the second part of the BXIII gloss, 'oiant plusors'. The Glossa explains 'en
lumiere' as 'in fiducia veritatis' in a marginal gloss, which is not at all close to the BXIII gloss. Av 36 is more like it, with 'actus vestri predicabuntur publice in ecclesia', which states quite clearly the idea of being made public. 'In ecclesia' presumably implied 'before a congregation', and may have a link with the idea of being heard by many people, found in BXIII's 'plusors'. Albt has an even closer link, with 'dicentur predicando et docendo', which expresses the idea of being made public, and 'audiri', which at least has the same etymological root as BXIII's 'oiant'.

The conclusion for this gloss, then, is that the Glossa, Av 36 or Gorr, (perhaps more likely the Glossa), was the source for the first part of this BXIII gloss, and that both Av 36 and Albt are needed to get the best possible source for the second part, Av 36 for the idea of 'plusors', and Albt for 'oiant'.

12.3(2)

This gloss explains the text's 'sor les mesons', as meaning 'en audience', which in Old French meant 'publicly', thus picking up the theme in the previous gloss.

Three Latin commentaries, the Glossa, Albt and RB 10855, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this
BXIII gloss. They all use the same word, although in each case the syntax is different. The Glossa has 'publice', Albt has 'ad publicum', and RB 10855 has 'in publico'. Of these, the closest, perhaps, on syntactic grounds, is either the Glossa's 'publice' or RB 10855's 'in publico', although it would probably be unwise to exclude Albt's 'ad publicum' on such grounds alone.

The conclusion for this gloss is that any of these three commentaries could have been its source.

12.21

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for this gloss.

12.27

This gloss expands a single word from the text, 'cez', as 'lis', thus identifying what it is that 'cez' refers back to.

The Latin for 'lis', 'lilium', is found in one Latin commentary at this point, in Albt, although in Albt 'lilium' is not a gloss on 'istis'. In any case 'lilium' occurs in the Vulgate only a couple of sentences earlier, and it is possible that it is from here that the BXIII
glossator took the information for his gloss from. He would not have needed a Latin source for material which is in the Vulgate anyway. Albright may have been the source for this gloss, but it is at least as likely, if not more so, that the source for this gloss was the text itself.

12.31

This gloss does three things: it re-writes the lemma slightly, changing the syntax, it explains what is meant by 'chez choses', and it changes 'vos seront ajostees' to 'Dex vos dorra'. The lemma phrase contains two clauses joined by 'et', "querez neporquant le regne Deu et toutes chez choses vos seront ajostees". In the gloss, this construction is changed slightly to one with 'se', 'se vos querez le regne Deu, Dex vos dorra totes chez choses'. 'Seek the reign of God and you will receive' becomes 'If you seek the reign of God, you will receive'. There is no change of meaning here, but there is a change in emphasis. 'Se' introduces a condition, and perhaps by changing the construction to use this, the glossator is trying to stress that the reward is conditional on the act of seeking the reign of God. This is not something which happens in any of the Latin commentaries with glosses on this lemma, but then it is possible that this is the sort of thing the glossator would not have used a source for. What he seems to be stressing here, is the idea that proper behaviour, i.e. the act of seeking the
reign of God, brings its just rewards. The theme of 'proper behaviour' is one which occurs elsewhere in the BXIII Gospel glosses, and may come from texts other than commentaries.

The gloss also includes an explanation of exactly what is meant by 'cez choses', as being 'cez choses terrienes de coi vos avroiz mestier et de quci vos ne poez consirrer'. Two Latin commentaries, the Glossa and Gorr, have glosses which can be compared to this part of the BXIII gloss, in that they both say that to the reign of God 'temporal things' will be added. The Glossa has 'quia etiam propter regnum adiecit temporalia', and Gorr has 'quoniam queratur et adietivum sic habito regno dei saltm in desiderio est hic temporalia adicientur'. If either of these commentaries was the source for this BXIII gloss, then the glossator translated 'temporalia' as 'choses terrienes', and then glossed this in turn, explaining them as being 'de coi vos avroiz mestier et de quci vos ne poez consirrer'. No Latin source expands 'temporalia', so it would seem that the glossator took material from a Latin gloss and expanded it himself. This is something he would seem to do elsewhere in the BXIII Gospel commentaries.

The final part of the gloss involves changing the 'vos seront ajostees' to 'Dex vos dorra'. This involves a change of construction, from a passive in the lemma to an
active one in the gloss, and a change from 'ajostes' to 'doner'.

Such a change of construction, with the change from the passive voice in the text to the active voice in the gloss, is not uncommon in BXIII\textsuperscript{15} and was probably something for which the glossator did not need a source. The verb 'doner' is found in one Latin commentary, Robt, and as in the BXIII gloss, in the future tense, 'complacita bonitate dabit vobis'. 'Vos dorra' could be a translation of 'dabit vobis', which, like the gloss, is an active construction. Robt, therefore, provides a good source for this part of the gloss. However, this commentary only provides two words; none of the rest of the gloss is found in it, and it remains generally true that the Glossa and Gorr are closer to the larger element of this BXIII gloss.

The conclusion for this gloss is that the glossator used either the Glossa or Gorr for the explanation of 'cez choses' as 'cez choses terriennes', with Robt for 'vos dorra' as a gloss on 'vos seront ajosteas', and then expanded this material along the lines he usually followed.

12.32

This BXIII gloss expands the text's 'regne' as 'regne de paradis'.
Two Latin commentaries, Av 36 and Bon, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. They both have 'regnum dei', which is an expansion of the Vulgate lemma 'regnum' just as 'regne de paradis' is an expansion of 'regne'. 'Regnum dei' is itself glossed in Av 36, as 'eterna bona', and this, or something like it, could have suggested 'regne de paradis' as a gloss on 'regne', 'eterna bona' presumably being found in 'paradis'. It is the material in Av 36, therefore, which is more likely to have suggested 'regne de paradis' to the BXIII glossator.

12.35

This BXIII gloss, like many others, explains the implications of the text for everyday life, giving an interpretation of the text which allows the glossator to instruct his audience on proper behaviour. He urges people to, 'atenez vos et gardez de luxure, et fetes bones huevres devant voz proismes'.

Eight Latin commentaries, the Glossa, PCh, RB 10109, RB 10519, Robt, Hugh, Av 36 and PComD, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. A comparison of them shows that there seem to be two ways
of glossing this lemma in Latin. The most common way would seem to come from the Glossa, and is also found in PCh, RB 10109, RB 10519 and Robt. The second way of glossing this lemma is not so well attested, and is only found in two commentaries, Av 36 and PComD. The material in Hugh seems to be unique to him. A hint in PComD suggests that some of the material alluded to here, and quoted more fully in Robt, may be from Bede.

The Glossa, and commentaries quoting it, have 'refrenata luxuria' for BXIII's 'gardez de luxure'. Hugh has something similar, with 'fugere luxuriam'. Both 'refrenata' and 'fugere' contain the idea of holding 'luxuria' in check, or putting it to flight, that is, avoiding it, as expressed by BXIII's 'gardez'. There is nothing relating to this in the gloss in Av 36 and PComD.

All eight commentaries have some equivalent to BXIII's 'et fetes bones huevres devant vos proismes'. The Glossa, and commentaries quoting it, have 'bona agit' and 'bona opera'. Hugh has 'opera ardentia propter Deum', and Av 36 and PComD both have 'ut bonum opus sit lucernae oportet ut ex adore divini amoris fiat et aliis prebeat exemplum'. The version given in Av 36 and PComD is perhaps the closest to BXIII here. Not only does it contain an exhortation to do good works, but it also has some equivalent to BXIII's 'devant vos proismes' in 'aliis prebeat exemplum'.
The conclusion for this gloss is that the glossator used a commentary which included the 'refrenata luxuria/fugere luxuriam' material from the Glossa group and Hugh, plus the exhortation to do good works and set others an example from either Av 36 or PComD. This means that the glossator used one of the Glossa, PCh, RB 10109, RB 10519, Robt or Hugh, plus either Av 36 or PComD.

12.43

This BXIII gloss explains the text's 'en tel maniere' as 'veillant'.

One Latin commentary, the Glossa, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss, with 'et in curam gregis vigilans'. 'Vigilans' reflects BXIII's 'veillant', and it the Glossa is therefore a possible source for this BXIII gloss.

12.46

This gloss explains the meaning of 'le departira', and adds from whom the servant will be separated.

The first part of this gloss, replacing 'departira' with 'ostera', involves perhaps a change of emphasis rather than meaning. 'Departir', meaning 'to separate', is
changed for 'oster', meaning 'to take or carry away'.
This is glossing by synonymity.

One Latin commentary, Robt, glosses the Vulgate lemma 'divido' by replacing it with another verb, 'segrego'.
This is glossing by synonymity too, and may be the source for this part of the BXIII gloss, in that the glossator does the same thing to his lemma as the commentator in Robt does to his. Both glossator and Latin commentator replace their lemma with a synonym.

The second part of this gloss is the addition of from whom the servant will be separated, given as 'de la compagnie des autres'. The commentator in Robt also felt that this was information which was needed, and says that it is 'a confortio [recte consortio] fidelium' that he will be separated. There is a link between 'fidelium' and 'autres' in that they both mean 'people', and 'consortio' matches BXIII's 'compaignie'.

It seems likely that Robt was the source for this gloss. The material in this commentary is not particularly close, but it does at least do the same things to explain the lemma as the BXIII gloss does, and in this way may have suggested to the BXIII glossator the type of glossing needed here.
No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

This gloss explains a lemma which is in two parts, the first part being "Ge ving metre feu en terre", and the second being "et que vueill ge fors que il soit espris".

The first part of this lemma is glossed as 'ge ving metre en terre amor et charité et doner vos exemple', giving a three-fold interpretation of 'feu' as 'amor', 'charité' and 'exemple'. Six Latin commentaries, the Glossa, PComD, Tour, Albt, Gor and Av 36, have material which can be compared to this part of the gloss. Four of them, the Glossa, PComD, Tour and Albt, have some form of the word 'caritas' in their glosses, which can be seen as a source for BXIII's 'charité', and four, the Glossa, Albt, Gorr and Av 36, have some form of the word 'amor', a likely source for BXIII's 'amor'. Av 36 and Albt have both 'caritas' and 'amor' in their glosses. No Latin commentary has any material which could have been the source for BXIII's 'doner vos exemple'.

Having interpreted 'feu' as 'amor', 'charité' and 'exemple', the second part of the gloss explains what
this means for one's behaviour, 'que vueill ge fors qu'elle soit tenue entre vos et gardee leaument, et que vos n'amiez mie de parole ne de langue mes d'oevre et de verite'. This gloss raises the question of proper behaviour, meaning specifically here that love of God is shown through deeds rather than words.

Three Latin commentaries, Gorr, Albt and the Glossa, all have the idea of action in their glosses. The Glossa has 'ex amore charitatis ad promerendam gloriam studium vestrum acuie', with 'acuie' urging one on to action. Albt has 'facit caritas', 'facit' again being a verb of action, and Gorr also has a verb urging action, 'impleatis', in 'ab errore revocata malo et ex amore hoc impleatis'. The gloss in Gorr, which, like the BXIII gloss, contains the idea that love of God is expressed through action, is probably the most likely source for this part of this BXIII gloss.

What we have here, then, are sources for 'amor' and 'charité', no source for 'doner vos exemple', and similar urging towards action in three Latin commentaries. Either the Glossa or Albt was the source for 'amor' and 'charité', and the best possible source for the second part of the gloss is found in Gor, although there is material for it in the Glossa and Albt too. The conclusion for this gloss, then, is that the glossator used either the Glossa or Albt, plus Gor, as the sources for this gloss.
This BXIII gloss gives the historical background necessary to understand the lemma 'le sano des quiex Pylates avoit meslé en lor sacrifices'. The belief that a knowledge of history was important to understanding scripture seems to have begun to be widely accepted during the twelfth century. Hugh of St Victor wrote historical chronicles as an aid to study\(^{18}\), and what else is Peter Comestor's \textit{Historia Scholastica}, if not scripture presented as history?

The BXIII glossator realized that this lemma would mean very little to an audience which did not know the history behind it, and duly supplied this in his gloss.

No Latin commentary consulted gives this story. Yet this is exactly the type of gloss for which a source would most likely have been needed, because it gives factual information. It is, of course, possible that the glossator may have had a source other than a commentary, although none has been identified, or even that he remembered this story from his own schooling. It is certainly not information that he could have invented. It seems probable that the source of this gloss - either
a commentary or some other text - has not been identified. Even if the glossator remembered this material from his own schooling, it is likely that the story would have survived in some text.

16.23

This gloss explains the idea of Abraham's bosom, and can be broken down into five parts: (1) that Abraham's bosom existed 'devant la resurrection Jhesuocrist'; (2) that it was 'une partie joste enfer'; (3) that the people there were 'li saint pere'; 'les peres qui ont vescu justement', who were not being tormented but were waiting for God to deliver them; (4) that this place is called the bosom of Abraham because Abraheim is the father of the Jews, so-called because he gave them the custom of circumcision; and (5) that Lazarus was in the bosom of Abraham with the fathers. This last part is merely repetition of material in the lemma to integrate the gloss back into the text.

Five Latin commentaries, the HS, RB 10855, Gorr, PCh and Av 36, explain this lemma, and for clarity the material in them can be considered according to the five elements of the BXIII gloss outlined above.

The first part, explaining that the bosom of Abraham existed, 'devant la resurrection Jhesuocrist', is found in three commentaries, the HS, Gorr and RB 10855. The HS explains that this is where 'animas praedestinatorum'
were, 'usque ad Christi descensum ad infernos'; Gorr describes it as being, 'ante passionis', and RB 10855 explains that the holy fathers were there 'adventum Christi expectantes'. These all make the same essential point as BXIII's 'devant la resurrection Jhesucrist', although none phrases it in quite the same way.

The second part of the gloss, explaining that the bosom of Abraham was 'une partie joste enfer', is found in four Latin commentaries, the HS, PCh, Gorr and RB 10855. The HS describes it as being 'in superiori margine inferni locus'; PCh's 'iuxta infernum' is similar; Gorr has 'in limbo inferni', 'limbus', like 'margo', meaning 'a border or edge', and RB 10855 is slightly different, with 'locus superior in inferno'. RB 10855 also goes on to add that it is also known as 'limbus'. Of these four, PCh is the closest to 'une partie joste enfer' in the BXIII gloss. It is possible that 'joste enfer' could be a direct translation of PCh's 'iuxta infernum'.

The third part of the gloss, explaining who was there, what was happening to them and what they were waiting for, has parallels in all five commentaries already listed for the first part. BXIII explains that 'li saint pere', 'les peres qui avoient vescu justement', were there, and this is best matched by Gorr's 'pater superiori' and RB 10855's 'sancti patres', the second of these being, perhaps, the most likely source. Gorr also has 'animae sanctorum'. The other commentaries have,
'animae praedestinatorum' (the HS), 'beatorum pauperium' (PCh), and 'sanctorum' (Av 36). The closest to the BXIII gloss, however, remains RB 10855's 'sanoti patres'.

On what was happening to 'li saint pere' in the bosom of Abraham, BXIII's explanation is that they are not suffering torment. Three Latin commentaries, Av 36, Gorr and RB 10855, say that the people there were resting. Av 36 has 'requies sanctorum' and 'requies bonorum'; Gorr has 'requies sanctorum', and RB 10855 has 'quieverunt'. A fourth commentary, the HS, has 'sine omni poena materiali ... locus propter sui tranquillitatem'. "Sine omni poena materiali" is perhaps closest to BXIII's 'n'estoient mie tormenté'. 'Requies' and 'quieverunt', however, obviously imply 'peace', which in turn implies a lack of torment, but the HS states this rather than leaving it implied, and for this reason is more likely to have been the source for this part of the BXIII gloss than the other three commentaries.

On what they were waiting for, BXIII's explanation is that they 'atendoient que Dex les en ostast'. The HS says that people would be there 'usque ad Christi descensum ad infernos', the implication being as stated in BXIII, that Christ would descend into hell and rescue them. RB 10855 has 'in quo quieverunt sancti patres adventum Christi expectantes', clearly stating that they were waiting for the coming of Christ, the implication being the same, that he will rescue them when he comes.
If either of these commentaries was the source for this part of the BXIII gloss, then what has happened is that the glossator has adapted his source, taking the purpose of Christ descending into hell as being the rescuing of all the just dead in the bosom of Abraham. It is this implied purpose which he states in this part of the gloss.

The fourth part of the gloss, the explanation as to why this place is called the bosom of Abraham is not found in any of the Latin commentaries consulted. The HS does compare the bosom of Abraham to a mother's breast, with 'qui locus propter sui tranquillitatem sinus Abrahe dictus est, ut sinum matris dicimus', but this is the most any of the commentaries do. Another, perhaps more likely, source for this part of the gloss, is that part of Genesis where the Lord tells Abraham that, to quote the BXIII version, "je t'ai establi a estre peres de maintes genz"19, and adds that circumcision will be the sign of this covenant between them20. This is the material that the BXIII glossator needs for this part of his gloss, and it seems likely, given that it is not uncommon for him to go directly to Old Testament sources where these existed21, that it is Genesis 17.6-14 which was the source for this part of the gloss.

The conclusion for this BXIII gloss is somewhat complicated. Three commentaries, the HS, Gorr and RB 10855, all seem equally likely to have been the source
for BXIII's, 'devant la resurrection Jhesuorist'. 'Joste enfer' is covered by the HS, Gorr, PCh and RB 10855, of which PCh is the most like BXIII here, and thus the most likely source for this part of the gloss. RB 10855 is the most likely to have been the source for 'li saint pere', although Gorr's 'pater superiori' is not excluded. The idea of there being no torment in the bosom of Abraham is best covered by the HS, and the idea that the people there are waiting for God to deliver them is probably based on the implications of the glosses in either the HS or RB 10855. Finally, the reason why the bosom of Abraham is called after him, and the reason why Abraham is called the father of the Jews, would seem to have been taken from Genesis 17.6-14.

To get the best possible coverage for this gloss, we need to consider the HS, RB 10855, PCh, and Genesis 17.6-14. Although Gorr would seem to have been used for the first part of the gloss, it ranks equally with the HS and RB 10855, and as Gorr provides no source material which does not exist elsewhere, and as the HS and RB 10855 do, then Gorr can probably be excluded. We could perhaps exclude PCh by arguing that even though the actual words 'joste enfer' are best attested by the material in that commentary, the idea behind them is found in three other commentaries, the HS, Gorr and RB 10855, two of which, the HS and RB 10855 look to be very likely sources for other parts of the BXIII gloss. However, to get the fullest possible coverage, PCh needs to remain in the
list of sources. It is certainly fair to say that the HS and RB 10855 are the commentaries which provide the source material for most of the gloss; and therefore it may be concluded that the BXIII glossator used the HS and RB 10855 as his main sources, and complemented the material in these with PCh and Genesis 17.6-14.

16.25

This gloss explains the lemma "'Filz, recorde toi que tu receus biens en ta vie, et li ladres recut ensement max'". The gloss on this lemma can be broken down into three sections, the first being an explanation of 'ensement', and the second an explanation of how 'li ladres recut ... max', that is, 'paciéntment et o buen courage', and the third an explanation of the importance of the word 'recut'. Two Latin commentaries, PCh and Av 36, have glosses which can be compared to this BXIII gloss.

The first part of the BXIII gloss, which explains 'ensement' as being 'tot le tens de sa vie', is not covered at all in PCh. Av 36 has 'recipisti bona in vita tua in voluptate temporali', but this is not like the BXIII gloss, although it is possible that 'voluptate temporali' gave the glossator the idea of a long time.

The second part of the gloss, the explanation of how Lazarus received the evils done to him, is found in PCh,
which has 'et Lazarus paciens et humilis', in which 'paciens' is an excellent match for BXIII's 'pacienment', although 'humilis' is not as good a match for 'o buen corage'.

The third part of the gloss, explaining the importance of the word 'recut', has not been found in either of these commentaries. This part of the gloss explains that it is significant that 'recut' is the verb used rather than 'sostint', and amounts to an instruction on how to receive evil, that is, willingly and not begrudgingly, which is in turn really an elaboration of 'pacienment'. Here, again, we have the glossator instructing people on how to behave, and giving guidance on what is correct behaviour. This is common in BXIII Gospel glosses, and may be from a tradition other than the commentary tradition.

The conclusion here must be, then, that Av 36 was the source for the first part of the gloss in that it suggested a way to gloss 'ensement', and that PCh was the source for the second part of the gloss, which was the source for 'pacienment', the implications of which may be from a source other than a commentary.

17.37

This gloss explains that the lemma 'li aigle' means 'li saint', and then goes on to explain why this is so.
Five Latin commentaries, the HS, Hugh, RB 10855, Av 36 and Albt, provide some interpretation of 'aquilae'. Albt has 'religiosas' ('religious women'), which is nowhere near as close to BXIII as 'sanoti', given in the HS, Hugh and RB 10855. Hugh, acknowledging John Chrysostom as his source, also has 'angeli' and 'martyres'. The gloss in Av 36 has 'boni' instead of 'sanoti', but is otherwise practically identical to the gloss found in RB 10855 and at the beginning of Hugh. 'Boni' is not unlike 'saint', but not such an obvious source for it as 'sanoti'.

The second part of the gloss explains how it is that the saints can be likened to eagles. The BXIII gloss gives two ways in which they can be compared. Firstly, 'li aigles vole haut plus que aucuns des autres oiseaux, en tel maniere montent li saint de vertu en vertu par buenes huevres'. This has not been found in any Latin commentary. Secondly, the saints are like eagles in that, 'si come li aigle s'assemblent au cors pour lui mengier et qu'il en puissent vivre, en tel maniere seront assemblé li saint el ciel o Nostre Seigneur qu'il puissent vivre pardurablement de sa vision, c'est qu'il vivent de vooir Deu'. The same five Latin commentaries which have interpretations of 'aquilae' also have material for this part of the BXIII gloss. The material
in Albt is least like that in the BXIII gloss and can be dismissed immediately. It merely has, 'aquilae volans ad escam', which is not as much like the BXIII gloss as some of the other commentaries. The next commentary to consider is the HS, which has 'Ubiunque fuerit corpus illuc congregabuntur et aquilae, id est ubi erit Dominus in corpore, congregabuntur aquilae, id est sancti, resurgendo innovati'. This matches BXIII's 'si come li aigle s'assemblent au cors' and 'en tel maniere seront assemble li saint el ciel o Nostre Seigneur'. It also broaches the matter of eternal life with 'resurgendo innovati'. Hugh writes at more length, admitting that he is quoting Job²³, and acknowledging Bede as his source, 'Sicut aquila volans ad escam ... Beda. Ubi fuerit Dominus corpore, congregabuntur electi, qui eius passionem humiliter imitando, tanquam de carne eius fatiantur, quorum per resurrectionem renovabitur, ut aquilae iuventus'. This is closer to the BXIII gloss in that it makes the image a little clearer, with resurrection and renewal presented as coming through partaking of the body of the Lord. The glosses in Av 36 and RB 10855 are identical except for a couple of differences in word order, with, to quote RB 10855, 'et aquilae id est sancti soicicet utrumque status aquilae comparati namque in praesenti status carne dominica refioebantur sicut aquilae carnibus velocuntur et in futuro renovabuntur sicut aquilae post semen iuvenescit nota aquilae ad corpus volant'. This is not as close as the HS and Hugh to 'si come li aigle s'assemblent au cors
... en tel maniere seront assemble li saint el ciel o Nostre Seigneur'. It does, however, make the image explicit, as does the BXIII gloss; as eagles grow strong (or young) again through eating, so are the saints renewed through 'carne dominica'.

The conclusion for this gloss would seem to be that the source for the initial interpretation of 'li aigle' as 'li saint' is the HS, Hugh or RB 10855. No source has been identified for the next part of the gloss, 'en tel maniere montent li saint de vertu en vertu par buenes huevres'. This is again on 'buenes huevres', a common BXIII theme, and one which may have been taken from a different tradition. This is moralistic material in that it is through 'buenes huevres' that the saints become more virtuous. The source for 'si come li aigle s'assemble au cors ... en tel maniere seront assemble li saint el ciel o Nostre Seigneur' was either the HS or Hugh, and either Av 36 or RB 10855 was the source for the rest of this gloss. Two Latin commentaries, then, are the minimum needed to cover this gloss, the possibilities being either one of the HS or Hugh, plus either one of Av 36 or RB 10855.

18.13

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.
The gloss on Mark 10.52 is a much shorter gloss on the same lemma. No Latin commentary source has been identified for either gloss.

This BXIII gloss does two things. It explains the lemma, "'por ce que tu n'as mie coneu le tens de ma visitacion'", and then gives the historical background which the glossator feels explains Christ's prophecy, given as 'tes anemis t'enolorront, et t'avironneront, et te contraindront et feront angoisse de toutes parties, et t'abatront a terre' in the lemma.

In the gloss, the lemma 'por ce que tu n'as mie coneu le tens de ta visitacion' becomes 'por ce que tu n'as pas receu ton sauveor qui estoit venuz por toi visiter'. No Latin commentary has any material which can be compared to this part of the BXIII gloss, but this is perhaps not surprising. There is no material here for which the glossator would have needed a Latin source. This part of the gloss is really a reworking of the lemma to make its implications absolutely clear. 'Coneu' is replaced by
'receu'; just knowing is not good enough, the saviour should be received too. The gloss also makes it clear who is doing the visiting and who is being visited; 'ta visitacion' means that it is 'toi' who is being visited by 'ton sauveor'. Such rewriting, which is there to make the lemma absolutely clear, may well not have needed a Latin source, and may have been done on the glossator's own initiative.

The second part of the gloss gives the story of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian, which fulfilled Christ's prophecy. Two Latin commentaries, ZC and Av 36, have material which may have been the source for this story in the BXIII gloss. ZC has material for BXIII's 'Tytus et Vaspasiens ... qui estoient emperoer de Rome' in 'a romanis principibus Vespasiano et Tito'. It also has, 'Ierusalem funditus eversa sit', likewise found in Av 36, which is a likely source for BXIII's 'et la destruistrent desi au fondement'. 'Funditus' is a very good match for BXIII's 'desi au fondement', but if the glossator used 'everus' then what he may have done is to gloss this as meaning 'destruistrent', and implying 'ocistrent'. Neither commentary states explicitly that all the Jews were killed, or that this happened 'xlii. anz enprés sa passion'.

ZC would seem to be a more likely source for this gloss than Av 36, but the situation is complicated here by the fact that the glossator claims to identify his source.
This story is 'si come l’en list es estoires des Roumains'. The difficulty here is to know which text the BXIII glossator means. A possible candidate is *Li Fet des Romains* written c.1213-426, but as this text only goes as far as the death of Julius Caesar the glossator may in fact mean one of the continuations of this text. He may, of course, be referring to some entirely different text which covered enough Roman history to merit being called the 'estoires des Roumains', such as the *Histoire ancienne avant César*, but again this does not go far enough. In the absence of any better source for this BXIII gloss, then, the best that has been identified remains ZC.

20.19(1)

This gloss explains the lemma 'queroient a metre main seur lui' as meaning 'il queroient achoison coment il l’osassent prendre'; it is a gloss which also occurs on John 10.39. No Latin source has been identified for this gloss, either here (in Luke) or in John.

20.19(2)

This gloss explains 'oeste semblance' (translating 'similitudinem') in the text as 'oeste parabole des cultivateurs de la vigne, come nos avons raconté i. pou
devant', and can be compared to the gloss on Matthew 13.3, which has 'parabole' (translating 'parabolis') in the text glossed as 'semblance de paroles'. In the Vulgate, 'parabola' and 'similitudo' would seem to be used synonymously, and 'parabola' is indeed glossed as 'similitudo' in Latin commentaries on Matthew 13.3.

One Latin commentary, Av 36, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss, but it has no gloss on 'similitudinem', which we might expect, from the evidence of Latin glossing on Matthew 13.3, to find glossed as 'parabola'. The BXIII glossator's use of a synonym here would not seem to be taken from a Latin commentary on Luke 20.19(2). His own gloss on Matthew 13.3 shows that he was aware of the synonymity of 'parabola' and 'similitudo' in Latin, and that this was matched by synonymity of 'parbole' and 'semblance', or 'semblance de paroles', in Old French. He may not, therefore, have needed a Latin source for his gloss in Luke, his own in Matthew (with possible Latin sources) perhaps being enough to identify a lemma which could be glossed by synonymity, and provide him with the synonym required.

Av 36 uses 'vinea' in its gloss here, and this matches BXIII's 'vigne'. Yet the presence of this word in this gloss is perhaps only to be expected given that the parable of the 'cultiveors de la vigne' occurs a few
verses earlier, in Luke 20.9-17. Such material may well not have been needed by the BXIII glossator.

Even though 'vinea' matches 'vigne' in the BXIII gloss, Av 36 is not a very likely source for this BXIII gloss as it does not gloss 'similitudo' as 'parabola'. This, as we have seen, may be material taken from another BXIII gloss for which a possible Latin source has been identified.

20.20

This gloss explains 'qu'il le peussent prendre en sa parole' as 'qu'il li feissent dire tiex paroles de quoi il peust estre repris'. This makes it clear that the 'agaiteors' will make Christ say things that he can be blamed for, and that Christ will not say such things otherwise. This gloss also changes 'prendre' in the text to 'repris' ('reprendre'), which can mean either 'take back' or 'blame, accuse', and is glossing by dittology. It adds nothing to the theme of the gloss, which is that the 'agaiteors' are here the villains of the narrative.

No Latin commentary makes this sort of change to the text in its gloss on this lemma, but this may be because this is a BXIII gloss which did not require a Latin source. There is no material in this BXIII gloss which needed any source other than the lemma, and such a rewriting of the
lemma, to bring out the implications in it and generally clarify the text, is something that the BXIII glossator does elsewhere\textsuperscript{32} and may well have done on his own initiative.

20.21

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

20.24

This gloss explains 'de qui font eles mencion' as 'de qui parolent eles, et quel non i est escrit'.

One Latin commentary, Av 36, has material which is a likely source for the second part of the gloss 'et quel non i est escrit', reading 'nomen superscriptus est'. It has nothing for the first part of the BXIII gloss, but this may be an expansion of the lemma by synonymity, done by the BXIII glossator without a Latin source.

20.25

This gloss explains exactly what it is that should be rendered unto God, this being 'primices et dismes et offerandes'.
Seven Latin commentaries, Gorr, RB 10855, RB 11374, Av 36, RB 9939, the Glossa and the HS, gloss this lemma in the same way as the BXIII glossator. Five of them, Gorr, RB 10855, RB 11374, RB 9939 and Av 36, quote the Glossa (whether they acknowledge this as their source or not); the Glossa has 'decimas' and 'victimas' for BXIII's 'dismes' and 'offerandes', but nothing for 'primices'. RB 11374, with 'decimas' and 'victimas', also has 'primitias', which is a likely source for 'primices'. 'Primitias' is also found in the HS, which groups it along with 'decimas' and 'oblationes'.

The situation of this BXIII gloss is as follows: the likely source for BXIII's 'dismes' is 'decimas', which is found in all seven Latin commentaries; the source for 'primices' is 'primitias', which is found in two, the HS and RB 11374; the source for 'offerandes' is either 'victimas', which is found in six, namely the Glossa, Gorr, RB 10855, RB 11374, RB 9939 and Av 36, or 'oblationes', which is found in the HS. Only those commentaries which have material for all three words in the BXIII gloss, can be considered as likely sources for it, and these are the HS and RB 11374. This leaves us with the choice of either 'victimas' or 'oblationes' as the source for 'offerandes'. 'Victima' definitely means a 'sacrifice', whereas 'oblatio' is a more general word, meaning any 'offering' or 'gift', including a 'sacrifice', and given this, it seems probable that
'oblationes' was the source for 'offerandes' rather than 'victimas'. The source for this BXIII gloss, then, would seem to have been the HS, although RB 11374 should probably not be excluded.

20.27

This gloss explains the lemma 'qui noient la resurrection' as 'qui dient et afferment que l'en ne resucitera mie en prés ce que l'en sera morz'. This really just rephrases the text, spelling out that 'resurrection' means resurrection after death, and glossing 'noient' by dittology.

Two Latin commentaries, RB 10855 and Av 36, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss, but they do not make the same point about the resurrection, and do not gloss 'negant' in any way. It may be, however, that the glossator needed no Latin source for this gloss anyway. His gloss contains no material for which a Latin source would have been needed, and seems to be there for emphasis rather than for information. He glosses 'noient' by dittology, as 'dient' and 'afferment', thus emphasizing the fact that the saducees do not believe, and he glosses 'resurrection' by defining it, which definition allows him to emphasize that concept too. Glossing for emphasis
is one of the recurring features of the BXIII Gospel glosses.

The conclusion for this gloss is that it is unlikely that Av 36 or RB 10855 was the source for this gloss, so either the source has not been identified, or the glossator wrote it on his own initiative.

20.36

This gloss continues the resurrection theme of the previous gloss, changing the text’s "il seront fill de resurrection" to 'il seront resuscité'.

Two Latin commentaries, Av 36 and Albt, gloss this lemma by referring to the resurrection of the dead. Av 36 has 'mortuorum restitutionem', and Albt has 'mortui resurgent'. Of these, it is Albt, using a verb phrase rather than a noun, and with 'resurgo' as a match for 'resusciter' which is the more likely of the two to have been the source for this gloss.

It is always possible that the BXIII glossator did not use a Latin source where the BXIII gloss is nothing more than a rewriting of the lemma, but it is interesting here that two Latin commentaries should do the same. Their rewriting is different, however, in that they both introduce new material, glossing 'filii' as 'mortui'. There is no equivalent for this in the BXIII gloss.
This rewriting of the lemma is common in BXIII Gospel glosses and in general would not seem to have needed a Latin source. However, where a Latin source also seems to rewrite the lemma, then it seems reasonable to conclude that in such cases the BXIII glossator did use a Latin source. The conclusion for this BXIII gloss, then, is that even though the glossator did not need a source for this gloss, he would seem to have used one anyway, viz. Albt, which treats the lemma for this gloss in a way which is common in the BXIII Gospel glosses.

20.38

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

20.42

This gloss identifies exactly who is meant by the terms 'Nostre Sires' and 'mon Seignor'. The first expansion is explained as meaning 'Dex li peres', and the second as 'Christ son fill'. Such glosses which identify exactly which emanation of God is meant by such terms as 'Nostre Sires' and 'Deu' are not uncommon in the BXIII Gospel glosses. Here, 'Nostre Sires' translates 'dominus', which, as has already been discussed, is a potentially
ambiguous word. The possibility for ambiguity is even greater here, where the lemma is 'Dixit Dominus a Domino meo'. The first 'Dominus' means 'God the Father', and the second means 'God the Son'. It is not just the BXIII glossator who realizes that a correct understanding of 'dominus' is important here; seven Latin commentators did so too.

The eight commentaries which have glosses which can be compared to this BXIII gloss, are the Glossa, Robt, RB 11374, Av 36, PComD, Hugh, RB 9939 and RB 10855. Seven of these, Robt, RB 11374, Av 36, PComD, Hugh, RB 9939 and RB 10855, explain that the first 'dominus' means 'pater'. Two of these commentaries, Robt and RB 11374, have Glossa-type interlinear glosses, with 'pater' written above the first 'dominus', and the others all have 'Dixit Dominus id est (RB 10855 'dominus') pater'. The only commentary not to make this first point is the Glossa, which does have 'pater' in its gloss on this lemma but not as an identification of the first 'dominus'.

'Pater' does mean 'Dex li peres', and is a perfect match for 'li peres'. 'Deus', which would be a match for 'Dex', is found in two commentaries, Av 36 and PComD, both of which have a second identification of the first 'dominus' as 'deus creator celci et terrae'. It is unlikely, however, that this means that Av 36 and PComD are more likely to have been the source for this part of the gloss than the commentaries which have 'pater' alone.
'Dex li peres' is a formulaic phrase in BXIII, a standard way of translating 'dominus' when this means 'pater', and so not at all likely to be dependent on 'deus' in its source commentary. This means that for the first part of the gloss, all six Latin commentaries are possible sources.

The second identification, that 'mon Seignor' is 'Christ le fill', is found in some form in all eight Latin commentaries. Again, Robt and RB 11374 have a Glossa-style interlinear gloss, with 'filio' written above 'domino'. This is presumably what the Glossa had too, although in the copy I consulted 'filio' was written above 'Dominus' at this point, which it seems fair to consider is an error which was introduced at some stage in the transmission of that particular copy. RB 10855 also identifies 'domino' as 'filio, with 'domino meo id est domino filio', and RB 9939 has 'dominus scilicet filio'. The remaining three commentaries, Av 36, Hugh and PComD, all identify 'domino' as 'Messias' and 'Christus'. As with 'Dex li peres', 'Christ le fill' is a common, formulaic phrase in BXIII, and would probably not have needed both 'Christus' and 'filio' in its Latin source for 'Christ le fill'. Any Latin commentary containing either 'filio' or 'Christus', that is, all seven which gloss 'domino', could have been the source for the second part of this BXIII gloss.
The conclusion for this BXIII gloss, then, is that any of the commentaries which gloss 'Dominus' as 'pater' and 'Domino' as 'filio' or 'Christus', could have been its source. The Glossa is the only commentary not to gloss them both, leaving Robt. Av 36, PComD, Hugh, RB 11374, RB 9939 and RB 10855 all as likely sources for this BXIII gloss.

20.46

This gloss explains the meaning of 'estoles', which it explains are, 'beles robes et precieuses'.

Five Latin commentaries, Av 36, PComD, RB 11374, RB 9980 and RB 9939 give some explanation of 'stola'. The glosses in Av 36 and PComD are practically the same, with, to quote Av 36, 'stola genus longe vestis', and the gloss in RB 9939 is very similar with 'stola est vestimentum longum et ornatum'; RB 11374 and RB 9980 have a different explanation, with 'purpura et bisso'. Of these, 'ornatum' is the most likely to have been the source for the explanation given in BXIII, although 'purpura' also implies the same thing.

However, the BXIII glossator may not have needed a commentary source for this gloss, as 'ephod', synonymous with 'stola', is described at length and in detail in Exodus 28.6–12. The richness and beauty of such robes is
clear from this description, and could easily be condensed for the BXIII gloss. If the glossator were aware that 'stola' and 'ephod' were synonymous, (for example, from a Biblical dictionary such as Brito), he could use a concordance to find the passage in Exodus where 'ephod' is described.

Of the commentaries consulted, it is RB 9939 which is the most like this BXIII gloss, although it is possible, and is perhaps more likely, that the BXIII glossator got the information for his gloss from the description of 'ephod' given in Exodus 28.6-12.

20.47

This gloss explains that those people who know the law but do not keep it not only do wrong, but make others do wrong too, and that it is for this reason that they will suffer 'double dampnement'.

Three Latin commentaries, Robt, RB 11374 and RB 10855, all make this point too. Robt and RB 11374 have the same gloss, 'Maiorem in hoo insinuat illos qui in angulis stantes orant ut videantur ab hominibus, damnationem quidem miseri sed istos maiorem'. RB 10855 is even more to the point, with, 'maiore meretur damnationem'.
'Maiorem dampnationem' is not exactly the same as BXIII's 'double dampnement', but the meaning behind these phrases is very much the same. 'Maiorem' implies a hierarchy of damnation whereas 'double' simply doubles the normal damnation, but both imply that the sin of hypocrisy, and of setting others a bad example that will lead them into sin too, deserves not just more damnation, but considerably more. The BXIII glossator might have felt that this was better rendered by 'double', which is more precise, than by 'maiorem', and this may account for 'double' in BXIII.

The material needed for this BXIII gloss is most concisely expressed in RB 10855, but it is also found in RB 11374 and Robt, and so any of these three commentaries could have been the source for this BXIII gloss.

22.7

This BXIII gloss explains a Jewish custom, that 'li jorz des azimes' is 'li jorz que l'en ne menjoit mie chose ou il eust miel ne levain', and is a gloss which is found elsewhere in BXIII, on Matthew 26.17 and Mark 14.1237.

This lemma is glossed in three Latin commentaries, the HS, RB 9959 and Av 36. RB 9959 has 'nondum comedebatur azima', which at least contains the idea of not eating leaven. The gloss in the HS has the idea of eating
leaven, 'id est ea die, in oujus vespera agnus erat immolandus, et edendus cum azymis', which perhaps implies that as leaven was eaten on the eve of this day, it was not eaten on the day itself, but this really is not very much like the BXIII gloss. None of these commentaries has any material which could have been the source for 'levain', or for 'miel'.

None of these commentaries look very likely sources for this BXIII gloss. The glossing of 'azimes' as 'levain' may not have needed a source as it is glossing by synonymity, or may have been taken from either of the other BXIII glosses on this lemma; this does not account for 'miel'. There is certainly no mention of honey in the account of the first Passover given in Exodus 12.1-36, or in the rules given for keeping the Passover in Leviticus 23.5-14. Honey is mentioned, however, and in the same context as leaven, in Leviticus 2.11, which says that neither leaven nor honey are to be burnt as food-offerings to the Lord. Now the rules for keeping the Passover in Leviticus mention that food-offerings are to be made to the Lord, in 23.8 and again in 23.13-14, and it could be that the presence of 'miel' in the BXIII gloss is an indication that the glossator misunderstood what was happening. Knowing that leaven should not be burnt as a food-offering to the Lord, and knowing that it should not be eaten before the Passover, he may have thought that as honey was also not to be burnt as a food-offering, that the rules regarding honey were the same as
those regarding leaven, and assumed that just as leaven
was not to be eaten before Passover, neither was honey.

This is the only mistake in factual information that I
have found in the BXIII Gospel glosses, and it is an
intriguing one, because the glossator seems to have been
concerned to get such facts about Jewish custom and
religious festivals right, and was prepared to take his
information from a source in the Old Testament. It is
also not an error that is repeated in the glosses on this
lemma on Matthew 26.17 and Mark 14.12. The general
picture that the glosses give, is not of a glossator who
would misunderstand his Old Testament sources in this
way.

One explanation might be that 'miel' was not originally
part of this BXIII gloss, but was an addition which was
incorporated into it at some point in the text's
transmission. Evidence that this may be what happened is
found in the variant readings listed by Sneddon.

'Miel' is not in this gloss in two of his manuscripts,
his F, Paris, BN MS fr.899, and his E, Paris, Bibl.
Mazarine MS 35, which Sneddon believes belong to the same
family (his h), Berger, De Poerck and Decoo all seem
to believe that this family (Sneddon's h), represented
the original version of BXIII, and if this were so, then
the gloss as given in F, without 'miel', would be the
original. Sneddon disagrees with this, however,
believing that the original family is represented by his
xl, and not by h\(^43\). For his edition of the Gospels, he has used manuscripts from both families, believing that (where his A is Rouen Bibliothèque municipale MS A 211), 'the agreement of AF will thus normally guarantee the archetype x'\(^44\). In this case, A and F do not agree, but given that E has 'nul levain' for A's 'miel ne levain', it is possible that F has shortened its model's text which in fact agreed with A. At all events, since it is Sneddon who has done most work on the manuscript tradition of BXIII, it seems reasonable to accept, following his lead, that his xl represents his original family and consequently that 'miel' is the original reading.

Given this, we need to account for this seeming error in the BXIII gloss. It may, paradoxically, support the idea that the BXIII glossator was not only interested in Jewish material, but interested in getting it accurate. The addition of 'miel' to this gloss may almost appear to be a hyper-correction on the part of the glossator; he knew that 'miel' and 'levain' were often associated and thought that not associating them here, that not including 'miel' here, was an error on the part of his sources and in the Old Testament. It is by correcting this seeming error that he introduced 'miel' into his gloss, and it is only because he is interested in getting his Jewish material accurate that he could even conceive that it needed to be considered and even added here. More prosaically it would also be possible that an
unidentified Latin source introduced this error, but in view of the BXIII glossator's interest in Jewish customs, the prosaic solution may not reflect what actually happened.

The conclusion for this BXIII gloss, then, is that RB 9959, the HS and Av 36 do not seem to be very likely sources either for 'levain' or 'miel' here. The replacement of 'azimes' by 'levain' may be glossing by dittology, and the addition of 'miel' may be the glossator's own.

22.22

This gloss replaces the 'diffiné' in the text with 'prophecié' in the gloss.

Five Latin commentaries, the Glossa, Alex, PComP, Hugh and Av 36, gloss this lemma, and all of them use some word which could have been the source for BXIII's 'prophecié'. The Glossa has 'praedixit', Alex has 'praerordinatum', PComP has 'praevisum', and Hugh and Av 36 both have 'provisum'. Of these, the Glossa's 'praedico' is perhaps the closest to BXIII's 'prophecié', but the other verbs are all close enough to merit not being excluded. Any of these five commentaries, therefore, could have been the source for this BXIII
gloss, with the Glossa perhaps being fractionally more likely.

22.43

This BXIII gloss is based on two lemmas in 22.42 and 22.43, 'oste moi oest boivre que ge ne le boive', and 'Lors li aparut uns angeles del ciel qui le conforta'. The gloss follows the second of these two lemmas, and deals with it first. Both lemmas are glossed in such a way as to bring out the same point, that Christ was 'verais hom'.

Two Latin commentaries, Hugh and Av 36, have glosses which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Their glosses are, in fact, practically the same. Hugh has, 'Christus ex humana infirmitate horrens mortem ... Et nota quia quis Christus verus homo esset, nulla tamen egebat consolatione angelica vel humana', and Av 36 has 'consolo angeli confortantis eum et nota quia licet verus homo esset nulla tamen egebat consolatione angelica vel humana'.

Both of these commentaries have 'verus homo esset', which is a probable source for BXIII's 'il estoit verais hom'. Hugh also clearly states that Christ's fear of death is a human feeling, 'Christus ex humana infirmitate horrens mortem', and this reflects the underlying theme of the BXIII gloss, that Christ was human. Otherwise, the gloss
in these commentaries is not a good match for the BXIII gloss. The expansion 'nulla tamen egebat consolatione angelica vel humana' means that he did not need any consolation, either from angels, or from people. This is not what BXIII has. The BXIII glossator has tried to explain the very reason why Christ should be comforted by an angel: 'Coment avoit il mestier de confort d'angele ou d'autre creature, cil qui estoit Dex toz poissanz et par qui toutes creatures furent fetes? Por oe, sanz doute, volt il estre confortez de creature qui fust plus haute que home, a mostrer qu'il estoit verais hom'. What the glossator may have got from either of these Latin commentaries was the idea that the question as to whether Christ needed the consolation given by the angel was a difficult one, and one which would need an answer. This may well have prompted his question in his gloss. The answer he gives, however, is a different one to those in these two Latin commentaries, and is one which emphasizes Christ's humanity. The gloss ends with a resounding statement of Christ's resurrection, actually quoting St Paul in Latin, 'Christus resurgens ex mortuis'. This seems to bring us back to the idea of Christ's divinity, and back to the implication of his question that is, how could God, who created everything, need comfort from an angel? This, presumably, is what the Latin gloss 'nulla tamen egebat consolatione angelica vel humana' implies too. It seems that the glossator took the angel comforting Jesus as an sign of his humanity, but the implications of this gloss seem to be that this was
comfort he did not really need as he was God. By this rather circuitous route, we get back to the original Latin gloss, which now looks a very probable source for this part of the BXIII gloss.

The source for this BXIII gloss, then, was either Hugh or Av 36.

*22.48 and 22.49(1)*

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

*22.49(2)*

This BXIII gloss explains "ferrons nos d'espees" as 'nos deffendrons nos'. This makes it clear that there was no question of the apostles using their swords to attack. As the BXIII gloss states, they ask if they may use them for defence.

The idea of defence occurs in three Latin glosses on this lemma, in the Glossa, Bon and Gorr. 'Defensionis' is found in the Glossa and Gorr, and 'ad defendum' in Bon. Either of these alternatives could have been the source for the BXIII gloss, and therefore any of these commentaries might have been the one that was used.
This gloss explains how it is that Peter was recognized as being a Galilean: 'Sanz doute sainz Peres fu coneuz par le langage, quar il avoit lors difference entre le langage de Galilee et le langage de Judee'.

Four Latin commentaries, Hugh, PComP, Av 36 and RB 11374, have glosses which make the same point, that Hebrew is spoken in both Galilee and Jerusalem, but that each province had its own idiomatic form of the language. The glosses in Hugh, PComP and Av 36 are the same, with, to quote PComP, 'sed numquid Galilei sunt et Ierosolimite Hebrei sunt utique sed unaqueque provincia habet propria ydiomata lingue'. The gloss in RB 11374 is a bit different, with 'Ierosolimite et Galilei eque sunt Ebres et unius lingue sed unaqueque provincia suas habet proprietas vernaculum loquem'. Both of these glosses provide the information needed for the BXIII gloss, and either could have been its source. All the glossator has done is to simplify the material in them. Instead of explaining that each province had its own variety of Hebrew, he merely says that there was a difference between the language spoken in Galilee and that in Judea. Any of the four Latin commentaries which give the same explanation could have been his source here.
This gloss changes and slightly expands the text’s 'ge l'amendrai' as 'ge le chastierai par fere li aucun torment'. It is clear from this that there will be some physical punishment involved, although there is nothing as to the nature of this in the BXIII gloss.

Three Latin commentaries, RB 10519, PCh and Av 36, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Two commentaries, RB 10519 and PCh, state that the punishment is to be both physical and mental. RB 10519 has 'flagris et ludibriis', and PCh has 'flagellus et ludubrue'. Av 36 has just physical punishment, with 'flagellari'.

'Flagris', 'flagellus', 'flagellari' and 'ludibriis' are all more precise than BXIII's 'chastierai par fere li aucun torment'. If the glossator used any of these commentaries as his source, then he has deliberately chosen to be more vague in the actual terms he uses. On the level of content, however, the BXIII gloss does make it clear that the punishment is to be physical, and this is best expressed by 'flagris', 'flagellus' and 'flagellari'. This means that any of these three Latin commentaries are sources for this BXIII gloss, although none of them is a particularly close match.
This gloss expands the lemma "Il a fet les autres saus; or se face sauf" as 'il avoit poo[i]r de ouer les autres, or mostre son pooir et s'oste de la oroiz'. This explains how the crowd wanted Christ to save himself, and thus makes explicit what is implied in the lemma.

Six Latin commentaries, PComD, Alex, Hugh, Av 36, the Glossa and Robt, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. PComD has 'crucifixione', Alex has 'noluit sibi descendere', Hugh has 'id est a cruce liberet', Av 36 has 'non debeat se salvare a morte crucis', and the Glossa and Robt (who is in fact quoting the Glossa), have 'sed quia ipse Christus dei electus de cruce descendere noluit ... se de cruce salvare neglexit'.

The BXIII gloss has the crowd wanting Jesus to save himself by coming down from the cross, which is what Hugh has. The other commentaries, the Glossa, Robt and Alex which state that Christ could not come down from the cross, Av 36 which says that he could not save himself from death on the cross, and PComD which says that the crowd wanted him to save himself from crucifixion, all imply that this is what the crowd wanted him to do. It is Hugh, with a gloss which makes this explicit like the
BXIII gloss, which is the most likely of these commentaries to have been the source for the BXIII gloss, but none of the others can be excluded.

23.41

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

23.43

This BXIII gloss is an expansion of the lemma 'paradis', and a lot of the material in it is found in another gloss, that on Luke 16.23 on the bosom of Abraham⁴⁶. The only part of the gloss on 23.43 which is not found in the gloss on Luke 16.23 is 'Jhesus ne li dist mie tu seras hui o moi el ciel, mes dist en paradis'. All of the rest is either found stated explicitly in the gloss on 16.23, or implied by it. When material is repeated in different glosses, there is always the possibility that the glossator used one gloss as the source for another, and, in theory, most of this gloss could have been taken from the gloss on Luke 16.23. This cannot be assumed to be the case, however, and it is still necessary to check for Latin sources, both for any parts of one gloss which are not found in the other, and because it may well be that
the material is repeated in the Latin source commentaries too.

For the purposes of comparison, this BXIII gloss can be divided into two parts, the first being, 'Et notez que Jhesus ne li dist mie Tu seras hui o moi el ciel, mes dist en paradis, quar, devant la resurrection Jhesucrist, nule ame d'ome ne de prophete ne d'autre entra el ciel', and the second being, 'ainz estoient tuit li juste joste enfer en .i. lieu assemble, ou il atendoient que li Filz Deu les en getast; et n'avoient iluec torment ne gloire'.

Six Latin commentaries, Bon, the HS, Hugh, Av 36, RB 10855 and RB 8831, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss.

The first part of the BXIII gloss is found in Bon, the HS, Hugh and Av 36. Two of these, Bon and the HS, have material for 'ne li dist mie el ciel, mes dist en paradis'. Bon has 'eris in paradiso non celesti', and the HS has 'coelum, paradisum scilicet Adae'. Both of these have the material necessary for this part of the BXIII gloss, but it is clearer, and most like the material in BXIII, in Bon. The point that 'devant la resurrection Jhesucrist, nule ame d'ome ne de prophete ne d'autre entra el ciel' is made in three commentaries, in the HS, Hugh and Av 36. The HS has 'in Paradiso: Non intellige ... de angelico, quia ad illum ante Christum nemo ascendit'. Hugh and Av 36 have something very similar to the HS, to quote Hugh 'Paradisum Adae, vel
ascenderit ad Paradisum angli, ad quam nemo ascendit ante Christum'. It would seem that the glossator used Bon plus one of the HS, Hugh or Av 36 for this part of the gloss. Another possibility, if we accept the HS for 'ciel' even though this is not quite as much like the BXIII gloss as Bon, is that the BXIII glossator just used the HS here.

Five Latin commentaries, the HS, Hugh, Av 36, RB 10855 and RB 8831, have material for the second part of the gloss. RB 10855 and RB 8831 have 'limbus', which is the central theme of this part of the gloss. Hugh has 'in iocunditate et quiete', in which 'quiete' at least suggests no torment, and Av 36 has 'in inferno'. BXIII's 'lieu' is matched by 'locus' in RB 8831 and the HS, even though the HS, with 'locaque', seems to be suggesting that there were many places, and not just one, although in its gloss on the bosom of Abraham, in 16.23, it is clear that there is just one place47. It is the HS which is generally most like this part of the BXIII gloss, with 'in requie quod est esse cum Jesu ...Forte fuit anima ejus cum anima Christi in sinu Abrahae ...multa loca bonorum praeter coelum, paradisum scilicet Adae, locaque in aere et terra, ubi beate vivent, nec tamen Deum videbunt'. This has 'requie' to suggest no torment, and 'anima' for 'ame', 'bonorum' for 'li juste' and the idea of 'prophete', 'loca' for 'lieu', and 'praeter' as an indication of where the bosom of Abraham was, for BXIII's
'joste enfer'. The HS seems the most likely source for the second part of this BXIII gloss.

It is the HS, then, perhaps supplemented from Bon, that was the possible source for this BXIII gloss. Even though a lot of the material in this gloss could have come from the gloss on Luke 16.23, or even, perhaps, from material in Latin commentaries on that lemma, all of the material in the gloss on 23.43 can be accounted for by Latin commentaries which gloss the lemma here. Bon, which may have been used, does not gloss this lemma on 16.23; the HS, which was very much more likely to have been used, does. This gloss is repeated in the HS just as it is likewise repeated in BXIII.
Chapter Five: Footnotes

1. For this gloss, see above, pp.102-105.
2. For the attribution of this gloss to Bede, see Hugh on this gloss in Appendix I.
3. See the discussion of this gloss on Matthew 1.25 on pp.103-4 above.
4. For this gloss, see below, pp.295-7.
5. For the reader's convenience, I quote this Genesis gloss (Ouereuil (1988: 183)) in full here:

Ce fu comandé a Abraham par III. causes: la première est qu'il plese a Dieu par obedience por ce qu'Adam li avoit despleu par Inobedience; la seconde cause, qu'il fust dessevrez des autres nascions par tieux signes; la tierce chose est qu'il fust circonois ou mambre ou luxure seult avoir seingnorie, por savoir qu'il doit garder chasté et refuser lecherie. Et Rabanus dist: la circoncision que Abraham físt ou membre senefie la circoncision esperitel que nos devon avoir ou cuer et ou sens corporel: nos devons circoncire le cuer, que nos ne pensons a mal, et les eulz, que nos ne veons vanité; et les oreilles doivent estre circoncises, ce est a dire estoupees, que nos noons mal; et ainsi doit estre faite la circoncision par touz les mambres.

7. For this gloss, see below, pp.261-4.
10. See below, pp.261-4.
12. See below, pp.461-89 (on moral sources).
15. See below, pp.410-11.
17. See below, pp.367-71.
20. Genesis 17.6-14.
25. See above, pp.189.
27. *Li Fai des Romains* was supposed to go as far as Domitian but stops at the death of Julius Caesar (see Flutre (1932: 143)), and several continuations were written, although these are mostly far too late to have been available to the BXIII glossator (see Flutre (1932: 143-58)). One which may have been available to the BXIII glossator is that which survives in London BL MS Royal 20 C I (Flutre (1932: 44)). This manuscript dates from the fifteenth century, but there would seem to be nothing about the text which suggests that it may not have been written in the thirteenth century. We can be quite certain of a *terminus a quo* for it as that part which covers the event that the BXIII glossator refers to in this BXIII gloss would seem to be dependent on the *Speculum historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais (Flutre (1932: 144)). The *Speculum historiale* is a compendium of world
history and initially went from the beginnings of time up to 1244, although it was later extended to 1250. It is part of the larger Speculum maius, completed c.1256-9 (A Gabriel, The Educational Ideas of Vincent of Beauvais, second edition 1962, p.3-4) although the Speculum historiale may have been available before the full Speculum maius was completed. This means that the continuation of Li Fet des Romains in London BL MS Royal 20 C I must have been written after 1244, may have been written after 1250, and might have been written after c.1256-9, although how much after is difficult to determine given that the London manuscript, which seems to be the only surviving copy of this continuation (Flutre (1932: 143-58), dates from the fifteenth century. I have not checked this continuation of Li fet des Romains, nor any other continuation, for this BXIII gloss.

28. For the Histoire ancienne avant César see R Bosssuat, Manuel Bibliographique de la Littérature Française du Moyen Age, Melun 1951, pp.356-357; this does not suggest any other French text which might be a likely source for this gloss, and 'Estoires des Roumains' would seem to be an unlikely way of referring to Vincent of Beauvais' Speculum historiale.

29. For this gloss, see below, p.323.

30. For this gloss, see above, pp.123.

31. The Glossa and RB 11654, see above, pp.123.

32. See below, p.375.

33. See below, pp.375-6.
35. See above, pp.218-9.
37. For these glosses, see above pp.143-4 and pp.193.
38. See below, pp.389-91.
39. See especially pp.389-91 below, on the glossator's use of Old Testament material.
42. For these scholars, Paris BN MS fonds fr.899 was the most important manuscript; this manuscript represents Sneddon's b family.
43. Sneddon (1978: I 69).
45. Epistle of Paul to the Romans 6.9.
46. For this gloss, see pp.242-8 above.
47. The HS here has a definite singular, with 'Erat enim in superiori margine inferni locus' and 'qui locus propter sui tranquillitatem sinus Abrahae dictus est'.
Chapter Six: JOHN

2.1

This gloss gives interpretations of the names Cana and Galilee. Cana is interpreted as meaning 'envie' and Galilee as 'transmigracion ou trespassement'.

Eight Latin commentaries, RB 9958, RB 10328, RB 10521, RB 8939, RB 11545, RB 1774, RB 10619 and the Glossa, give interpretations of these names. Seven of these (i.e. all of them apart from RB 10619) interpret Cana as 'zelus'; RB 10619 has something slightly different, 'Judas Chanaeus et zelothes', which refers to the same idea. Again, all of the commentaries apart from RB 10619 interpret Galilee as 'transmigratio'; RB 10619 offers no interpretation of it at all.

Any of the seven commentaries that offer interpretations for both names could have been the source for this BXIII gloss. The only one which can safely be excluded is RB 10619, which only gives an interpretation of Cana.

2.4

This gloss explains what Christ means when he says, "Feme, qu'est entre moi et toi?", in reply to Mary's statement that, "Il n'ont point de vin". The BXIII
gloss on this lemma broaches the subject of Christ's dual nature, his humanity and his divinity, and makes it clear that he can only perform miracles because of his divine nature, not because of his humanity.

Two Latin commentaries, the HS and Hugh, gloss the same lemma, and of these, the gloss in Hugh is very close to the BXIII gloss. The Hugh gloss starts with a rhetorical question, as does the BXIII gloss, 'commune, id est quid habeo a te unde possim hoc miraculum facere?', 'quel communauté a ton humanité a ma Deité, ce est a dire por quoi me requiers tu que je face miracles?'. The words may be different, but the idea behind them is the same, to raise the question of the link between Christ and his mother. The Hugh gloss makes the point that Christ is human because of his mother by saying, 'ex te habeo unde pati, et mori possum', because of her he can suffer and die. This is simplified in the BXIII gloss, where the glossator simply uses 'humanité' rather than reflect his slightly more complicated source. It is enough to say 'l'humanité que je pris en toi' for the purposes of his gloss; there is no need to complicate the issue by phrases such as 'ex te habeo unde pati'. BXIII's 'ge n'ai mie de toi que je face miracles', could be a translation of Hugh's 'ex te non habeo unde possem miracula facere'. The BXIII glossator then takes this to its logical conclusion; if it is not from the humanity he inherited from Mary that Christ can perform miracles, then it must be from 'la deité que je i aportai'. Hugh
does not say this; it is the glossator expanding his source gloss.

The HS does not have as much in common with the BXIII gloss as Hugh. The gloss in the HS begins with a rhetorical question too, like BXIII and Hugh, 'quid habeo tecum commune?', and the gist of the gloss is the same, 'ex natura tibi communa non ago hoo ... ex commune natura mihi, et tibi patiar'. "Ex natura tibi communa non ago hoo' reflects BXIII's 'ge n'ai mie de toi que ge face miracles', but Hugh's 'ex te non habeo unde possem miracula facere' is closer still to the BXIII gloss. The point about Christ's humanity is made in the same way in the HS as in Hugh, that is, it is through his mother that Christ will suffer, so had the HS been the source for the BXIII gloss the glossator would have simplified his source as he did Hugh.

Hugh is the more likely of the two commentaries to have been the source for the BXIII gloss; in fact, the links are so strong that it looks as if the glossator at one point perhaps merely translated his source. It is also interesting to note that all three glosses, in BXIII, Hugh and the HS, have a similar structure. They all begin with rhetorical questions, all make the point about Christ inheriting humanity from his mother, and all state unequivocally that it was not this humanity which allowed him to perform miracles. It is only in the BXIII gloss that this is taken to its logical conclusion; that if
Christ cannot perform miracles through his humanity, then this power must come to him through his deity.

2.6

This gloss explains that 'purification' was a Jewish custom, and that it meant 'washing', 'li Juyf avoient en costume d'avoir emprés els eve por ce qu'il estoient curieus de laver els sovent'.

Three Latin commentaries, RB 9981, RB 9920 and RB 9958, gloss this lemma, and all three make the point about 'purification' being 'washing'; RB 9981, 'purificationem lavationem', RB 9920, 'se lavare', and RB 9958, 'se lavarent'. Only one of these commentaries, RB 9958, has anything about this being a custom, or about it being something the Jews did 'sovent', 'secundum purificationem. id est quam inter alias phariseorum traditiones est hoc observabant ut crebro se lavarent'. This is very close to the BXIII gloss. It has 'traditiones' which could be a possible source for BXIII's 'costume', and 'crebro' for 'sovent'. This commentary, however, has nothing which could have been the source for BXIII's, 'd'avoir emprés els eve'. This could just be the glossator expanding his source slightly, and no closer source than RB 9958 may have been needed. It is logical to conclude that if the Jews
washed themselves a lot they would need water conveniently close by.

It is RB 9958, then, which is the commentary which is most likely to have been the source for this BXIII gloss. The phrase, 'd'avoir emprés els eve' may be an example of the glossator expanding the source he used.

2.13

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

2.18

This BXIII gloss is in the form of a question, copying the form of the lemma, which asks, '"Quiex signes nos demostres tu, qui fez ce que tu fez"'. The gloss turns this into, '"Quiex signes nos demostres tu, qui fez ce ... "(... que tu en aies pooir de ce fere?)'.

Two Latin commentaries, Hugh and RB 1744, have glosses which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. An equivalent to 'pooir' is found in both of them, with 'qua poteste hic facis et qui dedit tibi hanc potestatem?' in RB 1744 and 'ut per illud demonstres te habere potestatem talia faciendi in domo Domini?' in Hugh. Like the lemma, and
the BXIII gloss, these two Latin glosses are in the form of a question.

Either of them could have been the source for this BXIII gloss, as 'qua poteste hic facis' (RB 1744) and 'te habere potestatem talia faciendi' both match BXIII's 'que tu en aies pooir de ce fere'.

2.20

This gloss covers the lemma, 'et tu le restabliras en trois jorz?' This is a rhetorical question, which the glossator expands by describing the underlying feelings prompting it, namely the Jews' incredulity. It is, as the glossator says, 'Come s'il deissent: "Ce ne puert estre que tu diz"'.

A similar gloss is found on this lemma in Hugh, 'verbum est desperantium, qui non credunt ... ponens verba desperationis dicit: impossible est'. This is similar to BXIII's 'Ce ne puert estre que tu diz', and looks a possible source for it.

2.23

This gloss explains the lemma, 'le jor de Pasque', as, 'le jor que li Juyf fesoit lor Pasque', presumably to
make it clear to the audience that the Jewish 'Pasque' was not the same as the Christian one, and not to be confused with it. This is a gloss which complements the lemma by making it more precise.

Hugh has a gloss on this lemma, but does not make the same point, 'id est in Paschali tempore festivo vel in diebus Paschalibus festivis', and so cannot be considered a source for the BXIII gloss. He seems to be making the point that 'Pascha' was 'festivus', not that it was 'Jewish'.

No Latin source has been identified for this gloss, but then this may be a gloss for which no source ever existed. It may be an example of how the BXIII glosses were governed by their audience. Hugh is presumably confident that his audience, possibly Dominicans in his own house of St Jaques, knew that 'Passover' was not the same festival as 'Easter'. The BXIII glossator, perhaps writing for a less generally learned or educated audience, could not be so sure that his audience would be aware of this fact, hence the need for a clarifying gloss. To an audience knowing only that 'Pasque' was a festival celebrated every year in March or April, it would be important to point out that it is not that festival which is in question here, but its Jewish precursor.
This BXIII gloss replaces a single word in the text, 'alués', by another single word in the gloss, 'eritage'. This is interesting in that 'alués', of Germanic origin, is used to translate 'praedium' and is then glossed by the latinate 'eritage'. Smalley has discussed the use of 'allodium' by Comestor to gloss 'patrimonium', and says that allods 'were disappearing fast in northern France during the twelfth century'. This may explain the presence of the gloss on this term here in BXIII.

'Praedium' is a word also explained in Brito's *Summa*.

Two Latin commentaries, RB 10521 and the Glossa, gloss the lemma 'praedium', both as 'hereditas', and this could have been the source for BXIII's 'eritage'. Both the Latin sources and the BXIII gloss seem to be by dittology, although in this BXIII gloss the choice of word to use would seem to be governed by the word used in the Latin source.

Either RB 10521 or the Glossa, therefore, could have been the source for this BXIII gloss.
4.17

This is a very short gloss, again glossing a single word in the text by a single word in the lemma. In this case, 'bien' is glossed by 'voir'.

One Latin commentary, the Glossa, does exactly the same thing, with, 'quia vere dixisti' replacing 'Bene dixisti'. This commentary, therefore, is a likely source for this BXIII gloss.

4.19

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

4.36

This gloss, like the preceding one, glosses a single word in the text by a single word in the gloss. Here 'queult' is glossed by 'moissonne'.

Four Latin commentaries, the Glossa, RB 8829, RB 10521 and RB 10328, have material which could have been the source for this gloss. RB 8829 has 'messione', RB 10328 has 'messiones', RB 10521 has 'messis' and the Glossa has 'messore'. None of these is a verb form matching BXIII's
'moissonne'. The Vulgate itself uses the verb 'meto', translated in BXIII by 'queult', glossed by 'moissonne'. Any of the four commentaries could have prompted this use of 'moissonne', as could the Vulgate text itself. The situation here is confused; we could be dealing with a gloss with a Latin commentary source, or with a confusion of translation and gloss material by the glossator.

4.47

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

4.50

This gloss explains the lemma, 'ton fill vit' as, 'ton fill est gariz', thus explaining how it is that Christ can refer to someone as alive who is supposedly dead. He is alive because he has been cured.

Four Latin commentaries, RB 8893,5, RB 10521, RB 8717 and RB 1744, all make the same essential point. RB 8893,5 has, 'sanitati restitutus est', RB 10521 has 'ut sanaret', RB 8717 'curatus est' and RB 1744 'vivit id est restitutus est ... sanitate'. All of these contain the information found in the BXIII gloss, that the boy was cured, healed, or revived, matching BXIII's 'gariz'. Of
all the Latin words used, 'restitutus' is perhaps the least likely to have been the source for BXIII's 'gariz'. However, 'restitutus' does not occur alone in any of these Latin commentaries; in both RB 8893,5 and RB 1744 (it is not in the other two), it is found with 'sanitas'. The conclusion for this gloss must be, then, that either 'sano' or 'euro' are the most likely sources for BXIII's 'gariz', and that either of these occurs in all four commentaries. Any one of these four could have been the source for this BXIII gloss.

7.22

This gloss, like that on Luke 2.21, is on circumcision, and gives both a definition of 'prepuce', and a popular story. There is always the possibility with glosses which occur in more than one place that the glossator used one of his glosses as the source for the other, rather than using a Latin commentary.

The two glosses on circumcision share the definition of 'prepuce', but nothing more. The gloss on Luke 2.21 has, 'prepuce est proprement le bout del secré membre que l'en trenche a celui que l'en circoncit selon la loi as Juys'; the gloss on John 7.22 has, 'l'en li tranchoit le bout del membre genitaille'. Otherwise, the glosses are only alike in that they both give what can be called 'popular' stories about circumcision. The Luke gloss has
a story about how an angel gave Christ's foreskin to Charlemagne, whereas the gloss here tells how the knife used for circumcision was made from the stone with which David killed Goliath. Of this second story the glossator himself says it 'n'est mie autentiques'. Two details found in the John gloss, that circumcision was done on the eighth day, and that the child was given his name then too, do not even need to be in the Luke gloss, as they are in the story as given in Luke anyway.

The glossator could have taken the description of circumcision, plus the details about it being done on the eighth day at the same time as the naming of the child, from the Luke gloss and text. Unfortunately, no Latin source has been identified for the description of circumcision in the Luke gloss, but there may be one available for the John gloss. The part for which the glossator would have definitely needed a source other than Luke or his own Luke gloss is for the story about the knife.

One Latin commentary, RB 9958, has a gloss on this lemma, but one which does not help explain the BXIII gloss. It has 'ut hominem in octava die circumcideretis', which is very close to the Vulgate reading in Luke 2.21, and which the glossator could have got from there himself. It does not give the story about the knife.
It is always possible, with glosses describing Jewish custom or religious festivals, that the source for the gloss may be a passage from the Old Testament where the rules for observing that particular custom or festival are given. In the case of circumcision, the relevant passages to look at are Genesis 17.11-4 and Leviticus 12.3. Neither of these, however, gives any definitions of 'prepuce', and so they cannot be considered possible sources of the John gloss or indeed of the Luke gloss. There is also nothing in the Old Testament about the knife used being made from the stone with which David killed Goliath, although the use of stones and flints for knives used for circumcision is mentioned at Exodus 4.25 and at Joshua 5.2.

We might deduce that there may have been a Latin source for the BXIII gloss; it is certainly possible that the definition of 'prepuce' is from a different type of text\textsuperscript{4}, even if the story of the knife is from an unidentified commentary source.

8.3

This gloss gives a definition of 'scribe', (translating 'scriba'), as 'li sage de la loi'. Latin 'scriba' did in fact mean a doctor of the Jewish law in ecclesiastical Latin, so the gloss is accurate, but what is interesting here is that 'scriba' is usually translated as 'li sage
de la loi' directly, without using 'scribe' and thus without a gloss. What we would seem to have here is a confusion of translation and gloss material. In any case, gloss material, whether used as part of the actual translation or as a gloss proper, would probably still have a Latin source.

Three Latin commentaries, RB 10328, RB 10521 and RB 1744, give 'scriba' in their glosses on this lemma. RB 10328 has 'genera iustum legi', which is not very much like the BXIII gloss. The glosses in RB 10521 and RB 1744 are closer. RB 10521 has 'scribe autem erant scientes in legem', and RB 1744 has 'scribe enim doctores legis'. BXIII's 'sage' is perhaps more likely to be a translation of 'scientes' than 'doctores', making RB 10521 the more likely source for this BXIII gloss. However, 'sage' as a translation of 'doctores' is perfectly plausible, and the conclusion for this BXIII gloss is that either RB 10521 or RB 1744 may well have been its source. RB 10328 can be excluded.

8.6

This gloss explains why it is that the Pharisees tempted Jesus, and how, by tempting him, they could perhaps blame him. They tempted him when they asked him for an answer as to what he would do, in that whatever answer he gave
would allow them to reproach him. The lemma here is 'Ioe disoient il temptant le qu’il le peussent acuser'.

One Latin commentary, Hugh, has a gloss on this lemma. He has 'vel de immisericordia si iuberet lapidari, vel de iniustitia, et violatione legis si iuberet dimitti'. This has a good link with the key section of the BXIII gloss, 'se Jhesus respondist: "Lapidez la", il l’acussassent d’estre felon et sans misericorde, s’il deist: "Lessiez la aller quite", qu’il disssent contre lui qu’il ensaignoit a fere contre la loi et contre ce qui estoit oomandé'. The BXIII gloss can be seen as dependent on the gloss in Hugh, duly expanded with direct speech to keep to the style of the actual Bible passage.

The gloss in Hugh is a possible source for this BXIII gloss.

8.9

This BXIII gloss is unusual in that it does not directly follow the lemma. In this case, the lemma is at 8.6, 'Jhesus, enclinant soi en bas, esrivoit de son doi en terre'. The gloss begins 'Mes quel chos esrivoit Jhesus', which at least refers back to the lemma, so this gloss does not seem to be significantly out of place. The gloss itself contains two explanations of what it was
Jesus wrote on the ground. This, again, is unusual, as BXIII glosses normally give a single explanation.

Five Latin commentaries, the HS, Hugh, RB 8717, RB 9920, and RB 10328, all give more than one interpretation of what Jesus wrote. The second explanation given in the BXIII gloss, "'La terre accuse la terre'", is found in three Latin commentaries, the HS, Hugh and RB 8717, 'terra terram accusat'. Both the HS and Hugh claim that this comes from Jerome's Epistle to Iraeneus. The first explanation given, "'Terre, terre, angloutis oez homes qui sont malicieux'", is found in two commentaries, RB 10328 and RB 8717; RB 10328 has 'terra terra devora eos' and RB 8717 has 'terra terra terra absorbe hoo viros abdicatos'. 'Devora' and 'absorbe' could both have been the source for BXIII's 'angloutis'. RB 8717 is the only one of these two commentaries to give anything which could have been a source for BXIII's 'oez homes qui sont malicieux', with 'hos viros abdicatos'. Neither of these commentaries gives Ambrose and Gregory as the source for this explanation, so it seems likely that the glossator used another commentary which had basically the same gloss, but which acknowledged Ambrose and Gregory as its sources.

' Hos viros abdicatos' is not a very strong possible source for ' oe z homes qui sont malicieux', but it is very common in Latin commentaries on this lemma. As well as occurring in RB 8717, it appears in RB 9920, the HS and
Hugh. These three commentaries have it in the following gloss, which RB 9920 and the HS certainly, and Hugh probably, acknowledge is from Jerome again, from his 'epistola ad Studiosum' according to the HS, 'terra terra scribe hos viros abdicatos'. It is difficult to see what exactly is meant by 'scribe' in this gloss. It seems hardly to make sense as 'write'. Other meanings of 'scribo' include the legal sense of 'disinheriting by will', and this would seem to correlate with 'abdicatus', which means 'disowned or disinherited'. Another meaning of 'scribo' is 'to brand', and this would be another possible interpretation. There seems to be no evidence to suggest that 'scribo' could ever mean what could be colloquially expressed as 'to write off'. Whatever the exact meaning of 'scribo' in this context, it would never seem to be as closely related to BXIII's 'angloutis' as 'devora' in RB 10328 and 'absorbe' in RB 8717.

RB 8717 is the only commentary to give both the explanations of what Jesus wrote that are found in the BXIII gloss. Other commentaries give other explanations, such as 'terra terra terra audi sermonem Domini', found in Hugh and RB 9920, again possibly from Jerome, but no other commentary is as close to the BXIII gloss as RB 8717. It is this commentary, therefore, which is the most likely source for this gloss.
8.26

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

9.28(1)

This gloss contains a definition of the lemma 'essaueroiz' as 'leveroiz le fill d'ome en haut en la croiz'.

'Cruoe' occurs in four Latin commentaries on this lemma, RB 9958, RB 8717, RB 10328 and Hugh, but only one of these has any verb other than that given in the Vulgate, 'exaltaveritis', translated by 'essaueroiz', the very word glossed in BXIII. 'Exalto' would certainly seem to have been used for the raising of Christ on the cross, and even though there is no actual glossing of 'exalto' in any of the Latin commentaries, it is juxtaposed with 'crux' to make its meaning quite clear; RB 9958 has 'exaltaveritis me in cruce', RB 10328 has 'exaltaveritis filium hominis in cruce', and Hugh has 'in cruce' as an adverbial phrases complementing 'exaltaveritis'. Such glossing in Latin commentaries suggests that, even though 'exalto' was used in this context, its meaning could and needed to be made absolutely clear by adding 'in cruce'. This would have been enough to alert the glossator to any possible problem Latin commentators had already
identified with the word, and so be enough to prompt his own gloss clarifying the French translation.

That the glossator chose to change the actual verb is perhaps because his source had 'elevatus', found in RB 8717, but in this commentary 'elevatus' is not completed by the phrase 'in cruce'. The final part of the BXIII gloss, 'le fill d'ome', is found in one Latin commentary too, in RB 10328, as 'filium hominis'. 'En haut' is not found derived as such in any commentary, but this is easily deducible from RB 8717's 'elevatus', and probably even from 'exalto', so probably does not require an explicit Latin source as such.

The conclusion here seems to be that two commentaries are needed to give the best possible coverage for this gloss; RB 8717 for 'elevatus', becoming 'leveroiz', and RB 10328 for 'in cruce', becoming 'en la croiz', and 'filium hominis', becoming 'le fill d'ome'. To obtain all of this material, two sources are needed, RB 8717 and RB 10328, and it is these two Latin commentaries, used in conjunction, which would seem to be the source for this BXIII gloss.

8.28(2)

This gloss has two functions. First of all, it glosses the lemma, 'lors onoistroiz vos' as 'lors verroiz vos
signes verais par quoi vos porroiz conoistre', and then it glosses 'ce sui ge' as 'ge sui filz Deu'.

Two Latin commentaries, RB 9958 and Hugh, have material for the first part of this gloss. RB 9958 has 'tunc cognoscetis videbat enim', the 'videbat' being a possible source for BXIII's 'verroiz'. Hugh has 'id est cognoscibiliora, quomodo signa percipietis'. This is closer to the BXIII gloss in that it has 'percipietis' for 'verroiz', and 'signa' for 'signes'. RB 9958's 'videbat' may be technically closer to 'verroiz' than 'percipietis', but the presence of 'signa' along with 'percipietis' means that Hugh is the more likely source for this part of the gloss. Hugh does not have anything to match BXIII's 'verais'; he does not expand 'signa' in any way.

The second part of the gloss, the expansion of 'ce sui ge' as 'ge sui filz Deu', is found only in Hugh, and not in RB 9958. Hugh has 'quia ego sum, supple filius Dei'. BXIII's 'filz Deu' could be a direct translation of 'filius Dei'.

Hugh, then, is the closest of these two commentaries to the BXIII gloss; it is closer in the first part of the gloss, and is the only one of the two commentaries to have material, and excellent material at that, for the second part of it. The only part of the gloss not found in Hugh, or in RB 9958, is BXIII's 'verais', but this may
be an addition by the glossator. The concept of 'verais
signes' is a common one in the BXIII glosses, and his
addition of 'verais' here may be simply due to the fact
that this was a concept already in his repertoire, and
for which no Latin source would have been needed. Hugh,
then, is a possible source for this gloss.

8.31

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this
gloss.

8.37

This gloss takes the lemma, 'ne prent mie en vos', and
expands both the basic elements of it, changing 'ne prent
mie' to 'ne s'acorde mie', and 'en vos' to 'a vostre
volenté'. 'Ma parole ne s'acorde mie a vostre volenté'
is then itself glossed as 'ge di ce qui vos desplest'.
This gloss, then, expands the lemma, keeping the syntax
the same, and then makes the meaning clearer by
abandoning the syntax and rewriting the whole phrase
again as simply as possible, 'ge di ce qui vos desplest'.

One Latin commentary, RB 9958, glosses this lemma with a
gloss which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. It has
'sermo meus non capit in vobis, id est non habet locum in
cordibus vestris, id est non capitur a corde vestro'.
This gloss expands the lemma in the same way as the BXIII gloss, glossing both of the basic elements of its Latin lemma just as the BXIII gloss did both parts of its lemma. It expands 'non capit' as 'non habet locum', and 'in vobis' as 'in cordibus vestris'. The Latin commentator then glosses his own expansion of the lemma, 'id est non capitur a corde vestro', just as the BXIII glossator glossed his expansion of his lemma.

There are no particular vocabulary connections between the two glosses, although the basic theme, that what Christ was saying did not please the Jews, is the same. It is interesting to note that, in the manuscript, 'a corde' looks very much like a single word, 'acorde'; this bears an obvious resemblance to BXIII's 's'acorde'. It is entirely possible, then, that the glossator, seeing 'acorde', thought of the verb 'acorder' (meaning 'to agree, or be in tune with'), and used it, in spite of the difference in meaning. Even if this were what happened, the actual vocabulary links between the two glosses are still not very significant. What is significant is that the structure of the two glosses is the same. The BXIII glossator develops his theme in exactly the same way as does the Latin commentator. The words may be different, but the way they are put together and used is the same.

The conclusion for this gloss, then, is that in spite of different vocabulary, RB 9958 is a possible source for
this gloss. Thematically, the glosses are the same, and it is certainly possible that the glossator read the Latin gloss, grasped its meaning, and rewrote this to make it absolutely clear; Christ's words are not taken to heart by the Jews, and for the BXIII glossator this means his words did not agree with what the Jews wanted to do, did not agree with their 'volenté', introducing a hint of the theme of works, especially good or proper works, found in so many of BXIII's glosses, and possibly from a different type of source. The differences in the words used may just be the glossator adapting his source with his own aims in mind. That this is what actually happened is supported by the strong structural links between the two glosses.

RB 9958, then, is a possible source for this gloss if we accept that the glossator adapted it to make it clear and unambiguous, and to relate his glosses as much as possible to the idea of good works and proper behaviour.

8.38

This gloss identifies who Christ means by 'vostre pere', and then explains why this is an apt description. 'Vostre pere' (that is, the father of the Jews) is 'le deable', so-called because of the 'mauveses huevres' done by either the Jews themselves, or the devil.
The first point, that the father of the Jews is the devil, is made by six Latin commentaries, RB 9958, RB 10328, RB 10521, RB 1744, the Glossa and Hugh, in their glosses on this lemma. Five of these, RB 9958, RB 10521, RB 1744, the Glossa and Hugh, also give an explanation as to why it can be said that the father of the Jews is the devil.

Three commentaries say that the Jews are like the devil because they imitate him. As Hugh says, 'diabolum, cuius filii estis imitationes'. The Glossa and RB 1744, in what is essentially the same gloss, take this point a little further; they are only like him in imitation and not in their nature. To quote the Glossa, 'De diabolo dicebat cuius filii sunt id est non natura sed imitationes'. The gloss in RB 10521 says that the devil is called the father of the Jews 'a quo accipiunt ut mala operentur', in that they accept they were doing evil. The gloss in RB 9958 includes most of the material in these commentaries, with, 'scilicet diabolum cuius filius in quantum mali in quantum eum unitatem non ab eo creati, quas hunc patrem videbant opera quas faciebant qui ad imitatores diaboli facti erant omnium filium diaboli'.

It is these last two commentaries, RB 10521 and RB 9958, which are closest to the BXIII gloss. Both of these commentaries contain the idea that it is the bad works they do, or their works which imitate the devil's, which justify Christ calling the devil their father. It is
not, however, impossible that the BXIII glossator had one of the other three commentaries as his source. The theme of good works is a prominent one in the BXIII Gospel glosses, and may have come from a different tradition. The glossator could easily have taken the idea of the Jews imitating the devil and expanded it to mean 'imitating his evil works'. The conclusion for this gloss, then, is that either RB 9958 or RB 10521 are the most likely source, but that it is also not out of the question that the glossator used and adapted RB 1744, the Glossa, Hugh or even RB 10328.

8.40(1)

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

8.40(2)

This gloss expands the lemma, 'Abraham ne fist pas ice', as 'Abraham ne fu pas homicide, ne de volenté ne de fet'.

One Latin commentary, RB 10521, makes the point that, 'Abraham non erat homicida'. This could be the source for this BXIII gloss; 'Abraham ne fu pas homicide' could be a direct translation of the Latin. 'Ne de volenté ne de fet' could then be seen as the glossator's way of
emphasizing his central point; Abraham was not a murderer, neither in thought nor deed.

RB 10521, then, is a possible source for this BXIII gloss.

8.43 and 8.44(1)

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

8.44(2)

This gloss identifies the devil as the 'peres de menconge', and explains that he deserves this title for the first lie ever told, that to Adam and Eve, when he told them, 'Vos ne morroiz mie de mort, aiz seroiz come Dex et conoistroiz bien et mal," et les decut en tel maniere'.

Three Latin commentaries, RB 8829, RB 1774 and Hugh, identify the devil as the 'peres de menconge' in their glosses on this lemma. RB 8829 has 'primi pecoati dyabolus solus est pater', RB 1774 has 'id est pater dyaboli est ... id est pater mendacii', and Hugh, acknowledging Augustine as his source, has, 'Diabolus mendax est et pater mendacii'. Two of these
commentaries, RB 8829 and Hugh, then go on to explain why the devil is called the father of lies. The explanation in both RB 8829 and Hugh is simple; RB 8829 has, 'quia ipse primus peccavit', and Hugh has 'quia ipse primo adinuerit illud'. Neither of these commentaries quotes from Genesis 3.4, like the BXIII gloss does, but this is not problematic; the BXIII glossator is quite capable of quoting from the Old Testament on his own initiative, perhaps using a concordance to identify the appropriate passage, and would not need a quotation in his source commentary to do so.

The essential material needed for this BXIII gloss, then, is found in both RB 8829 and Hugh, and the addition of the quotation from Genesis is the glossator's own. This quotation is slightly different to that given in BXIII's Genesis, the gloss here having "Vos ne morroiz mie de mort, ainz seroiz come Dex et commeiroiz bien et mal", while in BXIII the translation of Genesis has "Vos ne morroiz pas ... seroiz si come Dieux sachanx bien et mal". This slight difference may well have been caused by the glossator not having a copy of the Old French Genesis to hand; rather, he may have had a copy of the Vulgate, in which he checked the quotation and translated it into Old French for the purposes of his gloss here.

We might conclude, therefore, that either RB 8829 or Hugh could have been the source for this gloss, and that this
source was complemented by the quotation from Genesis, put in on the glossator's own initiative.

8.46, 8.47(1) and 8.47(2)

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

8.48(1)

This gloss replaces a single-word lemma with a single-word gloss, slightly changing the syntax of the original at the same time. In this gloss, the text's 'bien' becomes 'vérité'.

Two Latin commentaries, RB 8829 and Hugh, gloss this lemma, both of them replacing 'bene' in the text with 'vere' in the gloss. Either of them could, therefore, have been the source for this BXIII gloss.

8.48(2)

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.
This BXIII gloss can best be described as explaining the implication behind what the Jews are saying when they say to Christ "'Abraham est morz et li prophete, et tu diz: 'Qui gardera ma parole ne morra mie pardurablement'". The BXIII glossator glosses this as 'coment oses tu ce dire, quant tuit puet voir que tu ne diz mie verite?'.

One Latin commentary, RB 1744, has a gloss on this lemma which is a possible source for this BXIII gloss. It has 'non gustabit in aeternum, apertum mendacium esse'. This clearly says that the Jews thought that, when Christ said 'non gustabit mortem in aeternum', he was lying, and this is the point made in the BXIII gloss. If the glossator used RB 1744 as his source here, then he took the idea from it and then composed his own gloss, adding, 'coment oses tu ce dire' to emphasize the Jews' indignation at what Christ was saying to them, and 'quant tuit puet voir', to emphasize how many people thought, like them, that Christ was lying.

8.56

This gloss takes the lemma, "Abraham vostre peres ot grant joie de voir mon jor", and glosses 'voir' as 'concoistre and 'apercevoir', explains that 'mon jor' means 'le tens de mon descendement et de mon
incarnacion', and then explains why it is that Abraham is pleased about it, because, 'il savoit par la consolacion del saint esperit que ge le rachatertoie et giteroie d'enfer'.

Three Latin commentaries, RB 9920, RB 9958 and RB 1744, have glosses which have material which may have been the source for this BXIII gloss. One of these, RB 9920, has material which might have been the source for BXIII's 'oonoistre' and 'apercevoir'. It has 'legi' and 'revelari', which are not very good matches for the vocabulary in BXIII, but may perhaps have suggested the verbs to use to the glossator. Both Latin and Old French gloss use dittology.

All three Latin commentaries give explanations of what is meant by 'diem meum' in their glosses on this lemma, and all three explanations are very similar. RB 1744 has, 'diem incarnationis', RB 9920 has 'hoc potest legi de die temporis in incarnationis ... vel de die eternitatis id est de eterna generatione', and RB 9958 has 'id est tempus meae incarnationis vel aeternitatem meae divinitatis'. Any of these could have been the source for BXIII's 'inoarnacion'.

It is RB 9920, with material for both 'oonoistre' and 'apercevoir', and 'inoarnacion', which is the most likely of these three commentaries to have been the source for this BXIII gloss. It is also possible that its 'die
eternitatis id est de eterna generatione' could have suggested the idea of Abraham being saved and being rescued from hell, found in BXIII's 'ge le rachateroie et giteroie d'enfer'. The Latin source might have suggested the explanation given in the BXIII gloss, although it is not very close to it. If the glossator used this commentary as his source, then what he has done is to simplify it; 'eterna generatione' presumably means eternal life, which in turn means not being in hell, therefore implying what is stated in glosses in Luke 16.23 and Luke 23.43¹⁴, that after the resurrection good people, such as Abraham, will be rescued from hell. RB 9920, therefore, is a possible, even if not a very likely, source for this gloss.

8.58

This gloss replaces a single word in the text, 'fet', with a single word in the gloss, 'nez', so that the text's 'devant ce que Abraham fust fet' reads 'devant ce que Abraham fust nez'.

One Latin commentary, RB 8829, has 'natus' in its gloss on this part of the text, and this could well have been the source for BXIII's 'nez'.
10.6

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

10.11

This gloss interprets 'ame' as 'vie'.

Four Latin commentaries, RB 9958, RB 11545, RB 1744 and the Glossa, have material which could have been the source for this gloss. RB 9958 has 'corpore et sanguine', which is in effect the same thing as 'vie', but is not as close to it as the material in RB 11545, RB 1744 and the Glossa, all of which gloss 'animam suam' as 'vitam'.

It is RB 11545, RB 1744 and the Glossa which are, therefore, the most likely sources for this gloss.

10.12

This gloss gives a definition of the lemma "mercennerres" as 'li sers qui sert por loier'.

One Latin commentary, RB 11545, glosses 'mercenarius' as 'mercenarius est ille qui lucrum terrenum exerceat'. It
is possible that 'luorum terrenum' gave the glossator the idea of 'loier'; certainly 'lucrum terrenum' strongly suggests wealth and money. It is also possible that the difference in the actual words used is due to the glossator making his source clearer. 'Lucrum terrenum' suggests wealth and money, but is actually vague; 'loier' is more precise.

RB 11545 is a possible, even if not very likely, source for this gloss. Another possibility is that the glossator has just repeated gloss material found in commentaries on Luke 15.19, where we find much the same glosas in BXIII. It is also possible that such material is from a different type of text rather than a commentary.

10.22

This gloss explains the lemma 'encehies' as 'renovelement de festes de temple, c'est a dire dediement'. This can be separated into three elements, 'renovelement', 'festes de temple' and 'dediement', for the purposes of discussing the source of this gloss.

Eleven commentaries, RB 8829, RB 9920, RB 9958, RB 8893.5, RB 10917, RB 10521, RB 8717, RB 1744, the HS, the Glossa and Hugh, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared with the BXIII gloss. Those commentaries most...
likely to have been the source for this gloss are those which have material covering all three of the elements of the BXIII gloss as outlined above.

The first two commentaries which can be excluded from further consideration, are those which have only one of the elements, namely, RB 10917 and RB 9958, which have 'dedicatio' for 'dediement', but nothing else. The next commentary that can be excluded is RB 9920, which has 'dedicatio' for 'dediement' and 'templi' for 'temple', but nothing for 'festes' or 'renovelement'; it therefore covers only one and a half elements of the BXIII gloss. The next three commentaries to be excluded are those covering only two elements, and these are RB 8829, RB 8893,5 and the Glossa, all of which have, to quote the Glossa, 'festa dedicationis templi'. This leaves five commentaries, RB 10521, RB 8717, RB 1744, the HS and Hugh, which all contain material for all three elements of the BXIII gloss.

These five Latin commentaries all use the material rather differently, apart from the HS and Hugh, which have very similar glosses. The HS and Hugh, with Hugh acknowledging Augustine as his source, have, to quote the HS, 'Encaenia dicuntur quasi enochaenea a neos quod est novum et sanat innovationes', 'neos' being Greek for 'novus'17. The HS has 'festum dedicationis templi' later on in its gloss, while this phrase comes at the beginning of the gloss in Hugh. The gloss in RB 10521 gives 'id
est innova quo inovata fuit dedicatio templi' and, later, 'festum dedicationis templi'. The gloss in RB 8717 includes the idea of consecration in its gloss 'id est festa innovationis id est consecrationis seu dedicationis templi'. Consecration is also found in the gloss in RB 1744, which has 'Encenena dedicationis festivitas dicebatur ... unde enconnia ordinairium id est quod innovationes sive nova festa ut sanat dedicationis et consecrationes ... id est festa et memorius dedicationis seu consecrationis templi'.

Any of these five commentaries could have been the source for this BXIII gloss, and it is hard to see which one, if any, of these five is the closest to the BXIII gloss. The choice lies, perhaps, with RB 10521 or RB 8717. BXIII has 'renouement de festes de temple', and this is perhaps best matched by RB 10521's 'innovata fuit dedicatio templi', or the possibly even closer 'festa innovationis ... seu dedicationis templi' in RB 8717. The phrase 'festum dedicationis templi' is a common one, occurring in six of the Latin commentaries compared to the BXIII gloss, but if this were the source for the BXIII gloss, then it was adapted rather than just translated.

The conclusion for this gloss, then, is that there are five Latin commentaries, RB 10521, RB 8717, RB 1744, the HS and Hugh, which could have been its source with the
preference perhaps resting with either RB 10521 or RB 8717.

10.27

This gloss, on the lemma "Mes oeilles oent ma voiz" , glosses 'mes oeilles' as 'oil qui sont mien et qui m'aiment', and 'oent ma voiz' as 'font mon comande'.

Three Latin commentaries, RB 8829, RB 10521 and RB 8893,5, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. One of these, RB 8829, has material for the first part of the gloss, explaining who is meant by 'oves meae' in its gloss on this lemma. It glosses this as, 'oves meum sunt homines qui per me reguntur et pasquentur per doctrinam meam'. The content of this is like BXIII's 'oil qui sont mien et qui m'aiment', even though its vocabulary is not the same. In this case, the BXIII gloss is not quite as precise as the Latin gloss, but this may be because the glossator adapted his source to avoid the Latin 'pasquentur per doctrinam meam', which would have meant adding material to his gloss which was not necessary to the understanding of the text.

All three Latin commentaries gloss the second part of the lemma 'vocem meum audiunt'. RB 8829 has 'audiunt et obediant verbis meis', RB 8893,5 has 'vocem meum audiunt credendo corde et obediendo opere' and RB 10521 has 'Ad
obediam preceptorum cognoscì'. 'Obediunt' in RB 8829, and 'obediendo opere' in RB 8893,5, are both close to BXIII's 'font mon comandement', but the closest to the BXIII gloss here is RB 10521's 'obediam preceptorum'.

Of these three commentaries, then, it is RB 8829 which is the most likely to have been the source for the first part of the gloss and RB 10521 for the second.

10.30

This gloss, on the lemma "Ge et li peres somes une chose"', explains the nature of the Trinity, as does another BXIII gloss, that on John 14.919. The explanation it gives is concise and totally orthodox. The phrase, 'et sont les .iii. .i. Deu et non mie .iii. Dex', seems to make a special point of avoiding the heresy of tritheism. The glossator explains that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are three 'personnes', but all 'une chose en substance et en Deité'. This gloss, therefore, is concerned with a point of dogma rather than giving a literal explanation of a word or phrase as most other glosses do. As such, this gloss contains nothing for which a Latin source would have been needed. The Trinity, being a point of dogma, would have been understood by the glossator without his needing to consult a Latin commentary for guidance, at least as far
as this straightforward explanation of the Trinity, is concerned.

What the glossator may have taken from a Latin source was the knowledge that such a gloss was necessary as an explanation of this lemma, and in fact five Latin commentaries, RB 9958, RB 8893.5, RB 10521, RB 1744 and Hugh, have similar glosses at this point. Being a point of dogma, we should expect no debate about the nature of the Trinity, and probably even little variation in the actual words used. What needs to be considered here is which Latin commentary was the most likely to suggest to the glossator that a gloss on the nature of the Trinity was needed here.

We have five commentaries to choose from. They could each be examined and compared individually to the BXIII gloss, but this would probably be a relatively pointless exercise. For example, the point could be made that, of these five Latin commentaries, three, RB 9958, RB 10521 and Hugh, all use the word 'substantia', matching BXIII's 'substance', in their glosses. Yet 'substantia' was such a standard, even technical word, to use when explaining the Trinity that we can be confident that the glossator would have known it without needing a Latin source, even as a reminder. The same is true of 'persona', matching BXIII's 'personne', which is found in three commentaries, RB 8893.5, RB 10521 and RB 1744. The only Latin commentary which could perhaps be excluded on content
grounds is RB 8893,5, which has, 'si cum pater et filius essent una persona', which seems to be using 'persona' where 'substantia' would be the expected word, and which, therefore, smacks of heresy. As the BXIII gloss says, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are three separate 'personne', but one 'substance'. Yet paradoxically even this commentary could have been the source of this BXIII gloss, as the glossator would have recognized any explanation which seemed heretical, and could easily have substituted a perfectly orthodox one for it in his own gloss. Thus all five commentaries should probably be considered to be possible sources for this BXIII gloss.

10.39

This gloss, which expands the lemma, 'Lors queroient il a lui prendre' as 'il queroient achoison qu'il l'osassent prendre', is also found on Luke 20.19(1)\textsuperscript{22}. No Latin source has been identified for this gloss in either Gospel.

14.1

This gloss, on the lemma, "Creez en Deu, et creez en moi", does two things; it glosses 'Deu' as 'Deu le pere' and 'moi' as 'Deu le fill', to clarify exactly what each word means, and it explains the implied link between the
two statements, that if people believe in God the Father, then it is right and proper that they should believe in God the Son as well.

Four Latin commentaries, RB 11545, RB 9958, Hugh and the Glossa, have glosses which contain material which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Three of these, RB 11545, Hugh and the Glossa, have material for the first part of the gloss. Neither the Glossa nor Hugh glosses 'Deum', but both gloss 'me' as, to quote the Glossa, 'ego deus sum'. RB 11545 does not gloss 'Deum' either, and it glosses 'me' as 'filius Dei sumus', which is more like the BXIII's 'Deu le fill' than the Glossa and Hugh's 'ego deus sum'. It would, however, have been quite within the glossator's competence to expand 'deus' from the Glossa or Hugh, given the possible ambiguity of 'deus', glossed for clarity elsewhere in the Gospels.

Three Latin commentaries, the Glossa, Hugh and RB 9958, explain the link implied in the lemma, found in the second part of the BXIII gloss. The glosses in Hugh and the Glossa, are, to all intents and purposes, the same, with to quote the Glossa, 'Quia si creditis in deum si est consequetur ut et in me quia ego deus sum'. The gloss in RB 9958 is very much the same, 'et in me credite consequens est enim ut si in deum creditis et in me credere debeatis'. Any of these three commentaries could have been the source for this part of the BXIII gloss. BXIII's 'il covient' may well have been inspired by
'consequetur', 'consequitur' or 'consequens'; RB 9958's 'debeatis' implies perhaps a greater sense of obligation.

RB 9958 can be excluded from further consideration as it has good material for the second part of the gloss, but nothing for the first. RB 11545 can probably be excluded given that it has material for the first part and nothing for the second, but it remains true that the first part of the BXIII gloss is better attested in this commentary than in any other, and it would probably be unwise to exclude it. The Glossa and Hugh, with what is practically the same gloss, have the best links with the second part of the gloss, and attest the first part well, although not as well as RB 11545. The conclusion for this gloss must be, that the glossator used either the Glossa or Hugh, plus RB 11545; a more adventurous conclusion would be that the glossator used either the Glossa or Hugh, and expanded 'deus' in the way he has done elsewhere.

14.2

This gloss identifies the 'meson mon pere' as being 'el ciel'.

Seven Latin commentaries, RB 8829, RB 8893,5, RB 10328, RB 10521, RB 8717, RB 8939 and the Glossa, all gloss this lemma using either some form of 'celum', or some form of
'celstis'. Either of these could have been the source for BXIII's 'ciel', and there are, therefore, seven commentaries which could have been the source for this gloss.

14.6

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

14.9

This gloss explains how it is that the lemma, "Phelipes, ois qui me voit voit le pere"', can be true. The explanation given is that God the Father and God the Son are 'semblables', and this leads the glossator to comment on the nature of the Trinity, with, 'ja soit sc que ge ne soie mie autrere chose que li Peres quant a la substance de nostre Deité, nequedent ge sui autre chose que il n'est en personne et en humanité'. As with the gloss on John 10.3024, which also contains an explanation of the Trinity, it is unlikely that the glossator would have needed a Latin commentary for a definition of the Trinity. The idea of the Trinity being dogma, and 'substantia' and 'persona' 25 being technical words used when describing it, makes it highly likely that the
glossator could have written such definitions himself, without having recourse to a Latin source.

That part of the BXIII gloss that might have had a Latin source is the beginning of the gloss, which describes how it is that two men may be so much alike that such a statement as "Se tu as veu celui, donques as tu veu cestui" may be accurate.

Two Latin commentaries, RB 9958 and Hugh, gloss this lemma. The gloss in RB 9958 has 'Philippe, qui videt me intelligit utique et patrem intelligit eo qui a patris similitudine in illo'. The 'similitudine' could have prompted 'semblables' and 'semblant' in the BXIII gloss, but otherwise this gloss, glossing 'videt' as 'intelligit', offers a different gloss on the lemma to the one found in BXIII. The gloss in Hugh is closer to the BXIII gloss. Hugh's 'similes' is at least a good a source for 'semblables' and 'semblant' as 'similitudine', and 'si istum vidistis, et illum vidistis', matches BXIII's "Se tu as veu celui, donques as tu veu cestui" quite closely. Hugh also has 'substantia' in his gloss, and this may have well have suggested to the glossator that a brief note on the 'substance' and 'personne' of the Trinity would not be out of place in his gloss here.

While both Latin commentaries could have been the inspiration for the BXIII gloss, the material in the Hugh gloss bears a much closer resemblance to the material in
the BXIII gloss, and must therefore be considered its likely source. All the glossator had to do to make it suitable for his own gloss, was to add an example to justify "Se tu as veu celui, donques as tu veu cestui", and add an orthodox explanation of the Trinity.

14.10

This gloss explains how it is that the 'huevres' done by Christ 'viennent del pere'. The explanation given is that they come 'de la volenté et de la cooperacion del Pere'.

One Latin commentary, RB 8893,5, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. It has, 'facit opera filius cuius et pater sunt unum in virtute cooperativa ex qua fiebant opera'. On the content level, this is very like the BXIII gloss; both make it clear that 'huevres/opera' are possible because of the close co-operation between God and Christ. There is also a vocabulary link, with RB 8893,5's 'cooperativa' matching BXIII's 'cooperacion'.

RB 8893,5, then, is a possible source for this BXIII gloss.
14.11

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

14.12

This gloss explains that 'huevres' in the text means 'miracles' and 'signes', and expands 'que ge faz' as 'tiex come ge les faz'.

Two Latin commentaries, RB 8893,5 and RB 10328, have glosses which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. Both have a plural form of 'miraculum', which matches exactly BXIII's 'miracles'. Neither commentary has anything which may be compared to BXIII's 'signes', nor BXIII's 'tiex'. The idea of 'signes', however, is a common one in BXIII glosses\(^2\), and may have been one that the glossator added on his own initiative. 'Tiex' is vague; the glossator does not say what this could mean, in that he does not say in what manner Christ performed his miracles and signs, and is probably nothing more than an expansion for emphasis.

Either RB 8893,5 or RB 10328 could have been the source for this gloss.
14.18

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

14.23

This gloss expands the lemma in three ways. It expands the first part, "Se aucuns m'aime", as 'quiconques m'amera veraiment', it expands 'gardera' as 'gardera et tendra', and changes 'ma parole' to 'mon comandement'.

One Latin commentary, RB 11545, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. In its phrase, 'verum hoc dei dileccoio', 'verum' matches BXIII's 'veraiement'. There is also a connection between 'mandationis' and 'comandement', although this is not a very good one, and 'comandement' here in the gloss could come from 'comandemenz' one verse later in the text.

The glossator, then, got the idea of the two key words 'veraiement' and possibly 'comandement' from his source, RB 11545, and expanded 'gardera' as 'gardera et tendra' by dittology, as he often does in his glosses.
14.24

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss, but in this case, we should probably not expect to find one. This gloss is a re-working of the preceding gloss, on 14.23. Whereas the gloss on 14.23 is on the lemma "Se aucuns m'aime, il gardera ma parole", the gloss on 14.24 is on "Cil qui ne m'aime ne garde mie mes comandemenz", which is the opposite of the lemma on 14.23. The gloss on 14.24 is thus nothing more than a negative version of the gloss on 14.23 simply inserting 'ne' to make it apply to the lemma. In this way, the glosses on 14.23 and 14.24 can be seen as complementary, with that on 14.24 added to emphasize the teaching given in the text.

14.27

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

14.30

This gloss interprets the lemma 'li princes de cest monde' as 'le deable'. It then explains why this interpretation is an accurate one.
Five Latin commentaries, RB 8829, RB 9958, RB 8893,5 RB 8717 and RB 11545, all gloss 'princeps mundi huius' as to quote RB 9958, 'diabolus'. Any of these five commentaries, therefore, could have been the source for this part of the gloss.

Two Latin commentaries, RB 8893,5 and RB 9958, give some explanation as to why the devil can be called 'princeps mundi huius', but their explanations are not the same as that given in the BXIII gloss.

The conclusion for this gloss must be that there are five possible sources for the first part of the gloss, but no likely source has been identified for the second part of the gloss.

15.26

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

16.23

This gloss, on the lemma "se vos avroiz aucune chose requis en mon non, il le vos dorra", can be divided up into two parts. The first part is an explanation of one element in the lemma, 'mon non'. This is expanded
initially as 'el non de Jhesucrist', which is itself developed as 'el non del sauveor' and 'el non de sauvement et qui appartiegn a verai sauvement'. The second part of this gloss is an illustration of the truth of the teaching of the lemma. St Paul, when he asked for the temptation to be removed from him, did not ask for this 'el non del verai sauvement', and this is why his request was not granted. The glossator then repeats the lemma, and the teaching in it, to remind the audience of the main point in the gloss; and also to re-integrate it into the text.

One Latin commentary, RB 9958, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. This Latin gloss begins 'Si petieritis patrem aliquid in nomine meo id est in nomine salvatoris qui ad salutis rationem pertineat', which is related to the BXIII gloss. It is possible that BXIII's 'el non del sauveor', could in fact be a direct translation of RB 9958's 'in nomine salvatoris'. RB 9958 also provides the essential interpretation of the lemma, that 'in nomine meo' means 'in nomine salvatoris', and this is found in the BXIII gloss. The re-stating of this theme in the BXIII gloss can probably best be interpreted as the glossator emphasizing the point.

RB 9958 also has material for the second part of the BXIII gloss, the illustration of the truth of Christ's words with the example of St Paul. It has 'sic a Paulo
non est remotus angelus sathane'. The content of this can be compared to the central point of the second part of the BXIII gloss. The devil is the arch-tempter, hence there is a link between BXIII saying that Paul 'ne fu mie oiz de ce qu'il requist que la temptacion qu'il avoit li fust ostee', and RB 9958's 'non est remotus angelus sathane'. As with the first part of the gloss, RB 9958 may be seen as providing the glossator with the key themes for his gloss, on which he then elaborates.

18.9

This gloss explains how it is that Christ's words "Que ge n'ai mie perdu aucun de coels que tu m'as donez" are true given that Judas betrayed him, and so ends up explaining Christ's motives for walking forward and giving himself up to the Jews.

One Latin commentary, RB 10328, has a gloss on this lemma, but there is very little in it that can be compared to the BXIII gloss. It does mention Judas, as does the BXIII gloss, but this is far from conclusive evidence that RB 10328 was the source for this gloss, given that Judas plays an important role in this part of the story anyway. The BXIII gloss is at pains to explain that nothing can be done to Jesus unless he wants it, that nothing can be done to him 'contre sa volenté'. It is possible that the glossator could have made this gloss
up for himself but, given the content, which is potentially quite complicated theologically, it seems likely that he had a source for this gloss. However, RB 10328 is not it.

19.2, 19.5, 19.10, 19.12(1) and 19.12(2)

No Latin commentary sources have been identified for these glosses.

19.13

This gloss gives an interpretation of the name 'Lithostracos', as 'diversité de pavement, ou come leu qui est pavé de divers pavement'.

Five Latin commentaries, RB 9981, RB 8893,5, the HS, RB 8717 and Hugh, give interpretations of this name, and they all give what is basically the same one. Lithostracos means, to quote RB 9981, 'composito lapidum sit autem parvulio crustellis et tesselis tinctus in varios colores', or, to quote RB 8893,5, 'lapis est stratus quia est pavimentum', 'varietatem pavimenti' in the HS, 'varietas pavimenti' in RB 8717 and 'varietatem pavimenti, vel varium pavimentum' in Hugh. 'Varietatem/varietas pavimenti' is closer to BXIII's 'diversité de pavement' than the more detailed
explanations given in RB 9981 and RB 8893,5. This is also the more common gloss on the lemma. It seems likely, therefore, that the source for this BXIII gloss was RB 8717, the HS or Hugh.

19.14

This gloss explains what is meant by 'Parasceve', and is, in part like the glosses on this lemma on Matthew 27.62 and Mark 14.16\textsuperscript{27}, although it is much more detailed than either of these. It can be divided up into five parts. The first part, coming at the beginning and the very end of the gloss, is an explanation of what 'Parasceve' actually means. It is explained at the beginning of the gloss as being 'le tierz jor devant Pasques que li Juyf apareilloient', and this is repeated and restated at the very end of the gloss, 'le tierz jor que l’en apareilloit ... Parasceve et vaut autant en francois come devant apareillement ou come preparascion'. The second part of the gloss, like the first part found at both the beginning and the end of the gloss, explains that what is prepared is 'ce que besoing lor estoit au jor de Pasques' and 'ce que mestier estoit au jor de Pasques'. The third part of the gloss, beginning 'por ce qu’il lor loisoit fere nule chose au jor de la feste de Pasques', explains why it is that anything needed during Passover has to be prepared in advance because even preparing food on the actual day would break the law. The fourth part of this
gloss explains that 'lor Pasque' (that is, the 'Pasque' of the Jews) is not the same as that of Christians; and, finally, the fifth part of the gloss, obviously related to the first part of the gloss on the meaning of 'Parasceve', is an explanation that the word 'Parasceve' is 'ebreu'.

Seven Latin commentaries, RB 9920, RB 9958, RB 8893,5, the HS, RB 8717, the Glossa and Hugh, contain glosses on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. All seven commentaries define 'parasceve' as being 'preparatio'; hence all seven could have been the source for BXIII's 'preparascion', when the Jews 'apareilloient'. Six commentaries have material for the second part of the gloss, what it is that is prepared. RB 8717 has 'feria preparatur', which is not very close to BXIII's 'ce que besoing lor estoit au jor de Pasque' and 'ce que mestier estoit au jor de Pasques'. RB 8893,5 has the Jews preparing 'cibaria', which is more precise than BXIII's 'besoing' and 'mestier', although it is made clear later in the BXIII gloss that 'besoing' and 'mestier' included food. The other four commentaries, RB 9958, the HS, the Glossa and Hugh, all say that what is prepared is the 'necessaria sabbato', which, of the three explanations in these six commentaries, is the most like BXIII. Hugh also adds that 'cenam' is prepared too. RB 9958, the HS, the Glossa and Hugh are the most likely sources for the second part of the BXIII gloss.
One commentary, RB 8893.5, has material in its gloss on this lemma which could have been the source for the third part of the BXIII gloss. This commentary has 'non erat licitum aliquid de coqui'. This is essentially what is found in the BXIII gloss, although the BXIII gloss elaborates on this for emphasis; if Jews 'feissent aucune chose ou seulement lor viande', they are breaking the law, they 'feissent grant offense'.

A second possible source for this part of the gloss could be those Old Testament passages which give guidance on how to keep the Passover and how to prepare for it. The rule that no work is to be done on the day of Passover itself is found in Numbers 28.25, 'omne opus servile non facietis in eo', and Deuteronomy 16.8, 'non facies opus'. Going directly to material in the Old Testament is something the glossator would seem to do elsewhere, in the glosses on Matthew 26.19 and Luke 22.729, and it is possible that this may be happening here too.

No Latin commentary identified has any material which could have been the source for the fourth part of the gloss, that the Jewish Easter is 'seulement ombre et senefiance de la Nostre Pasque et que la leur Pasque cessast et eust fin des iluec en avant, et la nostre Pasque fust tenue et celebree'. What this part of the BXIII gloss is really doing is explaining that Passover prefigures Easter. Préfiguration is not one of the common elements of the BXIII Gospel glosses, and as such
would not seem to have been one of the glossator's main concerns. However, prefigurative glosses do occur elsewhere in BXIII, notably in Genesis, so it is certainly possible that the glossator could have been following the Genesis glosses when he added this prefigurative material to this Gospel gloss.

Two Latin commentaries, the HS and Hugh, both give the origin of the word 'parasceve'. In the BXIII gloss, it is described as being 'ebreu' (the Hebrew is in fact 'pesach'); in both the HS and Hugh, however, it is described as being 'Graece'. It is possible that the glossator used some other source which described this word as being 'Hebrew'. That there is something here requiring explanation is clear from the HS, which has 'Graecis admisti Judaei, crebro utebantur Graecis vocabulis'. This seems to be explaining that the Jews often used Greek words, hence suggesting a reason for possible confusion over which words are Greek and which Hebrew. This amounts to a reason for explaining the etymology of 'parasceve', perhaps also suggesting that the belief that it was a Hebrew word was not an uncommon error. It is perhaps not an error we would have expected from the BXIII glossator given his usual accuracy on Jewish matters.

The conclusion for this BXIII gloss, then, is quite complex. Two commentaries which seem unlikely to have been the source for this BXIII gloss are RB 9920 and RB.
RB 9920 has material for the first part of the BXIII gloss only, and RB 8717 for two parts, but its material is not as close as that found in other commentaries. RB 9958 and the Glossa have material for only two parts of the gloss as well, (it is, in fact, the same), but theirs is considerably closer to that in the BXIII gloss. They can, perhaps, be excluded from further consideration on the grounds that this material, which is such a good match with the material in the BXIII gloss, is found in two other commentaries, the HS and Hugh. The HS and Hugh have the same material as RB 9958 and the Glossa, and also explain in the same way the origin of the word 'parasceve'. This is not an explanation found in the BXIII gloss, however. Finally, although RB 8893,5 is not as close to the second part of the BXIII gloss as the HS, Hugh, RB 9958 and the Glossa, it does have material for the third part of the gloss, found in no other identified Latin commentary. The material in this part of the gloss, however, could have been taken directly from an Old Testament source rather than from a Latin commentary; and, given that apart from this RB 8893,5 has no clear link with the BXIII gloss, this may well be what has happened. As long as the material exists in a Latin commentary, it is probably unwise to exclude that commentary; but it is, at the very least, necessary to be aware that there is an alternative explanation here. The conclusion for this gloss, then, is that the glossator would seem to have used either RB 8893,5, or perhaps Numbers 28.25 or Deuteronomy 16.8, and
either the HS or Hugh, perhaps adding the fourth, prefigurative, part of the gloss himself or using some other, unidentified, source for it.

19.15

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.

19.22

This BXIII gloss explains the lemma "Ge ai escrit ce que ge ai escrit". It does this in two stages. First of all, it is repeated with emphasis as meaning "Ce que ge ai escrit est ja escrit". This explanation is then itself glossed as 'ce que ge ai escrit sera estable et sera tenu sanz remuer'.

It is the second part of this gloss, the explanation of the initial glossing of the lemma, which is found in three Latin commentaries. RB 9981, the HS and Hugh all make the same point as this part of the BXIII gloss, that what is written is 'estable' and 'sera tenu sanz remuer'. RB 9981 has, 'Quod scripsi scripsi idem firmum et immutabile erit quod scripsi'. Hugh has something similar, with 'non mutabo, vel immutabiliter scripsi', as does the HS with 'id est immobiliter scripsi'. BXIII's
'estable' would seem to be most closely matched by RB 9981's 'firmum', or slightly less closely by RB 9981's 'immutabile' or Hugh's 'immutabiliter'; 'sanz remuer' would seem to be most closely matched by the HS's 'immobiliter' or, in Hugh, by the use of the verb 'muto', to move. In any case, all of the options in the Latin commentaries, 'firmum', 'immutabile', 'immutabiliter', 'non mutabo' and 'immobiliter' could have given the glossator the idea that is behind his own gloss, that what was written could not be changed, which he felt would be best expressed by 'estable' and 'sanz remuer'. Any of these three Latin commentaries, then, could have been the source for this BXIII gloss.

19.24

This gloss does two things. It defines 'sortissons' as 'gitons sort', and expands 'qui ele sera' to 'qui l'avra tote'.

One Latin commentary, RB 8893.5, has a gloss on this lemma which can be compared to this BXIII gloss. It has, 'solam tunicam miserunt sortem'. 'Miserunt sortem' is actually from Vulgate here, and could have provided the source for BXIII's 'gitons sort'.

RB 8893.5's 'solam tunicam' is not the same as BXIII's 'qui l'avra tote', but what is interesting is that the
Latin commentator felt, as did the BXIII glossator, that 'tunicam' on its own, without any explanation, was not clear. The BXIII glossator opts for explaining it as being the complete garment, that the garment would not be divided amongst them; the Latin commentator in RB 8893,5 opts for explaining that this is the only thing the soldiers could draw lots for. The explanations may be different, but the existence of an explanation in RB 8893,5 suggests that it was a lemma requiring glossing. Its presence in his source commentary may have alerted the glossator to the fact that there was something which needed glossing whether he chose to use any explanation found there or not. It is of course also possible that there was a closer, unidentified, source.

RB 8893,5 is a possible, but perhaps not very likely source, for this BXIII gloss.

19.26

No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss.
This gloss explains what Christ meant when he said "Voiz ci ta mere". For the BXIII glossator, this means 'garde la et heunneure come ta mere'.

One Latin commentary, RB 8829, has material in its gloss on this lemma which could have been the source for the BXIII gloss. It has 'honorem', which is clearly a possible source for BXIII's 'heunneure'.

This gloss is in two parts, and each part has a different lemma. The first part of the gloss, beginning 'Sainz Johans test ici son non', is on the lemma 'et celui deciple qu'il amoit estant' in John 19.26. The second part of the gloss, explaining why Christ did not call Mary 'mere', is on a lemma also in John 19.26, 'Feme, voiz ci ton fill'. This lemma is in fact followed immediately by a its own gloss, and this would account for why the gloss in 19.27(2), partly on the same lemma, does not follow the lemma. The glossator presumably felt that this gloss contained material pertinent to the whole of this passage (John 19.26-27), and was best placed at the end.
One Latin commentary, Hugh, glosses 'discipulum stantem, quem diligebat' as 'Ioannem', and this could be the source for the first part of the BXIII gloss. This commentary does not, however, cite the examples of Matthew and Moses, given in the BXIII gloss. Nor does this or any other commentary have any material which can be compared to the second part of the BXIII gloss. This part of the BXIII gloss, explaining the significance of the word 'feme' here, is likely to have had a Latin source since it goes beyond a simple question of identity.

While Hugh cannot be ignored as a possible source for the first part of the gloss, the source for the second part has not been identified.

19.30

This gloss does two things. It expands the 'Il' in the lemma, "Il est aempi" to explain exactly what it is referring to, and it qualifies 'aempi' by adding 'entierement'.

Six Latin commentaries, RB 8829, RB 9958, RB 10521, RB 8717, the Glossa and Hugh, have glosses on this lemma which can be compared to the BXIII gloss. They all have material for the first part of the gloss, the expansion of 'Il' as 'ce ... que li prophete avoient dit de moi'.
The gloss in RB 10521 is related to the BXIII gloss in content but not vocabulary with 'consumatum est ... omnia quae scripta sunt de filio hominis'. The other five commentaries all have glosses which are related in both content and vocabulary with the BXIII gloss. The glosses are all very similar. RB 9958 has 'impléatum est quicquid propheta praedixerat'. This is very similar to the Glossa's 'quod prophetia praedixerat'. Hugh has the same gloss as the Glossa here, but takes it further, 'quod prophetia praedixerat in Psalmos 68'. RB 8717 also mentions the psalms with, 'consumatum est quod prophetia dixerat de me in psalmos'. Finally, RB 8829 also mentions the psalms, as well as Moses, 'impléatum omnia quae scripta sunt in lege Moysi et prophetis et psalmis de me'.

When trying to decide which of these six Latin commentaries could have been the source for this part of the gloss, it is best perhaps to divide the gloss into three parts, 'prophete', 'dit' and 'de moi'. 'Prophete' is found in all of the Latin commentaries except RB 10521; 'dit' is mirrored by 'praedico' in RB 9958, RB 8717, the Glossa and Hugh, by 'dico' in RB 8717, and by 'scripta sunt' in RB 8829 and RB 10521; 'de moi' is found as 'de me' in RB 8829 and RB 8717, and as 'de filio hominis' in RB 10521. RB 10521, with nothing for 'prophete', and nothing very close for 'de moi', looks a less likely possible source for this gloss. RB 9958, the Glossa and Hugh have material for all of this part of the
The addition of 'entierement' to 'aempi' can be compared to 'nihil remanet' in RB 9958. This is the only Latin commentary identified which has material which could have been the source for this part of the gloss. The conclusion for the gloss as a whole would seem to be that the glossator used either RB 8829 or RB 8717 for his expansion of 'Il', and perhaps RB 9958 for his addition of 'entierement'.

20.2

This gloss picks up a theme already glossed a few verses earlier on John 19.27(2), the identification of 'cel autre deciple que Jhesus amoit'. The gloss on John 19.27(2) identifies this disciple as being John; the gloss here says that this may be John, but that some people believe it was Peter.

One Latin commentary, Hugh, has material which can be compared to this gloss. Hugh, like the BXIII gloss, has either John or Peter as being possible identifications of this disciple. Quoting Gregory, he has 'Illi prae ceteris cucurrerunt qui prae ceteris amaverunt, videlicet
Petrus et Ioannes. If the glossator used Hugh as his source for this gloss, then he expanded his source material to make it clear that Christ loved all of his disciples, and that this phrase, 'cel autre deciple que Jhesus amoit', is 'douteus a diffinir'. In the end, the glossator does not identify this disciple. He does all he can do, which is to recognize that there is a problem, that there are different possible explanations, but that it is a problem which must remain unsolved. The gloss in Hugh would have been all the glossator needed; it identifies that there is a problem, and gives the two possible solutions. The fact that Hugh quotes his source, and one of the Fathers of the Church at that, may well have suggested that this was a problem about which controversy exists, hence his 'douteus a diffinir'.

Hugh, then, is a possible source for this BXIII gloss.
Chapter Six: Footnotes

2. See Daly and Daly (1975: II 585).
3. For this gloss, see above, pp.213-5.
4. See below, pp.419-61, especially pp.443-4.
5. I have not traced this quotation.
6. Jerome is mentioned by name, but not this letter, see Appendix I, p.647.
7. See below, pp.370.
8. Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 17047, f.73f.
10. This gloss, as given in Sneddon (1978: II 318), reads '... por lor mauveses huvres qu'il feso[en]t'. The verb is either 'fesoit' singular, in which case it would be the devil's works that are in question here, or 'fesoient' plural, in which case it is those of the Jews'.
14. For these glosses, see above, pp.242-7, 277-80.
15. As this gloss does not form part of the sample studied, it needs to be quoted here:

"...mes fai moi oome i. de tes serjanz mercenneres." (Serjanz mercenneres est serjanz qui est acovenancé a servir desi a terme nomé por le loier qu'il en doit recevoir.)

16. See below, pp.419-61, especially p.450.
17. The HS and Hugh seem to be trying to explain the etymology of 'encaenia', εὐ 'in' and ένος new.
18. 'Festum dedicationis templi' would have given something like 'festes de dediement de temple' in Old French.
19. For this gloss, see below, pp.326-8.
22. For this gloss, see above, p.254.
24. For this gloss, see above, pp.321-3.
25. For 'substantia' and 'persona', see Kelly (1958: 114, 115).
26. See below, p.370.
27. For these glosses, see above, pp.161-2 and p.194.
28. '... s'il feissent aucune chose ou seulement lor viande qu'il devoient cel jor mengier'.
29. For these glosses, see above, pp.143-4 and pp.264-7.
30. See, for example, the glosses on Genesis 2.3, 2.20, 2.24, 3.5, 3.8, 4.8, in Queureuil (1988: 103, 107, 108, 111, 113, 121-2). See also the gloss on Matthew 26.19 (p.141 above), where the glossator seems deliberately to avoid prefiguration.
31. See below, p.391.
32. 'C'est a dire soies des ici en avant o lui come o ton fill'; no source has been identified for this gloss.
33. For this gloss, see above, pp.344-5.
Chapter Seven: TECHNIQUES AND ASPECTS OF GLOSSING

It is important, now that material from a large number of commentaries has been compared to the sample selection of BXIII Gospel glosses, that we consider any patterns which emerge from this comparison, and any outstanding problems or questions which this comparison has failed to answer. This chapter is therefore divided into the following sections: (I) the French and Latin compared, (II) other types of possible source material and (III) a linguistic survey. The first section draws together patterns in the glosses and glossing technique, and in doing so, highlights two main areas for further consideration. This present study of possible Latin commentary sources has taken us some way further in BXIII studies, but it will become clear from the first section that questions as to the possible source material used for the BXIII Gospel glosses remain. The second section therefore suggests further types of material which may, or may not, have been influential on the BXIII Gospels. The coherence of the glossing technique, as it emerges from the discussion in the first section, forces us to address another issue as well, that of whether the Gospels were likely to have been the work of a single translator or not. The third section contains a study of several linguistic features in an attempt to begin to address this issue.
I The French and Latin compared

The first matter to discuss is whether we have been able to identify those commentaries which were used as sources by the BXIII glossator, i.e. whether we are able to say he used X, Y and Z or not. Then we need to discuss the broad patterns which have emerged: the recurring themes that the glossator chooses to cover in his glosses, the way that he treats his source commentaries, and the rhetoric he uses for writing his glosses. Each of these three broad groups will be covered separately in the discussion that follows here, although it is inevitable that there will be a certain amount of overlap. For example, the way a source or lemma is treated in theBXIII may reflect the rhetorical patterns that could be used by the glossator. The division of the following discussion into three parts may seem arbitrary in places, but makes a convenient framework for discussion.

I.1 The Latin commentaries used as sources

What becomes clear from the discussion of the glosses in chapters three to six is that no BXIII Gospel gloss can be considered to be a translation of all or part of any Latin source gloss studied here. No direct source has been found for any of the BXIII Gospel glosses. This means either that there is a direct source which we have failed to identify for whatever reason this might be, or
it means that the BXIII Gospel glossator never had a direct source at all. The evidence that we have from the glosses suggests that it is the second of these possibilities, that no direct source ever existed, which is the more likely. We have had no indication that a direct source ever existed for any of the glosses, and this is something which we might reasonably expect to have found given the large amount of gloss material which seems to have been commonly used, and is found in several commentaries. We need only to remember the gloss on alabaster on Matthew 26.7(1) to realize this. Some form of the material in this BXIII gloss is found in ten Latin commentaries, yet not one of them would seem to have been translated directly to produce the BXIII gloss. It can always be argued that it was some other commentary which provided this direct source, but if a direct source had ever existed we could have expected some indication of it. Much of the gloss material on alabaster is found in several of the commentaries and given this repetition and similarity we might expect to have found some indication of a direct source in the glosses surviving in other commentaries. Yet such indications are what is missing, and it does not seem over-speculative to conclude that the BXIII Gospel glossator did not have source texts from which he copied and translated material. This is a conclusion which is reinforced when one considers the way that the glossing in the BXIII Gospels has been done. There are recurring themes, coherent patterns and clear rhetorical techniques throughout the BXIII Gospel glosses.
which all suggest that the glossator is reacting critically to any commentary material to which he had access, and is prepared to adapt it wherever he feels this is necessary. The following discussion also makes it clear that Latin commentaries alone would not seem to have provided the glossator with all of the material in his glosses. The BXIII Gospel glosses contain material commonly found in several different types of text, not just commentaries, and this argues against any vision of the glossator sitting working from a single Latin text from which he translated material for his own glosses. The BXIII glossator would seem to be producing glosses which are not meant to be merely vernacular duplicates of Latin originals.

We could only be confident that we have identified the Latin commentaries that the BXIII glossator used if he translated his sources directly for his own glosses. If we accept that this is not what he did then, it becomes impossible to be certain that we have identified those commentaries from which he took the material used in his own glosses. We cannot therefore talk about 'sources' as such; all that can be done is to look at the Latin commentaries which have material in common with the BXIII Gospel glosses, and see if there are any patterns which emerge from them. 'Sources', however, has been retained as a convenient portmanteau word, taken to mean those Latin commentaries sharing common material with the BXIII Gospel glosses.
The tables given in Appendix II, which give an overview of the commentaries used for the different glosses, show that we need a large number of the Latin commentaries consulted for this thesis if we are to provide Latin sources for as many of the BXIII glosses as possible. What is significant when trying to decide which of the commentaries listed in these tables were used is whether a commentary has unique material in it, that is material found in a BXIII gloss but not found in any other Latin commentary, whether a commentary shares material with the BXIII glosses, which material is also found in another Latin commentary, or whether, on any given lemma, it shares no material with the BXIII gloss. It is on this that the following discussion of the Gospels which follows is based. The number of commentaries which have material found uniquely in them will give us the number of commentaries needed to get the fullest coverage of the material in the BXIII Gospel glosses, a list of those which the glossator may have consulted, or which include the material used by him. This needs to be done for each Gospel before any comparison can be made, or general conclusions formulated.

Matthew

Twenty-four commentaries were consulted for Matthew and seventeen of them contain material comparable to the BXIII glosses in Matthew. Eight of these contain
material found in the BXIII glosses which is not found in any other Latin commentary. These eight commentaries together provide all the material for which Latin commentary sources have been identified. They are, with the number of unique glosses given in parentheses, RB 9577 (1), RB 1359 (1), the Glossa (2), Av 36 (10), RB 2604 (3), Hugh (3), RB 11654 (1) and RB 8893,6 (2). The HS is missing from this list and is in any case not directly quoted in Matthew. While it has material which could have been the source for some of the BXIII glosses in Matthew, all of these BXIII glosses are attested in commentaries which we cannot exclude as they contain material which is unique, found only in them and the BXIII gloss.

This particular selection of commentaries may help us form an idea of the possible date of compilation for Matthew. Most of the commentaries in this list, that is, RB 9577, RB 1359, the Glossa, Av 36 and RB 2604 date from the twelfth century (or perhaps earlier in the case of RB 9577). Hugh dates from c.1230-62. Of the remaining two anonymous commentaries, RB 11654 may well be earlier than the fourteenth-century manuscript it survives in; there are no chapter divisions of any sort in this text, which suggests that it may pre-date Langton chaptering (which seems to have been in circulation by the 1220s). RB 8893,6 survives in a fifteenth-century manuscript and seems to have Langton chaptering, so must be later than the 1220s, although how much later is
unknown. This means that five of our eight commentaries would definitely seem to have been produced before c.1200, one (RB 11654) would seem to have been produced before c.1220, one (Hugh) was produced c.1230-6, and one was produced after c.1220 although we can be no more precise than this.

The predominant sources for Matthew, therefore, would seem to be twelfth century. This is a conclusion which is supported by our knowledge that Hugh of St Cher used twelfth-century sources for his own glosses, especially Comestor⁴. The existence of different recensions of the Comestor commentaries, and the possibility that the texts in Av 36 are copies of Comestor’s commentaries, have both been discussed in chapter two⁵. This makes it possible that the three original glosses in Hugh may have been taken by him from a recension of a Comestor commentary that has not been used for this thesis, but in any case Hugh’s general reliance on twelfth-century sources may well account for the fact that his commentary and the BXIII glosses on Matthew share a certain amount of material.

Whether Hugh’s three original glosses were taken from Comestor or not, it and the other later commentary RB 8893,6 account for only five unique glosses in BXIII between them. This is less than half the number accounted for by Av 36.
Av 36, with ten unique glosses, is well ahead of its closest rivals with three (Hugh and RB 2604) and would seem to have been the Matthew commentary containing material closest to that in the BXIII glosses in Matthew. Its material is certainly far closer to BXIII than that of the Glossa and the HS. The results for Matthew seem generally to suggest that it is mostly twelfth-century material, from twelfth-century commentaries, which we find in the glosses in Matthew in BXIII.

Mark

Nine commentaries were consulted for Mark, and all of them contain material comparable to the BXIII glosses in Mark. Six of these have unique material. These are (with the number of unique glosses in parentheses) the Glossa (2), Av 36 (7), the HS (7), Hugh (3), RB 9438 (1) and RB 10891 (1). Av 36 and the HS also seem to have been used together for two glosses.

As with Matthew, the commentaries which seem to have most in common with the glosses in Mark in BXIII date from the twelfth century. Again, Av 36 would seem to be a key text, but this time in conjunction with the HS, which text may in fact be quoted in Mark (10.39(2)). Hugh's material could be earlier, as explained above for Matthew⁶. RB 9438 survives in a fifteenth-century manuscript and would seem to be later than c.1220⁷; this
commentary has only one gloss which is original and is not such an important commentary for the glosses in Mark in BXIII as the twelfth-century commentaries are. Once more, the glosses in Mark in BXIII seem to reflect predominantly twelfth-century material.

Luke

Thirty-three commentaries were consulted for Luke and of these twenty-seven have material which could be compared to the BXIII glosses in Luke. Eleven of these commentaries have unique material in them; they are (with the number of unique glosses in parentheses) the Glossa (2), Av 36 (3), ZC (1), the HS (3), PCh (2), Robt (1), RB 10891 (1), Hugh (2), Albt (1), RB 9939 (1) and Gorr (1).

Of these eleven commentaries, seven date from the twelfth century (the Glossa, Av 36, the HS, Robt, PCh, ZC and RB 10891), and four are definitely thirteenth-century texts (Hugh, Albt, Gorr and RB 10855, anonymous, but surviving in a thirteenth-century manuscript and with Langton chaptering). The other anonymous text, RB 9939, also has Langton chaptering, and survives in a fourteenth-century manuscript. The ratio here is one of seven texts from the twelfth century to four from the thirteenth or later. Of the definitely thirteenth-century commentaries, we know that Hugh used twelfth-century sources such as the Glossa, Comestor and the Chanter; Albt also used the
Glossa and Comestor, as well as Hugh\(^{10}\); Gorr will also have used material earlier than his own day as we know that his aim in his commentaries was to update Hugh's commentaries taking more recent scholarship into account\(^{11}\). Furthermore, Gorr simply complements another commentary (Albt) for a single gloss, and this suggests that the material in Gorr is not as important for the BXIII glosses as is the material in other commentaries, all of which would seem to be earlier.

What emerges from the results for Luke is that a lot of the material in the Luke glosses in BXIII is found in commentaries written in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the position seems to be here, as it is for Matthew and Mark, that the material in twelfth-century commentaries is important for the BXIII glosses in Luke.

**John**

Twenty commentaries were consulted for John and of these sixteen have glosses which have been compared to the BXIII glosses on John. Ten of these commentaries contain unique glosses and are needed to provide sources for as many of the BXIII glosses as possible. These ten are (with the number of unique glosses in parentheses) the Glossa (1), RB 9958 (4), RB 11545 (2), Hugh (7), RB 9920 (1), RB 10521 (1), RB 8717 (1), RB 1744 (1), RB 8829 (3)
and RB 8893,5 (2). Again, the HS (which is not directly quoted in John) is missing from this list. While it has glosses which share material found in some of the BXIII glosses, these BXIII glosses are attested in other commentaries which have unique material in them.

Three of these commentaries, the Glossa, RB 9958 and RB 11545 date from the twelfth century; the anonymous commentary RB 9920 seems to predate Langton chaptering^{12}, and RB 8717^{13} may do so too although they both survive in thirteenth-century manuscripts. Otherwise, all of the commentaries (Hugh, RB 10521 and RB 1744) appear to date from the thirteenth century or later (RB 8829 survives in fourteenth-century manuscript and RB 8893,5 in a fifteenth-century one). Again, the material in Hugh could resemble the material in the BXIII glosses because Hugh and the BXIII glosses have some common, twelfth-century source. This is, however, a more convincing argument for the other Gospels where there seems to be little original material in Hugh and far more in twelfth-century commentaries. In all, the twelfth-century commentaries account for seven unique glosses, two other possibly twelfth-century commentaries account for two, thirteenth-century commentaries account for nine; the two commentaries surviving in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts account for three and two respectively. These results give us very little evidence for what has emerged from the other Gospels, namely that the BXIII glosses reflect predominantly twelfth-century
gloss material. It is hard to know whether this is because twelfth-century commentaries on John do not survive to the same extent as those on the other Gospels (from this point of view, a notable lacuna is the lack of a commentary on John in Av 36), or whether this is because the glossator used different commentaries or was working at a later date.

What emerges most clearly from all these results is that the glossator would seem to have used slightly different sources for his glosses in the different Gospels. Av 36 is the key commentary for Matthew, is co-equal in importance with the HS for Mark, and is one of the more important commentaries for Luke. The HS does not seem to have been used for Matthew and John, and is of only moderate importance for Luke; it is, however, an important commentary for the glosses in Mark. The Glossa would seem to be of relatively minor significance, but is used for all four Gospels (with one unique gloss in John and two in the remaining Gospels). Hugh is of little importance for Luke (with only two unique glosses) when the BXIII Gospel glosses are compared with other commentaries, and of moderate importance for Matthew and Mark (with three unique glosses for each); it is however the most important commentary for John, (with seven unique glosses).

As has been discussed above\(^{14}\), it is impossible to be able to say for certain which commentaries were
definitely used by the BXIII glossator and which were not. All that we can do is to assess any patterns, and these patterns are slightly different for Matthew, Mark and Luke and considerably different for John. Although we are unable to date the BXIII Gospels from the sources used, what we can say is that the material in Matthew, Mark and Luke would seem to reflect a twelfth-century tradition rather than a thirteenth-century one, whereas the glosses in John have more in common with Hugh from c.1230-6. This suggests either that insufficient twelfth-century material survives on John for Hugh's and the BXIII glossator's dependence on it to have become evident, or that John was written using a different set of sources.

One thing which does emerge, however, is that even though not all of the commentaries could be checked for all four Gospels (the time constraints meaning I had to concentrate on the most promising ones from a study of Luke), this does not appear to have skewed the results. The full list of commentaries was checked for Luke, including all of the thirteenth-century commentaries, and yet Luke still shows a twelfth-century bias. John, which was only checked against the most promising commentaries (which, for the most part date from the late twelfth-century), still shows a thirteenth-century bias. If Luke on the full sample shows a twelfth-century bias, and John on a restricted sample still shows a thirteenth-century bias, this suggests that we can be fairly confident that
our results do reflect the sources used by the BXIII glossator, and that the twelfth-century bias of Matthew and Mark is probably sound.

No direct sources have been identified, so we have no definite information as to the dating of the BXIII Gospels. However, the material used at least identifies the possible broad dates of the type of material the BXIII glossator may have used. The glosses on Matthew, Mark and Luke suggest that, whenever the glossator was working - at the beginning of the thirteenth century, in the middle or towards the end of it - he would seem to have used mainly twelfth-century material in his own glosses. Whether he took this from twelfth-century texts to which he had access, or from thirteenth-century texts which themselves used twelfth-century sources, it is at least worth considering that he might have taken it from Hugh. This, however, is unlikely. If we compare the general coverage (i.e. all the Latin glosses which might have been used for the BXIII glosses and not just the unique glosses) in Hugh and Av 36, we find that for Matthew, Hugh covers ten glosses while Av 36 covers seventeen, for Mark, that Hugh covers eight and Av 36 sixteen, and for Luke, that Hugh covers thirteen and Av 36 seventeen. However, these figures demonstrate that together Hugh and Av 36 do give substantial coverage of gloss material.
Hugh has more material in common with John than with any of the other Gospels. One possibility is that the glossator was working on the first three Gospels before Hugh's commentaries became available, and on John after c.1234-5, when Hugh, compiling his commentary, would have reached the Gospels, which he commented on in order. We could also postulate that John was compiled earlier than this if we accept that the BXIII Gospel glosses and those in Hugh share twelfth-century material from a text not seen by me, or now missing. A further possibility is that Hugh is a convenient source for twelfth-century material on the synoptic Gospels, a lot of which survives independently anyway, thus showing Hugh's reliance on such twelfth-century material. There is less twelfth-century material surviving for John, and this could mean that Hugh's reliance on twelfth-century material for John is just not as clearly demonstrated. There is, however, an alternative. It may well be that the Gospels have material which seems to be typical of slightly different periods because of the commentaries available to the glossator wherever he was working. It is possible that wherever the glossator was working, even late into the thirteenth century, that he just did not have access to a complete set of Hugh's commentaries on the Gospels. BXIII is a massive project, but we have no idea how long it took to compile. Whether we believe that it was a publishing venture or a coherent single project we must accept that it probably took some years to complete. If the Gospels were done in canonical order beginning with
Matthew, then they may have taken some time to complete, and the commentaries written and available may have changed. It is possible that Hugh's commentaries were not available to the glossator while he was working on Matthew, Mark and Luke, for whatever reason this might be, although that for John may have been. Even if the glossator were working later in the thirteenth century, he may have had access to twelfth-century material only. We could also envisage the glossator as an older person educated in the late twelfth-century schools, who used material heard, learnt or produced there for his own glosses as being that material with which he was most familiar.

Whatever we conclude from this evidence, we have no certain indications as to the date the BXIII Gospels were produced. The study of the Latin commentaries done here suggests no more than that it would seem that twelfth-century material is the key to the glosses in Matthew, Mark and Luke, with John seeming to reflect slightly later material. We have no indication as to whether the glossator was working at the beginning, in the middle or towards the end of the thirteenth century.
I.2 Recurring Themes in the BXIII Gospel glosses

Repeated glosses will be discussed later in this chapter\textsuperscript{16}. Discussed here are those themes which recur in the different BXIII glosses.

Berger was the first to notice that there is an identifiable concern with morality in the Gospel glosses. For him, the 'morale du commentateur est bien celle de son époque; il voit en tout une exhortation à la pénitence et aux bonnes œuvres'\textsuperscript{17}, and he cites one gloss, that on Luke 14.27\textsuperscript{18}, as an example. It is certainly true to say that the BXIII Gospel glosses emphasize the idea of 'bones huevres' and 'penitence'. This, however, is not all they do. The themes of 'good works' and 'penitence' are part of the emphasis in the BXIII Gospel glosses on what can best be called 'proper behaviour'. This emphasis is contrasted with that of 'improper behaviour'. It is not simply a question of 'bones huevres' in the BXIII Gospel glosses; it is at least as much a question of 'mauveses huevres'. Nor is the matter left there. The glosses not only stress 'bones huevres' and 'mauveses huevres', but they draw a clear picture of what the just reward for them will be. It is not just 'bones huevres' and 'mauveses huevres' as such in the BXIII Gospel glosses; it is such 'huevres' as lead to a just or proper reward.
The BXIII glossator draws a clear distinction between 'bones huevres' and 'mauveses huevres'. The concern with 'good works' includes the teaching that Christ's commandments are to be kept (John 8.31 and John 8.43), that the word of Christ is the Gospel (Mark 10.29), that this word is immutable (John 19.22), that loving Christ means keeping his word (John 14.23 and John 14.24), that hearing the word of Christ means keeping it through works (John 8.47(2) and John 10.27), that evil and suffering are not only to be accepted but to be received willingly (Matthew 5.39 and Luke 16.25 (the example of Lazarus)), and that one should set others an example (Matthew 23.16 and Luke 12.35). The teaching that such things must be done is complemented by the information that Christ too must obey the word of God (Luke 2.49 and John 8.26) and that he is setting an example to be followed (Luke 12.49). To this is added the concern with suffering, that Christ must suffer (Matthew 26.39 and Mark 14.36), that people should suffer like him through love of him (Mark 10.38(1) and Mark 10.39(1)), that suffering means suffering martyrdom (Mark 10.39(2)), that the flesh is fearful of pain (Mark 14.38), and that suffering brings renewal (Matthew 26.35).

The other side of the coin is 'mauveses huevres' or disobedience. This is exemplified by the example of the Pharisees. The glossator establishes that certain things are given by the law (Mark 10.19, Matthew 5.21(21) and Luke 2.24) and then shows how the Pharisees fail to keep

The BXIII Gospel glossator therefore emphasizes the importance of 'good works' and reinforces this in two ways, by showing how Christ must obey, and by using the example of the Pharisees' 'bad works'. All of these glosses have the same underlying purpose, which is to describe proper behaviour. This concern is taken further by those glosses which deal with the theme of just rewards.

According to these glosses all actions have their proper rewards. Actions may be judged worthy of blame or condemnation (Matthew 5.22, Matthew 26.31, Matthew 26.33, Mark 14.27) or even worthy of death (Matthew 5.21(2), Matthew 26.66 and Mark 10.33(1)); enemies of Caesar deserve death (John 19.12(1)) and people receive only what they deserve (Luke 23.41); failure to act as one should when one knows better will result in greater damnation (Luke 20.47). However, humanity is to be saved through Christ (Matthew 26.38, John 8.56 and John 16.23). Within this category of 'just rewards' can be included those glosses which suggest that judgement means damnation (Matthew 23.14(2)), that judgement means hell (Matthew 23.15) and that a person may be in hell for ever (Mark 14.21(1)).
Many of the BXIII glosses are concerned with this theme, yet there is little comparable material in any of the Latin commentaries consulted. Given the importance of this theme in the BXIII Gospel glosses it is surprising that it is dealt with so rarely in the Latin commentaries which are otherwise major sources for the material on the BXIII Gospel glosses. These glosses fit into a coherent pattern and there are two possible explanations for the fact this material seems not to have been found in commentaries: (1) it is material found in some other type of text, and (2) it is material that the glossator added on his own initiative, almost as if he had a conscious plan in mind. Alternative sources for this material are discussed in section two.

This theme of proper behaviour, improper behaviour, and the rewards that each deserves is the most common theme in the BXIII Gospel glosses, but there are others. There is, for example, a group of glosses on the devil and how he is wicked (John 8.44(2), John 8.38 and John 14.30), and there are a number of glosses which identify exactly which emanation of 'God' is meant in a particular circumstance (Luke 2.22(3), Luke 20.42 and John 14.1). Other glosses deal with the theme that there is a proper time for things to happen, such as the glosses on Matthew 8.29, Matthew 26.16, Mark 14.41 and John 8.56, and 'signs', on John 14.12 and 8.28(2), and a number on how bad the Pharisees are (largely because the Pharisees are
the glossator's principal example of improper behaviour and hypocrisy).

Such a recurring theme in the BXIII Gospel glosses indicates something about the audience for BXIII. Much emphasis is placed on 'good' and 'bad' works and what the rewards for them are, but they are all described in terms which are quite vague. There is nothing very specific here which would allow us to suggest an audience for BXIII, nothing, for example giving teaching on how to live a contemplative or retired life. 'Good works' means obeying Christ's commands not only in what one says but in what one does, and the rewards for doing 'good works' will be what one deserves. The instructions however are not precise, and their very imprecision suggests perhaps that the glossator was not writing for people who were leading a contemplative life, but rather for those whose lives were more involved in the world. Even here, the advice remains vague - there is, for example, nothing specific on the needs for the laity to give alms. That the exhortations to do God's will are as vague as they are suggests that perhaps this text was meant for a general, and if general then probably lay, audience rather than any particular audience.
I.3 How the Latin sources are used

Several broad patterns can be seen in the way that the glossator treats his Latin sources. However, we must be aware of a reservation here. We can be confident of the themes that the glossator raises repeatedly in his glosses, and we can be equally confident of the rhetoric he uses. We cannot, however, be so confident of the patterns that emerge in the way he treats his sources. This is because the BXIII glosses would seem never to be direct translations of Latin glosses, with the consequence that we can never be confident that we have identified them. All we can do here is look for recurring patterns on the understanding that we will at least see the likely ways in which the glossator used any source material to which he had access.

In spite of this caveat, patterns do emerge which because they are so recurrent across such a wide span of glosses indicate how the BXIII glossator may have treated any Latin commentary material. The fact that patterns emerge which are so widespread suggests that we are working along the right lines and that it is valuable to discuss them in that they may reflect the BXIII Gospel glossator's attitude towards any commentary consulted.

The aim of this section is to illustrate these broad patterns, which can be listed as follows: (a) the use of material from the Latin sources, (b) the expansion of
material from the Latin sources, (c) repeated glosses, (d) the conflation of translation and gloss material, (e) the use of Old and New Testament material and (f) the use of the Latin gloss as a prompt for the BXIII gloss.

(a) the use of material from the Latin sources

A lot of the material that the BXIII Gospel glossator takes from his source glosses is factual, such as the explanation of customs and the clear identification of characters. There are also, however, glosses which take less factual information from the sources, such as those which explain the motivation behind certain acts or speeches.

Several types of factual material are taken from the Latin glosses to be used in the BXIII glosses. The first type can be called 'encyclopaedic'. This category includes information which gives the historical or geographical background to the story, such as the glosses on the ' Pertuis d'Aguille' in Mark 10.27, taken from perhaps the HS or Av 36, the story of the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus and Vespasian in Luke 19.44, perhaps from Av 36 or ZC, and the story about the martyrdom of some of the apostles in Mark 10.39(2), taken again from the HS or Av 36. A group of glosses related to these are those glosses which give information about Jewish feasts and customs, such as the feast of unleavened bread (Matthew 26.17, Luke 22.7 and Mark
14.12) and Parasceve (John 19.14, Matthew 27.62 and Mark 14.16), although the glossator often complements the material in his Latin source with information from the Old Testament, discussed below. Other factual information taken from the Latin glosses includes the definitions of alabaster (Matthew 26.7(1) and Mark 14.3(2)), centurion (Matthew 8.5 and Mark 15.39), and 'pretoire' (Mark 15.16), and the interpretations of proper names, such as Lithostratos (John 19.13) and Calvary (Mark 15.22).

The second type of factual information taken from the Latin glosses can be called 'identification material'. This is the material which identifies characters in or important to the story, such as the prophet who foretold Christ's coming from Bethlehem (Micah, Matthew 2.5), the identification of Christ's mother and father in Luke 2.33 as being Mary and Joseph, the identification of the woman who poured oil over Christ's feet in Matthew 26.7(2) as Mary Magdalen, and the identification of the disciple Christ loved as John in John 19.27(2) and John 20.2.

The third, less factual type of information taken from the sources consists of explanations as to why people do or say things, such as the glosses on Luke 16.23, Luke 22.43, Mark 7.28, Mark 9.12 and John 16.23. Many of these explain what Christ does or says, and many of these are in the form of a quaestio, which is discussed in more detail in the section on rhetoric below.
The glossator will also use his source for material which adds to the Gospel story where there is perceived to be a gap. An example of this is the gloss on John 8.9; Christ has just written on the ground, but what he has written is not given in the Gospel. The BXIII glossator therefore takes this material from his source, and in this particular instance attributes the gloss to Ambrose and Gregory, presumably for authority.

To these types of factual information can be added all those individual glosses which provide extra information which may be helpful to a fuller understanding of the story, such as why Abraham is called the father of the Jews (Luke 16.23), why the Jews call pagans dogs (Mark 7.25), how it is that people could know that Paul was from Galilee (Luke 22.59), and what the bosom of Abraham is (Luke 16.23).

(b) The expansion of material from the Latin sources

The BXIII Gospel glossator seems often to expand his Latin source, i.e. he glosses his source material in some way. Most of these expansions would seem to be for clarity, to bring out the implications of his source or to take it to its logical conclusion, or for emphasis.

The BXIII glossator may expand a single word from his source material, and this is what happens with the glosses on Mark 10.38(1) and Mark 15.16. In both of
these glosses the single word taken from the source is expanded to make its meaning clear. In the first of these, in which 'passio' becomes 'itel mort comme ge do soffrir por l'amor que ge ai au monde et por lui rachater', the expansion is for emphasis rather than because the direct French equivalent of the word in the source would not be clearly understood. In the second, the expansion of 'tribunali' as 'la meson ou l'en tient plez et ou l'en fet jugemenz' is because a straight translation of 'tribunali' into French may not have been understood and may still have required an explanation of what happens there; this is what the glossator supplies by expanding 'tribunali' in this way.

The gloss on Matthew 23.16 also expands a single word in the source; in this case 'fraudulentia' becomes 'qui devez mener les autres par exemple de bones huevres, et vos avez poiors huevres que n'ont li autre'. Not only does this expansion allow the glossator to make clear what it is 'fraudulentia' means in concrete terms, but it also allows him to introduce one of his common themes.

As well as expanding a single word in his source, the glossator also takes whole phrases, and expands them by adding to them. An example of this is the gloss on John 2.4. This gloss takes its fundamental point, that it is not through his humanity, which he got from his mother, that Christ can perform miracles, from its Latin source and then expands this to take it one step further; if it
is not through his humanity that Christ can perform miracles, then it is through his deity, which he did not get from his mother. This expansion takes the material in the Latin source to its logical conclusion, and also allows the glossator to raise the question of Christ's dual nature.

The implications of the Latin source may also be brought out in a BXIII gloss through expansion. In the gloss on Matthew 26.52, the glossator takes a phrase such as 'verbi dei', 'divine vindicte' or 'sententia divina' and expands it to make it clear that this means 'le droiturier jugement Nostre Seignor'.

(c) repeated glosses

There is quite a lot of repetition in the BXIII Gospel glosses, both of different themes, and of individual glosses. The fundamental distinction between repeated glosses and repeated themes is that a repeated gloss is a gloss which occurs in more or less the same form in more than one place, while a repeated theme will be made up of several glosses which may be different, but which all deal with the same idea. An example of a repeated gloss is that which occurs, with some variation, in Matthew 26.7(1) and Mark 14.3(2) on the subject of alabaster. An example of a repeated theme is that of the Trinity, in John 10.30, John 14.9, John 15.26 and Luke 18.43. While there is a limited amount of repetition in the glosses in
John 10.30 and Luke 18.43, ('cez .iii. sont une chose en substance' in the John gloss, 'les .iii. persones sont en une sustance' in that in Luke), the treatment of the theme is a little different in each case, although all four present the same, entirely orthodox explanation of the Trinity. Discussed here are the glosses, or parts of glosses, which are repeated. Recurring or repeated themes are discussed elsewhere.

A number of passages in the Gospels occur in more than one Gospel and we should probably not be surprised, therefore, that what is essentially the same gloss may occur in more than one place too, either in different Gospels, or twice within the same Gospel. That glosses are given in more than one place suggests that the glossator did not expect the BXIII Gospels to be read, or heard, consecutively. The BXIII glossator was obviously prepared to gloss a lemma wherever it occurred if he felt that the gloss was necessary for the reader's better understanding of the text.

Repeated glosses can be split into three groups: (1) those which are repeated within a few verses for emphasis, (2) those which contain information which it is necessary to have to understand the text literally and understand what is happening and (3) those which are repeated because they contain explanations of complicated ideas or theology which it is necessary to have to understand the text. We also need to consider how far
the glosses which are repeated in BXIII are repeated on
the glossator's own initiative or because they are
repeated in his Latin source. It is important to
remember here that while a Gospel Harmony commentary
covers a lemma once only, this same lemma may occur
several times in the four Gospels. In particular cases,
either a Gospel Harmony gloss or the first occurrence of
a gloss in one of the BXIII Gospels could have been the
source for all of the occurrences of it in the BXIII
Gospel glosses.

The first type of repetition is exemplified by the
2.51. These all have the same essential information,
that Christ's parents, who took him to the temple and
under whose authority he was, were Joseph and Mary.
While there can be no doubt that Mary was Christ's
mother, the identification of Joseph as being his father
is more problematic, and while three of the glosses, Luke
2.22(2), Luke 2.33 and Luke 2.41, merely state that his
father was Joseph, the gloss on Luke 2.51 makes some
attempt to explain how Joseph can be called this. It is
a repetition put in purely to emphasize the point.

Only one Latin source commentary has any repetition of
this material in its own glosses on these lemmas. This
is RB 10891, which has glosses on Luke 2.22(2) and Luke
2.31. Five other commentaries, Gorr, ZC, the Glossa, RB
9439 and RB 10397, gloss only one of these lemmas. It is
possible, therefore, that the glossator derived the idea that such an identification needed stressing from what in any case seems to be his Latin source commentary, RB 10891.

The second type of gloss which is repeated is that which contains information necessary for an understanding of what is happening in the story. Glosses which come into this category are: (i) those on Jewish custom and feasts, (ii) those which give definitions of things which may be unknown to the audience, and (iii) those glosses which identify the characters involved in the story. Since they are wholly factual, they can be listed without further discussion:

(i) Jewish customs and feasts

Azimes Matthew 26.17; Luke 22.7; Mark 14.12
Pasque (Passover) John 2.23; John 19.14; Matthew 26.19
Parasceve John 19.14; Matthew 27.62; Mark 14.16
Circoncision Luke 2.21; John 7.22
The custom of calling the first born 'premier né' Luke 2.7; Matthew 1.25

(ii) Definitions

Blaspheme Matthew 26.65; Mark 2.7
Centurien Matthew 8.5; Mark 15.39
Alabastre Matthew 26.7(1); Mark 14.3(2)
(iii) **identification of people**

Symon le liepreus = the one Christ cured, Matthew 26.6; Mark 14.3(1)

Some of these glosses are also repeated in the Latin commentaries. The glosses on 'premier né' (Matthew 1.25 and Luke 2.7) and 'azimes' (Matthew 16.17, Luke 22.7 and Mark 14.12), are repeated in one Latin commentary, Av 36. The glosses on Parasceve are repeated on John 19.14 and Matthew 27.62 in the Glossa, in RB 9958 and RB 9957, and RB 8893.5 and RB 8893.6 (these pairs of commentaries are found in the same manuscripts, but we will probably never know if they were composed by the same person or not). The gloss on alabaster is given in both places in two Latin commentaries, in Hugh and the Glossa. The gloss on Symon le liepreus occurs in the Glossa in both places.

The third type of gloss which we find repeated in the BXIII Gospel glosses is that which contains an explanation of some complicated idea or theological point which it is necessary to have to understand the text. This group includes glosses like that on the bosom of Abraham in Luke 16.23 and Luke 23.43, and the explanation that a person will suffer less in hell if he is only guilty of original sin (on Mark 14.21(2) and Matthew 26.26(3)).
The glosses on the bosom of Abraham are repeated in both places in three Latin commentaries, the HS, RB 10855 and Av 36. The glosses on suffering less in hell if only guilty of original sin are found repeated in Av 36.

The pattern seems to be that repeating glosses was something that Latin commentators were prepared to do when they felt it necessary. We find glosses being repeated in Hugh, the Glossa and Av 36. It is possible, therefore, that the BXIII glossator, in repeating his glosses occasionally, is only following a standard habit found in Latin glossing. In particular cases, assuming he used a commentary or commentaries to identify lemmas to gloss, he may simply be adopting the repetition found in his source. Where repetition did not exist in his Latin source, or where he would seem to have used no such source, the implication is that he was capable of finding, prepared to look for or to identify the need for other glosses on the same lemma.

It is, of course, impossible to be certain that the glosses were repeated in the different Gospels in Hugh, Av 36 and the Glossa because they were recognized as being needed in more than one place, or because the actual compilers of the different Gospel commentaries were different people. We know that Hugh’s commentaries are the product of teamwork; we do not know whether the commentaries in Av 36 were all composed by the same person or not, although the implication would seem to be
that they were\textsuperscript{23}. The Gospels in the Glossa would seem certainly not to have been written by a single commentator\textsuperscript{24}. Of the three Latin commentaries that repeat glosses, it seems that only Av 36 may be by a single person. This is, of course, similarly a potential problem with the BXIII Gospels.

The most that can be said is that we do find glosses repeated in Latin Gospel commentaries which are designed to cover all four Gospels. Even if different people wrote the individual commentaries, they seem to have been aware that lemmas needed glossing where they occurred; they do not seem to have been prepared to rely on the same gloss occurring earlier in the order of the Gospels. This gives us a valuable insight as to how Latin commentators thought their commentaries would be used; they seem not to have expected whole books or the four Gospels to be read in order. This would seem to be true of the Glossa as well. It is equally true of the BXIII Gospels. The repeated glosses in the BXIII Gospels suggests that they were not expected to be read in order, but perhaps in 'daily portions' or appointed Gospel readings for particular days.

(d) the conflation of translation and gloss material

It has been the assumption throughout this thesis that the glossator and translator are one and the same person\textsuperscript{25} and that the translator wrote the glosses as he
worked through the Vulgate translating it into Old French. (This does not, of course, preclude the possibility of there being more than one translator/glossator at work on the BXIII Gospels. The likelihood of this being the case is discussed in section three.) This assumption is supported by the fact that there are a number of lemmas and glosses in the Gospels where translation and gloss material have been confused, or used interchangeably.

Sneddon has already shown that there are a number of places in the BXIII Gospels where the translator has not translated the Vulgate literally, but has translated it in such a way as to expand and explain the original. The example he gives is that of Matthew 24.37, where 'in diebus Noe' is translated as 'el tens Noe quant li deluges fu seur terre', and his explanation for this is that the translator is 'concentrating on the essential meaning of his source', and that this leads him 'to expand the source with numerous explicitations and with glosses'. A number of such passages have been identified in the course of this study on the glosses, and these suggest that what the translator is doing here is making his text more explicit by incorporating gloss material that is found in the source commentaries.

Sneddon did suggest, in his notes to his edition, that this rather than variants in the Vulgate may account for five or so readings in the French text. The evidence from this study would seem to suggest, however, that the
practice is far more widespread than this. If this is what is happening, then it is further evidence that the translator and glossator were the same person.

The fact that the translator used gloss material in his translation presupposes that he had access to this gloss material as he was working. For the glossator to use translation material in his glosses, and for the translator to use gloss material in the translation, presupposes not only close attention to the text and an access to gloss material, but an actual interworking of the two. We can conjure up a picture of the translator with Latin commentaries open on his desk, translating and writing his glosses as he went along. If he was not writing his glosses as he translated his text, he would not have needed to consult Latin commentaries, and thus may not have noticed the gloss material which could be used in the translation. The presence of gloss material in the actual translation is strong evidence to uphold the idea that the glossator and translator were one and the same person. Furthermore, for the glossator to be so aware of decisions made about the translation and the gloss material included in it suggests more than that he read the translation carefully, comparing it to a copy of the Vulgate to identify those places where the translator had used commentary material in deciding how to translate certain readings, and wrote his glosses accordingly. Such careful interworking of translation and gloss material can only mean that the translator and glossator
were the same person, and that the glosses were written as the text was translated.

It is unlikely that all the places in the EXIII Gospels where gloss material has been incorporated into the translation have been identified. Sneddon gives five possible places in the notes to his edition, and working on the glosses has allowed me to identify some more. These places include Matthew 2.20, Luke 2.1 and John 8.3. Rather different is the gloss on Mark 14.4; in this gloss, instead of the translation using gloss material, translation material is given in the gloss.

In Matthew 2.20, the Vulgate reading 'animam pueri' is translated as 'la mort de l'enfant', where 'mort' is an interpretation of the meaning of 'animam'. Some form of 'mors' occurs in the glosses on this lemma in the Glossa, RB 1359 and Hugh; 'vitam corporalem' is found in the gloss given in RB 11682. Two other commentaries, RB 2604 and RB 9577, use the verb 'interficio' in their glosses on this lemma, and this, meaning 'to kill or slay', obviously implies 'mort'. The interpretation of 'animam' as 'mort' is, therefore, quite standard.

The gloss which follows the lemma 'qui queroient la mort de l'enfant' is 'qui queroient l'enfant a occire', which allows the glossator to introduce a slight shift in emphasis. That 'animam' means 'mort' is dealt with in the translation, and leaves the glossator free to make it
clear in the gloss that Herod was not simply waiting for the child's death, but was actively seeking it. This shift in emphasis is made possible by giving what was the standard interpretation of 'animam' in the translation, rather than in the gloss, and allows the glossator to keep the gloss short and precise.

Something similar may be happening with Luke 2.1, which translates the Vulgate's 'universus orbis' as 'tuit li home qui estoient el monde'. The source for this gloss is probably related to 'numerum hominem' (sic), found in the Glossa and RB 10519. Putting this material into the translated text rather than the gloss following it again allows the glossator to keep his gloss short, it being a vocabulary gloss in which the lemma 'descrit' is replaced by 'nombre'. Again, there is very little variation in the gloss material found in the Latin commentaries. The Glossa and RB 10519 both have 'numerum hominem', while the HS and RB 10855 both have 'numerum etiam civitatum'. The translator has again put undisputed gloss material into his translation.

Another example of gloss material being incorporated into the translation is brought to light by the case of the gloss in John 8.3. On first consideration, this translation and gloss appear to be perfectly straightforward; 'scribae' is translated as 'li scribe' and glossed as 'li sage de la loi', which is probably taken either from RB 10521's 'scribe autem erant scoientes
in legem', or RB 1744's 'scribe enim doctores legis'.
This is a gloss which also occurs elsewhere, on Matthew 7.29 and Mark 7.1. 'Li sage de la loi' is, therefore, gloss material with attested Latin sources.

However, these three glosses of 'scriba' are in BXIII the exception rather than the rule. It is far more common to find 'scriba' translated immediately as 'li sage de la loi' and not 'scribe' than it is to find 'li sage de la loi' given as a gloss on 'scribe'. Forty-five instances of 'li sage de la loi' used as a translation of 'scriba' have been identified, as opposed to eight places where it has been translated as 'scribe', only three of which are followed by a gloss. This example shows that the translator was prepared to use gloss material throughout his translation if he felt that the literal Old French equivalent would not be understood by his audience.

Another reason for repeating this gloss material so much may be the large number of times that 'scriba' occurs in the Vulgate. To avoid repeating the same gloss perhaps fifty times was presumably a good reason for using that gloss material in the translation.

The gloss on Mark 14.4 is an example of translation material that has been put into the gloss rather than the translation. The Vulgate text here reads 'unguenti'; this is not found in the BXIII translation, but occurs in the gloss as 'oignemenz'.
These examples of the translator using gloss material in the translation suggest that this was a technique that the glossator was prepared to use whenever he felt that it made the translation more explicit. It should also be noted that he seems only to use gloss material in his translation when this gloss material is universally accepted, such as the material in Matthew 2.20, Luke 2.1 and John 9.3. He would not seem to put disputed or disputable material into his translation. As well as allowing him to make the translation more explicit, this technique also allows the gloss to be kept to a single issue, such as a slight change of emphasis (as in Matthew 2.20) or to allow a single word gloss to be all that is required (as in Luke 2.1). It is also a technique which allows him to save space, and this is not a negligible consideration when perhaps as many as fifty glosses would be needed if 'scriba' were only ever to be translated as 'li scribe' and then glossed.

(e) The use of Old and New Testament material

The BXIII glossator uses material from both the Old and New Testaments in his glosses.

Old Testament material

Some of the glosses which give details of Jewish customs use material from the Old Testament as their source rather than material from a Latin commentary. The
glossator is quite capable of finding this material for himself, and does not usually depend on there being such material in his Latin commentary sources. These include the gloss on Luke 22.7, which is an explanation of 'li jorz des azimes'. This gloss explains that, on this day, the Jews did not eat anything which had leaven or honey in it. The idea of honey would seem to have been taken directly from Leviticus 2.11, where instructions for the making of food-offerings are found. Another example is that part of the gloss on John 19.14, where the idea that no work is to be done on the Passover may be taken from accounts on how to observe the Passover in either Numbers 28.25 or Deuteronomy 16.8. A third example of the glossator taking material from an Old Testament source is the gloss on Matthew 26.19; the lengthy description of what happens at Passover is taken from Exodus 12.1-20 with very little left out and some re-ordering of material. No Latin commentary on the same lemma has anything like the detail found in the account in Exodus which is reproduced in BXIII.

The presence of a gloss on such lemmas in his source may have suggested to the glossator (a) that it was a lemma requiring a gloss, and (b) the sort of material needed to gloss it. Having derived this from his Latin source, the glossator would then need simply to identify the appropriate passage in the Old Testament and take his material from there. What is interesting is that the glossator should choose to go to an Old Testament source
rather than simply relying on Latin commentaries. This may be because his sources had nothing in them, or because he was especially concerned to give accurate information on Jewish customs and was prepared to check the Jewish sources on such subjects as the observance of religious festivals. It is important to add, however, that in other glosses the glossator has been prepared to rely on the information in his source commentaries, such as the gloss on the Jewish custom of ripping one's clothes on hearing blasphemy, in Matthew 26.65, which cannot be from the Old Testament. It would seem fair to conclude, however, that in general the BXIII glosses reflect a concern on the part of the glossator to be accurate with regard to Jewish material.

New Testament material

The BXIII glossator also uses New Testament material in his glosses, and he does this in two ways: (i) as a paraphrase or (ii) as a direct quotation.

(i) An example of paraphrase is in the gloss on Mark 5.33. In this gloss the glossator uses information from John 11.1-2 and John 12.2 to reinforce his identification of 'la feme' as 'sainte Marthe'. This is not something which his sources do.

(ii) Examples of the use of direct quotations, usually of speech and especially of things Christ said, are often
found in those BXIII glosses which are *quaestiones*. The use of quotations in these glosses is discussed in more detail below. A brief summary, however, is not out of place here. In many *quaestiones* in BXIII direct quotations of speech, and for the most part of Christ's speech, are used to set up the *quaestio* which is to be answered (as in the glosses on John 15.26, John 20.2 and Mark 7.28), to develop it (as in the glosses on John 18.9 and Mark 9.13), or to complete it (as in the gloss on Mark 5.43(2)). Again, this would appear to be something which the BXIII glossator does for himself and which does not occur in his Latin sources.

(f) The use of the Latin gloss as a prompt for the BXIII gloss

The problem of being confident that any pattern genuinely reflects what the BXIII glossator was doing is even more of a problem for those Latin glosses which would seem to have been used as 'prompts' for the BXIII glosses. Arguing that a Latin gloss was a 'prompt' for a BXIII gloss is an argument from silence; we could only be confident that this is how the BXIII glossator treated a gloss in a Latin text if we knew that he definitely used that Latin text for material. For example, it is only if we can be absolutely certain that the glossator used the HS that we can argue that a BXIII gloss which is not the same as that in the HS was prompted by it.
However, the patterns discussed so far show that the BXIII glossator is not just copying or translating his sources, but, if he had sources as such, is reacting critically to them and being selective about what material he chooses to use from them in his own glosses. It is therefore plausible to suggest that one way of using his source commentaries is to identify lemmas requiring glossing, even if he then rejects the material in his source gloss. Such a rejection of his source material may be because he thought that the interpretations in it were not suitable for his own glosses (given a potentially different audience) or were even wrong. It is tempting to believe that the comment at the end of the gloss on John 7.22, "ce n'est mie autentiques", is the glossator saying that something in his source is wrong. No source has been identified for this gloss, but until we know exactly which commentary was his source we cannot be certain that this is the glossator's own comment.

This seems to be a pattern which may well exist but, as stated above, this is something which we can never be sure is happening until we can be certain we know exactly which commentaries were used by the BXIII glossator and which were not. Until that time, this pattern remains a problem as, being based on material which is not in a Latin source and so dependent on arguments from silence, it is very easy to account for any BXIII gloss which is different from a Latin gloss and has no closer source as
having been prompted by that, perhaps totally different, Latin gloss. This pattern, therefore, remains a possibility, but one for which we have no certain evidence.

I.4 The rhetoric of glossing

The rhetoric which the BXIII Gospel glossator uses for his glosses is another way in which he clearly reflects what is in Latin commentaries. He does not copy the rhetoric of his source directly, because he does not need to do so. Many of the rhetorical devices used by Latin commentators have their French equivalents, and he can use these as seems appropriate to him. He does not need them in his Latin source to be able to use them. Many of the techniques he uses to begin and develop his glosses are not ones he has had to develop for himself given the form BXIII takes (i.e. continuous text and gloss). Most of them are ones which already existed in the Latin glossing tradition and which he has merely used in his own vernacular glosses.

As was discussed in chapter one, both Sneddon and Quereuil have already broached the subject of the rhetoric used in the BXIII glosses. Sneddon cites glosses on Mark 11.2 and Mark 14.3 as examples of the repetition of the lemma which has been glossed at the end of the gloss. He believes that this helps to reintegrate
that gloss into the text. Sneddon also mentions the use for the same purpose of transitional phrases such as 'Lors lor dist doncques Jhesus' (added to the translation following a long gloss at Mark 10.40); and Quereuil has listed seven rhetorical devices which are employed in the Genesis glosses, of which he has identified one, the *quaestio*, as having a Latin equivalent.

Not all of the devices Quereuil has identified in the Genesis glosses are used in the Gospel glosses, and this is not surprising given the different nature of Genesis and the Gospels and the different type of glossing that each text requires. To quote Quereuil on the use of allegory in the Genesis glosses:

*L'allégorie est donc celui des quatre sens qui a le plus d'importance pour le lecteur chrétien, auquel il est essentiel de faire comprendre pourquoi le livre des Juifs a pu devenir partie intégrante de la Bible. Aux yeux des exégètes chrétiens, tout l'Ancien Testament préfigure l'avènement du Christ et de l'Eglise. ... L'idée que l'Ancien Testament ne prend tout son sens qu'à la lumière du Nouveau est développée à plusieurs reprises dans notre glose.*

Genesis is a very different text from the Gospels; it requires considerable allegorical glossing if its figurative significance for Christ and the New Testament is to be made clear. It is only to be expected, therefore, that many Genesis glosses explain that a particular person or a particular event prefigures Christ or some event in his life. This is indeed what we find in the Genesis
glosses. The Gospels are a fundamental narrative part of the New Testament; they present the life of Christ. As such, the glossing they require is of a different nature. It is only to be expected therefore that, while many of the rhetorical devices identified by Quereuil in the Genesis glosses are also found in the Gospel glosses, some of them, notably those which introduce allegorical and prefigurative glosses ('senefer' and 'senefianoe') are not found in the Gospels.

The rhetorical devices found in the Gospel glosses can be divided into three categories: (1) those which are used to begin a gloss, (2) those which are used inside a gloss and (3) those which are used to finish a gloss.

(1) The rhetorical devices used to begin a gloss

There are several ways in which the BXIII glossator may begin a gloss. By far the most common of these is the phrase 'c'est a dire', and the slightly shorter 'c'est'. These would seem to the French equivalent for the common Latin phrase 'id est'. There are numerous examples of all these phrases in Appendix I, and in many cases where there is 'id est' in a Latin gloss we have 'c'est a dire' or 'c'est' in a French gloss. However, both the Latin and French phrases are common enough to be insignificant when considering whether a Latin gloss is the source for a French gloss. 'C'est a dire' and 'c'est' are rhetorical devices that the glossator has at his
fingertips and can use wherever he wishes. The glossator does not need the Latin equivalent of these, 'id est' or the less common 'ipse est', in his source before he will use 'c'est a dire' or 'c'est'. For example, the gloss on Matthew 2.2 begins with 'c'est a dire', but this is not in its likely source Av 36. The same is true of the gloss on Matthew 2.20 and its possible sources RB 2604 and RB 9577. 'C'est a dire' and 'c'est' are part of the BXIII glossator's repertoire of stock rhetorical devices in exactly the same way that 'id est' is a stock rhetorical device for any Latin commentator. 'C'est a dire' is far less common in the Genesis glosses (see, for example, the glosses on Genesis 1.2 and 6.339) than in the Gospel glosses, but this is probably because of the different nature of the glosses and the different rhetorical devices used for them.

'C'est a dire' may also be one of the French equivalents of the many different Latin phrases based on the verb 'dico'. Another is the phrase 'aucun dient' found, for example, in the glosses on Mark 10.27 and Mark 15.35. In these two cases, the Latin commentary (the HS) has 'fuerunt qui dixerint'. Again, I would not wish to argue that the presence of 'fuerunt qui dicerint' in a Latin commentary is significant for deciding which of several commentaries is the source for a particular BXIII gloss. Phrases based on 'dico' are common in Latin commentaries, and the following expressions are all found: 'dicit aliquid' (on John 8.9 in RB 8893,5), 'dicunt' (on Matthew
23.3 in RB 1359 and RB 2604, and John 8.9 in RB 10328), 'quidam dicunt' (on John 8.9 in the HS), 'dicebat' (on John 8.38 in the Glossa), 'dicebant' (on John 19.14 in the HS and Hugh), 'dicitur' (on Luke 2.21 in the HS, Luke 16.23 in Gorr, Matthew 8.5 in RB 8893.6, Matthew 27.62 in RB 1359 and RB 2604 and John 19.13 in RB 8893.5), 'ipse dicitur' (on Mark 2.14 in RB 9471), 'dicuntur' (on John 10.22 in the HS and Hugh), 'dicentur' (on Luke 12.3(1) in Albt and Av 36), 'dicebatur' (on John 10.22 in RB 1774 and John 19.14 in RB 9958) and 'dicebantur' (on Luke 22.7 in Av 36). 'Aucun dient' would seem to be nothing more than the French equivalent of these Latin expressions.

Another French phrase, which may be an equivalent of all the Latin phrases based on 'dico', is 'aucuns croient', found for example in the gloss on Mark 5.33. In this case, the possible Latin source gloss in the HS has 'dicit'. However, both 'aucuns croient' and 'aucun dient' have the same function in the BXIII Gospel glosses, which is to introduce a belief held by some people.

The next opening phrases to consider are those which use the verb 'apeler'. There are two phrases which use this verb: 'est apelez' found, for example, in the glosses on John 8.44(2) and Luke 2.7, and 'apele', found in the glosses on John 8.38 and John 14.30. These phrases are often combined with 'ici endroit' or 'ici elueques'.
These phrases with 'apeler' correspond to Latin phrases formed from 'voco', and in this case 'apeler' can be made to reflect both the active and passive voice of the Latin phrases. 'Est apelez' is the equivalent of Latin phrases such as 'vocabitur' (for example in the gloss on Matthew 2.23 in RB 8893,6, where it is used in the lemma too) and 'vocantur' (for example in the gloss on Matthew 5.13 in RB 9577), and 'apele' is the equivalent of 'vocat' (for example in the gloss on John 8.38 in RB 10521). Again, the glossator does not need a phrase formed with 'voco' in his Latin source for him to use a phrase with 'apeler'. In only one of the four examples given above, that of the gloss on John 8.38, do we find 'vocat' for BXIII's 'apele' (in the gloss in RB 10521). Otherwise, we find phrases which are not unlike those formed with 'voco': 'quid loquitur' in the gloss on John 8.44(2) in Hugh, and 'dicitur' in the gloss on Luke 2.7. This usage again suggests that phrases such as 'apele' and 'est apelez' are the French equivalents of phrases such as 'vocat' and 'vocantur', but that the glossator did not need them in his source to use them in his own gloss.

Another way of beginning a gloss in the BXIII Gospel glosses, which is also found in the Genesis glosses (as noted by Quereuil), is 'vaut autant'. This is used in clearly defined contexts other than opening phrases such as 'c'est a dire'. In both the Gospels and Genesis it is used to introduce glosses on proper (usually Greek or Hebrew) names. Examples in the Gospels include the
glosses on Mark 10.46, John 2.1, John 10.22 and John 19.13. 'Vaut autant' is the French equivalent of the Latin '(quod) interpretatur', which would seem to have been commonly used by Latin commentators in the same way as the BXIII glossator used 'vaut autant', that is, to introduce explanations of proper names. We find 'interpretatur' in Latin glosses on Mark 10.46 in Hugh and Av 36, on John 2.1 in RB 10522, RB 8939 and RB 1744 and on Luke 2.11 in Gorr; 'interpretatio' is used in the gloss on John 19.13 in Hugh. 'Interpretatur' and its French equivalent 'vaut autant' are used in very precise circumstances, and this means that we often find that 'vaut autant' does occur in BXIII glosses where there is 'interpretatur' in the Latin source. However, because its use is so clearly defined, the BXIII glossator does not need 'interpretatur' in his source for him to use 'vaut autant' in his gloss. If the circumstances are such that 'vaut autant' is the rhetorical device needed, then this is what the BXIII glossator will use. He uses it for his gloss on John 10.22 where the Latin commentaries have 'vocabant' (RB 8829), 'dicuntur' (the HS and Hugh), 'dicebatur' (RB 1744) and 'sonat' (RB 1744 and the HS).

'Vaut autant' may also be used internally in a BXIII gloss if that is where the glossator gives the interpretation of a name. An example of this is the gloss on John 19.14. This is a perfectly regular use of 'vaut autant', but in this gloss the definition is
presented at the end of the gloss almost by way of summary. 'Interpretatur' is found in one of the possible sources for this gloss (the Glossa), but, like other examples of this phrase, the presence of its Latin equivalent in a possible source gloss is not significant.

Quereuil has noticed an alternative to 'vaut autant' in the Genesis glosses; this is 'sonne autant'\textsuperscript{41}. This would seem to be the French equivalent of a Latin alternative to 'interpretatur', 'sonat', found, for example, in the glosses on John 10.22 in the HS and RB 1744 (and probably Hugh\textsuperscript{42}), and on John 19.13 in the HS and Hugh. In the BXIII glosses on these lemmas the glossator has used 'vaut autant'; 'sonne autant' is not a form found in the BXIII Gospels\textsuperscript{43}.

Another way for the BXIII glossator to begin a gloss is by using the verb 'noter', in 'notez que' in the glosses on John 14.27, Luke 23.43, and Luke 16.25 (where it is used in the middle of a gloss) and in 'por ce puet l'en noter' in the gloss on Mark 5.43(1). This would seem to be the equivalent of the Latin 'nota quia', found in the glosses on Matthew 26.6 in RB 1359, Matthew 26.38 in RB 9577 and Matthew 26.65 in RB 2604, and of 'nota quod', found in the gloss on Matthew 23.35 in Av 36. There are clues that suggest that 'nota quia' and 'nota quod' were used in relatively specific circumstances. The gloss on Matthew 26.6 in RB 1359 uses 'nota quia' in a gloss which makes a point about Jesus. This gloss reads 'In domo
Simonis leprosi et nota quia Iesus mundum redempturus morabatur in domo obedienti' (quoted here because, not being a likely source for the BXIII gloss, it is not given in Appendix I). In the glosses on Matthew 26.38 in RB 9577 and on Matthew 23.35 in Av 36, 'nota quia' and 'nota quod' are used to introduce something that is not said in the text (RB 9577 'nota quia non mors sed tempus mortis' and Av 36 'nota quod non est Zacharias'). Finally, in the glosses on Matthew 26.65 in RB 2604 and RB 1359, 'nota quia' is used to introduce a gloss on a custom, 'nota quia mos erat Iudeorum'. In the BXIII glosses, the three glosses using 'noter' to begin the gloss all discuss something which Christ did not say or do, thus reflecting both the gloss on Matthew 26.6 in RB 1359, which uses 'nota quia' about Christ, and those glosses on Matthew 26.38 in RB 9577 and on Matthew 23.35 in Av 36, which use 'nota quia' and 'nota quod' to introduce something which is not said in the text. The gloss on Luke 16.25, which uses 'notez que' in the middle of the gloss, uses it to begin that part of the gloss which draws attention to something which was said and something which was not said, thus reflecting the use of 'noter' at the beginning of both French and Latin glosses. The limited examples available prevent us from coming to a definite conclusion about the use of 'nota quia', 'nota quod' and the French equivalents, but there is enough here to suggest that, like 'vaut autant' and 'interpretatur', they were used to introduce a specific type of gloss material.
The BXIII Gospel glosses can also begin with a question and there are two distinct types of question to discuss here. The first is a question which reflects a question in the lemma, and the second is the *quaestio*.

Examples of glosses beginning with a question following a question in the lemma include those on Matthew 5.13, Mark 14.4, Mark 10.38(2), Mark 14.37, Luke 20.24 and John 8.52. In two of these examples, the Latin source also has the beginning of the gloss in the form of a question, in the gloss on Mark 14.37 in the HS and the gloss on Matthew 5.13 in RB 2604, Hugh and RB 9577. It would seem that the commentator or glossator, whatever language he was using, recognized that, when the lemma is in the form of a question, a good way of beginning the gloss (i.e. of beginning the gloss on that lemma) is to keep the syntax of the lemma the same but change the wording slightly. Copying the syntax is another of the techniques that Latin commentators used, and would seem to be another that the BXIII glossator has taken over from them. The BXIII Gospel glossator was evidently aware that this was a recognized technique in Latin glossing. Thus the presence of a gloss in his lemma would prompt his employment of this technique whether or not it was used in his Latin source.

The second type of question used in the BXIII glosses is the *quaestio*, and Quereuil has noticed that these occur
in the Genesis glosses. He distinguishes two ways of beginning a *quaestio* in the Genesis glosses (1) 'l'en puet demander', which he interprets as a translation of 'quaeri' and (2) 'l'en demande' for 'quaeritur'. The Gospel gloss on John 20.2 begins 'ici puet l'en fere une demande', which is very much like the phrases Quereuil has identified as beginning a *quaestio* in the Genesis glosses. Otherwise, *quaestiones* in the Gospel glosses begin with various phrases: 'mes que est oe ore ici elueques' (Mark 9.1), 'mes qui apelcit ici elueques' (Mark 9.12), 'mes quel mestier estoit il que' (Luke 2.52), 'mes qu'est ce a entendre' (Luke 16.23), 'mes ooment est ce que ... ci elueques' (Luke 22.43), 'mes por quoi' (John 19.27(2), John 16.23, Luke 18.13, Mark 7.28, Mark 10.39(2), Mark 15.22 and Mark 5.43(2)) and 'por quoi' (John 18.9 and John 15.26).

All but five of these Gospel glosses (John 15.26, John 18.9, Mark 9.1, Luke 2.52 and Luke 18.13) have possible Latin sources but none of these sources have *quaestiones* in their glosses on these lemmas. This would suggest that the BXIII glossator did not need a *quaestio* in his source to be able to put one in his own gloss. Once he had decided that a *quaestio* was needed at any particular lemma, then he could introduce it by using one of the phrases listed above, which would seem to be the French equivalents of Latin phrases such as 'quaeri' and 'quaeritur' (although we only have Quereuil's evidence for this).
An interesting point about these *quaestiones* in the BXIII Gospels is that most of them have been used where the glossator wishes to explain something which Christ did (for example John 8.9) or said (for example John 14.27 and Mark 9.12), or his reasons for doing or saying something (for example Mark 5.43(2)). They are used especially when the glossator wishes to explain a seeming ambiguity (for example Mark 7.28). We do not have *quaestiones* at these points in the Latin commentaries consulted for this study which suggests that this use of the *quaestio* is the glossator's own. The BXIII glossator also used a *quaestio* for the allegorical gloss on Mark 9.1, which again does not seem to have a Latin source.

To sum up: the *quaestiones* in the BXIII Gospels seem to have been used consciously and deliberately wherever the glossator explained Christ’s word, actions or motives.

Smalley has briefly touched on the use of ‘vel’ and ‘aliter’ by commentators to present a list of alternative explanations where there was no question of the answer affecting one’s faith. This is a use illustrated by the gloss on John 8.38 in RB 10328. The closest French equivalent for this in the BXIII Gospel glosses is the use of ‘ou autrement’ to begin the gloss in John 19.22. In this gloss, ‘ou autrement’ introduces an alternative phrasing of the lemma before this lemma is expanded. In that it introduces an alternative it is not unlike the use of ‘vel aliter’ in the gloss on John
8.38 in RB 10329, although it does not introduce a series of alternatives. The most that can be said for this particular example is that 'ou autrement' would seem to be the French equivalent of 'vel aliter'.

Quereuil has noticed that a common way of beginning the Genesis glosses is by quoting the author to whom the gloss is attributed\textsuperscript{47}. In the Genesis glosses this is done using a phrase such as 'si come Strabus dit' or simply 'Rabanus dist'\textsuperscript{48}. This practice is also found in the Gospel glosses, although not to the same extent as authors are more rarely named in the Gospel glosses than in the Genesis ones; we have 'Bedes dit' in the glosses on Luke 4.13 and Matthew 26.7(1), 'li mestres ... dit' in the gloss on Luke 2.21, and 'si come dit Bedes' in the gloss on Mark 14.3(2). These phrases would seem to be the French equivalents for two Latin devices: (1) simply stating the name of the author before giving the gloss (as in, for example, the gloss on John 8.44(2) in Hugh 'Augustinus Diabolus mendax est'), and (2) 'dicit autem' (found in the gloss on John 10.22, again in Hugh 'dicit autem Augustinus'). If the BXIII glossator wished to begin a gloss by attributing it to an author, then he would use either of the two devices available to him in French and would not need an equivalent in his source.
(2) Rhetorical devices used within the glosses

There are several rhetorical devices used within a gloss by the BXIII glossator, and some of these have been discussed above because they are also used to begin glosses. An example is 'vaut autant', often used at the beginning of a gloss, but used towards the end of the gloss on John 19.14. 'Vaut autant' is used to introduce explanations of names, and so can be used at any point in a gloss where such an explanation needs to be inserted. This would usually come at the beginning of a gloss, but not necessarily so. Wherever an explanation of a proper name is going to be given, wherever it comes in the gloss, then the conditions for the use of 'vaut autant' exist. This is true for many of the devices used for beginning a gloss; if the conditions exist for them, no matter where in the gloss these conditions may be, then the glossator will use them.

There are several more general techniques used within the glosses and an important one to consider is the careful construction of many of the BXIII glosses. The gloss material is often added layer by layer to build up the complete gloss. Such careful construction often follows a similarly careful construction in the Latin source. There are many examples of this in the BXIII Gospel glosses, and I shall only discuss three of them here: (i) Matthew 26.7(1) and Mark 14.3(2), (ii) John 2.4, and (iii) Matthew 5.13.
(i) The gloss on alabaster found on Matthew 26.7(1) and Mark 14.3(2) is constructed in the following way: the glossator begins by giving a brief definition of what alabaster is, then proceeds to say what it is used for, and concludes his gloss by explaining why it is used for the purpose it is. The glosses on Matthew 26.7(1) in RB 9577 and RB 2604 are constructed in exactly the same way. Other glosses on this lemma are also carefully constructed, although with a slight variation in order. The gloss in RB 10891, for example, begins by defining alabaster, then explains why it is used for ointments, and then explains what can be made from it, thus inverting what are the second and third elements in the BXIII glosses. In this case, the careful construction of the BXIII gloss reflects the similarly careful construction of the Latin glosses.

(ii) The gloss on John 2.4 is also carefully constructed. It begins by following the question form in the lemma (which is discussed above), restating the question a first time to introduce the first elements of his gloss (the ideas of 'humanité' and 'Deité'), and then brings out the implications of this material, still in question form. Next, the glossator proceeds to answer these questions, with an unequivocal statement which allows him to return to the material introduced in his initial question ('humanité' and 'Deité') and so to give an explicit answer to the question posed in the lemma. The possible source for this gloss (Hugh) has a gloss which
is also carefully constructed, although not in the same way. The gloss in Hugh begins not with a question as in the lemma, but with an initial answer introduced by the phrase 'quasi dicit'. This allows him to introduce the idea of 'humanity'. The Latin glossator later has an unequivocal phrase to match that in the EXIII gloss. The structure of these glosses may be different, but they both show that their glossators wrote their glosses after having thought carefully about the material which needed to be included in the gloss and the best way for it to be presented. That they came up with different answers is perhaps a reflection on the different audiences for whom they were writing.

(iii) The gloss on Matthew 5.13 also follows the question form of the lemma. It restates this question a first time to introduce the first element of the gloss, i.e. to replace 's'esvanist' with 'défaut'. The question is then repeated a second time with the second and third elements of the gloss, i.e. with 'sel' replaced by 'doctrine' and with 'saler' replaced by 'enseigner'. The glossator could have introduced all three elements of the gloss in a single phrase, but chose instead to do it in two. The possible source for this gloss, RB 2604, also has a gloss here which introduces the elements separately in its gloss. The Latin gloss does not follow the question form of the lemma but instead introduces a phrase beginning 'quasi dicit'. The first element of its gloss follows, in this case the interpretation of 'sal' as 'apostoli'.
who are 'principium doctrine'. This is then followed by an interpretation of 'evanuerit' as 'defecerint', which in turn is followed by an interpretation of 'salietur' as 'instruxerit'. These elements are the same as those in the BXIII gloss and although they have been introduced in a different order, they have still been introduced separately rather than in a single phrase.

These three BXIII glosses, therefore, illustrate the careful introduction of gloss material element by element. This is something which is also found in the Latin glosses on these lemmas. There is enough similarity to suggest that the BXIII glossator was aware that glosses needed to be constructed carefully, with each element introduced separately if necessary. It seems probable that his own usage derives from a knowledge of the techniques of Latin glossing. However, there is also enough of a dissimilarity to suggest that the BXIII glossator was not prepared simply to follow the construction of the gloss and the introduction of gloss material exactly as it was in his source. What he seems to be doing is approaching his source gloss critically, assessing how it has been put together, and writing his own in the light of that assessment, or completely independently.

Another more general technique used by the BXIII glossator within his glosses is that of changing a passive construction in the lemma into an active
construction in the gloss. This practice allows the glossator to make the gloss more explicit and also to introduce a change in emphasis. Two examples of this are the glosses on Matthew 23.7 and Luke 12.31. A similar change of construction is not found in the possible Latin sources for the gloss on Luke 12.31, but one is found in the gloss on Matthew 23.7 in Av 36. The BXIII gloss glosses the text's 'estre apelé mestre des homes' as 'aiment que li home les apelent mestres' (which introduces a slight change in emphasis) and the gloss in Av 36 reflects 'vocari ab hominibus Rabbi' in the lemma with 'se vocaverit magistrum' in the gloss. This is a reflexive construction, but still an active one rather than a passive one.

The Gospel glosses have only produced a small amount of evidence for this change from a passive construction in the text to an active one in the gloss. However, even such limited evidence suggests that this is a change that both Latin and French glossators could make if they wanted the explicitness or change in emphasis that such a change would bring. The BXIII glossator may well have examples of this treatment of the lemma in his Latin source glosses, but it seems that he would not have needed a direct parallel in his source to be able to use this technique in his own gloss.

Another frequent device used by the BXIII glossator is synonymity, that is, the use of one or occasionally more
synonyms of the lemma as a means of definition in the gloss.

It is not unusual to find that the choice of word found in a BXIII gloss of this kind has been governed by what the glossator had in his source. Some examples will illustrate this: the gloss on John 4.17 replaces 'bien' with 'voir', matching the Glossa's replacement of 'bene' with 'vere'; the gloss on John 8.48(1) replaces 'bien' with 'vérité' and Hugh replaces 'bene' with 'vere'; the gloss on Luke 2.22(3) replaces 'presentassent' with 'offrissent', and several Latin glosses on this lemma, including those in the Glossa, Hugh and PCh, replace 'sisterent' with 'offerrent'; and the gloss on Luke 22.22 replaces 'diffiné' with 'prophecié' which is matched by 'definitum' being replaced by 'praedixit' in the Glossa, by 'provisum' in Hugh and Av 36, and by 'praedordinatum' in Alex. A gloss may also replace a lemma with two synonyms rather than one. The gloss on Matthew 23.23 replaces 'dismez' with 'donez (disme)' and 'rendez (disme)'. In this particular example, 'donez' reflects the replacement of 'decimatis' with 'datis' in Av 36, Hugh and RB 8839,6. The BXIII glossator then seems to have added the second synonym ('rendez') himself49.

There are also a number of BXIII glosses which gloss their lemmas by synonymity and for which no Latin sources have been identified. These include: the gloss on Mark 10.40 which replaces 'repudiement' with 'refusement'; the
gloss on Mark 10.52 which replaces "sauf" with two
synonyms, "sane" and "gari"; the gloss on Mark 14.44
which replaces "tenez" with "prenez"; the gloss on
Matthew 5.24 which replaces "reconcilier" with
"amesnier"; the gloss on John 4.19 which replaces "voi"
with "apercoif"; and the gloss on John 19.10 which
replaces "paroles" with "responz".

It becomes clear from these examples that glossing by
synonymity is something which happens in Latin glosses as
well as in the BXIII Gospel glosses. In many BXIII
glosses the choice of word to use in this type of gloss
would appear to be governed by the word used in the Latin
source. However, this sort of glossing would seem to
have been one of the standard ways of treating a lemma in
Latin commentaries, and as such was adopted by the BXIII
glossator for his own glosses. Being a standard
technique, the BXIII glossator could use it wherever he
felt it was needed, and we should not be surprised that
he sometimes chose to use it in different places to his
Latin sources, given that the language he is working in
is French, not Latin. Some of the BXIII synonymic
glosses which have no Latin source may have been added by
the glossator in the knowledge that the word forming the
lemma was in some way linguistically or stylistically
problematic.

The BXIII glossator uses quotations of the lemma and of
other parts of the text within his gloss both to set up
the *quaestio* which he will then answer, and to help develop the explanation in his gloss. Speech is often quoted, especially Christ's. The glosses on John 19.27(2), John 18.9, John 15.26, Luke 23.43 and Luke 18.43 all use things Christ said either to set up the gloss or to develop it. Such speech used within a gloss is often the lemma for that gloss (as in the glosses on Luke 23.43 and John 15.26), although it may also be speech taken from elsewhere in the Gospels (as in the glosses on Mark 9.12, Luke 18.43 and John 19.27(2)). The glossator is also prepared to put speech into Christ's mouth; in the gloss on John 8.6 he provides things Christ could have said to develop his gloss.

(3) Rhetorical devices used to finish the gloss

Quotations of the lemma are also used at the end of a BXIII Gospel gloss to help reintegrate that gloss into the text. Sneddon has cited the examples of Mark 11.2 and Mark 14.350, and to these we can add those on John 19.14, John 14.9 and Luke 13.1. There are also several glosses where the essential point of the gloss is repeated at the end of the gloss as another way of reintegrating the gloss into the text (i.e. by reminding the audience why the text has been added to here); examples of this practice are the glosses on John 14.27, Luke 16.23, Mark 9.1 and Mark 5.43(2). Not only the longer glosses have their lemmas repeated at the end; the gloss on Mark 14.3(1) (one of Sneddon's examples) is a
short gloss. Furthermore, a lot of the longer glosses have no repetition of the lemma at the end, even though this might seem a sensible strategy to aid the reader when the gloss is particularly long or discursive. Longer glosses which omit a final repetition of the lemma include those on Luke 20.43, Luke 18.13, Luke 16.25, Mark 15.22, John 18.9 and Matthew 26.19. Latin commentaries would have tended not to need such a device. If they followed the standard gloss layout, then it would not have been needed, and if they were written as continuous text, then a common way of indicating the end of one gloss and the beginning of the next was to underline the text quotation placed at the head of the gloss.

It appears, therefore, that there were a number of rhetorical devices used to start, develop and finish a Latin gloss, and that these devices had their French equivalents which were available to the BXIII glossator to use in his own glosses. It is not only the *quaestio* that we find in both Latin and BXIII gloss, but also the use of such phrases as 'interpretatur' and 'vaut autant'. We may often find that a phrase in a Latin gloss is matched by the equivalent in the BXIII gloss, but this is far from being always the case. Such similarities are probably not significant when trying to decide which of several Latin commentaries was the source for a BXIII gloss. What is interesting is that the rhetorical devices used by the BXIII glossator were not invented by him or by anyone else for use in BXIII because of the
special nature of that text. These rhetorical devices are the French equivalents of many that were available to and were used by Latin commentators. The techniques by which a gloss is written in BXIII are very much the techniques by which a Latin gloss is written. The BXIII glossator is simply adapting for the vernacular the same devices he would have used had he been writing glosses in Latin instead of French.

It is interesting to consider what this use of Latin-glossing rhetorical devices suggests about the glossator of the BXIII Gospels. It is certainly fair to say that he is quite capable of using these rhetorical devices wherever he thinks they are appropriate, and does not depend on them being in his Latin source gloss. This is perhaps most noticeable in his use of the *quaestio*; most of his *quaestiones* have possible Latin sources, but none of these presents the material as a *quaestio*. However, the *quaestio* was obviously a form he was competent to use, and was a form he felt was not out of place in the BXIII Gospel glosses. Such confidence in using the *quaestio* form, and such clear knowledge that 'vaut autant' and perhaps 'noter' were to be used in specific circumstances and to introduce specific types of gloss material, both suggest that the BXIII Gospel glossator is not only aware of the rhetorical practices of Latin glossing, but is even skilled in using them.
I.5 Remaining problems

Two major areas for further study emerge from the above discussion. It is clear from the discussion of recurring themes in the BXIII Gospels glosses that the single most important theme, that of the morality presented, contains, for the most part, material not usually found in Latin Gospel commentaries, certainly in none examined for this thesis. Given this, and given the fact that there is another group of glosses which we can define by their content as vocabulary glosses, with material from texts other than commentaries, there is still work to be done on the types of texts the BXIII Gospel glossator may have used for his glosses. We have seen how his glosses fit into the commentary tradition; we need next to examine how they fit into other textual traditions.

The other major area for study is the question of translatorship. The glosses present a picture of coherent techniques. The patterns of treatment of Latin material recur throughout all four Gospels, and the rhetoric used in the glosses is equally regular throughout. This very coherence means that the question as to whether the Gospels were translated by more than one person must be addressed. This coherence in the Gospels perhaps suggests a single translator, but this is something which needs to be challenged before it can be either confirmed or denied.
The following two sections begin to address these two areas. Section II is a study of some other types of text, including some originally excluded from this thesis, not with a view to trying to identify direct sources, but with the intention of identifying the other types of text containing material found in the BXIII Gospel glosses. Section III contains a survey of several linguistic features in an attempt to begin to try and identify the work of different translators in the Gospels.

II Other possible sources

As has already been said, many of the BXIII Gospel glosses contain material which appears not to come from the Latin commentary tradition. The aim in this section is to examine texts falling within other traditions to see whether it is from these traditions that this material is likely to come, to identify alternative types of texts likely to have been used to complement any commentary material. It is not the intention here to try to identify direct sources, or additional sources as such.

Rather than discuss alternative sources for each of the sample glosses studied in this thesis, I shall consider the two largest coherent groups of glosses which do not seem to reflect the commentary tradition. These are the
linguistic or vocabulary glosses (which explain the meaning of a word either by giving an explanation of what it is or by giving synonyms of it) and the 'moral' glosses (concerned with the idea of proper behaviour).\textsuperscript{51}

II.1 Vocabulary glosses

This group of glosses includes all those which explain the meaning of a single word. Many of these use words in the gloss which are also found in Latin commentaries, but many of them would seem to have no Latin commentary as source. This raises the question of a non-commentary type source which Latin commentators might have used as well as the BXIII glossator. Similarities between some of these BXIII glosses and Latin commentaries may stem from a single source which both Latin commentator and French glossator used rather than from direct use of a Latin commentary.

As these BXIII glosses replace one word with another, the type of text which might prove to have similar material is the 'dictionary of biblical terms'\textsuperscript{52} that contains explanations of 'difficult' words in the Vulgate, such as the Elementarium doctrinae erudimentum completed in about 1053 by Papias\textsuperscript{53}, the Derivationes of Hugutio of Pisa in the late twelfth century\textsuperscript{54} and the Summa of Guillelmus Brito in the late thirteenth century.
The *Summa* of Guillelmus Brito, a popular aid to study, is by far the best known of these. Brito was a Franciscan who may have been a master in Paris. His *Summa*, written between 1250 and 1270, contains about 2500 entries most of which explain 'difficult' words in the Vulgate. The explanations are taken mostly from the work of other exegetes, Brito being quite honest about his intentions to produce a 'compilation';

Hic ego doctorum compendi scripta sacrorum
Floribus auctorum.

As we might expect from this, there is very little original writing in this work; as Daly and Daly say 'Brito rarely expresses himself, and then only to assert a choice between conflicting authorities' or to show 'some interest in the relationship between his sources, commenting, e.g., that Papias or Hugutio are dependent on Isidore'. When quoting from earlier authors, Brito usually gives the author's name, supplementing this at times with the name of the work and the place within that work from which the quotation was taken; quotations from more recent authors are usually given without any attribution. Named sources include Augustine, Bede, Jerome, the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville, Rabanus Maurus, the *Elementarium doctrinæ erudimentum* of Papias, the *Derivationes* of Hugutio of Pisa, Hugh and Richard of St Victor, the *Glossa Ordinaria*, Alexander Neckham, Peter Lombard, Peter
Comestor's Historia Scholastica, and Peter Riga's Aurora. There are also a number of classical sources, including Vergil's Aeneid, Horace's Satires and Epistles and Juvenal's Satires. Of these named sources, the most heavily used were the two preceding biblical dictionaries of Hugutio of Pisa and Papias of Isidore's Etymologies. Of Brito's relationship to the two earlier biblical dictionaries Daly and Daly say that he 'drew heavily on both ... and soon competed with them on equal terms throughout western Europe'. Bacon had a very low opinion of the value of this work; as Smalley says, it 'struck [him] as unscientific'. But Daly and Daly believe that 'The celebrity of the work of Brito to which Bacon testifies and the amount of attention which he pays to it in spite of his low opinion of its worth suggests a position of some prominence for its author.' Brito's Summa would seem to have been the most popular of the biblical dictionaries available in the thirteenth century, and given both this and the fact that it is a compendium of earlier material and thus allows access to that material, it seems an excellent text to check whether the BXIII glossator used a biblical dictionary, or biblical-dictionary type material, for the 'vocabulary' glosses in the BXIII Gospels. Its probable date of composition also makes this Summa an appropriate text to check; dated to between 1250 and 1270, it not only falls within the dates (c.1100 and c.1284) for commentaries to check for this study, but it may also prove to be more or less contemporaneous with BXIII and
reflect similar themes and concerns. It is also available in a modern edition edited by L W Daly and B A Daly, and it is this edition which has been used here.

1.1 a Brito's *Summa* and the vocabulary glosses

Brito's *Summa*, then, is to be studied to see if it, or another text of the same type, could have been used by the BXIII Gospel glossator as the source of his 'vocabulary' glosses, i.e. to see if this text or another like it contains the sort of material found in the BXIII vocabulary glosses. In his *Summa*, Brito treats the words he discusses in alphabetical order, and the BXIII 'vocabulary' glosses have lemmas consisting of one word which can be looked up in this text. Using Brito's *Summa* relies on being able to look up a single word or simple collocation. Lemmas which could send the glossator to Brito would be single-word lemmas, lemmas consisting of a two-word collocation, or longer lemmas which could be summed up in or expressed with a single key word. Lemmas which would be far less likely to send the glossator to look for material in Brito are those formed of sentences, and with no key word, examples of which include the lemma glossed in Mark 14.21(2) 'bone chose fust a lui s'il n'eust mie esté nez' and the genealogy gloss on Luke 3.38.
It is the 'vocabulary' glosses, therefore, that are to be compared to the material in Brito's *Summa*. When deciding which BXIII Gospel glosses to compare to the material in Brito, it is important to make our selection from those already compared to the Latin commentary material and not choose completely new glosses. What is needed is not just information as to whether the BXIII Gospel glosses have material in common with Brito. We also need to know whether this is material which is also found in Latin commentaries, and for this reason need material from Brito comparable to the Latin commentaries studied.

The simplest glosses to check in Brito are those which give one or more synonyms of a lemma and those which give definitions of words, things or concepts. Into this latter group fall glosses explaining Jewish festivals or customs, and many of the BXIII Gospel glosses on proper names. A selection of these glosses should prove adequate to see whether Brito, or some similar text, had material of the type which could have been used by the BXIII Gospel glossator for his vocabulary glosses, and also to show whether or not this is material found exclusively in this type of text, or is also found in commentaries (i.e. whether such material is unique to dictionaries of biblical terms or not).

The following discussion is intended to complement the detailed discussion of the BXIII Gospel glosses in chapters three to six above. The discussion on each
gloss is brief, and is concerned with identifying: (a) whether Brito has the same material as the BXIII gloss or not, and (b) whether this material is unique to Brito (and BXIII), and is not found in any Latin commentary. The glosses are arranged in three sections, the first dealing with those glosses giving one or more synonyms of the lemma, the second with those glosses defining or explaining a word, concept or thing, including those explaining Jewish customs and festivals and the third with those glosses giving interpretations of proper names. Glosses both with and without a possible Latin commentary source have been included in all three groups where possible.

(i) Glosses containing one or more synonym of the lemma

Matthew 5.7 'misericorde'

The BXIII gloss changes the lemma 'misericorde' to 'paradis'. Brito has no entry on misericordia⁸⁹, and there is no material in his entry on paradisus⁹⁰ which suggests that 'misericordia' could be interpreted as 'paradisus'. Brito does not therefore share material with this BXIII gloss.
Matthew 5.24 'reconcelier'

This BXIII gloss replaces the lemma 'reconcelier' with 'amesnier'. Brito has no entry on the Latin version of this lemma reconciliari$^91$ and does not, therefore, share material with this BXIII gloss. No Latin commentary source has been identified for this gloss either.

Matthew 13.49 'consonmacion'

The BXIII gloss replaces the lemma 'consonmacion' with 'fin'. Brito gives synonyms in his entry on consummare$^92$: 'Consummare id est finire, perficere, ad effectum duce... Proprie autem consummatus dicitur finitus, perfectus, ad effectum perductus'$.^93$. This shares 'finire' with the BXIII gloss. However, this material is not unique to Brito, three Latin commentaries (RB 1359, RB 2604 and Av 36) all having 'finis' in their glosses on this lemma.

Matthew 20.13 'injure'

This BXIII gloss replaces the lemma 'injure' with 'tort'. Brito, in his entry on iniuria$^{94}$, has 'Iniuria dicitur iniustitia ... Et iniurias ... dicitur tortuosus, non servans ius.' 'Tortuosus' reflects BXIII's 'tort', this material being unique to Brito, comparable to nothing in any Latin commentary studied to date.
Matthew 23.11 'menistre'

This gloss replaces the lemma (a noun) with a verb. Brito, in his entry on minister\textsuperscript{95}, defines 'ministerium' as 'servitium', which definition shares material with the BXIII gloss. No Latin commentary has any comparable material.

Matthew 23.23 'dismez'

The BXIII gloss gives synonyms of this lemma, 'donez et rendez (disme)'. Brito has no entry on decimo\textsuperscript{96}, in spite of the ambiguous meaning of this word\textsuperscript{97}. Six Latin commentaries gloss this lemma, and four of them have material which the BXIII Gospel glossator could have used.

Matthew 26.10 'moleste'

This gloss replaces the lemma with a synonym. Brito has no entry on molesto or molestus\textsuperscript{98}, and no Latin commentary source has been identified either.

Matthew 26.28 'remission'

This BXIII gloss replaces the lemma 'remission' with 'pardonement'. Brito has an entry on remittere\textsuperscript{99} which explains this as 'dimittere', 'condonare', 'dissolvere' and 'lenire'. Of these, it is 'condonare' which is
perhaps most like the material in the BXIII gloss. No Latin commentary has any material which could have been the source for this BXIII gloss; Brito remains the only text with any comparable material identified to date.

**Matthew 26.61 'redefier'**

This gloss replaces the lemma with a synonym. There is no entry in Brito on reedificare\textsuperscript{100}, but he does have an entry on reficere\textsuperscript{101}; anyone looking for 'reedificare' in Brito could not fail to see the entry on 'reficere', one would follow the other. It is therefore possible that someone looking for the meaning of, or a synonym for, 'reedificare' would see the entry for 'reficere' and use that instead. Brito's entry on 'reficere' reads 'Reficere dicitur iterum facere, restituere, recreare'. 'Restituere' and 'recreare' make it clear that 'reficere' could be used as a synonym for 'reedificare', and so this entry has material comparable to the that in the BXIII gloss. The Latin commentaries studied have nothing on this lemma.

**Mark 10.4 'repudiement'**

This BXIII gloss replaces the lemma 'repudiement' with 'refusement'. Brito, in his entry on repudium\textsuperscript{102}, has:

'Repudium dicitru repulsio ... Unde repudium dicitur quasi repelledium, id est repulsio ab ede.
Et inde repudio ... id est repellere vel refutare.  

Old French 'refusement' could mean 'repudiation' as well as 'refusal', comparable with the material in Brito. No Latin commentary has any material for this gloss.

Mark 10.52 'sauf'

This gloss replaces the lemma with two synonyms. Brito has no entry on the Latin equivalent of this lemma (Salvum), nor do any of the Latin commentaries studied.

Mark 14.44 'tenez'

This gloss replaces the lemma 'tenez' with 'prenez'. Brito has no entry on teneo, tenere or tenete, or prehendo. No Latin commentary studied for this thesis has material for this gloss either.

Luke 2.22(1) 'purgacion'

This BXIII gloss replaces the lemma 'la purgacion Marie' with 'que Marie fust purifiee'. What is needed from Brito, then, is the information that 'purgatio' and 'purificatio', or 'purgare' and 'purificare' are synonyms, but he has no entries on any of these words. However, ten Latin commentaries (PComD, Alex, Hugh, Bon,
Albt, Gorr, RB 10617, RB 10855, RB 9439 and Av 36) have comparable material with some form of 'purificare'.

Luke 2.22(3) 'presentassent'

This BXIII gloss replaces the lemma 'presentassent' with 'offrissent', and 'Nostre Seignor' with 'Deu le pere'.

Brito has an entry on sisto\textsuperscript{108} which gives a synonym of 'sistere': 'Item sistere dicitur representare'\textsuperscript{109}, following this with the quotation from Luke 2.22 which forms the lemma for this gloss. Most of his information on this word is syntactical. In any case, 'representare' is not like BXIII's 'offrissent', especially in the light of the fact that no fewer than thirteen Latin commentaries (the Gloss, ZC, PCh, Tour, Hugh, Gorr, RB 10109, RB 10855, RB 11374, RB 10891, Av 36, PComP and the HS) have some form of the verb 'offero' in their glosses on this lemma. The material in Brito is much less like that in this part of the BXIII gloss than is that found in any of these commentaries.

No Latin commentary has material for the change of 'Nostre Seignor' to 'Deu le pere', and this is not found in Brito either, who has no entry on dominus\textsuperscript{110}, and no relevant material in his entries on deus\textsuperscript{111} and pater\textsuperscript{112}. 
Luke 22.22 'diffiné'

This gloss gives a synonym of the lemma. Brito, with no entry on definitum \(^{113}\) has no comparable material, unlike five Latin commentaries (the Glossa, Av 36, Hugh, PComP and Alex), which do.

John 4.5 'alues'

This gloss replaces the lemma 'alues' with a synonym, and Brito, in his entry on preedium \(^{114}\) has material comparable to this gloss:

Predium dicitur possessio, villa, ager, sed proprie allodium. Et dicitur allodium hereditas quam vendere et donare possum \(^{115}\).

Brito's 'hereditas' reflects BXIII's 'eritage'. However, this material is not unique to Brito, two Latin commentaries (the Glossa and RB 10521) also using this word in their glosses on this lemma.

John 4.17 and John 8.48(1) 'bien'

Both of these BXIII glosses replace 'bien' with a synonym, with 'voir' in the first instance and 'vérité' in the second. Brito has no entry on bene \(^{116}\), hence no comparable material. Material for both glosses is found, however, in commentaries, in the Glossa for first gloss and RB 8829 and Hugh for the second.
John 4.19 'voi'

This BXIII gloss replaces the lemma 'voi' with a synonym, but Brito, with no entry on video\textsuperscript{117}, has no comparable material, like all of the Latin commentaries studied to date.

John 4.36 'queult'

This gloss replaces the lemma 'queult' with a synonym. Brito, in his entry on meto\textsuperscript{118}, has 'Meto ... proprie autem dicitur messes colligere' and such an entry might have suggested the synonym 'moissone' to the BXIII Gospel glossator. Four Latin commentaries (the Glossa, RB 8829, RB 10521 and RB 10328) all use a word which could also have prompted the glossator's 'moissone', as, indeed, could the presence of 'meto' in the Vulgate, even though the glossator chose to translate this using 'queult'.

John 10.11 'ame'

This gloss replaces the lemma 'ame' with 'vie', and Brito, in his entry on anima\textsuperscript{119} has 'sed anima vite est\textsuperscript{120}', which reflects the BXIII glossator's use of 'vie' as a synonym for 'ame'. However, four Latin commentaries (RB 9958, RB 11545, RB 1744 and the Glossa) all have material comparable with BXIII's 'vie', three of them (RB 11545, RB 1744 and the Glossa) using 'vitam'.
John 19.2 'avironerent'

This gloss replaces the lemma with a synonym. Brito has no entry on the Latin equivalent circumoido\textsuperscript{121}, and no comparable material. No Latin commentary has comparable material either.

John 19.10 'paroles'

This gloss replaces the lemma with a synonym, and again, Brito has no entry on the Latin equivalent (loquor\textsuperscript{122}) and has therefore no comparable material. No possible Latin commentary has comparable material either.

(ii) Glosses containing a definition or explanation

Matthew 1.25 and Luke 2.7 'premier né'

Brito has an entry on primogenita\textsuperscript{123}, part of which can be compared to the two BXIII Gospel glosses:

\begin{quote}
Et nota quod primogenitus dicitur primus natus et post quem est alius vel alii. Sic Esau dicitur primogenitus Isaac. Item primogenitus dicitur ante quem nullus nec post quem alius. Et sic Christus dicitur primogenitus Beate Virginis\textsuperscript{124}.
\end{quote}

Brito, like Latin commentators, would seem to have used Bede for this entry, and would also seem to have been aware of the potential ambiguity of Bede's gloss (i.e.
the question as to whether 'primogenitus' is synonymous with 'unigenitus'. Rather than suggest that 'primogenitus' has a single meaning, however, Brito presents it as having two: the first being that 'primogenitus' does not mean 'unigenitus', and thus can Esau be described as 'primogenitus' even though he had a twin brother, and the second as being that 'primogenitus' means 'unigenitus', and thus can Christ be called 'primogenitus Beatae Virginis'. That 'primogenitus' means 'unigenitus' is what the BXIII Gospel glossator has in his glosses, found in two Latin commentaries (Av 36 and the Glossa). Like these commentaries, Brito has no material to cover the first part of the gloss in Matthew ('il ne jut charnelement o lui, ne enprés ne devant'), but as with the possible commentary sources, the BXIII glossator may not have needed material for this. Nor does Brito explain (again as in the Matthew gloss) that using 'primogenitus' for 'unigenitus' was a custom at this time.

A definition such as is found in Brito could have been used for the interpretation of 'primogenitus' found in these two BXIII Gospel glosses. Brito recognizes that there is some ambiguity about the meaning of this term, and gives both possibilities. If the BXIII glossator used Brito, all he had to do was choose the interpretation which he wanted for his own gloss. This is an interpretation which is not unique to Brito, however, although the giving of both does not occur in
any of the Latin commentaries consulted for this study. Material comparable to that in the BXIII gloss is found in both the commentary tradition (in the Glossa and Av 36) and in the biblical dictionary tradition (Brito). There is, of course, the problem of cross-fertilization. It is entirely possible that commentators used biblical dictionaries (although both Av 36 and the Glossa predate Brito), and vice versa. Brito certainly used the Glossa. Brito, therefore, has material which the BXIII Gospel glossator could have used, though this material is also found in Latin commentaries.

**Matthew 8.5 and Mark 15.39 'centuriens'**

Brito defines *centurio*, with quotes from Persius and Papias, as:

> 'Centurio a centum dicitur qui "preest c viris ... unde heo centuria, id est centum homines, in re militaria". ... Papias vero dicit sic, "centurio est qui preest c militibus"' 126.

This is very much like the explanations found in the BXIII Gospel glosses, these having 'pooir' (Matthew) and 'poëste' (Mark). It is also an explanation which is found in Latin commentaries, notably RB 11654 and RB 8893,6 (on Matthew) and Av 36 and Hugh (Mark). Again, Brito and Latin commentaries share the same material, also found in the BXIII gloss.
Matthew 8.15 'amenistra'

This gloss replaces the lemma with a brief definition. Brito has an entry on minister\textsuperscript{127}, which defines 'ministerium' as 'servitium', matching BXIII's 'servi', but in Brito this is not related to food ('au mengier' in the BXIII gloss). The definition in Brito is therefore more general, and less tied to the context, than that in BXIII. No Latin commentary has material comparable to the BXIII gloss, and general though it is, the Brito material is therefore most like the BXIII material of any text studied to date.

Matthew 23.2 'chaiere'

This BXIII gloss gives a figurative interpretation of 'la chaiere Moysi' as 'la doctrine que Moyses ensaigna'. Brito, in his entry on cathedra\textsuperscript{128} gives a literal interpretation of this as 'sedes est doctoris'\textsuperscript{129}, with a quotation from the Historia Scholastica, 'in cathedris sedebant doctores in gignasio'\textsuperscript{130}. This is not very much like the material in the BXIII gloss, which is much better covered by four Latin commentaries (the Glossa, RB 2604, RB 1359 and Av 36), all of which interpret 'cathedram' as 'doctrinam Moysi'.

\textsuperscript{127} Brito's entry on minister
\textsuperscript{128} Brito's entry on cathedra
\textsuperscript{129} 'sedes est doctoris' from the Historia Scholastica
\textsuperscript{130} 'in cathedris sedebant doctores in gignasio' from the Historia Scholastica
Matthew 26.7(1) and Mark 14.3(2) 'alabastre'

Brito begins his definition with an explanation of what alabaster was used to make, 'Alabastrum unguenti dicitur pixis de alabaustro, quod continet unguentum', and then continues with a definition of alabaster taken from the Historia Scholastica. Ten Latin commentaries also contain definitions of alabaster, four of which (RB 9577, RB 2604, RB 9978 and RB 10891) are more likely sources for the BXIII gloss than the others (including the Historia Scholastica). The definition in Brito, with the information (additional to the quotation from the Historia Scholastica) that alabaster was used for boxes for holding unguents, means that Brito compares favourably with the four commentaries listed. Brito used Bede, but, like the Latin commentaries, does not provide the source for the glossator's claim (in both glosses) that Bede was his source. The material in Brito is again not unique.

Matthew 26.17, Mark 14.12 and Luke 22.7 'jorz des azimes'

All of these BXIII glosses give the information that on this day people were not allowed to eat any 'levain', and the gloss in Luke adds 'miel' wrongly. Brito has an entry on azimus in which he explains that 'Azimus ... id est sine fermente', and quotes the Glossa, "id est xiii luna quando abieicto fermento agnus occidebatur ad
vesperum". In a second entry, on *prima azimorum*\textsuperscript{134}, he says that:

>'Prima azimorum "est xiii die mensis quando agnus immolatur et luna plenissima est et fermentum abicitur". Ita dicit Papias\textsuperscript{135}.

This is very like the quotation from the Glossa in the earlier entry. Both of these entries contain the information in the BXIII glosses, that people could not eat 'fermento'.

Seven Latin commentaries also have material comparable to the BXIII gloss, some of them repeating this information like the BXIII glossator. These are RB 9577, RB 1359, the Glossa, Av 36 and Hugh (on Matthew), the Historia Scholastica, and again Av 36 and Hugh (on Mark) and RB 9959 and Av 36 (on Luke). The material for this BXIII gloss could therefore have come from a commentary or a text like Brito's *Summa*.

**Matthew 26.19** and **Mark 14.16** 'apareillerent la Pasque'

These two BXIII glosses have the same lemma, but the gloss in Matthew is much longer than that in Mark, containing the information that is in the Mark gloss, and supplemented with material from the account of Passover given in Exodus 12.6-11. Brito has material which could have been used for these glosses in his entries on
azimus\textsuperscript{136} and prima azimorum\textsuperscript{137}. He also has an entry on pascha\textsuperscript{138}.

There is no material for these BXIII glosses in the entry on pascha and not very much in the other entries. Both of these entries give the information that the lamb is killed on the fourteenth day\textsuperscript{139}. The entry on azima also gives (quoting Bede) the information that this happened 'quando filii Israel egressi sunt de Egypto'\textsuperscript{140}. This material covers the gloss in Mark, but very little of the gloss in Matthew.

However, the gloss in Mark is also covered by material in Av 36, as well as Brito, and that in Matthew could, in part, come from Av 36, the Glossa and the Historia Scholastica. Most of the BXIII gloss in Matthew, however, is from the account in Exodus, not given in Brito. Brito, therefore, shares material on Mark with Latin commentaries, and does not give the extra material needed for the Matthew gloss, found in Exodus.

Matthew 26.39, Mark 10.38(1), Mark 10.39(1) and Mark 14.36 'henap'

All four of these glosses give a figurative interpretation of 'henap' as the 'death which Christ must suffer'. Brito has an entry on calix\textsuperscript{141}, but there is no figurative interpretation of it given here. Figurative interpretations of 'calix' are found in Latin
commentaries, however, in Av 36 and the Glossa for the
gloss in Matthew and in Hugh and Av 36 for those in Mark.

Matthew 26.65 and Mark 2.7 'blaspheme'

Both BXIII glosses include a definition of 'blaspheme',
and the gloss in Matthew explains what it was the custom
that one should do when one heard someone blaspheme.
Brito has an entries on blasphemare\textsuperscript{142}, blasphemia\textsuperscript{143}
and blasphemus\textsuperscript{144}, all of which give the same
definition - to quote the entry on blasphemare (in
turn, quoting Hugutio) - 'idem est quod " reprehendere,
detrahare, vituperare"'.\textsuperscript{145} The entry on blasphemia
adds that 'blasphemia' is 'irreligiosa', and a sin 'Et
est valde magnus peccatum, maxime quando fit in deum'.\textsuperscript{146}
Brito has no material for the second part of the gloss in
Matthew, describing how people tear their clothes when
they hear someone blaspheme.

No Latin commentary has any definition of the lemma, and
it is the material in Brito which is, to date, most
comparable with the gloss in Mark, and with the first
part of the gloss in Matthew.

Matthew 27.62 and John 19.14 'Parasceve'

Both glosses give 'preparacion' as a synonym for
'Parasceve' in their glosses, and the gloss in Matthew
explains this further, as being preparation for Passover.
The gloss in John also explains about the Jews not being able to do anything on that day, not even prepare their food, about Passover being 'ombre et senefiane' of Easter, and about the etymology of the word 'Parasceve'.

Brito's entry on Parasceve\(^1\), quoting the Historia Scholastica, gives 'preparatio\(^2\)' as being the Latin version of the Greek 'parasceve', and the information that 'Sic decebant feriam sextam quia in ea preparabant necessaria sabbato\(^3\). This is basically what is found in the Matthew gloss and at the beginning of the John gloss. Brito has nothing, however, on the Jews not being allowed to do anything at all, or about 'parasceve' prefiguring Easter. He does have material on the etymology of this word, though, quoting the Historia Scholastica on its being Greek 'Parasceve "greoe, latine preparatio ... Grecis ammixtis Iudei ouetebantur vocabulis"', this last part presumably being meant for 'crebro utebantur Grecis vocabulis'. It is hard to see what the version in Brito was thought or meant to mean, but it is certainly possible that someone reading it could take it to mean that Greek has Jewish words mixed in with it, or that Jesus used Greek words, perhaps wrongly believed to be Hebrew (or Aramaic) words. This is a possible source for the BXIII Gospel glossator's representation of 'Parasceve' as a Hebrew word rather than a Greek one, although the fact that Comestor even feels the need to explain that the Jews used Greek vocabulary suggests that some people assumed that the
Jews only used Hebrew words, not realizing that some used Greek words, or that a Greek word for a Jewish festival could be given in Greek in the Gospels. Hence the confused belief that ‘Parasoeve’ was Hebrew (the Hebrew for this being ‘pesach’) and not Greek.

There is material in Brito for the gloss in Matthew, but then similar material is likewise found in six Latin commentaries, (the Historia Scholastica of course, plus the Glossa, RB 2604, RB 1359, RB 9957, RB 8893, 6). Nor does the material in Brito change the rather complicated conclusion about the sources of the gloss in John, since it is no closer to this gloss than the Historia Scholastica. It seems unlikely that the material in Brito, given the material in the John gloss, could have been used on its own for the BXIII Gospel gloss.

**Mark 2.10 'sachiez'**

This gloss replaces the lemma with a short definition. Brito has no entry on scio, and no comparable material is found in any Latin commentary either.

**Mark 10.27 'le pertuis d'une aguille'**

Brito’s entry on foramen aoua is taken in part from the Historia Scholastica, with some additional material which goes some way towards explaining the image. The material in Brito is, therefore, comparable
with that in this BXIII gloss, but is no closer to it than the material in the Historia Scholastica, which in turn is not as close to this BXIII gloss as the material in Av 36. The material in Brito is less like that in the BXIII gloss than is material found in a Latin commentary.

Mark 10.33(2) 'paeiens'

This gloss explains who is meant by the lemma. Brito's entry on gens\textsuperscript{157} has no material comparable with that in this BXIII gloss, none being found in any Latin commentary either.

Mark 14.38 'enferme'

This gloss explains what is meant by the lemma. Brito has no entries on infirmus\textsuperscript{158} or caro\textsuperscript{159} and therefore has no material comparable with this BXIII gloss. The Historia Scholastica remains the only text with such material studied to date.

Mark 15.7 'homicide'

This gloss gives a definition of 'homicide'. Brito has no entry on homicidium\textsuperscript{160}, and no Latin commentary studied here has material for this gloss.
Mark 15.16 'pretoire'

This gloss gives a definition of 'pretoire'. Brito has an entry on pretorium, but the material in it is not very much like that in the BXIII gloss as it does not explain what happens in a 'pretorium', or what the function of a 'pretor' is:

Pretorium dicitur locus in quo pretor residet. ... Est autem pretor idem quod prepositus, sed prepositus proprie est in ecclesia, pretor in civitate. Unde Papias, pretor dicitur quasi princeps et preceptor sit civitatis.

The explanation found here, that 'pretor' is a secular term (used 'in civitate') rather than an ecclesiastical term, is not what we have in the BXIII gloss. The explanation of 'pretor', 'Vel dicitur pretor quasi pre alius torquens vel quia praeest tormentis', does not take us any closer to the BXIII gloss.

The material in Brito is not as much like the BXIII gloss as that in the one Latin commentary (Av 36) which defines this term; this has 'pro tribunali', which at least explains what happens in a 'pretorium'.

Luke 2.21 and John 7.22 'circoncis'

Brito has no entry on circoncisio. He does, however, have an entry on preputium which provides material for the definition of 'prepuce' found in both of
these BXIII glosses. Brito has ‘Preputium dicitur “anterior pellis priapi que preputatur, id est preciditur, Iudeis”’166. This provides some material for ‘prepuce est proprement le bout del secré membre que l’en trenche a cel qui l’en circoncit selonc la loi as Juys’ in the Luke gloss, and ‘l’en li tranchoit le bout del membre genitaille’ in the John gloss. However, Brito makes no mention of this being done as part of the Jewish ceremony of circumcision, and there is no material in his entry for any of the other material in the BXIII glosses (i.e. that the Historia Scholastia tells that an angel gave Christ’s foreskin to Charlemagne in the Luke gloss, and that the child was given his name at the same time, and that the stone used for the ceremony is wrongly believed to the one with which David killed Goliath in the John gloss).

Brito provides the definition of ‘prepuce’ needed for the BXIII glosses, but nothing else. The Historia Scholastia is indeed the source for the story in the Luke gloss, and no source has been found for the story in the John gloss. A definition like that in Brito could not have been used on its own for either of these glosses, but may have been used in combination with the Historia Scholastia (or some other text giving material from this) for the gloss in Luke and with some unidentified source for the John gloss.
Luke 12.47 'batuz de moltes plaies'

This gloss explains what this lemma means. Brito has an entry on the Latin version of this lemma (vapulo\textsuperscript{167}), but this entry has very little material in it which could have been used for the BXIII gloss. It does have 'significat passionem'\textsuperscript{168}, but this is not very much like BXIII's 'tormentez de moltes manieres de tormenz'. However, no Latin commentary has material comparable with this gloss, meaning that the material in Brito is all that we are able to consider here. However, Brito is perhaps too far removed from the BXIII gloss for it to be considered comparable material.

Luke 16.23 'el sain Abraham'

Brito's entry on \textit{sinu Abrahe}\textsuperscript{169} is nothing more than a quotation from the Historia Scholastica, and has no unique material. To get the best possible coverage of this BXIII gloss, the Historia Scholastica (and thus Brito) needs to be complemented with material from other commentaries, hence neither the Historia Scholastica nor Brito would seem to have been used on its own\textsuperscript{170}.

Luke 20.46 'estoles'

This BXIII gloss gives a definition of the lemma 'estoles'. Brito has two entries which are relevant to this gloss, one on \textit{stola}\textsuperscript{171} and another on \textit{ephot}\textsuperscript{172}.  

---

\textsuperscript{167} vapulo
\textsuperscript{168} significat passionem
\textsuperscript{169} sinu Abrahe
\textsuperscript{170} Historia Scholastica
\textsuperscript{171} stola
\textsuperscript{172} ephot
There is no material comparable with that in the BXIII gloss in the entry on *stola*, but at the end of this entry, Brito says of 'stola' that 'Et ponitur quandoque pro ephot vel logion', finishing with a cross reference to his entry on *ephot*. Having established a link between 'stola' and 'ephot', it is clear that whatever is said about 'ephot' is applicable to 'stola', and it is indeed in the entry on 'ephot' that there is material comparable to that in the BXIII gloss. In a long entry describing priestly vestments, Brito says:

Ephot, quod interpretatur latine superindumentum; erat enim pallium superhumeral supercoloribus et auro contextum, habens in utroque humero lapides duos smaragdinos auro conclusos in quibus sculpta erant nomina patriarcharum.\(^{173}\)

and later gives a long quotation from the Historia Scholastica (on Exodus\(^{174}\)), including a lengthy description of 'ephot'\(^{175}\) which also makes the sumptuousness of this garment clear.

Five Latin commentaries (Av 36, PComD, RB11374, RB 9960 and RB 9939) have some explanation of the lemma 'stola', but the closest that any of them have to BXIII's 'bele robes et precious' is 'ornatum' (RB 9939) and 'purpura' (RB 11374 and RB 9960). Brito's description, with gold and emeralds, is a more detailed description and this, or something like it, is perhaps more likely to have inspired the BXIII glossator's brief description using
'beles' and 'precious'. In this case, the material in Brito is closer to that in the BXIII gloss than is the material in any Latin commentary, although it is still possible that the BXIII glossator used the information in Exodus 28.6-12 directly.

John 2.6 'purificacioin'

This BXIII gloss explains about the Jewish custom of 'purificacioin', but this cannot be from Brito as he has no entry on purificatio176. Material from a Latin commentary (RB 9958) remains the most like that in this BXIII gloss.

John 2.13 'pres'

This gloss replaces the lemma 'pres' with a short definition. Brito has no entry on the Latin version of this lemma prope177, and there is nothing on it in any Latin commentary, meaning that for this BXIII gloss, no comparable material has been found in any text studied to date.

John 8.3 'scribe'

This gloss gives a definition of the lemma 'scribe'178. Brito also gives a definition of this term179, although this does not contain the material needed for the BXIII gloss180, making no mention of the 'lex' needed for
BXIII's 'loi'. The definitions of 'scriba' in three Latin commentaries (RB 10328, RB 10521 and RB 1744) all mention 'lex', and are therefore all more likely sources for this BXIII gloss than Brito.

John 8.28(1) 'essauceroiz'

This gloss gives a definition of 'essauceroiz', but there is no corresponding definition of exaltaveritis in Brito. Nor is there any entry on crux. It is only in Latin commentaries (RB 8717 and RB 10328 taken together) that we find any material comparable with this BXIII gloss.

John 8.31 'demorez en ma parole'

This gloss gives a definition of 'demorez' and a synonym for 'parole'. Brito has no entry on maneo and there is nothing in his entry on sermo which is comparable with the BXIII synonym of 'parole'.

John 8.37 'prent'

This gloss gives a figurative interpretation of this lemma, but Brito has no entry on the Latin equivalent capio. Nor is there anything in his entry on sermo which could have suggested the interpretation of 'prent' given in the BXIII gloss. The Latin
commentary RB 9958 remains the only text with material comparable with this BXIII gloss.

**John 8.40(1) 'ocirre'**

This gloss gives a brief definition of the lemma, and Brito has an entry on the Latin equivalent of this lemma *interficere*. His entry reads 'Interficere est inter duo divisionem facere, scilicet inter corpus et animam.' This looks like an unlikely source for BXIII's 'tretier a mort', unless one reasons that separating the body and soul means killing the body with the result that the soul leaves it. No Latin commentary has any material which could have been the source for this BXIII gloss, and Brito's entry is so different to the BXIII gloss as to make it an extremely unlikely source.

**John 8.43 'choissiez', John 8.47(2) and John 10.27 'ot' and 'oent'**

These three glosses all give figurative interpretations of their lemmas, the Latin version of which is, in each case, some form of the verb 'audio'. Brito has no entry on *audio*, and no figurative interpretation of this word in his entries on *sermo* and *verba*, which occur with the lemmas in two of these glosses, and no entry at all on *vox*, which occurs with the third. No Latin commentary has material comparable with the glosses on John 8.43 and 8.47(2), although three Latin
commentaries (RB 8829, RB 8893,5 and RB 10521) all give interpretations of 'vooem meum audiunt' which could have been the source for the interpretation of this lemma found in the gloss on John 10.27.

John 8.56 'vooir' and 'mon jor'

This gloss replaces 'vooir' with two synonyms and explains the meaning of 'mon jor'. Brito has no entries on either *video*¹⁹², hence on synonyms of this word, or *diem meum*¹⁹³, hence no explanation of this term. One Latin commentary (RB 9920) has material for both parts of this BXIII gloss.

John 10.12 'mercennerres'

This gloss gives a definition of the lemma, and a definition is also given in Brito's entry on *mercenarius*¹⁹⁴: 'Mercenarius est qui servit pro accepta mercede, conductus pro pretio'¹⁹⁵. This contains the material needed for the BXIII gloss, and is a more likely source than the Latin commentary (RB 11545) which also gives a definition of this term.

John 10.22 'Encenies'

This gloss gives a definition of the lemma. Brito has an entry on *Encenia*¹⁹⁶ which takes material from Jerome and
the Historia Scholastica and includes material which could have been used for the BXIII gloss:

Encenia ... diuuntur initiationes, nova festa, siunt dedicationes ecclesiarum ... Encenia, siunt dicit Beatus Hieronymus, dedicationes templi festivitas ... 197

This material could have been used for the BXIII gloss. However, material for this BXIII gloss is also found in five Latin commentaries (RB 10521, RB 8717, RB 1744, the HS and Hugh).

John 14.2 'la meson mon pere'

This gloss explains what is meant by the lemma, and Brito, with no entry on domo Patris mei198 and nothing appropriate in his entry on celum199, has no material which could have been the source for this gloss. Seven Latin commentaries (RB 8829, RB 8893, 5, RB 110328, RB 10521, RB 8717, RB 8939 and the Glossa) all have material which could have been used for this BXIII gloss.

John 14.30 'li princes de cest monde'

This gloss explains that the lemma refers to the devil and why. In his entry on princeps mundi200 Brito has the same interpretation of the term, and offers an explanation which is not unlike that given in the BXIII gloss, 'quia principatur mundanis hominibus quibus quasi suis pecoribus dominatur'. The identification of the
'devil' as 'li princes de cest monde' is also found in five Latin commentaries (RB 8829, RB 9958, RB 8893,5, RB 8717 and RB 11545), but only two (RB 9958 and RB 8893,5) give any explanation as to why this is so. However, the explanation given in Brito is closer to that given in the BXIII gloss, and the material in Brito is therefore a more likely source for this gloss than any of the Latin commentaries studied for this thesis.

**John 19.12(2) 'contredient'**

This gloss gives a definition of the lemma, but Brito has nothing on the Latin *contradico* and is not the source for this gloss. No Latin commentary glosses this lemma either.

**John 19.24 'sortissons'**

This gloss gives a very brief definition of the lemma as 'gitons sort', thus changing a verb to a noun. Brito, in his entry on *sortior* does the same:

Sortior, tiris dicitur per sortes divinare, subministrare, dividere, adipisci. Et dicitur a sors, sortis sortito, id est per sortes.

This could have been used for the BXIII gloss. However, the glossator may not have needed any source for this other than the Vulgate, as 'miserunt sortem' (quoted in the gloss on this lemma in RB 8993,5) occurs later in the same verse.
(iii) Glosses explaining proper names

Matthew 2.6 and Luke 2.11 'Bethlehem'

Brito's entry on this lemma refers to the prophecy from Micah 5.2 and interprets 'parvulus' as 'vicos'. This entry could have provided material for the gloss in Matthew, but does not; nor does it have anything at all like the interpretation of the lemma found in the Luke gloss. Nor does Brito have entries on civitas David and David which could have contained material for the Luke gloss. Latin commentaries, however, contain material comparable to both.

Matthew 27.53 'la sainte cité'

This BXIII gloss interprets this lemma as meaning 'Jerusalem'. Brito has no entry on sancta civitas and no suggestion in his entry on Jerusalem that it could be called 'la sainte cité'. Brito does not, therefore, have the material, found in three Latin commentaries (the Glossa, RB 2604 and RB 9957), and needed for this BXIII gloss.

Mark 2.14 'Levi'

This BXIII gloss replaces the lemma 'Levi' with 'Matheu'. Brito has no entries on either of these names. It is,
however, material which is found in three Latin commentaries.

**Mark 10.46 'Jericho'**

This gloss interprets 'Jericho' as meaning 'lune'. Brito has no entry on Iericho\(^{210}\), and there is nothing in his entry on luna\(^{211}\) which suggests that this is a possible interpretation of the name 'Jericho'. Three Latin commentaries (the Glossa, Av 36 and Hugh) do have this interpretation.

**Mark 15.22 'mont Escauvaire'**

This BXIII gloss explains the meaning of this name, how the place got this name, and repeats the story that some people believe wrongly that it is the site of Adam's tomb. Brito, in his entry on Calvaria\(^{212}\), has material for parts of this gloss. He explains, as does the BXIII gloss, that 'calvaria' means 'os de la teste', 'Proprie autem calvaria est superius os capitis humani supercilliiis imminens'\(^{213}\), and quotes Papias on it being bald\(^{214}\), 'esnue de tout en tout de char' being the version in the BXIII gloss. Brito also explains that some people believe (wrongly) that 'Calvaria' is the site of Adam's tomb, his account\(^{215}\) being largely dependent on that given in the Historia Scholastica, even down to including the same quotation from Ephesians. Brito adds to the fact that 'Calvaria' is not Adam's tomb by
explaining that it is near Hebron 'Adam vero sepultum iuxta Hebron in Iesu filii Nave volumine (Js 14.13) legimus'216.

Brito therefore provides material for much of the BXIII gloss, but then so do four Latin commentaries (the Historia Scholastica of course, the Glossa, Hugh and Av 36). Brito is a more likely source than the Glossa and Hugh, the Glossa account being brief and that in Hugh omitting the belief that 'Calvaria' is the site of Adam's tomb. Brito is about as likely a source for this BXIII gloss as the Historia Scholastica, and this account needs to be complemented by that in Av 36 to cover as much of the gloss as possible. The account in Brito, therefore, could have provided some of the material found in this BXIII gloss, but, like the Historia Scholastica, does not provide all of the material used on its own.

John 2.1 'Chana' and 'Galilee'

This BXIII gloss explains the meanings of these two names, but Brito has no entries on either of them217. He does, however, have an entry on zelus218, in which he writes:

'Simon vero apostolus zelotes dictus est a vico Gallilée, Chana, ubi aquas dominus convertit in vinum, Chana enim zelus interpretatur, et inde Chananeus, id est zelotes219.'
This contains the material needed for the definition of Cana given in the BXIII gloss and could have been its source, providing of course that the glossator knew to look up 'zelus' (and if he knew to look up 'zelus', then he knew that it could mean 'Chana' and would not have needed to consult Brito's entry). Nevertheless, the information is in Brito, and the glossator could have got it from here. However, Brito has no entry on transmigratio\textsuperscript{220}, thus no material for the interpretation of Galilee found in the BXIII gloss.

Brito provides material for part of this gloss. Seven Latin commentaries (RB 9958, RB 10328, RB 10521, RB 8939, RB 11545, RB 1774 and the Glossa), however, have interpretations of both names, and hence could have provided the material for it all.

**John 19.13** 'Lithostracos'

This gloss explains the meaning of the name, and Brito has an entry which does the same\textsuperscript{221}, beginning 'Lithostratos dicitur varietas pavimenti'\textsuperscript{222} and continuing with more detailed explanations from Hugutio and Isidore. The initial explanation though, contains all that is needed for the BXIII gloss, and the material in Brito is therefore comparable with that in the BXIII gloss. Five Latin commentaries (RB 8933,4, RB 9981, RB 8717, Hugh and the HS) also give explanations of this name, three of them (Hugh, the HS and RB 8717) using the same words as Brito. Any of these three commentaries, as
well as Brito, could have been the source for this BXIII gloss.

Could the BXIII Gospel glossator have used Brito?

Seventy-nine of the original sample glosses have been compared to material in Brito’s Summa, and the results are:

Glosses with material found only in Brito: 11223.

Glosses with part of their material found only in Brito: 2224.

Glosses with material found only in Latin commentaries: 27225.

Glosses with material found in both Brito and at least one Latin commentary: 19226.

Glosses with a possible commentary source for both parts of the gloss and Brito as a possible source for only one part of it: 1227.

Glosses with a possible Bible source: 3228.

Glosses with no possible identified source: 15229.
Twelve of these glosses have material found only in Brito, two have part only of their material attested in Brito (and in no commentary source) and another nineteen have material found in both Brito and Latin commentaries, meaning that Brito could account for as many as thirty-three of this sample of BXIII Gospel glosses. The Latin commentaries could account for as many as forty-six, but then this is with material from several commentaries and not a single text, as with Brito. If we compare the results from Brito and the Latin commentaries individually, then we find that Brito covers more of this sample of BXIII Gospel glosses than almost all of the Latin commentaries. (In the following table, the numbers given for Brito and the commentaries refer to those glosses for which Brito or that commentary is a possible source (and not to every gloss for which Brito or that commentary has comparable material, or to the amount of unique material found in that text). Results are only given for the most closely matching commentaries.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brito</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9577</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only for the glosses in Mark is there a commentary (Av 36) covering more than Brito's *Summa*; in John, one commentary (RB 9958) covers the same number of glosses (9) and one (the Glossa) covers only one less (8). Otherwise, Brito covers more than any commentary, especially for Matthew. The Glossa has the next widest range of material for all four Gospels, but its sixteen is still well behind Brito's thirty-three. We need to exclude the glosses from John if we are to have a result for Brito which can be compared to that for Av 36; Brito covers twenty-four glosses compared to Av 36 which covers fifteen. It is the result for Mark which gives this relatively better result for Av 36 in comparison with Brito.

If we refer to the tables in Appendix II^230, it becomes clear that even though we have only checked a few glosses in Brito, it is possible that Brito could replace two commentaries which up till now gave unique material.
Brito has the material needed for the gloss on Matthew 2.6, and could replace the possible commentary source here (RB 9577). As this is the only gloss original to this commentary, and as Brito has much more original material, it is possible to discount RB 9577 as a necessary source text and replace it with Brito's Summa. The same is also true of the gloss on Luke 20.46. The most likely commentary source for this gloss is RB 9939, but the material in Brito is closer to that in the gloss than is the commentary material, and could have told the glossator that 'stola' means 'ephod', thereby giving him the information he needed to use a concordance to find the detailed description of 'ephod' in Exodus. Again, there is no other original material in RB 9939 while there is in Brito, allowing us to replace RB 9939 with Brito's Summa on our list of texts needed to get the fullest possible coverage for the glosses.

The fact that some material is found in Latin commentaries, Brito and BXIII can be accounted for in any one of several ways: Latin commentators used Brito; Brito used Latin commentaries; Brito and the Latin commentators had some common sources (and we know that Brito used both the Glossa and the Historia Scholastica, likely sources for many Latin commentators); the BXIII glossator used a text which used both Latin commentaries and Brito, rather than commentaries and Brito directly.
There is a lot of material which would seem to have been common to both biblical dictionary texts (as represented here by Brito's *Summa*) and Latin commentaries. However, there is enough material unique to Brito to suggest that his *Summa*, or some such similar text, would have provided the BXIII Gospel glossator with material not found in commentaries. A biblical dictionary, from the study undertaken here, would have been unlikely to have provided the BXIII Gospel glossator with material for all of his glosses. Brito, for example, does not give many interpretations of proper names, nor does he give figurative interpretations of words (e.g. *calix* and *cathedra*). Also, a check for collocations such as *bona opera* and *opera*\(^ {231} \) show no material comparable with the moral glosses in the BXIII Gospels. It would seem indisputable, however, that the BXIII Gospel glosses contain material from this biblical dictionary type of text, as exemplified by Brito's *Summa*, complementing material taken from a variety of other sources.

1.2 Moral glosses

As has already been stated, this coherent group of glosses would seem to include material not usually found in Latin commentaries. This means that we need to consider material in other types of text with a view to finding the tradition from which the BXIII moral Gospel glosses stem.
A concern for morality is something which has come to be seen as being particularly associated with what Smalley, following Grabmann, calls the 'biblical moral school' of Peter Comestor, Peter the Chanter and Stephen Langton. These exegetes have, as Smalley says, 'a common interest in biblical studies and in practical moral questions, which distinguishes them from those who were primarily theologians and dialecticians: Peter Lombard, Peter of Poitiers, Adam of the Petit Pont, an interest in practical moral problems, and the practical moral purpose'. Such a concern for moral issues may be something which they inherited from their Victorine forerunners. The Victorine idea of tropology was, in Châtillon's words, to take from Scripture 'les enseignements qui guideront le chrétien dans sa vie morale et dans son cheminement intérieur'. For Smalley, Peter Comestor, Peter the Chanter and Stephen Langton have an interest in moral issues which amounts to a 'humanism that recalls the Victorines'. Peter the Chanter in particular objected to what Baldwin calls 'excessive allegorizing of the Bible' and 'maintained that the Scriptures were sufficient for Christian faith and morals'. One of the texts that he wrote, the *Verbum abbreviatum*, has been variously described as a *Summa* on moral behaviour and misbehaviour (mainly the latter) illustrated by *exempla* and a 'popular manual of ethics'. This text contains chapters on both the virtues and duties of a Christian, and sins and the failure to do one's duty as a Christian, and does, then,
contain a discussion of the moral views and teaching of a master in the Paris schools at the end of the twelfth century. Nor is this a moral teaching which few people knew about. The Chanter was influential on other theologians and on the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215241, and it seems likely that his teaching, on morality as well as on other aspects of theology and the study of Scripture, would have been relatively well known in the Schools. For Baldwin, the popularity of the Verbum abbreviatum is attested by the large number of manuscripts (at least ninety) in which it survives242. The teaching in this text may also have reached an even wider audience by being expounded in sermons.

For Peter the Chanter, the activities of a Parisian master of theology could be divided up into three parts: lecturing, disputing and preaching243, and of these, he considered preaching to be of central importance; to quote Baldwin, 'According to the Chanter's blueprints preaching constituted the roof and final adornment of the theological edifice'244. However, we cannot be sure how much the Chanter preached himself. He seems to have enjoyed a reputation as a great preacher in the thirteenth century but only one sermon can be attributed to him245. It seems more likely, as Baldwin believes, that his contribution to preaching was indirect246, through the Verbum abbreviatum and through his influence on other preachers.
The *Verbum abbreviatum*, as has already been said, contains the Chanter's teaching on morality which we might expect to have been expressed in sermons given by those preachers who were followers of the Chanter. It therefore provides us access to the material and teaching on morality that may have been used in sermons at the end of the twelfth century and at the beginning of and into the thirteenth century. It also contains a discussion on preaching and preachers and advice to preachers. Even more than this, Baldwin believes that 'this work might well have been composed with preaching in mind because some of the chapters (four of them) were later regarded as sermons'. Whether this was in fact the case or not, the *Verbum abbreviatum* contains moral teaching which might well have been preached.

The preaching of the morality in the *Verbum abbreviatum* would have been in both Latin and in French. It is not surprising, given the importance which the Chanter assigned to preaching, that several members of his circle in Paris were preachers, many of whom seem to have been renowned in their art. These include: Robert of Courson, active as a master of theology at Paris during the first decade of the thirteenth century, removed from his academic career by Pope Innocent III in 1212 but perhaps continuing to preach after this and referred to as one of the celebrated preachers of the Chanter's circle by Jacques de Vitry; Stephen Langton, known to his contemporaries as 'Stephanus de lingua-tonante'.
(thundering tongue), an obvious piece of word-play\textsuperscript{252}, who preached both while an academic and Archbishop of Canterbury\textsuperscript{253}; Foulques de Neuilly, 'a moving preacher whose sermons wrought wonders and miracles'\textsuperscript{254} and who preached the fourth crusade, dying in 1202; and Jacques de Vitry, who preached against the Albigensian heretics and for a crusade to rescue the Holy Land\textsuperscript{255}, and who died in 1240. Of these, Foulques de Neuilly dealt particularly with moral issues in his sermons\textsuperscript{256}. Both Foulques de Neuilly and Jacques de Vitry almost certainly preached in French\textsuperscript{257}. Given that sermons are not known to survive for all of these preachers\textsuperscript{258}, the \textit{Verbum abbreviatum} is a convenient source of the moral teaching which these preachers might have expounded.

The \textit{Verbum abbreviatum} is therefore an important text for two reasons: (1) it gives us access to influential moral teaching current at the end of the twelfth century and at the beginning of and into the thirteenth century, and (2) it gives us access to moral teaching which might have been expounded in sermons by at least those preachers directly influenced by the Chanter at the end of the twelfth century and in at least the first quarter of the thirteenth century. It is, therefore, a text which it is important to study if we are to try to identify the type of material which the BXIII Gospel glossator might have used for his own moral glosses.
As well as studying the *Verbum abbreviatum*, we can complement this by looking at a collection of sermons.

Hundreds of sermons, both anonymous and attributed, survive from the end of the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries, and many of these would have had a wide circulation. It is not the place here to discuss the problems inherent in studying both Latin and French sermons from this period; this has already been done by scholars such as Zink, Longère and D'Avray. Some of the many problems facing scholars in this area include that of deciding whether a sermon that survives in Latin was actually intended to be given in Latin or in French, whether a sermon that survives was written before it was given or whether it was written down afterwards from notes taken by someone listening to it, and the problem of the likely audience for whom the sermon was prepared. These are not problems which need to be addressed here when trying to decide which sermons to study for the BXIII glosses. The BXIII glossator used Latin commentaries for some of his glosses and seems to have been trained in the Latin commentary tradition, and could therefore have used either Latin or French sermons. We know little about the audience of BXIII, and so cannot decide which sermons to study on the grounds of common audience; in any case, the glossator adapted material in Latin commentaries and there is no reason to expect that he would not have done the same if he felt that he needed to with sermon material. Reasons for
deciding which sermons to study here need to be based on other criteria.

It is probably sensible to study sermons which were influential and would have been well known in northern France and Paris during the likely years of BXIII's composition, and amongst the most famous preachers from the end of the twelfth century were Stephen Langton and Maurice of Sully. As Longère says, 'Leur prestige personnel ou leur fonction ecclésiale ont pu assurer à l'œuvre oratoire de certains clercs séculiers un rayonnement immédiat et durable; on pense, entre autres, à Maurice de Sully, à Etienne Langton, à Jean Gerson'.

Jean Gerson lived from 1363 to 1429 and is therefore too late for the present study, but both Maurice de Sully and Stephen Langton wrote sermons whose fame may well have lived on into the thirteenth century. This may be especially the case with Maurice's sermons, as these form a sermon manual, a collection of model sermons. This collection of sermons was probably composed between 1168 and 1170 and was intended to be used by priests. Its popularity and success is attested by the large number of manuscripts in which it survives, by the fact that a French version was produced, and that Anglo-Norman and Middle English versions survive for some of the sermons in this collection. As a popular sermon manual which was used by priests preparing their own sermons, the collection of sermons by Maurice of Sully is a not unreasonable collection to study with a view to
confirming whether the BXIII Gospel glossator used sermon material in some of his glosses. It is also likely that these sermons reached a wide and varied audience. For Zink, such collections of model sermons had a dual audience: 'Ces manuels, ou plus exactement ces recueils de sermons modèles, visent à la fois le public des clercs qui les utiliseront pour leur prédication et le public laïque auquel ils s’adressent à travers les clercs et auprès duquel ils seront répercutés par la prédication'\textsuperscript{269}. Given that we know little about the likely audience of BXIII, it is wise to study sermons with such a potentially wide and varied audience. For Zink, evidence of this dual audience comes from the nature of the French version:

Les sermons de Maurice de Sully ont été, non seulement traduits, mais recomposés en français. Les ajouts de la version française, nombreux et importants, ...vont tous dans le même sens: il s'agit de mettre ces sermons à la portée d'un auditoire plus simple, moins cultivé, plus turbulent que celui de la version originale. Ce qui se comprend aisément si cette dernière était destinée aux prêtres et la version française aux laïcs\textsuperscript{270}.

The way that the Latin version of these sermons has been translated and adapted into French makes this French version a potentially interesting version for the present study. Changes to the Latin version of the sermons are almost entirely additions\textsuperscript{271} which are intended to make the sermon clearer for a less educated audience. To quote Zink again:
L'adaptateur des sermons de Maurice de Sully cherche d'une part à pallier les insuffisances intellectuelles de son public en expliquant et en développant le texte latin quand il le trouve trop elliptique ou trop difficile, et d'autre part à faire son éducation en complétant le texte original dans le sens qui paraît nécessaire.

and again:

De fait, le souci pédagogique de l'adaptateur est constant. Il veille sans cesse à simplifier l'idée originale de façon à la rendre plus compréhensible et à l'exprimer plus longuement ou à la répéter de façon à laisser à son auditoire le temps de l'assimiler.

It is this expanded French version, therefore, which allows us access not only to the text of Maurice’s sermons, but also to the expansions and adaptations thought necessary for a less educated vernacular audience.

One of the few things we can be certain of with regard to BXIII’s audience is that it too was a vernacular audience with little, if any, knowledge of Latin and exegesis; in this at least the audiences for Maurice’s sermons and BXIII are alike, whether the glossator used the Latin or French versions.

Another feature of the French version of these sermons which makes them more interesting for the present study, is the fact that moral issues are stressed more than in the Latin version. As Zink says:

A plusieurs reprises les innovations de la version française insistent sur l'obligation d'accomplir concrètement des œuvres bonnes, à condition qu'elles soient subordonnées à la foi, et en particulier de faire l'aumône.
Not only does the French version emphasize moral issues more, but it also gives more actual details\(^{275}\) as to what is improper behaviour. As moral issues are made clearer in the French version, and as it is specifically moral teaching that we are looking for here, it makes sense to study the French version of Maurice's sermons rather than the Latin one.

There are, of course, other sermons which would have been as influential of those of Maurice of Sully, such as Stephen Langton's, Bernard of Clairvaux's, and those given by the mendicants in the thirteenth century. It has not been felt necessary to consider all of these for the present study. We may, in any case, have access to Langton's moral teaching through the Chanter's *Verbum abbreviatum* given the fact that Langton was a member of his circle in Paris. The aim here is to examine whether the moral material in the BXIII Gospel glosses is the sort of material found in sermons, and a study of the *Verbum abbreviatum* and Maurice's sermons should show this without the need to consider all extant Latin and French sermons, and all extant aids to preaching.

Given the different nature and arrangement of the texts containing sermon material - the Chanter's *verbum abbreviatum* and Maurice of Sully's sermons - it will not be possible to compare individual BXIII glosses with individual parts of these texts. What we can look for, however, are the different strands forming that coherent
moral teaching found in the BXIII Gospel glosses, as analysed above\textsuperscript{276}, with the general moral teaching in each of the texts studied.

It will be recalled from the discussion above\textsuperscript{277} that many of the BXIII Gospel glosses stress the importance of 'bones huevres', making clear the distinction between these and 'mauveses huevres'. 'Bones huevres' are keeping Christ's commandments (John 8.31 and John 8.43), loving him by keeping his word (John 14.23 and John 14.24), receiving evil willingly (Matthew 5.39 and Luke 16.25) and setting an example for others (Matthew 23.16 and Luke 12.35). This is complemented by the statement that Christ too must keep God's word (Luke 2.49 and John 8.26) and that he is setting an example for people to follow (Luke 12.49). As Christ must suffer (Matthew 26.39 and Mark 14.36), so must men suffer through love of him (Mark 10.38(1) and Mark 10.39(1)) and that suffering brings renewal (Mark 26.35). 'Mauveses huevres' are exemplified by the Pharisees, who know and teach the law but fail to live by it (Matthew 23.2, Matthew 23.3, Matthew 23.5, Luke 12.1 and Luke 20.47). Actions will be judged on their merit and people will receive only what they deserve (Luke 23.41). 'Mauveses huevres' may be judged worthy of blame or condemnation (Matthew 5.22, Matthew 26.31, Matthew 26.33 and Mark 14.27) or even death (Matthew 5.21(2), Matthew 26.66 and Mark 10.33(1)); failure to act as one should when one knows better will result in greater damnation (Luke 20.47) and judgement.
may mean that a person will be in hell for ever (Mark 14.21(1)). These are the themes for which we need to examine Peter the Chanter's Verbum abbreviatum, and Maurice of Sully's sermons if we hope to identify the sort of material and types of text which the BXIII Gospel glossator might have used for his moral glosses.

It is possible that the BXIII Gospel glosses and these texts will share material which is not to do with such moral concerns, such as interpretations of proper names and explanations of Jewish customs. It is not for this, however, that we are looking. It is quite likely that sermons used material from Latin commentaries where necessary, and that similarities between them and some BXIII material may be due to a common Latin commentary source. It is of course possible that where a sermon and a commentary both have material that is in BXIII, it was the sermon that was used rather than the commentary. However, the Latin commentaries undoubtedly have far more exegetical material than the sermons, and they arrange it in a way which the BXIII glossator could use easily as he worked through the text; they are thus in principle much more likely to have been used by the BXIII glossator. Even if the BXIII Gospel glossator took his material from sermons rather than directly from commentaries, it remains true that much of the material in his glosses is commentary material. It is possible that preachers used commentary material in their sermons too, so that the possibility remains of a common use of commentary
material by the BXIII glossator and sermon writers. It is not possible here to examine the use of Latin commentaries by preachers, so that all that can be done is to identify the problem and concentrate on the main issue here - identifying the types of material and text that the BXIII Gospel glossator used for his moral glosses, as this was, from the material studied so far, not, for the most part, commentary material.

II.2.a Peter the Chanter's *Verbum Abbreviatum*

This text is divided into chapters discussing issues relevant both to Christians in general, and to Christians belonging to different, and distinct, sections of society. Some chapters are general in their approach, being on the virtues and duties of all Christians and sins and failing in Christian duty. Others are more specific, usually in addressing a more clearly defined audience likely to need advice on errors or sins that they are particularly likely to fall into, or giving advice which is particularly relevant to their position in society. Examples of these chapters include those addressed to clerics on issues such as pluralism in ecclesiastic and academic life, simony, clerical avarice, on the office of prelate, on clerics and the lower orders, on those things which prevent the lawful giving of benefices and on preaching and the virtuous life expected of preachers. Other more specific members of society addressed in the *Verbum*
abbreviatum include lawyers in chapters such as those on lawyers' vileness and on the accepting of gifts in return for doing justice, and those in the entertainment profession (who are censured). Chapters such as these are unlikely to contain material on the sorts of issues dealt with in the moral glosses in the BXIII Gospel glosses. BXIII's morality is in no way specific, as is that in many chapters of the Verbum abbreviatum, and it is the Verbum abbreviatum's more general chapters which are more likely to contain material comparable to the BXIII Gospels.

We can find parallels for much of the morality in the BXIII Gospel glosses in the Verbum abbreviatum, but the treatment of moral issues is very different in the Chanter. We find, for example, that he discusses virtues, duties and sins individually (whereas in BXIII they are covered by the catch-all terms 'good works' and 'bad works') and that his discussion of them (necessarily so given the nature of his text) is much more detailed than that of the BXIII glossator.

We find, for example, that (amongst the duties of a Christian life) the Chanter has chapters dealing with mercy, obedience, clemency, almsgiving, fasting, on visiting the sick and imprisoned and on burying the dead. He also deals with the virtues that a Christian should have, with a short introductory chapter on the four cardinal virtues preceding
chapters on them individually, on prudence, fortitude, temperance and justice, and on charity. None of these is mentioned as such in the BXIII Gospel glosses, but all are presumably covered by the term 'good works' (nowhere defined by the glossator). This term is probably also meant to cover virtues, again discussed individually in the Chanter. He has chapters on such virtues as patience, moderation, humility and truth. Again, this has no direct parallel in BXIII. The only particular virtue which is mentioned at all is that of patience and resignation to God's will, exemplified by Lazarus in the gloss on Luke 16.25. Otherwise, individual virtues are not mentioned, and are presumably felt to be included in the BXIII glossator's 'good works' category. The Chanter also has chapters on individual sins and errors, such as a failure to give alms to the poor, cupidity and avarice, pride ('superbia'), jealousy, humility leading to vainglory, gluttony and drunkenness, fornication, adultery and sodomy. This is complemented by chapters on actions or feelings which show that one has failed in one's duties as a Christian, such as ingratitude, slander, lying, against having too much food, too many clothes and too many buildings. Again, the parallel in BXIII is a general one, all sins and failures to do one's duties presumably being covered by the term 'bad works'.
The morality in the Chanter, therefore, is much more detailed than that in BXIII, which is not something that should surprise us given the different nature of the text. The *Verbum abbreviatum* is, after all, a relatively lengthy moral summa, whereas the BXIII morality is found in a collection of relatively short glosses. The Chanter is much more detailed, both in discussing virtues, duties and sins individually, and in discussing them (because he is able to do so) in considerably more detail than the BXIII glossator, but brevity in the BXIII Gospel glosses could be constrained by the space available. In spite of the difference in length and detail, the themes found in the BXIII Gospel glosses are also found in the Chanter's *Verbum abbreviatum*. We need next to consider if there are any parallels between the treatment of these themes in these two texts.

It will be remembered that in the BXIII glosses, the theme of 'good works' is connected with that of 'just reward'; those who do good will receive 'vie pardiabile', and those who do evil will be eternally damned. The Chanter also develops his discussions of virtues, duties and sins with details on their importance for the afterlife, and also has chapters on eternal pain and joy and the reward of eternal blessedness. We find, for example, that alms-giving and fasting can atone for sins. The Chanter uses a quotation from Ecclesiastes to express this idea:
Absconde eleemosynam in sinu pauperis, et ipsa orabit pro te ad Dominum, ut libereris ab omni malo.

and

Est enim eleemosyna una alarum orationis, et jejunium altera. Et item: "Sicut aqua exstinguit ignem, ita eleemosyna exstinguit peccatum."

This implies that alms-giving and fasting lead to eternal life, although this is not stated explicitly. The link between the duties of a Christian life and eternal life is expressed more clearly elsewhere:

Non maceratio carnis, habitus incul tus, crebrae vigilae, jejunia assidua et areta, austeritas vitae, et horro in facie te exhibent verum philosophorum et Christianum; sed haec sunt signa eleemosynae: si visceribus pietatis affluas, si nihil concupiscas, si nihil pertimescas, scien s, quia "quaestus magnus pietas cum sufficientia (1 Tim. vi)." Ad manum autem est quod sat est. Habet autem pietas promissionem vitae quae nunc est et futurae. Unde: "Primum quaerite regnum Dei, et haec omnia adjicientur vobis (Matth. vi)."

And again, on mercy, which must be shown if people are not to die a 'mortem peccatoris':

In Christo commendatur, "quia miserations ejus super omnia opera ejus (Psal. cxxiv); quia misericordia Domini plena est terra (Psal. xxxii)." Qui, etsi justus sit, tamen: "Misericordia ejus superexaltat judicium (Jac. ii);" quia multus est ad ignoscendum (Isa. lv), cujus proprium est misereri semper et parcere, qui non vult mortem peccatoris, sed ut magis convertatur et vivat (Ezech. xviii)." Propter quem, ut vivet in aeternum cum ipso misericorditer.

and patience:

Et te, si vis intrare in gloriam, per patientiam et passionem, oportet ingredi in eam.
The Chanter also discusses the importance of humility for the afterlife as well as for the present:


Humility leads to eternal life whereas pride leads to ruin:

'Superbia sequitur ruina et dejectio; humilitatem, gloria et exaltatio'.

The reward of poverty is also eternal life:

Pone eas in munus pauperis Christi. "Centuplum accipies et vitam aeternam possidebis (Matthe. xix)."

As the Chanter writes in his chapter on the reward of eternal blessedness 'Nullus labor durus, nullum tempus longum videri debet, quo gloria aeternitas acquiritur'.

As in the BXIII glosses, the other side of this coin is that of the eternal damnation which is what sinners deserve and will receive instead of eternal life. We have already seen that the reward of pride is 'ruina et dejectio'. To this we can add the knowledge that pride and envy lead to the ruin of the whole world.
'Item: Invidia filia, et mater superbia in unum conspivavere ad ruinam totius mundi'\textsuperscript{330}; it is the sin responsible for man being sent out of paradise, 'Haec est quae primum hominem de paradiso ocelisti dejeoit in mundum'\textsuperscript{331}. Sinners will have eternal pain, 'Ite, maledicti, in ignem aeternum'\textsuperscript{332}, and 'Et "ignis" gehennae "et sulphur." ide est fetor peccatorum, et poena "eorum (Psal. x)"\textsuperscript{333}.

Even though the Chanter discusses virtues, duties and sins individually, the rewards that each of these merit are clear in his discussions. 'Good works', fulfilling Christian duties and living according to Christian virtues, will lead to eternal life; sin and failings in duty will lead to damnation and eternal pain. This focus parallels markedly what we find in the BXIII Gospel glosses.

There are parallels, therefore, between the morality in the \textit{Verbum abbreviatum} and the BXIII Gospel glosses in that they are both concerned with 'good' and 'bad' works and both stress the just rewards of these. The treatment is perhaps necessarily different in the Chanter in that he is writing a \textit{Summa} rather than a collection of short glosses on the Gospels, and this may account for many of the differences. However, I have not found any evidence that the BXIII Gospel glossator quoted directly from the \textit{Verbum abbreviatum}, so how far it should be seen as a direct source for the BXIII moral glosses is very much
open to doubt. Even if the glossator used this text, his need to abridge would probably preclude any direct translation. Nor should it be forgotten that this text might have been a difficult one for the glossator to use, not being arranged according to citations from Scripture. He could not look up a lemma in it to see what interpretation the Chanter gave it. This perhaps suggests that it is unlikely to have been a direct source. There are significant parallels between the BXIII glosses and the *Verbum abbreviatum*, but the material is considerably simplified, has been very much distilled, for the BXIII glosses. We do not, for example, find each sin or virtue treated individually; they are covered under the much more general terms of 'good' and 'bad' works. The moral material in the BXIII Gospel glosses does indeed reflect the moral teaching in the *Verbum abbreviatum*, but adapted for a different text and audience. We can perhaps conclude that the moral glosses in BXIII reflect a 'popularizing' of the Chanter's moral teaching, (a 'popularizing' perhaps done by the glossator, or available through sermons preached by the Chanter's pupils). Such popularizing of moral teaching is not without precedent; we can cite as an example the *Bible Moralisee* from the beginning of the thirteenth century (c.1220-30). The morality in BXIII would certainly seem to be typical of the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth century, as exemplified by the Chanter's text.
II.2.b Maurice of Sully's sermons

The major moral themes in Maurice of Sully's sermons are those of 'good works' and proper Christian behaviour as compared to 'bad works' and sin, and that God will give to each what he deserves, 'good works' being required to win eternal life and 'bad works' leading to eternal damnation. This is complemented by the teaching that 'good works' must be done with a 'right intention' to be acceptable to God.

'Good works', proper Christian behaviour and the duties of Christian life are listed in Maurice's sermons. These include such things as going to church, fasting, almsgiving, believing in God and the Church, keeping feast days, being humble and not proud, hearing and responding to preaching, fulfilling one's duties to one's secular master and paying tithes and giving offerings to God and offering oneself to God through good works and leading a good life, suffering willingly and giving thanks to God for such suffering, forgiving people who sin against you, the fact that hearing the word of God means obeying it and that loving Christ means keeping his commandments. A considerable emphasis is also placed on the importance of confession, repentance and penitence. The point is made continually that it is only through these, through good works, by doing God's works and fulfilling
the duties of a Christian, that one may win eternal life. People are also exhorted to despise earthly joys which prevent them from doing good works and achieving eternal life. The story of Lazarus and Dives is used as an example here. Like Lazarus, the poor and beggars who suffer willingly and give thanks to God for their suffering on this earth, will receive comfort and riches in the next world. This story is also used to give guidance to the rich, or those who have money; they should give alms to the poor who will pray for us, and whose prayers will be heard by God.

'Good works', then, are essential, but they are not sufficient on their own. For Maurice of Sully believed, as did the Victorines, that they should be done with a 'right intention' if they are to lead to eternal life; 'good works' done by evil people are not acceptable to God. As Robson says, Maurice of Sully 'taught in his divinity that rites and almsdeeds avail nothing without a good intent, a complete orientation of heart and mind.' This 'right intention' includes belief in God and, more importantly, charity (love for God and one's neighbours). The importance of charity in good works is made especially clear in the final sermon in the collection, that on the wise and foolish virgins. In this sermon, the virgins' lamps signify 'les bones uvres qui sont beles e cleres' while the oil signifies charity: 'si com la lampe ne puet luire sans olie,'
ausi ne peut bone uvevre estre acceptable a Deu, quant ele est faite sans carite co est sans l'amor de Deu e de son proisme'\textsuperscript{367}. 'Good works' done without charity lead to eternal damnation\textsuperscript{368}.

Maurice of Sully, then, makes it clear that only good works, accompanied by charity and a 'right intention', can lead to eternal life, and he contrasts this with good works done without a right intention (as has already been seen), and sins which are not confessed, both of which lead to eternal damnation.

Sins are frequently listed in Maurice's sermons, and a distinction is often made between 'les menues peciés pardonables'\textsuperscript{369} and 'les grans peciés damnables'\textsuperscript{370}. Lists of 'les menues peciés pardonables'\textsuperscript{371} include drinking and eating too much, talking and laughing too much and dressing too proudly and too nobly. Lists of 'les grans peciés damnables' are given more frequently\textsuperscript{372} and these sins include: fornication, adultery, usury, robbery, larceny, gluttony, drunkenness, covetousness, hatred, avarice, envy, anger, murder and luxuria (indulgence, sensuality, lust, lechery). These sins lead to eternal damnation\textsuperscript{373} and it is better to have never lived at all than to die in sin and be eternally damned\textsuperscript{374}. Christians should pray for their bodies and souls to be preserved from and cleansed of sin\textsuperscript{375}. This brings us back to the importance of confession (repentence and penitence) as proper Christian
behaviour; only confession can atone for these sins and bring the sinner eternal life.

The sins and wrong-doing which lead to eternal damnation are inspired by the devil, whereas the good works and proper Christian behaviour which lead to eternal life come from God. Maurice gives examples of people who are not behaving as they should to win eternal life. False Christians, Jews and pagans are 'hors de la voie qui les doit mener a la vie pardurable' and Jews in particular are called the 'sons of the devil'. Maurice also exhorts priests (in the first sermon addressed to them) to give people an example of holy life, patience and humility to their congregations.

Also, by leading a good life, ordinary people will be a good example to others.

God, then, will give to each as he deserves, eternal life and glory to those who do his works and eternal damnation to those who lead a bad life and sin.

It will be clear from this that the moral teaching in Maurice of Sully's sermons is very much like that in the BXIII Gospels. There is the same emphasis on the importance of 'good works' as opposed to 'bad works', and the fact that people will be judged according to their merit and will receive what they deserve - eternal life for good works and eternal damnation for bad works and sin. Many of the Christian duties given by Maurice are
also given in the BXIII Gospel glosses, such as the fact that loving Christ means keeping his commandments, that hearing the word of Christ means keeping or obeying it, that suffering and evil are to be accepted willingly and that people should lead a good life as an example to others. Both Maurice and the BXIII Gospel glossator make it clear that it would be better not to live at all than to live in sin and be condemned to eternal damnation.

As well as having moral teaching in common, the BXIII Gospel glossator has also used two examples in very much the same way that Maurice has used them. These are the example of Lazarus, in Luke 16.25 and sermon 63, where Lazarus is used as an example of someone who receives suffering and evil in this life willingly, and that of the Pharisees in Matthew 23.2, 23.5, Luke 12.1 and 20.47, and sermon 33. In BXIII, the Pharisees are used as an example of hypocrisy, of people who know the law but do not keep it or only pretend to keep it, whereas in Maurice they are an example of pride. However, in Maurice too their hypocrisy is made clear:

'Phariseu estoient apelé cil qui par vesteure de religion estoient desevré del pueple, e si faisoient juste, ne mie por co qu'il le fuiscent, mais il en faisoient le samblant.'

The main difference between the moral teaching in the BXIII Gospel glosses and Maurice of Sully's French
There is only one BXIII Gospel gloss in which 'charity' and 'good works' are given together, but the link between the two, as expressed in Maurice's sermons, is not
developed. This is in one of the sample glosses, that on Luke 12.49:

"Ge ving metre feu en terre, et que vueill ge fors que il soit espris," (c'est a dire ge ving metre en terre amor et charité et donner vos exemple, et que vueill ge fors qu'ele soit tenue entre vos et gardée leaument, et que vos n'amez mie de parole ne ds langue mes d'uevre et de verité)?

The implications here are that 'amor', 'charité' and 'uevre' go together, but this is not made at all explicit in the way that it is in Maurice's French sermons.

There is also only one BXIII Gospel gloss which presents the heart as being involved in and important for the doing of 'works', in this case 'bad works'. In the gloss on Luke 18.13 the BXIII Gospel glossator says that 'premierement pense li cuers le mal et le covoite, que les autres membres le facent par huevre'. If the heart conceives of 'bad works' that the body does, then it presumably also conceives of 'good works' to be done, but this is not stated. In this gloss, the heart conceives and thinks, and so is the place where bad, and presumably good, works originate. Presenting the heart as the place where good works originate is slightly different to saying that good works must be accompanied by a 'right intention' in the heart. In Maurice's sermons, good works do not begin with the heart, but the heart must be involved in them if they are to be acceptable to God. The BXIII glossator is not saying this; he is rather presenting the involvement of the heart as a fait
accompli, as an inevitable and unavoidable first stage in any work. What he is saying is that the heart is always involved, not that the heart should be involved. By presenting this involvement in such a light, he is accepting the teaching of a 'right intention' found in Maurice and by presenting it as inevitable, giving it more force. The BXIII Gospel glossator would seem to have been aware of the theory of 'right intention' even if he did not make it explicit in his glosses.

This failure to make explicit the links between 'good works' on the one hand and a 'right intention' or 'charity' on the other is the only significant difference between the BXIII Gospel glosses and Maurice of Sully's French sermons. Even if this, as the gloss on Luke 18.13 suggests, was something the BXIII Gospel glossator was aware of even if he did not put it into his gloss. Other differences between them are on the level of detail rather than teaching, such as the fact that the BXIII Gospel glossator does not give lists of sins, either 'menues peciés pardonables' or 'grans peciés dampnables' and does not list as many duties of Christian life (such as confession, repentance and penitence) as Maurice of Sully does. Otherwise, the substance of the teaching is the same. It is thus clear that the moral teaching in the BXIII Gospel glosses is very like that in Maurice's sermons.
There are, then, parallels between both the *Verbum abbreviatum* and BXIII and Maurice of Sully's sermons and BXIII, the latter being more significant. It would seem indisputable that the moral material in the BXIII Gospel glosses reflects common teaching on morality from the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth century. The moral teaching in the glosses is not, therefore, the glossator's own, but is very like that found in sermons, sermon manuals and moral *summae*.

II.3 Summary

The BXIII Gospel glossator incorporated theological material, explanations and teaching commonly found in Latin commentaries, biblical dictionaries, sermons, sermon manuals and moral *summae* into his glosses. His gloss material covers a broad range of the exegetical material available in the thirteenth century, taken from several different types of text, and several different types of tradition. We should also postulate that a collection of *questiones* is likely to be needed for those without parallels in commentaries, especially those in Mark. Such a wide range of material from different types of text adds to the conclusion that the BXIII Gospel glossator would seem extremely unlikely to have had any single texts which he used as direct sources, reinforcing our impression of his level of education.
III A linguistic survey of the BXIII Gospels

While a detailed linguistic analysis is out of place in this thesis, it is necessary to see whether such a study is able to show how likely the Gospels are to be the work of a single translator, as well as to begin to gather data which could tell us more about the authorship of the BXIII Gospels. A number of features were chosen for study here, some because their use seemed interesting, some because discussed by Berger and some as having been identified as features of the translation of Genesis by Quereuil. Words and constructions chosen fell into the categories of vocabulary and syntax. The vocabulary considered consisted of the use of the following words: 'senefier', 'glaive' and 'espee', 'fornicaaison' and related words, 'sepulture/sepulcre' and 'tombel/tombliaus', the doubling of 'veraiement', 'locuste', 'langouste' and 'aosterele' and 'la mort d'enfer' as a translation of 'vae'. An initial decision to include the use of 'coturnix' and 'quaille' (discussed by Berger391) in this study was abandoned as neither of these words occur in the BXIII Gospels. The syntax considered consisted of the use of 'acertes', 'adecertes' and 'certainement', 'aussi come' in clauses with a main clause beginning with 'autressi' or 'ainsi' and as a variant of 'si come', and the use of 'vos' and 'tu' referring to God. Where possible, any results from the individual parts of this study have been compared to what is found in Genesis as edited by Quereuil, and any
occurrences of these words in the Pauline Epistles given by von Orelli are also listed\textsuperscript{392}.

III.1 Analysis of the vocabulary

(a) 'Senefier'

Some form of 'senefier' occurs seven times in the Gospels, and, in all but one instance, in John. In all but two of these instances, in which it is found in a gloss, it occurs as a translation of a word in the Vulgate. Its use is as follows: in John 12.33 'senefianz', and in John 18.32 and 21.19 'senefiant', translate 'significans', in John 3.33 'senefie' translates 'signavit', and in Luke 1.22 'senefioit' translates 'innuens'. It occurs in the glosses on John 13.7 and 19.14.

The greater use made of 'senefier' in John is unlikely to reflect the work of different translators, but rather the nature of the Vulgate source. None of the verses in John in which it occurs have parallels in the other three Gospels, hence we have no evidence either of the use or the need for 'senefier' in the other Gospels. This use of 'senefier' in the Gospels can be more profitably compared with its use in Genesis. Here, as Quereuil has pointed out, 'senefier' and the noun 'senefianciose' are often used to introduce allegorical glosses and
prefigurative material in the glosses. This is not what we have in the gloss on John 13.7, 'Jhesus respondi et li dist: "Tu ne sez mie ore que ge faz" (c'est a dire tu ne sez mie que ce senefie que ge faz ne por quoi ce est)'. In the gloss on John 19.14, however, 'senefiance' is used for prefigurative material:

'...Et por ce cruzechierent il lors Nostre Seignor Jhesucrist el tene de lor Pasque, que la leur Pasque estoit seulement ombre et senefiance de la Nostre Pasque...'

This is an interesting point to note, but it may not be especially significant. As has already been stated in the discussion on the rhetoric of glossing, different rhetorical devices may be found in Genesis as opposed to the Gospels because of the nature of the text being glossed and the nature of the gloss material being used. Genesis obviously has a lot of material which would need, or could be given, a prefigurative interpretation. This is not the case for the Gospels, which would require glossing in a different way. This may well account for the more intensive, and specific, use of 'senefier' and 'senefiance' in Genesis as compared to their use in the Gospels. It cannot be taken as such as evidence of different translators working on the Gospels and Genesis.

The use of 'senefier', is, therefore, unlikely to suggest evidence of the work of different translators in John as opposed to the other Gospels. Nor is its use in John significantly different to its use in Genesis, given the
different nature of the texts. 'Senefier' gives no
evidence as to the work of different translators for John
(at least of the Gospels) and Genesis.

(b) The use of 'glaive' and 'espee'

'Glaive' is not found at all in the Gospels; in all
instances, 'gladius' is translated by 'espee'\textsuperscript{395}. If
more than one translator worked on the Gospels, then they
all translated 'gladius' in the same way. 'Espee' is
also used to translate 'gladius' in Ephesians 6.7\textsuperscript{396},
although 'glaive' is the word used to translate this in
Genesis (3.24, 27.40 and 34.25). We may have evidence
here of different translators in Genesis and the Gospels.

(c) The use of 'fornicacion' and related words

There are six instances of the use of 'fornicacion' in
the Gospels\textsuperscript{397}, and in all cases it translates
'fornicatio' in the Vulgate. There is also one example
of the noun 'fornicaire', glossed so that it is replaced
by 'fornicacion'\textsuperscript{398}. In this example, 'il la fet estre
fornicaire' translates the Vulgate's 'facit eam
moechari'. In other instances in the Gospels, words
related to 'moechari' are translated by 'avoltire' or
'avoutire'\textsuperscript{399}. The use of 'fornicaire' in the Gospels
here may have been prompted by the rather complicated
syntax of the Vulgate - 'moechari' is the present
infinitive of the deponent verb 'moechor' - rather than
reflecting the work of a different translator. Even if we do accept it as evidence of this, it is the only example we have and so cannot be seen as significant on its own. The use of 'fornicacion' in the Gospels is regular, entirely dependent on the presence of 'fornicatio' in the Vulgate.

There would seem to be no examples of 'fornicatio' in Genesis, so we cannot compare how it is translated here with how it is translated in the Gospels. However, it is used elsewhere in BXIII, in I Corinthians 5.1 and in a gloss in Joshua taken from Origen, cited by Berger^400. Whether 'fornicacion' is used in the Joshua gloss because 'fornicatio' occurs in the Origen gloss that the glossator was using, or whether it translates some other word in the source gloss, would appear to be unknown.

This study of the use of 'fornicacion' and related words in the Gospels gives very little evidence; the use of 'fornicaire' may suggest the work of a different translator, or may not, and we have no material with which it can be compared from Genesis.

(d) The use of 'sepulture/sepulcre' and 'tombel/tombliaus'

The Vulgate 'sepulchrum' is always translated by 'sepulcre'401 and 'sepultura' by 'sepulture'402 in the Gospels; there are no occurrences of 'tombel' or
'tombliaus' in the Gospels. We have, therefore, no
evidence as to the work of different translators here.
(The use of 'sepulcre' in Mark 16.9 is an addition to the
text on the part of the translator.)

In Genesis, we find again that the Vulgate 'sepulchrum'
is translated by 'sepulcre' (23.4 and 23.6), but in this
book we also find some examples of 'tombrel' and
'tombliaux'403. These words are used to translate the
Vulgate's 'tumulus'. 'Tumulus' would seem to imply
something slightly different from 'sepulchrum', rather
suggesting a heap of stones or mound erected as a
memorial, and it may be this distinction that the Genesis
translator is keeping by using 'toblel' and 'tombliaux'
rather than 'sepulcre' here. The choice of Old French
word would seem to be governed by the word in the Vulgate
source. This may account for the lack of the use of
'tombrel' and 'tombliaux' in the Gospels; it was not a
word that the translator needed if it translated
something other than 'sepulchrum'.

It would seem, then, that the words 'sepulcre/sepulture'
and 'tombrel/tombliaux' had distinct meanings at least for
the translator of Genesis, and it would seem for the
translator of the Gospels. Each pair translated a
different Latin word, and it would seem to have been this
Latin word which governed the word used in French. This
accounts for the lack of 'tombrel/tombliaux' in the
Gospels, while it is used in Genesis. As the use of
'sepulcre/sepulture' and 'tombel/tombialiax' seems to have been dependent on the Vulgate here, we have no evidence as to the work of different translators.

(e) The doubling of 'veraiement'

Doubling of 'veraiement' is only found in the phrase 'Ge vos di veraiement veraiement' as a translation of the Vulgate 'Amen, amen dico vobis'. 'Amen, amen dico vobis' is in turn the form found in only one Gospel - John - the other three all having 'Amen dico vobis', translated in EXIII by 'Ge vos di veraiement'. Any evidence from the doubling of 'veraiement', therefore, can give evidence only for John and not for the EXIII Gospels as a whole.

As already stated, the Vulgate phrase in John in question here is 'Amen, amen dico vobis', found throughout the Gospel with no variation. However, this is translated in John by two phrases, 'ge vos di veraiement' and 'ge vos di veraiement veraiement'. Thus a single Vulgate phrase has two possible translations in the Old French John, and the occurrence of these may suggest the work of different translators, should the French phrases be grouped in any way. What we find, is that the phrase 'ge vos di veraiement' occurs as a translation of the Latin from the beginning of John up to and including 6.32, and that 'ge vos di veraiement veraiement' occurs from 6.47 to the end. There is one exception only to this pattern, in 13.20, where 'Amen amen dico vobis' is translated with
only one 'veraiement'. However, given that it is doubled in both the preceding and following verses (13.19 and 13.21), this example is perhaps more likely to reflect scribal error at some point in the text's transmission, or authorial variation rather than the presence of a different translator for a single verse.

The occurrences of the doubling of 'veraiement' in John do indeed suggest that we might be able to begin to identify the work of different translators. From 6.47 to the end, the translator (or translators) copied the Vulgate phrase strictly, translating each 'amen' in the phrase 'Amen amen dico vobis' as 'veraiement', with the subsequent doubling this produces. From the beginning of the Gospel as far as 6.32, however, the translator (or translators) did not follow the Vulgate so strictly, translating 'amen amen' with a single 'veraiement'. This does indeed suggest that John 1-6.32 may well have had a different translator to the rest of John. However, this is not quite as straightforward as it would seem. 'Ge vos di veraiement' is used regularly elsewhere in the Gospels, and therefore is an accepted set phrase, and it is not inconceivable that the translator of the first part of John used this phrase because it was familiar to him, and an acceptable phrase to use. It is certainly possible that the evidence here suggests different translators in John, but even this evidence remains inconclusive without corroborating evidence.
(f) The use of 'locuste', 'langouste' and 'aosterele'

The use of these words in BXIII has been discussed by Berger, who noted that the Vulgate 'locustae' is translated by 'locuste' in Exodus 10.4, by 'langoustes' in Numbers 13.34 (recte 13.33) and Judges 7.12, by 'aostereles' in Job 20 (recte 39.20) and its variant 'aoustereles' in Matthew 3.4 (given as 'aostereles' in Sneddon's base manuscript). He does not discuss the translation of 'locustae' in other places and concludes from these examples that they are evidence of 'diversité de traducteurs' in BXIII.

It is worthwhile seeing how far the different translations of 'locustae' found by Berger are also found in the Gospels, but unfortunately, there are only two occurrences of this word in them. In both places, 'locustae' is translated by 'aostereles' (Matthew 3.4 and 'aoustereles' (Mark 1.6). Neither 'locuste' nor 'langoustes' are found in the Gospels, and we have, therefore, no evidence as to the work of different translators in them. The evidence of the Gospels adds very little to what has already been done by Berger here; only a study of the Old Testament occurrences of the possible French translations of 'locustae' would add more to this.
Berger has already noticed that 'la mort d'enfer' is used as a translation for 'vae' in some places in BXIII, citing examples in Isaiah and Matthew (18.7 and 23.14). He believes that this suggests 'une sorte de parenté' between the Prophets and the Gospels, that 'Cette circonstance confirme la ressemblance, basée surtout sur un égal mérite dans la traduction, qui paraît exister entre les Prophètes et les Évangiles'. It would be interesting to see if there are any other examples of 'vae' translated in this way in the Gospels, and this is what has been studied here.

The concordance has shown that there are, in fact, only two examples of 'vae' being translated as 'la mort d'enfer' in the Gospels, these being those examples already cited by Berger. Otherwise, 'vae' is translated by 'las', and this is in fact the much more common way of translating it in the Gospels.

How far these different translations of 'vae' can be said to reflect the work of different translators, however, is very much open to question, given the example in Matthew 11.21. Here, we find 'vae' translated by 'las', but this is then glossed as 'vos avroiz la mort d'enfer'. The fact that 'la mort d'enfer' is, in this example, given in a gloss rather than as a direct translation of 'vae' should remind us of a phenomenon discussed elsewhere in
this thesis — that of the incorporation of gloss material into the translation proper, and in particular, the translation of 'scriba' as 'li sage de la loi'. It will be remembered that in this particular example, 'li sage de la loi' has been identified as material from gloss sources which the BXIII translator has, for the most part (in forty-five instances), used directly as a translation of 'scriba', instead of translating this as 'scribe' with 'li sage de la loi' given in a gloss (which occurs only three times). This suggests that while 'las' is the Old French translation of 'vae', 'la mort d'enfer' may be gloss material, which gloss material the translator incorporated directly into his text as part of the translation in some places rather than give it as a gloss.

If we look more closely at the examples of 'la mort d'enfer' in the Gospels text, it becomes clear that this may be what is happening. The example in Matthew 11.21 has 'vae' occurring once only, followed by 'la mort d'enfer' as a gloss. The examples cited by Berger, however, have more than one occurrence of 'vae' in the same verse (Matthew 18.17), or frequent occurrences of it in preceding and following verses (Matthew 23.14, preceded by 23.13, followed by 23.15 and 23.16). What could be happening here, is that the translator, aware that 'vae' translated as 'las' needs explanation, incorporates this explanation into the text, given that he has the opportunity to do so within the same or a
following verse. Hence the second occurrence of 'vae' in 18.7, and that in 23.14 (following 23.13), are translated as 'la mort d'enfer'. There is no need to give this material in a gloss, becomes the occurrences of 'vae' in the text allow the translator to incorporate the gloss material into it directly.

What happens in 11.21 confirms that 'la mort d'enfer' is gloss rather than translation material, and any differences between this example and the others in Matthew would seem to be caused by the slightly differing nature of the text rather than a difference in translator-attitude towards the source text. As in 18.7, 'vae' again occurs twice in 11.21, but rather than have the first occurrence of it as 'las' and the second as 'la mort d'enfer', we find that the two instances of 'vae' are combined and 'la mort d'enfer' is given in a gloss. Hence, the Vulgate 'Vae tibi Corozain, vae tibi Bethsaida' is translated as "O tu Corozaim et o tu Bethsaida, las a vos", with 'la mort d'enfer' following in a gloss. This is not what happens in 18.7, as has already been seen, but the difference in treatment is more likely to be have been caused by the fact that in 18.7, the two instances of 'vae' occur in different clauses. It is, in any case, not unknown elsewhere for two instances of 'vae' to be combined in the Old French. We find that in Luke 10.13, both instances of 'vae' in 'Vae tibi Corozain. Vae tibi Bethsaida' are translated by 'las' (but with no following gloss in this case).
Unfortunately, Matthew 11.21 was not one of the sample glosses checked against possible Latin sources, and so it cannot be stated for certain that 'la mort d'enfer' is gloss material. However, it seems likely that this would prove to be the case. What we are left with here, then, is gloss material incorporated into the text in the Gospels when it is possible, given the occurrences of 'vae', to do so, and given as a gloss when the text makes it difficult to do otherwise. How far this different treatment of 'vae' reflects the work of different translators is very much open to doubt, given the example of 'scriba', translated throughout the Gospels by the gloss material 'li sage de la loi'. If more than one translator worked on the Gospels, then the use of gloss material in the translation must have been a stylistic feature that they all shared.

We need now to consider how far, if at all, the example in Isaiah cited by Berger follows this pattern. Unfortunately, Berger gives no more precise a reference to the exact location of this example than 'les premiers versets d'Esaié'. It would seem, from this, that Berger means Isaiah 1.4 'Vae genti peccatrici', which is neither preceded nor followed by another occurrence of 'vae'. It is, however, translated as 'Ils auront la mort d'enfer'. However, it is clear from the above discussion that this example is stylistically different to those in Matthew 18.7 and 23.14, in that in Matthew,
'vae' is translated as both 'las' and 'la mort d'enfer', whereas here the standard Old French translation is omitted entirely. When we see that in Matthew 11.21 the style in the Gospels for the treatment of a single occurrence of 'vae' is to translate it by 'las' and add 'la mort d'enfer' as a gloss, then it becomes clear that the odd example, that which perhaps may show the work of different translators, is that in Isaiah. There is certainly enough stylistic difference here to allow us to doubt Berger's conclusion about the translation of 'vae' as 'la mort d'enfer'. 'Cette circonstance confirme la ressemblance, basée surtout sur un égal mérite dans la traduction, qui paraît exister entre les Prophètes et les Évangiles'414. It may not be fair to conclude, as Berger does, that this is further evidence of the similarity between the translation of the Gospels and Prophets. The use of 'las' in BXIII rather suggests that Isaiah and the Gospels may have been translated by different people.

III.2 Analysis of the syntax

(a) The use of 'acertes', 'adecertes' and 'certainement'

It is possible that the use of 'acertes', 'adecertes' and 'certainement' reflect the usages of different translators. However, the first point that needs to be made here is that the concordance shows that 'acertes'
does not occur in the BXIII Gospels, but 'a certes' does occur (in Matthew 5.18)⁴¹⁵. This verse reads:

"Ge vos di veraiement et a certes, une lettre ou . i. point ne trespasseront mie de la loi Nostre Seigneur ...".

translating the Vulgate's:

Amen quippe dioo vobis, donec transeat oaelum et terra, iota unum, aut unus apex non praeteribit a lege...

From this, it would appear that 'a certes' has been added for the Vulgate's 'quippe', which does not normally occur in the phrase 'amen dico vobis' and similar phrases⁴¹⁶. 'A certes' then, is not used as a variant of 'adecertes' here, but is added by the translator to match 'quippe' in his Vulgate source.

'Certainement' occurs only once in the Gospels, in Matthew 5.20, where 'ge vos di certainement' translates 'dico enim vobis'. This translation perhaps owes more to 'certainement' being seen as an alternative to 'veraiement' in the phrase 'ge vos di veraiement', the usual BXIII Gospel way of translating 'amen dico vobis' and 'autem dioo vobis'⁴¹⁷. 'Ge vos di veraiement' occurs in close proximity to 'ge vos di certainement', in Matthew 5.18 and again in Matthew 5.22 (then repeatedly, in 5.26, 5.28, 5.32, 5.34, 5.39, 5.44 and in chapter six), perhaps explaining the use of 'certainement' as a variant for 'veraiement'. If we compare the use of 'ge
vos di veraie" and 'ge vos di certainem', it does indeed appear that 'certainem' is nothing more than a rarely used variant of 'veraieem':

5.20 Ge vos di certainem, que se vos n'avez plus grant justice que les sages de la loi . . .
5.28 Ge vos di veraieem, que tuit cil qui verront feme et la covoiteront . . .
5.32 Ge vos di veraieem, que tuit cil qui leront lors femes . . .
5.34 Ge vos di veraieem, que l'en ne doit mie jurer del tout en tout . . .
5.39 Ge vos di veraieem, que vos ne contrestez mie au mal . . .

However it must be said, that as a variant, it is extremely rare, occurring only once, when it could have been used more frequently. As a single example of a variant, the use of 'certainem' provides no evidence of the work of different translators in the Gospels.

It is 'adecertes', then, which is the most commonly used of these three words. It is used in the following contexts in the Gospels: to render 'autem'418, to render 'enim'419, to render 'et enim'420, to render 'quippe'421, to render 'siquidem'422, to render 'quidem'423, and in places where there is no corresponding adverb in the Vulgate as an expansion of the Vulgate424.

Of these, only 'autem' and 'siquidem' seem not to imply the idea of 'truly, certainly, to be sure', conveyed in
'adecertes', although the translator(s) has obviously felt that this is the implication in these instances and has chosen to use 'adecertes' accordingly.

However, the use of 'adecertes' for 'autem' and 'enim' is sporadic; as Berger notes 'Les mots autem, enim, sont fort judicieusement omis'. The same is true of 'quidem', omitted entirely from the BXIII translation in, for example, Matthew 3.11, 9.37, Mark 14.38, Luke 1.1, 3.16, 10.2, 22.22 and 23.41.

The use of 'adecertes', then, for 'autem', 'enim', 'quidem, et cetera is sporadic and usually linked to certain words in the Vulgate. There is nothing here to suggest the work of different translators for different parts of the BXIII Gospels. However, the use of 'adecertes' in the Gospels can now be compared to its use in Genesis, as discussed by Quereuil.

It will be remembered that Quereuil has claimed that the copyist of his base manuscript has used 'adecertes' in a specific way - as a marker for the return to the translation proper following a gloss. This is not what we have in the Gospels, and so would seem to be a difference in usage which could indicate the work of different translators. However, Quereuil's statement as to the use of 'adecertes' in Genesis is open to challenge, and given this, it is only fair to quote exactly what he says:
La glose et le texte ayant été probablement traduit simultanément, ils se trouvent présentés sur le même plan. Cependant, le copiste du manuscrit A les sépare matériellement pour éviter tout risque de confusion, au moyen d'une sorte de parenthèse; de plus, le retour au texte est le plus souvent marqué par l'emploi d'une lettre capitale et la présence fréquente de l'adverbe *adecertes*. 427

Quereuil could just be expressing himself badly here, or could be seeming to imply that the copyist of his base manuscript deliberately used 'adecertes' at the beginning of a sentence or clause in the text following a gloss as a way of indicating that the gloss had finished, and that what follows is Scripture. He sees evidence for this use of 'adecertes' in the fact that it does not occur in all of the Genesis manuscripts in the same places.

However, this assessment of the use of 'adecertes' is based on the evidence of one version ('A') of the Genesis text, which version Quereuil used for his edition. It is frequently omitted from manuscripts representing the second version, usually from at least Quereuil's 'C' and 'L', and often from his 'B' too428. If Quereuil had used the 'CLB' group, his conclusions about the use of 'adecertes' in Genesis may have been different.

What Quereuil does not seem to have considered, however, is the possibility that this 'adecertes' is actually translating something in the Vulgate source, and was not added on his own initiative by the copyist. A relatively cursory check through Quereuil's edition of Genesis shows
that there are twenty-four occasions, scattered throughout Genesis, in which the text following a gloss begins with 'adecertes'. In fourteen of these incidences, 'adecertes' in BXIII corresponds with 'autem' in the Vulgate, as has already been seen with the occurrence of 'adecertes' in the Gospels. Again, as in the Gospels, 'adecertes' in Genesis also corresponds to 'quoque' in the Vulgate, which it does in six instances. In the remaining four instances, it corresponds to a Latin word to which it does not correspond in the Gospels, in two instances to 'vero', and in one each to 'porro' and 'etiam'.

'Adecertes' may certainly be considered as a translation for 'autem', 'quoque' and 'vero', and there is no problem about interpreting it as a translation of 'porro' and 'etiam' given the range of Latin words that it has been seen to translate in the Gospels. This all suggests that Quereuil is wrong to suggest that 'adecertes' was added deliberately by the copyist of his base manuscript to mark the end of a gloss. It is much more likely that its presence is due to the translator having used 'adecertes' to translate 'autem', 'quoque', 'vero', 'etiam' or 'porro' in the Vulgate. We need only remember what Berger has said about the translation of 'autem' and 'enim' in the Gospels, that they are 'fort judicieusement omis', to account for 'adecertes' not being found in the same places in other Genesis manuscripts. These other manuscripts may represent a different version of the
Genesis translation, one in which 'autem' and other words were omitted.

However, perhaps this is not being fair to Quereuil, who may mean something slightly different. It is possible that he has just expressed himself badly, and that what he is trying to say is not that 'adecertes' was added by the copyist independently of what was in the Vulgate source, but that given that 'autem' and other words could either be translated by 'adecertes' or omitted entirely, the decision to translate 'autem' et cetera by 'adecertes' was taken by the translator in the light of the position of that 'autem' in the Vulgate vis à vis the position of the glosses in Genesis. That is, that if 'autem' or some other such word occurred in a sentence immediately following a BXIII gloss on Genesis, that in those places only would 'adecertes' be used to translate the Latin, thus it would have a dual function, as both translation and marker. Otherwise, 'autem' et cetera would not be generally translated by 'adecertes', but would be omitted. It is certainly true that my relatively limited check through Quereuil's edition (for which I have had no access to a concordance), has only shown two instances of 'adecertes' being used to translate 'autem' in a position in which it does not follow a gloss.  

This may be what Quereuil means when he talks about a specific use of 'adecertes' in Genesis. However, there
is evidence that this is not what is happening, and that he is mistaken in believing to have identified this as a use of 'adecertes'.

As already stated above, there are twenty-four places in which 'adecertes' occurs in a sentence following a gloss. My cursory check of his edition has revealed that there are in fact far more places (sixty-five) in which a word translatable by 'adecertes' is not translated by this word, but is omitted entirely from BXIII in spite of its occurring in a sentence immediately following a BXIII gloss, in that very position in which we might (from Quereuil) expect 'adecertes' to appear. These sixty-five instances are comprised of forty-three in which 'adecertes' would translate 'autem'\(^436\), twelve in which it would translate 'quoque'\(^437\), six in which it would translate 'vero'\(^438\), two in which it would translate 'quippe'\(^439\) and one each in which it would translate 'porro'\(^440\) and 'enim'\(^441\). All of these Latin words are words which, as has already been seen, can be translated by 'adecertes'.

There are, therefore, many more examples of sentences following a Genesis gloss in which 'adecertes' could have been used but was not, than there are examples of sentences in which it could have been used and was. It seems unlikely given this that there is anything significant at all about the use of 'adecertes' in Genesis, although we could postulate an early exemplar
with 'adecertes' used in all the appropriate places, many of which were lost in surviving manuscripts in the same way as Ouereuil sees their loss in Genesis manuscripts he has consulted. The least that can be said is that he may be wrong to identify this as part of the glossator's, or copyist's, rhetoric or technique of incorporating gloss material into the text, and that his statement, that the presence of 'adecertes' in the same places in unglossed copies of Genesis means that a copyist suppressed the glosses and did not copy them from his exemplar\textsuperscript{442}, may be entirely without foundation.

Once Ouereuil's statement as to the function of 'adecertes' in Genesis has been examined more thoroughly in the light of the text, it becomes clear that it may well be erroneous. 'Adecertes' is used throughout the text to translate words such as 'autem', 'quoque', 'quippe' 'enim', 'vero' and 'porro' usually only in sentences following a gloss, but not with so much regularity and consistency that we can be confident that this is a specific, deliberate usage on the part of the copyist or translator. Otherwise, it is used to translate the same sort of words it translates in the Gospels. Again as in the Gospels, words such as 'autem', 'enim' et cetera may be omitted from BXIII, and Berger's statement that they are 'fort judicieusement omis' from the Gospels applies equally to Genesis\textsuperscript{443}. This would not have been the case had all eighty-nine possible instances been translated by 'adecertes'. There is,
then, very little evidence to suggest that the use of 'adecertes' reflects a deliberate intention on the part of the copyist of Guereuil's MS A, and, given this, our conclusion must be that its use in Genesis is not unlike its use in the Gospels, even though its use in Genesis shows signs of a little more regularity, but it is not regular enough to allow us to be sure of the copyist's intentions in his use of 'adecertes'. There is therefore no conclusive evidence on this point as to the existence of the work of different translators in the Gospels and Genesis.

(b) The use of 'ausi come'

This may be another phrase the use of which may reflect different translators, in that it could have one of two distinct usages. It may be used in the BXIII Gospels in a clause with a main clause beginning with 'autressi' or 'ainsi', or it may just be a simple variant of 'si come'. If there is any pattern as to how this phrase is used, then this may provide valuable evidence as to the existence of passages translated by different people.

The examples of the use of 'ausi come' in the BXIII Gospels, gleaned from the concordance available, show that it occurs only four times in the Gospels - Mark 7.9, Luke 19.46, John 7.10 and John 19.39, of which the examples in Luke and Mark are in glosses. In none of these instances does it occur in a sentence with a main
clause beginning with 'autressi' or 'ainsi', seeming in each case to be a variant of the much more common 'si come'. There are, therefore, no different uses of this phrase in the BXIII Gospels to help us identify different translators. Furthermore, it occurs so rarely as a variant of 'si come' that, taken on its own, it gives little evidence of the work of different translators. It is not as if we have a dozen or so examples clustered together, which might have been significant. It would appear that the BXIII Gospel translator used 'aussi come' as a variant of 'si come', but not very frequently.

Both 'si come' and its variant 'aussi come' occur in Genesis, so in that the translator could use both, Genesis is like the Gospels. 'Si come' also has a specific use in the Genesis glosses, being used to introduce the opinions or beliefs of a named source (usually a person), as in the glosses on 1.2 ('si come dit Strabus', and 'Si come dit Isodorus'), and 1.12 ('Si come Saint Gregoires dist'). However, this is a usage which also occurs in the Gospels, although more rarely, as named exegetes (or texts) are rarely mentioned. It is found in the Gospels in the glosses on Mark 14.3(2) ('si come dit Bedes') and Luke 19.44 ('si come l'en list es estoires des Roumains').

We have no evidence, from the use of 'aussi come' as a variant of 'si come', of the work of different
translators in the Gospels, or the Gospels as compared to Genesis.

(c) The use of 'tu' and 'vos' referring to God

Old French had the possibility of using 'vos' as a singular, polite form\(^{446}\), although there does seem to have been a certain amount of confusion and use of both 'tu' and 'vos' in a single phrase\(^{447}\). Berger, discussing the language of MS EN fonds fr 899, notices a similar confusion: 'Le tutoiement y est la règle ordinaire, tant pour parler à Dieu qu’aux hommes, mais il y a à cet usage beaucoup d’exceptions'\(^{448}\), which confusion is found, amongst other books, in the Gospels, Berger’s example being from Luke 10.21 'Ge regehis a vos', which is the reading given in Sneddon’s edition.

Given that 'tu' and 'vos' could both be used as singular pronouns in Old French, and in BXIII, it may be possible to use this information to begin to identify those passages of the Gospels translated by different people; where one translator has used 'tu', another may have used 'vos'. The choice of whether to use 'tu' or 'vos' as a polite form is one for which the translator gets no guidance from the Vulgate which uses 'tu' throughout as the second person singular pronoun and does not have 'vos' as an alternative (polite) singular form. Given this, it is possible that the occurrence of 'tu' and 'vos' in the BXIII Gospels may help indicate passages
translated by different people, with different attitudes towards the translation of the Vulgate's 'tu'. Ideally, any such study of the use of 'tu' and 'vos' in the BXIII Gospels should include all instances of these pronouns, but given that such a detailed linguistic study cannot form part of this thesis, only a particular instance may be studied. Berger, as has been seen above, has noted that both 'tu' and 'vos' are used of God (the Father), and this would be a sensible place to begin studying the use of the second person pronouns in the BXIII Gospels. This could be further complemented by studying the use of 'tu' and 'vos' referring to Jesus (God the Son), given that instances of people addressing him are much more common, and are therefore more likely to reflect different attitudes or usages on the parts of different translators.

The following study, therefore, is divided up into two sections: (a) the use of 'tu' and 'vos' referring to God the Father, and (b) the use of 'tu' and 'vos' referring to God the Son (Jesus).

(i) The use of 'tu' and 'vos' referring to God the Father

The usual form of address for God the Father, as used mostly by Jesus, is 'tu', used, for example in the Lord's Prayer (Matthew 6.9-13 and Luke 11.2-4). Other examples of this use of 'tu' for God the father include Luke 18.11 'Sire Dex, ge te rent graces...'; Luke 18.13 'Sire, soies
deboneres a moi pecheor', Luke 23.34 'Et Jhesus disoit: "Pere, pardon leur, quar il ne sevent ce qu'il font"', Luke 23.46 'Et Jhesus, criant a haute voiz, dist: "Pere, ge baille mon esperit en tes mains"', Mark 14.36 'et il dist: "Abba, Pere, tu puez toutes choses, oste moi cest henap ... et ce que ge vueill ne soit mie fet, mes ce que tu vels"', Mark 15.34 'Jhesus criant a haute voiz, disant: "Heloy, heloy, lagmazabathani?" Ce est a dire: "Mon Deu, mon Deu, por quoi m'as tu deguerpi?"' and John 17.1-21 'il estrema ses eulz el ciel et dist: "Pere, l'eure est venue de clarefier ton Fill ..."'.

'Vos' is much more rarely used referring to God the Father, occurring in the verse in Luke 10.21-22, where the Vulgate uses 'tu'. The only other place where 'vos' is used to refer to God the Father seems to be Matthew 26.39, where 'vos' and 'tu' are both used within the same sentence, separated by a gloss, 'Et Jhesus alant .i. pou avant, il se coucha seur sa face, priant et disant: "Mon Pere, se vostre volenté est, ostez moi cest henap que ge ne le boive" (c'est a dire destornez ceste mort qu'il ne la me coviegne souffrir); "neporquant, ce que ge vueill ne soit mie fet, mes ce que tu veuls."' The Vulgate uses 'tu' throughout, with 'transeat' and 'sed sicut tu'. A similar verse in Mark 14.36 (given above), uses 'tu' throughout as well. Such use of both singular and polite singular pronouns is not unknown elsewhere in BXIII; Berger notes the presence of this phenomenon in a verse in Acts.
There is little evidence here that the translator(s) of the BXIII Gospels did anything other than copy the pronoun used in the Vulgate, and that as this was 'tu', in the majority of cases this gave 'tu' in the Old French. There is a single example of 'vos' being used to render the Vulgate 'tu' referring to God the Father, and another example where both 'vos' and 'tu' are used to refer to him in the same sentence. It is difficult to assess the importance of these two examples, but it seems likely, given the very few examples of the use of 'vos' to refer to God the Father, that the translator(s) working on the BXIII Gospels did not, for the most part, choose to use the Old French polite singular 'vos' when referring to God. There is certainly no evidence here that can be used to begin to identify different translators.

(ii) The use of 'tu' and 'vos' referring to God the Son

Again, 'tu' is the pronoun usually used when referring to Jesus, again reflecting the Latin 'tu' in the Vulgate. As with God the Father above, examples of 'vos' used to refer to Jesus seem to be extremely rare. 'Vos' is used in Luke 6.2-3 "Por quoi fêtes vos ce qui ne loist pas estre fet el sabbat?", but this would seem to be addressed not to Jesus alone, but to Jesus and his disciples. The Vulgate has the plural verb 'facitis', suggesting that more than one person is being addressed here.
The only other examples to consider here are both in Luke, where the plural imperative 'vez' is used to address Jesus rather than the singular form 'voiz', Luke 19.8 'Et Zacheus, estant devant Nostre Seignor, li dist: "Sire, vez ci que ge donne la moitie de mes biens as povres..."' and Luke 22.38 'Et il distrent: "Sire, vez ci ii. espees."' Again, it is difficult to know how to assess these examples. In both cases, 'vez ci' translates the Vulgate 'ecce', which covers both singular and plural forms. It is only in the Old French versions that the translator needs to consider whether the 'ecce' in question is addressing one or more people, and choose between 'voiz ci' and 'vez ci' accordingly. 'Voiz ci' is always used where a singular verb or possessive pronoun makes it clear that only one person is being addressed, as in John 19.26 "Feme, voiz ci ton Fill ... Voiz ci ta mere"; Matthew 25.22 'Sire, tu me baillas ... voiz ci ...'; Mark 11.21 "Mestre, voiz ci le figuier que tu maudeis est sechié" and Luke 19.20 'Voiz ci ton besant ... ', and 'vez ci' where it is clear that more than one person is being addressed.

There is, however, a slight indication that 'vez ci' is used slightly more loosely for 'ecce' where no verb or pronoun governs the choice of which to use, that 'vez ci' is the unmarked variant. (It is the marked variant which tends to become the general, thus 'voiz ci' becomes 'voici' in modern French and 'vez ci' is lost.) As well
as the two examples from Luke, given above, where 'vez' addresses a single person, there is also the use of 'vez' in John 1.47, where we have no indication of the number of people Jesus seems to be addressing, 'Quant Jhesus vit Nathanael venant a soi, il dist de lui: "Vez oi verai Israelitien"'. In these examples, there is perhaps a hint that 'vez oi' was almost a formulaic translation for 'ecce' where 'voiz oi' was not demanded by a very obvious context (such as a singular pronoun or verb). This becomes clearer when we consider the example from Luke 19.8 again, and compare it to the example from Mark 11.21. The Luke example uses 'vez oi', 'Et Zacheus, estant devant Nostre Seignor, li dist: "Sire, vez oi que ge donne la moitié de mes biens as povres..."'. In this case, 'vez oi' is followed not by 'tu' or 'vos' but by 'ge', only the singular 'Sire' suggesting that 'voiz oi' should have been used here. The example from Mark, '"Mestre, voiz oi le figuier que tu maudeis est sechié"', however, is very similar, but significantly different. It has 'mestre' (for 'sire'), but this is followed by 'tu', which demands 'voiz oi'. If the translator saw the word 'ecce' and then looked for a following pronoun or verb on which to base his choice of translation, then the lack of following 'tu' in the Luke example may account for the presence here of 'vez' instead of 'voiz'.

There are only two examples of 'vez' used to address Jesus, and it is hard to find in them, taken alone, any evidence of the work of different translators. Two
examples can hardly be considered significant, especially
given the possibility that 'vez ci' could have been a
formulaic translation of 'ecce' where no following
pronoun or verb made 'voiz ci' the obvious choice.

The use of 'tu' and 'vos' to refer to God the Father and
God the Son would, therefore, seem to mirror the
Vulgate's use of 'tu' almost exactly, with so few
examples of 'vos' being used instead that these would
seem to provide no evidence at all of the work of
different translators. This can be compared to Genesis,
in which 'tu' is also used to refer to God (the
Father)\textsuperscript{451}. It would seem that generally in BXIII the
use of 'tu' and 'vos' followed the Vulgate, with only
relatively rare, sporadic exceptions\textsuperscript{452}. So rare and
sporadic do any exceptions seem to be that it may be
considered unlikely that they are any indication of the
work of different translators.

III.3 Summary

What conclusions, then, do these studies of vocabulary
and linguistic features allow us to reach?
Unfortunately, many of the features of syntax and
vocabulary studied here have yielded very little
material, but we can put everything together to see if
any patterns emerge.
First of all, we need to consider any evidence that we have for the work of different translators in the Gospels. The use of 'fornicaire' perhaps suggests a different translator for part of Matthew (5.32) as opposed to later chapters of the same Gospel (15.19, 19.19) and Mark (7.21) and John (8.41). However, this is based on a single example of a word and is not supported by evidence from any of the other words and phrases studied here. The evidence from the use of 'senefer' perhaps suggests different translators for Luke and John, but again this is based on very little evidence and unsupported. The doubling of 'veraiement' is the only other evidence identified for the Gospels, and this suggests that perhaps the beginning of John (1.1 - 6.32) had a different translator to the rest (6.47 to the end). We have no evidence for the work of different translators in the Gospels from the uses of 'glaive' and 'espee', 'sepulcre/sepulture' and 'tombel/tombiaux', 'ausi come' and 'tu' and 'vos'. The evidence from the use of 'locuste', 'langouste' and 'aosterele', tells us nothing, unless two examples of the use of the same word in the Gospels (in Mark and Matthew) are to be taken as evidence of the work of the same translator (which I think it would hasty to conclude). As already discussed above, the evidence from the use of 'la mort d'enfer' as a translation of 'vae' does not suggest the evidence of different translators either.
In the second place, we can now consider any evidence which allows us to compare the Gospels with the Old Testament. The evidence of the use 'glaive' and 'espee' suggests perhaps different translators for the Gospels as opposed to Genesis, and this is perhaps also true of the use of 'adecertes', although it has to be said that the evidence here is not convincing. The evidence from the use of 'locuste' adds nothing to what Berger has already concluded, unless the use of 'aostereles' in Matthew and Mark is taken to suggest the same translator as Job, but the evidence from three occurrences of this word can hardly be taken as conclusive. The evidence from the use of 'la mort d'enfer' as a translation of 'vae' suggests perhaps that Isaiah and the Gospels did not share the same translator, contrary to Berger's opinion. We have no evidence from the 'fornicacion' and 'fornicaire', 'sepulcre/sepulture' and 'tombel/tombiaux', 'veraiement', 'ausi come' and 'tu' and 'vos'.

The only evidence from all of this that is perhaps significant is that of the doubling of 'veraiement' in John. It is only here that we see any evidence for translators exercising a choice as to how to translate the Vulgate source, and choosing differently. Otherwise, the evidence collected is of very little value on its own, and unfortunately is of no more value when assembled. This study has, at most, suggested that it may be possible to identify the work of different translators, but any study which would hope to do so
would need to be considerably bigger than it has been possible to do here. We should, perhaps, remember the example of 'scriba'. If, in forty-five places throughout the Gospels, it is always translated using gloss material rather than the standard Old French translation, then if we postulate more than one translator for the Gospels, we must also accept that translation technique (for example the decision to use gloss material directly in the text where appropriate) was to a certain extent shared by these translators, or more variation would have been seen in the translation of 'scriba'. Such examples as this add considerably to the complexity of the issue. All that can be concluded here is that it is possible that different parts of the Gospels were translated by different people, indeed that different parts of BXIII were translated by different people, but there is very little evidence for this from the brief linguistic study undertaken here. As far as the Gospels are concerned, accepting the possibility of there being different translators means that we must also accept that there is an element of similarity in their translation technique, as much as has already been seen in the coherence of the glossing technique throughout the four Gospels.

Some of the evidence from this linguistic survey, especially that for the translation of 'vas', strengthens the conclusion already drawn, that the translator and glossator are indeed one and the same person.
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410. See above pp. 383-9 for a discussion of the material from gloss sources incorporated into the translation, and pp. 388-9 or a discussion of 'scriba'.

411. For a list of places in which 'scriba' is thus translated, see note 32, p. 525.

412. Berger (1884: 146).

413. Berger (1884: 146).

415. This single occurrence of 'a certes' was found by chance, as there are no occurrences of 'certes' given in the concordance used, and none listed under 'a'.

416. See, for example, the Vulgate readings for Matthew 5.20, 5.5.22, 5.26, 5.28, 5.325.34, 5.44.

417. 'Autem dico vobis' is translated as 'ge vos di veroim' in eg Matthew 5.22, to give but one example, and 'amen dico vobis' by the same Old French phrase in eg Matthew 6.2.


424. Matthew 26.26 has 'et dist: "Prenez et mengiez; adecertes, c'est mon cors."' for the Vulgate's 'et ait: Accipite, et comedite: hoc est corpus meum'.


428. For the manuscript tradition and the existence of these two versions, see Ouereuil (1988: 37-52). Examples of 'adcertes' missing from the second version, include:
1.6 (Quereuil 1988: 94 note w) 1.14 (Quereuil 1988: 97 note w)
1.20 (Quereuil 1988: 98 note j) 1.24 (Quereuil 1988: 99 note t)
3.16 (Quereuil 1988: 115 note b) 3.17 (Quereuil 1988: 116 note h)
4.1 (Quereuil 1988: 119 note a) 4.3 (Quereuil 1988: 119 note o)

430. 1.14, 4.3, 5.3, 6.16, 7.23, 11.5, 11.27, 14.21, 18.13, 23.1, 26.23, 35.22, 42.5 and 48.8.
431. 1.6, 1.24, 3.16, 4.4, 4.25 and 8.8.
432. 3.17 and 4.1.
433. 7.18.
434. 1.20.
435. 11.1 and 12.10.
437. In 12.10, 16.15, 18.8, 22.6, 32.1, 37.5, 37.9, 38.7, 41.27, 41.44, 45.22 and 50.22.
438. In 16.21, 18.7, 18.8, 25.1, 35.14 and 45.22.
439. In 21.5 and 50.3.
441. In 18.19.
443. Berger does not make this point himself in his discussion of Genesis (Berger 1984: 121-4).
444. The concordance shows that 'si come' occurs 66 times in the BXIII Gospels as opposed to the four occurrences of 'ausi come'.
445. See, for example, 'si come' in 3.4, and in glosses in 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5, and 'aussi come' in glosses preceding 1.1, and following 1.19.
449. 'Vos' is also used in John 10.34 'Ge dis que vos estes Dex?' in this instance copying the Vulgate's plural pronoun and verb 'Dii estis'. However, the translator would have had no choice as to the pronoun to be used here, and the use of 'vos' here is therefore no evidence of translator attitude or usage.
451. The use of 'tu' in Genesis to refer to God can be seen in the following passages: 3.10, 3.12, 4.13, 15.2-3, 17.18, 18.22-33, 24.42 and 32.9-12.
452. For another exception, see Berger (1884: 155), Psalm 115 verse 16 uses ‘vos’, whereas ‘tu’ is used in Psalm 118 verse 89.

Chapter Eight: CONCLUSIONS

I BXIII in Context

From the discussion of the themes found in the BXIII glosses, and of the material the glossator takes from his Latin sources and how he adapts it, it becomes clear that the glossator has two principal concerns in his glosses. These are, first, to help the audience understand the text and its narrative, and, secondly, to use whatever lemmas he can to guide his audience towards proper behaviour while at the same time stressing that proper (or improper) behaviour will be rewarded with what it deserves. This is glossing according to two of the four senses of scripture, the literal-historical and the tropological or moral. As regards the other senses, allegory is rare in the BXIII Gospel glosses, and eschatology is non-existent unless one includes in this category the idea of 'just rewards', properly part of the BXIII glossator's moral glosses. Such habits of literal-historical and tropological glossing may help us to place the BXIII Gospel glosses in a wider context.

The literal-historical glosses in the BXIII Gospels fall into two broad categories. The first of these comprises all those glosses which give factual information needed to understand the story, such as those glosses which provide historical background to certain events (such as the gloss on Luke 13.1) and which explain Jewish feasts
and customs (such as the gloss on Matthew 26.19, which explains what happens at Passover in some detail). The second category is made up of those glosses which explain the meanings of words and terms which are used in the BXIII translation of the Vulgate, and which, if not understood, obscure the meaning of the text. Both of these groups of glosses reflect specifically twelfth-century concerns, not surprisingly, perhaps, given the twelfth-century nature of much of the gloss material. It is to these concerns that we may now turn.

The emphasis on the literal-historical sense as the foundation of exegesis which supports allegory and tropology is found most notably in the writings of the Victorines. Hugh of St Victor (d. 1141) believed that the first step in studying scripture was a thorough grasp of the literal (as opposed to metaphorical) denotation of the words used, combined with an understanding of the text as history. This stage of study would include 'memorizing carefully the events, the persons, their time and place', and Hugh prepared chronicles and a map of the world as study-aids to this end. His Chronicon contains chronological tables of both biblical and non-biblical events. It is only after the student has a firm grounding in these stages that he may proceed to study allegory. As Châtillon says 'Aucune autre interprétation ne peut être légitimement acceptée si elle n’est fondée sur une explication historique solidelement établie.'
In his quest for the literal-historical sense of scripture, Hugh of St Victor was prepared to seek the help of Jewish exegetes and seems to have learnt the literal meaning of the Pentateuch from Jewish scholars. He would seem to have been particularly concerned with the accuracy of his text and compared the Vulgate text with a literal Latin translation of the Hebrew, which language he seems to have made some effort to learn.

This belief in the importance of the literal-historical sense of the text can also be seen in Andrew of St Victor (d.1175). Andrew would seem to have known more Hebrew than his master Hugh and consulted Jewish scholars extensively on the literal sense of the Old Testament. One aspect of explaining the literal sense of the Old Testament is explaining Jewish customs, and Smalley gives two examples, his commentary on Ezechiel 16.7 which explains that young girls who had not yet reached a marriageable age should be dressed plainly, and on Numbers 3.3 which explains how office was conferred on a man.

To sum up: Hugh of St Victor believed in the importance of understanding the literal denotation of words in the biblical text and understanding the text as history, and Andrew of St Victor believed in consulting Jewish scholars for the literal sense of the Old Testament and explaining Jewish customs. The BXIII Gospel glosses which explain the meaning of the words of the text, the
historical background to the text, and Jewish customs and feasts therefore may be said to reflect the principles behind Victorine scholarship.

The Victorine tradition did not die with Hugh and Andrew, but was carried on by Peter Comestor (who retired to and died in St Victor\textsuperscript{12}), Peter the Chanter and Stephen Langton\textsuperscript{13}. One of the consequences of Andrew's use of Jewish exegesis on the Old Testament was that it made Jewish exegesis available to scholars who would not otherwise have had general access to it; and it was used by his successors. Peter Comestor's *Historia Scholastica* provides the background in biblical history which Hugh of St Victor believed was a necessary first step to understanding scripture, and in it he quotes extensively from Andrew, as well as using Jewish sources directly\textsuperscript{14}. Peter the Chanter also used Andrew for his own Old Testament glosses\textsuperscript{15}, and Stephen Langton, writing some ten years after Andrew's death, used him for his own commentary on the Octateuch\textsuperscript{16}. Andrew was also used by thirteenth-century commentators including Hugh of St Cher\textsuperscript{17}. Given the lasting influence of Hugh of St Victor and especially Andrew of St Victor in the thirteenth century, it does not seem over-speculative to suggest that the literal-historical glosses in the BXIII Gospels reflect Victorine traditions. When we remember that for Matthew and Mark at least the most important commentaries are the commentaries in Av 36 (possibly to be attributed
to Comestor or Langton) then such a connection becomes more probable.

The moral glosses in BXIII may also show Victorine influence. As Châtillon says, the Victorine idea of tropology was to take from scripture 'les enseignements qui guideront le chrétien dans sa vie morale et dans son cheminement intérieur'\textsuperscript{18}. This is a concern with morality which we find later in the works of Comestor, the Chanter and Langton. As Smalley says, these commentators have an interest in 'practical moral problems, and the practical moral purpose'\textsuperscript{19} which amount to a 'humanism that recalls the Victorines'\textsuperscript{20}. Peter the Chanter in particular objected to what Baldwin calls 'excessive allegorizing of the Bible'\textsuperscript{21} and 'maintained that the Scriptures were sufficient for Christian faith and morals'\textsuperscript{22}. The Chanter's \textit{Verbum abbreviatum} has been compared to the BXIII Gospel glosses in this thesis, but does not seem to share much material with them. The same is not true of the other moral text studied here, the sermons of Maurice of Sully, which do share material with the BXIII Gospel glosses. Maurice's sermons were certainly influenced by the Victorines, both directly and indirectly. The direct influence comes from the use Maurice made of the \textit{Allegories} of Richard of St Victor (d.1173), which were written to provide a spiritual interpretation of scripture based on the historical-literal meaning\textsuperscript{23}; and a more indirect influence comes through his use of Peter Comestor's \textit{Historia Scholastica},
for which, as has already been discussed above, Comestor used Andrew of St Victor.

Not only may the literal-historical glosses in the BXIII Gospels reflect Victorine exegesis, but the moral glosses may do so too, attesting, perhaps, to the importance and influence Victorine exegesis had.

The next area which needs to be considered is that of the production of other religious texts in the vernacular. As has already been discussed, Sneddon has suggested that the Dominicans may have been responsible for BXIII, and this remains a possibility even though Dominican exegesis, and especially that of Hugh of St Cher, does not seem to have been particularly influential on the BXIII glosses. Berger was keen to place the production of BXIII in the university, and this too remains possible in the light of this thesis. The study of the sources has not allowed us to date BXIII, or at least the Gospels, more precisely in any way and so challenge either of these theories. However, the Victorine influence on the Gospel glosses suggests that it is at least worth considering any evidence for their being responsible for BXIII. It is certainly true to say that there would seem to have been Victorine involvement in the production of religious texts in the vernacular in both France and England towards the end of the twelfth century and in the opening years of the thirteenth.
The first example, that of a vernacular text produced in France, consists of the sermons of Maurice of Sully already discussed above, which were written between 1168 and 1175\textsuperscript{26}. The Victorine influence on the teaching in these sermons is clear, and it is both direct and indirect. There would seem to be little doubt about the popularity of Maurice's sermons. This is attested by the fact that an Anglo-Norman version of some of them exists and that they were translated into English in the thirteenth century\textsuperscript{27}; both Anglo-Norman and English versions survive in the same manuscript\textsuperscript{28}. This reflects diffusion of Victorine ideas in a more popular, because vernacular, format. Robson believes not only that Maurice used Victorine exegesis as a basis for his sermons; he sees Victorine influence as being the important factor behind later medieval vernacular sermons in general\textsuperscript{29}.

Maurice's sermons were written for 'royal councillors and Paris burgess folk'\textsuperscript{30}; our other examples of religious texts in the vernacular, in this case in English, which may have been written under the auspices of the Victorines, were composed for a very different audience. These are the \textit{Anarene Wisse} (a guide for anchorites), and a group of texts known collectively as the 'Katherine group', which consists of lives of St Katherine, St Margaret and St Juliana, \textit{Sawles Warde} (an allegorical description of torments in hell and the joys of heaven) and \textit{Hali Meithhad} (c.1190-1220\textsuperscript{31}, a homily on the joys of
virginity). All are written in the same West Midlands dialect, and they form a coherent group of linked texts.

All of these texts were written for women. The Anarene Wisse, written c. 1215-21 'or perhaps a little later' shows such extensive links with works by Victorines and Victorine theology that Dobson is led to conclude that it was written by 'a member of the congregation of St Victor'. There is, however, yet another influence on this text and that is the Chanter's Verbum abbreviatum. As Shepherd says 'Apart from the Bible, no writing affords more points of contact with the Anarene Wisse in themes, development of themes, and in common quotations than does the Verbum abbreviatum of Peter the Cantor.' This, as has already been stated, is the Chanter's moral summa, influenced by the Victorines.

Not only was the Anarene Wisse written by a Victorine, but it was also produced in a Victorine foundation. Dobson has considered the linguistic evidence, and arrives at the conclusion that the Anarene Wisse was written at Wigmore in Herefordshire; and we must remember that the first abbot of Wigmore was none other than Andrew of St Victor, who died there in 1175. A similar Wigmore-Victorine origin is likely for the Katherine-group texts, which have close affinities with the Anarene Wisse. It is also interesting to note that
the *Ancrene Wisse* was translated into French, and that this translation was made some time before c.1230.

There is, therefore, demonstrable Victorine involvement in producing vernacular texts for a secular audience (in the case of Maurice of Sully's sermons) and for religious women (in the case of the *Ancrene Wisse* and the Katherine group), and this involvement dates from 1168-75 (for the sermons) and from the last ten years of the twelfth century and first twenty years of the thirteenth century. Given this, and given the fact that many of the BXIII Gospels reflect Victorine exegesis, it is possible to add the Victorines to the list of those possibly responsible for BXIII, along with the Dominicans and the university. The main problem with the Victorine hypothesis is one of date. The Victorines seem to have operated at an earlier date than either the Dominicans or the university, and given the *terminus a quo* of c.1220 for BXIII, this remains a problem. The least that can be said, however, is that the BXIII Gospel glosses seem to contain a lot of twelfth-century material, which twelfth-century material, perhaps not surprisingly, reflects twelfth-century Victorine exegesis and concerns. This is not to say that the Victorines were in any way directly responsible for all or part of BXIII.

No matter who produced BXIII, it is possible that the impetus behind it was a development of that behind a very influential twelfth-century text - the Glossa.
De Hamel in his work on this text has discussed the ownership of glossed books of the Bible. He notes that there would seem to be a change in the pattern of ownership of both glossed and non-glossed Bibles:

It is noticeable too that in the second half of the century, owners are no longer thinking of glossed books as a random accumulation of single volumes but as complete Bibles. This represents a new way of looking at the Bible. Before the twelfth century, patristic and scholastic commentaries concerned one or more individual biblical books. Early glossed books were thought of similarly. From about the end of the third quarter of the twelfth century, however, the Gloss came to be regarded as a composite run of books. This coincides with the writing out of some of the earliest manuscripts of single-volume Bibles and it represents an important shift whereby the whole of Scripture, rather than single books of it, came to be regarded as the basic unit. A full 'bibliotheca' required every volume, and owners began to count up which sections were missing. There is nothing like a slightly incomplete set of anything to tempt a collector to spend money.

What happened with the Glossa Ordinaria may provide us with vital clues as to the impetus behind BXIII. It is not impossible to suggest that just as the demand for complete copies of the Bible, and of the glossed Bible, grew, a similar demand for complete copies of a vernacular Bible also arose. The demand for the complete French Bible could have grown out of an earlier demand, and subsequent production of, a complete Latin Bible, glossed or not. This, perhaps, is the demand which Chereuil believes would have been necessary for BXIII to be undertaken: 'Un ouvrage d'une telle ampleur n'a pu
être entrepris que s'il se trouvait un public prêt à l'accueillir. A demand for complete Bibles arising in the third quarter of the twelfth century could be the precursor of a similar demand for a complete French Bible in the first quarter of the thirteenth century.

The study of the sources has not helped us date BXIII, but it does allow us to place at least the Gospels in a wider context. The material in the glosses is, for Matthew, Mark and Luke, predominantly twelfth-century, later for John. No matter what the date of the material, it seems to reflect twelfth-century exegesis rather than later thirteenth-century exegesis, and this is at least something to add to our composite picture of BXIII even though we cannot be more precise as to date and production, or add to the debate over them.

II Towards some answers

We might now return to the six questions asked about BXIII in chapter one, 'what is it?', 'who wrote it?', 'when?', 'where?', 'why?' and 'for whom?', and see how far this study has helped us to answer them.

It will be remembered that two answers have been offered for the first question of 'what is it?': either BXIII is a single, coherent project (Berger and Sneddon) or it is a publishing venture (Robson). As far as the Gospels are
concerned, it seems fair to assert their unity in that the glosses form a coherent group with identifiable concerns. How much such a unity is due to a single translator for the whole of BXIII, or to a team of translators, remains unknown. If we postulate more than one translator for the Gospels, and probably Genesis, then we must accept the idea of considerable editorial guidance on translation technique (e.g., the incorporation of gloss material into the translation) and glossing (i.e., the type of glosses to write and the form these should take). This is a higher level of editorial control than the existence of two versions of Titus in some manuscripts suggests. The linguistic study undertaken for the Gospels has not shown that more than one translator was at work on the Gospels. The single example perhaps supporting this theory (the doubling of 'veraiemfl') can be accounted for in another way (as being an acceptable variant), and is not striking when compared to the lack of evidence from other linguistic features studied, the continuity of themes in the glosses, and the consistency in the use of Latin gloss material from Gospel to Gospel. It seems likely that the Gospels are the work of one person, and that the same person may well have been responsible for Genesis. More work needs to be done to be able to assert or deny the likelihood of this being the case with the rest of BXIII. This study of the Gospel glosses has shown in detail how the BXIII Gospel glossator treated his Latin sources and how he did his own glossing; now we have this information
we could collect comparable information from other
glossed books and compare the results. In that this
study gives us this information for the Gospels it gives
us a basis on which we can build and which may lead us to
further discoveries about BXIII as a whole.

We have a much clearer picture of the sort of person that
the Gospel glossator was as a result of this study of the
Gospel glosses. Although we can say nothing more about
the date at which he was working, we can speculate that
he received higher education and was probably a fully
trained theologian. The very least that we can say about
him is that he would seem to have gone beyond the arts
course and had studied theology. This much is clear from
his critical use of Latin commentary, and other,
material, his thoughtful construction of his glosses, and
his use of the traditional Latin rhetoric of glossing.
He uses 'vaut autant' when the nature of the gloss
material requires it; he uses the *quaestio* in particular
circumstances only; he does not rush at the glossing
indiscriminately. His glosses are carefully written and
coherent when viewed as a group, showing two purposes in
particular: to make the text and story as clear as
possible, and to guide the audience towards proper
behaviour. There can be nothing 'trivial or absurd'
about a group of glosses scattered through all four
Gospels which betray such unity of purpose, and reflect
so much the gloss material, sermon material and
linguistic material that we have found in Latin theological texts from about the same date.

The BXIII Gospel glossator appears to be a man of his time; his literal-historical and tropological glosses are part of the Victorine tradition which was kept alive at the end of the twelfth century by Comestor (d.1178), the Chanter (d.1197) and Langton (who left the schools in 1206). His concerns reflect the concerns of this period, and, given the range of possible dates for the composition of BXIII, it seems fair to conclude that he received his education at Paris while the teaching of these masters was still influential. Nor is it only the gloss material he used that shows this; it is as much true of the moral teaching in Maurice of Sully's sermons, which have clear parallels with the moral teaching in the BXIII Gospel glosses. His glosses also share material with the Biblical vocabulary type text (eg that written by Brito) suggesting that he was working at a period in which concern for the literal understanding of Scripture (a very Victorine concern) was being expressed through the production of texts designed to aid this. It is quite clear from this thesis that the BXIII Gospel glossator did not translate directly from any texts he may have used, but adapted his material, and it seems reasonable to assert that such texts would have included texts other than commentaries. The picture which emerges here is not one of a person sitting at a desk working from two source texts (the Vulgate and one Latin
commentary), but of someone who may have drawn material from several different sources and traditions, be these in texts to which he had access, from preaching and teaching he may have heard, or from material prepared for his own preaching and teaching. It is necessary to allow for sources other than manuscripts given the wide range of material given in the Gospel glosses. This would suggest that Berger's contention that the glossator wrote the glosses himself is correct, although we can now qualify this by pointing not to the glossator's ignorance and simplicity (as did Berger) but to the learning and knowledge that he must have had, and to his probable intellectual sophistication, all needed to enable him to write the Gospel glosses.

The study of the commentaries with a view to identifying sources has not helped very much with the problems of dating BXIII. No direct sources would seem to have been used by the glossator; none would seem to have been needed. The material in the Gospels glosses shows the influence of the late-twelfth-century schools, but we should not be surprised at this given influence of the schools generally. It is possible that the glossator used a concordance to identify Old Testament passages from which he took material for his glosses, and this may suggest that he was working after the completion of the Dominican concordance (c.1230). Without corroborating evidence, however, this is nothing more than a possibility.
Nor does this study take us any nearer identifying whether the glossator was, say, a member of the university, a Dominican or a Cistercian. We have seen that the Victorines were involved in the production of theological texts in the vernacular, but have no reason to suggest an earlier date for the BXIII Gospels, or BXIII as a whole, as would be required to suggest direct Victorine influence on the production of this text. As we are no closer to dating the Gospels, we are no closer to dating BXIII as a whole.

The next question to address is that asking 'where?' The answer to this remains 'Paris'. The glossator would certainly seem to have studied at Paris; his glosses reflect the teaching found there certainly at the end of the twelfth century and into the thirteenth. The competent use of Latin rhetoric in his glosses and his critical use of his sources may even suggest that he may have been a teacher there himself, and it is not implausible to suggest that he was still there when he was working on the Gospels.

Now that we have an idea as to the range of material used by the BXIII Gospel glossator, it might be possible to identify, from medieval library lists and catalogues, which libraries held such a range of texts, thus suggesting the type and location of the institution in which the Gospels, and by extension the whole of BXIII, was produced.
As to the question 'why?', the reason for the translation being undertaken in the first place may lie in what de Hamel has shown for the Glossa ordinaria and twelfth-century Bibles in general. If he is correct in believing that a desire for complete Bibles dates from the second third of the twelfth century, then the impulse behind Bxiii may be found here. Just as some people started to want complete Latin Bibles, so others may have begun to want complete French Bibles. The end of the twelfth century was a period of reform for the Vulgate text, which was revised to form the Parisian Vulgate. This would seem to be part of a more general movement towards making the text of the Bible more reliable and easier to use. Tables of references to parallel passages were already beginning to be incorporated into glosses (especially Langton's) and it was from these that the first verbal concordance was to develop. These, of course, would rely on chapter divisions being standardized, and standardization was carried out during this period. Smalley points to the example of Peter Riga's Aurora (probably 1170-1200), a spiritual verse commentary on the Bible, and believes that it filled an urgent need. Maurice of Sully likewise made Victorine moral teaching available to people with no Latin, to a more popular audience. Smalley also cites a slightly later example, that of the Bible moralisée, some of the earliest copies of which were begun in the 1220s. This project again made available a moral interpretation of the Bible available to people with little or no Latin.
All such works fit in with the demand for complete Bibles which de Hamel perceives as beginning in the second third of the twelfth century, also a period of production of religious texts in the vernacular. Nor should we forget the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215; the movements which led to this may also have led to the production of BXIII. The answer to 'why?' would seem to be that there was perceived need for such a text in the religious climate of the early thirteenth century and that BXIII grew out of, and was produced to satisfy, this need.

The final question is that which asks for whom the translation was done. We get clues towards this answer in the themes found in the BXIII Gospel glosses.

A characteristic feature of the BXIII Gospel glosses is that they make available standard gloss material. Many of the glosses in the Gospels reflect what must have been very common Latin glosses, e.g. the ten commentaries which define alabaster. We also find a certain amount of what can perhaps be called 'popular' material in them, such as the story related in the Historia Scholastica about Christ's foreskin being given to Charlemagne, and the story (for which no source has been found) about the knife used for circumcision being made from the stone with which David killed Goliath. We also find a certain amount of material which explains Jewish feasts. Allegorical interpretations are extremely rare. The common themes in these glosses are those of proper
behaviour, improper behaviour, and the rewards that each type of behaviour will bring on the doer. These are recurring themes, but they are actually left quite vague in that there are no definite instructions on how to live. There is nothing in the treatment of these themes which might lead us to suspect that they were written for a specific audience such as contemplatives. What the glosses in the Gospels contain is very general material and this suggests that they were written for a general audience without specific religious or devotional requirements, or with specific religious and devotional requirements which would be met elsewhere. Women are definitely a possible audience; the Victorine Ancrene Wisse and the Katherine-group texts were all composed for women. The ruling of the Dominican chapter general of 1242 also suggests that religious texts were being produced for women, the texts in this case being translations from Scripture.

To sum up: the BXIII Gospels would seem to have been produced by a person who was educated and perhaps taught in Paris, although we cannot be precise as to when. The Gospels form a coherent unit and the glosses show a unity and purpose on the part of the glossator which takes them far beyond the trivial or absurd. Not only do they reflect common late-twelfth-century material, but they also reflect the traditional techniques used for Latin glossing. They are not just translations, but carefully thought-out adaptations of Latin gloss material written
according to a strict system of rhetoric. Of course, how far these findings are true for the rest of BXIII is something which remains to be shown, although there is clear evidence of similar rhetorical patterns in Genesis.

We have not been able to say conclusively that the BXIII glossator used Latin commentaries I, II, and III and that he was working in the year X. What the results have shown us is much more exciting. The Gospel glosses reflect a much wider range of Latin theological material than is found in commentaries alone. They have also been shown to be wholly within the Latin glossing tradition. The BXIII Gospel glossator is a person who has been trained in Latin glossing and who is applying the same techniques to glossing in the vernacular, using much the same material. The glossator has not simply translated Latin glosses into French; he has actively and creatively written glosses in French, and in doing so shows that the vernacular was considered a suitable vehicle for traditional gloss material. This, of course, has implications in confirming the status of the vernacular as a language used for religious texts and is one reason why BXIII is an important text. What the BXIII Gospels show us is that French was an acceptable medium for traditional Latin learning in the thirteenth century, and that this learning was beginning to be made available to a general audience who had little or no Latin education. Just as the Glossa Ordinaria made patristic learning available in an accessible form, just as Andrew of St
Victor made Jewish learning available to scholars with no Hebrew, just as the *Historia Scholastica* made available to students that biblical history which would form a firm foundation for allegorical interpretations of scripture, so BXIII made elements of this same learning available to people with no Latin and no pretensions to a scholarly education. A scholar trained in Latin glossing was, in the thirteenth century, able to use his training to write a set of coherent, thoughtful glosses in French as an adjunct to his translation of the Gospels. The Gospel glosses transmit traditional Latin learning through the vernacular, using traditional Latin glossing rhetoric adapted for Old French. That this was possible, and that a person of considerable intelligence and education was involved in this text, attests to the importance of BXIII in general.
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Appendix I: Quotations

French

This appendix includes only those BXIII Gospel glosses (and their lemmas) used in this study, as given in Sneddon's most correct copy of his edition, which is the computer-generated copy in his personal files on the St Andrews mainframe computer. This is, to all intents and purposes, what is found in the edition forming his thesis, but has benefitted from corrections Sneddon has subsequently made and slight changes in presentation. I copy Sneddon's punctuation exactly as it is given in his edition. For the complete corpus of BXIII Gospel glosses the reader is referred to the edition in Sneddon's thesis.

Latin

This appendix includes quotations from the Latin commentaries consulted where the glosses in them have been compared to the BXIII glosses. I have only quoted those parts of the Latin gloss which relate directly to my discussion of the BXIII gloss. Omissions have been marked by ellipses.

No attempt has been made to produce a critical edition of this material. Even if I felt competent to do so, the
time involved would take this project far beyond the scope of a single thesis. I have, therefore, made very few emendations, marked very few of the errors, made no attempt to regularize spelling or add 'a' where it is missing from the 'ae' digraph, and made no attempt, other than capitalizing all proper names, to introduce modern punctuation. As far as punctuation is concerned, I have kept whatever punctuation existed in the manuscript or the printed edition consulted. However, the copy of the *Glossa Ordinaria* that I used had vertical lines as punctuation; these have been replaced with a semi-colon.

I have italicized and labelled '[sic]' only those words which seem to be corrupt and where an obvious interpretation does not present itself.

I have not marked words which are or may be errors but where the meaning seems to be clear. Individual cases, such as those where a very obvious emendation can be made, or which seem to be possible hapax legomena, are discussed in the notes.

Lemmas for the Latin glosses, where these are quoted, are underlined, except for those which occur in quotations from the edition of Hugh of St Cher's commentaries, in which case the editor's punctuation (following or surrounding square brackets) has been followed.
The quotations from Latin commentaries are given in as accurate a chronological order as possible, beginning with the earliest. Most of the anonymous commentaries can only be dated by their manuscripts, but where more accurate dating is possible, usually through the work of Smalley, or where a date earlier than the manuscript seems likely given possible attributions or chaptering, then these commentaries have been placed earlier in the list than the evidence of the manuscripts they survive in allows. What can be known about the dates of anonymous commentaries is discussed in Chapter Two.
Matthew

1.25 ... et ne la conut pas desi a tant qu'elle ot enfanté son enfant premier né (c'est à dire il ne la conut, c'est il ne jut charnelment o lui, enprés ne devant. Li evangelistes sainz Matheus apele Jhesucrist ici endroit premier né, non pas por ce que sainte Marie sa mere enfantast autres enfanz enprés lui, mes por ce que il estoit lors costume en Israhel que toute chose qui premiers nessoit, ja soit ce que autre ne nasquist mie enprés, estoit apelee premier nee).

Glossa ante quem nullus, nec post quem alius.
Primogenitum dicitur omne quod aperit vuluam, sive aliud sequatur sive non. Vel primogenitus inter omnes electos per gratiam. propriem autem unigenitus dei patris vel Marie dicit.

Av 36 Primogenitum id est genitum ante omnem genitum. hoc non habet hic in glossa sed in expositione Ieronimi est vel primogenitus patris et matris dicitur qui de patre vel matre nemo genitus ante illum ... dicitur primogenitus patris vel matris propriem namque dicitur primogenitus ante quem nullus et post quem alius propriem autem dicitur unigenitus patris vel matris per quo genitus dicit monogenes.

HS Non post quem alius, sed ante quem nullus.

2.2 "Nos avons veu son estoile en orient" (c'est à dire nos estions en orient)

9577 potest intelligi vel nos existentes in oriente vidimus stellam circa Jerusalem
Av 36 In oriente hic lucerna dupliciter distinguitur ut vel dicatur eam in oriente. sicut series lucerna vestra sonare vel vidimus enim existentes in oriente. post item quod vidimus eam in oriente id est in Arabia

9954 Potuit esse quod stellam in orientem viderunt.

2.4 ... il demandoit ou Crist devoit [n]estre (c'est a dire il lor demandoit ou il estoit prophetizié que li filz Deu nasquist).

2.5 "... est il escrith par le prophete" (c'est en Michee le prophete)

9577 scriptum est per prophetam Michee

1359 sic est notatum hebraice in Michea

Glossa Micheam

2604 scriptum per prophetam Micheam

Hugh Michea 5.a.m.

8893, 6 Michee

8532 te enim Michee egredietur qui sit enarrator

11682 Michee homo hec propheta

2.6 "'Tu Bethleem terre de Juda n'es pas petite entre les princes de Juda'" (c'est a dire tu n'es mie la menor cite, ne la mains vaillanz, des citez qui sont en la terre de Juda)
9577 Et tu Bethleem effrata parva est in milibus Iuda
... tu Bethleem que prius vocata est effrata quodvis sis
parvus vicus inter milia civitatem Iuda

Glossa In Hebreo sic est: Et tu Bethleem ephrata parva
es in milibus Iuda, ex te mihi egredietur qui sit
dominator in Israel ... tamen non es minima ... In
Hebreo: ephrata Bethleem est domus pravis, ephrata
speculum

2.7 ... et lor enquisit diligenment le tens de l'estoile
(c'est à dire om longuement il avoit que l'estoile lor
estoit apareue).

2.20 "... cil sont mort qui queroient la mort de
l'enfant" (c'est à dire qui queroient l'enfant a ocirre).

9577 quia sacerdotes et scribe tamen unde querebant eum
interficere

1359 non solum Herodem sed et sacerdotes et scribas
eodem tempore morte domini meditatos fuisse

Glossa quia scribe et pharisei mortem Christi
meditabantur cum Herode

2604 ideo dicit pluraliter quia sacerdotes et scribe tam
bene querebant eum interficere sicut et Herodes

Hugh Scribe enim et pharisei mortem pueri ovm Herode
meditabantur

11682 animam pueri id est vitam corporalem.
2.23 "Que l'enfant sera apolit Nazarien" (c'est a dire de Nazareth).

Av 36 Nazareth

9954 Nazareth dicit indice germinius autem id est sicit qua civitate sanctus sanctorum

8893,6 et Nazarenus vocabitur scilicet quia in Nazareth fuit conceptus et nutritus

5.7 "... quœ il avront misericorde" (c'est a dire Dex lor fera misericorde, c'est il lor dorra paradis).

8893,6 in oœlestis

5.13 "Et se le sel de la terre s'esvanist, en quoi salera l'en (c'est a dire se le sel defaut, de quoi porra l'en saler? C'est a entendre se vostre doctrine defaut, qui enseignera autre de vos)?

9577 nota quia ipsi vocantur sal et lux mundi ... lux per quos alii illuminantur tenebris ignorantie purgantur ... Quasi dicit apostoli sunt principium doctrine nec habent super se alios doctores. Si ergo defecerit quis saliet eos

1359 sal vocatur sapientia ...Si sal evanuent id est si fortitudo aliorum in tribulationem defecerit

Glossa id est si doctor enaverit. In tribulatione defecerit. Id est per quos infirmus populus confirmitur

Av 36 quasi dicit vis estis sal terre id est terrenorum terrena sapientem. sed si ipsum sal evanunt in quo sallietur. terra. terra. id est vos qui debetis aliiis
praestare asporem estis insipidi unde accipient
condimentum alii et exponitur dupliciter evanescere ut
doctorum in tribulatione oportet deficere. ut in
doctrina alius heretice

2604 quasi dicit apostoli sunt principium doctrine
ne habent super se alios doctores. Si ergo defecerint quis
saliet eos. ita quis instruxerit autem eos ... Si sal
evanuerit id est defecerit incipiendo ut peccet in aliquem
errorrem in quo sale sal salietur. Quasi dicit apostoli
sunt principium doctrine ne habent super se alios
doctores

Hugh Quod si sal etc. id est si doctor vel praedicator
erraverit, aut in tribulatione defecerit, per quem
populus infirmus confirmabatur?

5.21(1). "Vos avez oi qu'il fu dit pieca" (c'est a dire
vos avez oi et savez qu'il fu ommandé en la loi)

9954 tamen ea que sunt de lege et scilicet hie quod
scilicet vobis est data lex

Hugh quibus data est lex

8532 lex

5.21(2). "... cil qui occurra sera corpables de jugement"
(c'est a dire il sera corpables et doit estre jugiez a
mort).

1359 reus erit judicio et acusatione

Glossa ut judicio puniatur legis. accusatione legis

Av 36 id est accusatione et damnatione
Hugh Interlinearis Accusatione legis ut iudicio
puiniatur legis

11654 reus erit iudicio id est mortis quia lex punit

5.22 "... il sera corpables de concile" (c'est a dire et
a entendre qu'il desservira que il soit come .i. de cels
qui firent concile contre Jhesucrist)

5.24 "... va premierement reconcelier" (c'est est amesnier)

5.30 "... il te covient [mielz]" (c'est a dire plus
prouitive chose est a toi)

5.32 "... il la fet estre fornicaire" (c'est a dire il
li fet fere fornificacion)

9577 fornicatio

9954 ea fornicatio

9947 pro fornicatione dimittit debet a fornicatione esse

5.35 "... quar ele est cite de[1] grant roi" (c'est de
Deu)

5.39 "Ge vos di veraiement, que vos ne contrestez mie au
mal" (c'est a dire se tribulacion vient sor vos, que vos
la recevez debonerement et sanz contredit)
1359 Infirmus concensum est malum per malo reddere sed perfectionis doctrine doctor dico et principio vobis non tunc talionem reddem sed ipse nulli male resistere malum non accipere hic peccatum

Glossa Iusticia evangelii (que ducit homines ad regnum) est non resistere malo. Non resistere ut ipse idem Discite a me, quia mitis sum et humilis corde

5.40 "et delesse neis ton mantel a celui qui vorra estriver a toi en jugement" (c'est a dire pliedier en aucune cort)

5.41 "et quiconques te contraindra que tu voises o lui par corvee" (c'est sanz loier)

5.41 "et quiconques te contraindra que tu voises o lui par corvee" (c'est sanz loier)

8.5 li centuriens (c'est a dire li bailliz qui avoit baillie et pooir sor .c. chevaliers)

11654 centurio habens sub se .c. milites

8893,6 dicitur autem centurio quia habebat .c. homines in armis sub se ad custodias illius

8.15 Lors se leva ele et lor amenistra (c'est a dire et les servi au mengier).

8.28 ... .ii. homes plains de deables vindrent a lui (ce est a dire contre lui)

8.29 "Por quoi nos es tu venuz tormenter devant le tens" (c'est a dire encois que droit)?
... et noncerent toutes cez choses et de oels qui orent les deables (ce est de qui Nostre Sires avoit gitez fors les deables).

8893, 6 quia Christus dimittebat eis illos curatos a demonibus ad corum²

9.34 Lors issi toute la cité (c’est tuit oil de la cité)

13.3 Et il lor dist moltes choses en paraboles (c’est a dire en semblance de paroles)

Glossa Similitudinibus

11654 Glossa Similitudinibus

13.42 "... et les metront en cheminee de feu" (c’est a dire en feu tres ardanz)

Av 36 ad calorem ignium

13.49 "En tel maniere iert il en la consommacion" (c’est en la fin)

1359 in fines seculi

Av 36 litus finis seculi

2604 ita licus finem seculi

20.9 "... il recurent sengles deniers" (c’est a dire il recurent chascuns .i. seul denier).
20.13 "'Amis, ge ne te faz mie injure'" (c'est a dire ge ne [te] faz mie tort)

20.14 "'Ge vueill a cestui derrenier'" (c'est qui vint derrenier)

20.15 "'Et dont n'est ton oeill felon, qu'ar ge sui buens'" (c'est a dire dont ne regardes tu et juges neant droiturierement seur moi)?

23.2 "Li sage de la loi et li phariseu ont sis sor la chaire de Moysi" (c'est a dire il ont enseigné la doctrine que Moyses enseigna, mes il n'ont mie fait les huevres qu'il fist).

1359 id est in magisterio doctrine quam docuit Moyses sederunt scribe et pharisei quae scilicet recte mores instruunt secundum quam docent non agunt

Glossa doctrinam quam docuit Moyses

Av 36 doctrinam Moysi quia ... docent quam docuit Moyses ... cathedram id est doctrinam. cathedra enim doctores

2604 in magisterio doctrine quam docuit Moyses sederunt scribe et pharisei quae scilicet recte mores instruunt sed secundum quam docent non agunt

Hugh Chrysostomus quasi dicit multi sederint sacerdotes, multi in nomine, pauci in opere

23.3 "... il dient et ne font pas" (c'est a dire il ne font mie ce qu'il enseignant).
9577 non concordat doctrina eorum et vita

1359 dicon enim et non faciunt id est non concordat
doctrina eorum et vita

Glossa quia non concordat vita cum doctrina

2604 dicon enim et non faciunt id est non concordat
doctrina eorum et vita

Hugh Augustinus in libro prosperi Bene dicere et male
vivere

23.4(1) "Il lient granz fes et neant portables" (c'est
il comandent grievances penances, qui puent a paines estre
fetes)

1359 quia eas fuisse viribus nullus implere potest legis
mandata vocat onera importabilia

23.4(2) "... et le metent seur les espaules des homes;
et ne les vuent mie movoir a lor doi" (c'est il ne
vuent mie fere neis legiere peneance)

2604 ad penitentiam inponunt

23.5 "Donques, il font toutes lor huevres qu'il soient
veu des homes" (c'est a dire par ypocrisie)

23.7 "... et estre apelé mestre des homes" (c'est a
dire et aiment que li home les apelent mestres).
Glossa Magistri id est ne quod deo debetur, vobis presumatis et nec alios rabbi voceris, ne divinum hominibus honorem deferatio

Av 36 Hanc cum dominus ipse se vocaverit magistrum

23.11 "Cil qui sera graignor entre vos sera vostre menistre" (c'est a dire vos servira).

23.14(1) "... et vos mengiez les mesons des veves" (ce est a dire la substance qui est es mesons des veves)

23.14(2) "... et por ce recevoiz vos graindre jugement" (c'est a dire por ce seroiz vos plus dampné).

Hugh id est maiorem damnationem

23.15 "... vos le fetes fill d'enfer" (c'est vos le metez en la dampnacion d'enfer)

23.16 "Las a vos qui vos fetes meneor des autres et estes avugles" (c'est a dire qui devez mener les autres par exemples de bones huevres, et vos avez poiors huevres que n'ont li autre)

Av 36 hic arguit eos de fraudulentia quia fraudulentur allitiebant homines

23.23 "Las a vos sages de la loi et a vos phariseus ypocrites, qui dismez" (c'est a dire qui donez et rendez disme)
**Glossa** quae queritis decimam diligenter exigitis decimas

**Av 36** id est qui decimas datis vel exigitis

**HS** Hoc verbum decimatis, dubium est. Nam et qui accipit, et qui dat decimare dicitur

**Hugh** id est datis vel exigitis. Sensus dubius est

9080 decimas dabant ... decimas offere ... decimas dare ... decimas offerebant

8893,6 reciperent decimas ... decimas reddebant

23.24 "Meneor d'autres et estes avugle, qui colez le vuibet et gloutissiez le chameil" (c'est a dire qui fetes forces es petites choses et lessiez aler les granz)

9577 Quasi dicat erga ea ... lucrum habent diligentes estis sed magna praecepta de iudicio ... devoratis et negligatis

**Glossa** Opinione religionis in minimis quae lucrum habent diligentiam ostendis sed magna praecptae de iudicio fide et misericordia devoratis et negligatis

**Av 36** excolantes culicem id est minora subtiliter disquirentes camelum glutientes id est maiora subficientes

2604 Opinione religiosis in minimis quam lucrum habent diligentes estis sed magna precepta de iudicio scilicet et misericordiam et fide illa devoratis et negligatis

**HS** Et potest referri ad praedicta sic: Minima, sicut culicem, diligenter inquiritis, ut decimas, majora, scilicet misericordiam et iudicii absconditis, ut quod
glutitutur absconditum ... Minora peccata subditorum
diligenter arguitis, projicitis granora, et dissimulando
transitis

Hugh id est minora disquirentes ... camelum autem
 glutientes] id est subficientes maiora. Chryostomos Omnes
sacerdotes qui propter decimas corripiunt, et maiora
peccata videntes tacent, docent populum colare olibem et
 glutire camelum id est a medico abstinere, et maiora
committere

23.35 "...des le sanc Abel juste" (c'est a dire des le
martyre Abel juste)

Av 36 isti duo sunt ex nomine ut per eos intelligantur
duo genera martyres id est martyres laici igitur per Abel
pastorem et martyres igitur per Zachariam sacerdote

26.6 ... en la meson Symon le liepreus (c'est a dire en
la meson Symon qui avoit este mesel et que Jhesus avoit
cure)

9577 Symon iste leprosus fuerat sed curatus a domino

Glossa Permanet pristinum nomen ut virtus curantis
appareat. Per eam domum accipe illam partem populi quae
credidit domino et curata est

2604 Symon iste leprosus fuerat sed curatus a domino

HS Simon fuerat leprosus, et a Domino sanatus

10891 in domo Symonis scripsi leprosus quidem fuit sed
curatus a deo
... une feme vint a lui qui avoit une boiste plaine de precieus oignement, la quele boiste estoit apelee alabastre (Bedes dit que alabastre est une maniere de blanc marbre, del quel l'en fet boistes et vessex por metre precieus oignemenz, por ce qu'il le[s] garde lonc tens sanz corrupcion et sanz enpoirier.)

9577 alabastrum genus marmoris candidi variis coloribus intretincti quod ad vasa unguentarria causa resoltent ea quod optime servare ea incorrupta dicatur

1359 alabastrum est genus marmoris candidi variis coloribus intretincti quae solent caveri ad preciosa unguenta servanda

Glossa genus marmoris in quo bene servantur unguenta sine detrimento

Av 36 alabastrum unguenti id est vas alabausterum plenum unguento sicut dicit vas olei vel vini id est plenum olei vel vini

2604 est autem alabastrum genus marmoris candida variis coloribus intretincti quod ad vasa unguentarria cavare solerent eo quod optime servare ea incorrupta dicatur

9978 alabastrum vas ungentarium de lapide factum quem alabastriten vocant. Est enim marmor variis coloribus intretinctum in quo servatur incorrupta

HS id est pyxidem de alabastro plenam unguento nardi. Sicut enim dicimus soyphum vini, soyphum lactis, et hujusmodi, sic dicitur hac habens alabastrum unguenti. Et est genus marmoris candidi, et perlucidi variis coloribus intretincti, quod incorrupta servat unguenta
lapide et est genus marmoris candidi et perlucidi et variis coloribus intinti quod ad incorrupta servat unguenta ... fuit vasa unguentarium

Hugh Alabastrum, id est huius generis vas plenum unguenti siout dicitur vas vini, vel olei. Et dicit Bernardus quod in hoo genere marmoris unguenta servantur illibrata

alabastrum id est vasculum factum dicitur alabaster ... marmoris candidi quia ... conservat unigenta

26.7(2) Et cele feme espadi cel oignement seur le chief de Jhesu que qu'il seoit au mengier (cele feme fu sainte Marie Magdalaine).

mulier ista Maria erat Magdalene soror Lazari

mulier ... quae ad eum accessit Maria Magdalona soror fuit Lazari

Glossa Mulier ... Maria Magdalene soror Lazari

mulier ista Maria erat Magdalene soror Lazari

"Por qui estes vos moleste" (c'est por quoi estes vos corruocié)

Et des lors queroit il covenablete (c'est a dire tens et leu covenable)

Hugh loci, et temporis et societatis
26.17 Li primiers jorz des azimes (o’est a dire que li Juyf se garoient de mengier chose ou levains fust)

9577 decimum diem primi mensis quando fermento abieoto immolare

1359 decimum diem primi mensis quando fermento abieoto imolare

Glossa id est quartadecima die primi mensis quando abieoto fermento agnum immolant ad vesperam

Av 36 omnem fermentum tollebatur de domibus Hebreorum

HS id est die, in cujus vespera agnus erat immolandus, et edendus omn azymis

26.19 ... et apareillierent la Pasque. (La Pasque estoit fete en cel tens en tel maniere selono ce que Dex avoit comandé par Moysen as filz Israel en la terre d’Egypte. L’en prenoit .i. aignel .xiiii. jorz devant ce que Pasque devoit estre, et le norrissoit l’en cez quatorze jorz; et estoit oois au quatorzieme jor au vespre, et estoit mengiez sans rien remanoir, ne chief, ne teste, ne bouche; et se aucune chose en demoroit, il covenoit qu’il fust ars el feu. Quant l’en l’avoit ocis, l’en prenoit del sano, et le metoit l’en seur les .ii. principals polz qui sostenoient la meson et seur le lintel de l’uis. Il n’estoit mie cueit en eve ne en aucune autre maniere, fors tant seulement rosti. Lors covenoit il que oll qui le menjoioint fussent ceint et chaudie, et qu’il tenissent bastons en lor mains, et [qu’il] menjassent isnelement.)

Glossa (on 26.17) id est quartadecima die primi mensis quando abieoto fermento agnum immolant ad vesperam
Av 36 agnus immolatus est quartadecima luna agnus verus
id est Christus in quintadecima glosa respondet immolatus
in quartadecima id est eius immolatio inchoata quia
vespere quartadecime lune per consequens cenan

HS id est die, in oujus vespera agnus erat immolandus,
et edendus cum azymis

26.24(1) "... li filz d'ome va si come il est escrit de
lui" (o'est a dire si come les prophetes prophécierent de
lui)

Av 36 prophetas

26.24(2) "Las a celui par qui il sera traiz et
bailliez" (c'est a dire cil qui le baillera en la main
des Juys sera pardurablement en enfer)

Av 36 id est eterna damnatio erat homini illi

HS aeternam nolat damnationem, et est: Peribit
aeternaliter

Hugh aeternae damnationis

26.24(3) "bone chose fust a lui, se il n'eust onques
esté nez" (c'est a dire s'il eust esté morz el ventre sa
mere, il eust en enfer molt menor paine).

1359 multo melius erat omnino non esse quem male esse

Glossa Multo melius esset omnino non esse: quem male
esse
Av 36 melius esset ei quia decederet tamen cum originali et sic mitius puniretur

HS id est melius esset ei, si non esset natus de utero, sed periisset in utero. Tunc enim pro solo originali peccato damnatus esset

26.25 Judas, qui le trai, respondi, disant: "Mestre, sui ge donques ce?" Jhesus li dist: "Tu l'as dit" (c'est tu as dit verité, qu'ce es tu qui me trairas).

26.28 "... en remission" (c'est en pardonement)

26.29 "Ge vos di veralement, ge ne bevrail mie d'aucune maniere de vin des ici en avant, devant ce que ge boive icelui novel el regne de mon Pere" (c'est el ciel).

resurrectura secundum innovationem celestem

26.31 "Touz vos sofferroiz escandelizement en moi en ceste nuit" (c'est a dire vos desserviroiz en ceste nuit que vos soiez blasmé de ce que vos me leroiz seul et vos en fuiroiz)

26.33 "Et se tuit seront blasmé por toi, ge n'en seraie mie blasmez" (c'est ge ne ferai mie chose par quoi g'en doie estre blasmex).

26.35 "S'il me coenvoit morir o toi, [ge ne te rencoieroie mie] (c'est a dire ge sofferroie eincois que l'en m'oceist o toi que ge te rençoisse).
26.38 Lors leur dist il: "M'ame est tristre desi a la mort" (c'est a dire ge ne serai mie liez ne joieus desi que ge aie racheté l'uman lignage par ma mort et par ma resurrection)

9577 nota quia non mors sed tempus mortis in motu est donec apostolos sua liberet passione per virtutem eius resurrectionis post ea firmanda erat fides credentium

Glossa Anima est quae timet et tristatur ... Christus timet quia ut Deus in corpore constitutus fragilitatem carnis exponit, qui corpus suscepit omnia debuit subire quae corporis sunt. Usque ad mortem Hilarius Non propter mortem sed donec apostolos sua liberet passione. Non mors sed tempus mortis in metu est, quia post virtutem resurrectionis fides est firmanda credentium

26.39 "... oeste moi cest henap que ge ne le boive" (c'est a dire destornez ceste mort qu'il ne la me coviege souffrir)

Glossa id est ut me non moriente mors mortatur

Av 36 si possibile est sine morte mea temporali genus humanum salvari

26.41 "... mes ma char est enferme" (c'est a dire mes ma char redoute).

26.45 "... li filz d'ome sera bailliez en la main des pecheurs" (c'est a dire el pooir des pecheeurs).

26.52 "... tuit cil qui prendront espee pour ferir periront par espee" (c'est a dire tuit cil qui seront
homicide ou par fet ou par volenté periront par le droititurier jugement Nostre Seignor).

Glossa id est divine vindicte, et gladio spiritus id est verbi dei

Hugh gladium excommunicationis propter iram, vel odium, vel gladium vindictae. Gladio peribunt, id est sententia divina

26.58 ... et il entra dedenz et seoit o les serjanz, qu'il veist la fin (c'est a dire qu'il veist en quel maniere il traiteront Jhesum et s'il l'ocirroient).

26.61 "... et le puis redefier" (c'est refere)

26.64 "Tu l'as dit" (c'est a dire tu as dite verité, quar ge le sui).

26.65 Lors despeca li princes des prestres sa vesteure, disant: "Il a dit blaspheme" (c'est il a dit ledenge contre Deu. Il estoit lors costume, que quant aucuns disoit blatenge contre la Devineté, que celui qui l'ooit despecoit et fendoit sa robe a ses mains en tesmoing de la blatenge).

1359 et nota quia mos erat Iudeorum vestimenta scindere cum audiebant aliquod blaspheme

Glossa Mos est Iudeorum cum aliquid blaspheme audiunt scindunt vestimenta

2604 et nota quia mos erat Iudeorum vestimenta scindere cum audiebant aliquid blaspheme
HS consuetudinus Judaicae erat audita blasphemia in Deum, scindere vestimenta sua

Hugh Mos erat Iudaeorum quando horrible factum vel blasphemiam audierunt, scindere vestimentia sua, in signum quod corda eorum similiter scindebantur

26.66 "Il est corpables de mort" (c'est a dire il a mort deservie).

Glossa Quia eum blasphemum putaverunt et ideo morti addixerunt

27.6 "Il ne loist mie" (c'est a dire il n'est mie droit)

27.15 ... tel come il le demandoient (c'est a dire celui qu'il demandoit).

27.24 "Ge sui innocenz" (c'est ge ne sui mie corpables)

Av 36 vos videatis quis sit nocens vel quis sit in culpa

27.25 "Son sans soit sor nos et seur noz enfanz" (c'est a dire la colpe de ce qu'il est traitié a mort soit seur nos et seur noz filz).

Av 36 culpa et pena

27.53 ... en la sainte cité (c'est en Jerusalem)
Glossa | Ihierusalem ergo sanctam dicitur propter templum, et sanctam sanctorum quod nulla alia

2604 | Ierusalem celestem

9957 | Jerusalem

27.62 | L'autre jor qui est enprés la Paracce (c'est a dire qui est enprés la preparacion, que li Juyf avoient fet lor apareillement a lor Pasque)

1359 | Parasoeve dicitur preparatio haec nomine vocant sexta sabbati in qua preparabant necessaria sabbato

Glossa | Preparationem pasche Parasceve id est preparatio hoc nomine dicitur sexta sabbati id est in qua preparabant necessaria sabbato

2604 | Parasceve dicitur preparatio hoc nomine vocatur sexta sabbati in qua preparabant necessaria sabbato

9957 | id est preparationis ... Parasceve dicitur preparatio hoc nomen vocatur ... sabbati in qua preparabant necessaria sabbato

HS | Tamen Remigius exponit hic parasceven præparationem Dominicae passionis ... Altera autem die, quae post hanc parasceven, id est post inceptionem hujus præparationis, haec est ipsa feria sexta, quae orta est post ejus inceptionem

8893.6 | parascevo id est in sabbato ... parasceve id est preparatio
27.65 "Vos avez garde" (c'est à dire vos avez congé de moi de fere le garder)
Mark

2.7 "Il blaspheme" (c'est à dire il parole contre la Devineté).

2.10 "Et que vos sachiez" (c'est à dire que vos soiez certain) 

2.14 ... il vit Levi (c'est à dire il vit Matheu)

Av 36 Matheum fuit

9979 Levi Alphaei ipse est Matheus ex tribu unde ortus est Levi vocatus

9471 Levi Alphei ipse dicitur Matheus ex tribu unde ortus est Levi vocatus

2.26 "... et menja les pains de proposicion" (c'est à dire les pains qui estoient saintefié)

Glossa panes sanctificatos comedunt: significat sacerdotalem cibum

5.33 La feme, cremant et trenblant et certaine de ce qui avoit esté fet en soi, vint et se lessa chaoir devant lui et li dist toute le verité. (Aucuns croient que ceste feme fust sainte Marthe s'ostesse, qui fu sereur sainte Marie Magdaine et sereur saint Ladre que Nostre Sires resuscita; et meesment sainz Ambroises l'aféme.)

HS Ambrosius in sermone De Salvatore dicit hanc fuisse Martham ... Dum languidum sanguinis fluxum siccatio in
Martha, dum daemones expellit de Maria, dum corpus redivivi spiritus calore constringit in Lazaro

5.39 "La puècle n'est mie morte, ainz dort." (Jhesus, qui onques ne menti, disoit verité que la puècle dormoit; mes elle dornoit tant seulement quant a lui et estoit morte quant as autres, qui ne poient mie susciter ne esveillier del dormir de mort.)

Hugh Unde eos ejoiit, quia in confortibus dormit. Simile Io.11.b. Lazarus amicus noster dormit. Et hoo est verum licet mortus quo ad nos, non tamen quo ad Deum, aut facile est eum vel eam suscicire ac si dormirent

5.43(1) Et il lor comanda durement et expressément que nus seust ce. (Par ce peut l'en noter et entendre que Jhesus ne voloit mie avoir vaine gloire de ses bones huevres.)

5.43(2) Lors comanda Jhesus que l'en donast a la puècle a mengier. (Mes por quoi comanda il ce? Avoit donques la puècle faim? Nenil, ainz le comanda por demonstrer que elle estoit veraiement resusoitee et sanz aucune fantasies. Aucun enchanteor furent jadis, qui fesoient par lor charmes les cors des morz aler et parler; mes il ne les poient mie fere mengier. Et por ce dist Jhesus: "Donez li a mengier," en argument qu'elle estoit veraiement resuscitee.)

HS Hoo enim est verum experimentum verae resurrectionis. Magi enim mortuos suscitant quibusdam characteribus alligatis sub utraque assella, et loqui eos, et incedere faciunt, sed comedere nequa quam possunt

Hugh In signum vere resurrectionis
7.28 (7.27) "... ce n'est mie buen de prendre le pain que ses filz doivent mengier et doner as chiens." Et cele respondi et li dist: "Sire, c'est verité; mes les chaiax menjuent soz la table des mies des enfanz." (Li Juyf avoient lors en despit les paiens et les apeloient chiens, por ce qu'il n'estoient pas circoncis et ne tenoient mie la loi que Dex avoit done par saint Moysem; si come font or endroit aucuns des Christiens qui nonment les Juys chiens por ce qu'il n'ont mie receu baptesme. Et por ce dist Jhesus: "Ce n'est mie buen," c'est a dire ce n'est mie droit, "de prendre le pain," c'est la grace, "des filz," c'est a dire que Dex envoie par moi aus Juys, "et doner le as chiens," c'est a dire et doner la as paiens. Mes por quoi n'oi maintenant Jhesus cele feme de ce qu'elle requeroit? Dont n'avoit il dit: "Tuit cil qui quierent truevent, et qui demande reçoit, et l'en overra a celui qui boutera a l'uis?" Il avoit dit a ses deciples quant il les envioa premierement preeschir, qu'il n'alassent mie en la voie des genz et qu'il n'entrassent es citez de Samarie, ainz alassent eincois as oeilles de la mesniee Israhel qui estoient peries. Et por ce ne volt il mie oir la feme qui estoit piaiene et n'estoit mie des filz Israhel, qu'il ne semblast qu'il fust contreres a soi meesmes et qu'il ne feist contre ce qu'il avoit dit a ses deciples, come nos avons ja dit.)

Av 36 de cane fecit ovem id est de infideli fidelem ... ydolate genus canes vocabantur

HS Non est bonum sumere panem filiorum, et dare canibus ad manducandum. Hebraeorum mores gentiles canes dixit, quia edebant sanguinem, ut canes

9.1 "... qu'il voient le regne Deu venant en vertu."  
(Mes que est ce ore ici eleuques que Jhesus apele le
regne Deu? Ce n'est mie le regne de paradis ne del ciel, ainz est sainte yglise qu'il entent ici, come il entent aillors en l'Evangile la ou il dit: "Li filz d'ome envoiera ses anges, qui osteront et queuldroit de son reaume touz les esclandres," c'est a dire touz les mauvés; el regne des ciels ne porra mie estre trovez aucuns mauvés qui en soit ostez. Lors entent il donques de sainte yglise en cest present tens, et il est a entendre que Jhesus dit: "Ge vos di veraiement, que aucun sont de cels qui ci estent qui ne gosteront mie de mort devant qu'il verront le regne Deu venant en vertu," ce est a dire devant qu'il verront que sainte yglise croistra et monteploiera et sera en grant pooir et en grant vertu.)

9.13 "Mes ge vos di, que Helyes est ja venuz; et il li ont fet tout ce qu'il ont volu, si come il est escrit de lui." (Mes qui apeloit ici elueques Jhesus Helye? Estoit ce de soi qu'il disoit, ou de sainz Johan Baptiste? Il disoit sanz doute et entendoit que sainz Johans Baptistes estoit Helyes. Mes quant li Juyf envoierent a saint Johan lor mesages, il li demandèrent: "Hes tu Helyes?" Il respondi: "Ge nel sui mie." Coment puet ce donques estre, que ce que Jhesus afferme, sainz Johans noiez? Adecertes, li anges annonca a saint Zacharie le pere saint Johan en sa concepcion, disant: "Icest tuen enfant que tu engenderras ira devant Crist en l'esperit et en la vertu de Helye por apareillier a Nostre Seigneur pueple parfet." Mes ce que sainz Johans noie de la personne Helye [afferme Jhesucrist de la vertu Helye]. Lors est donc verité que Johans estoit Helyes quant a la vertu qu'il avoit del saint Esperit, mes il n'estoit mie Helyes quant a la personne.)

Glossa De venturus est Helias ipse in corpore sed etiam venit in spiritu et virtute scilicet Johannes
Av 36 in spiritu et virtate... sicut scriptum est id est prophetatum de Iohanne

10.4 "Moyse comanda que l'en donast a sa feme le libelle de repudiament" (c'est a dire de refusement)

10.6 "Dex oria male et femmele" (c'est a dire home et feme)

10.19 "Sez tu les comandemenz" (c'est a dire sez tu les comandemenz qui furent comandé en la loi)

Av 36 ergo precepta legis vitam conserbant eternam

10.27 (10.25) "Plus legiere chose est que li chamels puisse passer par le pertuis d'une aguille, que riche home entre el regne des ciels." ... (10.27) "C'est impossible quant as homes, mes toutes choses sont possibles quant a Deu." (Aucun dient que en Jerusalem estoit une porte qui estoit apelee Pertuis d'Aguille por ce qu'elle estoit petite; et quant chameil chargez i vencit, il le covenoit deschargier tant qu'il fust outre passez. Et por ce dist il: "Plus legiere chose est que li chamels puisse [passer] par le pertuis d'aquille," o'est a dire par cele posterne qui est apelee Pertuis d'Aguille, "que riche home entre el regne des ciels;" c'est a dire li chamels sueffre bien et consent que l'en li oste sa charge por passer a cele posterne, mes li riches ne velt mie oster ses richesses qui li sont conme charge por entrer el regne des ciels.)

Av 36 Aous erat quedam parvula porta in Ierosolymam erat autem Ierosolymam sita in montanis unde difficile erat ascens in eam bestiis honoratis ... cum venisset ad
portam honeratus intrare nihil depositis honeribus que
orum essent transportandum vehiculum emebantur usque ad
domos dominorum et tunc camelu exhoneratus poterat
intrare ergo difficile erat camelum honeratum per portam
illam intrare quia oportet primus honera deponere quod
laboriosum erat deponentibus similiter amator divitiarum
nihil posita honere divitiarum non potest intrare ad
patriam

HS Fuerunt qui dicerent, in Jerusalem parvam fuisse
portam, quae Aous dicebatur, ad quam cum veniebat cameli
pro compendio viae cum oneribus suis, non poterant
transire, vel subire eam. Exonerati ergo transibant, et
iterum receptis oneribus minabantur; secundum hoc ergo
similitudo notatur hic non impossibilitas. Oportet enim
avarum amorem opum dimittere, si vult ingredi ad vitam

10.29 "... por moi et por l'evangile" (c'est a dire por
estre mon mesage d'annoncier ma parole)

Hugh Evangelium] praedicandum

10.33(1) "... et li filz d'ome sera bailliez as princes
des prestres et as sages de la loi et as vieillarz; et il
le condampneront en mort" (c'est a dire il jugeront qu'il
soit dignes que l'en le detruie et ocie)

10.33(2) "... et le bailleront as paiens" (c'est a dire
as chevaliers Herode, qui estoient piaen)

10.38(1) "Poez vos boivre le henap que ge bevrai" (ce
est a dire poez vos soffrir pour l'amor de moi et por mon
non itel mort come ge doi soffrir por l'amor que ge ai au
monde et por lui rachater)
Av 36 passionem eius fuerit imitatus calicem id est passionem

Hugh Sicut socii passionem estis ... Unde appropinquante passione

10.38(2) "... ou poez vos estre baptizie del baptesme que ge sui baptizié" (c'est a dire vos poez vos garder de pechie autresi comme ge m'en garde)?

10.39(1) "Adecertes, vos bevroiz a mon henap" (c'est a dire vos sofferroiz mort come ge ferai)

Glossa Beda Iacobus ab Herode capite truncatus. Iohannes in ferventis olei dolium missus. Inde ad coronam martyrii athleta Christi processit ... Itaque et martyrio animo non defuit et calicem confessionis bibit quem biberunt in camino tres pueri; licet persecutor sanguinem non fuderit

10.39(2) "... et seroiz baptizie del baptesme que ge serai baptiziez" (c'est a dire vos recevroiz le saint Esperit qui vos nestoiera des pechiez veniax, des quiex hom mortiex ne se puett mie garder tant comme il est en oeste mortel vie. Mes por quoi ne morut donques sainz Johans par martyre come fyst sainz Jaques, a qui Herodes fyst la teste trenchier? Coment puett ce estre que la parole Nostre Seignor soit veraie qu'il dist: "Vos sofferroiz martyre comme ge ferai?" Sainz Johans ne fu mie ocis par martyre, ainz morut de sa mort. Mes .ii. manieres de martyres sont, [l'] un en apert et [l'] autre en repost. L'en truue es Fez des Apostres que sainz Johans fu batuz o les autres apostres en la synagogue as Juys, por ce qu'il portoient tesmoing de la resurrection
Jhesuorist; et es Estoires et en sa Vie trueve l'en qu'il fu mis devant cele porte qui est aplee Porte Latine en .i. tonnel plain d'uile boulant. Donques soffri sainz Johans martyrre plusors foiz en sa vie, qui est greigner chose que s'il eust souffert a sa mort. Donques est il martyr, et est verité que Dex dist a lui et a Jaque son frere: "Vos bevroiz a mon henap," c'est a dire vos sofferroiz martire por l'amor de moi).

**Glossa** (on 10.39(1); also quoted above) Beda Iacobus ab Herode capite truncatus. Iohannes in ferventis olei dolium missus. Inde ad coronam martyrii athleta Christi processit ... Itaque et martyrio animo non defuit et calicem confessionis bibt quem biberunt in camino tres pueri; licet persecutor sanguinem non fuderit

**Av 36** Iohannes ... cum esset missus in dolium olei ferventis et postea in Pathmos insulam in exilium ... Beda Iacobus ad Herode et cetera ad coronam sed opinionem suam et cum calicem confessoris id est persecutiones multas sed non martirio vitam finivit et videlicet Beda distinguere inter calicem confessionis et calicem passionis id est martirium quia calicem confessionis vocat

**HS** Alii tamen, et calicem, et baptismum pro eodem accipiant, scilicet pro martyrio. Et dicunt Joannem animo fuisse martyrem, quia animo suo defuit martyrium, et in ferventis olei dolium missus est

**8830** Unde relinquit calicem Christi dico non solumodo penam mortis gladio intentam sed calamitates varias passionum per amore Christi voluntarie tolleratas

**10.40** "Seoir a ma destre ou a ma senestre n'apartient mie a moi que ge le vos doigne, mes a cels a qui mon Pere l'a apareillié" (c'est a dire a cels qui le desserviront
par [lor] bones huevres, et non mie a vos se vos ne le
desservez par bones huevres).

10.46 ... en Jericho. (Jericho vaut autant comme lune.)

Glossa Itheronymus Ithericho luna vel anathema

Av 36 Jericho interpretatur luna

Hugh quod interpretatur luna et significat mundum

10.52 "Voies, ta foi t'a fet sauf" (c'est a dire ta foi
t'a sané et garï).

14.3(1) ... en la meson Symon le liepreux (c'est a dire
en [la] meson Symon qui avoit esté meseaux, mes Jhesus
l'avoit curé; et estoit encore apelez Symons li meseaux.
Et quant il estoit en la meson Symon le meseau)

Glossa Simon essi obediens dicitur. Nomen pristinum
manet ut virtus curantis appareat

Av 36 Simonis leprosi ... fuit leprosus et postea a
domino curatus

HS Simon fuerat leprosus, et a Domino sanatus, sed
tamen adhuc pristinum nomen manebat

10891 Symonis scripsi leprus quidem fuit sed curatus a
deo

Hugh Leprosi] Glossa Nomen pristinum manet, ut virtus
curationis appareat, leprosus enim fuerat, sed a Domino
curatus erat
14.3(2) ... une feme vint o une boiste d'alabastre plaine d'oiogement d'espirz de cele herbe qui est apelee narde precieus; et ele froissa la boiste et espandi l'oiogement seur le chief [de] Jhesu. (Alabastre est, si come dit Bedes, une maniere de blano marbre, del quel l'en fet boistes et autres vesseaux a metre precieus oignemenz, por ce qu'il i durent longuement sanz corrupcion.)

Glossa Alabastrum marmor candidum variis guttis distinctum unguenta incorrupta servat

HS id est pyxidem de alabastro plenam unguento nardi. Sicut enim dicimus scyphum vini, scyphum lactis, et hujusmodi, sic dicitur haece habens alabastrum unguentui. Et est genus marmoris candidi, et perlucidi variis coloribus intertincti, quod incorrupta servat unguenta

10891 lapide et est genus marmoris candidi et perlucidi et variis coloribus intertincti quod ad incorrupta servat unguenta ... fuit vasa unguentarium

Hugh alabastrum] Glosa Alabastrum marmor candidium variis guttis distinctum, unguenta incorrupta servat

14.4 "Por quoi est fete ceste perte" (c'est a dire por quoi est oeste oignement perdu)?

14.6 "Lessiez la; por quoi estes vos tristre envers ceste feme? Ele a ovré bones huevres en moi" (c'est a dire vos li atornez a mal ce que ele a fet por bien)
14.12 Et au premier jor des azimes (c'est a dire au premier des jorz que li Juyf menjoient nule chose ou il eust levain)

Av 36 agnus paschali quartadecima luna comedii debebat ad vesperam ... sicut preceptum erat in lege omne fermentum

HS id est ea die, in oujus vespera agnus erat immolandus, et edendus om azymis

Hugh dies Azymorum, quando primo Azyma comedebatur ... prima dies Azymorum, dies in quo primo non erat fermentatum in dominibus eorum

14.16 ... et apareillerent Pasque (c'est a dire il apareillerent l'aigiel del quel il devoient fere Pasque)

Av 36 agni paschales quem ibant parare discipuli

14.21(1) "Las a oel home par qui il sera trai" (c'est a dire il sera en enfer pardurablement)

HS Vae in sacra Scriptura, aeternam nolat damnationem, et est: Peribet aeternaliter

14.21(2) "... bone chose fust a lui s'il n'eust mie esté nez" (c'est a dire s'il fust avortez et fust morz nez, il n'eust mie si grant paine el dampnement d'enfer come il avra).

Av 36 Bonum erat si natus non fuisset supple de utero id est si mortuus esset abortivus quia tunc puniretur pro solo originali
id est melius esset ei, si non natus de utero, sed periisset in utero. Tunc enim pro solo originali peccato damnatus esset

si enim in ... utero decessisset sine peccato mansisset

14.27 "Vos tuit seroiz escandelizié en moi en oeste nuit" (c'est a dire tuit vos feroiz tant en oeste nuit que vos en devroiz estre blasmé)

14.35 ... que s'il pouoit estre fet, que l'eure de la mort trespassast (c'est a dire qu'il ne moreust mie)

14.36 "... osté moi cest henap" (c'est a dire osté moi oeste mort que ge ne muire mie)

14.37 "Symon, dorz tu" (c'est a dire coment oses tu dormir qui me prammoies que tu morroies por moi se mestiers en estoit)?

Vel ait Petro sic ironice, quasi dicat: Sic erat faciendum? In communi autem dixit illis tribus: Quid dormitis? Spiritus quidem promptus est, subaudii, vester, quasi promptulum habuistis spiritum, in promittendo mori etiam pro me, sed nunc patet carnis infirmitas

14.38 "... et la char est enferme" (c'est a dire et la char redoute le torment).

(on 14.37 above) Spiritus quidem promptus est, subaudii, vester, quasi promptulum habuistis spiritum, in
promittendo mori etiam pro me, sed nunc patet carnis infirmitas

14.41 "... l'eure vi[e]nt" (c'est a dire l'eure est venue)

14.44 "Celui que ge beraei est Jhesus; tenez le" (c'est a dire prenez le quant ge le vos avrai moustré et fet connoistre par cest signe)

14.61 "Es tu Christ, Filz Deu qui es beneoit?" (Il nome oï Deu beneoit a la difference des faux Dex qui sont maudit de Deu et de toutes criatures, ou por ce que toutes criatures sont tenues a lui beneistre.)

14.64 Et tuit le condampnerent estre corpables de mort (ce est a dire tuit le condampnerent comme se il eust mort deservie).

14.69 "Icestui est de cels" (c'est a dire icestui est des deciples Jhesu).

15.6 Il avoit costume qu'il lor donoit a jor de feste (c'est a dire a lor Pasque)

Av 36 sollemnitate pasche

15.7 ... qui avoit fet homicide (c'est a dire qui avoit home tué)
15.8 ... il li commencerent a proier qu’il lor feist comme il lor fesoit toz jorz (c’est à dire qu’il lor donast .i. prison si comme il leur avoit costume doner a lor Pasque).

15.16 ... del pretoire. (Pretoire est proprement la meson ou l’en tient plez et ou l’en fet jugemenz.)

Av 36 pretorium appellat domum pretoris in qua sedebat Pilatus pro tribunali

15.22 Et il menerent Jhesum en Golgotha, qui vaut autant en francois como mont de Cauvaire. (Mes por quoi estoit cel leu apelez mont de Cauvaire? Et Cauvaire, que est a dire? Cauvaire est proprement l’os de la teste esnué de tout en tout de char qui a long tens jeu en terre, comme l’en voit souvent es cymetires gesir; et por la planté des os des testes qui sont apelé cauvaires como nos avons dit qui giscoient iluec, estoit cel mont apelé mont de Cauvaire. Aucun dient qu’il estoit apelez monz de Cauvaire por la cauvaire Adam, le premier pere, qui fu ilueo mise et enfoie; mes ce ne fet mie a croire, quan l’en ne le puert mie savoir por aucune veritable reson.)

Glossa Calvarie decollatorum loca dicuntur

Av 36 Calvaria proprie dicitur os capitis nudatum carne sicut solet inventi in sepulchris mortuorum quamvis ipsum capites vel frons dicitur Calvaria ... et a carne et a capilli nudabantur ... a calvito capitis Ade in sepulchri

HS Calvaria est proprie os capitis humani nudum. Et quia ibi decollabantur rei, et multa ossa capium ibi asperserant, dieobatur locus Calvarie, vel Calvarium. Ambrosius in Epistolam ad Romanos, videtur velle, quod ibi sepultus
fuerit Adam, et a capite ejus dictum Calvariam ... De qua opinione dicit Hieronymus, quod favorabilis est interpretatio, et mulcens aures, non tamen vera. Unde credimus hoc a falsariis positum in Ambrosio, sicut et multa alia

Hugh Calvaria autem proprie dicitur os capitis carne, et capillis nudatum, quale solet invenirei in sepulcris mortuorum: sed qui frequenter homines ibi decollabantur, et remanebant ibi capita, ideo locus dicebatur Calvaria

15.26 Et li tytres de sa cause estoit esrot: "Rois des Juys" (c'est a dire por ce fu il crucifiez qu'il se fesoit rois des Juys; il estoit lors en costume que l'en metoit sur le chief a celui que l'en crucfioit esrot la cause et le forfet qu'il afoit fet por quoi il estoit crucfiez).

Av 36 Vide quia titulis cause continet causam crucifixionis euis. In titulo enim scriptum erat rex Iudeorum

HS Scrispsit autem Pilatus titulum causae ejus, id est in titulo causam mortis ejus: Jesus Nazarenus rex Iudaorum, quam dicat: Ideo crucifixus est, quia rex erat Iudaorum. Et scrispsit illum Hebraice, Graece et Latine, ut diversarum linguarum homines, qui convenierant ad diem festum, illum legere possent, et intelligere

15.36 Uns d'els corut et prist une esponge et l'empli de vin aigre et li mist sur .i. rosel et li mist a la bouche por boivre, disant: "Lessiez, et veons se Helys vendra por lui oster. (Aucun dient, que quant cil qui estoient crucfie estoient abevre de vin aigre, qu'il en moroient plus tost, et que por ce li donerent il a boivre.)
HS Fuerunt qui dicerent, crucifixos citius mori, si acetum cum felle biberunt, et ideo milites acetum secum tulisse, ut citius possent liberari a custodia, si citius morerentur, quos cruciferent. Potui esse, quod vile vinum secum tulerant ad bibendum, et ex calore quasi acetum factum est.

15.39 Li centuriens (c'est a dire celui qui avoit poesté seur .c. chevaliers)

Av 36 centurio id est super .c. milites habens potestatem

Hugh Centurio est miles habens centum in potestate

15.47 Marie Magdaleine et Marie Joseph (c'est a dire et Marie mere Joseph)

9438 et Marie Ioseph ... qui erat mater Iohannem Ioseph
Luke

2.1 Cesar Auguste comanda que tuit li home qui estoient el monde fussent descrit (o' est a dire fussent nombré).

Glossa censori. propterea census datus est: ut sciret rex numerum hominem et magnitudinem

HS Volens Caesar scire numerum regionum in orbe, quae Romanae suberant ditiani, numerum etiam civeitatem in qualibet regione

10855 Volens ergo Augustus sicut dicat magister in hystoris scire numerum regionum in orbe quae romane suberant dictioni numerum et civeitatum in regione

10519 census datus est ut sciret rex numerum hominem et magnitudinem

2.7 Et ele enfanta son enfant premier né (o' est a dire qui fu premierement que home fust fet. Jhesus n' est mie ici endroit apelez premier né por ce que sainte Marie sa mere eust autres enfanz en depart li, mes li enfes qui nest de feme, ja soit ce que ele n'en ait que i. seul, est apelez premier né).

Av 36 primogenitum ... Ioseph genuerit alios filios post Christum de alia uxore ... non post quem alii quid non dicitur primogenitus quid alii post eum sicut geniti

HS Non post quem alius, sed ante quem nullus

PCh unigenitus patris vel matris

Hugh Beda. Non post quem alius, sed ante quem nullus
primogenitus non post istum Maria alios filios habuit ... filius unigenitus offerebatur domino

... veillanz et gardanz les veilles de la nuit sor lor bestes (c'est a dire il gardoient lor bestes par nuit as chans).

"... en la cite de David, qui est Crist et qui est Seigneur." (La citez de Bethleem estoit lors apelee cite de David por ce que David i fust nez.)

Glossa in Bethleem unde David natus

PCh in Bethleem unde natus est David

in Bethleem et concipiendum et conceptum et natum dominum

in Bethleem natus est David

id est in Bethleem. Unde David natus est

in quo David natus est

id est in Bethleem unde ortus fuit David

Bethlehem ... natus est David

Bethlehem quod interpretatur domus parvis

in Bethlehem unde natus est David

in civitate David id est Bethlehem
2.12 "Et ce vos sera signe" (c'est à dire a cez enseignes et cest signe le troveroi vos)

2.21 Et enprés ce que viii. jorz furent aempli que li enfes dut estre circoncis et qu'il le fu, son non fu nomé et apelé Jhesus, que li angeles li avoit ja mis eincois qu'il fust conceuz el ventre de sa mere. (Li mestres qui fist les Estoires qui sont apelees Scolastiques dist que li angeles porta a Karlemaine la prepuse de la circoncision Jhesucrist, qui li avoit esté trenchiee quant il fu circoncis; prepuse est proprement le bout del secré membre que l'en trenohe a celui que l'en circoncit selon la loi as Juys.)

HS Dicitur quod praeputium Domini delatum est ab angelo Carolo Magno in templo Domini, et translatum ab eo Aquisgrani; etiam post a Carolo Calvo positum in ecclesia Salvatoris apud Carosium. Alii dicunt Antuerpiam delatum, nam illic in summa veneratione habetur.

2.22 Et enprés ce que les jorz furent passé de la purgacion Marie (c'est a dire que Marie fust purifiee)

Av 36 purificationem

PComD purificationem

Hugh purificatione matris

Alex purificatione matris

Bon purificato

Albt purificavit

Gorr purificari
10855 purificationem

10617 hic de matris purificatione

9439 oblatione .. purificationes

2.22(2) ... il portèrent Jhesum en Jerusalem (c'est a savoir Joseph et Marie)

10891 Joseph et Maria tullerunt puer

Gorr Maria mater eius et Ioseph pater eius putativus

2.22(3) ... qu'il le presentassent ilueo a Nostre Seignor el temple (c'est a entendre qu'il l'offrissent a Deu le Pere el temple

Glossa offerrent et consecrarent

Av 36 offerebant ... in templo offerebantur

ZC id est offerrent et consecrarent

HS id est offerendo praesentarent et dederunt hostias

PComP offerebatur domino puer

PCh offerrent vel consecrarent

10891 id est offerrent

10109 offerent et consecrarent

Tour id est offerrent eum in templo
Hugh id est offerrent, vel consecrarent

Gorr id est offerrent vel consecrarent

10855 id est offerent et consecrarent

11374 offerrent vel consecrarent

2.24 ... et il donerent et offrirent avec le sacrifice, si comme il est escrit en la loi Nostre Seigneur (c’est a dire en la loi que Nostre Sires comanda et dona a Moysi)

Albt Moysi scriptum est

10617 lex Moysi

2.25 ... et cist hom justes et cremeteus (c’est a entendre qu’il redoutoit forment a trespasser les comandemenz de la loi)

Av 36 timore legis

2.29 "Sire, or leras tu ton serjant en pes" (c’est a dire or morrai ge de mort corporel)

Hugh in pace, id est nexibus corporis absolvere

2.33 Et son pere sa mere (c’est a entendre Joseph, que l’en cuidoit qui fust son pere, et Marie sa mere)

Glossa Ioseph qui ad conservandam famam Marie pater est ab hominibus reputatus et quia erat nutritius
Ioseph quia nutritius erat et Marie famam conservabat secundum opinionem vulgi pater salvatoris appellantur

et erat pater eius Ioseph et mater Maria

et erat pater eius id est Ioseph qui meruit vocari pater Christi eo quo nutritius eius fuit et mater eius scilicet Maria que fuit mater eius

Et son pere et sa mere (ce est a entendre Joseph et Marie)

ibant autem Ioseph et Maria

"Ge et ton pere te querions dolent" (c'est a entendre ge et celui que l'en ouide qui soit ton pere te querions dolent et corroucié).

"Ne saviez vos mie qu'il me coivient estre es choses qui apartienent a mon Pere" (c'est a dire ne saviez [vos] mie qu'il me coivient fere la volenté mon Pere)?

Et il n'entendirent mie cele parole qu'il lor dist (c'est a dire il n'entendirent mie qu'il apelast Deu son Pere, ne qu'il se tenist por Filz Deu).

non intellexerunt scilicet numquid Maria non intellexerit quod filius externus patris est quod in hiis que pater eius erant oportuit eum esse

Et il ala o els en Nazareth et estoit sozmis a els (a els, di ge, et ne mie seulement a Marie, mes neis a
Joseph por Marie, c'est a dire por la reson de ce qu'il avoit espousee Marie sa mere).

2.52 Et Jhesus proufitoit par sapience et par grace envers Deu et envers les homes. (Mes quel mestier estoit il que Marie fust mariee a Joseph? Por ce que li Juif, qui sont anemi de tout bien, l'eussent lapidee se ele eust eu enfant et n'eust mari de qui il creussent qu'il fust conceuz, quar sanz doute il ne creussent mie la verité, ne qu'il fust conceuz del saint Esperit. Origenes met autre reson avec ceste, que il covenoit que le mistere de l'incarnacion Jhesucrist fust celez au deable.)

3.38 (3.23) Et meismes Jhesus estoit de l'aage de .xxx. anz, que l'en cuidoit qu'il fust filz Joseph, ... (3.38) ... qui fu filz Adam, qui fu filz Deu. (La construction de oez propres nons est a entendre en tel maniere, que cail qui vient devant est filz a celui qui vient enpres. Et est construit en tel maniere: Jhesus estoit en l'aage de .xxx. anz, que l'en cuidoit qu'il fust filz Joseph, li quiex Joseph fu filz Hely, li quiez Hely fu filz Mathat; et en tel maniere doit l'en construire en montant par ordre del fill au pere desi a Adam; et Adam est dit filz Deu por ce que Dex le fist et forma de terre et qu'il n'ot mie autre pere.)

Av 36 a filio di vide quia utique dicitur filius dei et Christus et Adam sed alter per naturam alter per creationem id est Adam qui est dicitur filius terre quia non patrem habuit sed de terra materialiter conditus est

PComP a filio dei vide quia utique dicitur filius dei et Christus et Adam sed alter per naturam alter per creationem id est Adam qui est dicitur filius terre quia
Hugh Adam, qui dicitur filius terrae, quia non habuit hominem patrem sed de terra materialiter conditus est

4.13 Quant toute la temptacion fu aemplie, li deables se departi de lui desi au tens (c'est a dire desi au tens de sa passion. Bedes dit sor Thobie iluec endroit ou Thobie esbrueille le poisson, que li deables vint a la passion Jhesuorist et se sist seur le destre braz de la croiz et regarda s'il i troveroit aucun pechié, mes il en i trova nul; lors se departi il d'iluec, ouidant que Jhesus fust prophetes et pur home et ne mie Dex).

Glossa passionis

Av 36 usque ad tempus Beda passionis

PComD Beda passionis

PCh usque ad tempus passionis

Robt passionis

Hugh Beda, passionis

Alex usque ad tempus scilicet passionis quo astitit super crucis brachia suggerens ut passio differetur

Bon usque ad tempus et cetera passionis

Albt hoc autem est tempus passionis

10855 usque ad tempus id est passionis

9439 tempus passionis
12.1 "Gardez vos del levain des phariseus qui est ypocrisie" (c'est à dire gardez que vos ne faciez voz huevres par ypocrisie comme il font).

Av 36 corruptionem

PComD fermentum id est corruptionem

LB a fermento phariseorum id est a malicia et ypocrisī

Gorr hoc duplici fermento corrupta erat sinagoga

12.3(1) "Ce que vos avez dit en tenebres sera dit en lumiere" (c'est à dire sera dit apertement et oiant plusors)

Glossa aperte Ambrosius Nota in tenebris id est in timore dixistis: dicentur in lumine id est in fiducia veritatis

Av 36 dixistis in lumine id est in evidentia dicentur cum actus vestri predicabantur publice in ecclesia

Albt dicentur predicando et docendo ... et revelacionis audiri

Gorr in aperto

12.3(2) "... sera præschié sor les mesons" (c'est à dire en audience).

Glossa publice

Albt ad publicum alte predictionis
10855 in tectis id est in publico

12.21 "... et n'est mie riches en Deu" (c'est a dire selon Deu).

12.27 "Regardez les lis des chans coment il croissant; il ne laborent ne [ne] filent. Ge vos di veraiement, que Salemon n'estoit mie vestuz en toute sa gloire come .i. de cez" (c'est a dire come est .i. lis).

Albt Beda florentem sicut et lilium

12.31 "querez neporquant le regne Deu, et toutes cez choses vos seront ajostees" (c'est a dire se vos querez le regne Deu, Dex vos dorra totes cez choses terriennes de coi vos avroiz mestier et de quoi vos ne poez consirrer).

Glossa quia etiam propter regnum adiecit temporalia

Robt regnum quaerite et de regno non dubiteas qua complacita bonitate dabit vobis

Gorr quoniam queratur et adietivum sio habito regno dei saltem in desiderio est hic temporalia adicientur

12.32 "...quar il plest a vostre Pere qu'il vos doint regne" (c'est a dire que il vos doint le regne de paradis).

Av 36 regnum dei

Bon regnum dei
12.35 "Voz rains soient ceint et voz chandoiles ardanz" (c'est a dire a[s]tenez vos et gardez de luxure, et fetes bones huevres devant voz proismes)

Glossa Deo non placet unum sine altero: cum quis vel bona agit nondum refrenata luxuria vel caste vivit non exercens se per bona opera. Et ut ab amore temporalium possitis removeri; et bona que agitis simplici intentione eternorum agatis

Av 36 habete lucem ad hoc alludit quod lucerna duo facit ceram combuvit et lumen diffundit ad hoc ergo ut bonum opus sit lucerna oportet ut ex adore divini amoris fiat et aliiis prebeat exemplum post hanc illam

PComD Bede continuatis et ut ab amore etc. habete lucem alludit ad hoc quod lucerna duo facit ceram combuvit et lumen diffundit ad hoc ergo ut bonum opus sit lucerna oportet ut ex adore divini amoris fiat et aliiis prebeat exemplum

PCh vel bona agit nondum refrenata luxuria vel caste vivit non exercens se per bona opera

Robt et ut amore temporalium possius removeri et bona que agitis simplici intentione eternorum agatis cingite lumbos id est motus carphantium desideriorum refrenate et habere lucernas autem ut in operatione vestra solo dei amore ardeatis et alius exemplum prebeatis

10109 bona agit ... bona opera , , nondum refrenata luxuria vel caste vivit non exercens se per bona opera

Hugh id est opera ardentia propter Deum, et lucentia aliiis in exemplum ... superbia fugienda, et sic ad pietatem et humilitatem ... et sic monet eos fugere luxuriam
motus carnalium desideriorum refrenate ...

12.43 "... que li sires trovera fesant en tel maniere"

Glossa et in curam gregis vigilans

12.46 "... et le departira" (c'est a dire l'ostera de la compagnie des autres)

Robt a confortio fidelium segregando

12.47 "... il sera batuz de moltes plaies" (c'est a dire il sera batuz et tormentez de moltes manieres de tormenz)

12.49 "Ge ving metre feu en terre, et que vueill ge fors que il soit espris" (c'est a dire ge ving metre en terre amor et charité et doner vos exemple, et que vueill ge fors qu'ele soit tenue entre vos et gardee leaument, et que vos n'amiez mie de parole ne de langue mes d'uevre et de verité)?

Glossa vos ex amore charitatis ad permerendam gloriam studium vestrum acuите

Av 36 id est spiritum scilicet sive amorem spiritus scilicet qui velut ignis usque terra ardeat et in manibus hominum lucerna accendat
PComD caritatem ... sit bonus dispensator ... a domino
vocatur fidelius est

Tour caritas ad calefaciendum frigidos

Albt caritatis ... dominis amor ... ut amantes se ipsos
amantibus ... facit caritas

Gorr ab errore revocata malo ut ex amore hoc impleatis
proptererea

13.1 Aucuns estoient lors en oel tens qui noncerent a
Jhesu de cels de Galilee, le sano des quiex Pylates avoit
meslè en lor sacrifices. (Pylates fesoit .i. conduit de
plon a amener en Jerusalem eve por la souffrete qui en i
estroit. Et por ce qu’il fesoit cele huvre a lor couz
aloient il encontre ce, et le desdisoient qu’il ne feist
mie tele huvre qu’il les grevast de couz et de despens;
et meesemement li Galileien estoient plus contre Pylate de
ce contre sa volenté que tuit li autre. Et por ce entra
il en lor temple o sa mesniee et o ses chevaliers armez,
et ocist iluec cels de Galilee seur lor sacrifioe la ou
il saecrifioient. Et por ce dit ici saint Luch, que
Pilates meslè le sano des Galileiens o lor sacrifices.)

Av 36 mortem Galileorum quorum sanguinem fuderat
Pilatus inter sacrificia ... de Galileis istis non
determinat hystoria evangelica

HS Aderant eo tempore quidam nuntiantes ei de Galilaeis,
quorum sanguinem Pilatus miscuerat cum sacrificiis eorum
... dum sacrificarent ei, superveniens Pilatus, ipsum cum
omnibus occidit, timuit enim ne et Judaeos seduceret

Albt et sic miscuit sanguinem sacrificationem cum
sanguine sacrificiorum ... miscuit autem sanguine eorum
cum sacrificiis eorum
16.23 "Il regarda en haut quant il estoit es tormenz, et vit Abraham de loing et [le] ladre en son sain." (Mes qu'est a entendre ce qu'il dit, que li ladres estoit el sain Abraham? Il avoit sanz doute devant la resurrection Jhesucrist une partie joste enfer ou li saint pere estoient et n'estoient mie tormenté, et atendoient que Dex les en ostast; et cil leux estoit lors apelez le sain Abrahe, quar Abraham est diz peres des Juys por la ciroconcision qui comenca a lui. Et por ce dit il ci, que li ladres estoit el sain Abraham; c'est a dire il estoit el repos des justes, o les peres qui avoient vescu justement en cel leu joste enfer qui estoit apelez le sain Abraham.)

Av 36 requies sanctorum unde oramus animas defunctorum collocari in sinu Abrahe id est in requies bonorum

HS Erat enim in superiori margine inferni locus, aliquantam habens lucem, sine omni poena materiali, in quo erant animae praedestinatorum, usque ad Christi descoensum ad infernos, qui locus propter sui tranquillitatem sinus Abraheae dictus est, ut sinum matris dicimus

PCh sinus Abrahe requies est beatorum pauperium quorum est regnum celorum quo post hano vitam recipiuntur ... inferni sui locus iuxta infernum qui tenebrosus erat tamen aliquid luminis habebat

Gorr sinus Abrahe dicitur requies sanctorum quia ante passionis erant in limbo inferni in cuius pater superiori erat aliquantula ... dicitur autem locus animae sanctorum

10855 sinus autem Abrae sicut tradunt sancti domus est locus superior in inferno qui alio nomine limbus dicitur
in quo quieverunt sancti patres adventum Christi expectantes

16.25 "Et Abraham li dist: 'Filz, recorde toi que tu receus biens en ta vie, et li ladres recut ensement max.' (Ensement, c'est à dire longuement, tot le tens de sa vie, recut il les malz come tu les biens; il les recut pacienment et o buen corage. Et notez qu'il dit qu'il recut les max et ne dit mie qu'il les sostint; ce que l'en sostint est contre la volenté de celui qui sostient la paine.)

Av 36 recipisti bona in vita tua in voluptate temporali

PCh et Lazarus paciens et humilis

17.37 "... iluec seront assembled li aigle" (c'est a dire iluec o lui seront assembled li saint. Li saint sont acomparagié a l'aigle ici elueques por ce que, si oome li aigles vole haut plus que aucuns des autres oiseaux, en tel maniéré montent li saint de vertu en vertu par buenes huevres; et si oome li aigle s'assemble au cors pour lui mengier et qu'il en puissent vivre, en tel maniere seront assembled li saint el ciel o Nostre Seigneur qu'il puissent vivre pardurablyment de sa vision, c'est qu'il vivent de vooir Deu).

Av 36 aquile id est boni scilicet utrumque statum aquile comparabiles namque in presenti statu carne dominica refitunitur sicut aquila carnibus vescitur et in futuro statu renovabuntur sicut aquila post semum reiuvenescit

HS Ubicunque fuerit corpus, illuec congregabuntur et aquilae, id est ubi erit Dominus in corpore, congregabuntur aquilae, id est sancti, resurgendo innovati
Hugh Aquilae,] id est sancti ... utrunque statum Aquilae comparabiles ... Iob 9.d. Sicut Aquila volans ad esca
Chrystomos Aquilae, Angeli, martyres, sancti ... Beda Ubi fuerit Dominus corpore, congregabuntur electi, qui eius
passionem humiliter imitando, tanquam de carne eis
fatiantur, quorum per resurrectionem renovabitur, ut
Aquilae iuventus

Albert assumpt pennas ut aquilae volabunt ... sicut
aquile volans ad escam ... et religiosas qui ex vapore
lucis sicut vultures

10855 et aquilae id est sancti scilicet utrumque status
aquilae comparati namque in prae senti status carne
dominica reficiabantur sicut aquilae carnibus vescuntur et
in futuro renovabuntur sicut aquilae post semen
juvenescit nota aquilae ad corpus volant

18.13 Et li publicans estanz de loing ne voloit mie
neis ses eulz lever au ciel, mes batoit son piz et
disoit: 'Sire, soies deboneres a moi pecheor,' " (Mes por
quoi bap l'en plus son piz que son chief quant l'en a
conponccion et l'en se repent et en orie l'en merci? Por
ce, ce me semble, que tout ist del ouer comme Nostre Sires
meismes dit en l'Evangile, quar premierement pense li
ouers le mal et le covoite, que les autres membres le
facent par huevre; et por ce que tout ist del ouer et
qu'il est racine et commencement, le fiert l'en plus que.
.i. des autres membres.)

18.43 Et Jhesus li dist: "Regarde, ta foi t'a fet
sauf." Et il vit lors maintenant et sivoit Jhesum o les
autres , magnefiant Deu et loant. Et quant li pueples vit
ce, il dona loange a Deu. (Jhesus dist en l'Evangile a
plusors quant il les avoit sanez et gariz: "Ta foi t'a
fet sauf," c'est a dire ta foi t'a gariz et par la creance veraie que tu creoies en moi es tu gariz. Donques est il a noter et a croire que veraie foi est a tenir et a garder devant toles choses, quar neant valent toles buenes huevres quelles qu'eles soient sanz veraie foi. Et c'est ce que dist Anastaises qui fu apostoles en la fin del Chatologne de veraie foi. Et neis el commencement il dit: "Quiconques veult estre sauf, il li est mestier devant toutes choses qu'il tiegne la foi de sainte yglise." Et quant il a tot destinte coment l'en doit croire en la sainte trinite et coment les .iii. persones sont en une sustance, si fine en tel maniere: "Iceste," fet il, "est la foi de sainte yglise; et quiconques ne la tendra feelment et fermement, il ne porra estre sauf.")

19.44 "... por ce que tu n'as mie coneu le tens de ta visitacion" (c'est a dire por ce que tu n'as pas receu ton sauveor qui estoit venuz por toi visiter. Icest destruiement de Jerusalem que Nostre Sires Jhesuoriz dist ici elueques avint .xlii. anz enprés sa passion, quant Tytus et Vaspasiens vindrent, qui estoient empercor de Rome, et la destruistrent desi au fondement et ocistrent toz les Juys qu'il troverent dedenz, si come l'en list es estoires des Roumains).

Av 36 id est visitationem tuum ita ad lucernam factum est quia Ierosolymam funditus eversa non reedificanda in eternum

ZC a romanis pricipibus Vespasiano et Tito non ignoramus et ipse transmigratio civitatis ... ut dominus crucifixus fuit testatur quod por illa Ierusalem funditis eversa sit

20.19(1) Et li prince des prestres et li sage de la loi queroient a metre main seur lui (c'est a dire il queroient achoison coment il l'osassent prendre)
20.19(2) ... il conurent et apercurent que a els avoit il dit ceste semblance (c'est a dire ceste parabole des cultivateurs de la vigne comme nos avons raconté i. pou devant).

Av 36 vinea locus circa misterium baptismum

20.20 Et li gardanz envoierent agaiteors qui se fainsissent qu'il fussent juste, qu'il le puissent prendre en sa parole (c'est a dire qu'il li feissent dire tiex paroles de quoi il peust estre repris)

20.21 "Mestre, nos savons que tu diz et que tu enseignes droit, et que tu ne recoiz mie persone d'ome" (c'est a dire tu n'enneures mie le riche por sa richece et ne despis mie le povre por sa povreté)

20.24 "De qui a il ymage, et les letres qui sont environs escrites, de qui font eles mencion" (c'est a dire de qui parolent eles, et qui non i est escrit)?

Av 36 ymaginem Cesaris inscripta et nomen superscriptus est

20.25 "Rendez donques a Cesar ce qui est suen, et a Deu ce qui est suen" (c'est a dire rendez a Deu primices et dismes et offerandes).

Glossa decimas, victimas

Av 36 interlinearis decimas et victimas
HS primitias, decimas et oblationes

Gorr decimas et victimas ut dicit Glosa

10855 decimas et victimas

11374 victimas decimas ... decimas et primicias

9939 Glosa decimas et victimas

20.27 Les [uns] des saduciens qui noient la resurrection (c'est a dire qui dient et afferment que l'en ne resucitera mie enprès ce que l'en sera morz)

Av 36 isti resurrectionem corporam credebant quam negabant saducei animas in corporibus

10855 hii negabant resurrectionem

20.36 "... quant il seront fill de resurrection" (c'est a dire quant il seront resuscité).

Av 36 mortuorum restitutionem

Albt et mortuis resurgent

20.38 "Dex n'est mie des morz, mes des vis" (c'est a dire il n'apartient mie a la grant digneté de sa Deité que il soit Dex des morz, mes des vis; c'est a dire il n'afiert mie a sa grant bonté, que cels qui l'avront servi en cest mortel siecle, qu'il ne lor en rende lor loier [en] resucitant les, et en metant lor ames o les cors des quiex il l'avront servi en gloire pardurable)
20.42 "Nostre Sires dist a mon Seignor'" (c'est a dire
dex li pères dist a Crist son Fill)

filio

Glossa Dixit dominus domino meo

Av 36 dixit dominus id est dominus creator celi et terre
domino meo id est messie ... dixit dominus id est pater
domino meo id est Christus

PComD dixit dominus id est dominus creator celi et terre
domino meo id est messie ... dixit dominus id est pater
domino meo id est Christus

pater filio

Robt dixit dominus domino meo

Hugh Dixit dominus, id est pater Domino meo, id est
Christo

10855 dixit dominus id est dominus pater domino meo id
est domino filio

pater filio

11374 dixit dominus domino meo

9939 dominus dixit ... pater dicit dominus scilicet
filio

20.46 "Gardez vos et vos eschivez des sages de la loi
qui vuent avoir estoles" (c'est a dire qui vuent
avoir beles robes et precieuses)

Av 36 stola genus longe vestis

PComD stola genus est longe vestis
9980 purpura bisso

11374 purpura et bisso

9939 stola est vestimentum longum et ornatum

20.47 "... qui deveurent les mesons des veves, faignanz longue oroison; icist avront greignor dampnacion que les autres." (Ce est a dire, por ce qu'il sevent la loi et ne la tienent ne ne gardent, ainz meffont et font les autres meffere par lor mauvés exemple, por ce seront il damné de double dampnemment.)

Robt maiorem in hoc insinuat illos qui in angulis stantes orant ut videantur ab hominibus, damnationem quidem miseri sed istos maiorem

10855 maiorem meretur damnationem

11374 in hoc insinuat illos et qui in angulis stantes orant ut videantur ab hominibus damnationem quidem miseri sed istos maiorem

22.7 Lors vint li jorz des azimes (c'est a dire li jorz que l'en ne menjoit mie chose ou il eust miel ne levain)

Av 36 dicebantur azima sive dies azimorum quia non hoc azimis nesciebantur

9959 quando nondum comedebatur azima

22.22 "... et li filz d'ome vet si come il est diffiné" (ce est a dire si come il est prophecie.)

Glossa sicut dei passione praedixit
Av 36 secundum quod definitum est id est ab eterno provisum

PComP secundum hoc quod definitum est id est ab eterno praevisum

Hugh Quod definitum est id est ad aeterno provisum

Alex diffinitum est a seculo aperte praeordinatum

22.43 (22.42) "Pere, se tu vels, oste moi oest boivre que ge ne le boive" ... (22.43) Lors li aparut uns angeles del ciel qui le conforta. (Mes contem est ce que li evangelistes dit ci elueques que angeles le conforta? Coment avoit il mestier de confort d'angele ou d'autre criature, cil qui estoit Dex toz poissanz et par qui toutes criatures furent fetes? Por ce, sanz doute, volt il estre confortez de criature qui fust plus haute que home, a mostrar qu'il estoit verais hom; et por ce pria il son Pere qu'il li ostast oel hanap qu'il ne le beust, non pas por ce qu'il ne le feist de sa bone volenté, mes por nos fere certains qu'il estoit en char humaine et mortel et passible. Mes ore est ele impassible et immortel por ce qu'ele est glorifiee, si come dit li apostres sainz Pox: "Christus resurgens ex mortuis, et cetera."

Av 36 consolo angeli confortantis eum et nota quia licet verus homo esset nulla tamen egebat consolatione angelica vel humana

Hugh Christus ex humana infirmitate horrens mortem ...

Et nota quia Christus verus homo esset, nulla tamen egebat consolatione angelica vel humana
22.48 Jhesus li dist: "Juda, tu trais et livres le fill d’ome par besier" (autresi comme s’il deist: "Por quoi et coment oses tu fere si grant desleauté")?

22.49(1) Cil qui estoient environ lui (o’est a dire ses apostres)

22.49(2) "Sire, ferrons nos d’espees" (c’est a dire sire nos deffendrons nos)?

Glossa Petrus auiditate defensionis maiore comotione pro domino percuissit

Bon ad defendum

Gorr defensionis

22.59 "Veraiement cestui estoit o celui, quar il est de Galilee." (Sanz doute sainz Peres fu coneuz par le langage, quar il avoit lors difference entre le langage de Galilee et le langage de Judee.)

Av 36 sed numquid Galilei sunt et Ierosolimitae Hebrei sunt utique sed unaqueque provincia habet propria ydiomata lingue

PComP sed numquid Galilei sunt et Ierosolimitae Hebrei sunt utique sed unaqueque provincia habet propria ydiomata lingue

11374 Ierosolimitae et Galilei eque sunt Ebres et unius lingue sed unaqueque provincia suas habet proprietates vernaculum loquem di sonum mutare non potest

23.16 "Donques, ge l'amenderai et puis le lera aler"
(c'est a dire ge le chastierai par fere li aucun torment et puis le lera aler).

Av 36 enim flagellari

PCh flagellus et ludubrue

10519 flagris et ludibriis

23.35 "Il a fet les autres saus; or se faoe sauf"
(c'est a dire il avoit poo[i]r de curer les autres, or mostre son pooir et s'oste de la croiz)

Glossa sed quia ipse Christus dei electus de cruce descendere noluit ... ut pro nobis crucifigeretur: ideo se de cruce salvere neglexit

Av 36 non debeat se salvere a morte crucis

PComD crucifixione

Robt sed quia ipse est Christus dei electus de cruce descendere noluit ... de cruce salvere neglexit

Hugh id est a cruce liberet

Alex noluit sibi descendere

23.41 "Et nos i somes par droit" (c'est a dire nos l'avons desservi par nostre forfet)
23.43 "Ge te di veraiement, que tu seras hui o moi en paradis." (Et notez que Jhesus ne li dist mie tu seras hui o moi el ciel, mes dist en paradis, quar, devant la resurrection Jhesucrist, nule ame d'ome ne de prophete ne d'autre entra el ciel, aiz estoient tuit li juste joste enfer en .i. leu assemblé, ou il atendoient que li Filz Dieu les en getast; et n'avoient iluec torment ne gloire.)

Av 36 paradisum Ade vel ascendit ad paradisum angeli ad quem nemo ascendit ante Christum ... fuerit cum eo in inferno

HS in Paradiso: Non intellige de terreno, unde expulsus est Adam, neque de angelico, quia ad illum ante Christum nemo ascendit, sed in requie quod est esse cum Jesu. Vel, hodie eris mecum, quod est esse in paradiso. Forte fuit anima ejus cum anima Christi in sinu Abrahae, et cum illa regressa. Et quia non tune penetravit latro coelos, etiam ex aliis multis locis Scripturarum, erraverunt quidam putantes esse multa loca bonorum praeter coelum, paradisum scilicet Adae, locaque in aere et terra, ubi beate vivent, nec tamen Deum videbunt

Hugh in Paradisoc] id est, in iocunditate et quiete. Non enim est putandum quod anima latronis translata fit in Paradisum Adae, vel ascenderit ad Paradisum angeli, ad quam nemo ascendit ante Christum

Bon eris in paradiso non celesti

10855 illa die fuit in limbo

8831 de quo autem paradyso dominus dixit dubitatur ad quo David quod paradyso locus dicitur voluptis ... esset in limbo sive alibi non caruit paradyso
John

2.1 ... une vilete de Galilee qui estoit apelee Chana.
(Chana vaut autant come envie, et Galilee vaut autant come transmigracion ou trespassement.)

Glossa Chana Galiaeae id est zelus transmigrationis

9958 Quod in Chana Galiaeae id est in zelo transmigrationis

11545 Chana interpretatur zelus. Galileea transmigratio

10619 Chana autem quae dicitur Judas Chananeus et zelotothes

10521 Chana interpretatur zelus. Galileea transmigratio

8939 Cana interpretatur zelus. Galilaea transmigratio.
Unde in Cana Galilee id est in zelo transmigrationis

1744 Cana enim interpretatur zelus Galilea notatur transmigratio

10328 Chana enim zelus ... et Galileea transmigratio

2.4 "Feme, qu'est entre moi et toi" (c'est a dire quel comunité a ton humanité a ma Deité, ce est a dire por quoi me requiers tu que ge face miracles? Ge n'ai mie de toi que ge face miracles, o'est ge n'ai mie de l'humanité que ge pris en toi que ge puisse ne doie fere miracles, mes de la Deité que ge i aportai).

HS vis fieri miraculum, sed ad hoc adendum, quid habeo tecum commune? quasi diceret: Ex natura tibi communo non
ago hoc, sed in hora passionis, quae nondum venit, ex communi natura mihi, et tibi patiar

Hugh ... commune id est quid habeo a te unde possim hoc miraculum facere? quasi dicitur ex te habeo unde pati, ut mori possum ... sed ex te non habeo unde possem miracula facere, et ideo in huiusmodi te non recognosco

2.6 ... selonc la purificacion des Juys (c'est a dire selonc ce que li Juys avoient en costume d'avoir emprés els eve por ce qu'il estoient curieus de laver els sovent).

9958 secundum purificationem id est quam autem inter alias phariseorum traditiones est hoc observabant ut crebro se lavarent

9981 purificationem. lavationem

9920 ut si in mundum retigisset posset se lavare

2.13 Et la Pasque des Juys estoit pres (c'est a dire devoit estre dedenz brief terme).

2.18 "Quiex signes nos demostres tu, qui fez ce que tu fez" (c'est a dire que tu en aies pocir de ce fere)?

Hugh id est quod signum ostendis, ut per illud demonstreres te habere potestam talia faciendi in domo Domini?
1744 Id est qua poteste hic facis et qui dedit tibi hanc potestatem

2.20 "Cist temples fu edefiez en .xlvi. anz, et tu le restabliras en trois jorz?" (Côme s’il deissent: "Ce ne peut estre que tu diz.")

Hugh verbum est desperantium, qui non credunt, quod vitam bonam ... qui duri sunt ad oredendum Dei misericordiam. quae excedit omnem culpam ... ponens verba desperationis dicit: [Ecce] impossibile est, et ideo multo impossibilius

2.23 Quant il fu en Jerusalem le jor de Pasques (c’est a dire le jor que li Juyf fesoient lor Pasque)

Hugh id est in Paschali tempore festivo vel in diebus Paschalibus festivis

4.5 ... joste l’alués (c’est a dire joste l’eritage)

Glossa In figura Christi: qui est legitimus heres patriarche; habens hereditatem in gentibus

10521 praedium qui est hereditas eterna data

4.17 "Tu as bien dit" (c’est tu as voir dit)

Glossa quia vere dixisti

4.19 "Sire, ge voi" (c’est j’apercoif)


4.36 "... et celui qui queult" (c'est a dire et celui qui moissonne).

Glossa Ut et qui seminat. Utroque opus erat; seminatore et messore

10521 messis ostendis fructum

10328 messiones spirituales et temporales

8829 Ouia in materiali messione messor qui mercenarius est ... in messione autem spirituli predicatores ... et fructum congregant in vitam eternam

4.47 ... il commenoit ja a morir (c'est a dire il estoit pres de morir).

4.50 "Va, ton fill vit" (c'est a dire ton fill est gariz).

10521 ut sanaret

8717 verbo in eo curatus est

1744 vivit id est restitutus est ad perfecte vite sanitate

8893,5 vivit id est perfecte sanitati restitutus est

7.22 "et vos ciroconcisiez home a vostre sabbat."
(Ciroconision estoit itele et fete en tel maniere a l'uitiesme jor que li enfes masles estoit nez; l'en li tranchoit le bout del membre genitaille, et li emposoit l'en son non. Aucun cuident et dient, que cele ciroconision estoit fete de coutel de pierre emprès ce
que David ot occis Goulie le jaiant de la pierre dom il le feri el front, por ce que li fers donna leu a la pierre; mes ce n'est mie autentiques.)

9958 ut hominem in octava die circumcideretis

8.3 ... li scribe (c'est a dire li sage de la loi)

10521 scribe autem erant scientes in legem

1744 scribe enim doctores legis

10328 cum ut ex illa capent eum faciet ergo iustum legi

8.6 Ice disoient il temptant le qu'il le peussent auser. Jhesus, enclinant soi en bas, escrivoit de son doii en terre. (Li phariseu le temptoient por iche que, se Jhesus respondist: "Lapidez la," il l'acussassent d'estre felon et sanz misericorde, s'il deist: "Lessiez la aler quite," qu'il deissent contre lui qu'il ensaignoit a fere contre la loi et contre ce qui estoit comandé.)

Hugh vel de immisericordia si iuberet lapidari, vel de iniustitia, et violatione legis si iuberet dimitti

8.9 (8.8) ... et derechief, il s'enolina et escrist en terre. (8.9) Quant il oirent ce, il issirent li uns emprés l'autre, comancant as vieillarz; et Jhesus remest seul, et la feme estant el milieu. (Mes quel chose escrivoit Jhesus? Aucuns des mestres et des sainz doctors de sainz doctres de sainte yglise, comme est sainz Ambroises et sainz Gregoires, dient que il escrivoit ice: "Terre, terre, angloutis oez homes qui sont malicioz." Li autre dient que il escrivoit: "La terre acuse la terre," c'est a dire li uns mauvés acuse l'autre.)
HS Quid scribèbat? Quidam dicunt id quod eis respondit. Hieronymus in quadam epistola ad Studiosum, videtur eum velle scripsisse: Terra, terra, scribe hos viros abdicatos; vel: terra terram accusat, in epistola ad Iraeneum


9920 quod scripsit non est fine . . . Jeronymus autem dicit quod scripsit hoc terra terra scribe hos viros abdicatos . . . Jeronyme xxii terra terra terra audi sermonem domini scribe

8717 quod scripsit terra terra terra absorbe hos viros abdicatos . . . quidant diount quod scripsit terra terram accusat

10328 Alii dicunt quod scribèbat hic terra terra devora eos vel que nihil scribèbat hic

8.26 "...ge parole el monde ce que ge ai oi de lui" (c'est à dire ce que il m'a dit et mandé).

8.28(1) "Quant vos essauceroiz le fill d'ome" (c'est à dire quant vos leveroiz le fill d'ome en haut en la croiz)

9958 cum exaltaveritis me in oruce

Hugh in oruce
8.28(2) "lors conoistroiz vos que ce sui ge" (c'est a
dire lors verroiz vos signes verais par quoi vos porroiz
conoistre que ge sui Filz Deu)

9958 tunc cognoscetis videbat enim

Hugh id est cognosciibiliora quomodo signa percipietis
Quia ego sum] supple filius Dei

8.31 "Se vos demorez en ma parole" (c'est a dire se vos
fetes mes comandemenz perseveranment et sanz entrelessier
et sanz defailir)

8.37 "... vos me voleiz oicrirre por ce que ma parole ne
prent mie en vos" (c'est a dire por ce que ma parole ne
s'acorde mie a vostre volenté et que ge di oe qui vos
desplest).

9958 sermo meo non caput in vobis id est non habet locum
in cordibus vestris id est non capitur a corde vestro

8.38 "... vos fetes ce que vos avez veu de vostre
pere." (Jhesus apele ici endroit le deable pere des Juys
por lor mauveses huevres qu'il fesoien[t].)

Glossa De diabolo dicebat cuius filii sunt id est non
natura sed imitatione

9958 scilicet diabolum cuius filius in quantum mali in
quantum eum unitatem non ab eo creati quas hunc patrem
videbant opera quas faciebant qui ad imitatores diaboli facti erant cum filium diaboli

**Hugh** diabolum, cuius filii estis imitatione, et quod eius suggestione in mentem conceptis et revoluistis

10521 Item patrem vocat hic diabolum a quo accipiunt ut mala operentur

1744 quia vos facitis quem indutis dyabolo surgunte apud patrem vestrum scilicet ipsum dyabolum cuius filii estis non natura sed imitatione

10328 vel aliter que viditis apud patrem vestrum, facite id est apud patrem Habraham vel que viditis ex patre vestro facite ... demonium ut habeo unde ipse exoluent eis duos patres ... vos habetis patrem deum vel Habraham vel dyabolum

8.40(1) "... Ore querez vos moi oicirre" (c'est a dire vos querez achoison dont vos me puissiez tretier a mort)

8.40(2) "... Ore querez vos moi oicirre ... Abraham ne fist pas ice" (c'est a dire Abraham ne fu pas homicide, ne de volenté ne de fet).

10521 unde autem Abraham non erat homicida vos autem homicide

9.43 "... Por quoi donques ne conoissiez vos ma parole" (c'est a dire por quoi donques ne fetes vos ce que ge vos comant)?
8.44(1) "... quant il dit menoonge, il parole propre"
(c'est à dire de lui et non mie d'autre)

8.44(2) "quar il est menongiers et peres de menoonge."
(Li deables est apelez peres de menoonge por ce qu'il
controva la premiere menoonge quant il dist a Adam et a
Eve: "Vos ne morroiz mie de mort, ainz seroiz come Dex et
conoistroiz bien et mal;" et les decut en tel maniere.)

Hugh Chrysostomos ... parturivit mendaciurn primus ...
Augustinus Diabolus mendax est et pater mendacii ...
mandacii, quia ipse ipse primo adinuerit illud

1744 id est pater dyaboli est

8829 ipsiu mendaciis pater erit quia omnis homo mendax
sed primum peocati dyabolus solus est pater quia ipse
primus peocavit

8.46 "Se ge vos di vérité, por quoi ne me creez vos?"
(C'est a dire ge vos di vérité, et por ce me deussiez vos
croire.)

8.47(1) "Cil qui est de Deu" (c'est a dire cil qui est
de la partie Deu)

8.47(2) "ot la parole Deu" (c'est a dire ot volontiers
la parole Deu et l'aemplist par huevre).

8.48(1) "Dont ne disons nos bien" (c'est a dire dont
n'est verité ce que nos disons)

Hugh id est vere, et iuste
8.48(2) "que tu es Samarien" (ce est a dire que tu es de Samarie)

8.52 "Or savons nos que tu as le deable el cors. Abraham est morz et li prophete, et tu diz: 'Qui gardera ma parole ne morra mie pardurablement.'" (C'est a dire coment oses tu ce dire, quant tuit pueent vooir que tu ne diz mie verité?)

1744 non gustabit mortem in aeternum apertum mendacium esse

8.56 "Abraham vostre peres ot grant joie de vooir mon jor" (c'est a dire de conoistre et d'apercevoir le tens de mon descendement et de mon incarnacion, por ce qu'il savoit par la consolacion del saint Esperit que ge le rachateroie et giteroie d'enfer)

9958 id est tempus meae incarnacionis vel aeternitatem meae divinitatis

9920 hoc potest legi de die temporis in incarnationis ... vel de die eternitatis id est eterna generatione

1744 Abraham vidit diem Christi ... diem incarnationis

8.58 "Ge vos di veraiement veraiement que ge fui devant ce que Abraham fust fet" (C'est a dire devant ce que Abraham fust nez).
8829 antequem fieret Abraham in tempore ego sum ...
Abraham enim natus est antequem Christi in tempore

10.6 ... et il ne conurent mie ce qu'il lor disoit
(c'est a dire il ne l'entendirent mie por quoi il le
disoit).

10.11 "Li buens pasteurs met et done s'ame" (c'est sa
vie)

Glossa vitam

9958 corpore et sanguine suo

11545 hoc est vitam suam

1744 vitam corporalem

10.12 "...li mercennerres" (c'est a dire li sers [qui
sert] por loier)

11545 Mercenarius est ille qui llorum terrenum exercet

10.22 Encenies furent fetes en Jerusalem; et il estoit
yver. (Encenies vaut autant come renovelement de festes
de temple, c'est a dire dediement.)

Glossa Cenum id est novum inde encenia id est initiare.
Encenia festa dedicationis templi

9958 hoc dedicatio que tempore hiems celebratur
immemoriam erat illius dedicationis ... prima dedicatio a
Salomone factate
HS Encaenia dicuntur, quasi enohaenea, a neos, quod est novum et sonat innovationes ... quod latinus dicit dedicationem ... hie autem Encaenia vocantur, festum dedicationis templi

Hugh id est festa dedicationis templi ... Dicit autem Augustinus Encaenia dicuntur quasi encaenia a neos quod est novum, et sont\textsuperscript{10} innovationes

9920 ecce dedicatur in celebrem et divinum usum innovatur. legitur autem triplex templi dedicatione
Salomon edificato templo. dedicavit

10521 a cenum que est novum ... id est innovaro quia innovata fuit dedicatio templi ... festum dedicationis templi

8717 cenum novum unde encenia id est festa innovationis id est consecrationis seu dedicationis templi

1744 encennia dedicationis festivitas dicebatur ... unde encennia ordinarium id est quod innovationes sive nova festa ut sonat dedicationis et consecrationes ... id est festa et memorius dedicationis seu consecrationis templi

10917 dedicationis

8829 unde encenia vocabant festum dedicationis templi

8893.5 id est festum dedicationis templi encenia

10.27

"Mes oeilles oent ma voiz" (C'est a dire oil qui sont mien et qui m'aime font [mon] comandement)
Oves meum (sic) sunt homines qui per me reguntur et pascuntur per doctrinam meam ... audiunt et obedient verbis meis

Vocem meum audiunt credendo corde et obediendo opere et ego cognosco eas

"Ge et li Peres somes une chose." (C'est voir en Deité et non mie en personnes, quar li Peres est une chose en personne, et li Filz une autre, et li sainz Esperiz une autre; mes cez .iii. sont une chose en substance et en Deité, et sont les .iii. .i. Deu et non mie .iii.Dex.)

Una substantia, una divinitas perfecta equalitas

Hugh et patre unum sumus secundus virtutem, id est pares in virtute. De virtute enim erat sermo universus, si vero virtus eodem manifestum est quoniam et substantia

Unum in substantia ... unum suum que duas unas in patre et filio astruit cum unum una naturam significatur sicut sumus duas personas

Est unum cum domino ... et hoc modo filius potest esse unum cum domino

Si cum pater et filius essent una persona dixisset

Lors queroient il a lui prendre (c'est a dire il queroient achoison qu'il l'osassent prendre)
14.1 "Creez en Deu, et creez en moi" (c'est à dire creez en Deu le Pere, et creez en moi qui sui Deu le Fill; ou en tel maniére, se vos creez en Deu le Pere, il covient ensement que vos creez en Deu le Fill).

Glossa Quia si creditis in de si est consequetur ut et in me quia ego deus sum

et in me credite consequens est enim ut si in deum creditis et in me credere debeatis

que filius domini sum

Hugh quasi, si creditis in Deum consequitur, ut in me, quia ego sum Deus

14.2 "Moltes mensions sont en la meson mon Pere" (ce est a dire el ciel)

Glossa Domus dei; templum dei; regnum dei. Regnum celorum

quia mansiones in celo sunt

in domo patris mei id est celo

hec domus regnum celeste sive vita eterna est

mansione celum

in domo patris celestis sicut diverse mansiones

domus patris vicatur gloria celestis

14.6 "...nus vient au Pere" (c'est a Deu le Pere)
14.9 "Phelippes, cil qui me voit voit le Pere" (c’est a dire ge sui semblables au Pere. L’en dit vulgaiement de .ii. homes qui sont semblables li uns a l’autre quant l’en les veult aconcarer devant aucun: "Se tu as veu celui, donques as tu veu cestui," non mie por ce que les .ii. homes soient .i. home seulement, mes por ce que li uns est tiex come li autres. Et por ce dit Jhesus: "Qui me voit voit le Peres," c’est a dire par mon semblant puet il savoir le semblant del Pere, quar ja soit ce que ge ne soie mie autre chose que li Peres quant a la substance de nostre Deité, nequedent ge sui autre chose que il n’est en personne et en humanité. Donques dist Jhesus a Phelippe; "Phelippes, qui me voit voit le Pere)  

9958 non cognovistis me esse in patre et patrem in me. Philippe qui videt me intelligit utique et patrem intelligit eo qui a patris similitudine in illo  

Hugh Non, quia alius sit pater, et alius filius sed quia omnino similis, et id de duobus similibus dicitur. Si istum vidistis, et illum vidistis ...Eccle. 24. a. Ego ex ore altissimi prodii, id est simillimus ei. Et cum omnino sim similis ... id est in eadem substantia  

14.10 "... les huevres que ge faz qui viennent del Pere" (o’est de la volenté et de la cooperation del Pere).  

8893,5 facit opera filius cuius et pater sunt unum in virtute cooperativa ex qua fiebant opera  

14.11 "Ne creez vos mie que ge sui et maing el Pere, et li Peres en moi? Se autrement est" (o’est a dire se vos ne le creez)
14.12 "... fera les huevres que ge faz" (c'est a dire fera les miracles et les signes tiex come ge les faz)

9958 opera ... maiora operatur ... in me faciet primus ego facio

10328 quia fecerat ... de miraculos sis operibus consolatur eos

8893,5 faciebat miracula

14.18 "Ge ne vos deguerpirai mie ne lerai come orfelins" (c'est a dire ge ne vos lerai mie esgarez)

14.23 "Se aucuns m'aime, il gardera ma parole" (c'est a dire quiconques m'amera veraiement gardera et tendra mon comandement)

11545 verum hoc dei dileccio ... mandationis eius quem diligenter exerceri

14.24 "Cil qui ne m'aime ne garde mie mes comandemenz" (c'est a dire a ce put l'en veraiement conoistre et savoir de celui qui ne m'aime mie, qu'il ne garde mie mes comandemenz)

14.27 "Vostre ouers ne soit mie troublé et n'ait mie poor." (Notez que Jhesus ne dit mie ci endroit voz cuers, mez vostre cuer. N'avoient donques tuit li .xi. apostre fors que un cuer? Voirs est qu'il n'avoient que une volenté tuit ensemble, fors que Judas qui s'estoit departiz d'els si come nos avons ja dit. Donques lor dist il: "Vostre ouers ne soit mie troubelez," c'est a dire vostre volenté ne soit mie muee.)
14.30 "... li princes de cest monde est venuz, mes il n'a mie aucune chose en moi." (Il apele ici elueques le deable prince de cest monde por le grant pooir qu'il a seur cels qui habitent en cest monde.)

9958 hic princeps mundi huius diabolus que est princeps peccatorum non creat autem eiusdem amatorum mundi

11545 venit diabolus ad crucem

8717 id est diabolus princeps mundanorum

8829 dyabolus

8893, 5 venit princeps mundi huius id est dyabolus qui est princeps ... per secundum tempora venit ad Christum ipsum temptando in deserto et princeps Iudeorum contra ipsum

15.26 "Quant li sainz Esperiz vendra que ge vos envoierai del Pere, li esperiz de verite qui ist del Pere, il portera tesmoing de moi. "Cone li sainz Esperiz isse del Pere et del Fill, por quoi dit oi elueques Jhesus: "Li esperiz de verite qui ist del Pere," et ne dit mie: "et de moi?" Mes por ce ne le dit il mie, que il senblast s'il l'eust dit que ce fust vantanoe; et por ce croient malement et sont heretiques cil qui croient et afferment que li sainz Esperiz ist seulement del Pere et non mie del Fill. Donques dit Jhesus a ses deciples: "Li esperiz de verite qui ist del Pere, ioil me portera tesmoing.

16.23 "Ge vos di veraiement veraiement, se vos avroiz aucune chose requis en mon non, il le vos dorra" (c'est a dire se vos requerroiz aucune chose el non de Jhesucrist, c'est a dire el non del sauveor, c'est el non de
sauvement et qui appartiegn a verai sauvement, il le vos dorra. Mes por quoi donques ne fu oiz sainz Pols li apostres, qui estoit si parfez si come sainte yglise croit qu'il labora et travailla, si come il meemes le dit, plus que tuit li autre apostre, et nequedent il ne fu mie oiz de ce qu'il requist que la temptacion qu'il avoit li fust ostee? Por ce ne fu il mie oiz, qu'il ne requeroit mie el non de Jhesu, c'est a dire qu'il ne requeroit mie el non del verai sauvement, ne chose qui apartenist a son salu, quar se la temptacion li eust esté ostee, il n'eust mie aquise corone de conbatre contre la temptacion; et por ce ne li fu ele mie ostee, aizn li respondi Nostre Sires: "Pols, ma grace te soffist," c'est a dire tu avras si habondamment ma grace que la temptacion ne te vaintra mie, aizn la veintras tu et en seras coronez. Lors dist Jhesus verité quant il dist: "Ge vos di veraientment veraientment, que se vos requerez le Pere d'aucune chose en mon non, il la fera).

9958 Si petieritis patrem aliquid in nomine meo id est in nomine salvatoris qui ad salutis rationem pertineat dabit vobis ... sic a Paulo non est remotus angélus satanæ ... unde dictum est ipsi Paulo virtus in infirmitate perficitur

18.9 (18.4) Jhesus, sachanz tot ce qui estoit a venir sor lui, ala contre els ... (18.6) Quant il lor dist: "Ce sui ge," il alerent arriere et chairent en terre...
(18.9) Et que la parole que Jhesus dist fust aemplie: "Que ge n'ai mie perdu aucun de cels que tu m'as donez." (Et por quoi lor ala Jhesus a l'encoentre offrir soi quant il estoient venu a lui prendre, et por quoi fist il par sa vertu qu'il chairent arriere quant il lor dist: "Ce sui ge?" Il semble que Judas soit escusasle et qu'il livra soi meismes. Mes voirs est qu'il livra soi meismes, mes ce fu por l'amor et por la charité qu'il avoit au monde que il voloit rachater de son precieus sanc; et
Judas le livra par son avarice et par sa covoitise. Et por ce lor a Jhesus a l'encontre disant: "Ge sui Jhesus de Nazareth," por mostrer qu'il soufferoit volentiers, que ce n'estoit mie contre sa volente; et por ce fist il par vertu de sa Deité, que quant il lor dist: "Ge sui Jhesus de Nazareth," qu'il chairent arriere, que l'en peust apercevoir qu'il avoient nul pooir contre lui lors que sa volenté.)

19.2 ... et l'aironèrent (c'est a dire l'encolostrent)

19.5 (19.4) Pylates issi fors del pretoire derechef et lor dist: "Vez ci que ge le vos amaine fors, que vos sachiez que ge truiz en lui nule cause." (19.5) Lors issi Jhesus portant la corone d'Espines et le mantel de porpre; et Pylates lor dist: "Vez ci l'ome" (c'est a dire puisque il n'a en lui cause de mort ge ne le vueill mie condampner ne tretier a mort a tort et sanz reson).

19.10 (19.9) ... et dist a Jhesum: "Dont es tu?" Et Jhesus ne li respondi mie aucune parole. (19.9) Lors [li] dist Pylates: "Ne paroles tu mie a moi" (c'est a dire por quoi ne responz tu)?

19.12(1) "Se tu lesses cestui aler, tu n'es mie amis de l'empereur César" (c'est a dire a ce porra Cesar apercevoir que tu n'es mie son ami, se tu lesses aler son anemi quite sanz condampnement de mort qui a mort desservie)
19.12(2) "tout oï qui diennent qu'il sont roi contrediuent a l'empereur Cesar" (c'est a dire sont contrere a lui et diennent contre sa volanté).

19.13 ... en cel leu qui est apelez Lithostracoos;
(Lithostracoos vaut autant en francois come diverseté de [pavement, ou come leu qui est pavé de divers] pavement;)

9981 Lithostotos composito lapidum sit autem parvulio crustellis et tessellis tinctus in varios colores

HS quod sonat varietatem pavimenti

Hugh Graece, id est iudicium vel iudiciale. Hebraice autem gabatha] id est collis sive sublimatis. Tamen secundum Esaim, ut dicunt, sonat varietatem pavimenti, vel varium pavimentum, non que talis sit interpretatio, sed que a talis erat locus in quo fiebant iudicia

8717 Lithostratos Grece Grece Hebrayce galbata
Lithostratos id est Grece quod Latine varietas pavimenti

8893, 5 in loco qui dicitur Lithostratos id est lapidum ... lapis est stratus quia est pavimentum sive strata et nomen Grecum Hebrayce autem gabata

19.14 Il estoit lors la Parasoeve de la Pasque (c'est a dire il estoit le tierz jor devant Pasques que li Juyf apareilloient ce que besoing lor estoit au jor de Pasque, por ce qu'il lor loisit fere nule chose au jor de la feste de Pasques; et il creoient lors, que s'il feissent aucune chose ou seulement lor viande qu'il devoient cel jor mengier, qu'il brisassent lor loi et qu'il feissent grant offense. Et por ce crucifierent il lors Nostre Seignor Jhesucrist el tens de lor Pasque, que la leur Pasque estoit seulement ombre et senefiance de la nostre
Pasque, [et que la leur Pasque] cessast et eust fin des iluec en avant, et la nostre Pasque fust tenue et celebre. Il estoit lors le jor de la Parasceve de Pasques, c'est a dire il estoit le tierz jor que l'en apareilloit ce que mestier estoit au jor de Pasques; Parasceve est ebreu, et vaut autant en francois comme devant appareillement ou comme preparacion. Il estoit lors Parasceve de Pasques)

Glossa Augustinus parasceve quod interpretatur preparatio; est sexta feria qua preparabat necessaria sabbato

9958 parasceva id est preparatio hoc nomen dicebatur .vi. sabbati inquam preparabat necessaria sabbato ut de manna dictum est

HS Graecis admisti Judaei, crebro utebantur Graecis vocabulis. Parasceve enim Graece, praeparatio Latine, sic dicebant feriam sextam, quia in ea parabant necessaria sabbato, sicut et in deserto duplo colligebant manna

9920 parasceva id est preparationis pasoe id est immolationis agni

Hugh Parasceve nomen Graece, preparatio Latine, vel parasceve, parans cenam. Sic dicebant feriam sextam, qua in ea preparabant necessaria sabbato, sicut in deserto duplum precepit colligere manna

8717 parasceva id est quod preparatio quia sexta feria preparatur

8893, 5 parasceve id est preparatio quia illa dicit preparabat Iudei cibaria prolicitant sabbati in quo non erat licitum aliquid de coqui
19.15 Li evesques respondirent: "Nos n'avons roi lors que l'empereur Cesar." (Cil qui estoient vesques lors et qui distrent: "Nos n'avons roi lors que Cesar," furent Cayphas et Annas. Et cd le estoient plus volenteis et plus angoisseus que Jhesus fust ocis que tuit li autre Juyf, por ce que il ne perdissent lor digneté; et puert l'en entendre par les paroles que Cayphas dist quant il oussillirent grant concile contre Jhesum a porpenser entr'els et a establir coment il le porroient tretier a mort, quar Cayphas dist: "Il covient que uns hom muire por le pueple," c'est a entendre il est miez que nos ocions cest home, que li Romain viegnent et nos toillent noster leu et noster gent. Et por ce estoient icii dui plus angoisseux que Jhesus fust ocis que li autre Juyf n'estoient, que par les miracles que Jhesus fesoit ne venist en avant autre secte que la leur et qu'il ne fussent gité lors de la digneté de lor office.)

19.22 "Ge ai escrit ce que ge ai escrit" (ou autrement: "Ce que ge ai escrit est ja escrit," c'est a dire ce que ge ai escrit sera estable et sera tenu sanz remuer).

9981 Quod scripsi soripsi idem firmum et immutabile erit quod scripsi

HS id est immobile scripsi

Hugh non mutabo, vel immutabiliter scripsi

19.24 "... mes sortissons qui ele sera" (c'est a dire gitons sort qui l'avra tote)

8893,5 solam tunicam miserunt sortem
19.26 "Feme, voiz ci ton fill" (c'est à dire soies des ici en avant o lui come o ton fill).

19.27(1) "Voiz ci ta mere" (c'est a dire garde la et hennreuse come ta mere)

8829 honorem

19.27(2) (19.26) Quant Jhesus vit sa mere et celui deciple qu'il amoit estant ... (19.27) ... et des ioele heure la recut il en sa garde. (Sainz Johans test ici son non et neis en toz les leux en l'Evangile ou il fet mencion de soi, come fet saint Matheu et come fet Moyses en la loi. Mes por quoi dist Jhesus a sa mere ici endroit de saint Johan: "Feme, voiz ci ton fill," et non pas: "Mere, voiz ci ton fill?" Por ce par aventure, que se li felon Juyf seussent qu'ele fust mere Jhesucrist et l'entendisset a sa parole quant il la nomast mere, qu'il ne la ledenjassent en despit de lui.)

Hugh honorât ipsum Ioannem quia dilecto, dilectam

19.30 "Il est aempli" (c'est a dire tot ce est aempli entierement que li prophete avoient dit de moi).

Glossa quod prophetia praedixerat

9958 impletum est quicquid prophetia predixerat et nihil remanet que ante quam moriar

Hugh quod prophetia praedixerat in Psal. 68 ... testamentum quia sicut dicitur Heb. 9.e. Testamentum in mortuis confirmatum est13
10521 consummatio hic est nostre redemptionis ... consummatum omnia quae scripta sunt de filio hominis

8717 consummatum est quod propheta dixerat de me in psalmos

8829 impletus omnia quae scripta sunt in lege Moysi et prophetis et psalmis de me

20.2 Lors vint ele corant a Pierres et a cel autre deciple que Jhesus amoit et lor dist: "Il ont osté mon seignor, et ge ne sai ou il l'ont mis." (Ici puet l'en fere une demande, por quoi sainz Johans qui fist oeste Evangile dit en plusors leux de soi meismes: "Ioelui deciples que Jhesus amoit?" Il semble por ce qu'il dit en tel maniere, que Jhesus n'ama mie les autres deciples; mes einsi n'est il pas, quar il les ama touz. L'en croit nequedent que Jhesus l'ama plus que aucun des autres. Et nequedent, aucun croient que sainz Peres l'ama plus ardamment que aucuns des autres; ice nequedent est fort, et douteus a diffinir.)

Hugh Gregorius Illi prae ceteris ocurrerunt qui prae ceteris amaverunt, videlicet Petrus et Ioannes
Appendix 1: Footnotes

1. Recte ‘doctore utriusque juris’?
2. ‘Corum’ is a problem here. There are three things it could be: (1) it could be meant as the accusative of ‘cor’, being in fact ‘cor’ plus the standard accusative ending ‘um’, (2) it could be meant as the accusative of ‘corpus’, perhaps less likely than (1) as there is no trace of a ‘p’, or (3) it could be meant for ‘porcorum’ (from 8.31), the ‘por’ having been reduced to an abbreviation at some stage in the text’s transmission and eventually missed out.
3. Recte ‘illibata’?
4. Recte ‘unguenta’?
5. John 11.11.
6. Recte ‘virtute’?
7. Recte ‘consortio’?
9. Recte ‘ludibrium’?
10. Recte ‘sonat’?
11. Ecclesiastes 24.5.
12. For the adjective ‘cooperativus’, see Latham (1965: 114).
Appendix II: Tables

These tables are designed to give an overview of the results for each gloss in each Gospel. The tables give the results only for the commentaries checked, but where material is found in Brito which is comparable to that in a BXIII gloss, this is marked by 'B' in the final column. The tables do not reflect cases where both Brito and a commentary may have been used, or where a commentary, or Brito, is the more likely source of the BXIII gloss, for which, see the detailed discussion of Brito on pp. 419-61 above. Maurice of Sully and Peter the Chanter have been omitted from the tables as the nature of the material in them does not, for the most part, permit one-to-one comparisons to be made with the BXIII Gospel glosses.

What these tables show, then, is as follows:

(1) Those commentaries which seem most likely to have been the source for the gloss, as discussed in detail in the preceding chapters. These commentaries are marked by '1'.

(2) Those glosses which would seem to have had more than one source, are marked as follows:

'1' shows one source or group of sources used.

'2' shows the second source or group of sources used.

For example, the glossator seems to have used two sources for the gloss on Matthew 5.21(2), RB 11654 (marked as
'1') plus either the Glossa or Hugh (both marked as '2').

(3) Commentaries with a gloss which has been compared to the BXIII gloss in the detailed discussion, but which would not seem to have been its source are marked as 'o'.

The commentaries are listed along the top in chronological order, as in Appendix I, for which see above p. 574-666, except for Brito, given in the final column.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>s.xii</th>
<th>s.xiii</th>
<th>s.xiv</th>
<th>s.xv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.21(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.21(2)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Matthew

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>s.xii</th>
<th>s.xiii</th>
<th>s.xiv</th>
<th>s.xv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9577</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>Glossa Av 36</td>
<td>2604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.4(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.4(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.14(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.14(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.7(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>s.xii</th>
<th>s.xiii</th>
<th>s.xiv</th>
<th>s.xv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.7(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.24(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.24(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.24(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.xii</td>
<td>s.xiii</td>
<td>s.xiv</td>
<td>s.xv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matthew
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>s.xii</th>
<th>s.xiii</th>
<th>s.xiv</th>
<th>s.xv</th>
<th>Glossa Av 36</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>9979</th>
<th>10891</th>
<th>Hugh</th>
<th>8830</th>
<th>9471</th>
<th>9438</th>
<th>Brito</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.43(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.43(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20.38
20.42 o 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
20.46 o o 1 1 B
20.47 1 1 B
22.7 o 1
22.22 1 1 1 1
22.43 1
22.48
22.49(1)
22.49(2) 1
22.59 1 1
23.16 1 1
23.35 o o o 1 0
23.41
23.43 o 1 0 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>s.xii</th>
<th>s.xiii</th>
<th>s.xiv</th>
<th>s.xv</th>
<th>Br.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glossa</td>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>10545</td>
<td>10619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>8.28(1)</td>
<td>8.28(2)</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>s.xii</td>
<td>S.xiii</td>
<td>s.xiv</td>
<td>s.xv</td>
<td>Brito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glossa 9958 9981 11545 HS Hugh 9920 10619 10521 8717 8939 1744 10917 10328 8829 8893.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>o 1 1 1</td>
<td>o 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>o 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.27(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.27(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>o 1 1 1</td>
<td>o 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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